

"Proposed Quarry SSD1159-1659" "Objection"

As we move forward, approvers and other departments must take into consideration some of the current standards are not in line with community expectation, if we don't challenge some of current standards then we will never improve. Just think one day a quarry (or similar) will come knocking at your door.

There is no doubt a number of these projects get approved due to a few greedy people and the approvers who have little understanding of the actual impacts or regard for the people, flora and fauna it affects.

If some projects are approved we must have higher standards applied to protect our communities in relation to noise, dust, light, air quality, traffic, social impacts, water, bio diversity and visual impacts. Increased conditions must be applied prior to approval with heavy financial penalties together with close down of business applied when the conditions are not met.

The local councils, Mid Coast, Port Stephens & Dungog say they support and want to increase tourism, but I fear this type of development will drive tourism away, and I suggest tourism and other similar opportunities collectively will provide far greater financial, community and supporting business benefits. This proposal will reduce those opportunities.

It is clear the area needs to be rezoned (E4) to protect the current well-being of the people in the community, native fauna & flora, together with the creek and river systems between the M1 and Gloucester, "the forgotten corner".

Inserted below is an extract from Published by:

Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water NSW. DECCW 2011/236

1. 1.3.1 NSW State Plan

Investing in a better future: NSW State Plan (NSW Government 2010a) is the NSW Government's long-term plan to deliver the best possible services to the people of NSW. It sets tough, realistic targets for service improvement across the public sector and provides an open and transparent way to measure performance.

In 2009, the NSW Government held an extensive state-wide consultation with the community, business, local government and stakeholder groups, to assist in developing the State Plan and to

make sure it reflected the needs and vision of the NSW community. More than 3,500 groups and individuals provided their views and local knowledge.

The State Plan aims to ensure:

- the economy grows stronger, supporting jobs and attracting business investment
 - the transport network is world-class – safe, reliable and accessible
 - NSW is the Clever State – children are better educated, people are more skilled, and the state is known for its research and innovation
 - the health system provides the highest quality care, accessible by all
 - NSW is the Green State – energy is clean, the natural environment is protected and NSW is a leader in tackling climate change
 - the most disadvantaged communities are strengthened and the most vulnerable citizens are supported
 - the police and justice system keep people safe.
- Further information on the State Plan may be found on www.stateplan.nsw.gov.au.

My question is are these objectives applied when new projects are under consideration and can we see them demonstrated during the assessment?

Noise & Vibration

Machinery reverse alarms.

Truck & dog – noise evaluation does not account for poor road conditions along the Buckets Way specifically an empty truck combination and measured as vehicles in motion. The acceptable level should be based on the lowest SPL of a European manufactured truck. The majority of the truck combinations used will be Australian/American built and therefore a high use of engine braking (Jacobs Brake) will be used, exponentially increasing obtrusive noise levels.

The noise emission estimates for the low- noise heavy trucks were based on the noise limits for heavy trucks used in Europe as specified in UN ECE Regulation 51 and EEC Council Directive 92/97. These regulations specify noise limits for heavy trucks that are 7 dB less than the noise limits specified in Australian Design Rule ADR28/01.

Low noise trucks must be used on all proposed projects.

Most, if not all of the road trucks will be contractor if not sole traders and therefore the proposed quarry will take no responsibility for the actions or noise levels of this equipment as soon as they leave the property. This is no longer acceptable.

Product dispatch 6.00 am to 6.00 pm. This means additional trucks travelling on the Buckets Way 5.30am to 6.30 pm

Maintenance shall be limited to 7.00 am to 5.00 pm Monday to Friday

WHO guidelines state that the recommended noise level for a community should be **less than 30 dB**.

Air Quality

In the EIS reference to using Beresfield and Mayfield as the criterion, this is flawed as these testing areas have been set up due to coal train dust and therefore the criterion is set higher than what it is along the Buckets Way. [Respiratory diseases are of a growing concern in Australia](#), please refer to the Hunter Valley, do not continue to widen an already problem.

Traffic

No assessment included for Fridays, public holiday or school holiday am or pm times. The wait times at the Buckets Way / M1 intersection will be unbearable and will have a high probability of major accidents including death, rated at 5A. See table below.

Risk Probability	Risk Severity				
	Catastrophic A	Hazardous B	Major C	Minor. D	Negligible E
Frequent 5	5A	5B	5C	5D	5E
Occasional 4	4A	4B	4C	4D	4E
Remote 3	3A	3B	3C	3D	3E
Improbable 2	2A	2B	2C	2D	2E
Extremely Improbable 1	1A	1B	1C	1D	1E

A similar intersection of the New England Hwy (A15) and The Golden Hwy (B84) which has high levels of waiting traffic was modified and the A15 speed limit for approx a kilometre in either direction was limited to 80 Kph.

