

6 July 2026

RE: OBJECTION TO STATE SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION SSD-76210271 — BLUESTONE HARDROCK QUARRY PROJECT

Location: 253 Stanhope Road, Elderslie and Blind Creek Road, Glendon Brook, Singleton LGA, NSW

Applicant: Bluestone Hardrock Pty Ltd | Exhibition period: 9 June 2026 – 7 July 2026

1. Statement of Objection

I am writing to formally OBJECT to State Significant Development Application SSD-76210271, the Bluestone Hardrock Quarry Project ("the Project"), currently on public exhibition until 7 July 2026.

I have lived at a property off Elderslie Road for the past 5 years. Noise from the existing truck movements on Elderslie Road is already noticeable and intrusive at my property, and I am very concerned about the impact of additional 220 heavy vehicle movements per day over the life of the project.

I have three school aged children. They ride their bicycles along and across Elderslie Road as part of daily life in this community, and they wait at a bus stop on Elderslie Road for the school bus, at a location that offers no protection, refuge or separation from passing traffic. I am deeply concerned both for their physical safety from the very substantial increase in heavy vehicle movements this proposed project would bring, and for their long-term health, given the potential for airborne silica dust from the extraction, processing and haulage of hard rock to affect them at home, their bus stop and while riding along the route.

I object to the Project in its current form. My objection is made on planning, road safety, traffic, noise, air quality, amenity, property value, biodiversity and social impact grounds, which are set out in detail below. I ask that this submission be considered in full by the assessing officer and, if the matter proceeds to the Independent Planning Commission (IPC), by the Commission panel.

2. Summary of Grounds of Objection

For the detailed reasons set out in this submission, I submit that the Project should be refused, or, in the alternative, should not be approved unless it is substantially redesigned and made subject to the additional conditions set out in Section 13. In summary, my grounds of objection are:

1. The local road network — Springvale Road, Stanhope Road, Elderslie Road and the single-lane Elderslie Bridge — is not built or engineered to withstand a sustained increase of up to 220 laden and unladen truck-and-dog movements per day for up to 30 years, and will suffer accelerated structural deterioration.
2. The haulage route lacks footpaths, cycleways, and any dedicated pedestrian refuge, creating an unacceptable and avoidable road safety risk, particularly at unprotected rural school bus stops used daily by children.

3. The proposed project will materially worsen noise pollution along a route that residents already describe as noisy from existing heavy vehicle movements.
4. The proposed project will generate significant air quality and dust impacts, including airborne silica dust, from extraction, processing, and haulage, with impacts extending well beyond the site boundary.
5. The Proposed project will negatively affect the amenity, rural character and property values of homes along the haulage corridor and surrounding the site, in a manner that has not been adequately assessed or mitigated.
6. The Applicant has not demonstrated that it has properly investigated feasible alternative haulage routes that would avoid the historic Elderslie Bridge and the Elderslie village school-bus corridor — including a route via Standen Drive and Lower Belford — and should be required to do so before any consent is considered.
7. Singleton Council itself has formally resolved to object to the Project, triggering mandatory determination by the Independent Planning Commission, and has found that the EIS does not adequately address traffic, biodiversity, amenity or road-user impacts.
8. The Project's cumulative social, amenity and traffic impacts meet the threshold for refusal applied by NSW courts and the IPC in comparable resource-extraction cases, including Gloucester Resources Limited v Minister for Planning [2019] NSWLEC 7 ("Rocky Hill"), the Bylong Coal Proposed project refusal, and the Hume Coal Proposed project refusal.
9. The Proposed project is a "controlled action" under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC 2026/10452) in relation to threatened species and ecological communities, and this Commonwealth assessment should be fully resolved and made public before any State determination is made.

3. Proposed project and Site Context

The proposed project is a proposal by Bluestone Hardrock Pty Ltd to establish a new hard rock quarry on a rural property at the northern end of Springvale Road, within the localities of Elderslie and Glendon Brook, approximately 17 km west of Singleton and 25 km north-west of Maitland, within the Singleton Local Government Area. The site is zoned RU1 Primary Production and is currently used for cattle grazing.

