

We wish for the Dept of planning to delete our personnel details before publishing on line.

NSW Planning and Infrastructure.

Att: Mike Young. Manager Mining Projects.

Re: ARDMORE PARK QUARRY MODIFICATION (mp 07 _0155 Mod 2)

We would like to protest in the strongest possible way, against this modification, that Ardmore Quarry has proposed.

We have looked at the Environmental Assessment to support this application, and find a number of flaws with this application.

In the Executive summary page it is making a statement "The assessment of traffic-related impacts confirmed that the additional traffic generated by the proposal would be within acceptable traffic capacity limits, SO MY QUESTION IS "WHAT IS THE LIMITS" IT DOES NOT STATE A NUMBER.

THE TRAFFIC Noise and vibration assessment predicted are below the respective criteria "WHAT CRITERIA. Relevant point to consider , this is a rural area with very low background noise, therefore noise that would be considered normal in metropolitan area would be quite loud and carry some distance in this setting degrading the amenity of the area.

It is also stated the proposed modification would result in minor changes to local traffic conditions, but would meet reasonable community expectations. WHAT is classed as reasonable community expectations? Any extra truck movements on any country road, that is not designed for heavy haulage trucks, that this company want to use, the roads in this area are already in disrepair and unable to be upgraded by the local council (Goulburn Mulwaree Council) as funds are not available, and to date and to my knowledge, there have been NO contributions of section 94 as this company have made NO effort what so ever to do any repairs or upgrades to any road in this area to date, in regards to the original proposal, they just keep trying to go around the original DA conditions.

The proposal to increase heavy truck movements is an increase on existing movements in excess of 100% which is unacceptable to the local community.

It also states in this new amendment that the quarry access intersection does not need modification as the truck would turn left onto Oallen Ford Road, "What about trucks returning and having to turn into the quarry entrance. The original DA conditions are that the quarry entrance be relocated to avoid any possible conflict between traffic entering the quarry.

This new proposed route was bought about because this company states that they have restricted movement of their trucks and cannot deliver to local residence that they have had enquiry's from?

I wonder if they could supply affidavits from these so called local people, because the small amount of local product required I doubt Ardmore Quarry could be competitive. There are a number of operating Quarries in this area with direct access to the South and north of the Hume Hwy such as

Divalls who area a local supplier to this area, and have a quarry on the Hume Hwy just north of Goulburn.

In the Bungonia, Windellama , Tarago area there is NO local haul route, leading from the Hume Hwy at Marulan, through Bungonia towards Windellama and DIRT road onto the Tarago Road, the Jerrara Road, was to be upgraded by this company FIRST, since 2009 NOTHING has been done EXCEPT purchase of private land, and also crown lands TSR (travelling stock reserve) which was grossly undervalued by the crown lands department, Lot 101 DP 1167749 and is currently being investigated by ICAC . This piece of land is pivotal in Multiquip obtaining a haulage route around the township of Bungonia and was paramount in the plans of Multiquip, to build a bypass, without this piece of land the company could not put the haulage route around the township of Bungonia to build the original haulage route. Specified in the original DA.

It would appear that the original haulage route, has become too costly for this company so they are trying to open back doors, to get any trucks they can on the road, even at 5 movements a day, this already adds to the large amount of traffic on any of the country roads, mentioned in the submission. It now brings into play, a country primary school, at Windellama which I know has children crossing a road mentioned in the modification, to get to a play area, and a recent fatality has already happened to a school child on this very road. In addition several hundred children wait on local road verges to catch local school buses which cover this area, to get to school in Goulburn, with the proposed large increase in heavy vehicle movement's potential conflict will exist and collisions envisaged.

Since 2009, there has been a significant increase in traffic along these country roads mentioned, and a few fatality's, there has been NO traffic counters put on the roads, recently even if multiquip state there has, as a company employed by Multiquip to carry out this work, lost their counters they put on Jerrara Road, they were taken by person/s unknown, this company did not obtain permission from the Goulburn Mulwaree council nor apply for a section 138 certificate to put counters on any roads mentioned in this new proposal in the first place, so any figures this company have supplied to you are out of date, and false.

The road infrastructure of this haulage route amendment and amended proposed transport route is inadequate to support any significant increase in an extra heavy traffic movements, shoulder widths of this proposed route are NO different to the original application, and in fact they are even narrower in sections of the route, than Jerrara Rd.

Council and NSW Planning is required to consider the public interest under s 79c(1)(e) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, with the increase of traffic flow, noise and heavy traffic to and from the quarry, increase of dust level, if using Tarago Road, with adverse health impacts from dust, noise and carbon emissions, road safety along the new proposed route mentioned, (the Windellama school) loss of land values with people living in close proximity of the quarry, and along the haulage route mentioned.

NSW Planning should consider in the public interest it is best served NOT to allow the amended development application to precede, if anything stick to the original application, which will at least allow the route to be more direct, and be upgraded, as was asked, when judgement was handed down in 2009. Rate payers in this area, are fed up with fighting this company, a judgement was handed down, Please read this if you are not familiar with it, as rates payers money could be spent better, than fighting this company yet again, and wasting public monies it already cost \$350,000 of GMC monies, please don't let this happen again, for the same outcome.

Also for your information, Multiquip has NOT had any meetings with the community, Multiquip has had meetings on their own property with people they have invited, not people in the area, that are opposed to this new application. So it is time to get some facts straight, and make this company do the right thing, build the bypass, upgrade the roads, as required in the original DA not keep making amendments, wasting rate payers monies and time, and further endangering lives of people that live and visit this community and rural area.