

The Director (email: [information@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:information@planning.nsw.gov.au))

1<sup>st</sup> September 2016

#### WALLARAH 2 COAL PROJECT SSD 4974 Amended Development Application

The fact that the resources arms of the South Korean Government are restructuring and concentrating on energy systems other than coal means that this coal project is not likely to extend for a great many years but the damage that will be caused in the process is not likely to be repaired or compensated for due to lack of funds in the future.

It is alarming to know that the actual proponent, Wyong Coal Pty Ltd, is in fact a \$400 paid up company and therefore under law is limited to the value of its assets. Any claim in the future for reparation or compensation is not likely to be realised under law.

#### Costs/Benefits

Royalties to be paid over the supposed 28 years of operation only equate to \$7 million a year. With falling coal prices and Government concessional rebates this figure is inflated. Taking into account the costs of repair and rehabilitation, particularly in the Jilliby valley water catchment and Hue Hue subdivisions following subsidence, easily negates the benefits to the State and local authorities. By adding the long term costs to public health and to greater airborne diseases in the population, it begins to look like a costly enterprise for the public purse.

#### Dust, Health and Noise

Coal dust is a problem for the health of people in the Blue Haven and Wyee precincts despite partial coverage of infrastructure. There is no attempt to cover coal wagons which will travel through the southern suburbs to Newcastle affecting all the communities along the line through Lake Macquarie and Newcastle which has happened on the Hunter to Port line. The community based study of coal trains (Higginbottom et.al) recently shows alarming PM10 depositions particularly from empty wagons that demonstrate air pollution figures well off the map.

Blue Haven and Wyee communities are within 200 and 400 metres respectively from the new conveyor system and very near the 9 storey high loader on the rail line that will operate 24 hours per day, seven days a week. These communities have a very high child population and encompass schools and pre-schools.

Please refer back to the submissions (2010 and 2013) by Dr. Peter Lewis, former Area Director for Public Health who showed great concern about morbidity and trips to the doctor for many children and those already suffering from respiratory disease. Planning should recognise that this development is disastrous for long term public health and on this basis alone should reject the proposal.

Noise exceedences are admitted to for "residences to the north of Bushells Ridge Road at Wyee" but will be problematic for all those living in the nearby communities. Insomnia and depression are also afflictions associated with constant noise and should be taken into account more seriously than the proponent demonstrates.

## SALTY BRINE STORAGE

5,270 cubic metres of semi solid brine per annum is destined to be stored underground for at least the first 14 years. OEH has shown great concern about the lack of detail and effort by the proponent to explain details of this scenario and also the long term disposal of saline water disposal into the Wallarah Creek system and possible overflows into Budgewoi Lake. The proponent needs to fully explain how the underground aquifers will not be contaminated and how the Wallarah Creek system will not be compromised over the life of the mine. The uncertainty about rehabilitation as expressed earlier is pertinent to this aspect of the proposal.

## WATER LOSS and SUBSIDENCE

Much has been put to the earlier Planning Assessment Commissions about the loss of potable water in the catchment valleys and also the subsidence of 245 homes and infrastructure. Please refer to the many submissions and that by Professor Philip Pells whose lengthy submission to the 2010 PAC explains the many risks involved in mining below the fresh water aquifers. Any threat to fresh water supplies of the Central Coast should not be considered. The precautionary principle should apply to this development and the worldwide standard of Environmentally Sustainable Development should also be applied, and on that basis this ADA and the development of Wallarah 2 should be clearly rejected.

## CLIMATE CHANGE

The world governing body, United Nations, and the vast majority of countries have agreed that coal is linked with the rapidly changing climate and so the major financing bodies now reject loaning to any country funds that will allow expansion of the coal industry. Indeed as we stated South Korea is redirecting its efforts in energy away from coal burning as is China and others. This development is not compatible with this change in international efforts and so again this project should be rejected outright.

Please take into account all of the aspects of our submission and those of others who have opposed Wallarah 2 over the years. Our climate future is our most precious ideal and this is now the most fundamental issue we all face.

Yours faithfully

Michael A Campbell OAM

56 Little Jilliby Rd

Little Jilliby 2259

Ph 0243 551287