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1st November, 2022

Re: Martins Creek Quarry (Application SSD 6612)

I object to the above proposal for the following reasons:

The proposal intends to increase production from a currently approved figure of approximately 300,000tpa to 1,100,000tpa.

There is distinct potential for significant impacts on the physical health, emotional and mental wellbeing of all those who reside along or adjacent to the proposed haulage route as well as to the rural lifestyle amenity, the tourism potential, economic viability and the region’s biodiversity.

This is not an assumption based on the proponents of SSD6612 modelling. It is my family’s lived experience demonstrated during the period when illegal operations were being undertaken at the quarry.

What we experienced was:

* Locals were so intimidated by the trucks in the town they started shopping elsewhere. This impacted our economy and local employment opportunities suffered.
* Amenity within the village suffered due to excessive dust, exhaust fumes, unbearable noise and horrendous traffic congestion. This extended the entire haulage route to East Maitland and also through Lorn to Maitland.
* Our local tourism visitation decreased as pedestrian safety became a major risk.

The amendments to the existing proposal do not clearly quantitatively define:

1. The air quality impacts from the base of 300,000 tpa to 1,100,000 tpa either at the quarry site or along the road and rail haulage routes.
2. The noise impacts from the base of 300,000 tpa to 1,100,000 tpa either at the quarry site or along the road and rail haulage routes. The quarry is currently audible several kilometers away.
3. The health and wellbeing impact from the base of 300,000 tpa to 1,100,000 tpa either at the quarry site or along the road and rail haulage routes.
4. How the product will be treated to minimize air silica loaded airborne dust. Both the road and rail haulage routes traverse through built up residential areas. Either form of transport will require to be treatment uniformly, this has not been addressed.
5. How they will proactively manage the core Koala habitat. Photographic evidence of koalas from lands adjacent to the quarry confirm the proponents finding of the significance of this area as habitat. Although not sited in the surveys local are confident this area is also habitat for the quoll who’s conservation status is listed as vulnerable in NSW and endangered under the Commonwealth legislation.
6. The economic impact due to the loss of tourism for East Maitland, Bolwarra Heights, Tocal, Paterson and the Dungog Shire due to the impact on heritage and rural amenity by the proposed truck haulage.
7. The impact on Maitland and Dungog Councils residential development plans. Should the proposal be approved by the State, how and who will compensate these Councils and their community members for the loss of amenity and residential potential for the next 25years. Today allotments are being sold in Bolwarra Heights and the buyers are not informed of SSD6612, a proposal which will impact upon their amenity, health and wellbeing, their sense of community and region, future property values and their safety.

SSD6612 in my opinion is not conducive to building better, stronger, healthier and more resilient communities for the future. This proposal due to the impacts and the lack of adequate assessments provided within the applications should be rejected.

I have never contributed to political parties

Yours faithfully

Sue Jakes