

The Hon Paul Scully MP
Minister for Planning and Public Spaces
NSW Government
GPO Box 5341
SYDNEY NSW 2001

I ask that the proposal for the Monaro Rock quarry, including industrial site to mine and process rock, and manufacture concrete, hot asphalt and recycle concrete, be rejected outright at this time, thus avoiding further time and expense to the applicant.

There are enough quarries already

I question the need for and object to another quarry in this area, given there is an existing quarry in the Royalla area with associated issues already in operation. This quarry already impacts residents in the area with dust issues (wind knows no boundaries), noise and electricity brownouts. The existing quarry at the other end of the valley has sufficient supplies to extend for many decades. Is another one put into operation for private personal gain worth the risk to people living, eating, and enjoying life in the surrounding area?

Dangers to myself and our community

I question the need for and object to this quarry in this area, given it is within a few kilometres of multiple residences, including my residence purchased more than 20 years ago when there was no flagging of a quarry to be commenced in this location. Having a blasting hard rock quarry and associated concrete and asphalt industrial site so close to several rural-residential estates is irresponsible and negligent.

Dust and pollutants: Dust is carried on the wind. Wind knows no boundaries. I have grave concerns about the impacts, both short and long-term, of silica dust particles carried in the air over my residence, and the associated impacts on me and my family including grandchildren who stay at my home weekly. The EIS does indicate air pollutants such as silica are likely. Any regulation to be imposed on dust does not work. Applying a layer of water over the area intermittently may reduce some particles but does not adequately address the health risks. I am concerned that any regulation that may be imposed would be self-managed by the applicant with no adequate monitoring or oversight, consequences and enforcement. I am concerned there would be no or insufficient funding of regulatory oversight – external regulation such as weekly testing by a Commonwealth or State Regulator of air particles in the surrounding area, mapping and recording of dust layers on solar panels and inside residences, monitoring of the quality of drinking water in stored water tanks, etc does not or would not exist or be adequately funded, including mitigation measures. It may be easy to say dust will be managed or suppressed, but it would be too late in 30 years to find that the applicant failed to adequately suppress dust and residents in the area, including myself, my family and my neighbours, have been harmed by exposure to silica.

Property values & community impacts: I question the need for and object to this quarry in this area, as it will likely detrimentally impact on the value of my property and I have not been and will not be adequately compensated for this. This is a private business developing an industrial estate in a residential community area, to the benefit of a private landholder/owner yet detrimentally impacting a whole community. This land is not zoned as an industrial estate, and was not zoned as such or indicated for future zoning as such when I purchased my property in 2003. The location is a rural residential area. Surely there are more appropriate locations of the existence of the rock to be quarried in regions that do not have such a high population of people including children residing in

the surrounding 20kms. At a minimum, there would need to be an adequately managed trust put in place to share the gross income of the quarry/industrial estate with the surrounding community, likely to increase in the next 30 years, similar to that in place with the [Veolia-Mulwaree Trust](https://www.anz.veolia.com/about-us/corporate-social-responsibility/veolia-mulwaree-trust). This trust manages and distributes funds to not-for-profit community groups and organisations for the benefit of the relevant Council area, as well as its immediate surrounds. The trust's foundation was driven by the Council Mayor at the time, to manage funds from Veolia's Woodlawn Mine Eco-Precinct. Google searching indicates the trust has, since 2005, distributed over \$14 million to more than 1,800 community projects, and academic and arts scholarships (<https://www.anz.veolia.com/about-us/corporate-social-responsibility/veolia-mulwaree-trust>). Any trust established should be based on gross income/turnover, and should be an externally administered trust. Safeguards would need to be put in place to ensure the quarry/industrial estate operator did not seek to minimise finances in order for personal gain. If this enterprise is not to be exceedingly profitable, I question the need for it to be commenced in the first place. If the surrounding community is set to be so adversely impacted, the surrounding community should share in the daily takings.

Water & water quality: I question the need for and object to this quarry in this area given the impacts on water. I have real concerns my drinking water will be contaminated, and there will be no regulatory body to conduct regular testing to mitigate risks. For most of the two decades I have lived in Royalla we have been in drought. The quality of the soil is generally poor and dusty. The rural residents in this community either have a bore or a dam, depending on their land approval. In this area we are not on town water – we catch our drinking and washing water on our house and shed roof and store it in water tanks. I have an above ground water tank that is fed with water from my house roof. I do not want it contaminated with minute silica dust particles blown down-wind from the quarry planned to be to my north. Any westerly or northerly winds, the prevailing winds in this region, will bring those particles to my roof and into my water; which I drink; which my grandchildren drink. Where is the Government's assurances that me and my family will be safe? Will we be tested weekly for contamination? I would expect asphalt production will use petro-chemicals and other hazardous chemicals. I understand mine/quarry workers are required to be tested regularly for health surveillance. Will that testing extend to myself, my grandchildren and other householders in this region given we will be similarly subjected to hazards such as silica dust and other chemical pollutants?

