

Glendell Continuation Project

Attention: Director Resource Assessments

NSW Department of Planning

We are lodging an objection to the Glendell Continuation Operations Project due to these important grounds listed below:

- a) Ravensworth Homestead Complex must remain in the place of construction of 1832 to hold its significance to country. The Ravensworth estate was involved in the hostility of two cultures which resulted in lives lost and this should not be taken lightly of the significance of these incidences, in the material provided shows there is missing timeframes or even to the point locations or the numbers that might have been killed or hurt in the hostility. Ravensworth Homestead complex might be the location of the burial site of the original founder Dr Bowman or number of individuals that are not recorded, so therefore there is questionable concern if this project will disturb burial sites.
Ravensworth Homestead complex is significant in both European and aboriginal heritage, moving such structure would change the value and more importantly make a statement that heritage does not matter in our state or our shire, if we allow the relocation for a coal mine opens up the acceptability to destroy at all costs to our heritage, that other homes with historical heritage significance in the Singleton shire can be now destroyed.
- b) Air quality: The Camberwell district is subjected to high levels of pollution and alerts received in the last two years have shown high increase, yes the drought is a factor but in reality drought is apart of the environment we experience, the severity might have changed but this should be calculated into the air quality assessment and how this impacts the whole of the Hunter. There is a clear inadequacy of cumulative impact assessment related to air quality and even to make comment to 2010 Camberwell cumulative assessment just proves how out of date the assessment is to look at a report which is ten years old as reference, especially when there has been more approvals, the cumulative impact study must look at beyond the boundaries of the project but to the whole Hunter air shed.
Just because the village of Camberwell is in the acquisition zone of other operations, does not take away the fact that this project will cause harm to the occupants health, as stated the air quality will remain in exceedance and this is clearly unacceptable to deny the right to clean air. The fact of the air quality will be impacted by the project, would indicate that the proponent is responsible for the health impacts of the community.
- c) Noise is another factor that has impact on the mental health of others and the failure to identify the noise levels in the village due to location of inversions, but more importantly the increase of traffic that comes from outside the district, which adds to the noise shed, the modelling has inadequately addressed the topography of the village to noise through different conditions.
- d) Blasting is another major concern related to the health impact of the residence, will this cause harm to the home and the burden of cost for repairs, the assessment fails to identify the cumulative impact of blasting from several sources on the residence. The number of blasts at cumulative level and the impact on air shed has not been addressed over a day or annually.

- e) Water quality of tank water of rural residences- the fact stands there is no town water to rural properties and the importance of the collection system for each residence to collect water is impacted from polluted air shed, this has a major impact on health and financial burden for continual tank cleaning and filtration systems and yet this seems to be overlooked on the rights of others to have clean water, the severity of drought should open up the discussion related to water and the importance of collection for drinking and not have polluted water due to poor air quality, just note the dust in the gutters is grey and the source is clear where it comes from.

Conclusion

The objection on these grounds highlight the inadequacies of assessment related to not making a comprehensive cumulative impact assessment of 2020, to look at 10-year-old report is not relevant of the events of today, the environment has changed.

Relocation of heritage is unacceptable behaviour, imagine moving the pyramids because Glencore wanted to mine and the actions this would produce.....