

Schedule of Submissions

(as provided by Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale)

No	SUBMITTER INTEREST		NATURE AND SUMMARY OF SUBMISSION	APPLICANT RESPONSE
1	Local resident		No objections.	Noted.
2	State agency: Environmental Protection Agency	2.1	Proposal has been assessed by the EPA. Conditions relating to its implementation are required to be met prior to the commencement of the project.	Noted The Minister for Environment issued an approval under the Environmental Protection Act 1986 (EPA 1986) Statement No. 810 on the 19 October 2009. (Ministerial Approval)
		2.2	The project is a prescribed premises and requires Works Approval and Licence under Part V of the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> .	All necessary approvals and licences shall be obtained as statutorily required
		2.3	The project is mining of minerals, and there is some question as to whether an extractive industry licence is appropriate as the Model Scheme Text excludes mining from the definition of 'Industry – Extractive'. It is noted it is up to the Shire to decide if an extractive industry licence is appropriate.	Refer to comments within submission 2.2.
		2.4	Although tenement conditions do not apply, the safety provisions of the <i>Mines Safety and Inspection Act 1994</i> apply.	Refer to comments within submission 2.2
		2.5	The EPA's assessment of the project related to the environmental impacts from the project and did not consider the project in the context of planning schemes. The Shire is not prevented from applying additional or stricter conditions, if these are required under the TPS.	<p>Although the Environmental Protection Act 1986 gives the EPA a broad remit in respect of environmental matters, in respect of this development application, the EPA has discharged its functions and its submissions are of little or no relevance. The comment in the EPA submission concerning the role of the Shire in respect of the imposition of conditions in the planning process is an expression of opinion about the statutory power of the Shire. This is not a function of the EPA.</p> <p>A town planning scheme may allow the local government to impose conditions not included in the EPA assessment, but such conditions are to be imposed in the context of, and for the purposes of, orderly and proper planning, and to address issues concerning amenity, rather than repeating the entire environmental assessment process. The Shire must be guided by the terms and purpose of its town planning scheme when evaluating any development application. In this case there are no additional orderly and proper planning or amenity issue that arise under the Shire of Serpentine</p>

				Jarrahdale Town Planning Scheme No. 2 in respect of the environmental issues.
3	State agency: Department of Water – Peel/Kwinana Region	3.1	Refer to the DoW Water Quality Protection Note: <i>Extractive industries near sensitive water resource</i>	Noted This submission was retracted by subsequent correspondence from the Department of Water
		3.2	The taking of groundwater will require a licence under the <i>Rights in Water and Irrigation Act 1914</i> . The issuing of a groundwater license is not guaranteed, but if issued will contain a number of binding conditions.	Refer to comments within submission 2.2.
		3.3	Provisions of the Environmental Protection (Peel Inlet – Harvey Estuary) Policy 1992 and the Statement of Planning Policy No 2.1 – the peel-Harvey Coastal Plain Catchment apply.	Refer to comments within submission 2.2.
		3.4	Existing remnant vegetation should be retained.	Retention of vegetation was considered and addressed through Ministerial Approval.
		3.5	Any conventional on-site effluent disposal systems shall only be supported where it can be demonstrated that there is at least a 2 metre vertical separation between the base of the leach drain and the highest known groundwater levels and a 100m horizontal separation between the disposal system and the nearest water body.	Noted All onsite effluent disposal systems shall be installed in accordance with this requirement
4	Local resident	4.1	Confident that previous concerns regarding traffic and environmental impacts have been addressed.	Noted.
5	Local business	5.1	Object to the application on the basis that the impact of dust would make thoroughbred horse breeding business unviable.	Refer to response relating to the Dust Management Plan.
6	State agency: Department of Indigenous Affairs	6.1	The Register of Aboriginal Sites suggests there are no known Aboriginal sites on the subject land. However, the Register is not a definitive statement. The land has not been examined for the presence of Aboriginal sites.	Refer to statements provided within section 3.4 of the development application. No archaeological sites will be disturbed by the proposed extraction of mineral sands (the Proposal). An Aboriginal Heritage survey was undertaken in 2006, which revealed no archaeological sites to be located in the subject site.
7	Infrastructure owner/operator:	7.1	Do not support the proposed mining, as it does not meet the appropriate 'safe' distance from the Dampier to Bunbury Natural Gas Pipeline.	Revised correspondence received (27/04/2010) indicating support of the proposal.
	DBNGP Nominees	7.2	Any works within the Dampier to Bunbury Natural Gas Pipeline require the approval of the DBNGP Land Access Minister delegated to officers within the Department for Regional Development and Land, including: a. Any encroachment by construction personnel, equipment, the	Noted. There will be no encroachment, access and construction work over the Corridor. No blasting is proposed as part of the Proposal.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Access road construction and movements of heavy machinery across the pipeline Corridor; c. Any construction work, access or fencing within the Corridor; d. Any blasting within 660m of the Corridor must also be approved by the DBNGP Land Access Minister 	Refer to comments at submission 7.1.
8	Local resident	8.1	Suffers from multiple chemical sensitivity. Would like written confirmation from the proponent that all care would be taken to protect submitter from fumes.	Noted. The proponent will undertake the handling and use of chemicals in accordance with all statutory requirements.
9	State agency: Department of Planning	9.1	Subject site is not identified as a Priority Resource Location in State Planning Policy 2.4 Basic Raw Materials.	Noted.
		9.2	Subject site does not contain and is not adjacent to a Bush Forever Site.	Noted.
		9.3	The proposal has received Ministerial approval under the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> , and identifies a range of management and contingency actions that will be implemented during the course of the extractive works.	Noted.
		9.4	Preliminary advice from DEC is that the two Conservation Category Wetlands (CCWs) within the subject site are not conservation category, but resource enhancement wetlands.	Noted.
		9.5	With regard to black cockatoos which are listed under the <i>Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> , the Federal Minister for the Environment has determined that this proposal is environmentally acceptable subject to the undertaking of the previously identified rehabilitation and revegetation processes.	Agreed
		9.6	No objection to the application providing that the proponent's proposed management and contingency actions are successfully implemented throughout the course of the extractive works.	Noted. The Ministerial Approval provides for a number of management plans and associated monitoring. The Ministerial Approval also provides for significant performance bonds under the Environmental Protection Act 1986.
10	State agency: Department of Water	10.1	The Department has previously provided input into the Environmental Protection Authority's approval process for the proposed operation. Management measures/plans prepared by the proponent, as a result of the EPA assessment process, for the mitigation of impacts to water resources have since been satisfactorily addressed.	Agreed. This correspondence was provided by the Department of Water and it was indicated that this submission should be considered instead of the comments provided for within submission 3.
		10.2	The proponent is currently undertaking an application process for a groundwater licence for abstraction from the Leederville Aquifer for operational purposes. An Operating Strategy is currently required to support this application. The matter will be determined following the receipt and assessment of this information.	Noted.
		10.3	It is likely the proponent will be required to undertake localised dewatering from the superficial aquifer in months where groundwater levels are highest. A licence under the <i>Rights in Water Irrigation Act 1914</i> will be required.	Noted.

11	State agency: FESA	11.1	No information or comment to provide at this time.	Noted.
12	Local resident	12.1	Made a deliberate decision to buy, build and live in a country environment.	Noted.
		12.2	The applicant is only in the area for the life of the project, and residents are left to deal with “what they leave behind”	The Ministerial Approval requires a range of rehabilitation measures and management plans to be implemented as part of the Approval and continued operation. They relate to protection of native vegetation, water courses and wetlands, rehabilitation, weed and dieback, nutrient, water, acid sulphate and air quality and dust. The implementation and compliance reporting required as part of the Ministerial Approval will ensure the land is remediated and rehabilitated at completion of mine operations. In addition there are significant performance bonds are to be paid to ensure full compliance with the management plans. The Ministerial Approval requires a bond to be paid for each year of operation. The bonds are significant in nature (approximately \$43.9 million indexed to inflation). The Minister also has the ability to have the financial assurances called on in accordance with section 86A of the Environmental Protection Act.
		12.3	Traffic movement, dust and noise will be an issue.	Refer to response in relation to the Dust Management Plan.
		12.4	Biggest concern is the impact on the use of domestic groundwater.	The Ministerial Approval requires the preparation of a Water Management Plan which monitors ground water, details trigger levels and monitors the quality and quantity of ground water in the area. 11-4 (d) of the Ministerial Approval requires the following: <i>identify measures to provide an alternative source of water, particularly to surrounding groundwater users where monitoring in item (a) indicates that mining activities has adversely affected water quality to the point where it cannot be used for its intended purpose or ecosystem maintenance.</i>
		12.5	The company proposing the mining is small. Questions who will pay for rehabilitation if the company goes bankrupt; would a bond be in place? Ratepayers should not have to pay for cleanup and restoration.	Refer to comments provided within submission 12.2. Noted.
13	Local resident	13.1	Made a deliberate decision to buy, build and live in a country environment.	Refer to comments provided within submission 12 as submission is the same.
		13.2	The applicant is only in the area for the life of the project, and residents are left to deal with “what they leave behind”	
		13.3	Traffic movement, dust and noise will be an issue.	

