

Mike Brearley & Associates Pty Ltd <u>mike@mbaconsult.com.au</u> 5 Park St Wingello, NSW 2579 tel: 0407 953 249 ABN 75 648 705 834

19 June 2018

The Director General NSW Planning & Environment

Lodged through the Major Projects Submission Portal

Dear Sir/ Madam

Sutton Forest Quarries SSD 6334 Interim Submission

I write in my capacity as a consulting civil engineer located not far from the proposed Sutton Forest Quarry project. I have serious technical reservations regarding the project and respectfully suggest that this project should not be approved.

My first concern relates to ground water. I understand that this mining proposal will excavate to a depth of 39m below the current water table. I am aware that many land holders, including myself, depend on ground water for their livelihood, and that the quality of this ground water is impacted by natural filtering through the Hawkesbury Sandstone. Surely, the extraction and crushing of sandstone, removal of the sands, and eventual replacement with imported filling material will permanently and irreversibly impact the ground water in this area. Surely, these impacts will have adverse consequences for the Sydney drinking water catchment?

Another of my concerns relates to traffic impacts. I understand that a new overpass will be constructed that eliminates the rest area on the Hume Highway. This obtrusive structure will forever change the amenity and appearance of the area and will place up to an additional 400 trucks per day onto an already stressed road network. The haul road proposed is very close to existing residences and is unacceptable.

The impacts of noise, dust, and blasting are significant. I understand that continual noise and blasting activities will happen within a short distance of the Shrine of Our Lady of Mercy and other residents. In particular, the Shrine of Our Lady of Mercy has been a

place of quiet tranquillity and worship since 1984. It is a centre of great cultural diversity with many shrines constructed very close to the proposed quarry on the northern boundary. I understand that on some days the shrine attracts 5,000 visitors, and around 50,000 visitors per year. Surely, any proposed mining operation is incompatible with the established land uses immediately south of the site. Further to the impacts of noise and vibration, surely there are many hazards in airborne particles associated with sand mining, which will have detrimental health impacts on residents and visitors to the area?

The points mentioned above merely "scratch the surface" of many technical reasons why this proposal is inappropriate in this location. The short exhibition period has not afforded the opportunity for me to closely examine the technical detail in the EIS. A proponent has many years to engage experts and to assemble technical data in favour of an application. Why is it that the people whom this proposal impacts have only 1 month to assemble a detailed response to complex technical and environmental matters? I request the opportunity to lodge a further submission once I have had the opportunity to examine the technical information in detail.

Yours Sincerely

Mike Brearley

Director, Mike Brearley & Associates