

To Department of Planning and Environment

I strongly object to the modification on these grounds:

Air Quality and emissions

1. The report done by TAS for the proponent – the area considered for the cumulative impact from the maps looks very close to the mine lease area, cumulative means the whole of the valley related to the changes of the criteria from 30 to 25 in relation to the emission's produced from the premise and the impact on the broader region
2. The increase in the amount of impacted residence's privately and mined owned residences due to air quality changes in PM2.5 and PM10
3. There is no reference to diesel emission's with the changes in the air quality standards
4. There is no comment related to the health and safety of the public within the area impacted, or a health risk assessment related to the increase of numbers impacted, the cost related to health and our public system, especially of the World Health Organisation report of no safe levels of PM, and yet this project has increased the number of individuals impacted
5. Also the proponent has mentioned that the village of Camberwell will not be impacted as only one residence will be, but by the cumulative impact this is not the case, the changes in landform has the potential to cause the area to be greater, especially when the height of the overburden is to increase. Therefore the modelling needs to prove that the village and properties are not be affected by PM, that the consultant is required to sign this statement as true and correct and held accountable if not accurate

Acquisition of residences

1. The proponent mentions a number of times that the residences impacted are in other mine acquisition criteria but effectively the applicant is responsible for its actions and by increasing the area of impacted they are also responsible for the acquisition of these properties
2. The social impacts needs to be increased to greater area and due to the changes related to the height of the overburden, how this impacts other business, related to weather patterns, wind movements or water availability.
3. The requirement of 25% related to dust impacts from the premise annually, is out of date requirement especially now it is public knowledge due to the release of the WHO findings of no safe levels, therefore the removal of this number to the proponent must ensure that no privately owned land is impacted by hazards produced from the site, if any hazard is not controlled on site- the privately owned residence has the option for acquisition.

Final voids and landforms

1. The final void management plan must be available now and must be a working document, so the public has the ability to comment and understand the true costs of what a final void will entail for the future, how the void is to be managed.
2. The modification now provides the fact that the proponent must provide adequate reasons why there is requirement of a final void at all, the risk assessment of having a evaporate sink void and the impacts this will have on the hunter.
3. There is no cumulative impact risk assessment for the said thirty final voids in the upper hunter
4. The size increase from 440 to 523ha is absolutely disgusting that more land will sterilised by final voids in the hunter valley, this needs to explain why the hunter requires this said increase
5. The report does not look at the increase of water loss to the void and the cumulative impact of the increase on size of this said void on the other 30 final voids
6. The management of toxic water in the final void, the slope dangers, the impacts on wildlife and fauna, impacts on business in the future, if the final void requires continual maintenance and what are the costs and monitoring costs has not been provided.
7. How does the changing landform within the hunter, will impact on the final voids and does this change in the cost projects in the future.