Key features of the Proposed project as exhibited include:

- Extraction and processing of up to 1 million tonnes of hard rock and conglomerate per annum, for up to 30 years, totalling approximately 30 million tonnes of material.
- An average of 220 heavy vehicle movements per day (110 laden movements out, 110 return movements in), using truck-and-dog combinations, undertaken five days per week.
- Extraction, processing and maintenance activities six days per week.
- Blasting approximately 40 times per year.
- A haulage route travelling via Springvale Road, Stanhope Road and Elderslie Road (Singleton LGA), across the historic single-lane Elderslie Bridge, and continuing via Elderslie Road and the

New England Highway (Cessnock LGA) before connecting to Wine Country Drive and the Hunter Expressway.

- The Proposed project has been declared a "controlled action" under the EPBC Act (reference EPBC 2026/10452) in relation to listed threatened species and ecological communities, and will be jointly assessed under the NSW–Commonwealth Bilateral Agreement.
- Singleton Council has, by mayoral minute, formally resolved to object to the Project, which under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 means the application must be determined by the Independent Planning Commission regardless of the number of public submissions received.

I note that the Elderslie Bridge is a Transport for NSW asset, is listed as a local heritage item under the Singleton Local Environmental Plan 2013, and is a single-lane structure with a stated mass rating in the order of 42.5–50 tonnes depending on configuration. It is a critical pinch-point on the proposed haulage route and a focal point of community concern.

4. Ground 1 — The Road Network Cannot Withstand the Proposed Haulage Volumes

Springvale Road, Stanhope Road and Elderslie Road are narrow, sealed and unsealed rural roads that were never designed or constructed to carry sustained heavy vehicle traffic at industrial volumes. The Proposed project proposes an average of 220 heavy vehicle movements per day, five days a week, for up to 30 years. On a conservative calculation this equates to more than 1,100 heavy vehicle movements every week and in excess of 57,000 heavy vehicle movements every year — a figure consistent with community estimates reported in local media.

Rural roads of this type are typically designed around a much lower design traffic loading than that generated by a continuous fleet of laden truck-and-dog combinations. The cumulative effect of this volume of heavy axle loading will lead to accelerated pavement failure, edge break, potholing, and shoulder deterioration, well beyond what the road was designed to tolerate.

This is not a hypothetical concern: Singleton Council's own mayoral minute objecting to the Proposed project specifically found that the road network is "not designed for heavy vehicle movements" and that the proposed control measures would place the financial and practical burden of managing and maintaining that damage onto Council — and, by extension, onto ratepayers — rather than squarely onto the proponent that causes it.

The Elderslie Bridge compounds this concern significantly. It is a single-lane, weight-restricted, heritage-listed structure over the Hunter River. Long-term residents have already described the experience of sharing this bridge with heavy vehicles during an earlier period of coal haulage from the former Greater Greta Colliery, recalling dangerous "stand-off" situations between trucks and oncoming cars. Reintroducing constant heavy vehicle crossings of a single-lane historic bridge, at a rate of potentially dozens of crossings per hour during peak periods, reintroduces that same conflict risk on a daily basis for the life of the Project.

The Applicant's Voluntary Planning Agreement commitment, as reported, is limited to widening and upgrading a 300-metre section of Springvale Road near the quarry entrance. This falls well short of addressing the structural adequacy of the full multi-kilometre haulage corridor, including Stanhope Road, Elderslie Road and the Elderslie Bridge itself, over a 30-year operational life. A localised

upgrade at the site entrance does nothing to protect the remainder of the route, or the bridge, from cumulative damage.

I submit that consent should not be granted unless and until an independent structural and geotechnical assessment of the entire haulage route — not merely the site frontage — has been carried out, publicly exhibited, and used to determine the full scope of upgrade works required, funded in full by the Applicant, before any haulage commences.

5. Ground 2 — Absence of Safe Pedestrian, Cycling and School Bus Infrastructure

There are no footpaths and no cycleways anywhere along the proposed haulage route, aside from a few hundred metres along a portion of Radford Park. Residents, including school-aged children, must currently walk and cycle along the road verge, sharing the carriageway directly with passing vehicles. Introducing up to 220 additional heavy vehicle movements per day onto a route with no separated pedestrian or cycling infrastructure materially increases the likelihood and severity of a collision involving a vulnerable road user.

