

Melissa Blackhall  
380 Yarraman Road  
WYBONG NSW 2333

28 August 2019

Department of Planning Industry & Environment

**Mangoola Coal Continued Operations Project (SSD-8642) - Objection to Mine**

I am a joint landowner of property situated at 380 Yarraman Road, Wybong (Property Id: 124) (the "Property").

The current mining operation is approximately 5 km's from my Property. The expansion under the proposed Project SSD-8642 (the "Project") will result in the mining operation being approximately 3 km's from my Property.

I object to the Project for the following reasons:

1. Impact on Property Value

I am concerned that if the Project is approved that the value of my Property will be negatively impacted. I am further concerned that my ability to sell my Property in an open market in the future will be dramatically reduced (if I am able to sell at all) due to the Project's close proximity to my property.

I purchased this Property with my husband and this was our first home. It took 10 years to save enough deposit to purchase a rural property which ticked all our boxes. It was important that the property was close to town and had access to water to enable us to continue with our primary production business. To us, the Property was the perfect rural lifestyle to raise our young family that we had sought after for many years. I may not have lived at this Property all my life however this is my first home and there is a real sense of connection to this Property.

I am not against mining operations, however, there has to be a balance and there needs to be accountability for the impact that the Project will have on the nearby landowners.

I have a young family and am concerned that not only our future but their future is being compromised by the impact that the Project will have on the value of the Property.

I am concerned that I will be left with a mortgage that far exceeds the value of the Property.

If the Property value and ability to sell is affected as predicted, how will I repay the mortgage or any shortfall if I am required to sell for financial reasons, medical reasons, employment relocation or if forced to sell pursuant to a power of sale?

## 2. Noise

As the current mining operation has moved west towards my Property I have already experienced an increase in noise particularly at night. A number of complaints in relation to the excessive noise have already been lodged due to the sleep disruption.

The modelling results indicate that my property will not be negatively impacted to the extent that I will qualify for voluntary acquisition rights.

I fail to see how this can be feasible when the proposed mining operation will be twice as close when I am already experiencing increases in noise.

## 3. Dust

The Property is already impacted by excessive dust.

The house (inside and out), veranda, pool and outdoor table and chairs are constantly filthy. The children's toys are not left on the back veranda as they are constantly covered in coal dust and I am concerned about the excessive exposure of the dust to our health.

I feel that there can only be an increase in dust once mining commences should the Project be approved as the mining operations will be twice as close.

## 4. Disturbance/Inconvenience

My Property will be further impacted by the increase of kangaroos, deer and wombats which will be forced towards my Property once mining operations commence. The wildlife cause significant damage to properties and I will be forced to implement further pest management practices.

Not only do the wildlife cause damage to property but there is a real likeliness of increase in motor vehicle collisions as the wildlife are forced closer to the roads in particular Yarraman Road, Wybong Road and Wybong PO Road.

The change in location of Wybong PO Road will also add extra travelling time each time I am required to travel to Muswellbrook.

## 5. Community benefits

Whilst investment is made in the towns of Muswellbrook and Denman there is no direct benefit for what is left of the Wybong community and no direct benefit to the landowners.

There is a real likeliness that the Property will be sterilised with no entitlement to be compensated. How is this fair?

The only means of being compensated is pursuant to the voluntary acquisitions rights set out in the VLAMP.

The modelling results have concluded that I am not entitled to any further mitigation or voluntary acquisition rights. Therefore I have no grounds for any compensation for the detrimental impact that I will experience as a result of the Project.

There needs to be greater accountability or at least a mechanism in place to address sterilisation of property or the decline of property value instead of an arbitrary mechanism pursuant to the criteria in the VLAMP (ie, you either meet the criteria or you don't and if you don't it's a case of bad luck).

How is this just particularly when the proponent is set to make such a profit? The landowner receives nothing and will be placed in a worse position.

I have contemplated selling now before it is too late, however, I feel that the ship has already sailed and it is too late. Even if we did sell, where do we find another property in the Local Government Area ("LGA") that has rural acreage, with access to water, close enough to town, for the same replacement value? The answer is you can't particularly if you consider that "mines" own around 50% of the land in our LGA. The costs to purchase what we have now will far exceed any sale price and we will be forced to move out of the area (meaning further travel time to school, work and shopping).

Melissa Blackhall