

EPDCustomerServices@act.gov.au

Objection to EIS201700053

To the Director-General for ACT Planning

Dear Sir

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on the EIS No.201700053. The CRS proposal to locate a major waste facility at Fyshwick in Central Canberra, where land is at a premium under Government policy of urban renewal, conflicts with the *Market Sounding to Industry* and the *ACT Waste Management Strategy (2011-2025)*.

Minister Fitzharris in February 2017 called for innovative ideas from industry to manage ACT's waste into the future. The accompanying Market Sounding echoes page 32 of the ACT Waste Strategy (2011-2025), where it advises that;

Major new waste infrastructure will primarily be located in the Hume Resource Recovery Estate beside the Mugga Lane Resource Management Centre. The Hume Resource Recovery Estate is being developed in conjunction with the Mugga Lane Resource Management Centre as a recycling estate housing a range of facilities.

The *Market Sounding to Industry 38532-01* in Attachment 2 (p.16) reaffirms Hume Waste Precinct;

A2.1 The Hume Waste Precinct is immediately southeast of the ACT landfill and, aside from its proximity to the transfer station, recycling collection and green waste processing that occurs, is adjacent to a major arterial road that connects to the interstate highway. Rail and air links are nearby, as is the NSW boundary. The area is zoned industrial and it is an excellent site for a waste precinct and is one that will eventually grow into a nationally recognised waste centre of excellence.

In regard to the Fyshwick location;

- a. CRS must justify its selection of the Canberra Central site with its IZ2-Mixed use industrial to be in the interests of the Government's process of urban infill;
- b. CRS must properly account for the operation at Fyshwick to transfer waste 70km away is any economic advantage to the people of Canberra in comparison to continuation of the present landfill at Mugga and FOGO to our new green bins;
- c. CRS must justify how its proposal to take 80% of the waste to landfill in comparison to the stated aims of the government in regard to composting FOGO;
- d. CRS must justify how its Fyshwick proposal will be economically viable without the putrescible component of the waste;
- e. Will waste be imported to feed its transfer to Woodlawn or a future second stage WtE incinerator to be located in urban Fyshwick?

Sincerely

