

Submission  
No 637

**INQUIRY INTO PROPOSED ENERGY FROM WASTE  
FACILITIES**

**Name:** Name suppressed

**Date Received:** 23 October 2025

---

Partially  
Confidential

## **Parkes Waste Incinerator concerns**

We have a family history in Parkes that goes back to the early gold days. Back then no one knew what effects gold mining and processing of the gold had on the environment, later it turned out that water wells were contaminated and had to be closed. We also used chemicals such as 24d and much later we found that these, despite being effective at the time, have caused us problems in the future.

So why should one not wonder what effects this new waste incinerators will have on us in the future.

These are some of my concerns regarding the ongoing/proposed waste incinerator at Parkes NSW. One must consider with man's history of polluting one's environment as per above examples or is this proposal mainly based on the economic removal of rubbish created in the Sydney basin and not actually looking at the long-term sustainable health of the people of Parkes, surrounding towns and agricultural areas.

What type of waste is being sent from Sydney, has Sydney no defined recycling policy or so how toxic is the waste that is going to be burnt at Parkes. Is it also correct that Sydney water will be transporting their waste to the region as well.

What control measures are in place to ensure that this type of waste will not impact on our underground water tables. Again, if there are no concerns, would it not be cheaper to use waste facilities closer to Sydney to reduce transport costs and keep most Sydney voters happy.

Overseas countries have found that recycling has declined and more rubbish is being incinerated. What control measured being put in place to govern what type of rubbish is going to be incinerated at proposed Parkes Incinerator and will the existing proposed level be maintained or will just increase with the growth of waste from Sydney. The later being the obvious and most correct answer.

What is the Greater Sydney Councils doing about controlling the types of waste that can be recycled in their own back yards, or are these, country-based incinerators the cheaper alternative than implementing recycling in the Sydney basin. Again, the answer is to go where there is less voter backlash – the bush. And/or is it cheaper to fund the Parkes Shire to take the waste?

An unknown assumption at this stage.

With the continued growth of Sydney, waste to Parkes can only increase. With the residual waste that is not being burnt by the incinerator, how is this going to be disposed of and where will this be stored. A concern for future generations, or has this been resolved?

If there are no concerns over toxic waste and fallout why is the project not being built closer to Sydney, this would reduce the building and cartage costs to the incinerator. If there are concerns, would these concerns be any different to the people of Parkes compared to the people of Sydney, or again it is the politics of the greater population being played against the less population of the country.

In comparison to overseas builds of new incinerators, how does the efficiency and the pollution emissions compare to these. As it appears the major objective is to remove rubbish from the

Sydney Basin and no great effort being placed into the generation of electricity which is only for the benefit of the Parkes Special Activation Precinct, no defined benefit to the Parkes community.

What long term guarantee is the government and the EPA going to give that any waste fallout will not contaminate the surrounding farmlands, noting that there has been some concern that the smoke/exhaust plume from the incinerator may extend to some 250 kms around the proposed site. This would mean that there would have to be some impact on the farming land and impact upon and organic cropping and animal health. All of which may be found out when it is too late.

The impact on farm water storages and houses that have tank water will obviously be impacted as there again is no firm guarantee from the EPA that residual levels will be nil or minimal.

Also, there are schools in the area that must have the same issues that were raised by the people of Sydney. Again, the number of votes leaves Parkes with very little support.

One of the speakers at Parkes was a doctor who stated that she would not move to Parkes because of her concerns about the long-term health risks associated with this type of incinerator.

Is it not time that the governments of today started looking at solutions to their problems. Problems that they have created and have lacked the ability to control by making hard decisions by governments, rather going for votes to stay in power. Government should seek solutions to our problems rather than getting over involved in achieving targets for lower greenhouse gases and zero emissions. Both of which have tended to be hidden by State and local governments by hiding under the Federal jurisdictions.

More effort must be made to control the types of materials being used and produced for everyday life that continue to add to the growth of waste.

Government should have been looking at facilities that can be built to recycle the waste that the greater populated areas create. These facilities should be built clean enough to be built in the areas of waste creation.

Instead, the people in the country areas are now expected to cover for the failing of the governments of the more populated areas. Yet there is little being placed before the people of Parkes on how the people of Sydney are going to try and stem the continued growth of rubbish and effluent from their city.

Trusting all levels Government, (including our own Parkes Shire Council) will start being accountable to the people and implement some action to counter the continued rubbish growth from the Sydney region.

I feel that it is a bit late to win this battle, as this incinerator project has obviously been in creation for some time and work has been not halted on this project pending any government enquiry. Maybe some more due diligence on behalf of the Parkes shire Council would have brought these concerns to the people of Parkes earlier.

This may also create more thoughts on how our council operates and the need for more of us everyday people to become more involved in knowing the operations of the administration of our shire.