

Objection to proposed Abalone Farm Project at Pindimar

Application number 10-006

I object to an Abalone Farm proposal at South Pindimar I write this objection as a concerned person.

I have an extensive knowledge of Pindimar as I have spent 40 years visiting this area regularly. I have spent much time enjoying and protecting the waterways and bush areas of South Pindimar and its surrounds. I have spent large amounts of my childhood and adulthood staying in Cambage Street. I am very familiar with the waterways and bush land areas in the vicinity of where the Abalone Farm is proposed. I have bushwalked for many hours in these areas and have spent much time swimming, fishing, windsurfing and kayaking in the beautiful estuaries and in the Port. I have protected this area in the 1980's when there were illegal attempts to fill in swamp land near the Creek. –I remember that day as the birds flocked the air as their homelands and nesting grounds were disrupted.

I am supportive of the local Community and have been involved with and supported local community events.

I therefore believe I am in a position to comment with the best interests of this area as my priority and to fully understand the implications of the proposed Abalone Farm proposal to this area. I strongly believe that the proposed Abalone Farm will: challenge the high standards aimed for with respect to the environment of Port Stephens and also have a detrimental impact upon the quality of life issues for the residence and visitors to South Pindimar.

I am not alone in being able to offer experience and I would strongly urge the Department of Planning to listen to the Community concerns. This is a small but active and positive community who work hard to improve the quality and address safety issues of the area they live in.

The Mental Health of communities is affected by decisions that they feel strongly opposed to. This defragmentation has a flow on effect- resulting in less positivity and volunteering and less affiliation with an area for local residents.

Pindimar has been a role model with respect to Community care and for such services has been nominated for local awards.

I believe that it is important to listen to those who have expertise in certain areas but it is just as important to draw on local knowledge and experience in order to really understand the impacts on any development. Here is an opportunity for this to be achieved.

Use of Local knowledge and expertise

I do not believe that this has been in any way adequately incorporated into the Proponents submission. This lost opportunity to me indicates the lack of acknowledgment of the importance of Community and the breadth of knowledge and understanding they have to offer.

It takes a community to nurture a community and come together to look after those less vulnerable. In this case: the environment, the Port, and people who may be not so in the position to express and offer their opinions. Yet at the end of the day- these are the ones who are being expected to take the brunt of such a development.

Conclusion: My concerns are that if the Abalone Farm project is allowed to continue that the local community will continue to be disregarded and their concerns not listened to. Projects have the best outcome when local resident's warnings and concerns are adequately addressed.

If an Abalone Farm is allowed - then to gain community confidence. There would need to be in place a legally binding regular meeting with a professional facilitator (agreed to by all parties involved) present to discuss and address concerns from local residents and to give updates on the progress of the Project Farm. The voluntary Pindimar- Bundabah Community association would be in an ideal position to voice these concerns for residents. Any costs incurred e.g. professional facilitator fees should be paid by the Proponent.

Background and project Context

The Proponents write page xxii'*A proposal for an Abalone farm on the site was originally granted development consent (under Part 4 of the EP&A Act) by Great Lakes Council in 2006. However an objector appealed to the Land & Environment Court under Section 98 of the EP&A Act against the granting of consent. During the Court hearing, detailed documents were requested which were not able to be immediately produced, and the applicant had concerns about the financial implications of the legal proceedings. The applicant therefore agreed to the making of consent orders allowing the appeal, and the proposal was withdrawn.*

I feel that this is an unclear and biased way of representing the history of this project and does not represent the longevity of local concerns to the project.

On 22nd March 2007- In the Land and Environment Court of New South Wales the Court made the following orders. By consent the Appeal was allowed.

Development Application DA 313/2003 to Great Lakes shire Council is determined by refusal.

I think the wording that an 'objector' appealed to the Land and Environment Court makes it sound like one individual was concerned. This was not the case it was The Pindimar Bundabah Association Inc. who objected and represented the views of many local residents and holidaymakers.

Reading other reports that have been prepared as part of the Proponents submission- there is this same use of 'an objector'.

The outcome in 2007 was that the Abalone Farm was not able to progress- **refusal**. 'Underprepared – not able to produce documents – legal costs' is irrelevant. Both sides had financial burdens as a result.

The Proponents not acknowledging that it was the local community group, I feel 'trivialises' the widespread concern that had already been associated with an Abalone Farm proposal at South Pindimar.