I have a bore on my property. I use that water when needed on my property for irrigation and native animal water sources. With the quarry needing up to 42.4 million litres per year of extracted groundwater for its activities, will it be taking my bore water and that of my neighbours? Is the extraction of that level of groundwater sustainable in this region? The Bureau of Meteorology website (www.bom.gov.au) informs me that the mean annual rainfall statistics at the weather station 12.3km away in Isabella Plains is 642.1mm. Not a lot to replenish the connected aquifers underneath my property and that of my neighbours and the quarry/industrial estate. Particularly when considering the evaporation rate in this region – which I understand is more than double the rainfall rate. I would also expect the operation would reduce rainwater and groundwater flows into surrounding creeks, thereby impacting creeks and rivers not just in this region but also in Tuggeranong. Also, can it be guaranteed that the bore water and creek water would not be contaminated from concrete being recycled on site and other industrial processes with the mining and asphalt production with potential pollutants entering groundwater that I use as well as water flows to surrounding creeks that flow down to Tuggeranong?

Traffic: I question the need for and object to this quarry in this area given the impacts on an already stressed Monaro Highway, and to avoid the impacts on minor small community roads within the project area such as the Old Cooma Road. Old Cooma Road has incurred increased congestion following the development of Googong, and the intersection with Monaro Highway has suffered several fatal accidents in the recent past. I question whether there would be adequate funding provided to Council for road upkeep – management of potholes etc with such a large number (estimates between 200 and 500 heavy vehicles a day) travelling in the area. Most importantly, any intersection with the Monaro Highway would need to allow for these heavy vehicle movements each day – it would be unsafe and likely lead to fatal accidents if the current vehicle intersections were used either during construction or when operational. All surrounding roads could be impacted, as traffic may use alternate routes to avoid heavy vehicles, potentially using the Royalla Drive/Monaro Highway intersection as well. I would need assurance that development of a major intersection with Monaro Highway would be required prior to any commencement of construction of any project. This major intersection would need to be of a standard that ensured the safety of the highway during congestion times – the north-bound returning ‘ski traffic’ is often banked up to the top of Tuggeranong Hill on the Monaro Highway, and both the north and south-bound traffic is a steady stream of 100km per hour traffic along Monaro Highway, particularly during the autumn/winter months. I would expect a new Monaro Highway intersection for the quarry, which would be located in the Australian Capital Territory (ACT), should be an overpass and there would need to be either dual carriageway or two lanes both ways north and south from the Quarry/Monaro Highway intersection to the Johnson Drive (Calwell, ACT) roundabout, as well as improvements to the Johnson Drive roundabout to consider the increased heavy vehicle traffic.

Odour, noise & vibrations & bushfire: I question the need for and object to this quarry in this area given the other detrimental impacts on myself and my family as residents in the area including persistent foul odour (hot mix asphalt generates strong and persistent odours), and noise and vibrations from blasting (already suffered by residents in the area from the existing quarry at the other end of the valley). Will there be adequate protection for the surrounding community with the storage I would expect will occur on site of petro-chemicals, hazardous chemicals and petroleum products and fuel, particularly given the bushfire risks in this area.

Project description and mapping: I question the need for and object to this quarry in this area given the project description and mapping does not provide sufficient details on the proposal including the extent of direct and indirect impacts.

I have some questions on the details provided:

1. Is the tree screening area considered in the development footprint? Will it also be impacted by operations, drainage, dust, habitat fragmentation, isolation of populations, etc.? Will the screening be introduced or existing vegetation? If introduced, will the species be mature plants and native to the area? What monitoring and regulatory follow-up would occur on ensuring the screening is sufficient and well-maintained over time?
2. What are the indirect impacts of the development on the surrounding woodland including habitat and individual species recorded (eg. drainage, dust, habitat fragmentation, ground water drawdown)?
3. What is the clearing footprint and what is retained?
4. It is unclear the staging of the project and whether the whole project and boundary is defined. How will the project be staged? Is the project as described the total impact?
5. Have other potential impacts of the project been considered? For example, the impact of roadkill from increased trucks on threatened species such as the striped legless lizard and gang gangs?

6. *Offsets:*

The offset proposal lacks information and is not sufficient for the projected loss of biodiversity on the site. The applicant has not demonstrated that a suitable offset is possible, and proposes to move this discussion to post approval. This does not show me or our community what is proposed including how, when and where the offset will occur. I am also concerned that there will be insufficient regulation post approval to ensure offsets are adequate and in place.

Flora and fauna including endangered species: The proposal does not comment on the acceptability of the impacts to critically endangered and endangered species and instead goes straight to offset options without demonstrating this. I am concerned as to the large area to be cleared (vegetation including critically endangered Box-Gum Grassy Woodland), with the associated loss of and impacts on over 300 species of flora and fauna, including endangered Swainsona Recta and Hoary Sunray and other plants, and including woodland birds, animals, insects, reptiles, etc.

The project does not consider the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (EPBC Act) offset policy despite saying referral is likely required, and doesn't say how they will address the relevant NSW policy.

Is there to be a public hearing to respond to the issues I have raised?