		13.4	Biggest concern is the impact on the use of domestic groundwater.	
		13.5	The company proposing the mining is small. Questions who will pay for rehabilitation if the company goes bankrupt; would a bond be in place? Ratepayers should not have to pay for cleanup and restoration.	
14	State agency: Public Transport Authority	14.1	No objections to the application subject to there being no drainage into the corridor and dust management control measures must be in place as there can be no fouling of the track affecting the line of sight for train drivers.	Dust will be controlled in accordance with the Dust Management Plan and the ambient dust concentration levels monitored with limits set within the Ministerial Approval that will ensure that dust emissions do not harm or adversely affect environmental values or the health, welfare and amenity of people and land uses.
15	Heritage Council	15.1	Appear to be no heritage impacts with the proposal.	Agreed.
16	Local resident	16.1	Relies on rain and groundwater for daily water use. The proposal will draw high levels of groundwater, which will affect the volume that domestic bores can draw on.	Refer to comments at submission 12.4.
		16.2	Wastewater from the mining process may spill and discharge into groundwater, which would affect drinking water.	Refer to comments at submission 12.4. Various management plans and work practices in accordance with statutory regulations and responsibilities will mitigate any adverse impacts occurring.
		16.3	Proposed mining operations will generate dust and sand storms. Sand and dust deposited on rainwater tanks will pollute drinking water, and dust will aggravate respiratory problems.	Refer to discussion in relation to Dust Management Plan.
		16.4	Proposed haulage route involves heavy vehicles passing through the North Dandalup town site. This will have noise impacts and compromise the safety of children attending North Dandalup Primary School.	The South Western Highway is an identified existing heavy haulage route. A significant number of heavy vehicles currently pass through the town site regularly on a daily basis. The Proposal will facilitate marginal increases in heavy haulage vehicle movements. It is considered that the safety of school children attending school in North Dandalup is not significantly more compromised than is currently the case based on the number of heavy haulage trucks currently utilising South West Highway.
		16.5	Heavy vehicles will generate dust pollution, causing health problems and hazards.	Refer to discussion in relation to Dust Management Plan.
		16.6	Noise generated from heavy machinery will disturb residents.	Refer to discussion in relation to Noise Management Plan.
		16.7	The beauty and character of the area, with migratory birds, will be destroyed.	The Proposal has Ministerial Approval under the provisions of the EPA Act 1986 and any affects on migratory birds in the area has been taken into consideration.
		16.8	Proposed mining will devalue properties, and presents more disbenefits than benefits to the environment and the community. Lower property values will lower the Shire's revenue through rates.	Property and stock devaluation is not a planning consideration and is unsubstantiated.

				<p>Mining operations are expected to last for a maximum of 10 years and is therefore temporary in nature</p> <p>The Ministerial Approval requires the preparation of a Rehabilitation Management Plan. This will result in the eradication of weeds, identification of dieback and re-establishing self-sustaining local provenance native vegetation at a ration of 1.4:1 which will result in greater coverage of vegetation on site than would be currently provided for under current agricultural practices. There are environmental benefits to the proposal that will have flow on amenity improvements for the area.</p> <p>Refer to response relating to the Dust Management Plan in relation to the control of dust on site.</p>
		16.9	The company does not have strong financial resources (based on its financial report as at 10 June 2009). Concern regarding the company's ability to meet rehabilitation obligations if the project proves to be unviable or the company is unable to secure additional funds to continue.	Refer to comments within submission 12.2.
17	Local resident	17.1	Relies on rain and groundwater for daily water use. The proposal will draw high levels of groundwater, which will affect the volume that domestic bores can draw on.	Refer to comments within submission 16 as the submission is the same.
		17.2	Wastewater from the mining process may spill and discharge into groundwater, which would affect drinking water.	
		17.3	Proposed mining operations will generate dust and sand storms. Sand and dust deposited on rainwater tanks will pollute drinking water, and dust will aggravate respiratory problems.	
		17.4	Proposed haulage route involves heavy vehicles passing through the North Dandalup town site. This will have noise impacts and compromise the safety of children attending North Dandalup Primary School.	
		17.5	Heavy vehicles will generate dust pollution, causing health problems and hazards.	
		17.6	Noise generated from heavy machinery will disturb residents.	
		17.7	The beauty and character of the area, with migratory birds, will be destroyed.	
		17.8	Proposed mining will devalue properties, and presents more disbenefits than benefits to the environment and the community. Lower property values will lower the Shire's revenue through rates.	
		17.9	The company does not have strong financial resources (based on its financial report as at 10 June 2009). Concern regarding the company's ability to meet rehabilitation obligations if the project proves to be unviable or the company is	

			unable to secure additional funds to continue.	
18	Local resident	18.1	Relies on rain and groundwater for daily water use. The proposal will draw high levels of groundwater, which will affect the volume that domestic bores can draw on.	Refer to comments provided at submission 16 as the submission is the same.
		18.2	Wastewater from the mining process may spill and discharge into groundwater, which would affect drinking water.	
		18.3	Proposed mining operations will generate dust and sand storms. Sand and dust deposited on rainwater tanks will pollute drinking water, and dust will aggravate respiratory problems.	
		18.4	Proposed haulage route involves heavy vehicles passing through the North Dandalup town site. This will have noise impacts and compromise the safety of children attending North Dandalup Primary School.	
		18.5	Heavy vehicles will generate dust pollution, causing health problems and hazards.	
		18.6	Noise generated from heavy machinery will disturb residents.	
		18.7	The beauty and character of the area, with migratory birds, will be destroyed.	
		18.8	Proposed mining will devalue properties, and presents more disbenefits than benefits to the environment and the community. Lower property values will lower the Shire's revenue through rates.	
		18.9	The company does not have strong financial resources (based on its financial report as at 10 June 2009). Concern regarding the company's ability to meet rehabilitation obligations if the project proves to be unviable or the company is unable to secure additional funds to continue.	
19	State agency:	19.1	Managers the Dampier to Bunbury Natural gas Pipeline corridor that houses the gas pipeline on behalf of the Minister.	Noted.
	Department of Regional Development and Lands	19.2	Prepared to provide "in principle" agreement to the proposal subject to the following conditions:	Noted.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Pursuant to section 41, restrictions will apply to the area of land that is contained in the DBNGP corridor. Any works within this area require prior approval from the DBNGP Land Access Minister. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Any works within this area require approval from the Minister. Any possible encroachment by construction personnel, equipment, excess building materials and spoils during construction should be referred to the Infrastructure Corridors Branch for assessment ii. Access road construction and movements of heavy machinery across the pipeline will also need to be assessed should it impact the DBNGP Corridor. 	Noted. As outlined in the Proposal there are no works for access proposed which encroach as on the pipeline corridor.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Any approvals granted under section 41 will be subject at all times to the rights granted to pipeline operators under section 34 of the 	Noted.

			DBPA. Should future pipeline operations (including Looping activities) impact on the approved works, then the proponent may be required to remove, realign or modify any facilities established on the access area at your cost.	
			<p>b. A notification, pursuant to section 165 of the <i>Planning Development Act 2005</i>, is to be placed on the Certificates of Title of proposed lot(s) advising the existence of a hazard or other factor. Notice of this notification is to be included on any new Deposited Plans. The notification to state as follows:</p> <p><i>“This lot is located on the Dampier to Bunbury Natural Gas Pipeline (DBNGP) under the Dampier to Bunbury Pipeline Act 1999, approval from the Department for Planning and Infrastructure’s ‘Infrastructure Corridors’ branch is required for any constriction work, access or fencing that will affect the DBNGP”</i></p>	Noted.
			c. As the development is within the notification zone for high-pressure gas pipelines, this notice has been referred to the gas pipeline operators for the Parmelia Pipeline and Dampier to Bunbury Pipeline for comment.	Noted.
			d. The Applicant should also be advised to contact the “Dial Before You Dig” before commencement of any works.	Noted.
			e. Any development proposals outside the DBNGP Corridor should take into account the restrictions relating to setback distances under Planning Bulletin 87 and proponents should seek comments from pipeline operators at the earliest opportunity.	Noted. The extractive area is outside of the setback provisions outlined in Planning Bulletin 87.
20	Local resident	20.1	Strong opposition to the application, in agreement with the Shire’s policy to maintain a presumption against the excavation of mineral sands unless there are demonstrated social, economic, and environmental benefits. No such benefits would result for either the Shire or its ratepayers	There are a number of social, economic and environmental benefits that have been outlined in support of the proposal, some of which are the increased local employment opportunities and increased level of vegetation across the subject area on completion of works. There is expected to be a boost to the local economy through the discretionary spending patterns of workers.
		20.2	Significant, serious impact on the community, as the proposal would modify an idyllic country lifestyle to a dirty, dusty mining operation with no end in sight.	The Proposal is temporary in nature of the operation. The planning approval sought is only for a ten year period. The management plans that are required as part of the Ministerial Approval will control dust, noise, water, rehabilitation and revegetation of the subject site.
		20.3	Granting approval would set a precedent for future similar activities which threaten the fragile local environment.	Precedent is not a relevant planning consideration. Each proposal must be assessed on its merits in accordance with relevant planning legislation. All relevant policies of the local, State and federal government are taken into consideration

				when assessing a development application.
		20.4	The application would inhibit/stop the planning and development of the area for future land use for the benefit of the community.	<p>The Proposal is temporary in nature. The Proposed land use does not impede the long term strategic planning and development of the area.</p> <p>The Ministerial Approval requires that the land be re-established as functioning pasture in accordance with its current land use.</p> <p>The proposed operation is defined as an 'extractive industry'. Extractive industry is a permissible land use within the 'Rural' zone.</p>
		20.5	A large quantity of water is required to mine and process the low grade mineral deposit. This precious resource is already decreasing and under stress in what is a growth corridor, with potential for groundwater levels to decline in the vicinity of the operations with disastrous impacts on the environment and domestic and rural use of groundwater.	<p>Department of Water grants approval for groundwater extraction use. The applicant is currently progressing through the necessary approvals process to obtain all appropriate licences.</p> <p>Refer to comments made by the Department of Water at submission 10.2 and 10.3.</p>
		20.6	Whilst there are noise restrictions for dwellings, the proposal does not consider the effect of noise on stock for example stud horses and cattle.	Refer to the discussion relating to the Noise Management Plan.
		20.7	Mineral sands deposits are present throughout WA which can be accessed without mining in and close to the metropolitan area.	The Department of Mines and Petroleum letter states that 'Titanium-zircon mineralization has strategic economic importance in the Swan Coastal plain, which includes the Keysbrook area, and makes a significant economic contribution to the local community and the State.' The letter goes on to state that 'The proposal for titanium-zircon mining lies within a Strategic Mineral Resource Protection Area for that purpose.' Refer to comments within submission 45.
		20.8	Proposal only presents economic benefit to the applicant, with no benefits to the community or Shire.	Refer to comments within submission 20.1.
		20.9	People have purchased properties in the area since the initial intent to mine and there appears to be no communication process at Government and shire level to inform potential buyers of the application/intent for mining in the area. This situation must be addressed.	The application had been advertised in accordance with the provisions of the local town planning scheme. The State and local government have entirely met associated advertising obligations.
21	Local resident	21.1	Concerned that a relatively small, short term, and fast moving mining operation will "here and gone" before the ramifications can be monitored, analysed, and remedied.	Refer to comments within submission 20.2.
		21.2	Dust would be difficult to control, and the application does not seem to appreciate the enormous erosion that local turbulent easterly winds can create. A local farmer has reported a 10m diameter sandy patch becoming a 250m	Refer to response in relation to Dust Management Plan.