Conclusion- I believe a person would be more concerned and consider a proposal longer and look at it more closely if they were aware that the local community group had already not supported it- to the point that they had taken it to the Land and Environment Court and the appeal had been allowed- and the DA to the Council is determined by refusal.

Cost of the Project-

The Application form states the estimated cost of the project is **\$1.8 million**. I believe that this is an underestimation of the project costs.

If the Project continues I believe the General Public should be made aware of the real cost. There should be costing for all works to be undertaken. The worse case scenario is a half finished project taking years to complete. Meaning years of building disruptions and the important psychological impact on the Community as to 'exactly when the Project is finally going to be completed and will it actually be viable?'.

Much of the Construction will be 'new' to Port Stephens. To my knowledge there have never been underwater pipes such as is proposed placed across large tidal areas before and placed into the Port.

Reading the submission – I have become aware that there is extensive specialised infrastructure needed and also specific machinery that it is unrealistic to expect will be readily available from the Tea Gardens industrial site (as suggested)

There will be specific costs- needed as the environment is protected - including specialised scuba divers to identify protected seaweeds, placing of the pipes, dredging, digging, upgrading of roads.

Questions- I have not been able to find in the proposal where there is mention of special equipment needed specific for Abalone Farms. Does this mean that everything can be sourced within NSW and is readily available? Can we be assured that there will not be any 'waiting' for parts that need to come from further afar (for example that may need replacing) and that waiting on them would not have any effect water quality in Port Stephens?

Conclusion: This is an extensive project. It needs to be treated as such and costs not be underestimated. Real costs need to be shown and a guarantee given that this project will not run out of funds. And specific insurance if this was to happen.

Length of time to complete-

The Proponents have nominated that the project will take 3 years to complete. If it is to go ahead - I believe this time period is too long to expect the local community and holidaymakers to tolerate the disruptions associated with such a complicated development site. From my reading of the Proposal -it seems more consistent with developing a factory than setting up a farm.

Conclusion I believe there should be a maximum time period of 18-24 months for completion of this development. And that there should be substantial legal binding monetary penalties enforced if this time period is broken. And without any special clauses re- severe weather hindering building-, as this is a well-known entity for Pindimar- considering the Port's easterly position.

Probability of succeeding

I note the statistics provided and that there has been changes/additions needed to numerous areas of the development process in order to decrease risks/ disruptions to the environment etc.

Many of these changes appear to need further absolute attention to detail in order for them to remain in the low risk category.

From the information provided in the Submission- the running of a successful Abalone Farm requires high levels of expertise. There has been an emphasis on acting early and quickly to any changes in Abalone health, the need for quality

water for the Abalone to succeed, there is the quality sourcing of Abalone required, strict adherence to reduce possible virus being introduced, breeding techniques, controlled diets, water temperature adjustments, rearing larva, specifics for the juvenile stage, specific requirements for the grow out stage and then the delicacy of harvesting ensuring live arrival to market with in a relatively short time period (48 hours). This Project requires dedicated attention to detail with what seems like many possibilities of potential failure along the way. I have concerns that there will be large reliance on the technical director. As a person who now works in a multi disciplinary team I reflect that reliance on one person is fraught with its own problems and can put extreme pressure on an individual.

Using words 'like 'low risk' and 'not likely' to describe whether possible concerning events may occur are not reassuring when the results are significant changes expected to this area.

At this point in time – I believe it is not possible to say whether this project will succeed- despite the companies best intentions to re-assure us all. There has never been an Abalone Farm in Port Stephens. To my knowledge there has never been a land based Abalone Farm as far North on any of the Coasts of Australia. To my knowledge- the proponents and the proposed Technical Director Graham Housefield have not managed a commercially viable Abalone Farm before. It is noted that Graham Housefield has technical knowledge/experience and a research basis in the area- as stated in the proposal. But I believe this is significantly different - in that the Proposed Abalone Farm will be a commercially driven project where the outcome must be profit.

So at this point in time- the community of Pindimar and the wider community of Port Stephens, -along with protected fauna and flora species are expected to join this experiment- for better or worse.

Questions and Conclusion - More information is needed- we need to know the worse case scenarios. Not just how everything will be fine- as long as the pipes keep pumping, the electricity and generators work to capacity, the roads are able to be accessed properly, the people responsible after hours are contactable and able to come straight away.

Pindimar is known for electricity failures, sudden large volumes of rainfall, severe weather, challenging road access and communication challenges.

