

Rebecca Gorton
1895 The Bucketts Way
BOORAL NSW 2425

1 July 2025

Subject: Objection to Proposed Hillview Quarry Development (SSID 70557215)

To Whom it May Concern,

I write as a resident in the vicinity of the proposed quarry at Booral to lodge my formal objection. My home is located 120m off The Bucketts Way, on the western side, and 250m south of the Maytoms Lane intersection. As such, I will be negatively impacted by this development.

After careful review of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and associated documentation, I am convinced that there is no justification for this project to proceed. It will cause irreversible environmental damage, and significant social and infrastructure disruption to the community.

1. Environmental and Ecological Impacts

- **Biodiversity Loss:** The clearing of vegetation across the site and its buffer zones threatens remnant native bushland, wildlife corridors and habitat for threatened species. In particular, the Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) identified Koalas and a significant area of Koala habitat within the development zone, yet no adequate measures are proposed to avoid or offset this loss. To the contrary, with the EIS determining “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 the species”. This is at odds with the NSW Government’s Koala Strategy, and the community’s expectation that the habitat and wellbeing of an endangered species.

- **Water Resources:** Quarry dewatering and surface water diversion will alter groundwater flows, potentially lowering local bores and affecting downstream ecosystems. The EIS lacks a rigorous hydrogeological study to quantify drawdown and contamination risks. Further, none of the submitted documentation discusses the real change that water resources will be contaminated with quarry dust, including dust potentially containing silica – known to cause Silicosis, an irreversible respiratory disease.

2. Air Quality and Noise

- **Dust Emissions:** Predicted emissions “at or above” guideline values will jeopardise air quality for properties surrounding the development. My household relies on rainwater for drinking and washing; any airborne pollutants directly threaten our health and water supply. It also threatens the safe water supply of livestock and native fauna populations. As previously mentioned, the likelihood that the extracted material (Rhyolite) contains silica causes further concerns as the Applicant fails to acknowledge the presence of, or

hazardous surrounding silica. This is unacceptable, shows a disregard for their Duty of Care obligations and breaches multiple health and safety regulations.

- **Noise Intrusion:** Continuous truck movements, along with blasting and crushing operations, will produce noise levels well above residential amenity thresholds—particularly during early morning and evening hours. In addition, the noise assessment (Appendix G – Noise) surveyed traffic travelling along The Bucketts Way. It did not take into consideration traffic decelerating on the approach to the Maytoms Lane intersection or accelerating out of it. This level of noise will be unbearable, given my proximity to The Bucketts Way and the intersection. My wellbeing will be negatively impacted by 136 decelerating truck movements and 136 accelerating truck movements, 11 hours per day, 6 days per week that have the potential to increase noise levels by up to 25% - well over the already exceeded RNP criteria levels. How is that reasonable?

3. Traffic, Safety & Infrastructure

- **Road Wear and Safety:** An estimated 136 heavy-vehicle return trips per day will accelerate pavement deterioration along The Bucketts Way, increase accident risk and impede traffic flow at the A1 Pacific Highway intersection. The Bucketts Way/A1 Pacific Highway intersection is precarious to navigate in its current state and exacerbated when traffic volumes increase significantly during school holidays and public holidays. The Hillview Quarry submission fails to identify how traffic issues will be mitigated.

- **Lack of Alternatives:** The Applicant did not consider any alternate routes to remove materials from site. Using the nearby railway line should have been considered as part of this submission.

4. Community Amenity & Health

- **Amenity Degradation:** Dust-soiled homes, constant noise and increased traffic will erode property values and undermine community cohesion. It is also in direct opposition to the rural lifestyle this community desires, and hence why we live here. The Hillview Quarry submission completely disregards the wellbeing of the community, dismissing concerns regarding noise, traffic and the environment as minor or insignificant, and offering no land acquisition/dislocation compensation for impacted neighbours. The lack of community consultation surrounding this project is further evidence that the Applicant is focused solely on the financial benefit this project will deliver to them.

- **Health Risks:** Long-term exposure to fine silica particulates and low-frequency noise is linked to respiratory illness, stress and sleep disturbance. The EIS and associated documents are generic in nature and insufficiently detail measures required to mitigate the risks to people, wildlife and the environment.

5. Market Oversupply

- **Market Oversupply:** Existing quarries, including two recently approved developments located within 40mins drive south of Hillview Quarry, in the region already meet current and forecast demand. The proponent provides no independent evidence of an unmet need that justifies this new extraction site. The application submitted by Hillview Quarry

fails to provide evidence supporting its claims that there is market demand. The protracted time it has taken for this project to crawl from exploration to submission is further evidence that there is not an urgent market demand for materials.

Considering these unmitigated impacts, I respectfully request the Commission to:

1. Refuse the Hillview Quarry application; or, at a minimum,
2. Require the proponent to prepare a revised EIS that:
 - a. A comprehensive zone-of-affectation study for air, noise, water and traffic impacts.
 - b. Closer review of the BDAR to better mitigate the impact the development will have on native flora and fauna.
 - c. A thorough acoustic modelling investigation that includes the impact of accelerating and decelerating heavy vehicle movements on noise levels; and
 - d. A robust mitigation, monitoring and compensation package, including voluntary land-acquisition and dislocation compensation for affected neighbours.

Please consider my submission in conjunction with the submission written by my sister, 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 your consideration of this submission.

Yours faithfully,

Rebecca Gorton