

345

Rebecca Newman - Submission Details for [REDACTED] (object)

From: [REDACTED]
 To: <Rebecca.Newman@planning.nsw.gov.au>
 Date: 7/05/2012 2:38 PM
 Subject: Submission Details for [REDACTED] (object)
 CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

X Department of Planning

Confidentiality Requested: yes

Disclosable Political Donation: no

[REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]
 [REDACTED]

Content:

As a resident of Tighes Hill in Newcastle, a mother, school teacher and a citizen of the Earth, I object to the proposed development of a fourth coal terminal by Port Waratah Coal Services (PWCS) at the Port of Newcastle on the grounds below.

The case for the need for an additional terminal, as stated by PWCS, has not been sufficiently established by the proponent:

- * The demand for coal is in a state of flux as the market is currently flooded with an oversupply of coal making an extra coal terminal financially unfeasible.
 - * The community were not adequately involved in the agreement between the government and PWCS that PWCS claims gives it a mandate to build an additional terminal. Indeed from my participation in PWCS community meetings this privately owned conglomerate of mining and foreign coal purchasing interests have treated the terminal construction as a fait accompli with little regard to community sentiment, well being and concerns.
 - * PWCS have not made available for public scrutiny the public the 'trigger thresholds' that it claims sets the development of an additional coal terminal in play.
 - * It has not been sufficiently demonstrated that investing in increased efficiencies at existing terminals would not amply cover the need for a further coal terminal - this being in the interest of the Region given the risks of development on the proposed site which is a storage site for toxic sediments from the BHP Billiton Steel River Remediation.
 - * The impact of coal, mined in Australia and exported from the Port of Newcastle Port, when burned on our global climate is massive and will jeopardise the well being of humanity - that's 228 million tonnes of carbon dioxide produced per annum from the proposed export capacity of 120 million tonnes of coal per annum.
 - * International trends to using low carbon emitting and renewable technologies for power generation and away from highly polluting fossil fuels such as coal mean that by the time the terminal is built it may be obsolete whilst it's construction would have port irreversible damage to Hunter communities and the Hunter River ecosystems that are used both recreationally, commercially by fisheries and for threatened species bird habitat.
- It would be irresponsible to allow further development of the industry when current impacts and associated health and quality of life concerns remain unaddressed.
- * PWCS and its owners have failed to address the impacts of coal mining and transport on coal affected communities.
 - * The current dust monitoring system is patchy and non-specific to the concerns of the community.
 - * There is no noise monitoring or noise barriers currently in place in Newcastle to assess the impacts of noise pollution on the community from the coal rail corridor and coal terminals.
 - * Nightly offshore winds (as the prevailing winds in the Lower Hunter Valley) mean that Newcastle residents are frequently subjected to noise from the current loaders and coal trains that penetrate walls and windows. In my experience this is particularly the case in Tighes Hill, Carrington, Mayfield and Waratah and is also experienced in Newcastle East.
 - * PWCS, as representatives of a multibillion dollar industry, is renowned for deflecting responsibility for the impacts of coal transport to the mines, rail carriers, rail networks and other heavy industry in the Port rather than instituting measures to reduce noise and dust.
 - * PWCS has only paid lip service to the concerns of the community about the known health effects of breathing in fine particulate matter that causes upper respiratory disease and potentially cancer.
 - * The current dust suppression measures are ineffective on very dry and windy days and use vast amounts of precious fresh water.

The increase of coal dust, noise, vibrations and traffic that would result from the proposed Terminal stretching from the

Upper Hunter and Liverpool Plains to the Port of Newcastle is unacceptable.

* Forty-one additional coal trains on the network is almost a doubling of current capacity would result in more dust, vibrations, noise and traffic hold ups for the Hunter.

* Given the known health impacts of exposure to coal dust, in particular, this is an unacceptable increase on the population of the second largest city in NSW.

The dredging required to deepen the harbour for the shipping swing berth has the potential to remobilise toxic sediments present in Newcastle Harbour from historic heavy industry threatening the health of local fisheries, bird populations and recreational fishers and River users.

Construction of the proposed Terminal on Kooragang Island on top of where toxic sediments are being stored is a ridiculous proposal.

* The construction method -compacting the wetlands to form a solid base on which to place the loaders- threatens to re-release these sediments into the groundwater system.

* This is a particularly risky proposal for high rainfall years (such as 2012) and in the event of sea levels rises (especially those associated with extreme weather events) which will increase water flow on the site and risk breaching the clay aquitard barrier that is supposed to contain toxic sediments stored there.

* The condition of the clay aquitard, which is thin or non-existent at points across the site, and its long term maintenance for the proposed development has not been sufficiently assessed.

* The Environmental Assessment does not make plans for the long term maintenance of the site. Surely long term maintenance plans must be assessed as adequate before approval for construction is given.

* Even where the risk of contamination is low the wide reaching impact of contamination of groundwater aquifers for the Lower Hunter makes such a risk untenable.

* The need for uncontaminated groundwater aquifers which serve the ecological needs of the environment and humanity are paramount and must not be compromised for the short term gain of PWCS.

As a resident of Tighes Hill I am shocked that our suburb has been excluded from noise assessments for the proposed Terminal. Given the noise impacts we are currently subjected to from the Carrington Coal Terminal it is essential that any further noise impacts for a variety of winds and weather conditions be assessed for our suburb. I call for the Noise study as part of the Environmental assessment to be redone to include Tighes Hill.

The use of National Park land for the proposed Terminal is unacceptable.

* These lands provide essential habitat to 23 threatened bird species and the green and golden bell frog.

* Deep Pond is the only drought resistant habitat for wetland birds in the Lower Hunter.

* Conservation of this wetland habitat is especially important with predicted sea level rises associated with global warming that will further limit migratory shorebird habitat.

Yours Sincerely

[Redacted Signature]

Submission: Online Submission from [Redacted] (object)
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_diary&id=29600

Submission for Job: #4399 Port Waratah Coal Services Terminal 4
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_job&id=4399

Site: #2 406 PWCS Terminal 4
https://majorprojects.affinitylive.com?action=view_site&id=2406

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

Powered by [AffinityLive](https://affinitylive.com): Work. Smarter