



4th. November, 2017

Planning Assessment Commissioners Mr. David Johnson, Mr. Andrew Hutton and Dr. Peter Williams

Wallarrah 2 Coal Project

Dear Commissioners,

I have previously registered my objection to the approval of the proposed Wallarah 2 Coal Project and I am again writing to record my strong objection to any approval being given to this project. I am not only objecting on my own behalf but also that of my family and many others of the Central Coast community and beyond. Any approval of this project is against my will and that of those I am representing.

Our concerns and objections as previously stated, in submissions to the Department of Planning and Environment and the previous Planning and Assessment Committee, we continue to hold as valid. For your convenience copies are attached to this submission.

At this date the probable pollution of the Hunter Valley water supply surely enhances the necessity of maintaining the water supply of the Central Coast area as the provision of water to the Central Coast from the Hunter water supply in recent years was to be a reciprocal arrangement, if needed by Hunter Water at a future date. Both the Central Coast and Hunter areas are residential growth regions, at the behest of the New South Wales State Government, and therefore demand the integrity of the water supply and catchment areas be maintained as essential. The possibility of damage to our water supply cannot be tolerated; especially as such damage through subsidence and/or pollution will undoubtedly be irreversible.

There can be no doubt that the intentional and especially unintentional discharge of waste water into the Wallarah and Spring Creeks will cause a degree of pollution in both the creek system and the Tuggerah Lakes. The extent of the effects of such pollution is unknown and any effective remediation unlikely.

The health risks of coal dust and small particle pollution cannot be denied and to site a coal loader adjacent to an existing and growing residential area is totally unacceptable. The area has been subjected to strong westerly winds throughout August and September this year which would undoubtedly carry pollution beyond the immediate area of Blue Haven, with over two thousand homes, two child-minding centres and a primary school, to adjoining residential areas, schools and shopping areas. Southerly winds will carry the effects to the northern residential areas and northerly winds to areas to the south which would include Wyong Public Hospital, the private hospital currently under construction opposite Wyong Public Hospital and adjacent to Kanwal Primary School.

The health risks posed by light and noise pollution remain with any mitigation apparently unconsidered and if not impossible any such mitigation would undoubtedly be inadequate at best and therefore unacceptable.


It seems the only positive aspect of the Wallarah 2 Coal Project is based on a financial return to the state. I have heard the extent of such benefit refuted by presenters who have examined the proposed figures. This benefit surely remains questionable, especially when weighed against the costs arising from known health problems engendered by mining and coal loading activities, the economic costs of pollution and probable loss of employment opportunities in other local industries due to pollution. The "moth-balling" of some existing mines surely also brings into question the actual economic benefit of a new mine with a proposed life span of less than thirty years.

Whilst there can be no iron-clad guarantee by the Wallarah 2 Coal Project that the proposed mining activities will not adversely affect the water supply of the Wyong Valleys we are guaranteed pollution of our air, waterways and soil and be subjected to noise and light pollution and have our health endangered all of which will be long lasting consequences of the Wallarah 2 Project if it is approved. I therefore implore you gentlemen to totally reject this application by the Wallarah 2 Coal Project.

Yours sincerely,

S.J. Clay (Mrs.)

Attachments 2



29th. August, 2016.

The Director,
Planning Services,
Department of Planning and Environment.
G.P.O. Box 39,
SYDNEY.
N.S.W 2001

Dear Sir,

Re: Wallarah 2 Project SSD 4974 Amended Development Application.

I am writing to lodge a strong objection to the Amended Development Application for the Wallarah 2 Project and any approval of this project.

My objections are based on many concerns raised by the prospect of mining under the Wyong Valleys and especially with the locating of a coal-loader close to both existing and approved housing.

My principal objections and concerns include the following:

- **Water** - Whilst I can survive and even live without a number of things I and all I depend upon, be it animal or vegetable, cannot survive without water.
 - The proposed mining being below the ground water-table creates an unacceptable risk to the water supply, through subsidence, which is an acknowledged problem. Further subsidence would undoubtedly follow proposed "second workings" of the mined area and exacerbate such loss.
 - Some eighty million dollars of state money has been expended on a pipe-line to enable water to be pumped from the Wyong water catchment area to Mangrove Dam. Without this supplementary water supply it is questionable that the Mangrove Dam would be able to support the current population of the Central Coast area let alone the proposed population.
 - Contamination of both the ground water and water flowing into the Tuggerah Lakes system cannot be discounted through various aspects of mining and subsequent treatment of the mined coal.
 - The Wallarah Creek and Spring Creek systems are both vulnerable to such contamination.
- **Air Pollution** - Is a known problem from other mining areas and along rail corridors where coal is transported. Both coarse particle and fine particulate matter are known and acknowledged to cause health issues for people living within the vicinity of such activities. This is of concern with a coal-loading facility proposed to be located near existing housing.
- **Noise and Light pollution** - The adverse effects on the inhabitants of increased and continuous noise arising from locating a coal-loader within a short distance of an existing



8th. April, 2017

Planning Assessment Commissioners Kruk, Johnson and Hutton

Wallarrah 2 Coal Project

Dear Commissioners,

The reasons for my concerns about the approval of the Wallarah 2 Coal Project remain as stated in a previous submission (copy attached).

Further concerns include;

The imposition of compensatory measures are not reassuring. Some mines remain un-remediated. Companies do not have an impeccable record of meeting compensatory obligations.

In the event that the water supply of the Wyong Valleys is damaged or compromised I suggest that restoration, rehabilitation or adequate compensation would be beyond the abilities of the Wallarah 2 group.

Likewise the possible pollution of the Wallarah and Spring Creeks and therefore the Tuggerah Lakes, could not be remediated and undoubtedly would compromise the breeding grounds of many fish species. Pollution and decreasing fish stock would close the fishing industry of the area.

I question whether climatic events the area has experienced have been considered, such as:

Exceptionally heavy rainfall over short periods producing flash flooding and flooding either due to previous or subsequent rainfall,
Cyclonic winds (category 2 in April 2015) and destructive winds on other occasions,
Earthquake (29 December 1989, magnitude 5.6)

All the events mentioned have caused damage in this area. The approval of the Wallarah 2 Coal Project would inevitably lead to pollution from the activities of this project, when the area again experiences such rainfall and wind events.

Health risks have been well established by work done in the Newcastle and other areas. How approval can be sanctioned so close to an existing residential area I do not comprehend. There are over two thousand homes, two child-minding centres and a primary school existing in Blue Haven.

I consider the known health and environmental risks to far outweigh the proposed benefits, which are not satisfactorily proven.

Yours sincerely,

S.J. Clay (Mrs.)

Attachment 1