As I understand this process is set up to find out if the proposed mine is in the best interests of the community. This question can be easily answered by a look at the dept of planning and infrastructure’s website that lists all 757 submissions to the project. Only 32 residents of Wyong Shire or Gosford Council made a submission in support of this mine. That is a mere 4.2%. So to answer the PAC’s question NO this project is not in the best interests of the community.

Of those 32 people that support the mine over 12% are from the 1 family. That family I refer to is the Gaggin’s that have been given FREE use of Wallarah 2’s shed at Bryant Ave Tuggerah to run the poultry auctions for the life of the mine. Conservatively at $30,000 rent per year for 28 years the Gaggins and the poultry auctions stand to benefit by over $1,000,000 in free rent.

I would also like to state for the record that several people on the submissions list in support for the mine have been included more than once. Mr Gaggin appears twice whilst William John McGill is one individual who appears on page 31 and again on page 32 and again on page 37. How did the dept of planning and infrastructure allow this to happen???????? So even the 4.2% so called community support for the mine is an embellishment and the dept has accepted this on face value.

We have already been told today by the Aboriginal Land council that the application is invalid as it does not have the consent of all land owners and this is before the Land and Environment court. Even if this mine is given approval the Darkinjung land council have made it clear today that they will NOT lease or sell their land to Kores and if they cant build their train line then the coal can not be moved off site. This is a large oversite by Kores and they do not seem to have any plan B. So it makes it a waste of time even being here today discussing other objections to the mine. There is NO court in Australia that will rule that Kores can compulsorily acquire land that is already owned by the Aboriginal Land Council.

The claimed benefits are largely distributed away from the population bearing most of the impacts of the project. There will be financial benefits for Kores, the NSW state govt and the poultry association. But all the costs are worn by the local residents such as myself and my family who are left to reside in the valley to deal with subsidence, flooding, air pollution and water contamination

There is nothing in the EIS that suggests the project will generate any significant demand for housing or facilities in the local Wyong area.

I have never been approached in person or by mail from a Wallarah 2 representative to discuss any impacts the mine may have on my property. In fact according to the EIS my house does not exist. The EIS states the project will have a negligible impact on local residents. How can Kores assure me I will not be impacted in any way when they don’t even know I live there. If my house has been missed then how many other houses are not included in their list of 245 homes to be subsided????????????

Unfortunately for me my property appears on a map on page 140 labelled figure 34 that details an increased level of flooding will occur once mining operations begin. How can a high level of flooding on my property be deemed negligible?????????? We don't get flooding and therefore, an “increase in flooding” is not negligible, it is completely unacceptable.

The dept of planning and infrastructure that has just given the green light to the Wallarah 2 coal project is the same department who, in January 2012, approved the extension to Glencores West Wallsend
Colliery at Mount Sugarloaf. Despite getting this approval the mine was exposed by the Newcastle Herald in August 2013 for a catastrophic environmental disaster due to mine subsidence. This subsidence resulted in cracks of 120 metres by 17m which were subsequently filled with 180 tonnes of grout. The disaster did not end there with all the grout escaping into a tributary of Cockle Creek and to the best of my knowledge is still getting chiselled out by hand and flown by helicopter in an attempt to clean up their mess.

Glencore stated in their proposal that subsidence of 2.5 metres may occur in the mined area. This is the same figures that Kores state in their current EIS for land in my valley. The dept of planning and infrastructure did not see this as a problem and approved the mine extension. The PAC admitted they will rely on the expert advice from a subsidence guru called Jim Galvin. How come this subsidence guru didn’t see any issue with the computer modelling that was presented by Glencore?????? Having the PAC rely on a staff member from the dept of planning is NOT at arms length nor a transparent process. The PAC must use independent experts to make their decisions and not staff members from the dept of planning and infrastructure. Mt Sugarloaf is only 30 minutes north of our valley. How can the PAC or the dept of planning and infrastructure approve this current proposal by Kores now that we have proof of the devastating effects of mine subsidence in our area????????????

**Sugarloaf mine subsidence areas may be off limits for a decade: photos**

By *DONNA PAGE*
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Sugarloaf mine subsidence areas may be off limits for a decade.
A SECTION of Sugarloaf State Conservation Area is expected to be closed to the public for more than a decade as authorities struggle to deal with threats to safety posed by mine subsidence damage.

Expert reports reveal a series of possible safety risks to people using the public reserve including rockfalls, large-scale landslide and trees toppling.

Part of the reserve, around the largest subsidence damage, will be fenced off indefinitely following recommendations by the mine’s consultants.
It is considered too dangerous to allow workers in to remediate because “soil and toppling failure” could occur quickly and people would “not be able to evacuate”.

“The only way to ensure public safety is to prevent access to this area until the vertical block movement feature [three large subsidence-affected areas] and associated subsidence impacts are considered safe and stable by the relevant experts and authorities,” the state government’s Sugarloaf State Conservation Area safety and remediation committee report says.

It is estimated the area could be fenced off for more than a decade.

Miner Glencore Xstrata’s West Wallsend Colliery has agreed to spend $100,000 on the reserve to make up for the loss of access.

The revelations have outraged bushwalking and environment groups, who are demanding a guarantee more of the reserve will not be lost to longwall mining under the range.

A National Parks Association Hunter spokesman said Glencore Xstrata must provide “concrete evidence” the public will not have more of its park “fenced off due to damage caused by mining”.

“We are talking about a public conservation reserve that is meant to provide for public recreation,” he said.

“Their subsidence risk analysis was flawed in the first place, so I have no idea how we are to trust that this will not happen again in other areas of the park.”