

I wish to provide the following additional submission **against** the proposed Martins Creek Quarry.

The Department and the Applicant have used the request for further information to specific questions by the commission to change important conditions of the development. The applicant now proposes to decrease the truck movements by up to 40% - but the annual tonnage by only 10%. The department and the applicant are still saying this is less than what was historically transported – again indicating we should be used to it. It is also noted they state it less than what was agreed to by Dungog Council - but that may be the number of truck movements per hour/day not the allowable tonnage per year. As I understand the court ruling indicated the maximum of 150,000 tpa by road transport – (500,000 x maximum of 30% by road). Therefore they still want a 300% increase in road tonnage.

Being a very cynical person it seems strange that the applicant has had a “light bulb” moment and discovered that they now can do the job with fewer trucks per hour/day. This only happened after what they heard at the commission’s public hearing at Tocal. Did they get the feeling that it would not be granted approval at the requested documented conditions?

The request for more information has also given the applicant the ability to cherry pick small pieces from verbal submissions made to the hearing and use these to indicate residents would be happy to go back to the good old days. Since the legal judgements were made and Daracon scaled right back to almost negligible use of Martins Creek quarry we have enjoyed a better “lived” experience. Minimal quarry trucks through Paterson has seen business increase and more people are using our services throughout the week – **not just the weekend** – (as consistently cited by the applicant). It is only because of the brave but justified decision by Dungog Council to take court action against Daracon that the residents of Martins Creek and Paterson now know how life should have been. Now the applicant and the Department are hell bent on pushing this through, one way or another, regardless of the effects of the residents affected.

The additional information responses show that the applicant still intends to have the corner of King and Duke Sts, Paterson “realigned”- new line marking –

and the removal of 1 parking space. As owner and licensee of Paterson Post Office this directly and most assuredly adversely affects my business. As stated in my previous submission this is a specifically designated 10 minute parking space directly in front of the Post Office. It not only affects the Post Office but also the service station, newsagency and cafe. What right does the applicant and the Department have to say this is OK – it is only for the applicant’s benefit to get the proposal through. No mention was made in the proposal that a representative from Umwelt came into the post office and showed me their 5th or 6th version of the plan for our corner. I stated straightaway that I was against their proposal. Oops – can’t have negative feedback shown.

Looking at the some of the responses to the commission’s questions by both the Department and the applicant it seems they use every amount of spin possible to show the project and any reports associated with it to be accurate and beyond question. Looking at Dungog Councils extra submission to the commission dated 15/11/2022 – this calls into question some of the details in the reports supplied and relied upon. Also i always thought that the Department and any application must be dealt with “at arms length”. It seems on this occasion that the arms are extremely short.

With regard to responses as to why rail cannot be more utilised to transport product other than ballast. It possibly shows that there is no real intention to attempt this due to increased costs and other cited impediments – so it probably will never happen. Therefore it is not an application for 1.1 million tpa with 500,000 tpa (now 450,000 tpa) by road but an application where more than 90% will be by road and the rest being ballast trains for Railcorp.

Paterson Post Office will be directly and severely affected by the removal of the 10 minute parking space and corner modification to King and Duke Sts Paterson as well as the massive increase in truck movements proposed (one every 2.5 minutes) from what is currently happening.

I am against the proposal, even in its modified (and modified again) form.

Phillip Ellicott

Paterson Post Office - 31/.01/2023

