

## **The Independent Planning Commission**

### **Re: Response to Additional Questions – Alan Mitchell**

This is a response to the material raised by Daracon in relation to the request for more information by the Independent Planning Commission (IPC) into the application in respect of Martins Creek Quarry (MCQ). The material has taken the form of a) a letter from McCullough Robertson of the 8/12/2022. b) a letter from the Department of Planning and Environment (The Dept) dated the 19/12/2022 c) a letter from Daracon to the IPC dated the 19/12/2022

I will deal with these in order:

- A) The letter from McCullough Robertson of the 8/12/2022. This purports to be an advice to Daracon about whether previous planning decisions should be considered by the IPC. It reviews the background and answers in 33 paragraphs the advice sought of it by Daracon.

(1-9) Sets out that each DA must be determined on its own merits. No arguments there. This is settled law. One cannot argue from one set of facts to another. What you can do is to extract legal principles that apply in one case and then apply them to another. However the advice goes on to say in (9) to (13) and subsequently that if you can't do that and seek to argue from one set of facts to another, that well, the facts here are very different and should be determined in favour of the applicant. In other words the advice given in the guise of a legal advice, argues strongly on the facts that the applicant is entitled to its DA on the facts which it purports to set out. Talk about having five bob each way!  
In any event the advice gets it muddled to an incredible extent.

In (16) it points out that the CEAL case involved

- a) widening of the haul route to 6 metres.
- B) Within (Bungonia Village) widening the haul route to 7 metres.
- C) Widening three culverts to 8 metres.
- D) Widening 3 bridges to 8 metres.

Hang on! The applicant, Daracon doesn't propose to do any of that. Doesn't that make it more comparable?

17) So what, and in any event what about not arguing from one set of circumstances to another?

18) a), b), c) and d) These are in any event improvements which won't take place for some time and, affect only a small part of the haul route.

## 19) Road Noise

Another attempt to use a supposed legal advice to add a voice to the objectionable issue of road noise. Incidentally the reference is to some 200 vehicles per hour. The argument really is in favour of the objectors.

(22) The same applies to this paragraph. It beggars the imagination why this should be raised.

(24) to (26) It is correct that the Dept has supported the application. However the Departments comments have been subjected to very heavy criticism and its role in supporting Daracon and the very doubtful claims made by it in support of Daracon have been called into question. In any event what does the fact that the Dept heavily endorses the applicant have to do with the IPC's assessment?

(28) True it is that Martins Creek Quarry is not unique. It can be replicated elsewhere. It doesn't however, have less potential for impact. The impact is devastating.

(29) Teralba and Brandy Hill Quarries compared. They don't have a haul route through Paterson before travelling through Bolwarra and Flat road to East Maitland.

(32) The advice points out that the haul route has been used for many years. For most of these it was a small railway ballast quarry with very little road traffic. Then for a number of years it operated illegally until it was stopped by court action.

The proposal is apparently reduced still further, showing that Daracon's claim was essentially an ambit claim. The changes are cosmetic.

(33) The proposed changes are ridiculous. It was never proposed that there would be haulage between 24<sup>th</sup> January and 1<sup>st</sup> January and prior to 6:45am anyway.

The purported advice is simply an attempt to get a lawyers imprimatur on to their application. It should be disregarded.

## **B) Response for Dept of Planning and Environment dated 19 December 2022.**

This purports to reply to 9 questions put to the Dept by the Independent Planning Commission (IPC). The Department suggests that fewer complaints were received under the previous interim arrangements than under historical operations. However as pointed out previously the primary receptacle of complaints is the DSC. Now there are 9 questions put to the Dept by the IPC. These questions are very simple and precise.

### **Question 1. Firstly is the project essential?**

The Dept has difficulty in answering this in simple terms, or at all. In short, it says that they don't know but that anecdotally (that is without evidence) the other quarries can't keep up with demand. Why? The purported answer doesn't answer the question.

### **Question 2. Why can't a greater proportion go by rail?**

Well the Dept says that Daracon has demonstrated that it is 'severely constrained' in rail transportation. Curious then that Daracon now volunteers to transport more by rail. The

suggestion by Daracon that it doesn't have suitable rail off loading facilities doesn't sit well with the fact that it now suggests it can do rather more by rail.

The Dept however accepts, without evidence, Daracon's suggestion that it can't rely entirely on rail. Daracon still hasn't identified the destination of material transported by rail and road. The purported answer doesn't answer IPC's question.

