

Submission  
No 650

**INQUIRY INTO PROPOSED ENERGY FROM WASTE  
FACILITIES**

**Name:** Name suppressed

**Date Received:** 23 October 2025

---

Partially  
Confidential

## **Submission to the Parliamentary Inquiry into Proposed Energy from Waste Facilities in Regional NSW**

**Name:**

**Date:** 23 November 2025

I am a resident of Parkes and have lived in Regional NSW for most of my life. My parents are farmers, and I have grown up with a deep appreciation for the importance of clean soil, air, and water to both our local agriculture and our wider food supply. I am writing to formally object to the proposed Parkes Energy from Waste incinerator. In this submission I am addressing multiple Terms of Reference, including (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (i) and (j). At this time, I do not wish to provide evidence at a hearing.

I am concerned about the health impacts associated with emissions from these facilities. International research shows that fine particulate matter (PM2.5), heavy metals, dioxins and furans can accumulate in soil, water and the human body, and even low exposure levels may increase the risk of respiratory illness, developmental issues in children, and certain cancers. Many households in Parkes and surrounding farming areas rely on rainwater catching systems. Airborne pollutants that settle on roofs and in tanks pose additional risk to residents who may not have access to town water. I believe these concerns are relevant to Terms of Reference (b), (c) and (d).

As the child of farmers, I am worried about the potential impacts on agriculture locally and across the region (Term e). Our community supplies clean produce, livestock and grain, and even the perception of contamination can cause reputational damage. Buyers and markets may be hesitant to purchase goods from areas near thermal waste incinerators. These risks could affect farm income, property investment, and the long-term viability of agricultural businesses that our region depends on.

I am also worried about the placement of this facility within the Parkes Special Activation Precinct (Term f). This area was intended to attract innovation, sustainable industry and stable local jobs. Large-scale waste incineration has the potential to deter future investment, reduce population growth and undermine the original vision of a clean, modern regional hub. Transporting Sydney's red-bin waste over long distances is not consistent with circular economy principles, nor is burning recyclable and reusable resources. This links directly to Term (i), which calls for consideration of alternative solutions, including waste reduction, expanded recycling infrastructure and emerging cold technologies.

The Regulation that prohibits thermal Energy from Waste in most of NSW but exempts several regional areas is not equitable (Term j). Regional residents deserve the same health protections as those living in metropolitan areas. The exemptions appear to

unfairly burden communities with less political power and fewer medical resources. I am also concerned about the adequacy of consultation. Many residents only became aware of the proposal late in the process, which has led to confusion, stress, and declining community trust. The ongoing uncertainty about future contamination has already had an impact on wellbeing and mental health in the community.

Additionally, large Energy from Waste facilities require long-term feedstock contracts, often locking councils into producing minimum quantities of waste. This disincentivises waste avoidance, reuse and recycling, and contradicts NSW Government messaging around sustainability. Overseas trends show many countries moving away from thermal incineration due to environmental and public health concerns. Australia should learn from their experiences, not ignore them.

Based on these concerns, I respectfully request that the Committee recommend rejecting the proposed Parkes Energy from Waste incinerator. Our region deserves industries that are safe, sustainable and supportive of local agriculture, not developments that risk contamination, discourage investment and damage community wellbeing. If the project proceeds despite strong community opposition, I request that the proponent be required to provide 24/7 independent emissions monitoring publicly accessible online, create a compensation trust to address future environmental and health impacts, fund baseline water, soil and air testing by an independent body, supply town water to residents reliant on tank systems, and fund mental health support services for the affected community.

In closing, I strongly oppose the proposed Parkes Energy from Waste facility. The health, agricultural and economic risks are too high, and alternative waste solutions exist that do not place this burden on regional families, farmers and children. Thank you for considering my submission.

Sincerely,