

From: Craig Lee <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Tuesday, 31 January 2023 12:21 PM
To: IPCN Submissions Mailbox
Subject: Martins Creek Quarry

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Sir / Madam ,

Thank you for your email of 23 December 2022 with the attachments from the Department and Umwelt for Daracon.

It is welcome and encouraging to see the changes and reductions from Daracon .
Are they enough or is it window dressing to gain approval of the Project .

One has the impression the Department is bending over backwards to promote and support the Project and not giving due consideration to the many objections.

Is this because :

“ .. the proposed quarry extension would contribute a broad range of affordable high quality construction materials to local and regional markets for the construction of housing and major regional infrastructure projects “ [page 5] Should financial gain for a few override everything else ?

And on page 8 :

“ The Department acknowledges that ... the road conditions do not strictly conform with the current Austroads guidelines ... that Daracon's operation ... has not caused any road accidents “.

Does there need to be a road fatality before the impacts are carefully looked at .

There are a number of items in the legal opinion that should be mentioned , including :

Paragraph 13 :

“ ... the proposed development will result in additional traffic movement along the primary haulage route... much of the impacts associated with this Project have been experienced for many years ...”

This does not make the impacts any less serious or any more acceptable.

Paragraph 18 :

“ the Applicant expressly incorporates within its development application a proposal to undertake several road upgrades ...include the following :

(a) construction and use of a new access road and bridge crossing from Dungog Road ... (b) improvements at the Dungog Road and Gresford Road intersection ; (c) improvements to the King and Duke Street intersection ... (d) upgrades to the approach to Gostwyck Bridge . “ What is not noted is that the works will not be done immediately and prior to the expansion and that (a) will be within 2 years after approval and (b) (c) and (d) within 18 months afterwards.

What if the works are not done ?

Who is going to police them ?

Why shouldn't the works be done prior to the expansion ?

With Daracon's additional information road haulage for me is still an issue , even with the proposed reductions.

24 truck movements an hour [i.e. a truck every 2.5 minutes] between 7 am and 3 pm weekdays through the centre of Paterson village will destroy it This is a very busy time of the day for the village -

- school children on their way to school , locals and visitors around and many vehicles about and parked along the haulage route.

The Applicant proposes to restrict haulage during significant community events [page 5] such as a funeral .

How will this work ?

Will the funeral director contact Daracon a week before the funeral and make a booking ?

Is the restriction for the full length of the service [say 2 hours] or just while the hearse and procession are leaving the church ?

Will the trucks that have been taken off the road be added to the truck numbers for the rest of the day ?

What if Daracon has an urgent delivery to be made at the same time ?

On page 19 it is stated :

“ ... road haulage from Martins Creek Quarry is not a new impact to communities located along the haulage route ..”

Again this does not justify or make right the proposed road haulage nor does it take into account the increase in the population and the number of road users and the general popularity of the area.

There is also a concern about the life span of the Project - 25 years is a very long time .

The number of objections to the Proposal tell the story - the application should be refused.

I confirm my previous submission and object to the Project .

Craig Lee