

46A Bellereeve Ave,
Mt Riverview 2774
17th April 2014



Re:

**Part 3A Modification 4 – Invincible Mine Extension (07_0127 MOD 4) and
Part 3A Modification 2 – Cullen Valley Mine Extension (DA 200-5-2003 MOD 2)**

Dear Sir/Madam,

I object to the proposed modifications to the Invincible and Cullen Valley coal mines. I am an avid bushwalker and canyoner and, in a selfish way I guess, I would like more areas to explore but I understand the need for resources to be found and used to sustain our communities. This proposal however I find intolerable and a 'grab' for an area of beauty and creature habitat that I feel deserves protection.

The Planning Assessment Commission, as I read its recommendations, requires a 300 metre minimum buffer from the base of the pagoda rock formations and the open-cut area. This proposal fails to do this as far as I can determine and this sort of breach gives me no faith in the integrity of the proposers or the proposers itself. I love the pagoda formations and the recreational 'fun' these formations provide. I am convinced this proposal will result in an adverse impact on the pagoda landforms in the Ben Bullen State Forest.

I have great sympathy for the people of Cullen Bullen. Their own objection to the dust and noise from the works associated with this proposal is a strong argument that the community is not well served by this proposal going ahead.

There are success stories in mine rehabilitation. These can be seen in proceedings from workshops like the Mine Rehabilitation & Closure Planning Summit November 18-19, 2013 in Las Vegas, NV. These however, are massive efforts with vast sums of money spent and the availability of fill from other nearby operations. I cannot see that Coalpac can match what is needed to achieve rehabilitation and once the formations are gone they are not able to be recreated. The area will end up being 'cod ordinary' instead of having the fascination it has now. I do not believe there is sufficient seed bank, nor any interest in creating a seed bank that will allow revegetation of the area with the species that are there now. Diversity is compromised for the sake of the company gain.

I find the claim of increased costs to electricity consumers if the proposal does not proceed insulting. It is an illogical argument that smacks of the same sort of scaremongering used in political election campaigns when 'ordinary mums and dads' are threatened with more taxation if certain initiatives go ahead. It is a 'clutching at straws' tactic especially when coal in other areas can equally supply the needs for the foreseeable future.

As a final note, I understand I need to make it clear I have no political affiliation so I declare that I have not made any donations to political parties in the last year.

Yours sincerely,

(Graeme Carrâd)