Telecommunications-

I have concerns that the farm is to be manned only 6 days a week, and not after hours or Public Holidays. We are informed that SMS messages and emails will be sent if monitoring systems fail. Other residents in Cabbage Street have

consistent problems with mobile reception and Internet connections.

Questions - More detail is needed regarding how the after hours monitoring of the farm will work? How close will be the expertise to fix a problem if water quality fails to be adequate, cooling fails, or there is a technical problem with pumps?

Conclusion - Telecommunication facilities available at South Pindimar are known to be unreliable. Relying on these service to /manage and monitor' a farm after hours or to communicate with people of expertise in an Emergency situation is unworkable and potentially irresponsible.

Weather

It is well known by local residents that Pindimar is subject to severe weather. Including- flooding and sudden down pours.

I do not believe that an adequate plan for the holding tanks is provided in the case of severe weather. That is- when the tanks overflow – despite their being a 30cm 'safety zone'. There should be specific rainwater data recorded at PIndimar before it is concluded that the extra buffer on the holding tanks would be adequate for excess rain.

Question- What impact will this have on the local fauna and water quality issues within the Port?

Conclusion- There needs to be a plan with respect to overflow of these holding tanks to protect the local fauna and the Port.

Monitoring

There are no specific guidelines re: abalone farms for NSW. The proponents state that they will endeavour to gain accreditation among peer organisations.

Conclusion- I believe this should be a mandatory requirement and confirmation and review of preliminary negotiations prior to commencement of any works.

Which Local Government Councils will be monitoring what?

After reading the Proposal I am not clear as to how the 2 Councils will coordinate particular aspects of monitoring. As there are significant environmental land issues and maintenance of the high Port standards - there will need to be slick

Council coordination and communication.

Questions- Who will coordinate this whole procedure?

Conclusion- I do not think that it is appropriate for the Proponents to have this role. This role should not be expected to be paid by either Council, as I do not feel ratepayers should have to subsidise this. This should be paid by the Proponents and with representation by the Local Community Group and the Councils.

This way the Community would have the reassurance that the Complex interplay needed between 2 Council bodies is being met.

Both Councils have not had any experience with monitoring an Abalone Farm and we cannot afford to make errors that could result in any detriments to the Port.

Responsible Use of the Land

One question on the application is whether the Company has a history of responsible use of the land. I have tried to confirm with City plan that the company is locally owned. Jillian from City Plan confirmed by email that *'Austasia Leefield is a company set up by Graham Housefield and his brother-in-law Ken Lee for the purposes of the abalone farm. Graham lives and works in the Port Stephens area. They are private citizens trying to start an aquaculture business'*.

I have tried to confirm further by email to Jillian on 2 further occasions as to whether they are the only 2 in the Company- but have not been able to confirm if this is so. As these emails have not been replied to.

On the Application form – it has the Proponent as Austasia Leefield Pty Ltd and name- CO Dominic Bressan. Then signed by Graham Housefield and Ken Lee. With the land owners consent being Richard Halliday and Helen Halliday. And Robert and Andre Bressan.

I am unsure therefore who exactly is in this Company. This is relevant as I have concerns that there is a history on this land site where the Abalone Farm is proposed that would indicate less than expected care with respect to the environment.

Including – a fire in 2006 (I understand that there is still pending investigation as it was lit during a fire ban and the adjacent Wildlife refuge Tallallowfield was put at risk). There has also been Council related development issues with an infringement notice issued (specific details are available on the Website) and to my knowledge the rocks that were placed on the foreshore are yet to be removed.

Question - I do not think that it is possible to determine at this point in time whether Austasia Leefield Pty Ltd will be responsible as a Company without this information as to exactly who is in the Company?

Conclusion - The Community is essentially being asked to have confidence in Austasia Leefield Pty Ltd being environmentally responsible without having enough information to do so..

It also makes no sense to me that any outstanding issues on the property are not cleared up prior to starting a new project i.e. removal of the rocks on the beach front.

Sea Water temperatures

We seem to all be in agreement that water temperature is an issue with abalone growth and that with global warming - water temperatures are increasing.

My understanding is that water temperatures within Port Stephens itself can vary.

South Pindimar and particularly the area out the front of Cabbage Street have a large sandy tidal beach - especially compared to other areas of the Port. It is popular with locals, holiday and day trippers particularly with young children to come to swim in the lovely warm water- arriving both by road and by boat.

The water can become very warm- just like a bath as the hot sun warms the sand before the tides meander in. There has not been any reference made to this fact and the impact it will have on the water temperatures where the pipes are going to suck the water in.