			scar, with the area stripped of grass and topsoil in a single hot, windy afternoon.	
		21.3	With large areas of soil disturbance, monitoring of water level changes, sulphate acidification movement, dust and noise at downwind/downstream boundaries will not enable issues to be addressed before the impacts are present. For example, if trees on adjacent properties are affected, by the time the impact is apparent, it is too late to save the tree.	Monitoring and compliance reporting is required as part of Ministerial Approval for all management plans.
		21.4	Stabilisation and rehabilitation of the site will take longer than anticipated and may not be completed to sufficient standard, despite the existence of a performance bond, as the local wind will compromise rehabilitation and the additional effort required would affect the final profit margins of the finished mining.	The management plans required as part of the Ministerial Approval indicate an agreed standard with penalties that apply. For non compliance there are also significant bonds required, refer to comment 9.6.
		21.5	Considers the proposal is short sighted and exploitative. Strongly opposed.	The application has progressed through appropriate approvals at a Federal and State level. This application is submitted to address the local government assessment and approval requirements.
22	Local resident	22.1	We pose the question what will happen if in each case the Shire of Murray rejects certain conditions and likewise the Serpentine Jarrahdale Shire also rejects conditions affecting them, is there any provision or likelihood of all or nothing in each Shire that this project will be approved (<i>comment provided verbatim</i>)	The Proposal is required to be assessed by the relevant local government and Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC). These authorities must assess the application in accordance with current legislative framework.
		22.2	Concern regarding commuter traffic and car parking, sewer, and water. Consider that the project would have a comparatively greater impact on landowners within the Shire of Murray.	<p>It is expected that the staff will predominately access the site via existing roads within the Shire of Murray as the Primary Processing Plant and associated facilities will be located on land within the Shire of Murray.</p> <p>There are limited number of staff that are required to attend the site, with a maximum of 35 workers on site over a 24 hour period.</p> <p>Sufficient on site car parking provided at the Primary Processing Plant.</p> <p>Reticulated sewer is not proposed. On site effluent disposal is proposed and will be installed in accordance with Health regulations.</p> <p>A Water Management Plan is required to be prepared in accordance with the Ministerial Approval.</p>
		22.3	Previous works on their property by a utilities provider resulted in loss of soil, and a paddock that "looks like a desert" due to damage by heavy equipment.	The Ministerial Approval requires a Rehabilitation Management Plan that 're-establishes functioning pasture'.

		Resultant soil compaction from works in a 12m corridor has affected an entire 30 acre paddock, with concern that pasture grasses may not re-establish. The impact from the proposed mining may have wider spread issues.	
	22.4	Concerned that approval will result in more mining activities across the coastal flats.	Refer to comments within submission 20.3.
	22.5	Proposal will have significant visual impact in a picturesque landscape that acts as a doorway for tourists en route to the South West.	Refer to response in relation to the Landscape Assessment.
	22.6	Impacts of the proposal will affect the quiet, peaceful lifestyle over significant time period of 10 years.	Extractive Industry is permissible within the 'Rural' zone within the local town planning scheme. The Proposal outlines the significant measures taken to reduce any adverse affects on the local amenity. A number of management plans in particular the Noise Management Plan outlines a range of measures. Refer to response relating to the Noise Management Plan.
	22.7	Concerned that land values would decrease, and rates may increase.	The value of the land is not a relevant planning consideration. The land use is temporary in nature and on completion the land will be completely remediated as per the requirement within the ministerial approval. It is difficult to accurately assess the impact as the location of the land owned by this submitter is not indicated however much of the activity will be some distance from the lot boundary and will potentially be screened by either existing vegetation or proposed rehabilitation.
	22.8	The loss of land value by landowners directly affected will have no options left to them.	Refer to comments within submission 22.7.
	22.9	Noise will impact residents	Refer to response in relation to Noise Management Plan.
	22.10	Dust levels will impact residents	Refer to response in relation to Dust Management Plan.
	22.11	Concerned regarding the excessive usage of water for managing dust and in the mining process	The Ministerial Approval indicates that the Dust Management Plan is to be approved by the CEO of the EPA, therefore any dust amelioration measures will be in accordance with current legislation.
	22.12	Concerned regarding the use of local roads, which will need extensive upgrading, and who shall be responsible for road upgrading.	No local roads are proposed to be used for heavy haulage purposes. Local roads may be used by staff from time to time to access the site, however with only 35 staff required the increase in traffic is expected to be within the capacity of the roads.
	22.13	Disagree that remnant bush stands are not regarded as being of sufficient importance to justify their retention, particularly considering the amount of time it	The subject site is predominantly open paddocks that have been previously cleared with limited remnant bush. The

			takes for vegetation to grow.	Ministerial Approval has identified a portion of the extractive area (75 hectares) within the Shire of Murray to be protected. This provides the vegetation with a higher level of protection than is currently provided for.
		22.14	Concerned that tree species from the eastern states are being planted in the area. Locally indigenous plant species should be used.	The Ministerial Approval requires a Rehabilitation Management Plan that revegetates areas with local species of local provenance.
23	Local resident	23.1	Concerned about noise management and not confident that the noise management plan is sufficient; the plan relies on process changes based on unrealistic climatic conditions. Concerned there will not be a reliable contact should noise become a problem.	Refer to response in relation to Noise Management Plan.
		23.2	Concerned about potential contamination of land, water and air and the risk this poses to prime farming land.	The Ministerial Approval requires continued monitoring and reporting of compliance in accordance with environmental regulations, this will ensure that there is no contamination of the subject site. The Ministerial Approval also requires the land is rehabilitated by 're-establishing pasture'.
		23.3	The area is rich in natural beauty and flora and fauna resources, less than an hour from Perth. There are multiple land uses other than a mine more suited to the area, which would bring a larger financial reward to a greater portion of the population. The area is better suited for small lot rural living. Mining of the area would reduce its appeal for future development, having a negative impact on the area.	Currently the land cannot be used for small lot rural living due to the local town planning scheme provisions. The Proposal outlines the temporary nature of the proposed operation.
24	Local resident	24.1	Concerned regarding land degradation, particularly with strong winds that come off the Darling Scarp which have more severe impact if the soil is disturbed.	Refer to response relating to the Dust Management Plan.
		24.2	Concern on the impact on fauna, which are threatened due to extensive clearing, fragmentation and degradation of vegetation which would be exacerbated by the proposal. Rehabilitation is required to support the work of the local Landcare group.	The environmental approval process has considered the impact of the proposal on the fauna and determined that the Proposal is appropriate. The Rehabilitation Management Plan required as part of the EPA approval will ensure that work completed by the Landcare group is complimented.
		24.3	The proposed development will disturb soil and have noisy traffic continually moving in the area.	There are limited vehicle movements associate with the operation. The 8 trucks are expected to enter or leave the site each day utilising local road networks within the Shire of Murray and will not be a significant increase in traffic. The South Western Highway is an existing heavy haulage route, the proposed truck movements will not significantly increase traffic on this route.
		24.4	Groundwater resources are declining with a changing climate.	Noted.
		24.5	No guarantees that aquifers cannot become contaminated, despite safety	The operations will be in accordance with the Ministerial

			precautions.	Approval which reflects the regulatory requirements with the environmental legislation.
		24.6	Heavy vehicle movements will increase traffic through North Dandalup and add to the congestions and frustration for heavy vehicles and drivers travelling through the Pinjarra town site.	The South West Highway is identified as a heavy vehicles route as it has been designed specifically to provide a movement network for these types of vehicles.
25	Local resident	25.1	Opposed to mineral sand or any other mining in the area	Noted.
		25.2	Quiet rural countryside and lifestyle would be impacted by noise and pollution.	Refer to response in relation to Noise Management Plan. The Proposal will be in accordance with the Ministerial Approval thus not creating a pollution problem.
		25.3	Properties are the superannuation and retirement funds of most residents; mining would reduce property values.	Financial matters are not a planning consideration. Refer to comments at submission 22.7.
		25.4	Residents of North Dandalup are pursuing development of the area as a rural village. Mining would compromise this objective, with rezoning restrictions over mining areas and buyers not wanting to purchase land near a mining site.	The development of the North Dandalup town site is a matter for the Shire of Murray to consider as the town site is located within that local authority.
		25.5	The proposal would provide economic benefit only to the applicant, without considering the aspirations of or consequences on local residents.	Refer to comments within submission 20.1.
26	Local resident	26.1	Mineral sand mining is not compatible with the quiet lifestyle of the local area.	Refer to comments within submission 20.2.
		26.2	The proposal would increase the number of trucks using South Western Highway, with additional noise and pollution.	Refer to comments within submission 24.6
		26.3	Proposal would result in reduction in land value.	Refer to comment at submission 22.7.
		26.4	Residents are against mineral sands mining, as has been demonstrated by previous submissions and petitions. "How many times do we have to keep telling the Shires that we do not want mineral sand mining in our area?"	It is a statutory requirement for each application to be assessed on its merit in accordance with current legislation and policy. The local authority has advertised the application in accordance with the local town planning scheme provisions.
27	Local resident	27.1	Concerned that dewatering will affect the local water table and leave residents with no water for stock and household consumption.	Refer to comments within submission 12.4
28	Local resident	28.1	Have a bore in the Leederville Aquifer and would like written guarantee that the bore supply will not be affected by mining operations.	The Ministerial Approval requires water to be managed in accordance with that approval.
			Drinking water for the property is sourced via rainfall, with treated groundwater needed if required to supplement rainwater stores. Groundwater is also used for stock watering. Cannot afford any loss in water supply from proposed mining.	Noted.