### **Question 3**

#### **Why shouldn't the Commission adopt the CEAL reasoning?**

The answer is – 'over to Daracon'. Daracon attempted to answer this by getting a legal opinion which says only that you can't argue from one set of facts to another and then does precisely that and goes in to bat for Daracon.

### **Question 4**

#### **How have intergenerational factors been measured?**

The answer appears to be that you've got to take into account future generations and that's been done. The only problem is that it hasn't. The Dept says that the 'fears, values and aspirations of the community' were important considerations and that the communities acceptance has been shaped by the 'lived experience'. However, notwithstanding the effect of that experience, the Dept has found that 'the future impacts of the Project would be acceptable.' Tell that to the weeping members of the community.

The Dept suggests that the quarry has operated in one form or another for over 100 years. Not so. For most of its history it operated as a Railway Ballast Quarry. Historically it is suggested that the quarry has operated 'without certainty of its environmental, social and economic management obligations'. That's certainly true. For most of its recent history, the quarry has, under its present ownership, operated illegally and quite clearly without a 'social licence to operate'. The Dept considers that Daracon ought to be given the opportunity to 'develop environmental performance standards' and to 'allow for adaptive management practices' to be implemented. Daracon has already had ample opportunity to do that and it has failed. Obviously the economic benefits have been assessed by the Dept. The problem is the Department's flawed analysis.

### **Question 5**

#### **What are the proposed mitigation measures to ensure that those most affected by road transport are targeted?**

The purported answer appears to say that you've got to look at their documentation. It's difficult to say when the Dept responds to the IPC's questions with gobbledygook.

Let's examine the response: 'The Department's recommended conditions also establish specific parameters and management requirements to mitigate road transportation impacts for those most affected.' What recommended conditions? What operating parameters? What management requirements? The example given is no traffic before 6:45am. Earlier truck traffic was never part of the proposal.

There is supposed to be a Social Impact Management Plan (SIMP). What for? To explain to people that their lives are being destroyed. Weasel words indeed?

In addition there's supposed to be a community benefit program. How can the community deal with Daracon when it's been amply demonstrated by Daracon's past behaviour that it can't be trusted? The Department also refers to Daracon's response.

### **Question 6**

#### **What about the viability of businesses?**

There was considerable affectation of businesses when the road traffic was at it's worst. The proposed maximum is not less than the historical average rate. It's considerably more. In any event, this doesn't answer the IPC's question. It seeks to evade it.

There has been no significant design change. There is no road widening in the proposed upgrade to the King Street Paterson intersection. No attempt has been made to suggest any measures that would cost anything.

Again, the Dept doesn't attempt to answer the IPC's question.

### **Question 7**

#### **What about the impact on road users such as cyclists, school bus passengers and pedestrians?**

The traffic impact assessment is already very considerably out of date. Specifically in relation to the matters raised by the Dept:

- Station Street Martins Creek: It is not proposed to fix this in the short term.
- The single lane operation at Gostwyck Bridge remains a nightmare.
- Gresford Road: Lack of a RHT lane. This will still provide the opportunity for rear-end collisions.
- The 90 degree bend at King and Duke Streets. This remains a huge problem. Even more when trucks are queued after being held up at the railway crossing.
- Lack of pavement width at Bolwarra Heights. This applies along the whole of the haul route. The Dept coyly concedes that the road conditions don't comply with guidelines. That's an understatement. And at a time when its proposed to greatly expand heavy truck traffic. There hasn't been a recent reported traffic incident because over the last few years the truck quarry traffic has been constrained.

#### **Daracon's proposals:**

- a) In relation to the quarry access – this isn't to be for some years.
- b) Upgrades to Gostwyck Bridge - Cosmetic. It's still a one-lane bridge.
- c) This would reduce only to some extent the potential for collisions.
- d) It's difficult to see how marking the footpath and road and King and Duke Streets is going to do anything to the passage of having articulated vehicles round the corner. It is hard to accept that Daracon's conceptual design has been developed to the satisfaction of TFNSW when it is conceded by the Department that road conditions do not strictly conform with the Australian Government guidelines. The existing footpaths and pedestrian crossings are said to allow for the safe movement of pedestrians. So they might, where they exist at all.

### **Question 8**

#### **Why not impose a condition requiring the upgrades prior to the increase in road traffic?**

Why not indeed. This isn't answered by the Department and is said to be answered by Daracon.

### **Question 9**

#### **What about other local roads outside the primary haul route?**

This isn't responded to by the Dept and is said to be answered by Daracon.