Of particular concern are the rural school bus stops located along the haulage route. These stops offer no dedicated bus bay, no barrier, no line-of-sight treatment and no refuge for waiting children — they are simply a point on the verge of an open rural road. Children gather at these locations twice a day, five days a week, during exactly the hours the Proposed project proposes to run its heaviest and most frequent truck movements. The combination of a single-lane historic bridge, no footpaths or cycleways, and unprotected school bus stops along the same corridor represents a serious, foreseeable, and readily preventable road safety hazard.

In addition, there is a narrowing of the road reserve accessible for pedestrians where Elderslie Road meets the New England Highway in Branxton. This is the only access point that residents in Radford Park have to Branxton. Children and adults all need to walk on the road in order to reach Branxton, and this will become significantly more dangerous than it already is.

I note that, on the Applicant's own published information, a formal Road Safety Audit of the haulage route "will be carried out" as part of ongoing assessment — meaning that, at the time of exhibition, this audit does not yet appear to have been completed or made public. I submit that the community, Council and the Department cannot properly assess the true safety implications of this Proposed project without that audit being completed and exhibited before determination, not treated as a post-consent condition to be satisfied after the Proposed project has already been approved.

I request that, at minimum, any consent require: a completed and publicly available independent Road Safety Audit prior to determination; provision of protected bus-bay infrastructure and adequate sightlines at every school bus stop on the approved route, fully funded by the Applicant; and an enforceable prohibition on haulage movements during school bus pick-up and drop-off windows.

6. Ground 3 — Noise Pollution

Residents along Elderslie Road already report existing heavy vehicle traffic on the route as intrusive. Superimposing up to 220 additional truck-and-dog movements per day onto this baseline — each movement involving diesel engine noise, engine braking, tyre noise on an uneven rural pavement, and reversing/loading noise at the site — will materially and adversely affect the rural amenity currently enjoyed by properties fronting the corridor.

This is compounded by blasting activity proposed approximately 40 times per year, which introduces an additional, intermittent, and highly perceptible noise and vibration impact on top of continuous daytime haulage noise. While the Applicant proposes to model blasting against relevant standards and to notify neighbours in advance, notification does not equate to mitigation: it confirms that a recurring disturbance will occur, not that its impact will be avoided.

The cumulative effect of constant daytime haulage noise, punctuated by periodic blasting, over a 30-year operational life is a substantial and long-term degradation of the acoustic amenity that residents currently enjoy in what is, and should remain, a quiet rural setting.

7. Ground 4 — Air Quality and Dust, Including Respirable Silica

Hard rock extraction, crushing, screening and stockpiling inherently generate dust, and this impact does not stop at the site boundary. Trucks travelling the full length of the haulage route — along Springvale Road, Stanhope Road and Elderslie Road — carry loose rock product that, if not fully and continuously covered, will shed dust and fine particulate matter directly onto the road corridor and the properties along it. This means residents along the entire haul route, not just those adjoining the extraction site, are exposed to airborne dust every time a truck passes their home. The Applicant proposes standard operational controls — water carts on internal haul roads, covering of off-site loads, site speed limits, and reduced material drop heights — but these are administrative and operational measures that depend on continuous, correct implementation and enforcement over three decades, including strict compliance with load-covering requirements by every driver on every trip. They reduce dust generation; they do not eliminate it, and their effectiveness in practice — particularly during dry, windy conditions typical of the Hunter Valley, and particularly where a load has not been properly covered — cannot be guaranteed by a written management plan alone.

Of particular concern is the potential for the rock resource to generate respirable crystalline silica dust during drilling, blasting, crushing and screening, and for this fine dust to be carried along the haul route on truck loads and disturbed road surfaces. Silica dust is a recognised occupational and community health hazard capable of causing serious long-term respiratory illness at chronic low-level exposure. This risk is not limited to healthy adults: for residents along the haul route who already live with pre-existing respiratory conditions such as asthma, even modest increases in ambient dust and fine particulate matter can trigger or worsen symptoms, and chronic exposure over the life of this 30-year Project raises real concerns for long-term respiratory health, particularly for children. The community has specifically raised concern that the level of silica in the rock to be extracted has not been transparently disclosed or independently verified. I submit that the Department should require full, independently verified disclosure of the silica content of the resource, and a health-risk assessment addressing chronic community exposure along the full haulage corridor — including specific consideration of impacts on people with pre-existing respiratory conditions — not only compliance with generic particulate matter (PM10/PM2.5) criteria at the site boundary, before any determination is made.