Questions Particularly – how it will effect the management of the Abalone and what extra pressures it will put on electricity to cool the water or will extra tanks be needed? Which would affect costs of the farm, added noise pollution and also it's impact on possibility of Abalone death.

Conclusion- I think it is important to have this specific data re: temperature of water particularly in spring, summer and autumn prior to placement of permanent pipe infrastructure in our bay. And the above questions be answered by a renowned expert in the area.

Placement of Pipes

The Proponents state that with respect to the Bay the pipes will be underwater until the mean Indian Spring tidemark. My observations over 40 years is that there are significant differences even between low tides and high tide water

marks obviously depending upon the seasons, moon cycles and weather.

Visible pipes along a beach are unsightly and dangerous including being a trip hazard and not appropriate on a peaceful recreational beach.

Conclusion- Pipes should never be visible on South Pindimar Beach. I believe the current proposed place where the pipes will resurface after being buried will be visible to those on the beach in some tides.

If the Abalone Farm is accepted then these pipes should be placed at least 3 metres out further than the low low Indian Spring tide mark would be- to exclude unsightly pipes and any risk of tripping over them.

Burying pipes on South Pindimar Beach

Along with sea grasses there are also an abundance of sea creatures who bury themselves in the sand For example soldier crabs, sea snails and yabbies. They will be affected by the placement of the pipes.

Question- I am also not clear as to how the diggers needed to dig the very deep tunnels on the beach are to get there and retreat during the high tides? And will they need to come back through the Mangroves at nighttime? Or will they remain an obstruction on the beach? How will they get on the beach without constantly disturbing the Mangroves and the root system?

There is a well used walk along the foreshore of South Pindimar to Pig station. Beach (Piggy's Beach) How long will this be interrupted for?

Conclusion- I believe there has been an underestimation of the possible destruction to to the Mangrove System and ecology along this area. Which is already known to be vulnerable and vital for erosion management.

Filters at the inlet pipes.

The site for end pipe placement is will known as a place abundant of sea life- particularly with the sanctuary offered by the nearby protected Marine Park.

Question- How will small marine animals be reassured of not being sucked up into the pipes? We are yet to be informed exactly what screens/filters are to be used. Then a more relevant assessment as to whether small fish and other marine life may be able to enter the pipes can be presented. . Even with filters on them – I would expect that small fish and other sea creatures would be able to enter the pipes? What happens to them from there? How often would the screens need cleaning? How is this achieved?

Where would the waste from this be managed?

What about curious shoveled nose sharks and dolphins - Is it possible for them to become stuck between or below the supporting pylons? .

Has Noise pollution and vibration below the sea for this particular area been accessed? Will this interfere with Dolphin sonar?

Quality of water issues

I have concerns regarding the potential of high nutrient levels being pumped back into the Port. Port Stephens generally has the sought after reputation of being a pristine area promoting tourism. No where is this clearer than the bill boards on the highways- promoting Port Stephen's- clear waters, dolphins, marine parks. Ironically the view shown on many of these posters can be viewed by sitting in a boat above where the inlet and outlet pumps are proposed!

Also- I disagree with comparing the water quality with post Abalone with what may enter the Port from residential is irrelevant and just confuses the issue.

Conclusion- The gold standard for Port Stephens deserves to be pristine water and any proposal or development for Port Stephens should be expected to comply with that.

Concerns over specific water quality issue at Pig Creek Station –

From another perspective- unfortunately there are concerns regarding water quality coming into the Bay from the Creek at the end of Cambage street (Pig Creek Station) My understanding is that it has been reported to Great Lakes Council by locals with concerns regarding a thick grey offensive smelling (chemical like) discharge that has been seen entering the Port from Pig Creek Station - that appears to then dissipate throughout the water. I have also seen and smelt this discharge and discussed my concerns with local residents particularly its impact on sea grasses and water quality.

Question What impact will this have on water entering the water pipes and the growth of Abalone? Has the water been specifically analysed where the proposed pipes are to be?

If this is already a problem in the area- can we afford to then add any more possible discharge/high nutrients from the Abalone Farm into this section of the Bay? With the risk of contaminating the sea grasses and nearby Ramsar Wetlands?

If this is an intermittent discharge observed from the Creek at South Pindimar pig Creek Station. How can this be monitored and acted upon

acutely with respect to contaminating pipe water- before it impacts on the Abalone health? Particularity if it occurs out of hours? Will the expertise to interpret and make management decisions be available?