				Noted, refer to comments within submission 12.4.
		28.2	Concerned that heavy vehicles will pose a risk to the safety of students at three schools located on the proposed route. A right turn from Readheads Road to South West Highway would pose risk to traffic on the highway.	Refer to response within submission 20.4.
		28.3	Hydrocarbons are highly flammable; there has been no indication as to what hydrocarbons would be used and stored on site, and any potential risk to residents and the environment in the event of a spillage/accident.	The use and storage of hydrocarbons will be in accordance with regulations.
		28.4	Current mining operations in the area results in significant dust issues. Local winds change direction across 180 degrees within a single day and are of sufficient strength to blow over iron, wood and fibre cement structures. Has little confidence in the wind monitoring undertaken and the proposed measures to control dust.	Refer to response in relation to Dust Management Plan.
		28.5	Drinking water is collected from rainwater tanks; concerned dust will contaminate supply.	Refer to response in relation to Dust Management Plan.
		28.6	The application identifies a range of monitoring to be carried out; if this is to be done by the company, how can we be confident it will be done correctly? Will the Shire and other governing bodies regularly check and report, and will residents be contacted expediently if there is an issue?	The Ministerial Approval requires regular compliance reporting to occur, where there is non-compliance there are corrective and preventative actions that are to be undertaken in accordance with a directive of the CEO of the EPA. The compliance requirements will deal with the: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • frequency of reporting, • approach and timing of compliance assessments; • retention of compliance assessments; • reporting of potential non-compliance and corrective actions taken; and • public availability of compliance reports.
		28.7	Cannot see any local benefit of the proposal, and is strongly opposed.	Refer to comments within submission 20.1.
29	Local resident	29.1	Property was purchased for its position, offering a relaxed country lifestyle in close proximity to Perth and other amenities.	Noted.
		29.2	Originally, the property supported a Standard bred Horse Stud; however the fragility of the soil and strong winds resulted in soil degradation so the number of horses kept was reduced, with the farm maintained as a hobby and lifestyle only. In the context of such experience, it is difficult to consider a mine in such a fragile environment.	The Ministerial Approval has assessed the Proposal in accordance with the APA 1986 and determined that the Proposal is appropriate.
		29.3	Concerned that groundwater abstraction/dewatering will affect water supply for domestic and stock uses. Question whether the proponent will truck in water for affected farms. The application proposes huge water volumes for very little result.	Refer to comments within submission 12.4.
		29.4	Seeks assurance that there will be no contaminants affecting water supply via rainwater tanks.	Refer to response relating to the Dust Management Plan.

		29.5	The local area is affected by extremely strong easterly winds and sea breezes. With no grasses or trees as protection, the soil “lifts up like a magic carpet and travels”. The dust impact would be unreasonable, on residents and roads.	Refer to response relating to the Dust Management Plan.
		29.6	With constant maintenance and an active pasture weed control program, invasive weeds affect the area. Concerned that weeds would spread and establish through the local area with the soil degradation presented by the proposal.	The Ministerial Approval requires a Weed and Rehabilitation Management Plan to control weeds.
		29.7	Removal of trees and altering the water table will exacerbate issues of salinity and acid sulphate soils, almost certainly impacting soils.	The Ministerial Approval requires the preparation and implementation of an Acid Sulphate Soils Management Plan. The Proponent shall not lower the depth of the watertable to below that required for assessing the ore body and shall not cause acid sulphate soil contamination either within the proposal area to elsewhere. The Acid Sulphate Management Plan will establish monitoring and trigger levels and reporting and management requirements.
		29.8	Atkins Road is a gravel road, which would be hazardous for large numbers of trucks and would generate huge quantities of dust.	Atkins Road not being used within the shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale.
		29.9	Significant danger presented by trucks entering South West Highway at Readheads Road, due to a rise and dogleg that affects the visibility of traffic approaching from a northern direction.	The Ministerial Approval requires the upgrade of the road reserve at the intersection of Readheads Road and the South West Highway. This will assist with any concerns relating to traffic safety. Determination of these matters is the requirement of the Shire of Murray / WAPC approval.
		29.10	Concerned that the application will impact the community, with community members upset with the operation, and people from outside the community coming and going at all hours.	Refer to comments within submission 22.2.
		29.11	Pools of water lying around from mining operations would encourage mosquito breeding; mosquitoes are a problem in the local area.	The preparation of a Mosquito Management Plan will address those concerns.
		29.12	There are no benefits from the proposed mining; profit will go overseas, whilst local economic impacts would be experienced through lowering property values and inability to subdivide land to support retirement and bring peace of mind.	The financial matters raised are not a planning consideration. There is currently limited ability for landowners to subdivide land with the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale only supporting the subdivision of land to a minimum lot size of 40 hectares in areas zoned ‘Rural’.
		29.13	Strongly opposed to the application.	Noted.
30	Local resident	30.1	Community consultation has been extremely poor; no information has been received regarding the change from Olympia Resources to Matilda Zircon, and the last newsletter received was in November 2007.	There is no statutory requirement to inform community of a change of ownership of the land. The local authority and the State government has advertised the proposal in accordance with the legislative requirements.

	30.2	The large excavation area will have a visual impact from vantage points on the escarpment. Questions how high stockpiles would get, and how they would be screened from roads.	The stock piles will be regularly re used in the rehabilitation process with continued infill or the excavation area.
	30.3	Any approval would allow other areas to be mined, stifling the future development of the North Dandalup town site.	Refer to comments within submission 20.3. Refer to comments within submission 25.4 in relation to North Dandalup town site.
	30.4	Questions any plans and procedures should excavation be interrupted or deferred part way through the project, similar to an Iluka project near Waroona, which will now exceed initial planned timeframes.	In the situation where the Proposal is approved and the proposed works are for a greater period than stated in the proposal there would be a requirement for the operator to gain another planning approval.
	30.5	Questions whether there is a fire management plan for the project, what level of fire training is required and will be provided, whether the local governments and/or bush fire brigades received a list of chemicals stored on site, and who is responsible to establish and manage firebreaks.	Operations upon site, if approved, are statutorily required to comply with all State and Federal regulations including chemical storage, fire fighting and Occupational Health and Safety amongst many others.
	30.6	How often will the local governments carry out compliance checks to ensure that no more than 30 hectares will be opened at any one time?	In the situation where a planning approval is issued and a condition of development reflects the 30 ha stipulated in the Ministerial Approval the local authority would be able to ensure the development under goes regular compliance checks.
	30.7	Are Atkins and Readheads Roads classified for heavy haulage; what is the commitment to contribution to the maintenance of local infrastructure?	Atkins Road within the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale will not be utilised. The portion of Readheads that will be used is within Shire of Murray and therefore the responsibility of the Shire of Murray.
	30.8	Concerned with the volume of water to be used, when there is emphasis placed on water conservation. Specifically, the cost the proponent would be charged for water being used, whether there will be monitors on the proponent's bores, the effect of groundwater abstraction and dewatering on future generations, and the percentage of recycled water being used.	Refer to comments within submission 12.4.
	30.9	Questions whether operations would cease if a noise complaint is received, and where noise monitors would be located and who can access the data? EPA requires the proponent to self test – who is responsible for auditing?	Refer to response relating to the Noise Management Plan.
	30.10	Excessive winds occur in the area. Queries dust suppression measures to cope with local extreme conditions.	Refer to response relating to Dust Management Plan
	30.11	Queries the overall benefit to the local area, compared with Alcoa which contributes extensively to the local and wider community.	Refer to comments at submission 20.1.
	30.12	What type of medical/first aid care is available?	An appropriate level of first aid to ensure the highest safety of staff will be provided.
	30.13	How does a company sustain operations using low grade ore?	Not a factor required to determine a development application.

31	Community group: Dandalup & Districts Community Association, Inc.	31.1	Has previously made submissions to the EPA and the Appeals convenor on behalf of concerned residents. The community does not support the proposal.	Noted.
		31.2	Haulage should be by rail as the proposed road haulage route is unsuitable due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Atkins Road is unsealed with single land bridge • Readheads Road is narrow, a school bus route, and used by recreational horse riders • South West Highway has a primary school and conflict with the Hines Road intersection could arise if there is an expansion of Alcoa mining into the Myara area. 	Refer to comments within submission 29.8 – 29.10. The concerns raised are under the jurisdiction of the Shire of Murray and will be determined by that local authority.
		31.3	Questions whether Atkins and Readheads Roads are suitable for heavy haulage, and whether the proponent would contribute to the upgrade and upkeep of local roads so costs do not fall to ratepayers.	Refer to comments within submission 16.4.
		31.4	Suggest an alternative road route should be considered with the opening of the new Perth to Bunbury highway.	The Proposal outlines the most efficient route based on the location of the proposed extraction area and the secondary processing plant.
		31.5	Suggests community consultation has been lacking, despite the EPA having advised that the proponent has been advised of the necessity to engage with the community and address any issues raised throughout the life of the project. Ministerial conditions from the approval under the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> were amended through the appeals process to include requirements for the proponent to make relevant information available to the public. No consultation regarding mining information, sale/takeover of Olympia Resources Limited to Matilda Zircon limited nor the development applications has been undertaken.	The development applications have been advertised in accordance with the statutory requirements of the local town planning scheme. The Ministerial Approval requires regular reporting and compliance prior to ground-disturbing activity.
		31.6	Visual impact is a concern: residents on the escarpment will have full view; tourist vantage points (e.g. North Dandalup Dam) will be discouraged, road and rail users will be affected, and the unnatural revegetation plan will be a visible scar from the South West Highway, Railway, and tourist drives along the Darling Scarp.	Refer to response regarding Visual Impact Assessment.
		31.7	Questions what would happen if mining operations are interrupted or deferred during the project lifetime, and whether the excavated landscape would simply be left during such a hiatus.	Refer to comments within submission 12.2.
		31.8	Questions what happens to the extraction site and rehabilitation on ceasing operations.	Refer to comments within submission 12.2.
		31.9	How long after mining ceases does rehabilitation occur?	Rehabilitation is proposed to be occurring on a continued basis.
		31.10	Questions whether a suitable perpetuity will be placed on the company for rehabilitation, and whether all shelter belts, rehabilitation and remnant vegetation would be protected in perpetuity through a covenant.	The Ministerial Approval requires the payment of a bond in relation to the implementation of Rehabilitation Management Plan. Where there is non compliance with the plan financial assurance will be withheld as a security. So while there is no