These air quality impacts must also be considered cumulatively with existing diesel particulate emissions from background traffic already using the route, and from the Applicant's own construction and extraction plant.

8. Ground 5 — Amenity and Property Value Impacts

The introduction of an industrial-scale quarrying and haulage operation into a quiet, rural residential and agricultural setting will materially change the character of the area. Properties along the haulage corridor — many of which are rural-residential lifestyle properties, small acreages, and agricultural holdings, including established tourism accommodation in the immediate locality — will be directly exposed to increased traffic, noise, dust and visual intrusion for up to 30 years.

It is a well-recognised planning consideration, and one expressly endorsed in the NSW Social Impact Assessment Guideline and by the NSW Land and Environment Court in *Gloucester Resources Limited v Minister for Planning* [2019] NSWLEC 7, that impacts on a community's sense of place, amenity and quality of life are legitimate and material matters for assessment — separate from, but connected to, the reasonable expectation that these impacts will be reflected in reduced property values and reduced marketability of affected land. Whether or not those value impacts are separately compensable, their likelihood is itself a real social cost of the Proposed project that the exhibited documentation does not appear to have properly quantified for the full length of the haulage corridor, as opposed to the immediate site boundary.

I submit that the Social Impact Assessment supporting this Proposed project should be required to specifically and transparently address amenity and property value impacts along the entire approved haulage route, not merely in the vicinity of the extraction site itself.

9. Ground 6 — Inadequate Consideration of Alternative Haulage Routes

The Applicant's own supporting documentation indicates that alternative site access and haulage alignments were considered and discounted — including an alignment via Blind Creek Road (discounted due to additional road works and distance) and a more elevated southern alignment (discounted due to greater potential noise and intersection limitations on Stanhope Road). What this analysis does not appear to address is a route that avoids the single-lane, heritage-listed Elderslie Bridge and the Elderslie village school-bus corridor altogether.

Given the scale of this Proposed project — up to 30 million tonnes of material over 30 years — and the severity of the road safety and heritage-bridge concerns identified above, I submit that the Applicant should be required to properly investigate and publicly exhibit a comparative Route Options Assessment. This should include, at minimum, an alignment travelling via Stanhope Road toward Standen Drive and Lower Belford, connecting to the New England Highway or Golden Highway corridor closer to Whittingham/Singleton without needing to cross the Elderslie Bridge or pass through the Elderslie village school-bus corridor at all.

I am not in a position, from publicly available mapping alone, to confirm whether the existing Standen Drive alignment is presently engineered to a standard capable of carrying laden quad-dog vehicles for the life of the Project, or what property or environmental constraints such a route may itself present. That is precisely the point: a route of this consequence, servicing a 30-year, 30-million-tonne operation, should not be determined on the basis of the Applicant's own internal, undisclosed route-selection process. It should be the subject of an independent, transparent options assessment — carried out in consultation with Transport for NSW and Singleton and Cessnock Councils, and exhibited for public comment — comparing the Elderslie Road/Elderslie Bridge alignment against a Standen Drive/Lower Belford alignment and any other technically feasible option, on the basis of comparative road safety, structural impact, heritage impact, and amenity impact to affected communities.

This approach is consistent with how comparable extractive industry projects elsewhere in the Hunter have been assessed. For example, in the Hillview Hard Rock Quarry assessment (Port Stephens LGA), a competing quarry operator formally raised concerns before the Department about the cumulative heavy vehicle impact of multiple approved and proposed quarries sharing the same intersection with the Pacific Highway, and requested that no product be despatched until that shared intersection was upgraded to the satisfaction of the relevant road authorities. The same logic should apply here: the cumulative loading that this Proposed project would place on the Elderslie Bridge and the Elderslie Road/New England Highway corridor should be properly quantified against feasible alternatives before, not after, consent is granted.

10. Ground 7 — Singleton Council's Own Objection and the Mandatory IPC Referral

It is significant that Singleton Council — the local authority with direct responsibility for the affected road network — has itself formally resolved, by mayoral minute, to object to this Project. Council's resolution specifically found that:

- The level of community consultation undertaken has not been adequate to address the concerns raised;
- An initial review of the EIS does not indicate any amendments to the Proposed project that would avoid or mitigate impacts to traffic, biodiversity, amenity and road users;
- The proposed project will impact local roads that are not designed for heavy vehicle movements, likely resulting in significant ongoing maintenance obligations for Council; and
- The proposed control measures place the onus of managing and maintaining the increased heavy vehicle impact on Council, rather than on the proponent through avoidance and mitigation measures.

