

Object to the proposal due to the impact of noise, pollution, and traffic on our health and wellbeing.

Reasons for Objection:

1. The combined impact from the proposed changes to the expansions of both Martins Creek and Brandy Hill Quarries should have been notified to the public jointly and with sufficient time to reply and with sufficient assessment of the combined impact. We (my husband and I) were unaware of the Martins Creek proposal as we were away for almost all of the Exhibition period. Even so, we would have objected to the Martins Creek expansion based on the adverse impact we currently experience from quarry trucks, although not as vigorously as we do to the impact of both quarries expanding.
2. Impact of combined traffic from Brandy Hill Quarry Expansion proposal and operations of Martins Creek Quarry Expansion.
 - a. Currently there is 'Offensive Noise', as defined on Port Stephens Council website, from shortly after 6am until after 5 pm on weekdays from trucks travelling to and from these facilities. Occasionally this noise has been noted outside these hours and days.
 - i. The loudness of the noise is such that it can heard throughout the property inside and out. Conversations often have to be paused while the vehicles pass. Doors and windows must remain closed throughout the hours that quarry trucks are passing to minimise the noise levels. Even then the noise is intrusive and offensive.
 - ii. The character of the noise is such that you cannot ignore it. When trucks are leaving the Quarries the noise is loud and penetrating throughout the house and the rest of the property as the trucks shifting gears to climb the hill on Adelaide Street to reach the 60kph signposted as quickly as possible. When trucks are returning to the Quarries there are gear changes, engine or compression breaking and more than a few times a day breaks squealing as they approach the turn at the bottom of the hill.
 - iii. The time and duration of the noise during current operating hours is such that there are respites during the day and through most of the weekend. But, 6am should be sufficiently early to rouse people from their beds. We've observed that over the last few years the number of trucks has increased, to the point where it is not unusual to hear 5 or 6 trucks pass in less than ten (10) minutes.
 - iv. Typical traffic noise for Adelaide Street includes a variety of trucks throughout the weekdays, although the Quarry trucks form the majority of these movements and usually are the loudest. We accept that as part of living in an economically vibrant community. But, we look forward to the end of the workday when the street becomes fairly quiet again, usually after 6pm.
 - v. There are a large number of homes, a nursing home, a preschool, a motel and two primary schools that are along Adelaide Street on the route to the Pacific Highway all of whom are impacted in a number of ways by the current frequency and operating hours of both Quarries.

- b. The Development Application (DA) provides a number of noise and vibration reports. I note that none of these reports cover the impact to Adelaide Street.
- i. Appendix 9 – Noise page 3 states “The predicted noise generated ... on Brandy Hill Drive would comply provided ...”. Appendix 9 further states “The potential sleep disturbance impact from the overall level of road traffic generated noise, including potential traffic movements associated with the proposed Brandy Hill Quarry Expansion would be within the applicable criteria at the nearest noise sensitive receiver ...”. This does not take into consideration the off-site traffic that residences along the route will have to endure. Along Adelaide Street, where no noise sensitive receivers were placed, many homes are within a few metres of the route and will be subjected to ‘Offensive Noise’ at intervals for up to 18 hours per day, 6 days per week should this expansion be approved in the current form.
 - ii. Further Appendix 9 – Noise - 5.2.3 PRACTICE NOTE 3 (SLEEP DISTURBANCE IMPACT) The RNP refers to the RTA Practice Note 3 protocol as the method for assessing and reporting on maximum noise levels that may cause sleep disturbance. The guidelines indicate that:
 - Maximum internal noise levels below 50-55 dB(A) are unlikely to cause awakening reactions, and
 - One or two noise events per night with maximum internal noise levels of 65-70 dB(A) are not likely to significantly affect health and well-being.

No study has been made of the impact to Adelaide Street or other residential areas along the off-site traffic route. Many homes along the off-site traffic route are less than 20 meters from the road, including the parking lane. Some older homes are less than 10 metres from the road. The impact on these residences has not been considered, especially as they are currently subjected to more than one or two noise events per night.

- c. There are a couple of mentions in the DA of the ‘primary haulage route is south via Brandy Hill Drive to Seaham Road to Adelaide Street, Raymond Terrace and then on to the Pacific Highway to Newcastle’ and yet there has been no assessment of Adelaide Street of the ‘off-site traffic noise impacts’ as mentioned in the list of SEAR Requirements. Most frequently, the reports refer to joining the Pacific Highway at Raymond Terrace, see section 3, is this to deliberately mislead the reader as to the nature of the route through an urban residential area.
 - d. No assessment has been made of vibrations currently experienced due to quarry traffic; nor has any analysis been carried out on the vibration impact of increasing the quantity of off-site traffic. Vibrations are only mentioned in the title of the report. We have felt vibrations from passing quarry vehicles regularly, and we suspect that those living in closer proximity to the quarries experience vibrations during on-site operation hours.
3. Statements in Appendix 8 - Traffic Impact Assessment are misleading. The Executive Summary on page 5 states “The main haulage route used for transporting the extracted material from the site will not change with the majority of quarry traffic (heavy vehicle) heading south along Brandy Hill Drive to Seaham Road and onto the Pacific Highway at Raymond Terrace.”
- a. This is an extremely misleading statement given the fact that access to the Pacific Highway at Raymond Terrace is via Adelaide Street or Adelaide Street and Richardson Road. Both these routes are predominantly residential and also include schools, motels, childcare centres, and a nursing home.