			perpetuity of certain areas of rehabilitation outside of the 75 ha of bush land within the Shire of Murray there are a series of compliance measure that will ensure rehabilitation will occur in accordance with the Ministerial Approval.
	31.11	Concern that areas identified for future rezoning and development could be stifled by this proposal and the mining constraints map developed by the Department of Mines and Petroleum.	<p>The Ministerial Approval requires the land to be re-established for pasture on completion of the operations. The long term planning strategies for the area will not be adversely affected.</p> <p>The objective of the Department of Mines and Petroleum is to ensure the protection of strategic mineral deposits. It is the role of the State and local government to appropriately balance the completing needs of the greater community with the more local needs of a community or a land owner.</p> <p>This Proposal is for a short term project that provides a high level of revegetation that will result in a new environmental benefit with increased employment opportunities for the community.</p>
	31.12	Concerned about devaluation in properties, and the impact on property sales which would be difficult to negotiate with the threat of mining.	Refer to comments at submission 22.7.
	31.13	Questions whether the rating criteria would change, and whether there is a difference in rating criteria for mining operations and farming.	Further information required to understand this submission in detail and therefore provide a considered response.
	31.14	Questions the financial benefits to the Shire and State Government.	The financial benefits of the proposal to the local and State government are not a planning consideration.
	31.15	Questions the effect of extracting 2 gigalitres of water on future generations, noting that the original proposal stated that 1.8 gigalitres would be required. Concerned that development and housing proposals would be restricted if the proponents are allowed to extract significant water resources, when research is projecting a marked decrease in river flows and water yields with changing climate and increasing demand.	Refer to comments made by the Department of Water in relation to the extraction of water in submission 10.2 and 10.3.
	31.16	Questions what recourse landholders have if existing bores run dry, and notes that residents in close proximity to the excavation area have received notification informing them that there will be a reduction in the amount of water they can draw from their bores.	Refer to comments within submission 12.4.
	31.17	Not confident that proposed suppression measures are adequate in the context of local wind conditions.	Refer to reponse regarding Dust Management Plan.
	31.18	Questions how the low-grade nature of the resource could be considered profitable.	Profitability of the project is not a planning consideration.
	31.19	Questions whether any community benefits will be provided.	Refer to comments within submission 16.8.

		31.20	Questions why the project duration has been extended from the eight year period included in the original application.	The application for planning approval over a ten year period will to ensure that the works, including the rehabilitation works would be completed in the specified time frame.
		31.21	Questions where noise monitors would be located.	Refer to response regarding Noise Management Plan
		31.22	Questions who makes the proponent accountable for conditions.	The Ministerial Approval has a series of compliance measures associated with the approval monitored by the EPA. Any conditions attributed to an approval under the planning approval will be enforced by the authority that has required the conditions.
32	Local resident	32.1	Concerned the proposal would negate all the local environmental benefits being achieved by local Landcare group and the volunteer hours put into water quality and biodiversity projects.	The Proposal is located on private property. The reporting and compliance regime required by the Ministerial Approval require the data be made public. This data will assist the Landcare group in collecting data.
		32.2	Visual impact of full extent of project across both Shires cannot be hidden; the large project area will be seen from all vantage points, including views from drives along the scarp.	Refer to response regarding Visual Impact Assessment
		32.3	There has been a lack of consultation, with no advice provided to the community regarding Matilda Zircon Limited taking control of the project on 16 July 2009, and a lack of attendance by the proponents at recent public sessions organised by the Shire.	Refer to comments within submission 20.9.
		32.4	Olympia Resources Limited has previously ignored requests to have the internal boundary of the haul road moved away from property boundaries. There is an existing laneway through Lot 300 or through Lot 62 onto Hopeland Road.	Refer to response in relation to the Dust Management Plan,
		32.5	Insufficient buffer is provided to adjacent properties; high powered power lines that bisect the proposal have a buffer of 35 metres, whereas local residents may have mining within 20 metres of their property boundary.	Refer to response in relation to the Dust Management Plan,
		32.6	The application states that portions of watercourses have been re-aligned to suit farm drainage requirements. Did these re-alignments seek the relevant approval from various department bodies?	The alignment of the watercourses are historical and not a consideration in the assessment of the Proposal.
		32.7	Other mining proposals are supporting by several years worth of wind monitoring. The current application is only supported by one year's worth of monitoring – split over two years. In recent weeks the area has been subjected to very extreme and destructive easterly winds.	The Ministerial Approval requires an Air Quality and Dust Management Plan that includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outlining the results of on-site baseline dust monitoring and modelling; • Identify dust management measures for a range of predicted weather forecasts, including avoiding, ameliorating and protecting from dust impacts; • Identify dust management measures according to actual wind experienced at the site; • Agreements with landowners when mining in close proximity to occupied residences

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monitoring program, management measures including trigger values for the implementation of management measure to ensure dust emission from activities undertaken in implementing the proposal do not cause ambient dust concentration levels outside the boundary of the proposal area that are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Higher than 1ug/m3 of Total Suspended Particles as a 15 minute average; or Higher than 50ug/m3 of Particulate Mater smaller than 10 microns as a 24 hour average, in excess of five times per year. <p>Refer to discussions relating to the Dust Management Plan.</p>
		32.8	Drinking water is collected from rainwater tanks, and stock water from bores. What compensation will be provided if drinking water becomes contaminated or bores become dry?	Refer to comments within submission 12.4.
		32.9	Ministerial Statement 810 refers to conditional approval of environmental items. An assessment of the application cannot be completed as the required Management Plans have not been submitted. The application should be revoked until all the documents have been submitted for viewing.	The management plans are to be prepared to the satisfaction of the CEO of the EPA (the State agencies required to implement the environmental legislation) and therefore will address the objectives identified within the Ministerial Approval.
		32.10	Due to the enormity of the proposal, the company should have erected large, visible signs so residents and locals could see the whole picture. This shows a genuine lack of consideration to the community.	Advertising has occurred in accordance with the local town planning scheme provisions. A comprehensive development application has been prepared and advertised in accordance with the relevant provisions.
		32.11	Recommend that staff and Council reject the proposal.	The development application outlines how the Proposal addresses the relevant planning and environmental legislation and is thus in accordance with sound orderly and proper planning principles. Extractive Industries is a use that is contemplated within the local town planning scheme and therefore requires Council's due consideration based on the merits of the Proposal.
33	Local resident	33.1	Plans for approval for a new dwelling on a property adjacent to the proposed mine were submitted. Once approved and constructed, the great new home will have an outlook of a dusty mine.	There is significant rehabilitation proposed across the site. Depending on the location of the proposed dwelling the view may actually be improved with increased levels of vegetation within the immediate area.
		33.2	The proposed haulage route affects school bus routes, compromising the safety of children that use the various bus services.	The proposed transport route does not utilise local roads within the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale therefore is not able to compromise the safety of school children within the

				Shire. If the roads being utilised in the Shire of Murray are also school bus routes, then the Proposal will be assessed by the Shire of Murray taking that into consideration. Refer to comments within submission 16.4.
		33.3	Several vehicle accidents already occur at the intersection of Readheads Road and South Western Highway. It is too dangerous a corner to introduce heavy vehicles.	Refer comments within submission 29.9.
		33.4	Strong winds in the area already result in significant dust issues. The wind monitoring in support of the project was undertaken in a year that was extremely different to conditions usually experienced, with low wind speeds. Questions whether dust can be controlled.	Refer to response regarding Dust Management Plan.
		33.5	The Shire should require that all land in the affected area be valued prior to approval of the application. Landowners within the extraction area should be required to compensate others for the loss of land value.	Value of land is not a planning consideration. There are no provisions within the legislation for the compensation of one landowner to another landowner.
		33.6	No sand mining should be allowed within 1,500 metres of any building/dwelling at any time, not just during night hours.	The Proposal has progressed through a rigorous environmental approval process in accordance with relevant legislation. The Ministerial Approval provides for distances between mining and sensitive uses indicating that the proposal must comply with the Noise Regulations at any building associated with a noise sensitive use at any noise sensitive premises.
		33.7	No sand mining should be allowed within 40 metres of any property boundary.	Refer to comments within submission 32.5.
34	Local resident	34.1	Purchased their property for a farming based lifestyle, which would be impacted by industrial use.	Refer to comments within submission 20.2.
		34.2	Concerned that mining will exacerbate water shortages in the region, and affect a number of dams and bores on the property that supply domestic water.	Refer to comments within submission 12.4.
		34.3	Do not consider Readheads Road appropriate for heavy vehicles, particularly as it is a school bus route and used by horse riders.	Refer to comments on submission 33.2.
		34.4	Exceptionally strong easterly winds will have a devastating impact on disturbed soil on the mine site and surrounding areas.	Refer to response regarding Dust Management Plan
		34.5	A sand mine would result in de-valuation of surrounding rural land.	Refer comments within submission 22.8.
35	Local resident	35.1	Strongly opposed to the project	
		35.2	Have never been contacted by Matilda Zircon Ltd, despite residence being within 300 metres of proposed mine boundary, where the EPA Bulletin predicts dust emissions would exceed NEPM standards.	Refer to comments within submission 31.13. The Ministerial Approval provides dust emissions levels that are required to be achieved within the boundary of the proposal area. Refer to response relating to the Dust

				Management Plan.
		35.3	Do not support location of mining haul roads, which are proposed less than 200 metres from residence and tenanted dwelling, and directly past main private access gate.	Refer to comments within submission 31.13.
		35.4	Currently retired, and rely on income from lease of farm and second dwelling; this income stream would be jeopardised by mining operations due to nuisance (dust, noise) and safety risks.	Refer to response regarding Noise and Dust Management Plan.
		35.5	Water contamination is a risk, with all water consumed by humans and animals on the farm is drawn from a shallow bore.	The Ministerial Approval requires the preparation of a Water Management Plan that monitors ground water, details trigger levels and monitors the quality and quantity of ground water in the area.
		35.6	Not confident at the ability or inclination of the applicant to manage the project; being “reckless” with potential impacts on their closest neighbours and their “environmental consciousness” may not be sufficiently developed to justify permission to mine in the area.	The Minister has issued an approval under the provisions of the EPA 1986 thus indicating that the Proposal is justified within the constraints of the environmental legislation. The Proponent has not acted in a “reckless” manner and cannot be judged to have done so until such time as operations have commenced. The Ministerial Approval requires a series of compliance that will ensure that the Proposal is not undertaken in a “reckless” manner.
		35.7	Australia is a large continent; surely alternative sources of mineral sand deposits can be found outside populated areas.	Refer to comments within submission 20.7 provided by the Department of Petroleum and Mines.
36	Local resident	36.1	Strongly objected to proposal, with grave concerns for wellbeing should the project go ahead.	Refer to comments within submission 31.3.
		36.2	Sea breezes and easterlies are frequent and strong; there can be no doubt that fine sand and dust of unknown toxicity will reach property and possible damage health of humans and animals.	Refer to response regarding Dust Management Plan.
		36.3	All water used on the property comes from a small spring; dust is likely to contaminate the water source.	Refer to response regarding Dust Management Plan.
		36.4	Has a direct view of the landscape, which would be destroyed by the extent of proposed extraction.	Refer to response regarding Visual Impact Assessment.
		36.5	Noise from heavy machinery would be a nuisance and affect quiet lifestyle.	Refer to response regarding Noise Management Plan.
37	Local resident	37.1	Opposed to proposed mining development.	
		37.2	No detailed investigation or study has been produced to deal with water drainage.	Refer to response regarding Water Management Plan
		37.3	Keysbrook/Westcott Road has average annual rainfall in excess of 1 metre. In an average winter, the groundwater is at or within a few inches of ground level. In an average summer, the groundwater level is no more than 1.5 to 2m below ground level. This has been demonstrated by test holes on a lot adjacent to the proposed mine.	Noted.