Because Council has formally objected, the Proposed project must, by operation of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, be determined by the Independent Planning Commission rather than by departmental delegation, irrespective of how many public submissions are ultimately received. I submit that this submission, and the concerns of the broader community, should be understood in that context: this is not a marginal or easily conditioned proposal — it is one that the responsible local council itself does not consider can be appropriately mitigated on the basis of the EIS as exhibited.

11. Ground 8 — Consistency with NSW Precedent on Social Impact and Rural Character

NSW courts and the Independent Planning Commission have, in a series of comparable resource-extraction cases, established that where a project's negative social, amenity and land-use impacts on an existing rural community cannot be satisfactorily mitigated — and where those impacts are disproportionate to the project's claimed public benefit — refusal is the correct and available planning outcome, even where the proposed use is otherwise permissible under the applicable planning controls. I submit that this Proposed project should be assessed, and refused, on the same basis.

Gloucester Resources Limited v Minister for Planning [2019] NSWLEC 7 ("Rocky Hill")

In this case, the NSW Land and Environment Court upheld the refusal of a proposed open-cut coal mine in the Gloucester Valley, finding that the mine would be incompatible with the rural character of the land and with the existing residential, rural-residential, agricultural and tourism uses in its vicinity; that its noise and dust amenity impacts would cause significant adverse social impacts including effects on residents' sense of place and psychological wellbeing; and that these impacts, together with the Project's other effects, were not capable of being satisfactorily mitigated. The Court found that the mine's claimed economic benefits had been overstated and did not outweigh the social and amenity costs imposed on the existing community. The Court adopted a formal social impact assessment framework — considering effects on people's way of life, their community, their access to and use of infrastructure, and their sense of place and surroundings — which I submit is directly applicable to the assessment of this Project's impact on the Elderslie, Stanhope, Radford Park and Branxton communities.

Bylong Coal Proposed project (2019) and Hume Coal Proposed project (2021)

The Independent Planning Commission subsequently refused consent for the Bylong Coal Project, citing long-lasting environmental, agricultural and heritage impacts that could not be adequately addressed, and expressly applying the reasoning in Rocky Hill regarding the weighing of cumulative impacts against overstated public benefit. In 2021 the IPC likewise refused the Hume Coal Project, finding that its incompatibility with the land use objectives for the area was, on its own, sufficient reason for refusal, compounded by unresolved groundwater, social and greenhouse gas impacts, and concluding that the proposed project was not in the public interest given the potential for long-term and irreversible impacts on the social and environmental values of the region.

Application to the Bluestone Hardrock Quarry Project

While the Bluestone Hardrock Quarry Proposed project is a hard rock quarry rather than a coal mine, the same analytical framework applies directly. This is a 30-year, industrial-scale resource extraction proposed project proposed for a quiet rural valley characterised by grazing, small-acreage rural-residential living, and tourism accommodation. Its claimed public benefits — supplying aggregate to the wider Hunter, Newcastle and Sydney construction markets, and an estimated \$2.5 billion in downstream retail sales — are diffuse, regional and largely captured by parties outside the immediate area. Its costs — road damage, road safety risk to children and other vulnerable road users, noise, dust including potential silica exposure, loss of rural amenity, and diminished property values — fall directly, concentratedly, and for thirty years, on a small and identifiable group of rural residents along a single narrow haulage corridor with a historic, single-lane, weight-restricted bridge at its centre. On the reasoning applied in Rocky Hill, Bylong and Hume Coal, I submit that this imbalance between diffuse regional benefit and concentrated, long-term local harm is precisely the circumstance in which refusal — or, at the very least, a fundamentally redesigned haulage strategy — is the appropriate outcome.