- b. This reports states that the 'primary haulage route is south via Brandy Hill Drive to Seaham Road to Adelaide Street, Raymond Terrace and then on to the Pacific Highway to Newcastle' on page 5. The photograph of the route provided does not include the Raymond Terrace area. The report includes no analysis of the traffic impact to the dozens residences along the route within Raymond Terrace.
 - c. The Traffic report does not address the impact of additional, let alone current, quarry traffic at Raymond Terrace intersections or along any of the routes to the Pacific Highway.
 - d. We noted about three (3) years ago that there was a noticeable increase in quarry traffic particularly with respect to noise levels, frequency of noise, and increased dust and diesel pollution in the air and on our home. None of these issues are addressed in the Traffic Report, nor are they addressed in the Application as a whole.
 - e. We have considered increased current levels of traffic before 6am and after 7pm weekdays and on Saturday morning to be within tolerable levels. It is part of the 'price' of choosing to live on a main thoroughfare through the town in a location that places us within walking distance to shopping, doctors, public transport and other amenities. Even the increase of quarry truck traffic 3 years ago, although intrusive and offensive was deemed as tolerable, especially as it was during daytime hours. An increase in operating hours would significantly impact on the health and wellbeing of residents along Adelaide Street, in either direction.
 - f. With current levels of traffic, and specifically quarry truck movements, it has become more difficult to safely enter and exist driveways along Adelaide Street. Truck drivers attempting to accelerate to 60kpm uphill from the intersection at William Bailey Street assume that vehicles are proceeding to the top of the hill despite people signalling a left turn into their driveway. There have been occasions where we have had to continue past our driveway as it is unsafe to slow and complete the turn due to the speed and lack of following distance of a quarry vehicle.
 - g. We strongly object to the phrase that a combined "limit of 584 truck movements during the daytime and 78 truck movements during the night-time periods respectively" is acceptable.
 - h. We also strongly object to the proposal that Hanson's maintain the right to 24 hours a day 7 days a week operations. There are currently heavy transport vehicles travelling along Adelaide Street between the hours of 1am and 5 am on occasion. They are noted, they do disrupt your sleep, and do impact health and wellbeing.
4. Additional degradation of Air Quality for those living along Adelaide Street is also a concern.
- a. We considered cleaning this as part of home care and maintenance to be performed regularly, especially as we chose an older home near the road. When we first purchased our home, in 2007, there was minimal impact of noise, dust, or diesel emissions. Regular maintenance of the exterior was required only once or twice a year.
 - b. The current levels of dust and diesel emissions are extremely high. The weatherboards on our front veranda, windows, and screen doors are covered in black soot. This increased in 2014 to the point that we considered researching how to lodge complaints or selling and moving. We since determined that for various reasons we prefer to remain in our home.

The proposed increase in operations, both in the number of quarry transport movements and hours of operations, will burden the community with additional health and property maintenance hazards.

5. The proposal will have an economic impact on those owning residential properties, rural or urban, along the designated off-site traffic routes.
 - a. Decreased property values may be experienced by owners. We have invested time and money in our home with various maintenance projects over the past 10 years and had intended to invest further. Now, we worry that despite these investments the value will decline with proposed increased impacts of quarry traffic.
 - b. Increased difficulty in selling properties may well be expected.
 - c. Increased electricity expenses will, and currently are, experienced by residents along the off-site traffic routes during operating hours of the quarries as doors and windows must remain closed preventing cross ventilation and requiring the use of air conditioners. Our home is over 100 years old and positioned to take advantage of breezes from any direction throughout the year. During discussions with neighbours we found that we frequently have electricity bills well under half of the neighbourhood average. Should the proposal be approved this will no doubt impact on our ability to access those breezes.
 - d. Increased maintenance expense will be incurred, both financial and personal time, as the dirt and diesel emissions further increase on paintwork and outdoor living spaces. This has already been noted with the water use restrictions and increase in quarry traffic over the past 3 or 4 years.
 - e. Homes along the routes may require the installation of soundproofing and double glazing due to the intrusive and offensive noise levels.

Will residents be compensated for any of these additional costs and expenses?

In summary, we strongly object to the expansion proposal due to the extensive impacts that the extension will impose on the communities both close to the quarry and along the routes travelled by off-site traffic. The number of residents adversely impacted by the proposed expansion(s) greatly exceeds the few (26) employment positions stated by the report. We do not like to see people become unemployed but the community as whole deserves some consideration.

We have made various accommodations and have not complained to date as we were able to alter our home, activities, and lifestyle. We now retire between 9 and 10pm and rise between 5 and 6 am having altered our schedules, when possible, to suit the quarry off-site traffic.

How much more are we supposed to alter our lives and homes to accommodate the quarries who do not acknowledge that we exist in their reports or that we have a right to enjoy the amenities of our homes and communities without the adverse impacts of 24/7 nor even 18/6 increased 'offensive noise', vibrations of our homes, sleep disruption, traffic, economic costs and other hazards; as well as reduced air quality and probably reduced property values over time.