

From: [REDACTED]
To: [IPCN Enquiries Mailbox](#)
Subject: Objection to the Bylong Coal Project
Date: Wednesday, 31 October 2018 5:15:37 PM

Dear Planning Commission,

I am personally writing to you to object to the proposed Bylong Valley Coal Project. I know many of the submissions will only have the details far below in this email, (see the P.S.) which have been painstakingly produced by the Lock the Gate alliance, and which I support and agree with whole heartedly, however I urge you to read the next few paragraphs to ensure you are cognisant of my personal objection as well.

I am a long term resident of Mudgee and a local business owner and so do care about the general prosperity of all residents of the Greater Central West, NSW and Australia as a whole. I am a Married White Female Aged 58 with 3 children and have only ever once voted Green at a state election which happened to be the last election. I am a conservative person not a radical Green voter and as such expect my objection to be read and considered.

I believe that the Liberal/National Coalition in particular are not in step with the general population and country NSW residents especially when they proposed and support further mining projects that are not in keeping with a target of lowering emissions.

I hope the planning commission is as its name suggests "Independent" and looks at all world wide data on the detriments of coal mining, not just for the local communities effected but for the wider Australian population and the World. We need to be investing in renewable energy and supporting old technologies such as Coal mining defeats the purpose and endangers the wellbeing of all Australians.

This may be in the mine's interest, the local lobbyists interests, the Liberal/National parties interests and of course some local interests for spending in Mudgee, however this is not a rational view to take, wider interests must be considered.

We should be making coal mining a thing of the past and force these companies to invest in renewable energy resources. AND like the Lock the Gate Alliance I believe strongly that the Commission has a duty to consider the IPCC 1.5 degrees report.

Regards

Melissa Tym
Director


harbour isp
PO BOX 572, Mudgee, NSW, 2850

P.S The Bylong Valley is spectacularly beautiful, rich in heritage and a productive agricultural district with highly constrained water availability. It's the last place you would ever want to see a dirty great coal mine.

Salient points that I'm sure you have received multiple times, but I hope you read them.

1. The Department of Planning final assessment report fails to adequately consider:
 - threats to the Bylong River and connected groundwater, threats to other water users and agricultural production
 - threats to state significant heritage landscape values of Bylong Valley
 - threats to ongoing farming enterprises including the pioneering natural sequence farming techniques at Tarwyn Park
 - threats to the Wollemi National Park and Greater Blue Mountains World Heritage Area
 - cumulative loss of Aboriginal cultural heritage, biodiversity and community in the region
2. The Bylong Valley has been an important source of drought fodder for many years. This production is reliant on an adequate source of water to grow lucerne and pasture.
3. The Independent Planning Commission has a duty to consider the IPCC 1.5 degrees report that was handed down on the same day as the Bylong final assessment report. Keeping global warming below 1.5 degrees means phasing out coal in OECD countries like Australia and South Korea need to phase out coal burning by 2030.
4. This mine has a life span up to 2044 and is not consistent with NSW Government policy which states that, "The NSW Government endorses the Paris Agreement and will take action that is consistent with the level of effort to achieve Australia's commitments to the Paris Agreement."
5. There is no clear or properly costed justification for Bylong Coal Mine. The long term environmental, social and economic impacts including loss of farming capability into the future have not been considered.
6. The loss of 400 ha of prime agricultural land consisting of fertile soils overlaying good groundwater cannot be rebuilt on mine rehabilitation. There is no precedent for this scale of prime land reconstruction anywhere. Likewise the proposed reconstruction of 65 ha of critically endangered ecological community on the rehabilitated open cut mine site is an unproven risk.
7. The potential impact of subsidence from the underground mine has been

underestimated and is acknowledged to be a problem. It is inappropriate for the largest biodiversity offset to be on the mine subsidence area. The cumulative loss of threatened species habitat, particularly of the critically endangered Regent Honeyeater, has not been assessed.

m: [REDACTED] | f: 1300 766 909 | National Service Desk: 1300 579 403
e: [REDACTED] | w: www.harbourisp.com.au

National Broadband Network Service Provider | Satellite, Fibre and Fixed Wireless

Please consider the environment before printing this email

This email has been scanned by the Symantec Email Security.cloud service.
For more information please visit <http://www.symanteccloud.com>
