

REJECTION OF AMENDED SUBMISSION FROM DARACON

APPLICATION NUMBER SSD-6612

To Whom It May Concern,

I wish to object in the strongest possible terms to the proposed expansion of Martins Creek quarry.

I live at 28 King Street Paterson NSW 2421, in the village of Paterson. I am more than concerned at the proposal to increase the output of the quarry to 1.1 million tonnes.

We own another property in Queensland and I travel between the two residences. My Partner is a local school teacher and resides in Paterson most of the time.

I have noted that in Queensland, I only need to wash the car fortnightly, yet in Paterson, the same amount of grit accumulates on the car in a couple of working days. I have no doubt that the excessive dust is coming from the great many trucks hauling through Paterson each day. I cringe at what that's doing to residents respiratory systems. Further, the noise that results from trucks with empty trailers catapulting through the lever crossing in the early hours of the morning is mind shattering. It would not be so bad if all the drivers adhered to the movement restriction (as agreed), but that's not always the case. Apart from the dust and noise there is a significant safety issues that occurs when trucks (with trailers) are navigating in the major intersections (Tocal Road and King St.) The streets were never designed with these sorts of vehicles in mind. I have been pushed off the road on several occasions when trucks swing-wide in order to get through the intersection. It may appear I have an issue with the truck drivers, I don't. I know full well the pressure they are under to perform, and I understand that they are simply trying to earn a living. I believe Daracon's imposed requirements on these drivers that result in these unacceptable conditions occurring. A proposed 40% increase in truck traffic is unthinkable.

I know if I expand of each issue I have of concern, it will end up being an unwieldy document and readers may miss the essence of the arguments, so I will simply dot point other consideration I believe need be kept in mind:

- Daracon have transitioned away from rail transport and have qualified their application to move the extra tonnage by rail "if feasible". They have previously said in other court cases that (they think) it is not feasible, and yet they've put "if feasible" in this amendment application,
- I am concerned about koala and endangered quoll habitat being sacrificed for profit,
- Double standards: all trucks have to be covered - full and empty - rail cars do not.
- I find it unbelievable that Earnst and Young have written there will be "no" appreciable effect on depreciation of house prices! That's an unrealistic prediction without a comparable basis h to make such prediction.
- I believe that Daracon's application has little by way of monitoring and timelines for action, and ensuring compliance. eg a covered building to mitigate the noise and light of 24/7 operation will be built - - in year 4!
- The EPA cannot be relied upon to enforce any imposed conditions. Why are Linfox trucks monitored by satellite and Daracon's trucks don't "have" to be?

- Daracon have said they have consulted "widely" with the community. Umwelt (lawyers for Daracon) only had to consult residents within a 4km radius of the quarry, so no-one has been consulted along proposed haul routes,
- Daracon reportedly made \$100 million profit while operating outside the conditions imposed by Dungog Council between 2012 and 2019. They kept appealing the initial decision which also shows they have plenty of money to throw at this issue when they want to, but it appears they won't spend a cent for world's best practice e.g. quarries in Marulan.
- FINALLY, in my opinion, Daracon have shown scant regard for conditions of operation imposed by regulators (initially Dungog Council) and are prepared to operate outside these conditions. They have shown in the past that they will only abide by conditions if they are forced to by law, and even then are prepared to appeal conditions they don't like. I am concerned that even if an approval is gained from the Department of Planning with imposed conditions, that Daracon will quickly apply for amendments; which do not require an extra application. This will result in the Community having even less opportunity to put their point of view forward.

I would like to be kept up to date with the results of this application. I can be reached on <lenebert@bigpond.com>.

Yours faithfully,

Bob Christie