	37.4	This would require dewatering throughout the entire year, not just winter. Drains on the adjacent property quickly reach capacity in winter; these would be disrupted by mining operations and it is anticipated there would be substantial flooding that would affect their land.	<p>Refer to comments provided by the Department of Water in relation to dewatering at submission 10.3.</p> <p>The Ministerial Approval requires the preparation of a Water Management Plan that is required to monitor groundwater quality and quantity, including bores located on surrounding properties.</p> <p>Ministerial Approval also requires the quality and quantity of groundwater is maintained at post-mining level and measures to minimise impacts with the discharge of excess water are identified and implemented.</p>
	37.5	Query where surplus water from dewatering would go, as water use in the mining operations would be reused in a closed system. Current drainage in the district is not designed to cope with the large scale dewatering required for the mining operations.	Refer to comments within submission 37.4.
	37.6	The application does not show any drainage design work to cope with the outflows from dewatering the mine pits, or any calculations of the amount of water to be removed.	Refer to comments within submission 37.4.
	37.7	The application states that the operating mine will require 1.82 megalitres per hour to be drawn from the Leederville aquifer, to a total of 15,899 megalitres per year. There are no calculations on how the annual drawdown will affect the aquifers in the vicinity of the mine bore field. The submitter has a bore into the Leederville aquifer and is concerned that they will be impacted by the amount of water sought to be used by the applicant.	<p>Refer to comments within submission 12.2.</p> <p>Refer to comments within submission 12.4.</p>
	37.8	The extraction process involves washing the soil profile to extract the heavy minerals clearly salt mineralisation within the current soil profile would be released into the water. What is to occur with the potential salt water? The application does not deal with issues of salt release at all and the crucial environmental impact, particularly as the surface flow of all surface drains from the site would end up in either the Balgobin Brook and Nambeelup Brook, which contain draft EPP listed wetlands.	Refer to comments within submission 37.4.
	37.9	The extent of investigation of potential acid sulphate soils is inadequate, relying only on general mapping within Planning Bulletin 64. A comprehensive grid pattern drilling program should be undertaken to ensure no high risk areas are present, with no mining in or adjacent to high risk areas.	Refer to comments within submission 29.7.
	37.10	The area is subject to prolonged high intensity easterly winds and valley winds. There are also sustained south westerly winds, which do severe damage to unprotected soil. Have grave concerns that wind erosion on the mine site will cause large quantity of sterile silica sand to deposit on their land. Wind records show the majority of days in the year are subject to wind gusts in excess of	Refer to response regarding Dust Management Plan.

			30kph, with morning and afternoons having wind speeds above 20kph. Substantial wind erosion will occur at wind speeds above 30kph.	
		37.11	The current locality is peaceful and quiet at night, with little light pollution. A 24 hour mine will result in significant light pollution on adjacent properties at night, and noise impacts.	Refer to response regarding Noise Management Plan.
		37.12	Proposed backfill will contain 45 percent water. The application does not mention how long the backfill slurry will take to dry and settle before it is capable of carrying the weight of machinery necessary to return topsoil and reseed and repasture the area, particularly in winter when there is a high water table. Concern that there may be a “pudding effect” whereby a dry crust forms, however there is a significant time lag before the slurry settles and in the meantime the exposed dry surface erodes in the wind, to the detriment of neighbours.	Refer to response regarding Rehabilitation Management Plan and the Dust Management Plan.
		37.13	Substantial increase in wind blow silica risks injury to the cattle, with eye problems such as pink eye. This will result in economic loss if cattle are downgraded at market.	Refer to response regarding Dust Management Plan.
		37.14	The proposal will result in loss of amenity; the area is currently entirely rural with a quiet and peaceful environment. Increased traffic, noise, dust and light pollution will substantially reduce the amenity with no compensation or apology.	Refer to response regarding Dust and Noise Management Plan.
		37.15	The land is located within the Metropolitan Region Scheme; with project population increase for Perth, the land may be urban in years to come. It is questionable that the land would be suitable for intensive or urban development (e.g. potentially unstable ground), therefore whether the proposal would disrupt the orderly planning and development of adjoining land in the district to obtain its appropriate use.	The Ministerial Approval requires the area to be re-established as pasture.
38	Utilities provider: Water Corporation	38.1	Subject land falls outside a planned Water Supply Scheme and a reticulated potable water supply is not immediately available. If a reticulated water connection is required the development will require planning to be undertaken and may require headworks infrastructure to be constructed.	No reticulated potable water connection is proposed.
		38.2	Subject area falls within the Karnup-Dandalup Underground Water Pollution Control Area Proposed P2 (UWPCA) to ensure there is no increased risk of pollution to water sources. It is recommended the proposal is referred to the Department of Water for assessment to ensure the proposal is in accordance with the <i>Land Use Compatibility in Public Drinking Water Sources Areas</i> publication.	The proposal has been referred to the Department of Water, comments provided within submission 10.
		38.3	The subject area falls outside a planned wastewater scheme catchment.	Refer to comments provided at submission 38.1.
		38.4	The subject area falls within the Dirk Brook Drainage Catchment	Noted.
		38.5	The developer is expected to provide all water and sewerage reticulation. A	These comments are quite general in nature and do not

			contribution for Water, Sewerage and Drainage headworks may also be required. In addition the developer may be required to fund new works or the upgrading of existing works and protection of those works. Any temporary works needed are required to be fully funded by the developer. The Corporation may also require land being ceded free of cost for works.	provide specific advice therefore it is difficult to address any specific concerns. Refer to comments provided at submission 38.1. Reticulated sewer is not proposed. On site effluent disposal is proposed in accordance with Health regulations.
39	Local resident	39.1	Proposed amount of water usage is of great concern. The commitment to identify watering points and substitute affected water supplies within 500metres is not sufficient, and this distance should be extended. Loss of water supply from dams and bores around the proposed mining area would be devastating.	Refer to comments within submission 12.4.
		39.2	Potential dust is of concern, with farming practices undertaken in very close proximity to the mine (within 50 metres). The amount of water required to lower dust is of concern.	Refer to response regarding Dust Management Plan.
		39.3	Entire area famed is surrounded by proposed mining operations.	Refer to comments within submission 31.13.
40	Local resident	40.1	Endorses the submission of the Keysbrook North Dandalup Action Group.	Noted.
		40.2	Has been "fighting against" Mineral Sand Mining in the Shire since 1986. Considers the current application the most "ludicrous" presented.	The Proposal has been assessed under the provisions of the EPA 1986 and been granted approval. The Proponent is now required to gain planning approval and development application has been lodged in accordance with standard planning proposals.
		40.3	The Shire's policy against mineral sands mining should be sufficient to refuse the application.	The development application is required to be assessed within the planning legislation framework and within the context of State and local desires. The Shire's policy has a presumption against the approval of mineral sands mines which is in direct conflict with State planning policy. The proponent has made a submission in relation to the appropriateness of Local Planning Policy No.30 and the reasons are still valid.
		40.4	Previously objected to the proposal in 2007; the current proposal has not changed since then.	This is an underestimation of the considerable approval process this Proposal has under done in relation to the environmental approval process.
		40.5	The proposal has no benefits for the Shire, the State, or the communities of Keysbrook and North Dandalup.	The Department of Petroleum and Mines has indicated otherwise. Refer to comments within submission 20.7. The development application has indicated a number of benefits. Refer to comments within submission 20.1.
		40.6	Drawing significant amounts of groundwater will lead to environmental damage.	The Ministerial Approval indicates that in accordance with the EPA 1986 that is not the case.
		40.7	Dust pollution will be significant with strong easterly winds. Questions how dust can be suppressed with the scale of the operation exceeding anything carried out in the Shire before.	Refer to response regarding Dust Management Plan.

