

Ian Hunter Moore,
& Robyn Ann Moore
"Strathmore",
Apple Tree Flat,
Jerry's Plains NSW 2330.
Email: ihmoore@bigpond.com

18th June, 2015.

The Secretary,
The Department of Planning Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Ms McNally,

Re: Objection to Drayton South Coal Project
Application Number: SSD 6875

We are writing as concerned landowners and residents from the Jerry's Plains area to object to the second application by Anglo American for the Drayton South open cut coal mine project.

We operate a successful mixed farming enterprise where we produce top quality Vealers for the Butcher Shop market, with the main crop/fodder grown on our properties is Lucerne to produce top quality Lucerne Hay for the Equine and Cattle Industries

As farmers in the area, we have grave concerns with this mining proposal, our decedents started farming in the area in the early 1840's. Our properties in this area are at Jerry's Plains and at Apple Tree Flat, both are in close proximity to Drayton South Coal Project. As we look out from our home over our Apple Tree Flat property where I (Ian) has lived for nearly 60 Years, of which 43 of those years was spent dairying, we stop and think of the dust and the noise pollution, that we will have to endure from the prevailing North Westley winds that this area is known for, if this mine is allowed to proceed.

Our reasons for objecting to this proposal are as follows: -

This proposal is an additional mining operation in the mid Hunter Valley North West of Jerry's Plains. This area in the Hunter Valley cannot with stand any more mining activities, people living and operating sustainable Primary Production farms in this area are facing many challenges.

1. Pollution and destruction of our water sources, - be it rivers, creeks, or underground streams, they are all important resources for the farming, thoroughbred, viticulture and tourism industries and also for our villages and communities.
2. We have grave concerns for the water that the mining proposal would need to use to subdue the dust, this precious water is of high quality, however as it runs from the higher alluvium water streams down into the coal seams, it becomes contaminated.
It is impossible to eliminate the dust that is produced, when the mining operations are digging with machines that are capable of tearing out around 100 tonnes of overburden with one bite of their machines and swinging it out and over to where they are dumping.
Wouldn't it be better to allocate this water resource to farms in order to produce food?

3. The EA lacks credibility and raises concerns with respect to compliance with the Government's Aquifer Interference Policy. We as farmers have to comply with policies, why is there one law for them and another law for us?
4. The impacts on farm productivity and land values for neighbouring properties.

There is a need for Government and Government departments to realise that NSW needs a future in farming, we need to be able to produce our food locally without the threat of dust, noise and visual pollution.

Farmers also need to have the option to be able sell their land for true value (to new farmers) when they need to move off their land and retire. When there is a mine nearby, the only buyer that would be interested in purchasing their property, is the mining company.

The devoted farmer would have a problem selling to a mining company, after they had nurtured and cared for this land, for their entire life, however this is usually their only option.

5. The effects of dust on the air quality in the area, health surveys conducted in the area have found an alarming amount of asthma especially in children. Taking this into account- what is another mining proposal in the area going to do to the health of the workers that work outdoors and to the animals (cattle, horses sheep etc.) and to the grapevines and horticulture that the community eat and drink.
6. There have been no cumulative impact studies done to collect sufficient data to be able to make a sensible determination regarding the health effects upon the residents and animals of the area that are already exposed to high density coal mining.

The Drayton South proposal lacks consideration of all the cumulative impacts of mines together in the region on dust, health, noise traffic, safety and the character of the region. We would have thought that a precautionary principle regarding effects short and long term should be applied. The jury is still out, but the impacts may be devastating to our health.

We have seen the massive impacts of mining in recent years. From the quiet area that we once lived in, to a very noisy area. On many occasions while inside listening to the television along with other household noises, we have gone outside to see what all the noise is, to realize that it's only the mines many kilometres away. Is that fair?

7. With continuing to allow mining, the threat to the diversity of the area's economy, as mining drives out other sustainable industries and the long time employment they provide. The damage caused to this area by mining is irreversible; a line must be drawn to protect what we have left, so post mining the Hunter Valley will still be sustainable for future generations.
8. We are disappointed of the lack of evidence, that appropriate rehabilitation is taking place and have no confidence that the proponent will comply with its rehabilitation commitments in the future.
At this stage there is no evidence that land can be returned to a viable agricultural use post mining, or to the former productivity that this land once produced in its natural state to produce food and fibre for this nation.

In the 60 years that I have lived in the area I have witnessed many dryland crops been produced from this land in question, with previous owners growing and harvesting of grains and also Lucerne seed, not many area are capable of achieving this, along with the breeding of cattle and sheep that were bred for meat and wool. If this land is mined it will never be able to do this again post mining

9. We have also seen another challenge from the Drayton South proposal. This is in the form of stands in our local shopping centres where shoppers were asked if they would like to add their names to the submissions in favour of the Drayton South Proposal. Our concerns with this is, the majority of these new submission writers would not know the full details of this proposal, including the close proximity to the thoroughbred studs of Coolmore and Darley, and the destruction of the prime agricultural lands and the impacts on other sustainable industries in the area.
10. Anglo American, on numerous occasions, has argued that a smaller mine plan would render the Project economically unviable – their economic analysis does not justify why a smaller mine plan is now viable.

We would like to ask WHY the employees at Drayton South are more important than the employees of Coolmore, Darley and other industries in the area, many of the Drayton employees do not live in the local council areas or contribute socially and financially to the local communities, whereas the employees of the studs work and reside locally and will be greatly impacted.

We stated at an earlier PAC hearing at Denman in August last year, that when John Howe discovered the Upper Hunter in 1819, he described this local area in his journal as the "finest agricultural land he had seen since leaving England". This land will continue to be enhanced by the Horse Studs and agricultural Industries, whereas if this land is mined, it will never recover to be the prime agricultural land that it is today.

As we said earlier this Drayton South proposal lacks consideration of all the cumulative impact of mines together in the area on dust, health, noise, traffic, safety and the character of the area.

This mine should not be allowed to proceed in this form.

We respectfully ask that you register our objection to this proposal and seriously consider our objections when assessing the appropriateness of the Drayton South open cut coal Proposal.

Yours sincerely,

Ian Hunter Moore
and
Robyn Ann Moore