

28 June 2021

We, the Paterson Progress Association (PPA) strongly object to the Amended Development Application (ADA) SSD-6612.

As the name of our association implies, we work toward ensuring the progress of the township of Paterson and its environs. This ADA is anything but progress. If approved, the ADA would be highly regressive for Paterson.

Employment

Paterson is a lively community serviced by a number of local businesses which cater to locals and tourists alike. Even if the ADA quarry expansion were to be approved local businesses employ many more than the quarry does and is ever likely to. These businesses also employ real 'locals' living in or close to the town. Not what Daracon defines as 'local' - up to 40km away from the quarry. That is not local. If approved, the businesses in town will suffer. This in turn will ripple down to employment. Jobs will be lost.

Trucks and Road Safety

The most prominent concern of residents is that of trucks traversing the small rural roads through and near Paterson. The quarry was constructed to only ever transport rail ballast by rail. This was a time long before a 'truck and dog' bulk transport mode was dreamed of. The roads of Paterson were never designed to accommodate up to 280 large trucks per day.

Daracon have gone some way to mitigate the impact of trucks through the town but a cynical tweak here and there to 'get this over the line' will not appease the community. Up to 280 trucks per day will create dust, diesel fumes (containing harmful nitric oxide (NO) and nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), noise - both motor and chassis and considerable damage to roads and heritage buildings due to vibration. Safety is also a huge issue, particularly truck interaction with school children and school buses. Also, there have been many recorded and anecdotal incidents of rock and stone falling from trucks which has caused damage to vehicles and great concern to the community.

The PPA's past experience with quarry trucks travelling to and from the quarry has evoked a reason to be concerned about what is to come if the ADA is granted. Behaviour of the drivers is poor at best and often dangerous. This relates particularly to contract truck drivers that Daracon have little control over. Speeding, cutting corners, tailgating are just a few examples of what residents have witnessed and endured. Do Daracon really think drivers signing a Code of Conduct will control driver performance? If so, they are delusional.

We read in the Traffic Impact Assessment that route 2 has been deleted from two of the primary haulage routes. Does that mean that quarry trucks returning to the quarry will use route 1 only? Or will they go where they like - typically a faster route therefore increasing daily haulage trips. This needs to be clarified. Also, only local deliveries will use the previously named haulage route 2. What does that mean? Is there a tpa limit for route 2? How will Daracon control contractors if they wish to use route 2 **as their** preferred haulage route which to them may be a shortcut that is not considerate of those that live on that route.

Social Licence

The spin that Umwelt/Daracon have infused into the ADA via technical reports is palpable. We refute the majority of what is contained within the reports that indicate noise, dust, water pollution and social impact issues are within acceptable government parameters. We understand that government agencies require a bench-mark to base their recommendation on but the results of the ADA listed amendments (21) do not tally with the lived experience. The PPA finds the process of examining and assessing the technical reports submitted by Umwelt/Daracon an unfair process as by its very nature it favours the proponent. They have the money, expected to be in the millions, to engage experts in their field whereas individuals and small community associations and organisations have nowhere near the financial might to contest the results of each report.

It should be noted that the technical reports in the ADA use recent quarry history to base their claims. What these reports neglect to acknowledge is that during this time, particularly when Daracon were in control of the quarry, is that the quarry was operating illegally. Much of what is contained within the technical reports should be considered inadmissible. The baseline extraction amount **is** the 1991 consent. As determined by Justice Molsworth in the NSW Land and Environment Court.

[Dungog Shire Council v Hunter Industrial Rental Equipment Pty Ltd (No 2) [2018] NSWLEC 153]

Daracon are not doing the community a favour, as they spin it, by reducing the proposed extraction amount from 1.5 mtpa to 1.1 mtpa but are actually increasing extraction from 300,000 tpa to 1.1 mtpa. The extraction of up to 300,000 tpa of rail ballast, 70% by rail and 30% by road, is accepted by the community. If this amount is not financially viable it's not up to the community to make that decision or the NSW Department of Planning and Environment nor the IPC. That decision lies solely with Daracon.

The fact that the quarriable resource is in the location of Martins Creek does not mean that the resource there must be exploited, regardless of the adverse impacts of doing so. A development that seeks to take advantage of a natural resource must, of course, be located where the natural resource is located. But not every natural resource needs to be exploited.

If Daracon wishes to reinstate lost community social licence they must put in place infrastructure that will enable the quarry and the residents to coexist equitably. All quarry processing to be enclosed in noise attenuating buildings. Light screen placement at the quarry to mitigate light spill to neighbouring properties. A bypass road around Paterson. Rail facility upgrade. Many other quarries within New South Wales have constructed such infrastructure and have a positive social licence within nearby communities.

At a recent community meeting held on June 24 2021, convened by the Martins Creek Quarry Action Group, approximately 200 community members voiced their concern and anger with the ADA. The DoP may have viewed the meeting on facebook, as they were unable to attend. It can be viewed at

www.facebook.com/mcqag/videos/958156865037200/

The PPA believes the presentation was clear, factual and without emotion. What did come across, when summarising questions from the floor, is the complete lack of trust in Daracon. Many said that they are a company that can not be believed no matter what is stated in the ADA to mitigate the impact to residents of an expanded quarry.

The ADA, as stands, will destroy the community of Paterson. We trust the above comments will demonstrate the wishes of impacted residents to coexist with the quarry but not on Daracon's terms.

Yours sincerely,



Mark Walker
President, Paterson Progress Association

