

Submission
No 845

**INQUIRY INTO PROPOSED ENERGY FROM WASTE
FACILITIES**

Name: Name suppressed

Date Received: 23 October 2025

Partially
Confidential

Submission: Opposition to the Proposed Waste-to-Energy Incinerator in Parkes

I'm a 26-year-old Parkes resident. I own a home here with my partner and our newborn child, and I've worked in IT for the past eight years. You might wonder why that matters — it's because I work with complex IT and operational systems every day, and I know one thing for sure: no system is perfect. Every system, no matter how advanced, will fail or glitch at some point.

The proposed waste-to-energy incinerator is being promoted as a safe and reliable form of power generation. From my experience, that claim isn't realistic. The systems that control combustion, filtration, and emissions are just as prone to faults as any other. When they fail, the consequences could be serious for both health and the environment.

Another major concern is what happens to the 30 % of waste that remains as toxic ash. Where will it go and how will it be stored or transported safely? How will filters and other parts of the plant be cleaned or replaced without putting "safe levels" at risk? These are critical questions that have not been clearly answered.

Beyond the technical issues, this project also risks damaging Parkes socially and economically. An incinerator on the outskirts of town will reduce property values and harm Parkes' image as a clean, family-friendly regional centre. Many locals feel this project has been pushed through without real consultation or transparency. I also note that none of the waste-industry executives involved appear to live near the site of an incinerator, which raises questions of fairness: why should our community absorb the risks while the industry decision-makers live elsewhere?

The promise of "50 jobs" is not enough to justify these risks. That number is minimal compared to the potential long-term harm to our town's reputation, health, and environment — and there's no guarantee those jobs will even go to Parkes residents.

In short, this proposal offers little local benefit and carries significant risk. Parkes deserves better — clean, sustainable solutions that support the community rather than threaten it.

I urge Parliament to reject this proposal and to prioritise the health, safety, and future of Parkes residents.