Daracon has in responding to the question put to the Dept by the IPC had yet another attempt to push its application in a 50 page submission being material which they have already placed before the IPC.

It is noted that the questions put to the Dept by the IPC relate largely to road transport along the haulage route. Does this mean that the IPC regards the ecological issues, quarry noise, issues involving wildlife, psychological issues, as being of no consequence or does it mean that they have considered the issues raised by the objectors in their responses and determined them in favour of the objectors? It is interesting to see that Daracon has taken the opportunity to put its case once again in a 50 page submission. This is an attempt by the proponent to wear down the objectors in order to exhaust them and to have the last say in one final burst to the IPC.

The Department has throughout the whole of this process been uncomfortably close to Daracon to the extent that it has adopted Daracon's aims and motives as its own. This is evidenced by GIPA information obtained pertaining to email comments on a draft of the DPE Assessment of the Martins Creek Quarry Proposal. Examples of this include such internal comments as "Strong report. Well done. I think there is some potential improvements including stronger emphasis on the changes that we forced." "Something to demonstrate how we've gone over and above the statutory requirement for consultation."

"I think that we need some intro sentence saying that many of the social aspects relate to traffic noise and are assessed separately."

"Perhaps list out the various mitigation measures" and in relation to Daracon responding to the feedback from the department "again- Let's take the credit."

The comment in relation to

(6) Assessment "Perhaps need a short para following this. Something along the lines that ... There is evidence that the Quarry has at times operated outside the conditions of its approval" and "I've reworded this and included a statement acknowledging that upgrades will be required."

In relation to the quarry access:

"Did we push them to do this? Apparently not as its still approximately two years."

And in relation to noise controls "The intent here is to demonstrate that the existing facility is a key contributor...I can remove the mention of the exceedances and just focus on the total exceedances for each scenario."

There is much more of this. A pattern emerges whereby the Department is very much in Daracon's pocket.

### **C) Daracon's Document**

In its yet further response of December 2022 Umwelt acknowledges the traditional custodians of country and pays it's respects to past, present and future elders. It's a pity it doesn't do the same for the current occupants. The growth fetishists have after all gotten rid of the traditional custodians.

Daracon begins by reciting again the history of the project.

#### **2.0 Proposed amendments.**

2.1. Daracon acknowledges that in the past truck numbers were unacceptable. It now proposes another quite minor change for the rate of trucks. They are now proposing a maximum of 160 hundred truck movements a day. Whilst it isn't specified it seems that the average is going to be 63 per day (how many days? How many trucks?)

2.2 Rail Haulage. There is it is suggested no reliable unloading facility for the regional supply (Where is it going?) For that matter Daracon hasn't identified an unloading facility for road transport (and it hasn't occurred to the Department to ask them). Again Daracon canvasses rain Delays, other extreme weather events, construction site logistics and quarry production logistics. Obviously these can occur. Daracon repeats its litany that there will be no truck movements on Saturday, (Sunday) and at night. We've heard all this before. This is just a fact of life.

(8 of 51) Proposed further reduction in Road Haulage Rates. There is now proposed to be an increase in rail transport and a decrease in road transport (prompted by the huge opposition to the transport of any material by road). The proposed reduction would still involve a huge upheaval for the unfortunate people of Paterson and the residents of Mindaribba, Bolwarra Heights, Bolwarra, and East Maitland.

It is suggested that low levels of community complaint were received between February 2019 and 24 September 2019. The first avenue of complaint is not to Daracon or the Department but rather to the Council. Inevitably there will be some reduction in complaints when there is a significant reduction in volumes of heavy vehicle traffic.

It was suggested that DSC had an agreement with Rail Corp to transport 550,000tpa. That didn't happen. It isn't the case that any of the haulage rates mentioned by Daracon were acceptable. That is just a spin put on by Daracon.

#### **(12 of 51) 3.0 Additional Information**

Daracon's report identifies 6 other hard rock quarries with the capacity to provide significant volumes of hard strength aggregate. As a civil contractor attempting to source material Daracon is aware that a number of quarries are unable to satisfy local demand (Then where's it coming from at a time when Daracon is constrained for legal reasons, from supplying this by road?) This is anecdotal. The actual figures are supplied to indicate a shortfall. In relation to the quarries:

