

OBJECTION NOTIFICATION FROM:

Carol Henry

11th November 2019

121 Port Macquarie Rd.,

BOGEE 2849

To: Steve O'Donoghue, Director, Resource Assessments,

Planning and Assessment Group, Department of Planning, Industry and
Environment, GPO Box 39 SYDNEY NSW 2001

Sir,

RE: PROPOSED AIRLY COAL MINE MODIFICATION 3 (SSD 5581 MOD 3)

On this Remembrance Day, I reflect that my original objection forwarded to NSW Government on 10th October 2014, was not considered adequate enough to derail Airly Coal Mine activity.

In Modification 3 (SSD 5581 MOD3) the Planning, Industry & Environment Department asks:

How is the modification substantially the same as the original development? Airly Coal Mine's application indicates that **'There will be minimal environmental impacts associated with the proposed modification'**.

MY OBJECTION: The above statement causes me to point out that the environmental impact has already occurred and it is not minimal to the environment. During the worse drought in Australia, the mine has to rail water from Springvale into its establishment in order to continue processing coal. The train movements from 2 to 3 trains per day, I suspect, can be attributed to continuing water supply needs. Any water that was allocated to Airly Coal mine has been used and that same water which would have been used to replenish the Capertee Valley water tributaries (e.g. Coco Creek) for the local district vanished two years ago. The mine, at times during its existence, has been in 'caretaker' mode, limiting job opportunities and definitely not producing employment for FTE 155, let alone providing an increase of jobs to 200.

In Modification 3 (SSD 5581 MOD3) the Planning, Industry & Environment Department asks: **Do you have evidence of all Land Owners' consent?** Airly Coal Mine's application indicates: **No**

MY OBJECTION: Who does own the land and what environmental benefit is it to the Land Owner to have a coal mine in which the coal mining company want to proceed with 'underground blasting (shot-firing)'? The very thought of explosives blasting this ancient and fragile area is horrendous for the consequences such action will bring to the Capertee Valley escarpments. Is it possibly the NSW Govt. Dept. that can see a part of the \$6 million 'Resources and Geo Science' grants going to Airly Coal Mine, without any consideration to

the science that has already been acquired in trying to preserve such a delicate environment?

In Modification 3 (SSD 5581 MOD3) the Planning, Industry & Environment Department asks:

Is the land, or part of the land, critical habitat? Airly Coal Mine's application indicates: **No**

Is the development likely to significantly affect threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats? Airly Coal Mine's application indicates: **No**

Is the development biodiversity compliant? (refer to Schedule 1, Part 1, clause 1(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation) Airly Coal Mine's application indicates: **No**

MY OBJECTION: A firm defence in stopping this modification proceeding is Centennial Coal Company Limited's own blatant denial that the land is of critical habitat and will not affect threatened species, populations or ecological communities. The Capertee Valley has been deprived of water, has seen fissures develop more speedily than by natural events and the application already states that the development has no biodiversity compliance.

Refer to the following Haydn Washington Report to substantiate my objection.



Haydn Washington Report on Airly Mine Submission.pdf

Additionally, I resubmit my original objection to ANY modifications of Airly Coal Mine requested by Centennial Coal Company Limited

SUBMISSION TO REJECT Airly Mine Extension Project sent 10th October 2014

Under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999, the proposal for the Airly Mine Extension Project should not be allowed to go ahead. As a resident in the Capertee Valley, along with many others, seeing the degradation that is caused by underground mining with subsidence in several areas of NSW, has promoted a fear that the same will happen along the cliff faces of our valley. No amount of justification at Table 12.1 for the project warrants a blind acceptance to forgo the very act that should be protecting our environment and closing this coal mine not extending it. Where is the Biodiversity of this project? We know that the underground water will be reduced if this project goes ahead and there isn't enough for nature as it is. We know that there would NEVER be a total of 135 people working at the mine at any one time...it is the least convincing statistic presented. We know that the voice of the community is low on the government's list of being of value and is nine out of ten times ignored but please not this time!!!

There have been no reportable political donations made by Carol Henry in the previous two years.