Conclusion - This highlights the inappropriateness of this site as an Abalone Farm in an experimental phase i.e. never been one in the Port before.

Mangrove trimming

The Proponents state that there will be only trimming of the Mangrove trees for pipe placement. Trimming is an undefined term in this context and not helpful in making an assessment of its impact on Mangrove survival and health.

The Pindimar Foreshore Management study commissioned by the Great Lakes Council and available on the website found that erosion should be managed at Pindimar. Particularly encouraging Mangrove Trees. I have noted that the Mangroves along this part of the foreshore have particularly been struggling in the last 3 years, and require further close observation and support.

Conclusion - I have concerns that any trauma to the Mangrove Trees and their root systems will result in a negative impact on the erosion management.

Also-as discussed elsewhere – I have concerns that the equipment will be required to be brought back and forth across for pipe building has not been clearly explained and may result in further damage.

Aboriginal and Heritage and Archaeological assessment

Question- Was the proposed Board Walk area also studied - as it is also part of the proposed development?

Land

An area of approximately 5.14ha (around 10% of the subject site) is proposed to be conserved in perpetuity for ecological purposes, to compensate for the small area of vegetation required to be cleared or disturbed in association with the Abalone farm.

Question Who is responsible for making sure this is carried out?

Conclusion- This is a priority and the workings of it should be finalised prior to commencement of any construction.

Environment

I have concerns regarding the koala population and other endangered species present on the property and surrounding properties. The Abalone Farm is next to a gazetted Wildlife Refuge. Questioning once again the appropriateness of the site as an Abalone Farm.

Having read the Environmental report provided by the proponent- I do have concerns that the significance of the koala scat findings and recent sightings close by have been underestimated. Particularly putting it in the context of recent sightings of a mother and baby at the Tallowfield Refuge next door. Also the study period was limited.

Pindimar South is an ideal place to continue foster the growth of a koala population and with only the neighbouring small area of National Park – koalas and their habitat should be a priority.

Conclusion – I believe that this area may be Core Koala Habitat and is yet to be determined and in the interim should be respected as such.

I think it is important that we protect the endangered trees that have been identified on the Property. I believe that an Arborist should be present on site – while any trees are being chopped down – so that an inadvertent mistake is not made.

65 trees only to be removed

I have not been able to find this detail in the submission. I have concerns that this is an underestimation.

Question- Could a map be provided to show exactly what trees are to be removed? And where the pipes are going to be diverted around certain trees?

Conclusion- There should be close monitoring of what trees are removed and specific approval sought if further trees are removed regardless for what purpose.

CAMBAGE Street as the only access point

Cambage Street has developed from a sandy track to a tarred road- upgraded as the number of Residents increased – to now there being few empty blocks along

the street. Starting mostly as weekenders and holiday makers – to now mostly permanent residents.

As housing increased there has been pressure placed on the road. Drainage became an issue and swales were placed on either side. The Swales fill with water and a common complaint has been that they do not drain adequately. There is no footpath and being a narrow street- it's the type of street where cars usually wait for each other to pass or if small cars proceed at a very low speed. It's a low speed and homely street.

Cabbage Street is a residential street- from spring to autumn it is busier with day-trippers visiting, families visiting, children riding bikes, leisurely strolls. A residential street for a community attracted by the quiet pace. This is the culture.

This road was **never** designed for the building or maintenance of an Abalone Farm.

It is unfair for a residential street to be expected to bear the brunt of an Abalone Farm- it's construction and ongoing increased use of the road.

Conclusion - I cannot imagine that this road could ever be deemed appropriate. To me it demonstrates the lack of respect or understanding of the Community to even expect it to be accepted. Why would you want to place such an inconvenience on people?

If the Abalone Farm was allowed to continue then the Proponents should pay for – the creation of a wide safe footpath along Cabbage Street and be expected to maintain its upkeep. This should occur prior to any use of the road for construction of an Abalone arm.

Any current damage to the road should be repaired prior to commencement of any work .As it would be expected that the extra stressors placed on the road during the building phase would worsen the road and make it potentially unsafe for residents. The road should also be inspected and repaired by the Proponent from the wear and tear that would be expected from the building of significant infrastructure.

Noise Pollution

From my own reading- noise pollution appears to be a particular concern with respect to land based Abalone Farms.

The proposal is now larger than the previous unsuccessful submission and it makes sense to expect with a larger proposal that more electricity related and pump noises would also increase.

