

Islington Village Community Group

history diversity community

P.O. Box 132, Islington 2296

islingtonvillagecg@hotmail.com

Wednesday 30 January 2013

Planning NSW

Attention: Paul Freeman (by email)

information@planning.nsw.gov.au

Project reference number SSD-4966

OBJECTION TO STRATFORD EXTENSION PROJECT

Islington Village Community Group (IVCG) is a local community group formed to:

1. Engage the local community in social activities and events for the betterment of our daily lives;
2. Inform the local community of local and state issues that impact their daily lives; and
3. Represent and communicate the Islington Village community's position on local and state significant matters by interacting with all levels of government.

Accordingly, IVCG wish to state our objection to the proposed extension of the Stratford Mine project.

Government claim that mines and mine sites are State significant positive developments as they add to the revenue base of the State and provide employment within NSW.

Conversely mines and mine sites are also very significant to the community of the State but negatively as they are major contributors to the cause ill health, create negative long lasting environmental change and commit the State (negatively) to major future financial expenses for both the health and environmental budgets.

The proposal, as exhibited, fails to inform the reader the level of revenue in dollar terms the State of NSW can expect to receive, directly from the project if approved, in each of the mines years of life. Also I can find no details of the indirect revenue this mining proposal will generate the State in each of the mines years of life.

However we do know that this project will create dust, noise and vibration impacts to the area surrounding the development. The mine proposal documentation fails to provide graphs or charts that clearly predict the ambient levels, the levels with the first mine, the maximum and minimum expectance of the new project and the cumulative effect with other current projects.

The production of noise, dust, greenhouse gasses and vibration are all admitted however there is very little detail quantifying. The solution proposed to resolve some of these issues is land acquisition however this may not be the local communities preferred outcome.

There is very little detail of the impacts off the site in the neighbouring community.

The absolute minimum impacts should include calculations detailing the impact of coal transportation to the Port of Newcastle. There is no statement of the quantity of dust, noise or vibration to be emitted by full and empty coal trains along this corridor and how that impacts the neighbouring community's enroute apart from the reference to the noise levels from trains 9 metres each side of the corridor.

What of the community's further afield than this corridor?

There is no detail of the coal wagons proposed to operate on this corridor or the strategies that will be used to prevent coal and coal dust escaping from wagons. World's best practice shows that wagons fitted with solid bottoms and lids can have zero coal losses, yet Australia fails to operate with world's best practice despite repeated statements from all levels of government and the industry that our coal industry is world best standard.

This world's best practice operations should include the freight forwarders, not simply the coal producers. Now is the time to hold the freight forwarders accountable and start to make them compliant with world's best practice in the movement of coal to the port.

My interpretation of the benefit Cost analysis in table 2.3 of Appendix P is that it fails to account for the direct community costs of noise, vibration, dust and greenhouse gas and the indirect costs of health and environment.

The documents do not show an analysis of the coal to be produced. This is very important to the community as it has a direct impact on health due to the presence of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, sulphur, mercury, chlorine and sodium in coal and the well documented adverse health impacts of some of these constituents.

Therefore on behalf of IVCG I urge that when Planning NSW considers this application that not only the benefits to the proponent be factored and weighted favourably but that you consider the real and complete impacts of this application on the people of Barrington, Gloucester, Stroud, the Hunter Valley and Newcastle with particular emphasis to those along the transport corridor and in close proximity of the port.

Health must be the stand out number one.


Terry McCauley
Coordinator
Islington Village Community Group
Mobile: 0427 311614

Check us out at either our website:

<http://islingtonvillage.wordpress.com/>

or on facebook:

<http://www.facebook.com/IslingtonVillage>