

7<sup>TH</sup> July 2014

Claire Bettington  
357 Maroubra Road  
Maroubra NSW 2035

Mining and Industry Projects  
NSW Department of Planning & Infrastructure  
GPO Box 39  
Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Sir/Madam,

**Re: Submission on the Airly Colliery DA 162/91 Modification 3 proposal, currently on exhibition.**

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the above proposal.

My position is that what is being proposed is inappropriate, and I am **OBJECTING** to the granting of this DA modification.

I have read the associated documents and I feel qualified to comment as a citizen of NSW, and as a person who is keenly interested in the preservation of the environment. I have studied Human, Physical and Environmental Geography (BA from Sydney Uni, 1996); I have a qualification in GIS (digital mapping) and I am currently undertaking the Cert III in Land and Conservation Management at TAFE. I am also greatly worried about Global Warming, Greenhouse gases, Climate Change and the fact that Australia exports a great deal of coal, vastly contributing to these problems.

Specifically, my objections to DA 162/91 Modification 3 are these:

1. **The DA was issued in 1991 and is therefore out of date.** Conditions have changed, therefore a new DA should be lodged: There is now a declared State Conservation Area (SCA) which covers virtually all of the mining lease areas, therefore the old DA should be considered inadequate and cancelled, and the proponent invited to apply for a new DA.
2. Under this old DA, 1.8m of subsidence caused by mining was deemed acceptable. Today, this is **TOTALLY** unacceptable practice, especially in an area of recognised environment significance, and the following limits should be applied: **Vertical subsidence to a maximum of 125mm; maximum tilt of 2.5mm/m; and maximum strain of 2.0mm/m.** This will ensure minimal damage to the rock formations known as pagodas and historic mining relics, and any Aboriginal sites within the mining lease areas.
3. Given that the World Heritage Advisory Committee has recommended that Mugii Murumban SCA be added to the Greater Blue Mountains World Heritage Area on completion of mining activities, proper safeguards should now be put in place to protect the environmental values that exist there. Under DA 162/91 there are no such safeguards; therefore a new DA should be sought by the proponent.

4. The mining leases abut the Gardens of Stone National Park, part of the Greater Blue Mountains World Heritage Area. This old DA allows for the **discharge of polluted mining water into Airly Creek**, which flows into the Gardens of Stone area. In my opinion, this is a totally unacceptable practice and should not be allowed. A new DA should be applied for, showing how polluted mining water can better be dealt with, for example by on-site treatment and re-use.
5. There is no mention in this DA modification of the **historic New Hartley Oil Shale Mining** remnants, and it is very hard to determine from the maps supplied in the various documents whether or not the proposed mining will impact this historic area. The DA modification should be amended to state what impact the proposed mining will have on the old mining remnants.
6. Due to the beauty of the area, **the impact on tourism** should be carefully considered when considering an extension to this old DA. Such a large amount of coal being mined will be stockpiled in large heaps waiting for a train, as will the “rejects” – those pieces of coal too large or too fine for shipment. Should these heaps become very large, they would cause a huge blot on the landscape in an area of outstanding natural beauty.
7. Nothing much has been said about the **impact of noise and dust** of such a large mine on the surrounding properties. The old DA allows 24hr/day, 52 weeks/year operation, which will mean continual uninterrupted movement of coal – on conveyor belts, onto trains, from stockpiles into the coal crusher, etc. This will involve continual and uninterrupted noise and dust with no breaks whatsoever. It will do nothing to enhance the surrounding environment, and be very unattractive in an area of outstanding natural beauty, totally incompatible with tourism. Tourism has the potential to be a sustainable long term local source of income; mining is a one-off unsustainable activity which leaves a great deal of destruction behind. I suggest that tourism and mining are virtually incompatible.
8. Nothing whatever has been said about the ultimate use of the coal, which to date has all been exported. Of course this coal will be burned, probably to produce electric power. In this day and age, shouldn't there be some consideration given to the fact that such a large amount of coal being mined and burned is actually not in the interests of humanity as a whole? **Global warming** is a fact, and the coal from this mine, when burnt, will contribute to the overall Global Warming problem, and to worsening **Climate Change**. The Briefing documents refer at length **Ecological Sustainability**, but do not apply the principles embodied in the concept to the proposed expansion of this mining operation, except in a limited and narrow way applied only to the mining operation itself. Surely such a glaring omission is a major flaw that in itself should disallow this proposed DA modification?
9. The fact that **the original DA was granted to a completely different company** to the one that now owns the coal mine is another factor against the approval of the DA extension: the current owner of the mine, Banpu Singapore, are probably only interested in making as large a profit as possible from the continuation and possible subsequent further massive expansion of this mine, and I am sure that they have no interest whatsoever in the likely damage to our environment, which if it happens will be irreversible. The area of outstanding natural beauty in which this mine is situated is of course totally irreplaceable. Therefore, the new owner of the mine, Banpu (through Centennial) should be required to make a completely new DA application, especially since conditions and scientific knowledge have changed markedly since the original DA was approved. They should NOT be allowed to make the modification to the DA which will expire in October 2014.

Thank you again for the opportunity to comment on this DA,

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, reading "C. E. Bettington". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Claire Bettington  
Maroubra NSW 2035