

26th July 2018

Dear Department of planning

I object to the modification on these grounds,

1. The Department's failure to identify non-compliance lease zones in the last eight years and the failure of checking systems in place is now proven to be inadequate, below standard if in the last two years there has been two cases in the Singleton area of mining outside the mine lease boundary.
That all modification approvals to the Integra and Rixs creek complex including the underground owned by Glencore have all the lease boundaries checked and approved by independent specialist which the public has a direct link to the process to ensure clear independence.
2. The non-compliance of the lease area is still being utilized as a haul road and the perceived perception from the landholders of the village of Camberwell that the department and the proponent believe this is acceptable behaviour to act in breach of the Act, which would be considered breach of the law.
3. The Landholders of the village of Camberwell have been exposed to poor air quality since 2010-2017 of 267 alerts initiated from Camberwell monitor of 24hour Pm10 rolling average of exceedances of national air quality standard and 135 days of daily exceedances of PM10. Which clearly indicates that the village of Camberwell is heavily impacted by cumulative air quality and the location of the premise to the village has contributed to the poor air quality, therefore the landholders should be considered in the acquisition area and have the right of acquisition on request.
4. The landholders of the village of Camberwell have been exposed to noise levels from the haul road of the last eight years and has contributed to the overall noise airshed including the highway, which was not apart of the original EIS in 2010, which means the community of Camberwell have been ultimately lied to and the perceived perception of been mislead when making a complaint when the haul road and mining activities were not meant to be in that areas and endured impacts related to the operation which should have not been activated.
5. The area should now be rehabilitated and returned to the natural state before disturbed without consent, ownership of the land as stated does not mean you can mine without consent, this action was a clear breach of trust and there is no cost analysis report of the impact on the village of Camberwell and the surrounding resident of the related infringement or breach of law.
6. As members of the Community of Camberwell are away on leave and the timeframe was so short to make a submission, it would be deemed unfair to them the right to make a comment, so therefore this request a larger timeframe for submission response especially in
7. this case it is to cover an act of breach to make a comment and specially enlighten that the proponent has made a substantial benefit from the use of the haul road at cost to others.