

Dear Director General;

8th October, 2013

Re; Rocky Hill Mine EIS; Project SSD-5156

May I respectfully make the following submission to the Determination Process.

The EIS fails to address several very serious impacts of the proposal on nearby farms and residences. Specifically;

1. Impact on Neighbouring homes, acreages and small "lifestyle" farms.

The value of nearby farms is primarily based upon not their dollar profit per hectare, but on what real estate agents term "lifestyle value". It is a fact that farm land near the affected area in the past sold for about \$15,000 per Ha with average improvements. Small acreage prices were much higher. Not now. Current real estate estimates are that this land is now either Unsaleable, or if Saleable, at best at 1/3 of that value.

This is not really surprising. Imagine the Determination Committee members were considering buying a lifestyle property, small farm or homestead. Who, when given the choice of many properties to buy by a real estate agent, for lifestyle or retirement purposes, would choose the one that consisted of land adjoining a 24 hour per day coal loader, or adjacent to a coal mine? Can anyone in the Determining Body honestly say that this is a fair situation to those property owners whose life savings may have been almost destroyed by this application?

The EIS entirely fails to address such an outcome.

Put aside the debateable environmental issues (although I do not). The simple destruction of neighbours assets proposed by Rocky Hill is unfair. That is one of the reasons residents become so agitated, and will continue to be so until this issue is addressed fairly to adjacent rural and residential property owners.

So the EIS Commissioned by Rocky Hill can say what it says about the coal loader having no or minimal impact. But in reality it is moot; because the real estate market has spoken; by making the affected adjacent farm and homestead properties almost unsaleable, or at sharply reduced prices. All for a mine that is so small as to be economically insignificant to NSW.

2. Impact Upon the Mental and Physical Health of Nearby Residents;

If a nearby house, acreage or lifestyle farm has its value eroded, perhaps the lifetime saving of some residents, it may not be surprising if they suffered anxiety, stress, loss of sleep and decline in general health and well-being as a result of the impact of the coal loader and the mine. The EIS entirely fails to address such an outcome.

How do we measure the dollar impact upon local residents so affected? How many illnesses, mental and otherwise, even suicides are to result from this proposed Rocky Hill Development if it does proceed?

My Request;

- a. **That the application be entirely rejected** as it is a small mine with low economic significance to NSW, but enormous detrimental effect on property values and to the residents of Gloucester, most of whom demonstrably do not want this mine.
- b. **Or** if it is not, that all properties, house, farm or acreage that lie within 0.5 km of the mine, conveyor and within 1 km of the 24 hour operation coal loader be given the following option. To have a sworn valuer of their choice value their property at fair market value in 2007, prior

to GRL involvement, subject only to rise and fall in accordance with CPI as issued by the ABS. That GRL be required as a condition of consent to buy the property at that revised value. If both parties agree to enter into a lease back or rental arrangement, so be it. If the Determining Authority agree with this principle, but prefer a different means of compensation for owners whose property values have been negatively affected then that may also be acceptable.

- c. **Or** that if ultimately my request a. and b. are both not accepted under the determination; that the hours of operation of the Coal Loader be restricted to 8.00 am to 5.00 pm Monday to Friday with no provision whatsoever for “testing”, repair or other work outside those hours. That all coal loading be indoors and that all coal train wagons are totally covered.
- d. **Or** that if a. or b. or c. are not determined as requested, and the mine is to proceed, then the coal loader part of the application be rejected entirely. I submit that legal precedents set in Western Australia, whereby adjoining mines with separate owners are directed to share existing loading facilities be invoked as a requirement of the determination. That Rocky Hill / GRL be required to transport coal by covered conveyor on the Eastern side of the valley onto the directly adjacent land owned by Yancoal, and on to the existing Stratford Coal Loader. At least this would reduce the visual and aesthetic impact of the project somewhat, and reduce noise from a 24 hour loader within the Forbesdale area.

Thank you for considering my submission.