- 1) Martins Creek: If Martins Creek is constrained by Consent priorities, so be it. The environmental cost is too great for it to be otherwise and for Daracon to be given carte blanche to proceed.
- 2) Karura East: Some delays exacerbated by wet weather. The same could well apply to Martins Creek (and all other quarries).
- 3) Seaham, Allandale, Teralba, Brandy Hill: There is a suggestion by Daracon that all of these have problems. Where has the material been coming from whilst Martins Creek has been subject to legal restraint?
- 4) High Demand for Product: If the past 3 1/2 years to the quarry hasn't supplied any significant volumes, how significant is the demand and should it be satisfied at the expense of the residents of Martins Creek, Paterson, Tocal, Bolwarra Heights, Bolwarra and East Maitland?
- 5) Martins Creek Quarry is the only quarry with its own rail siding for the transport of material by rail. It is suggested that there is no viable rail unloading facility. Notwithstanding that, Daracon has offered to increase the amount carried by rail. Both propositions can't be right.

There has not been any attempt by Daracon to analyse for the purpose of its proposal, the costings of rail transport versus road transport. There is no analysis of the number of trains that can be loaded in a day. There is no indication of the volume that can be carried by these trains per day. There is no indication of how quickly the rail loading facilities can be got up to speed.

It is mentioned by Daracon that Mayor Connors indicated that Dungog Shire Council had some delays in sourcing gravel and road base. I don't know what that's supposed to prove but the amount of gravel that is required locally is only a tiny amount of the fraction that is proposed to be transported by road to Western Sydney markets.

Daracon also refers to 259 supporting submissions. These have been obtained by Daracon employees and from property developers all over the State. Its like part of an Old Boys network.

Incidentally the whole of the proposal for road transport doesn't fit well with the advice that Daracon is seeking approval to load trains 24 hours per day (surely an overkill) and to extend the rail spur by 360 metres. Why can't this be brought forward and road transport scrapped entirely? No details are given by Daracon. Why if there's no "...current feasible option to use the rail logistics to supply the local and regional market for the revised project" is it proposed to transport something to the order of a million tonnes annually by rail?

What is the number of trains that can be loaded in one day? No figures are given. Why can't these be loaded on multiple days of the week? Why can't the Department as an arm of government urge the State to provide an extension to the rail spur?

There is, it is suggested, a cost benefit in having road based delivery. It may be necessary in the interests of the well being and the sanity of residents along the haul route to forgo this cost benefit.

### **3.2 Transport and Haul Route:**

All that the opinion by McCollough Robertson says that is relevant is that each DA has to be considered on its own merits. As Daracon here analyses the opinion, I'll canvass the maths covered by it here.

Firstly it is an attempt in the guise of providing a legal opinion to add another voice in favour of the arguments raised by Daracon in support of its application. Having said that you can't argue from one set of facts to another, it goes on to do just that. It refers to the difference between Bungonia and Martins Creek (though how that is relevant, other than in favour of the objectors remains to be seen), the adequacy of the haul route, the absence in the CEAL case of road upgrades, and the laughable suggestion that the project will not result in any unacceptable noise impact along the haul route (what – a heavy articulated vehicle every 1-2 minutes or so). Also it is suggested that the Department has undertaken its own assessment. So it has in a biased and incomplete way. The opinion argues that the merit-based reasoning applied in the CEAL decision cannot really or reasonably be applied to the project. That's against the thrust of their argument that you can't argue from one set of facts to another. It goes on, in the same vein, as Daracon says, to compare other quarries throughout NSW. Teralba, Brandy Hill. McCullough have obviously been furnished by Daracon with information concerning Teralba's approval modification.

The suggestion that the route has been utilized for many decades is wrong. The quarry was until recently a railway ballast quarry after which it operated illegally for significant periods.

One of the arguments used by Daracon in its proposed changes is that it is behaving in the way of sweet reason itself and as a responsible corporate citizen would. Its more likely that having seen the extent of the opposition its decided to make some cosmetic changes and argue that the proposal is not so bad after all. However the proposed number of truck movements (160 per day) is still mind boggling at about one every minute or two. There is no real change.

The SIA is said to acknowledge the fear and aspirations in relation to 'one or a combination of the social impact categories and that for the purpose of the SIA that all of the identified impacts fall within the fears and aspirations category' (Whatever that may mean). If it means that Daracon has allayed the fears of the residents, then it clearly hasn't as demonstrated by the opposition.

The TIA is said to have found that traffic movements associated with the revised project will have an acceptable impact upon the operation of intersections upon the primary haul route. This is not so and is an interpretation placed on it by Daracon. Road noise is said to be imperceptible to the average person. What, with the noise of a heavy truck every minute or so?

Why won't the road works at King and Duke Street have a visual impact?

