

## May Patterson

---

**From:** system@accelo.com on behalf of Graham Kelly <grakel15@tpg.com.au>  
**Sent:** Saturday, 16 June 2018 5:50 PM  
**To:** May Patterson  
**Subject:** Submission Details for Graham Kelly (object)

Confidentiality Requested: no

Submitted by a Planner: no

Disclosable Political Donation: no

Agreed to false or misleading information statements: yes

Name: Graham Kelly  
Email: grakel15@tpg.com.au

Address:  
6 Toongoon Rd

Burradoo, NSW  
2576

### Content:

I live in the Southern Highlands, enjoying its fresh air and its accessibility to Sydney, Canberra and Goulburn and beyond.

Unfortunately, I suffer chronic severe respiratory problems (COPD, Pulmonary Fibrosis and left diaphragm paralysis) such that my breathing is adversely (and dangerously) affected by even small amounts of particulate dust in the air. The proposed sand mine and processing facilities are to the South West of my home. The prevailing winds are often South Westerly. So I am concerned that the mine and processing equipment will inevitably produce large amounts of particulate dust that will reach my home (even if only in small amounts). I have no confidence that the dust control measures put forward by the proponents (mostly watering down, to an unspecified amount) will be effective to guarantee that my healthy occupation of my home will not be compromised.

I, therefore, oppose the proposal on that ground.

As well, as alluded to above, my wife and I are frequent users of the Hume Motorway, travelling both North and South (via the Illawarra Highway at the Hoddle's Crossroad intersection).

We are concerned about the massive increase in heavy vehicle traffic from the facility, particularly trucks with a Southerly destination that are planned to do "U" turns at the Hoddle's Crossroad intersection.

We regularly use the Hoddle's Crossroad exit onto the Illawarra Highway easterly. It is, at best, a tricky intersection controlled by a "Stop" sign; moreover, the exit's slip road is not exactly perpendicular to the Illawarra Highway and there is a rise to the left, adversely impacting vision to the left.

Similarly, we regularly use the Hoddle's Crossroad entrance to the Hume Motorway to the South.

It too is tricky; in particular, it is (a) busy (taking a large amount of traffic from the Illawarra and the Southern Highlands) and (b) near a right oriented bend in the Hume Motorway travelling South. To increase the use of this entrance by large sand trucks from the proposed facility is a recipe for disaster (be it on the heads of those who are promoting this idea, and anyone who approves it, when the inevitable fatal accidents occur).

We, also, frequently use the Hume Motorway to travel North, usually joining at the Alymerton entrance. The Hume Motorway North from there is already near to what we would judge to be full capacity for heavy vehicles. It makes no sense to put further pressure on this road, including in light of the increased traffic it is likely to bear from the proposed Wilton New Town.

So I also oppose the proposal on the ground of the heavy vehicle traffic that it envisages.

Those are my particular objections. I also have major concerns about the impact of the proposal on the use of the Great Western Wildlife Corridor by vulnerable and threatened species of birdlife. Other objectors will no doubt spell out the details of the adverse impacts and the deficiencies in their description in the EIS. But, in particular, I find the so called onsite, and nearby offsite, 'offset' proposals so stupid that they are insulting to the intelligence of anyone with the slightest knowledge of Australian wild life. Does anyone really believe that wild birds will hang about the perimeter of somewhere where there will be blasting and noisy and dusty processing? I object to being treated as such an idiot. The ideas put forward fall so far short of anything that could be sensibly embraced that they call the credibility of the whole EIS into question.

The proposal should be rejected completely. We should find somewhere else, more sensible from, which to source Sydney's and Canberra's building sand: somewhere less environmentally sensitive; and somewhere better able to be

served by transport (preferably rail).  
Graham Kelly

**From:** information@planning.nsw.gov.au [mailto:information@planning.nsw.gov.au]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, 11 July 2018 7:15 PM  
**To:** DPE CSE Information Planning Mailbox <information@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Subject:** Website contact form submission from Graham Kelly Ref ID: 20180711191102



An email has been received from **Graham Kelly** from the Department of Planning & Environment website's Contact Us online form.