12. Additional Matters for Assessment

12.1 EPBC Act Controlled Action

The Commonwealth Minister for the Environment and Water has determined that the Proposed project is a "controlled action" under sections 18 and 18A of the EPBC Act in relation to listed threatened species and ecological communities (reference EPBC 2026/10452). I submit that this Commonwealth assessment, being undertaken jointly with the State assessment under the NSW–

Commonwealth Bilateral Agreement, should be fully completed, and its findings made public, before any State determination is made. Approving a 30-year, 30-million-tonne extractive proposed project ahead of the resolution of a formally declared controlled action on threatened species impacts would be premature.

12.2 Blasting Near Sensitive Receivers and Elderslie Airport

Blasting is proposed approximately 40 times per year, with notification to be given to surrounding neighbours and to Elderslie Airport. I request that full blast and vibration modelling, including worst-case scenarios, be made public and independently reviewed before determination, rather than being addressed solely through post-consent monitoring plans.

12.3 Bushfire Risk

The community has raised concern regarding increased bushfire risk associated with heavy machinery use and on-site fuel storage in a rural, fire-prone landscape. I request that the NSW Rural Fire Service's assessment of this risk, and any recommended conditions, be made a mandatory and enforceable part of any consent, not merely a matter addressed through consultation.

12.4 Heritage Impact on Elderslie Bridge

The Elderslie Bridge is a locally listed heritage item. I request that any heritage impact assessment specifically address the cumulative structural and vibration impact of decades of heavy vehicle crossings on this historic structure, rather than relying solely on the absence of proposed physical works to conclude that heritage impacts are unlikely.

13. Requested Outcome

For the reasons set out above, I request that the Department recommend refusal of SSD-76210271 in its current form.

If, notwithstanding the matters raised in this submission, the Department or the Independent Planning Commission is minded to consider approval of the Project, I request that any consent be made subject, at minimum, to the following conditions:

1. An independent, publicly exhibited Route Options Assessment comparing the Elderslie Road/Elderslie Bridge haulage alignment against a Standen Drive/Lower Belford alignment (and any other technically feasible alignment) reaching the New England Highway or Golden Highway without crossing the Elderslie Bridge or the Elderslie village school-bus corridor, completed before determination.
2. A full independent structural and geotechnical assessment of the entire approved haulage route, including the Elderslie Bridge, funded by the Applicant, with all identified upgrade works completed and funded by the Applicant before haulage commences — not limited to the 300-metre section near the site entrance.
3. Completion and public release of an independent Road Safety Audit of the entire haulage route before determination, together with Applicant-funded pedestrian and cycling infrastructure and protected school bus bay treatments at every affected stop.
4. An enforceable prohibition on haulage movements during school bus pick-up and drop-off times, and no haulage on weekends or public holidays.

5. Independently verified disclosure of the silica content of the resource and a community health-risk assessment addressing chronic low-level exposure, with real-time public reporting of dust and noise monitoring data for the life of the Project.
6. A Social Impact Assessment that specifically addresses amenity and property value impacts along the full length of the haulage corridor, not only in the immediate vicinity of the extraction site.
7. A Voluntary Planning Agreement that funds road maintenance and safety infrastructure along the full haulage route for the life of the Project, indexed appropriately, rather than being limited to works at the site entrance.
8. Full resolution and public release of the Commonwealth EPBC Act controlled action assessment (EPBC 2026/10452) before any State consent is granted.
9. A direction that the matter be the subject of a public hearing before the Independent Planning Commission, given the scale of community concern and the number of unresolved technical matters identified above.

14. Conclusion

The Bluestone Hardrock Quarry Proposed project proposes to introduce an industrial-scale, 30-year resource extraction operation into a quiet rural valley, serviced by a road network — culminating in a single-lane historic bridge — that was never designed for this purpose. The road safety risks to children at unprotected school bus stops, the absence of footpaths and cycleways, the structural burden on local roads and the Elderslie Bridge, the noise and dust impacts, and the damage to rural amenity and property values are all serious, foreseeable, and — on the evidence exhibited — inadequately addressed. Singleton Council itself has reached the same conclusion. Consistent with the approach taken by the NSW Land and Environment Court and the Independent Planning Commission in Rocky Hill, Bylong and Hume Coal, I submit that the concentrated, long-term local harm of this Proposed project outweighs its diffuse regional economic benefit, and that the Proposed project should be refused.

Thank you for considering this submission. I am happy to be contacted for any clarification and would welcome the opportunity to speak to these concerns at any public hearing held by the Independent Planning Commission.

Thank you for your consideration