

19th June 2015

Pauline Rayner
202 The Inlet Road
BULGA NSW 2330
Email: rcorino@bigpond.com

Department of Planning & Environment
23-33 Bridge Street, Sydney NSW 2000
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

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

I am writing as a concerned member of the Hunter Valley to object to the second application by Anglo American for the Drayton South open coal mine project.

This mine has been assessed by the PAC twice and has been refused and shown not to be in the public interest.

PAC Review Report 2013: The PAC recommended:

- *The Coolmore and (Darley) Woodlands horse studs should be recognised as essential to the broader Equine Critical Industry Cluster and given the highest level of protection from the impacts of mining.*
- *The mine plan for the site should not be approved.*

PAC Determination Report 2014: PAC Refused the Project:

- *The project does not provide sufficient buffer to protect Coolmore and Darley from the impacts of mining as recommended in the PAC Review Report and the Gateway Panel Report.*
- *The project has not demonstrated that it will not adversely impact on equine health and the operations of the Coolmore and Darley horse studs.*
- *The approach of monitoring the response of thoroughbred horses to the mine's operation to address uncertainty is not acceptable because once the damage to the operations of the studs occurs, it is irreversible.*

The economic benefits of the project do not outweigh the risk of losing Coolmore and Darley and the potential demise of the equine industry in the area with flow on impacts on the viticultural tourism industries.

The project is not in the public interest.

The impact this mining proposal will have on neighbouring industries and community; wine and thoroughbred industries are key employers in the region and the project is across from the two biggest horse studs and Hollydeen Winery. This will have flow on affects to the other producers and the community in the region.

This mine is a threat to an already sustainable community, equine, wine, farming and tourism which employ many thousands of workers. These jobs are long term continuing to support a sustainable community, where as a mine is short term and when the coal is gone the work force moves on.

The economic analysis does not justify how a smaller mine plan is now economic. Mining companies seem to ignore in their economic plans the final void and rehabilitation of the land, they usually say it is too expensive to completely fill the void. If this is the case then the reason for approving this mine on significant economic benefits is not a valid argument when the final void should be included as expenditure.

The SEPP states - **Significance of resource**

(1) In determining an application for consent for development for the purposes of mining, the consent authority must consider the significance of the resource that is the subject of the application, having regard to:

(a) the economic benefits, both to the State and the region in which the development is proposed to be carried out, of developing the resource,

(2) The following matters are (without limitation) taken to be relevant for the purposes of subclause (1) (a):

*(b) **expenditure**, including capital investment,*

No community wants to be left with the devastation of final voids, saline water, unusable land and ruined aquifers as well as their property and homes of no value so they can't sell but have to continue breathing the dust and under extreme stress from the noise.

Please register my objection to this proposal

Thank you

Pauline Rayner