

RECEIVED

20 DEC 2012

Director-General

Terry J Wall  
6 Top Deck  
53 Ronald Ave  
Shoal Bay 2315 NSW

17<sup>th</sup> December 2012

The Director General  
The Department of Planning & Infrastructure  
GPO Box 39  
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Sir / Madam,

**Re: Objection to the Anglo American Drayton South Open Cut Mine Proposal**

I am writing as a concerned citizen to object to the Drayton South open coal mine project. I am an active member of several local environment concerned groups including EcoNetwork Port Stephens, the Tomaree Rate Payer and Residents Association Inc and the Shoal Bay Community Association Inc as well as subscribe to several e-papers on this subject. My reasons for objecting to this proposal are as follows:

- I am a human with a clear heart having not listened to lobbyists of the fossil fuel corporations and as a result I am not suffering from avarice.
- My family includes children and grandchildren and we have real concerns for their future on this planet.
- Our politicians seem to have ears for the spin merchants and few for their voters.
- We still subsidize the non sustainable and environment damaging fossil fuel industry and offer token support for renewables. So bad is this trend that even feed in tariffs for the solar PV industry have been priced at less than what is paid for fossil fuel generated energy. This says it all.
- We subsidize coal plants even today. Another obscenity.
- We offer no subsidy to transport gas prices.
- Coal fired power stations are not taxed for the toxicity that is proven by product of their fuel.

The thought of another 25 years of production from the Anglo American Drayton South mine horrifies me?

With regard to the **Environmental Assessment**, there appears to be a number of inadequacies:

- 1) Surface Water Impacts; The EA fails to discuss the relative values of the local watercourses from commercial, aesthetic and ecological perspectives.
- 2) Groundwater Impacts; The EA fails to address the cumulative effects from existing operations and are likely to be compounded by the impacts from proposed adjacent mining projects.
- 3) Agricultural Impact Assessment; The economic analysis does not address the impacts on the neighbouring farms. The assessment is solely based on the site and the off-set site.
- 4) Ecology; The competition resulting in the nearby farm and woodlands from the addition of new species from the project site would result in high levels of competition for food and shelter.

- 5) Economic Impact Assessment; The assumed value of coal in the analysis appears high given a 27 year project time span. The impacts on farm productivity and land values for neighbouring properties have not been included. The assumptions around the impact on Labour appear inconsistent with extremely low unemployment rates of the neighbouring towns.
- 6) Social Impact Assessment; No serious consideration is given to assessing and addressing the cumulative effects of this project on agricultural industries or to the impact of a larger population or demand on housing affordability, supply and demand for community services and facilities.
- 7) Soil and Land Capability; the criteria for assessing the land suitability has not been specified in the report.
- 8) Visual Impact Assessment; Lack of information on the visual changes on the site in the initial years. The mapping makes it difficult to full assess where the bund will be positioned. What will be the impact of the bund on the local microclimate, wind directions etc. The impact of dust and lighting to the local community is only briefly addressed at the end of the impact assessment. Measures to mitigate the visual impact of the construction of the bund include progressive tree planting however no detail is given as to likely success of this, strategy if survival rates are low, maturity profile of trees being planted etc.
- 9) Acoustic Impact Assessment; the impact of blasting on the community, neighbouring livestock and continued and incremental increase in rail noise is not fully accounted for.
- 10) Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment; In addition to concerns about the cumulative impact of an additional mine on the infrastructure in the area, there are also concerns that key proposed intersection upgrades should be completed before the construction period for the mine commences to ensure it operates safely.
- 11) Air Quality Impact Assessment; Whilst the report states that ground-level concentrations will be minimised through monitoring and mitigation measures and best practice will be implemented, the study has not demonstrated that these will be sufficient to achieve compliance with the criterion.
- 12) Surface Water Impacts; The EA fails to discuss the relative values of the local watercourses from commercial, aesthetic and ecological perspectives.
- 13) Groundwater Impacts; The EA fails to address the cumulative effects from existing operations and are likely to be compounded by the impacts from proposed adjacent mining projects.
- 14) Agricultural Impact Assessment; The economic analysis does not address the impacts on the neighbouring farms. The assessment is solely based on the site and the off-set site.
- 15) Ecology; The competition resulting in the nearby farm and woodlands from the addition of new species from the project site would result in high levels of competition for food and shelter.
- 16) Economic Impact Assessment; The assumed value of coal in the analysis appears high given a 27 year project time span. The impacts on farm productivity and land values for neighbouring properties have not been included. The assumptions around the impact on Labour appear inconsistent with extremely low unemployment rates of the neighbouring towns.
- 17) Social Impact Assessment; No serious consideration is given to assessing and addressing the cumulative effects of this project on agricultural industries or to the impact of a larger

population or demand on housing affordability, supply and demand for community services and facilities.

- 18) Soil and Land Capability; the criteria for assessing the land suitability has not been specified in the report.
- 19) Visual Impact Assessment; Lack of information on the visual changes on the site in the initial years. The mapping makes it difficult to full assess where the bund will be positioned. What will be the impact of the bund on the local microclimate, wind directions etc. The impact of dust and lighting to the local community is only briefly addressed at the end of the impact assessment. Measures to mitigate the visual impact of the construction of the bund include progressive tree planting however no detail is given as to likely success of this, strategy if survival rates are low, maturity profile of trees being planted etc.
- 20) Acoustic Impact Assessment; the impact of blasting on the community, neighbouring livestock and continued and incremental increase in rail noise is not fully accounted for.
- 21) Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment; In addition to concerns about the cumulative impact of an additional mine on the infrastructure in the area, there are also concerns that key proposed intersection upgrades should be completed before the construction period for the mine commences to ensure it operates safely.
- 22) Air Quality Impact Assessment; Whilst the report states that ground-level concentrations will be minimised through monitoring and mitigation measures and best practice will be implemented, the study has not demonstrated that these will be sufficient to achieve compliance with the criterion.

I respectfully ask that you register my objection to this proposal and seriously consider my objections when assessing the appropriateness of the Drayton South open cut coal Proposal.

Yours faithfully,



Terence James Wall  
[tj.wall@bigpond.com](mailto:tj.wall@bigpond.com)