

Karen Hutchinson
“Queensbury”
1895 The Bucketts Way
BOORAL NSW 2425

28 June 2025

Ref: Hillview Hard Rock Quarry (SSID-70557215)

To Whom it May Concern,

I write as a full-time resident and property owner immediately adjoining the proposed Hillview Hard Rock Quarry on Maytoms Lane, Booral. This submission constitutes a formal objection to Development Application SSID-70557215.

My concerns derive from substantive deficiencies in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), negligible community engagement, and unaddressed impacts within the project’s *zone of affectation*.

1. Biodiversity & Koala Habitat

- Maytoms Lane is a recognised koala corridor. The EIS (Section 6.2) identifies 99 fauna species—five of which are listed as threatened. Yet the assessment downplays the value of local habitat.
- The EIS also states the Applicant was preparing a referral to be submitted to the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water. Without knowing the outcome of that submission, habitat removal along Maytoms Lane cannot be justified.

2. Air, Dust & Water Quality

- Predicted PM10 exceedances “at or slightly above” guideline levels pose serious health risks and contravene the NSW Air Quality Objectives. My family relies on rainwater harvested on-site; any airborne contamination directly jeopardises our potable supply.
- Groundwater drawdown and disruption to aquifers have not been rigorously modelled for the full *hydro-affectation zone*. As such, it is not clear what impact this will have on the water table, and in turn, how that will affect surrounding pastures.

3. Noise, Blasting & Health Impacts

- Long-term exposure to fine silica dust is omitted from the EIS. Dust suppression is vaguely defined (“dependent on climatic conditions”), falling short of industry best practice.
- The noise and vibrations from regular blasting will affect residents' mental and physical health, particularly vulnerable groups such as children and the elderly.

4. **Traffic, Infrastructure & Alternative Transport**

- An additional 272 quarry trucks per day will exacerbate pavement fatigue along Buckets Way (19.5 km), yet upgrades by the Applicant are limited to the Maytoms Lane intersection. Further to that, the Applicant is treating Maytoms Lane as part of their haul road, believing they can remove whatever tress and flora are in the way. Clearly, a comprehensive survey of Maytoms Lane is required to identify easements, property boundaries, as well as Koala habitats and other areas of biodiversity that are important to support local ecosystems. I note that there is a pocket of habitat near to the Applicant's gate that is on our property. We request that this habitat be preserved as it is densely populated by fauna due to its proximity to the creek.
- The properties adjoining Maytoms Lane have access/egress onto Maytoms Lane for the purpose of property access and livestock transportation. There is no acknowledgement of these access points in the submission, and therefore the Applicant has failed to detail how access to these properties will be maintained at all times. What is the contingency plan for a truck breakdown along Maytoms Lane? What processes are in place to minimise the disruption to surrounding properties in the instance of a truck breakdown?
- The EIS fails to evaluate rail transport as an alternative, despite viable rail links within the broader catchment.

5. **Strategic Land Use & Demand Justification**

- Existing quarries (Deep Creek, Stone Ridge, Karuah) collectively exceed market demand forecasts; the proponent offers no independent evidence to support a new supply source.
- Our property is an operating farm, with the potential for further primary production expansion. We also have the opportunity for subdivision, which would require additional access points along Maytoms Lane. This should be considered alongside this development proposal, to ensure property access is maintained, and that primary production operations can continue unimpeded by the impacts of the proposed quarry.

6. **Zone of Affection & Compensation**

- The EIS neglects to delineate a formal *zone of affection*—the minimum spatial footprint where environmental, health, and property impacts will occur.
- I note that the Applicant did approach my husband and I to purchase some of the land adjoining the proposed quarry site, however, the price offered was offensive and discussions ceased. This action is evidence that the Applicant is aware of the impact this project will have on surrounding properties and further demonstrates their disregard for such negative impacts.
- Should consent be granted, I insist on mandatory land-acquisition rights and dislocation compensation for all residences, water users, and landholders within the validated zone of affection, in line with Section 7.11 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*.

In summary, the Hillview proposal exhibits fundamental flaws in impact analysis, stakeholder consultation, and strategic justification. The long-term external costs imposed on private landholders, biodiversity, and public infrastructure far outweigh any ephemeral economic gains.

I respectfully request the Commission refuse this application or, at minimum, require a revised EIS that:

- Fully maps and quantifies the project's zone of affectation.
- Incorporates rigorous hydrological, air, noise, and vibration modelling.
- Outlines enforceable community compensation and land-acquisition mechanisms; and
- Explores less-invasive transport options such as rail.

Please consider my submission in conjunction with the submission written by my daughter, Dayanna Finch, as her submission is reflective of my concerns and covers in greater depth the potential impacts and threats this development poses. Also, as I am still reviewing the supplementary material, I reserve the right to submit a supplementary document within the coming weeks.

Thank you for considering this objection.

Yours faithfully,

Karen Hutchinson

Adjoining Property Owner and Fulltime Resident