

## Philippa Vale

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Saturday, 8 April 2017 10:44 AM  
**To:** PAC Enquiries Mailbox  
**Subject:** Wallarah 2 Coal Project

The Director, Planning Assessment Commission

NSW Planning and Assessment Commission

Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street

SYDNEY NSW 2000

20 March 2017

Dear Sir/Madam

RO41-17 : Wallarah 2 Coal Project – Wyong Local Government Area

I wish to object to the current ADA on exhibition and to the further progression of the mine proposal itself. The application portrays the economic benefits and job figures clearly for the whole project and does not confine itself clearly to this Amendment alone.

### PREAMBLE

The real fact that the proponent KORES is withdrawing from overseas development due to massive debt ratios, as recently expressed in the Korean press tells the community that the future job prospects, development and most importantly environmental repair, compensation and rehabilitation have little hope of being realised.

### POINTS OF OBJECTION

#### Costs/Benefits

Page 85 of the ADA states that the royalties to the State over the proposed and improbable 28 years life of the mine is \$200 Million which equates to just over \$7 million per annum. With falling coal prices and Government concessional rebates this figure is inflated. Taking into account the costs of repair and rehabilitation, particularly in the Jilliby Valley water catchment and Hue Hue subdivisions following subsidence, easily negates the benefits to the State and local authorities. By adding the long-term cost to

public health and to greater airborne diseases in the population it begins to look like a costly enterprise for the public purse.

## Employment

Pages 86 and 87 state job creation beginning with 79 through to direct and indirect job figures in year 2 of 1,111 jobs. This application states very clearly that this assessment is only looking at this Amendment and not the whole Project yet the job figures are obviously being included for the whole project such as a larger “intersectoral linkages” job quotation during construction of 1605 direct and indirect jobs.

Because the original rail spur is not being built and will be replaced by a conveyor system (essentially being the main thrust of this Amendment) does not create an additional 1605 jobs for the whole Project as configured above. As in the original EIS the job prospects are not defined and again highly inflated and misleading.

## Dust and Health and Noise

Dust remains a real issue for health in the Blue Haven and Wye precincts despite partial coverage of infrastructure. There is no attempt to cover coal wagons which will travel through the southern suburbs to Newcastle affecting all those communities of southern Lake Macquarie and Newcastle as has been demonstrated in the Hunter to Port line. There has been great concern about the mapping of coal dust and the lack of authorities to control those emissions. This project exacerbates the problem adding to that congestion toward the Newcastle terminal. The added times of daily rail crossing closures at Adamstown and Islington need to be disclosed to the Newcastle community

Pm10 emissions from the site are conservative as usual and do not take into account the changing nature of intense wind and storm events in the recent years. BlueHaven and Wye townships are now as close as 200 and 400 metres respectively from the new proposal bringing even greater problems for families in the area for both constant dust and noise 24 h/per day. There are many schools, pre-schools and establishments within 5 kms of the facility and they will suffer from emissions from the site.

Please refer back to the submission by Dr.Peter Lewis, Area Director of Public Health for North Sydney and the Central Coast wherein the outlines greater risks to children and health sufferers in this region should this project to be approved.

Noise exceedances are admitted to for “residences to the north of Bushells Ridge Road at Wye” and general noise 24 h/per day for those living in BlueHaven and Wye areas are issue of concern.

## Unresolved issue from the EIS 2014

Massive subsidence figures represented in the proponents EIS affect 245 homes and their infrastructure, 86 of which are destined to suffer a metre or more drop right up to 2.3 metres and the valley floor suffering subsidence up to 1.8 metres fall right up to 2.6 metres near the Jilliby Conservation Area provokes “inevitable uncertainty concerning subsidence predictions” as a PAC principal finding. The regular flooding of the Jilliby Valley means that this proposal condemns the area to degradation and to long periods of separation from facilities and emergency services.

The woeful performance of the Mine Subsidence Board in refusing the vast majority of claims Statewide for subsidence year in year out does not protect residents as is claimed in the application.

“The project predicts risk of reduced availability of water for the Central Coast Water Supply” according to the PAC wherein they... ” recommended there should be no net impact on potential catchment yield” .The Central Coast water catchment supply in the Wyong valleys is at real risk of destruction due to massive subsidence and loss of potable water to the mine area below.

This Amendment should be rejected and the whole project put aside due to many areas of risk.

Yours faithfully

Tabitha Tucker

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

[Redacted]