

(BEEF)  
My name is Jerry Germon. I am a former ~~councillor~~, ex-director of nursing, ex-councillor and currently a member of Legacy Fund management committee, the Shire Red economic development committee and Advance Gloucester.

My family moved to the area in the mid 1800s. My roots are well grounded in the social fabric of the area as a consequence of how long our family has been in the area.

I have read the Rocky Hill EIS, and as an ex-councillor I believe the mine development is a compliant development as the non-discretionary components have all met the standards required by the State. As such I believe the mine should be approved.

I recently travelled to Gunnedah to assess the impact of mining in the Gunnedah region. I spoke to five major business owners, the mayor and deputy mayor of the shire as well as members of council staff. They all reinforced the positive social impact that mining had had in the Gunnedah region.

When a mine was first mooted in that region there were many people against it, but as mining developed people have become more positive. They have established 500 homes in Gunnedah as a consequence of mining. They have developed a major nursing home and the 32 shops that were empty prior to mining commencing the area, are now full and flourishing. The main street is extremely vibrant with many cafes and restaurants established as a result of mining. The other positive from mining in the area has been the establishment of tourism around mining, which has brought many people to the area to see what mining is all about.

This really impressed on me the similarities between Gloucester and Gunnedah, and what could be achieved in Gloucester if mining goes ahead. It will certainly prop up our hospitality industry which is floundering at the moment. It will also help bring young people to our region, which will help maintain our health and educational facilities.

I also don't think the mine is too close to town and residents. Current residents are living in a narrow corridor between highway and railway line and I can't see that the noise and air quality could impact them more than



trucks and cars on the highway, and multiple trains going past day and night. The Department report said they share former Administrator John Turner's view that the mine is in the wrong place, and that this view is held by "the majority of residents of the former Gloucester LGA." I want to know how the Department's knows what the majority of Gloucester people think. They haven't asked me, and they haven't asked many others in town. Are they basing their opinion on newspaper reports and surveys done by Groundswell?

On the matter of public interest, I believe that for Gloucester's long term future this project is in the public interest. It will create jobs, will improve economic income for the area and will create social outlets for the community.

Finally, the Department in its report mentions that the mine development is incompatible with the aims and objectives of the LEP to protect the scenic amenity of Gloucester. Any new development in the area will have an impact on the scenic amenity – even farming shouldn't be allowed if the scenic amenity is to be protected. Dairy farming comes with large rotary dairies and sheds etc. Even sub-divisions for residential use impacts on the scenic amenity. It seems the Department is picking and choosing – it is OK to build other things that impact scenic amenity, but not a mine that will bring us prosperity. It seems hypocritical and inconsistent. If you rule out projects that impact the scenic amenity, you rule out progress.

