

8 May 2015

Mr & Mrs Jenkyn  
3625 Chinchilla Tara Road  
Wieambilla QLD 4413

The Chief Executive Officer  
Western Downs Regional Council  
PO Box 551  
DALBY QLD 4405

ATTENTION: Ms Kate Swepson

RE DEVELOPMENT PERMIT FOR MATERIAL CHANGE OF USE EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRY  
(SAND QUARRY UP TO 100,000 TONNES PER ANNUM)  
AND ENVIRONMENTALLY RELEVANT ACTIVITY – ERA 16(1)(B) 16(2)(A) and ERA 16(3)(A)  
Lot 5 RP 135939 Ravens Road, Wieambilla  
APPLICATION NUMBER 030.2014.1165.001

Dear Ms Swepson

My wife and I write to you in strong objection to the above-mentioned proposed development.

Ten years ago, we bought a property and moved to the rural area of Wieambilla specifically to provide a peaceful and quiet environment in which to raise our family and care for our disabled son who has Cerebral Palsy Quadriplegia. One of the many symptoms of our son's condition (and a key reason for our move) is acute noise sensitivity.

We have no doubt whatsoever that this development would impact negatively upon his health and wellbeing we also believe that this development poses unnecessary and serious health risks to our community.

TRAFFIC:

I note that the proponent has NOT provided an assessment of the noise that would accompany the vehicular movements throughout our rural residential areas. This would be necessary as it would impact people along the route of the vehicles' journeys.

The proponent proposes that there will be 32 plus heavy vehicle movements to and from the site per day. They also estimate that there will be 12 light vehicle movements to and from the site (I believe these estimates to be an underestimate as they do not allow for miscellaneous movements/errands etc). The proponent does not make mention of or account for extra vehicular movements that will be associated with the project, such as visiting vehicles, deliveries/heavy machinery movements etc. Based on only a 5 day working week, this accounts to over 400 additional vehicular movements on our roads and throughout our community. Again, I believe that this figure is a conservative estimate on part of the proponent.

As a ratepayer, I am deeply unhappy about the multiple risks that this poses to residential commuters.

Many of these 80 plus daily vehicular movements will pass by my property and as such, my family would be impacted by not only the obvious increase in noise, but also the fugitive emissions and increased traffic stemming from the proposed development.

The roads servicing the proposed development are substandard rural roads and have predominantly sandy/gravel surfaces which are completely unsuitable for heavy vehicles/ heavy traffic.

Traffic of this amount transiting through rural/residential areas should require bitumen sealed road surfaces.

The proponent makes no mention of whether or not the trailers of the heavy vehicles carting the frack sand will be securely sealed in an air-tight manner.

#### AMENITY:

The proposed development will not only impact negatively upon my family's right to peaceful amenity, but also upon that of my fellow resident.

The division of the lands in the area indicate likely future development in the form of rural/residential development. This has not been taken into account within the development proposal.

The assessment should realistically take in the future use of the surrounding lands and not just the homes that currently exist in the area. This project (invasive heavy industry) does not fit in with a rural/residential landscape.

Stating that extractive industries are best suited to a rural zoning should be no means to argue for the negation or destruction of our right to peaceful amenity in a rural area.

The proposed development will impact on our already suffering roads, adding to and escalating their further degradation and increasing the risk of vehicular accidents for local residents.

This matter has not been addressed sufficiently.

The proponent has not undertaken that they will upgrade the road system to accommodate their usage.

Ratepayers should not be expected to fund upgrading of roads for the benefit of short term industry development. These upgrades are necessary for such a proposal.

Lot 5 has recently been extensively cleared in part, by the proponent (without authorisation). Habitat has been fragmented and trees and vegetation pushed into the creek. Environmental harm/damage has clearly already occurred. This is listed as Category B Remnant Vegetation and is unusual to the area, in that there are melaleucas and paperbark abundant on the property – indicating wet or or water prone ground.

One of the things that we loved about this area was the diversity of wildlife. This development would fragment and destroy such sustaining and vital habitat as well as posing very real health risks to such fauna.

We note that there is no mention of a flora/fauna survey or in fact of any such survey having been conducted to establish the ecological status of the property and it's ecosystems/habitants – nor of the surrounding lands.

