

**Genevieve Seed
Senior Planning Officer
Resource Assessments
NSW Dept of Planning & Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001**

2 November 2018

RE: Brandy Hill Quarry Expansion Proposal – Response to Hanson’s Response to Submissions Paper

As a resident , and as a member of the BHAG, VOWW and as a CCC representative for the Brandy Hill Quarry I have reviewed Hanson’s *Response to Submissions* document and remain frustrated, concerned and disappointed over the lack of adequate attention given to legitimate Community concerns across many areas.

Please review my original Submission which highlights a number of my concerns which I feel have not been given an adequate response in the Hanson’s *Response to Submissions* (RTS) Paper.

Several of my areas of ongoing concern include, but are not limited to:

Dust and air quality:

- I am a local resident nearby to the quarry. We are on tank water. I urge the Quarry or relevant Authorities to test the dust that lies on my roof and the resultant quality of tank water that my children and family drink, cook with and wash ourselves with.
- The Quarry has been doing a ‘dust monitoring’ Assessment on my property. However, the dust monitor only operates on a rotating day basis, ie. Monday one week, Tuesday the next etc. It does not operate continually, thereby, not necessarily operating on a day of a blast, nor in different wind or weather conditions. I ask for continuous dust monitoring on my property.
- I regularly see dust plumes over the Quarry. Dust suppression and the health impact of dust particles under the Quarry’s current operations and projected potential increase of operations and change of operations to concrete recycling etc have not been adequately addressed in the RTS Paper.
- I continue to be extremely concerned over the potential impact on my and my family’s health from potential dust contaminates. The potential health impact has not been given adequate attention in the report. Stress is also a concerning health issue and its impact has not been given attention.

Noise:

- The extreme crushing noise that I hear on a daily basis is 'glossed over' in the report. The crushing noise is extremely frustrating and is a constant annoyance from early in the morning to late. On many occasions, crushing is clearly occurring beyond current time guidelines.

Blast disturbances and vibration damage to buildings:

- P.117 of the report asks that residents directly approach the Quarry for an investigation of the structural impact. I have asked the Quarry to undertake Blast monitoring on my property, which they did on several occasions. The Quarry Representatives were surprised by the level of sound and vibration heard and felt on my property. Given that the Quarry seeks to increase their operations, this is very concerning and I ask that more attention be given to the Quarry only blasting under favorable weather conditions, using blasting techniques that limit impact and also alert the community to when they are to blast.

Traffic and Roads:

- There is discrepancy in the number of trucks and truck movements that are estimated. The estimated number of truck movements has been deemed to have a 'low' impact on residents. This statement is ridiculous and unacceptable.

land clearing:

- There is confusion throughout the document on exactly where and how deep some of the various stages of the project are to focus on.

Threatened species:

- Inadequate attention was given to a number of highlighted species that will be potentially threatened, affected or lose habitat. Nor were there adequate surveys undertaken that took into account seasonal changes etc.

Changing scale of the project:

- The parameters of the project, and scope of the 'stages' have changed. I am extremely concerned over the 'grey' areas of what exactly is proposed and when it is proposed to happen.

Impact on Property Values:

- P.82 / p. 128 of the Report does note the potential economic impact on property values and the potential negative economic impact on local land values if there are significant and sustained losses to the amenity and current lifestyle of local residents. Given the current proposal, impact will clearly be extensive and very costly. When I moved here 3.5 years ago, I asked several Council Members, including a Town Planner, what the future of the Quarry would be. I was told "Don't worry about it. They're wrapping up. They are running out of rock and their license will not be

renewed". How wrong this statement was. I would not have moved here with my young children, if I had known they were about to embark on another 30 year license!

Insufficient Local Benefit:

- The Report finds that Hanson deems itself to be a 'valuable part of the local community' and is projected to give 12m over 30 years to the upkeep of roads etc. This figure is low and clearly inadequate based on their projected expansion and estimated truck movements that will do substantial damage to the road. Limiting truck speed to 60km/h (in the current 80km/h) zone will not substantially lessen the impact on road surface, nor impact on the level of noise and disturbance felt by residents. It will simply 'slow down' the truck noise.
- It is also highly questionable the suggested \$15,000pa to a community group or fund. I agree that all businesses should work as good Corporate Citizens and support the community they work in, but good corporate social responsibility is multifaceted and not limited to a single paycheck. It also includes operating under the best possible work practices and with the most current operating equipment. This is not what Hanson is currently doing.

Future Residential Development:

- Under the principles of Ecologically Sustainable Development and future housing projections in the Seaham and surrounding areas, heavy industry operations and burgeoning residential areas with projected growth patterns do not go hand in hand. This area has been given inadequate attention in the RTS.

In Conclusion:

I strongly feel that the concerns outlined in my original submission of April 2017 have not been alleviated nor addressed adequately.

The document did not adequately reflect, nor adequately answer, the overgoing concerns, queries and questions of the 165 individual submissions that were submitted by the community. In fact, the report was far from impartial, and felt too heavily weighted towards pushing the project through rather than trying to objectively address the submissions.

The *Response to Submissions* Paper has done little to dampen my concerns and fears towards Hanson's Brandy Hill Quarry proposed extension.

In fact, I feel extremely disappointed by the *Response to Submissions* Paper.

In summary, I re-state my objection to the proposal.