The contact form submission details are below:

---

**Name:** Graham Kelly

**Email address:** [grakel15@tpg.com.au](mailto:grakel15@tpg.com.au)

**Post code:** 2576

**Type of enquiry:** Feedback

**Your enquiry is about:** Major development proposals

**Enquiry details:**

SUTTON FOREST SAND MINE I am making this supplementary submission (supplementary to my earlier submissions against this proposal) in view of the farcical, abortive meeting last night ( Tuesday 10 July) in the back room of the Sutton Forest Hall. Much could be said in abject condemnation of the arrangements (including that the Council allocated an wholly inadequate venue for such an important meeting). So, undeterred by being deprived of speaking trenchantly against the proposal, I submit the following What is the point of going to all the fuss - and bother - of proclaiming an LEP establishing a Wildlife Corridor, if a development involving habitat destruction, blasting and grinding is allowed to be established BANG in the middle of it. [The LEP provides: 'Development Consent must not be granted to development on land [within a Regional Wildlife Habitat Corridor ie the land to which this proposal relates] unless the consent authority is satisfied [emphasis added] that: (a) the development is designed , sited and managed to avoid [emphasis added] any potential adverse environmental impact; or (b) if that impact cannot be avoided - the development is designed , sited and will be managed to minimise [emphasis added] that impact; or (c) if that impact cannot be minimised - the development will be managed to mitigate [emphasis added] that impact.' On the basis of what is said in the proponents' documents, it cannot possibly be said that the consent authority can be satisfied of any of these requirements. Thus the LEP would require the proposed consent to be refused.] The inappropriateness of the proposal is the more so, when the proponents must have known about the Wildlife Habitat Corridor well before they started conjuring up this travesty. Secondly, I can fairly claim to be 'the Father' of legislative requirements for Environmental Impact Statements in Australia. (I am happy to provide details in support of this claim, if you so require.) You should reject it. And if you don't, we, the People, will by whatever legitimate means we can. I can speak with some authority when I say: - this is an hopeless EIS. Not just because it seeks to justify the unjustifiable, but because, in some cases, it is just plainly laughable. For instance, it - patronisingly, I would say, - expects us to believe that wildlife surveys, done over just a couple of days, in October 2012, have the slightest credibility to establish the fauna, particularly migratory birdlife, that would be critically affected by the proposed habitat destruction; blasting; and grinding. A JOKE, I would say. What is more, the claims in the supporting documents that this proposal does not require Federal approval are wrong. That assertion is supported by superficial artifice, that the habitat to be destroyed, or otherwise irreparably adversely affected, is not utilised by endangered or threatened species. The area most certainly is habitat (at least in the sense of foraging sites or landing grounds) for the Glossy Black Cockatoo (see the Glossies in the Mist campaign, promoted by your very own Department of Planning and the Environment). And it is, highly likely, for the critically endangered

Regents Honeyeater (see Wingecarribee Shire Council web site and related links). So this is a proposed action to which the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (Cth) applies and therefore must be referred to the Federal Government. (By the way, the sleight of hand by which the proponents dismiss any need for Federal approval hardly engenders confidence in their other assertions in favour of their proposal.) One sad thing about the apparent charade engaged in this process (including the farce last night) is its alienating effect on the confidence of citizens (particularly the youthful) in the processes of government, in particular, that our views count for anything. You should take this as notice: that we, the people of the Southern Highlands, won't accept your attempts to treat us with disdain, as your behaviour tonight did. (It was childish that officers of the Department ran around with the key, trying to demonstrate it was not your fault that we were reduced to where we were, when it was your responsibility to arrange a suitable venue. As one 'objector' called out: 'You are the Department of What - 'Planning' ?) Our considered view, is that this is a bad and unnecessary proposal that will have irreparably bad impacts on the environment. The proponents expect us to swallow the nonsense of this proposal because the urban sprawl of Sydney is running out of sand to fuel it. The locals of the Southern Highlands, the people who have to put up with it, say - loudly - and clearly - the sand mine should be rejected. And we will not take this lying down - unless perhaps in front of the trucks trying to take our heritage away. You should reject it. And if you don't, we, the People, will by whatever legitimate means we can.

Graham Kelly

**Newsletter subscription confirmation:** False

---

Department of Planning & Environment | GPO Box 39 | SYDNEY NSW 2001  
T 1300 305 695 E [information@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:information@planning.nsw.gov.au)