

SUBMISSION AGAINST THE MRF IPSWICH STREET FYSHWICK

EPDCustomerServices@act.gov.au

EIS.201700053

FOR THE DIRECTOR-GENERAL OF PLANNING

Dear Sir,

The public were never consulted about the site for the development. That is unacceptable. If they had been consulted they would have said as they are now saying "Not on this Site".

It is madness to think about bringing all of Canberra's household and commercial waste into Fyshwick instead of either leaving at a Mugga Lane or constructing the new facility at a more suitable location away from the active commercial district of Fyshwick which is so close to residential and future residential development.

If a rail line was the determining factor then Beard or Hume should have been considered as an alternative to Fyshwick. It is deeply concerning that the Draft EIS did not take the time to discuss in detail any alternative sites. It should have offered proof which could be tested as to why the railway to Hume could not have been reactivated. It should have done a comparative cost analysis of reactivating the site at Fyshwick and one at Hume taking into account the advantages and disadvantages of each. I argue that extra cost of reconstituting rail service to Hume would have been outweighed by the adverse social and environmental impacts to a wider community near Fyshwick.

Two of the most obvious advantages of a site at Hume would be size and buffer distances. The total 3.2ha site at Fyshwick is too small for all that is planned to go on it. When all stages of the development are completed there will be a MRF 7250 square meters in size, associated administrative and educational resource centre, fuel and waste water and leachate tanks, an employee and visitor car park, a railway terminal hardstand, two weigh bridges, access roads, a WtE plant with its associated infrastructure and probably more. It will be an overly crowded site with high risk for onsite traffic incidents and difficulty of manoeuvre for emergency services if they need access to it.

The site is overdeveloped to such an extent that there are no natural or other buffers to the nearby commercial properties which will most certainly be affected by the noise and odour and dust generated without the traffic problems it will also create for them.

It is inconceivable that an odour-offensive industry could be considered suitable for that area. All transfer stations and the like smell. They are the most complained about facilities and odour is on top of the list. On certain days when the weather or meteorology is right the odours can be smelled at a greater distance from them. Residents of Narrabundah, Kingston and Barton the caravan park, and future residents of East lakes and Dairy Road plus all the visitors and shoppers at Fyshwick and the employees there will have their amenity affected in a deleterious manner. This is unacceptable and can be avoided by simply rejecting this development as "Not suitable on this site"; "Not in the Public Interest".

I understand that the old Shell depot is an eyesore and that a beneficial use of it would be an improvement but not until it is fully remediated to the satisfaction of the EPA. The contaminated nature of that site is another reason it is unsuitable for an MRF and WtE plant. The level of pollution on site of the highly carcinogenic BTEX chemicals and other hydrocarbons in several places exceeds

the acceptable criteria for human health. Benzene vapours for example inside a building are many times more toxic than when released outdoors. That is why the proposal includes a vapour barrier under the slab. This barrier as a means of protection of the health and well-being of the workers inside is untested and vulnerable to damage that seriously affects its reliable performance. Again, the solution is for a different industry on this site which does not require such large buildings and for the site to be fully remediated to make it safe for any industry. The EIS makes it clear that comprehensive remediation is not the intention of this Development. I reiterate; Not on this Site.

Respectfully yours,