		40.8	Removal of sand dunes and recontouring will remove natural wind breaks and exacerbate wind.	Refer to response regarding Dust Management Plan.
		40.9	The land is good farming country; mining threatens use of the land for food production. There are mineral sands deposits elsewhere; the proposed area is not compatible with farming or residents living in the Metropolitan area.	The Proposal is not located within an Agriculture Priority Management Area or Precinct as defined within the State Planning Policy No. 2.5 – Agriculture and Rural Land Use Planning.
41	Local resident	41.1	Opposed to proposed mineral sands mining	Noted.
		41.2	The proposal presents no benefit for any adjoining land owners	Refer to comments within submission 20.1.
		41.3	The proposal will create nuisance	Refer to response relating to the Noise Management Plan.
		41.4	The proposal will hinder other proposed developments for the surrounding area.	The Proposal is to be assessed in accordance with the existing planning legislation it cannot be assessed against a proposed or future requirement.
42	Local resident	42.1	Purchased the property for its relative isolation, quiet surroundings and rural lifestyle. Utilise the land as a sheep stud, fish hatchery and plant growing facility.	Noted.
		42.3	<p>Concerned regarding noise; trains three kilometres away can be heard in still conditions; mining operations and trucks movements will be within one kilometre of the dwelling which will have noise impacts.</p> <p>The property was purchased deliberately for a quiet lifestyle and due to suffering of migraines that are aggravated by noise.</p> <p>The majority of the mining area within the Serpentine Jarrahdale Shire is located within 1,500 metres of dwellings; therefore operational hours are restricted. How will this be monitored, and who is responsible for enforcing the requirement? Quarterly noise monitoring and review is proposed – does this mean noise would have to be dealt with for three months until the next monitoring? Will time restrictions result in a mine life beyond the proposed ten years?</p> <p>Noise travels readily in the area, and will add considerable discomfort and distress to standard of living.</p>	Refer to response regarding Noise Management Plan.
		42.3	<p>Domestic and stock/pasture water used is obtained from bores and runoff from adjacent properties.</p> <p>High quality pasture results from runoff, supporting stock for sale, and a considerable income would be lost if that runoff was lost.</p> <p>With proposed abstraction and dewatering, is there a guarantee that bore and soaks will not be lowered or dried up? The water is required for plant and koi</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>In the situation that the operations were required to extend beyond ten years a new planning approval will be required, assuming this application will be approved for ten years.</p> <p>Refer to comments within submission 12.4.</p>

		<p>hatchery businesses.</p> <p>Drinking water is obtained from rainwater tanks, which may be contaminated by dust.</p>	Refer to response regarding Dust Management Plan.	
		42.4	<p>Sheep are prone to pink eye in dusty conditions, therefore vet bills and losses due to blindness could occur with dust from mining.</p>	Refer to response regarding Dust Management Plan.
		42.5	<p>Wind in the area is extreme; during building their house, builders had to stop work a number of times due to the danger of easterlies, and rebuild the eastern side of the house several times which was pushed over by wind. The wind regularly hollows out firebreaks or other sandy areas. Dust from roads and topsoil currently causes issues in summer.</p> <p>Mining will cause heavy dust storms.</p> <p>Wind tests carried out at or near Perth Airport are not reflective of local conditions, and not in open farming areas.</p> <p>Dust will have impacts on livestock, pasture, drinking water, and plants.</p> <p>Screening plant programs in the area have had little success to manage the wind or dust.</p>	Refer to response regarding Dust Management Plan.
		42.6	<p>Properties values will be impacted, with some current landowners attempting to sell however the possibility of sand mining has been an issue with potential buyers. With mining, properties will be virtually unsellable unless prices are dropped significantly, with no compensation from the mining company.</p>	Refer to comments within submission 22.7.
		42.7	<p>Westcott Road is gravel, and rough at certain times. The application states that workers will be encouraged to access the operation from South West Highway, however Westcott Road would provide faster access for those travelling from western locations.</p> <p>Increased traffic will increase road damage, and have safety impacts.</p>	With less than 35 staff required over a 24 hour period and the facilities located on land within the Shire of Murray there is expected to be limited increase in traffic long Westcott Road. The standard of road is able to accommodate the increase in traffic.
		42.8	<p>The proponents do not live in the local area, and have no understanding of the beauty and tranquillity of Keysbrook and the quality of life it offers. They are chasing a financial gain only, with no concern for the local residents who care for the natural environment and the peaceful way of farming life.</p>	Refer to response regarding Visual Impact Assessment. The Proponent has progressed through an environmental assessment and gained approval indicating that they are able to address concerns relating to the environment. By addressing the environmental concerns the Proponent has demonstrated the ability to take into consideration local residents concerns.
		42.9	<p>Strongly opposed to the application and the stress it has placed.</p>	Refer to comments within submission 31.13.
43	Local resident	43.1	<p>Would the company consider taking the final produce down Elliot Road to</p>	Alternative transportation routes within the Shire of Murray

			Yangedi Road (extend to freeway) and not travel through the township of North Dandalup?	are to be considered by that local authority.
		43.2	Are there other industries present that would exacerbate noise impacts, such as the accumulative impact of the mining operations and the railway. The noise regulations would be impacted if there is more than one industry present within a certain radius.	Refer to response regarding Noise Management Plan.
		43.3	Are copies of noise modelling reports available or to be made available for the general public to view?	Refer to response regarding Noise Management Plan.
		43.4	What baseline water monitoring is being/has been conducted to understand seasonal variation local to the area?	Refer to response regarding Water Management Plan. EPA approval requires monitoring and reporting
		43.5	What is the connection between the Leederville and superficial aquifers; how confident is the proponent that any drawdown on the Leederville aquifer will not affect the superficial? If there is an impact, where does the onus of proof lie and what is the comeback for residents?	Due to the fact the Shire has provided the Proponent with limited time to address submissions (that were provided during advertising which concluded on 26 March 2010) there has not been adequate time provided to the Proponent to address this information requests. Technical input is required to address these requests in a comprehensive and sophisticated manner. Not withstanding the time constraints the Ministerial Approval indicates a range of conditions that address these water management concerns.
		43.6	What is the pressure and level in the Leederville aquifer and how much water will be extracted from production bores? Will the community have access to the monitoring information?	Refer to comments within submission 43.5.
		43.7	The report refers to backfill containing 45 percent water – does this refer to 45 percent of soil volume, or 45 percent saturated?	Refer to comments within submission 43.5.
		43.8	What will the company do in terms of community benefit/contribution to local communities? Is there a local spend policy for contractors and use of local business? There is a volunteer Bush Fire Brigade in Keysbrook; the community would appreciate input into these groups plus other community development.	Matilda Zircon regularly engages in activities that positively contribute to the communities in which they operate. Currently all resources have been dedicated to gaining an approval. Refer to comments within submission 20.1.
44	State agency: Department of Health	44.1	The document suggests that the proponent does not fully understand the issues associated with potential health and amenity, and it is not appropriate to assume that there will be no adverse impacts. Given the information provided, comments are unsubstantiated and unsupported, and as such not acceptable to the Department of Health.	The following comment is provided in response to all the concerns raised by the Department of Health. The Department of Health's (DoH) concerns are noted. No substantive health issue is raised, which is not covered by the Ministerial Statement. It is important to remember that the DoH was consulted in the Environmental Protection Act 1986 process as a 'Decision Making Authority' pursuant to section 45(7) of that Act.

			As stated in the development application the Department of Health has been notified of the Ministerial Statement in accordance with section 45(7) of the EPA 1986.
	44.2	<p>The nearest township and residences are within or at 500m from the site, and modelling clearly identifies potential dust impacts on residents during operational scenarios. Comments within page 25, Section 7.4.4 are unsubstantiated and unsupported, and as such not acceptable to the Department of Health.</p> <p>WA Health supports all conditions within Ministerial Statement 810, and considers it appropriate for WA Health to review the revised dust management plan.</p>	
	44.3	P13 5.5.4 dot point “ <i>Ensure dust emissions from activities undertaken in implementing the proposal do not cause ambient dust concentration levels outside the boundary of the proposal area</i> ” should be reviewed as it does not make sense.	This statement is taken directly from the Ministerial Approval and relates to the requirements of the Dust Management Plan.
	44.4	Dust management has implications for private rainwater collection.	Refer to discussion regarding Dust Management Plan.
	44.5	The application states that dust will be managed in accordance with a Ministerial Approval (Minister for the Environment) with reference to an Air Quality and Dust Management Plan. However the plan was not included in the submission to demonstrate that potential problems will actually be addressed. It should be noted that environmental protection does not always cover health concerns.	<p>The Ministerial Approval specifically makes reference to the health of people: Clause 15-2 (c) Ensure that dust emissions do not harm or adversely affect environmental values or the health, welfare and amenity of people and land uses.</p> <p>The Ministerial Approval goes on to state the ambient dust concentrations that would achieve that Dust Management Plan objective.</p>
	44.6	It is noted that there is a dwelling within the actual proposal site, 250metres from an extraction area, and it is not clear where it obtains water from.	Refer to comments relating to submission 31.13.
	44.7	<p>The application does not cover rainwater supply concerns, however the EPA Report and Recommendations (Oct 2007) includes an undertaking that the proponent will wash down roofs at the end of summer to ensure winter rain will be clean.</p> <p>This does not protect against early rains or unseasonal storms washing accumulated dust into drinking water tanks. It also does not address incidental potable use of rainwater at impacted premises which do not rely on rainwater as their sole water supply (and so would not receive the wash down service). The</p>	Refer to comments within submission 44.1.

		submission does not address where the wash down water will be disposed of.	
44.8		The proposal has extraction within Serpentine Jarrahdale and processing within the Shire of Murray, and a number of issues were not included in the application as the proponent does not appear to consider them relevant to the Serpentine Jarrahdale Shire. However, it would have been useful to be able to view all information for the whole super site.	It is expected that the development application lodge with the Shire of Murray will be referred to the Department of Health as part of their planning assessment processes.
44.9		It is advised that permanent toilets will be in the processing plant within the Shire of Murray. No indication has been given for any temporary facilities within Serpentine Jarrahdale for staff in areas remote from the plant.	It is expected that staff will take appropriate breaks at the facilities provided at the primary processing site.
44.10		The proposed development is in a region that may occasionally experience problems with nuisance and disease carrying mosquitoes. There is potential for mosquitoes to breed in on-site infrastructure and constructed water bodies if poor engineering results in water retention, the growth of invasive vegetation and water stagnation.	It is expected that the preparation of a Mosquito Management Plan will be a condition of approval.
44.11		Changes to topography resulting from earthworks (e.g. the installation of pipelines and infrastructure) must not allow run-off to create surface ponding.	Refer to comments within submission 44.10.
44.12		Constructed water bodies (drainage ponds and swales, settling ponds, etc) must be located, designed and maintained in a manner such that they do not create favourable mosquito breeding habitat. This may require the regular monitoring and harvesting of invasive vegetation to prevent the harbourage of mosquito larvae.	Refer to comments within submission 44.10.
44.13		Water tanks and other water-holding infrastructure must be sealed to prevent mosquito access and breeding. If this cannot be achieved, then they must be regularly monitored for mosquito larvae and treated with larvicide as necessary.	Refer to comments within submission 44.10.
44.14		As there are dwellings, farming/agricultural and industrial activities in close proximity to the proposed mining activity, the proponent needs to demonstrate due care where pesticides are applied. In managing the site for principally weed and dieback control, consideration of the meteorology, in particular wind direction and wind speed are important factors in reducing the impact of spray drift on adjoining land. The 300m buffer zone (with screen vegetation) is noted to address dust and noise. This may help to address spray drift matters. Furthermore, the proponents will be establishing an ongoing Weed & Dieback Management Plan to monitor and control weed species and the dieback in the mining area, hence the application of pesticides (including herbicides, fungicides) should be applied in conditions that have lower public health impact on adjoining land users and the public. Care in selecting herbicides (pesticides) is important, as more volatile herbicides such as esters and other volatile compounds could be detected outside the buffer zone.	Refer to response regarding Dust Management Plan.
44.15		Pesticide Safety acknowledges the proponents will be establishing and	Refer to comments within submission 44.1.

