

Kane Winwood - Online Submission from Adrian MacKenzie of Flocolo1 Pty Ltd ATF Flocolo Family Trust (object)

From: Adrian MacKenzie <mackenziehk@yahoo.com>
To: Kane Winwood <kane.winwood@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 6/02/2011 9:46 PM
Subject: Online Submission from Adrian MacKenzie of Flocolo1 Pty Ltd ATF Flocolo Family Trust (object)
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

The Flocolo Family Trust owns the property known as Pelican Farm located at Lot 8, Oxleys Hill Road, Berrima, NSW 2577. It is one of the properties referenced in the Environmental Assessment as "elevated residences on the northern side of the Wingecarribee River".

Firstly, I am disappointed with the lack of notice relating to this project. It is significant in nature and affects a number of different parties in the region of the project. Although the project has apparently been on display since 15th December, the letter of notification was only sent to me on 19 January 2011. Given that this is the major holiday period when many Australians take leave for large parts of January (myself included), it suggests that approval is being sought and notices are being sent at a time designed to ensure the least attention, thereby smoothing the passage of the application. I do not believe that this is appropriate.

I have a number of objections:

Noise - I have significant concerns about the level of noise that will be generated. Not just from the operating activity itself but from the significantly higher levels of traffic that will access the site. It is difficult to believe that this will not be the case. An independent third party report would appear to be appropriate. Furthermore, the proposed management recommendations including the restriction of some activities during adverse weather conditions will be extremely difficult to police and it is unclear how this will be managed. It should be by an external party with the ability to prevent activities and the imposition of fines and penalties in the event of breaches. There should not be any operation whatsoever on Saturdays or Sundays under any circumstances - the operator would simply have to manage the site within these restrictions.

Visual Amenity - I have significant concern about the impact on views. An inspection of my property would quickly undermine the suggestion that there is little impact given the "backdrop of the cement plant and stockfeed plant". The implication is that both of these are readily visible and that the visual amenity is compromised already, therefore what difference will the project make? This is not the case and it appears that little consideration has been given to the impact on my property and those adjoining it. Both the cement plant and the stockfeed plant are at a considerable distance and the topography and vegetation of the land provide significant camouflage against their visual impact. I would recommend that a more thorough assessment of this impact is undertaken.

The proposed amenity bunds and planting appear to be wholly insufficient to offset any impact on noise, air quality, and visual amenity. Neither the height, the landscaping nor the extent of planting is adequate. It does not appear "designed to address all of the issues raised by the local community". It appears that the absolute minimum has been proposed by suggesting that risks are moderate or low and therefore acceptable. This is not the case.

Traffic - whilst not a primary concern as the owner of a property on Oxleys Hill Road, I do believe that the impact of the sustained high level of additional traffic would be detrimental. There is a risk of a significant negative impact on economic activity as a result of problems created by traffic jams and roadblocks. This would have an adverse impact on small local business and would be a tremendous negative for tourism - an important contributor to the area. Mittagong and Bowral will bear the brunt and it will be difficult for residents, businesses and importantly tourists to navigate the area. To propose operations at the weekends is very selfish and does not attempt to address the impact on residents and visitors leisure time. It appears that Austral would be the only beneficiary. To suggest that the project is beneficial for the local community is incorrect. The investment is only \$1m - a figure commensurate with extremely minor capital projects. It seems that the claims of its positive impact are grossly exaggerated. It would only employ 5 part time staff. The impact on tourism alone could see more jobs than this lost.

The conclusion in the Environmental Assessment that "This would provide significant social and economic benefits to the local and wider community" is simply incorrect. There is a significant chance of many adverse impacts on the community.

I believe that this project should not go ahead. I would like to be kept fully informed on the debate.

