

5<sup>th</sup> December 2019

Attention: Director - Coal and Quarry Assessments  
Planning and Assessment  
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment  
GPO Box 39, Sydney NSW 2001

**Re: Public Submission for SSD – 7293, Sancrox Quarry Expansion Project.**

Dear Sir,

I wish to submit my objection to the above development application. The proponent's application and EIS is inaccurate and flawed. I believe that any of my submissions below are just reasons for halting this development and the application should be rejected.

Submission 1:

**The right of quiet enjoyment of local properties will be destroyed by this development.**

The quarry was originally only intended for a life until approximately 2005, when the estimated winnings were forecast to be exhausted.

The development of adjacent land for rural residential use was made prior to the operation of the quarry. It was made on the premise that the quarry would cease operation ~2005.

The agreements made at the mines' inception, to cease operation, are testament to the fact that the surrounding rural residential development was forecast and approved to expand.

The continued operation of a mine in this area was NOT COMPATIBLE then (2005) and is absolutely INCOMPATIBLE now!

.....

Submission 2:

**The economic advantages to the community, cited in the application are invalid and should be ignored.**

There is no community advantage by increasing output from this quarry and alternatively and more importantly, there will be no community disadvantage if this mine ceases operation.

The supply of all rock aggregates (both current and future), produced at this site can be sourced from alternative quarries in the local area. These alternate quarries are better environmentally suited to this operation and do not impact the environment to the extent that this new development will.

The proposed extra operations of finished product supply, (concrete and asphalt), is currently satisfied by other local businesses.

The “job creation” that is touted for this site will be at the expense of current jobs in other local businesses that will be forced to close or reduce operation by this development. There will be NO net gain in employment, it will in fact, lead to a reduction in jobs.

.....

Submission 3:

**The “expansion” of the operation constitutes a new and separate development.**

The operation of this quarry from establishment was located on Lot 353 DP 754434 prior to licensing regulation.

A condition of the continuing operation of the quarry was that the operation would cease in approx. 2005 and the pit be converted to a water storage dam at cessation.

The quarrying operation at this site has continued past the agreed closure date and it is obvious by the application that the resource on Lot 353 is now, or soon to be, exhausted.

Commencement of mining on another separate parcel of land that has not previously been approved must surely constitute a new and distinct development. Any new development should be subject to the appropriate approval process with the checks and balances that would apply to any new development. This new development should not be touted merely as an expansion to an operation (that should have been closed years ago).

.....

Submission 4:

**The new operations of concrete batching plant, concrete re-cycling plant, asphalt batching plant and pug mill should not be included in this application.**

These are additional operations and are not part of the current operation and are not a state significant development. They should be treated as a new development and sited on appropriately zoned industrial land.

.....

Submission 5:

**The environmental significance of this site is more important than opening another mine that is not necessary.**

A large section of the subject land is defined as Koala habitat and a smaller section of this habitat area is defined as high activity Koala habitat.

Given the significant concern at all levels to the destruction of Koala habitat and the decline of yet another species, it's not logical to proceed any further with destruction of this habitat. Especially when there are other existing quarrying choices available.

Further to this, the recent bushfires that have destroyed much of the existing Koala habitat must surely invoke even more precedence to the protection of any remaining habitat.

There are also studies, (annex C of the DA), identifying that this habitat has a unique biodiversity that supports many threatened species of birds, mammals and plants. The supplementation by "eco-credits" will not replace the loss by destruction of this precious habitat.

.....

Submission 6:

**The company does not demonstrate responsibility to the current conditions of operation, how can they be expected to comply with an "expansion" of the operation?**

The proponent has recently incurred a substantial fine by the EPA for breaches of their environmental compliance obligations.

.....

Submission 7:

**The 24/7 operation of the processing plant is not necessary and should be rejected.**

Even if this development is granted, there is no need for a 24/7 operation. The current demand for building materials for this area is more than adequately catered for by current suppliers operating in normal hours. The plant and equipment required can readily be shutdown and restarted; there is no continuous type of process that requires a 24/7 operation.

The background noise that has been generated already by the upgrading of the highway to a motorway is there 24/7 and can be heard kilometres away due to the terrain and tree clearing associated with the upgrade. At a recent Christmas get together of local people, the unanimous opinion was that the ambient noise from the highway had substantially increased.

The Sancrox Quarry operation will exponentially add more to the already increased background noise. I acknowledge that noise monitoring has been done as part of the EIS and may be within “perceived” tolerances but when this noise is there all day, all night and every night, it will become intolerable.

.....

Submission 8:

**The application is in conflict with the objectives of the RU1 zoning and should be rejected.**

There are approved substantial subdivisions (some 142 allotments) on adjacent land that this development will negatively affect.

The objectives of the RU1 zoning state:

“• To minimise conflict between land uses within this zone and land uses within adjoining zones.”

A large and noisy mining operation on nearby land will only generate conflict and is directly in contradiction of the objectives of the zoning.

.....

Thank you and in closing I add:

*I have never made any reportable political donations.*

*I agree to the department publishing my submission on its' website in accordance with the privacy policy of the DPIE.*

Yours faithfully,

Name Withheld