

Paul Hutchinson

“Queensbury”

1895 The Bucketts Way

BOORAL NSW 2425

28 June 2025

To Whom It May Concern,

Re: Objection to Proposed Hillview Hard Rock Quarry Development (SSID-70557215)

I am writing to formally object to the proposed quarry development at Booral as outlined in the development application SSID-70557215 currently on exhibition.

As a property owner and full-time resident of a property adjoining the development on Maytoms Lane, Booral, I am deeply concerned about the significant and irreversible impacts this project would have on our health and wellbeing, environment, community wellbeing, and local infrastructure.

After reading the EIS and associated documents, it is clear that this development has been poorly planned, and the consultants involved with preparing the submission have failed to assess the real impact this development will have on the community and the environment. The lack of community consultation (2 x 2-hour “drop-in” information sessions), which included the cancellation of a community forum, is further evidence that the developer has a complete disregard for the impact of this project on the local community.

My concerns with this project extend further to the points noted below.

Environmental Impact:

- The proposed site access along Maytoms Lane is a known koala corridor, and home to an abundant amount of native flora and fauna. In Section 6.2, the EIS identified 99 fauna species, including five threatened species – including Koalas. Clearing along Maytoms Lane to accommodate the access road would be detrimental to this well-established habitat. How can the Applicant justify that “The habitats to be removed for the Koala and other listed threatened species that could potentially occur are not considered to be important to the long-term survival of these species”? Surely the sighting of any threatened species in an area would automatically determine their habitat to be highly valuable in securing their future. The EIS also states the Applicant was preparing a referral to be submitted to the Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water. What is the outcome of that submission? Overall, this submission has shown complete disregard for the preservation of the environment, especially in relation to threatened and endangered flora and fauna species.
- Appendix B3 - Tree Removal Change Sketch shows a tree on my property marked for removal. It would be appreciated if the applicant could explain why they have earmarked vegetation on my property for removal. I would like it to be formally noted

that I do not authorise any works on my property related to this development. Confirmation that no such works will proceed is required. Further, a comprehensive survey of Maytoms Lane is required to clearly delineate easements and property boundaries.

- Increased dust, noise pollution, and groundwater disruption would pose a serious threat to biodiversity and air/water quality, and quality of life. From my home, I will be able to see and hear the vehicle movements entering and exiting the proposed site. The quantity of vehicle movements, and the hours of operation are excessive, with operations running 11 hours per day, six days per week. This will have a detrimental impact on my quality of life. Furthermore, as noted in the Environmental Impact Study, the applicant knows that the development is expected to operate at *“either at or slightly exceeding the guideline for PM10 24 hour averaging”* for air quality. Air quality is of particular significance to myself, and my family, as we collect rainwater for drinking, washing, bathing, and farming.

Community and Health Concerns:

- The noise and vibrations from regular blasting will affect residents' mental and physical health, particularly vulnerable groups such as children and the elderly.
- Decreased air quality may increase the risk of respiratory issues and long-term illness. There is no mention of the potential exposure to silica in the EIS, and dust suppression measures are vague and inadequate (*“The rate of water application for dust suppression is dependent on the prevailing climatic conditions and rainfall”*).
- The applicant has failed to demonstrate meaningful consultation with the community. The applicant hosted 2 x two-hour “drop-in” information sessions and cancelled a proposed community meeting. Four hours for a project of this size is inadequate in allowing the community the opportunity to assess the development and seek answers to their concerns.

Traffic and Infrastructure:

- The significant rise in heavy vehicle traffic will put strain on local roads not designed for frequent industrial use, increasing the risk of accidents and wear on public infrastructure. The Bucketts Way is already unable to withstand current vehicle numbers, so adding an additional 272 truck movements per day, six days per week, is only going to add to the degradation of the road surface and negatively impact the safety of road users – including school buses. Additionally, the applicant refers to Maytoms Lane as though it is a private road. There is a complete disregard for other property owners along Maytoms Lane that have access gates situated along the length of the lane, and no mitigation plans for maintaining property access in the instance of a truck breakdown.
- There has been no alternate mode of transport addressed in the EIS. Why did the applicant not consider rail as a means of transporting material from the site?

Cultural and Lifestyle Impacts:

- The presence of a quarry will fundamentally alter the character and liveability of our community, undermining local amenity, property values, and future planning objectives.

- Our property is a working farm, with the potential for further primary production expansion. If our property were to be sold, it would be done so as a going concern, and as such, this proposed development needs to protect our right to operate without restriction and maintain its saleability.

Justification for the Project:

- The Applicant attempts to justify this development citing “*strong market demand and this demand is anticipated to remain strong well in to the future*”, yet it has taken the applicant almost 10 years to get to this stage of the application process. This suggests that the market demand is not as strong as the Applicant would have us believe.
- The applicant has failed to adequately justify the need for this development. Deep Creek Quarry (SSID-11591659) at Limeburner’s Creek approved in January 2024 (expected to produce 500,000 tonnes per annum), and Stone Ridge Quarry (SSID-10432) at Balickera (expected to produce 1.5 million tonnes per annum) approved in December 2024, along with existing quarries at Karuah and Balickera, is there a need for another quarry in the area? As stated in the EIS, production tonnage will be well below the expected 1.5 million tonnes per annum in the initial years as the site is established, therefore suggesting that the development is not critical to the supply chain.
- The applicant commenced exploratory drilling in mid-2015 (without a DA), and again in early-2016 (DA -122/2016), yet it has taken until mid-2025 for the submission to
- In the EIS (2.1.3 Resource Location, Supply and Demand) the Applicant refers to “Demand will be driven by both private developments and State and Federal funding of infrastructure projects with the region”. Where is the evidence to support this claim? The Transport for NSW Major projects hub advises the Pacific Highway and Princes Highway upgrades will be completed within the next four years, again questioning where the “demand” for this development is coming from.
- The Applicant has failed to explore any potential post-quarry site uses, suggesting that site rehabilitation will not be a priority.

Zone of Affectation:

- This submission fails to identify the Zone of Affectation, a crucial element of planning and managing the potential impacts of a development.
- Should this application gain approval, it is expected that all affected residents would be compensated as part of the determination.
- I note that the Applicant did approach me to purchase some of the land adjoining the proposed quarry site, however, the price offered was offensive and discussions ceased.

In short, from what I have read so far, this application is based on outdated data (noise, water, air, biodiversity, traffic), and requires comprehensive surveys, studies, and modelling to be

undertaken to show the true impact this operation will have on every aspect of life for this community.

The long-term costs of this development far outweigh any short-term economic gains. I urge the assessment panel to prioritise sustainable development that protects our region's ecological integrity and respects the needs and wellbeing of its residents.

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 my submission. I trust the concerns raised here will be considered during the decision-making process.

Sincerely,

Paul Hutchinson

Adjoining Property Owner and Fulltime Resident