

srlup - Submission re PROPOSALS TO BALANCE VALUABLE LAND USES AROUND NSW (Amendments to Mining SEPP 2007)

From: "DIANE MICHEL" <wilby11@bigpond.com>
To: <srlup@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 10/28/2013 12:55 PM
Subject: Submission re PROPOSALS TO BALANCE VALUABLE LAND USES AROUND NSW (Amendments to Mining SEPP 2007)

Director, Assessment Policy, Systems & Stakeholder Engagement,
 NSW Department of Planning & Infrastructure

In order to form an opinion on the proposals advertised 12 October 2013, it appears that one would need to go no further than the submission deadline and the DP&I's selection of spin words and adjectives. For example:

1. The oddity of a 29-day exhibition period.
2. The proposed amendments to the 2007 Mining SEPP apparently have been composed, and certainly have been exhibited, separately from numerous interrelated changes to environmental and planning legislation. In view of the long period this Government has devoted to some sort of meditation on landuse and environmental protection, it is more than a little strange to see that the numerous white papers, green papers and drafts are revealed in a piecemeal, overlapping fashion which makes rational overall comment close to impossible.
3. Perhaps it is unintentional that the DP&I advertisement states that *"the new Gateway process (is) for coal seam gas development"*. There is little suggestion that the "Gateway" would stop the "development".
4. Agricultural land, vineyards, orchards and stud farms frequently provide opportunity for the survival of native flora and fauna, including Threatened Species . . . but the draft amendments to the Mining SEPP do not recognise the relationship.
5. Water quality, and indeed water supply are key longterm concerns threatened by inappropriately sited mining and coal seam gas extraction. Protection of water must not apply solely to newly mapped strategic agricultural land, or future residential growth, or the prettiest horse studs and wineries. Surely some employees of DP&I may recall the capping of bores throughout the area of the Great Artesian Basin . . . and the need to truck water to sizeable towns . . . and the alarmingly low level of Warragamba Dam? This is a dry continent. We need our water more than a handful of entrepreneurs need to export csg.
6. There is no indication of cross-referencing this SEPP to ensure that air quality and noise are given due consideration in terms of both human and animal health.
7. As made clear by some people sorely affected by governmental reluctance to act responsibly, the recommended *"exclusion zones"* are horribly inadequate, particularly if the resident in pursuit of the original landuse is surrounded by longwall coal mining, csg extraction, etc.
8. *"Mapping of an **additional** one million hectares of agricultural land (biophysical strategic agricultural land) to protect this valuable resource through the new Gateway process for mining and coal seam gas development"* offers no redress for those whose property and livelihood have already been destroyed. Neither does the mapping guarantee protection of all land valued for purposes other than mining.
9. *"The protection of **additional** areas from coal seam gas activity by mapping exclusion zones for future residential growth areas and additional rural villages"* offers no redress or relief for residential areas and villages which already have been rendered unliveable by csg activity.
10. Proposals for the horse and wine industries in the Upper Hunter provide a dazzling array of weasel words and careful omissions: *"Revised mapping of **valuable** horse and wine industries in **the***

Upper Hunter region as a basis for the Gateway process and coal sea gas exclusion zones.” Which horse and wine industry businesses are, and are not, deemed sufficiently valuable to justify protection? Are there no other rural activities deserving of protection? Are there no other regions of similar value and sensitivity?

The authors of these amendments may be happy to present them in isolation from the bulk of proposals related to revision of environmental protection and land classification. It could be noted that neither they nor Members of Parliament form a voting majority.

Mrs Diane Michel
23A Epping Rd,
North Ryde 2113