Intergenerational equity is said to be based on the principle that the environment is maintained for the benefit of future generations. There's no indication that this will be done in the next 25 years.



The objectives of Daracon are again set out. Again this is done in a document that shouldn't even be received other than in so far as it says that one can't argue from one set of facts to another. It's by an entity that has no standing to comment upon the merits of Daracon's case one way or the other and to that extent it should be rejected.

The 1991 consent is within the parameters of the local government legislation in place and as determined by Council. As such, it should be followed. It isn't appropriate for McCullough Robertson to comment upon whether the project generates significant benefits for the State and local region. In any event it is going to be done at the expense of incomes which would otherwise be generated by local businesses or by tourism.

Daracon can't be said to have made significant efforts 'to minimise impacts associated with the Project.' Its proposal is essentially unchanged from DAY 1. There's no real reduction in the flow of truck traffic. No noise abatement. No change by way of improvement to the road surface. No assistance given to road authorities to rectify the damage caused to the roads. No satisfactory offer to the Dungog Council to contribute to the roads which will have to be done at taxpayer expense, and nothing done about air quality. There's nothing done about the impact on wildlife.

#### **Question 5**

**How do the recommended conditions ensure that those most directly impacted by road transport are targeted by the proposed mitigation measures. (social mitigation measures).**

These are said to include a new access road (a very short distance when one looks at the total haul route and are done simply for Daracon's benefit not the benefit of the community), changes to operating hours, reduced road transportation times and increased rail transportation. Why weren't these offered before? How is it that it has suddenly become possible to transport more material by rail. One has to be suspicious of these attempts made at this stage, to vary the mix.

The alleged changed arrangements are again recited, new access road, Dungog Road and Gresford Road intersection, upgrades to Gostwyck Bridge and noise bunds and noise attenuation to the fixed plant.

In any event the new access road is some years off.

Conditions B40, A16, B44, B65. These are minimal requirements concerning particular areas and times. They only provide for what was already required to be done (e.g. no weekend truck traffic, nothing prior to 6:45am).

There is a requirement that DSC, MCC and TFNSW be consulted. The approval has to be given by the Planning Secretary. Given the level of cosy relationship between the Department and Daracon, what do we expect is going to happen in relation to that being given a tick? After all it's been done at every point in the planning process. The same applies to condition B44 B43 and the much vaunted Driver's Code of Conduct. These are merely expressions of a pious hope. That up to 200 or so drivers per day, week in, week out will always do the right thing.

(30 of 52) Similarly the Social Impact Management Plan (SIMP) required by B65 is just that as shown by the vague language used:

- ‘include a summary of the social baseline assessment of social impacts and risks including the social impact risks’ (whatever that may mean).
- Include a Stakeholder Engagement Strategy including details about proposed communications with relevant stakeholders particularly focused on the Paterson and Martins Creek Communities (whatever that may mean).
- Describe the measures that would be implemented to manage and mitigate negative social impacts (whatever that may mean).

It goes on. Strategies, consultation, measures. It hasn't happened to date. Daracon has been deaf to the communities concerns.

(32 of 51) Daracon acknowledges that some community members will be more affected than others. That's true enough. For some it will be a living hell. Daracon has already engaged a Community Relations Officer to facilitate ongoing engagement. Where has this officer been for the last three years? The recommended conditions in part D are just that. Recommendations with nothing to enforce them.

### **Question 6**

#### **What evidence is there that businesses won't be affected?**

Various businesses are mentioned. Many felt concern (It would be astonishing if this didn't apply to them all). Indeed it is difficult to imagine that with a heavy articulated vehicle every minute or two, that the businesses wouldn't be decimated with no room to park, to exit vehicles, to safely reach the pavement, before another truck presents itself. These trucks are probably 25 metres long and they will on occasions, when Railway gates are closed, be bumper to bumper. It just isn't possible for the businesses to survive on Saturday/weekend trade alone. They have rents to pay, wages to pay, supplies to get in and out, garbage to dispose of.

(34 of 51) All of this will be next to impossible to effect.

It is very easy for Daracon to suggest that businesses in Paterson (and further read Bolwarra, Lorn and East Maitland) manage to survive by dint of hard work. Why should they be forced to survive an embattled experience, locked in their shops whilst outside the truck traffic rages. What is meant by ‘a local Services Provision Framework which will require the inclusion of mechanisms to mitigate impacts on local service providers’. In soothing language designed to disguise death by a thousand cuts. And remember, this is only a spin placed on it by Daracon. It's Daracon's interpretation that the businesses suggest they may be able to survive. On what amounts to two sevenths of their trading hours. A 71.5 % reduction.