Also with respect to recording of data – I am unable to confirm whether Noise Impact was assessed for those houses on the beach side – and also specifically for Pump noises and vibration.

There is no data regarding wind directions specific for this area of Pindimar. Southwest winds can be present and from my own experience – wind or not-noise travels readily from this part of the Bay/estuary – where the Pumps and Tanks will be- across the front of the beach – like an Amphitheatre type effect. N

Any generators from intermittent Campers over the Christmas period are easily heard. This is in stark contrast to the majority of the time- where Cambage street is incredibly beautiful and still at night. A place where you hear owls and other nocturnal birds. . It is a place where outside living is embraced and a place where windows are left open as much as possible in preference to air conditioners.

I have grave concerns regarding the noises that will generate and travel from the Pumps (24 hours) and the use of any generators and cooling apparatus (as water temperatures rise). Disruptions to electricity are not uncommon and the Generator use and noise needs to be specifically assessed.

Questions - With respect to the Noise Impact study- I have never heard any car noises from the highway when I have stayed in Cambage Street. I would question that finding as to how the location was established as background noise? I do not feel that Pump noises at Abalone Farms have been really specifically addressed in the Impact Study. I do not feel that noise has been assessed from the Beach front perspective.

The results of noise of the Generators, refrigerators and pump on a peaceful Pindimar night with a south-west wind blowing will give the true answer regarding noise pollution impact.

Conclusion- I believe that there will be significant noise pollution that will affect the quality of life among Cambage Street residents. Particularly those residents living at the end of the street closest to the Abalone Farm and those living on the water front side.

Noise pollution has a detrimental effect on sleep and is very distressing. It can be very debilitating to a population's health. It is unfair to expect residents to accept this inconvenience.

Once again- highlighting the inappropriateness of the proposed Abalone Farm site- close to a Residential Street.

Other places for Abalone Farm land based

The development of a land based Abalone Farm is inappropriate in the suggested site. It can often be tempting to fit a square peg in a round hole. I am certain this is what we are observing here.

I was not convinced by reading the Proposal that a land based Abalone Farm at Pindimar was the 'best place' for this experiment.

Austasia Lee field Pty Ltd does not have a history of success with a commercial Abalone Farm. With any new venture there is always a steep learning curve. There is no mention of support by the larger experienced Abalone Farm Factories and Companies or them commenting or supporting the whole model and location.

I note Graham Housefield has knowledge in the area with respect to Abalone as the Proponents point out - but **I would consider at this stage that it is still an experiment.**

Conclusion- If The Abalone Farm at Pindimar South fails it will have impacted negatively on a local Community, a relatively undisturbed and environment and even the Port. Who wants pipes left in the middle if the Port?

Failure of the Abalone Farm

The Proponent has made several suggestions as to how the heavy infrastructure that is needed for the Abalone Farm can be used if the Project fails. EG Turtle breeding facility.

Each suggestion comes with its own environmental and once again water quality issues with respect to Port Stephens.

Conclusion

If the Abalone Farm proposal is approved then the possibility of failure must be treated as a reality and a plan in place.

Bond and insurance cover should be undertaken prior to any commencement of works. TO completely cover costs of removal of infrastructure when the Project fails.

CONCLUSION-

The application for an Abalone Farm at South Pindimar with such closeness and requiring access by a Residential street. Surrounded by a richness of great environmental potential that will be affected is NOT appropriate.

There is no imminent or urgency to establishing such an Abalone farm at South Pinidmar and it would be devastating to make a decision that has the potential to cause so much disruption.

South Pindimar is not an appropriate site. I do not believe that there is any more reason to consider it now than was present in 2007 when it was rejected at the level of the Land and Environment Court.

I strongly believe that the aims of the Austasia Leefield Company – are not achievable at the proposed Abalone Farm site.

For the Port and Local community and ecology - there is too much at stake. Here is an opportunity to make the right decision.

There is nothing to be lost by determining that a Project is not appropriate for a particular area. There is nothing lost by deciding that the Proponents need to look elsewhere for their project where it is more likely to have a better chance of success and be safer and have less impact on a community village.

.It takes a Community to raise a child – lets show our children we do care about their future and leaving them behind a quality environment. There is too much to lose!

Thank you for taking the time to consider my concerns and responding to my questions

Yours sincerely

**Dr Rebecca Webster (Richardson)
MBBS BSC (Med) FRACP (Paeds) DipCH**