

## **IPC Submission**

Independent Planning Commission NSW  
Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street  
SYDNEY NSW 2000  
[ipcn@ipcn.nsw.gov.au](mailto:ipcn@ipcn.nsw.gov.au)

### **RE: United Wambo Open Cut Coal Mine Project and Associated Modifications**

United Wambo – consideration of a consent condition requiring an export management plan and restriction to selling coal to signatories of the Paris Agreement.

#### **I object the proposed consent condition**

Climate change whilst important and the source of hot political debate, was one of the main policies for a number of political parties in the Federal Election. On the balance the notion of stringent environmental policies were rejected by ordinary Australians. This is not to concede there is little or no regard to GHG and climate change, a growing swell of support for sensible and practical policies by our elected representatives, where by all Australians have a voice and input to our future. It is indeed concerning that unelected bodies, who do not represent the broader community, instead are influenced by minority focus groups seem to be attempting to set policy and direction outside the bounds of Federal Climate change policy. Indeed in this instance it seems the IPC are attempting to forge into this precedent / policy setting space.

In the Queensland Land Court in *Hancock Coal Pty Ltd v Kelly & Ors and Department of Environment and Heritage Protection (No 4)* [2014] QLC 12. Member Smith states the GHG emissions and impacts on climate change are outside the jurisdiction of the court and were a matter for the International Community and Federal Government.

In NSW Justice Moore determined the Wallarah 2 Coal Project should be approved stating that scope 3 emissions from the combustion of coal should be dealt with at the location where those emissions are being generated.

In the current economic environment; jobs, affordable living and high electricity prices are concerning the broader community. Conversations I have every day locally centres on job security, drought and community investment. The reliance on companies to fund the short fall from the State and Federal governments for schools, sporting clubs, farmers, infrastructure, community charities and roads. The time and red tape involved in project development approvals raises concerns about the future of mining. This type of consent condition could very well drive mining of coal out of Australia and lead to inferior less efficient coal be mined in other countries such as Indonesia.

It seems the IPC are going beyond the assessment of the project on merit with this proposed consent condition and requesting the company to move into a space of international influence. The limitation of supplying coal to countries that are signed onto the Paris agreement is beyond the projects control. How is this to be managed if a country withdraws from the agreement? How will the IPC assess if a country has adopted suitable policies to minimise GHG, or will this simply be a burden placed on an already strained industry in Australia.

The requirement to develop an *Export Management Plan* to the satisfaction of the Planning Secretary has no criteria to support this approach, and yet presents a further hurdle and delay to economic significant projects that inject much needed benefits into our local community.

So, if not our coal whose coal? Demand for high quality low emission coal exists and will continue to exist for a significant time into the future. The choice is to do you choose High quality low emission coal, or do you constrain this supply which will increase the supply of lower quality coal which is high in ash and sulphur. The low efficiency of this coal means you need to produce more to produce the same amount of electricity ultimately leading to a further spike in scope 3 emissions.

Finally is this a one sided debate? Is this an attack on an industry that provides significant employment and economic benefits both for the State and Federal governments? Is this attack on an industry that provided Australia safe passage through the GFC? What are the restrictions that are placed on other industries that produce scope 3 emissions or sell products that when consumed produce scope 3 emissions by the end user?

I am extremely concerned this has been put out in the public arena without full consideration of the downstream environmental and economic impacts. Most concerning is the impact on families and farmers in this region that rely on continuity of employment!