It is intended that a framework be set up to collect information to ‘assist in the tracking of any impact on business.’ This is a new one. And then what? Is Daracon going to reduce its road traffic? Unlikely!

## Question 7

**How is the conclusion reached that the impacts on school bus passengers, cyclists and pedestrians presents an acceptable level of risk.**

The answer is that it doesn't.

A TIA was proposed to answer the traffic impacts. You can answer anything with a survey.

No reportable accidents have been associated with the quarry operations. That's because for the last few years there hasn't been as much truck traffic. With the increasing use of the road by the civilian population including light vehicles and cyclists meeting with a huge increase in the volume of trucks it's a recipe for disaster. What do we do to get figures? Wait for the fatalities?

There are no significant road improvement works proposed. The haul route will remain a narrow strip of bitumen with poor sight distances compounded by a one way bridge and a busy rail crossing. None of these things are going to change. Daracon reiterates that it will provide a new quarry access and a new turn lane at the Gresford/Dungog Road intersection. Yes but not for some years and in any event these are minor changes to the haul route. There is essentially no change to the 90 degree bend in Paterson or at the Gostwyck Bridge approaches other than line marking.

There are a number of primary schools and preschools in the area. As suggested there are a number of drop off points and these are not sign posted.

Again there have not been any incidents to date but then the volume of trucks has been low over the last few years whilst Daracon has been subject to legal restraint.

Daracon has offered funds to provide shelters within Paterson for school children. This doesn't provide any security for children at other drop off points or security for children leaving their buses or for the buses themselves. Remember that the carriageway is only narrow and the increased flow of truck traffic increases the risk of children being struck. This is going to be exacerbated by trucks following immediately in procession, when there is a hold up at the gates.

(37 of 51). Cyclists are more often using the road during the week as tree changes take place. Inevitably these will be subject to an additional risk with the very narrow carriageways present. Daracon again sets out its wish list in the Driver Code of Conduct. Some of it is impossible to reach including trucks not to follow in convoy which would happen when trucks are held up at the gates. It may well be that Daracon will report road surface irregularities to DSC or MCC for them to fix at taxpayer cost the damage caused by Daracon.

There is also a list of things that Daracon says it will do if the project is approved. These are supposed to be done by Daracon's liaison officer.

Apparently Paterson doesn't meet the TFNSW criteria for a pedestrian crossing. So there is not proposed to be any support here from TFNSW.

## **Question 8**

**Why if the Commission grants consent should there not be a condition requiring upgrades to be in place prior to the commencement of any increase in road haulage?**

Daracon says that it has committed to three upgrades. Incredibly Daracon even opposes this condition being added except in a modified form. There is however a sting in the tail of Daracon's response. It may take 6-8 years to commission a new rail spur extension.

## **Question 9**

**What proportion is being supplied locally?**

The retention of some road transport is apparently important so that they can continue to operate. It's the most important consideration. The projects listed are local and could easily be satisfied (and no doubt are) from other quarries in the lower Hunter Region. An indication of this is given in that Daracon suggests that material is supplied to a Dungog plant by one of its competition. It is also suggested that Daracon providing material from elsewhere is preferable to its being supplied from elsewhere by competitor quarries

(42 of 51) **4.0 References**

Attachment letter from McCullough Robertson. This is discussed above.

In short Daracon doesn't reply adequately or at all to the questions put by the IPC (and neither does the Department).

And it mightn't be inappropriate to talk about the morality of it all. In 25 years time when the Project is designed to finish, the valley and the world will both look very different. Let's hope it's not looking all that bad because of decisions we make now.

On a day in February 1809 Charles Darwin and Abraham Lincoln were born. They were both products of their time. Both, although enlightened for their time, did not favour equality for African Americans or black races generally. Both would probably have been horrified by their expressed attitudes today. Many of the U.S. founding fathers, these guardians of democracy kept slaves. Women were allowed to vote in 1928 in the U.K. and at that time quite reasonable men could say things like "Women are sweet and pretty but they can't think logically." Until quite recently homosexuality was illegal in NSW. More recently same sex marriage became legal.

And who knows, perhaps in the future some recognition may be given to the need to protect the environment. And perhaps growth fetishism, that is to say, the perceived need for growth at all costs may end. And perhaps it may happen within the next quarter century when the Project urged on us by Daracon is supposed to end.

Let's hope so and let's hope there's something left of the Paterson Valley by then.