Adrian MacKenzie

Name: Adrian MacKenzie

Organisation: Flocolo1 Pty Ltd ATF Flocolo Family Trust

Address:

5 Trahlee Road, Bellevue Hill, Sydney NSW 2023 (former address was 77 Bulkara Road, Bellevue Hill)

IP Address: cpe-58-173-10-13.ecxf2.clt.bigpond.net.au - 58.173.10.13

Submission for Job: #2713 New Berrima Quarry Project

https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=2713

Site: #1720 New Berrima Quarry

https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=1720

Kane Winwood

E: kane.winwood@planning.nsw.gov.au

[Powered by Internetix Affinity](#)

Kane Winwood - Reference 08_0212

From: Robert McLean <rob@gowanbrae.com>
To: "plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au"
 <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 7/02/2011 1:34 PM
Subject: Reference 08_0212

New Berrima Clay/Shale Quarry

Submission by Robert and Paula McLean, Lot 5 Bakers Lane, Berrima
 Property referred to as R12 in the name of Pingama Pty Ltd

We have owned the property referred to as R12 for almost 7 years and prior to that we owned the property referred to as R13 for 11 years. We run the property as a nature reserve. According to the EA we are 1.2 km from the extraction site.

We oppose the quarry project as set out on the grounds of excessive noise, health risks from PM10 concentrations and an inadequate plan to address water quality threats to the Wingecarribee river and wildlife habitat. Our concerns are set out below.

1. Noise

The setting is one we chose for its peace and quiet along the river. Having a mining operation 1 kilometre away will change that dramatically. The noise levels given in the EA are theoretical numbers. At no time were monitors installed on our property to develop actual noise levels. We are most concerned about the 26 week period constructing the environment bunds where it is admitted in the EA that noise levels could well exceed limits. We would have liked to see a proposal with the following requirements/agreements:

- a. Noise site monitors be installed at properties like ours which is among those most affected
- b. Agree that if noise levels are exceeded for more than 2 weeks then rest weeks are interspersed.
- c. Agree that no mining operations are allowed on Saturday
- d. Limit the campaigns to no more than 3 per annum, of a month intensity, to lessen the noise impact, compared to the proposed 2-3 campaigns of 4-6 week duration, with ability to make up for wet weather time loss which could see the quarry operating half the year.

2. Air quality

The assessment of air quality is a major concern as stated by the EA conclusion 'the potential for cumulative exceedance of the 24 hour average PM10 assessment does exist during proposed operations'. Our property is given an estimate of 49.2 with a maximum 50. There is of course a standard deviation around this estimate. We anticipate that with actual data from Blue Circle the maximum will be exceeded. While this is discounted by a table showing that over 90% of the time the level of fine particles would be less than the maximum, the report is alarming rather than convincing. We wish to see the following analysis undertaken and commitments made:

- a. Assess cumulative impacts together with data from Blue Circle over a 3 month period with differing wind conditions
- b. Assess cumulative impacts with Blue Circle data linked to the frequency of southerlies which affect properties such as R11,12,13
- c. Air quality monitor to be installed at R12
- c. Agree to cease operations on days where PM10 exceeds regulatory levels as recorded at nominated sites such as R12

3. Water quality, wildlife habitat and native flora

The Wingecarribee river below the proposed quarry is a bird breeding ground for pelicans and a haven for swans and other water birds. We see platypus frequently in the section of the river in front of Mandurama. The EA concluded 'no wildlife habitat corridors occur adjacent to the site in which it could

be inferred that noise and traffic may affect the functioning of such a corridor'. We believe this to be incorrect. There is potential for noise to be a factor in bird breeding. Of even greater concern is the risk of suspended solids ending up in the river in flooding and runoff following the proposed high fertiliser use for land rehabilitation. The report says that there are no endangered flora on Mandurama. There are areas on both sides of the river that have the vulnerable Cabbage's kunzea, and closer study may well identify other endangered native flora on adjacent properties as well as pockets of the highly endangered Southern Highlands Shale Woodlands. We believe these issues are best addressed as follows:

- a. Plant reed beds to allow the river to act like a wetland, especially around the bottom dam
- b. Fence off the river from cattle grazing now that quarrying is proposed as the major land use
- c. Commit to a substantial revegetation of the property with native species to reduce noise levels
- d. Commit to an independent endangered and vulnerable native plant study on adjacent properties as well as the site property

Respectfully Submitted

Robert and Paula McLean