Attached photograph of Buckets Way / M1 intersection, car turning right toward Newcastle and if a heavy vehicle from the south is in the Buckets Way turning lane the vehicle turning right loses vision of vehicles travelling north.



It is clear the traffic study has not considered high traffic times as noted previously; the assessment is skewed to support the approval for the project.

Extract from EIS

In the operational phase the quarry is expected to quarry product 49 weeks of the year, 5.5 days per week. The quantity hauled, using 32 tonne truck and dog haulage vehicles, is estimated to be an average of 10,200 tonnes per week or 1,800 tonnes per day. The tonnage per day would vary greatly however a maximum of 4,000 tonnes could be supplied on any given day based on customers' needs. This maximum quantity would equate to a maximum peak of approximately 110 haulage vehicles leaving the quarry on a peak demand day and approximately 55 haulage vehicles on an average day. The highest peak hour traffic volume would be no greater than 25 laden haulage vehicles exiting in a peak hour based on loading / weighing dispatch times. It is important to realise this will not occur every day and every hour but would be a short term peak associated with a number of concurrent major orders.

Do the numbers make sense?

$1800 / 32 = 56.25$ loaded truck movements $\times 2 = 112.5$ truck movements in 720 mins
= a truck every 6.4 mins

$4000 / 32 = 125$ loaded truck movements $\times 2 = 250$ truck movements in 720 mins =
a truck movement every 2.88 mins

The queuing effect at the Buckets Way / M1 intersection will not be acceptable, people including truck drivers will take risks to enter the M1 going in both directions with the most likely consequence being death.

Increase in truck & dog combinations means an increase in animal deaths together with frightening of animals and birds.

There are also a large number of side roads and personal accesses that are already dangerous due to low visibility in either direction and with the high number of additional trucks presents a high risk of accident with a catastrophic outcome.

Social Impacts

Firstly, I must refer to the MARA Consulting Social Impact Assessment, 23 Sept 2021, Executive Summary treats the local community with contempt. It is written with the underlying support of the project approval, and basically states the project will have no significant impact in any area or to the local community.

I clearly remember being in one of the online zoom meetings with Mara Consulting and they weren't interested in any comments being put forth, they just muted the meeting and advised the project met current requirements and standards.

Water

Refer to App P. Table 4.1 Summary of Average Water Balance (ML)

Areas of concern are:

(Assuming the numbers are correct)

Imported water of 1.8 ML in the first stage is equal to an additional 138 semi-trailer movements of water purchased, I doubt they will do this. These additional movements have also not been considered in the traffic assessment.

Secondly, the "controlled" and "uncontrolled" releases are not acceptable and will cause irreparable damage to downstream flora, fauna and aquaculture industries.

Please look for the obvious, water releases from many projects have caused permanent damage to our water ways in the past and if this project is approved will only continue to destroy natural habitat together with the profits of other natural industries that far better provide economic and tourism opportunities within the LGA.

Bio Diversity

Refer App L.

Koalas are in the area and need to be protected not moved on or relocated.

Koalas tend to be faithful to their home range and **will attempt to return if moved elsewhere** (relocated). The relocation of mature individuals that are healthy and who are coping well within their home range is discouraged unless there has been a recent and significant loss of habitat. It is a known fact clearing of Koala habitat is devastating to the species.

I also make note the only Kangaroo identified in the area as being the Brush Tailed Rock Wallaby. I live nearby and have a number of Eastern Grey, Common Wallaroo, and Black Wallaroo frequent our property on daily basis and I will suggest these and other species are common and widespread.

It an undeniable fact the impacts of blasting, vibration, man made noise, diminishing air quality, vehicular traffic headlights have a destructive effect on animals not only in the immediate but widespread area and they never return, if they indeed survive.

Visual Amenity

Refer App V. Whilst the Mara Consulting document details that no resident will have visual siting of the proposed quarry, what are the ramifications if they do? The public are sick and tired of soft measures that provide no consequence for the instigator. In this case the operation must cease until a hard measure is put place that rectifies the problem.

I object to the comment by Mara Consulting regarding the haul access road. "the visual impact will begin to diminish as the road becomes a part of the landscape." Their documents constantly playdown the impacts of the proposed quarry. Based on the EIS this road could have a truck and dog travelling on it every 2.8 min plus other support vehicles.

Refer "Community Strategic Plan - MidCoast 2030"

Our environment

We protect maintain and restore our natural environment

Value, protect, monitor, and manage the health and diversity of our natural assets, wildlife and ecosystems

Protect, maintain and restore water quality within our estuaries, wetlands and waterways

Improve the capacity of industry and the community to achieve the best possible outcomes for the natural environment.

I don't see how this supports the proposed quarry as I will further discuss directly with MCC.

Conclusion

In conclusion we request that our views, comments and outstanding questions are considered in full. Based on the information currently provided and with community and regional expectation this project must not be approved.