

Planning Submission – Omar Khalifa

Project Name: Gerroa Quarry - Gerroa Sand Production Increase (MOD2)

Case ID: MP05_0099-Mod-2

I am making this submission as a concerned resident of Berry in the Shoalhaven and a landholder in proximity to the Cleary Brothers sand mine entry point on Beach Road, Berry.

I believe the proposed changes included in the document have so many omissions, inconsistencies, misrepresentations and errors that a decision to approve the expansion and acceleration of mining is not justified based on this proposed variation.

There has also been a complete lack of engagement with affected members of the community (especially those most impacted), their representatives and even Shoalhaven City Council. This has manifested in a lack of understanding, confusion and even awareness among impacted parties about the proposal. This lack of consultation and transparency goes against the foundation of current government policy.

In fact, my neighbours and I have only come to learn of the proposal through a group that was directly involved in the original consent and was among the few that received notice of the expansion.

Specific Issues I would like to raise against the approval as currently submitted:

1. The residents closest to the sand mine have expressed serious concern about the noise and dust impacts expanding beyond their current levels. It is acknowledged in the report that there has never been any modelling of air quality or noise impacts from the sand mining, even though it identifies many potentially impacted properties. In the variation document, it clearly states (Appendix 3 Consultant Report):

It is anticipated that the Proposed Modification would require specialist assessments of the following key potential environmental impacts.

- a. Air Quality preparation of an Air Quality Impact Assessment to address potential impacts associated with the increased production (extraction, processing and truck loading) rate.***
- b. Noise preparation of a Noise Impact Assessment to address potential impacts associated with the increased production (extraction, processing and truck loading) rate***

However, **the revised proposal seeks approval without the studies**, by simply extrapolating completely different topography, activity and meteorology from another mine site over 20km away. **An approval without these studies would go against the professional advice sought and provided to the Department of Planning and may result in serious health and property value impacts.**

2. The very important increase in truck movements on the roads is very poorly modelled, sometimes contradictory and even appears deceptive.

- a. The new modelling appears to conclude that, because **larger trucks could be used, the net traffic impact would be nil**. Of course, this would only be true if larger trucks were to replace all smaller trucks currently used. **There is no actual commitment to this change, or whether it is feasible or realistic.** **Therefore, the possibility of no net increase in truck movements cannot be taken as fact for this proposed variation.**
- b. The modelling provided suggests that the truck traffic will use the same corridors in the same numbers as previously proposed – 26% through Berry and the remainder through Gerringong/Gerroa. However, **if larger trucks are to be used as suggested, the Beach Road to Berry route does not appear appropriate or even viable**, as the overpass en route might not allow the larger trucks to pass. This would mean that either smaller trucks (12T or smaller) in higher numbers going through Berry or that more of the larger trucks (all of the trucks?) would have to go via Gerringong/Gerroa and vastly increase traffic movements there.
- c. Either larger trucks or more than double the number of smaller ones will do even **more damage to the connecting roads that already suffer from overloading**. There appears to be no discussion or effort to address the increased cost and frequency of road repairs or to upgrade the road surfaces to avoid faster deterioration. We believe a plan to do so with the cash-strapped neighbouring councils is warranted.
- d. The **safety impact on Berry and Gerringong/Gerroa residents** from either the significant increase in number and/or size of vehicles negotiating narrow village streets, **including school and retirement village areas** and road sharing with pedestrians and cyclists or school bus pickups and drop-offs along the route is not included or assessed.
- e. The truck movements are not defined by what days they will be taking place. It is implicit in the assumption that the truck movements are spread evenly over the weekdays and half of Saturday. It is my understanding that **there would be little control on demand, and it may be that traffic movements are much higher on some days or even weeks than others unless there is an enforced daily cap put on truck movements**. Is that what Cleary Brothers are suggesting?
- f. There is no discussion as to **whether road speeds and restricted hours of use within the working hours of the sand mine operation are appropriate**. The presence of heavier vehicles, combined with an increase in truck movements, significantly impacts our roads and infrastructure. Addressing these factors is crucial for maintaining safety and efficiency.

- g. There is no stated view or assessment as to **how more trucks will safely negotiate the increased local road use due to new housing and the depot developments** along the two major thoroughfares since the initial proposal was approved 16 years ago.

3. Profitability and income generation by the applicant should not be a pivotal consideration or factor, despite its repeated reference in this document.

- a. **The extraction is of a public resource**, and the maximisation of its value either in situ or for other use is at the discretion of the people of NSW and their representatives, not the applicant. Speeding up extraction may only encourage even future expansion rather than early site termination.
- b. There is no attempt at actually comparing costs and benefits or more competitive alternatives that may be available. The case is not made, and it could be argued that the preferential treatment of this applicant by way of overlooking significant shortcomings is not appropriate or desirable for the government or customers. **The government should not be facilitating advantages or look to be picking winners.**
- c. It is unclear if accelerating the mining activity is indeed in the public interest or only in the applicant's interest, especially when weighed against the issues raised. It is also clearly stated that there will be no additional employment as a direct result of the speedier use of this resource. The remaining advantages are listed vaguely as an enabler of other employment without substantiation. **One is only left to conclude that the only gain that can be certain will accrue to the applicant and costs to the local community.**

In conclusion, I believe that the variation is completely inadequate at addressing important issues, including health and safety, and this is compounded by the lack of any community engagement. The applicants even failed to properly notify affected councils before submitting

I hope you will agree that this proposal is not sufficiently complete for approval and should be rejected.

Regards,



Omar Khalifa

Appendix

Beach Road – can it safely handle large trucks? Over 25 entry/exit points over 4 kilometres plus blind crests, narrow lanes, cyclists, a hospital/hospice, childcare centre and school bus drop-offs. Plus holiday traffic.



Beach Road is Full of Crests, is without Shoulders and Many Blind Entry Points



David Berry Hospital/Hospice Facility Entry



Broughton Creek - Narrow Bridge



Jumping Jelly Beans Early Childhood Centre on Beach Road



3m-3.3m South Coast Rail Overpass Pedestrian and Cyclist Crossing Near Overpass



New Council Dirt and Gravel Depot with Truck Entries and Exits Directly on Beach Road with 80kmh Speed Limit



Is more of this appropriate?