



11 June 2017

Planning Services, Department Planning and Environment  
<http://majorprojects.planning.nsw.gov.au>

**This is a submission to the Hume Coal Project EIS SSD7172**

I object to this project and recommend that it be rejected.

The Hume Coal Mining proposal is located within the Sydney Water Catchment. Any development within the Catchment must be scrutinised in detail as it has the potential to impact this critical water resource. Water NSW rules require that **“Developments in the Sydney drinking water catchment must have a neutral or beneficial effect on water quality”**. We know that the Hume Coal Mine proposal will have a range of impacts including:

- 93 bores will be affected by the water draw-down. The impact on bores will remain for between 36-65 years after mining ceases (ES4.1.2)
- It is expected that some bores affected may never fully recover
- Treatment and release into Oldbury Creek of surplus on site mining water in years when above average rain falls (ES4.1.1)
- Water used to wash coal and residual spoil which will be pumped back underground into mine voids, which has the potential to impact ground water systems (ES41.1.1)

I am concerned about the impact on native vegetation and wildlife through the reduction in water and removal of 64 trees and 17 dead trees. A number of trees to be removed include *Eucalyptus macarthurii* (part of a critically endangered ecological community) which I believe must be retained and protected to encourage ecological diversity.

I am concerned that there will be a substantial negative effect on wildlife and vegetation due to water draw-down, potential aquifer contamination and serious toxic water and waste disposal issues. The Hume Coal project threatens water bodies and therefore vegetation which create habitat for wildlife and contribute to the unique landscape quality of the Southern Highlands. I do not believe Hume Coal has answered these concerns in the EIS.

The potential impacts of the Hume Coal proposal on water and Sydney catchment must be considered within the context of the widely accepted **“Precautionary Principle”** which is a fundamental principle of ecologically sustainable development and which is a benchmark used in the assessment of such projects. I believe the potential and very real risk to our environment posed by this development is too great and I object to this project.

**GEOFF DUXFIELD**