

I wish to claim submitter's rights and by this email lodge my objection to the SSD 17_8795 project proposal for a new gravel quarry.

I have particular concerns about the water impacts, given the proponent wishes to discharge the used (dirty) water from their holding dams into creeks which flow into the Karuah River and on to Port Stephens.

It is concerning that oysters farmers were not consulted about the impacts of this on water quality and thus on their livelihoods. But the water in our creeks and rivers support far more than oysters – a vast variety of plant and animal life –and must not be treated as drains.

Ideally the project should be a 'controlled action', but if approved, it MUST be attended by strict conditions of consent to prevent any direct discharge into the Yalimbah Creek system. The sediment-laden water must be managed and contained within the project area itself.

The other issue of great concern is the adverse impact on air quality and subsequently on health. The proponents have stated their crushing plant will be uncovered, hence releasing fine particles ('dust'), including silica, into the air; this of course is 'shared' with surrounding air space and residents, mostly on tank water.

People in the Karuah area already complain of frequent nose bleeds; the irritation from silica particles?

The crushing plant should be in an enclosed building and dealt with like other harmful substances. I assume the workers need respiratory protection; so do other air breathing creatures, human or otherwise.

Noise from an operation like this of course impacts locals too; an enclosed crushing plant would greatly help minimise that.

A plant which would run 5am to 6pm on weekdays (plus 24hr maintenance) has even greater impact on local amenity. In a city or town, 7am start to noisy operations like this would be an enforced condition; why do rural dwellers deserve less consideration?

The cumulative impact from this and other quarries must be given due weight.

The land to be cleared is rich in wildlife, including at least 60 very old and increasingly rare habitat and food trees, especially for phascogales and koalas. Our koalas are facing extinction, largely due to the removal of so much suitable bushland; the offset strategy is a sick joke and results in net loss of species. Offsets should not be accepted as a genuine saver of biodiversity. Retention of original habitat is the only way to do that.

I urge you to reject this proposal.

Thank you for considering my reasons.

Sharyn Munro

19 Primrose Street, Wingham 2429 NSW

0438 052 685

sharyn@sharynmunro.com