

SUBMISSION LETTER OPPOSING WALLARAH 2 COAL PROJECT

The Director, Planning Services
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY 2001

**RE: Wallarah 2 Coal Project SSD 4974 Amended Development
Application**

I wish to object to the current ADA on exhibition and also to the further progression of the mine proposal itself.

PREAMBLE

The application portrays estimates of the economic benefits and job figures for the whole project and does not confine itself clearly to this Amendment alone.

The fact that the proponent KORES is withdrawing from overseas development due to massive debt ratios, as recently expressed in the Korean press tells the community that the future job prospects, development and most importantly environmental protection and repair, have little hope of being realised and the same concerns apply to compensation and rehabilitation.

POINTS OF OBJECTION

Costs/Benefits

Page 85 of the ADA states that the royalties to the State over the proposed and improbable 28 years life of the mine is \$200 Million which equates to just over \$7 million per annum. With falling coal prices and Government concessional rebates this figure is inflated. Even so the benefits to the State and local authorities is easily negated by the costs of repair and rehabilitation, particularly in the Jilliby Valley water catchment and Hue Hue subdivisions following subsidence. By adding the long-term cost to public health through greater airborne diseases in the population it begins to look like a costly enterprise for the public purse.

Employment

Pages 86 and 87 of the ADA claim job creation commencing at 79 through to direct and indirect job figures of 1,111 in year 2. Modern mining techniques have been developed with the utilisation of automation to such an extent as to render these estimates suspiciously high but either way, they are irrelevant because this application states very clearly that this assessment is only looking at this Amendment and not the whole Project. In all probability the Amendment will lead to a net sum outcome. Specifically, the original rail spur is not being built and will be replaced by a conveyor system (essentially being the main thrust of this Amendment) and this change does not create additional jobs for the whole Project. As with the original EIS the job prospects are not defined and again highly inflated and misleading.

Dust, Health and Noise

Dust still remains a real issue for health 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 those communities of southern Lake Macquarie and Newcastle as has been demonstrated in the Hunter to Port line. There has been great concern about the mapping of coal dust and the lack of authorities to control those emissions. This project exacerbates the problem adding to that congestion toward the Newcastle terminal. The added times of daily rail crossing closures at Adamstown and Islington need to be disclosed to the Newcastle community.

Pm10 emissions from the site are conservative as usual and do not take into account the changing nature of intense wind and storm events in recent years. Blue Haven and Wyee townships are now as close as 200 and 400 metres respectively to the new proposed coal loader bringing even greater problems for families in the area for both constant dust and noise 24 h/per day. There are many schools, pre-schools and establishments within 5 km of the facility and they will suffer from emissions from the site.

Please refer back to the submission by Dr. Peter Lewis, Area Director of Public Health for North Sydney and the Central Coast wherein he outlines greater risks to children and health sufferers in this region should this project be approved. Excessive noise is admitted to for "residences to the north of Bushells Ridge Road at Wyee" and general noise 24 h/per day for those living in Blue Haven and Wyee areas are issues of concern.

Remembering that the coal loader is to be located on the southbound side of the railway whilst the direction of destination for the coal trains is north There will be contention between busy passenger services and the shunting of coal wagons.

The result of this contention will, in all probability lead to a concentration of coal loading activity at night.

The noise will be constant and distressing.

Citizens, particularly those with children, will wish to sell in order to move away from the noise and dust but they will discover that their houses have devalued as a result of mining activities and will find themselves trapped.

Unresolved issue from the EIS 2014

Massive subsidence figures represented in the proponents EIS affect 245 homes and their infrastructure. 86 of these homes are destined to suffer a metre or more drop right up to 2.3 metres. The valley floor will experience subsidence up to 1.8 metres generally and up to 2.6 metres near the Jilliby Conservation Area. These estimates provoke "inevitable uncertainty concerning subsidence predictions" as a PAC principal finding. The regular flooding of the Jilliby Valley means that this proposal condemns the area to degradation and to long periods of separation from facilities and emergency services.

The woeful performance of the Mine Subsidence Board in refusing the vast majority of claims State-wide for subsidence year in year out does not protect residents as is claimed in the application.

"The project predicts risk of reduced availability of water for the Central Coast Water Supply" according to the PAC wherein they... "recommend there should be no net impact on potential catchment yield".

The Central Coast water catchment supply in the Wyong valleys is at real risk of destruction due to massive subsidence and loss of potable water to the mine area below.

This Amendment should be rejected and the whole project put aside due to many areas of risk.

Yours faithfully

JOHN McQUARRIE
127 BIRDWOOD DRIVE
BLUEHAVEN N.S.W. 2262

Blue Haven 2262

