Bev Smiles Ringwood Rd Wollar 2850



Major Project Assessment Department of Planning & Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

plan comment@planning.nsw.gov.au

Monday 9 September 2013

## Submission of Objection Modification to the Wilpinjong Coal Mine Project (05\_0021 MOD 5)

Dear Sir,

I am a member of the Wilpinjong Community Consultative Committee (CCC) and a long term resident of the Wollar community. I live at property number 160 to the east of the mining operation. I am regularly impacted by low frequency noise and the cumulative increased train movements from the three mines to the west, particularly at night, and can hear the current mining operations at Wilpinjong mine.

The CCC has received presentations from affected landholders in the Wollar area from the time that the mine started operating. There is no clear or fair process in place to protect citizens from the destructive social processes that have been experienced in the Wollar area for the past 7 years.

I strongly object to any expansion of the Wilpinjong Coal Mine because the current impacts are unmanageable and have caused a significant level of unpredicted environmental and social impact on the area.

I particularly object to the validity of model predictions for noise impacts, the proposal to increase blasting MIC and the potential for increased spontaneous combustion impacts.

The noise modelling does not take into account the impact of low frequency noise.

I am concerned that the Noise and Blasting Impact Assessment undertaken by SLR Consulting records predicted noise levels at properties 160A and 160B without identifying which households these refer to.

Previous noise modelling for Wilpinjong Mine has proven to be incorrect in relation to impacts on residents in the area. The result has caused a high level of stress, ill health, unhappiness and unfair purchasing negotiations from a variety of staff and consultants employed by Peabody Energy.

The scale of property ownership by the mining company is an indication of the scale of impact the mine has had on the local community, which has virtually been destroyed.

The level of machinery lost hours due to the real-time monitoring noise triggers is a clear indication of the level of noise generated by the mine above conditions of approval. This demonstrates that noise predictions approved in the original Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) were seriously incorrect.

There has been no socio-economic analysis conducted on the emptying out of an entire community. If the original proposal had been presented with honest predictions and a fair compensation package, the community of Wollar and region, plus the broader community, would have been provided with a set of reasonable choices on which to make decisions.

The piecemeal destruction of amenity and impact on the physical and mental health of community members has been a very cruel experience.

There is no confidence that the current experience relating to the unsustainable impacts from large coal mining projects is about to change.

The fact that Wilpinjong coal mine has already undergone four modifications and is now proposing a fifth, indicates that the original EIS did not provide adequate information for an economically viable operation.

The approval granted in 2006 was for a period of 21 years based on the EIS submitted to the Department of Planning. The project has now changed significantly from that original approval and continues to change to the cumulative detriment of the environment, amenity and local community.

I have no confidence in any of the modelled predictions provided in the application for Wilpinjong Mod 5 and believe that it should not be approved on the basis of long term uncosted community impacts.

Yours sincerely

B. Smiles

**Bev Smiles**