

16/06/13

Michelle Campbell

30 Treelands Drive

Jilliby NSW 2259

Phone: 02 4353 9903

17/06/13

Dear Sir/Madam

I would like to Object to the Wallarah 2 Coal Project – Application no: SSD-4974.

My reasons are:-

Living at Jilliby my home will be above the coal seam.

I have just got my home the way I want it, I don't want to see cracks from mine subsidence in my walls or in the ground my house sits on. I don't want to have to take anyone to court and have to prove that any damage to my home was from mine subsidence –(I don't need that stress).

My Family moved to the Central Coast for the Clean Air and Healthier Lifestyle.

The water we use to drink is gathered from the rain that falls on the unpolluted roof of my house.

At the end of my property is Jilliby Creek where we have a lot of Fauna that enjoy a drink from the creek or live in the creek, or close to the Creek. Some of these creatures are Wombats, Echidna, Goanna, Wallaby and on occasion Deer.

Please consider the Health and wellbeing of the people in our shire, yes we understand that there will be a few local jobs created, but this is no compensation for the stress of when the mine subsidence happens what happens to us. When the unhealthy get sicker from coal dust what happens to them.

There is a lot more to consider that just the few cents per ton the Government will receive for the lease, let's not forget this is Australian Land, Australian Coal, why are we giving this Overseas Company the rights to any of this. Would you like this threat under your home, would you like it to happen to your Kids, Grandchildren, Family etc

PLEASE DO NOT LET THE MINE GO AHEAD.

Yours Faithfully



Michelle Campbell

Director, Mining Projects  
 Development Assessment Systems & Approvals  
 Dept. Planning & Infrastructure  
 GPO Box 39 SYDNEY NSW 2001

Objection to proposed Wallarah 2 Coal Project - Application No. SSD – 4974

Dear Sir/Madam

The original application by Wyong Areas Joint Coal Venture in 2010 was rejected by the previous NSW Government in March 2011 on grounds of unsustainability (ESD principles) and the Government's application of the Precautionary Principle. Nothing in the new application changes that concept as essentially it is a reworking of the previous application. The current NSW Government's "Aquifer Interference Policy" as intended should nullify the application at hand.

- The Wyong Water Catchment was protected under a proclaimed NSW Statute in 1950 (Gazette No. 153 of the LGA 1919, 1950).
- Some 300,000 people in the Wyong and Gosford Local Government Area rely upon this major water catchment for their potable water. The recently completed Mardi-Mangrove pipeline also relies upon the sustainability of the water catchment district to transfer water from this system to the Mangrove Dam for water banking.
- In 1999 groundwater consultants, ERM Mitchell McCotter, found that transient pathways for water to travel downwards to the coal strata was evident and so bulk water would not be impeded on its downward path.
- Kores claim that there will be no effect upon the water supply due to impervious layers between the surface and the mine seam. Professor Phillip Pells, Senior Lecturer at the University of NSW, dismisses these claims. Kores do admit to a loss of water rated at 2ml per day per square metre of the mine surface area. This extrapolates over the whole mine area to approximately 8 megalitres per day or 3000 megalitres each year once mining is complete. The professional uncertainties characterised within the Kores submission paint a very tentative picture for protection of the coast's natural potable water supply.
- The Peer Review by Professor Bruce Hepplewhite (page 258, Appendix H) questions many of the terms used and assumptions made during the geological modelling upon which subsidence and water loss are based.
- Some 46 panels are to be mined, including in the Hue Hue Subsidence Area where 150 houses (Appendix H Map on page 240) mostly of modern brick design exist on subdivided acres and will be subjected to subsidence up to one metre but may well suffer further subsidence due to the existence of Awaba Tuff strata below the mine on which the remaining pillars are supported.



Much discussion within the application refers to the uncertain nature and caution needed re the soft bedded Awaba Tuff leading to a scenario of adaptive management as mining begins to proceed. This type of experimental mining should only be carried out in an outback remote location and not under modern homes within the expanding outer suburbs of Wyong. The Department of Infrastructure and Planning should be alarmed by this and immediately inform the unsuspecting owners of the properties in the Hue Hue Subsidence District.

- A total of 245 houses (Appendix H, Page 130) will be impacted by subsidence from a conservative one metre to 1.6 metres throughout the mine area. A total of 755 Rural Building Structures will be impacted (Appendix H, leading up to 179) and 420 Farm Dams suffering subsidence to some degree (Appendix H, leading up to 187). As can be seen the projected damage inside the mining lease area would be catastrophic. The hinterland of the valleys are to be subsided 2.6 metres; Little Jilliby Jilliby Creek at the southern end is predicted to fall 2 metres; the main artery into the Jilliby/Dooralong Valley, Jilliby Road is destined to be subsided 1.75 metres in places, remembering that these valleys flood on a regular basis leaving residents isolated from all directions.
- Dust and noise from stockpiling and rail movements will impact on the established suburbs of Blue Haven, Wyee and all along the rail corridor from Morisset through Cardiff and southern suburbs to the port of Newcastle. The proponent fails to adequately address these ramifications. New burgeoning suburbs being created in northern Wyong shire will be impacted by the mining proposal. It is placed amid these developments and should not be considered based on known high rates of asthma and bronchitis as voiced by the medical profession for decades.
- Nineteen species of avian migratory waders in the area are protected under the Federal EPBC Act with binding agreements with China (CAMBA), Japan (JAMBA) and South Korea itself (ROKAMBA). The proposal directly affects these agreements. There are also flora species listed as threatened under the Act and local fauna species listed as endangered under the Act with the proposed mining area.
- The Director-General's Requirements are extensive and in most areas Kores have failed to address these adequately. The proposal should be rejected outright as the long term damage to the coast's water, bio diversity, infrastructure, amenity and health is unacceptable. The addition of the result of burning this resource within the next ten years has not been evaluated upon damage to the earth's climate and will be wholly condemned as the trend to reject fossil fuels gains momentum.

Yours faithfully

*Michelle Campbell*