The scant mention of rehabilitation being offset (or up to the discretion of the owner of the land) is grossly inadequate. The habitat of this particular block appears to be quite delicate and unique for our area.

## DUST AND PARTICULATE MATTER/POLLUTION:

My wife is asthmatic and my son's immune system is compromised. The inhalation of silica sand can cause silicosis. Silica and dust/particulate matter can travel long distances. Sand can disperse particles en route to its destination and this is a very important health issue for both ourselves, anyone around the proposed site, and anyone along the proposed routes.

The health impacts of such a development in our local area are of enormous concern to us.

"Silica-related lung disease is incurable and can be fatal, killing hundreds of workers in the U.S. each year. The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) has estimated that at least 2.2 million workers in the mining and construction industries are exposed to inhalable silica each year. However, the Institute noted, "There are no surveillance data in the U.S. that permit us to estimate accurately the number of individuals with silicosis." " Silica exposure is a well-known danger for workers in mining and construction. With the spread of frack sand mining, however, silica air pollution has also become a danger for residents near sand mining and processing operations. Children, older adults and people with respiratory diseases are especially at risk."

<http://www.ewg.org/research/sandstorm/health-concerns-silica-outdoor-air>

"One study of a sand and gravel facility in California found that at 750 meters (almost half a mile) downwind, the furthest point monitored, the level of silica in the air was twice as high as at an upwind site (Shiraki 2002). The silica content in particulate matter samples decreased from 33 percent at the plant itself to 10 percent at 750 meters away (Shiraki 2002). EWG recommends that air quality should be monitored at up to 1,500 meters (almost a mile) from sand mining and processing facilities. Monitoring at even greater distances may be necessary if significant quantities of silica are found at 1,500 meters downwind".

"Silica levels detected near frack sand facilities in Wisconsin and Minnesota are at least 10 times higher than the health-based exposure limit of 0.3 µg/m<sup>3</sup> that EWG considers safe for children and other vulnerable populations. This represents a significant health risk for residents living in close proximity to these sand mining and processing facilities. Residents exposed to sand dust spreading along the sand truck driving routes may also be exposed to silica dust in amounts that should cause concern."

<http://www.ewg.org/research/sandstorm/health-concerns-silica-outdoor-air>

The proponent has not made mention of explosive blasting. Will there be blasting carried out at any time with this proposed development?

I could see no mention of chemicals used in the process of sand mining extraction by the proponent. Chemicals used can include (but are not limited to) "polyacrylamides which are used to remove unwanted minerals from the sand. Polyacrylamides can turn into acrylamide, which is a neurotoxin and carcinogen".

"There are currently no drinking water standards for some of the chemicals used in sand mining. Many laboratories do not even test for them, so the health impacts, if any, won't be known for some time".

<http://conservationvoters.org/issues/frac-sand-mining/>

It concerns me greatly that the development proposal will impact on ephemeral creek/ creeks. Jack Creek flows through many properties in this area. These creeks are vital to our area in terms of having ecological importance.

There is no mention of springs on the property. Are there any springs, large or small on the property? If so, these deserve special mention/attention.

There appears to be somewhat of a conflict in regards to reporting regarding surface water management and the MCU development assessment tables. One indicates that the streams/waterways of the land are ephemeral, whereas the MCU development assessment tables (with regard to providing sustainable water supply) indicate the diversion of waterways to ponds will be used to provide the proposed development's water supply. Clearly there is not an adequate supply on site to feed the needs of this development. How can this development harvest water from local streams and creeks without impact? What effect will this development have upon those downstream from it in terms of erosion, possible contamination/possible pollution and altered water flow?

What is to happen with these pond/s in the event of flood and the resultant flow off site of the potentially polluted water?

There is no mention of connectivity between surface and ground waters.

In summary, we object strongly to the proposed development and feel very concerned about the irreversible environmental impacts as well as the long and short term water impacts (not outlined here in detail), traffic & road impacts, health impacts and the impacts on our right to peaceful amenity. This project puts our community's health at very real risk of serious harm.

Yours sincerely

John and Jo Jenkyn