			maintaining a register to monitor and respond to any public health and safety complainant to ensure “the proposal does not unreasonably interfere with health, welfare ... of the people on the subject site or within the surrounding area.” Was a risk assessment conducted on the potential risk of adverse health effects from spray drift assessed/reviewed.	
		44.16	Contractors engaged to apply pesticides must be trained and hold a current Pesticide License and be employed by a Registered Commercial Pest Control Firm. Where pest management treatment is undertaken by Matilda Zircon employees, they should be provided with sufficient knowledge, skills, training, and the personal protective equipment to safely apply pesticide. Whether the application of pesticides is undertaken by Matilda Zircon employees or a licensed contractor, an assessment of risk should be undertaken, with specific emphasis on the conditions mentioned above and in particular wind speed, wind direction and choice of chemical.	Noted.
		44.17	The application of pesticides must be applied in accordance with the Health (Pesticides) Regulations 1956.	Noted.
		44.18	Regular monitoring and treatment for the pests should reduce the impact of pesticides on adjoining land users. At the same time, the proponent should ensure that pest numbers are minimised, as treatment for the pests may increase the risk/exposure of the public to unwanted pesticides.	Noted
		44.19	Reference is made to agreements with land owners when mining is in close proximity to their residence; however there is no indication of the potential for landowners to decline agreements.	Refer to comments within submission 44.1.
		44.19	Appendix 5 – Summary of submissions and proponents response to submission – there are no actual attachments.	Noted.
45	State agency: Department of Mines and Petroleum	45.1	Information on all mineral resources, including mineral sands, is of importance to the Geological Survey of Western Australia.	Noted.
		45.2	Titanium-zircon mineralization has strategic economic importance in the Swan Coastal plain, which includes the Keysbrook area, and makes a significant economic contribution to the local community and the State.	Noted.
		45.3	Refer to DMP's comments on the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale's Local Planning Policy No. 30 Mineral Sands Mining.	Noted. Proponent requests a copy of this submission.
		45.4	The proposal for titanium-zircon mining lies within a Strategic Mineral Resource Protection Area for that purpose.	Noted.
		45.5	Supports the proposed Extractive Industry development application.	Noted.
46	Community Group: Keysbrook North Dandalup Action Group, Inc.	46.1	Keysbrook North Dandalup Action Group (KNAG) Inc. was incorporated on 1 March 2006 after the then proponent Olympia Resources Limited failed to allay the fears of the local community that their standard of living, property values, the environment and their personal safety would be under threat.	Noted. The proponent is no longer Olympia Resources Limited.
		46.2	The vast and overwhelming majority of community members oppose this mining	KNAG represents the views of the members of that group.

		proposal and that KNAG fairly represents this view.	
	46.3	The project is the lowest grade heavy mineral sand mining proposal in Australia. South-west communities have become accustomed to high-grade small footprint mining operations; however, this project would destroy more land per tonne of heavy mineral concentrate mined than any other sand mining operation in Australia.	Not with standing the low grade nature of the mineral sands deposit the quality of the ore is not a planning consideration. Where the Proposal addresses the planning legislation then the Council is required to consider the application on its merits.
	46.4	The mineral deposit is located on land titles that can be traced back to pre-1898. The Local, State and Federal Government receive no royalty from minerals extracted from these titles.	Noted.
	46.5	The company claims that there is a special ratio of high value heavy minerals. However, in truth the marginal profitability is due to the lack of royalty payments required. The 1.2mT of heavy mineral concentrate (HMC) is valued by the company at approximately \$500 million dollars gross. In normal mining operations this would equate to a royalty payment of 25 million dollars.	Noted. Comment is not provided on the correctness of these statements. The profitability or otherwise is a financial matter not a planning consideration.
	46.6	Farmers attempting to make a living using farming techniques that date back three generations, but with a fraction of the work effort, can fall victim to short term offers of "easy money". The fact that they devalue their property and their neighbours is not considered. Less than half the farmers approached and less than half the area proposed for mining, have signed up.	Refer comments within submission 16.8.
	46.7	The original mining company Olympia Resources Limited had a disastrous history of poor planning and even worse public relations and environmental attitudes. The debt-ridden company was finally restructured and a new company Matilda Zircon Limited was cobbled together under an umbrella group, Sterling Resources Limited. The new company has made no effort to consult with the wider community and has thus ignored the conditions of the EPA approval.	This is not a planning consideration. The Proponent has not acted in contrast to any conditions of the Ministerial Approval as works have not commenced on site.
	46.8	The company has been raising money to stay afloat with debt and equity agreements with a Chinese company. The company now has a Chinese national as a Director.	This is not a planning consideration.
	46.9	The previous company has had a history of telling the community a different story to that of the business community. We note that the new company has failed to tell the business community that less than half the project area has	This is not a planning consideration.

		been signed up, i.e. they should inform investors that access to their resource has been halved.	
	46.10	The company plans to avoid paying royalties and thus undermines the viability of other reputable mining companies.	This is not a planning consideration.
	46.11	The proposed mining and the quarantining of the rest of the Bassendean Dune systems from development means that:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The most suitable soils for future housing i.e. good drainage and elevated positions will be quarantined from development for future mining. • The best stands of remnant vegetation will be cleared for mining; • The highest potential for Acid Sulphate Soils (PASS) will be left for housing development in areas subject to inundation; • The most fertile farming land will be under pressure by housing development; • The areas to be mined will be only useful for farming i.e. the least fertile soils 	Refer to comments within submission 20.7.
	46.12	The current mining proposal would mean that the narrow country roads (Atkins Road with school children on bicycles and is a recreation area for horse and bike riding. Readheads Road is a school bus route) would become haulage roads. Atkins Road is unsealed with a single lane bridge totally unsuitable for heavy haulage. Readheads Road is a school bus route. How would the shire ensure that a country road used for a haul road be kept in a safe condition for the community?	Refer to comments within submission 16.4. There is no proposal to use any local roads within the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale.
	46.13	This project fails the triple bottom line test by any rational assessment. There are strong negatives in Economical, Social and Environmental Aspects.	Refer to comments within submission 20.1.
	46.14	2 landholders in each Shire with landholdings worth 10's of millions of dollars will receive minimal compensation.	Refer to comments within submission 31.13.
	46.15	There will be some employment on offer; however, due to the state-wide shortage of mining personnel this will probably be filled in part by foreign nationals.	Not a planning consideration.
	46.16	Negative economic impacts will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Royalty free mining will force more royalty paying sand mining closures in the rest of the state, with an estimated loss of \$25 million dollars to the state. • 2 Gigalitres/year of water valued at \$2 million dollars/year (desalination cost) extracted from our diminishing ground water. • Sterilizing of land suitable for subdivisions valued at \$750 million dollars 	Not a planning consideration. Department of Water providing an assessment of the extractive licence. Limited subdivision potential as the Shire only supports subdivision to a minimum of 40ha with a consistent approach to not supporting subdivision. Western Power is supportive of the application. Not a

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increasing demand from an already over stretched power grid at cheaper rates than domestic consumers. i.e. the community will be subsidizing the power usage. Imported diesel with tax rebates. Wear and tear on Shire roads and highways. Incalculable loss of life style and living conditions. Unsafe roads Traffic hazards in towns of North Dandalup, Pinjarra and beyond. Loss of tourism potential. 	<p>planning consideration. No roads will be utilised within the Shire. Refer to comments within submission 20.2. No local roads to be utilised as part the proposal. These are matters to be considered by the relevant local authorities. Limited ability to see the extractive area therefore limited adverse affects on tourism.</p>
	46.17	The community image would be changed from an idyllic country lifestyle to a dirty, dusty, mining operation.	Refer to response regarding Visual Impact Assessment. Proposal is limited in extend to a maximum of 30ha at only one time and for a limited time, ten years.
	46.18	The proposal will place added demand on the Shire's resources with no significant compensation.	Refer to comments at submission 31.13.
	46.19	Land values will be depressed and development stifled.	Refer to comments at submission 16.8.
	46.20	Tourism potential will be lost with scars visible from tourist drives in the hills, e.g. Gobby Road, Boyd Road, Hines Road, Reides Road and Gold Mine Hill.	Refer to the response relating to the Visual Impact Assessment.
	46.21	Areas of remnant vegetation should be shown as caveats (in perpetuity) on land holders' titles and permanently fenced before approval.	This is onerous as the Ministerial Approval has made an assessment of the Proposal in relation to vegetation and provided a ratio of 1.4 hectares of revegetation per 1 hectare of vegetation cleared.
	46.22	Areas of proposed revegetation should be shown on title before mining and permanently fenced after mining.	Refer to comments within submission 46.21.
	46.23	<p>Funding should be provided to the Shires to allow for staff to be employed for continuous monitoring and compliance of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Fencing of remnant vegetation and rehabilitation Protection of Westcott Road reserve Acid sulphate increases Nutrient run-off Radiation increases Noise excess Dust levels Rainwater collection pollution Safe conditions of local roads Draw-down of water table Traffic hazards associated with displaced wildlife Buffer zones from residents Ensure the protection of water and drainage routes (e.g. Balgobin Brook, Balgobin Brook South and Nambelup Brook South) with permanent fencing prior to approval 	<p>The Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale collects rates that are managed to enforce the various policies adopted by the Shire. It is not appropriate to require one Proponent to pay for this monitoring and compliance when it is a duplication of the monitoring that is occurring within the Ministerial Approval. It is the responsibility of the local authority to fund compliance from consolidated funds in the absence of an appropriate town planning scheme provision.</p>

	46.24	<p>Proposed hail route should be replaced with rail haulage.</p> <p>If this is ignored, the road route should be adjusted to access the new freeway rather than Atkins Road/ Readheads Road/ South West Highway.</p> <p>If this is ignored, then Atkins Road should be sealed and widened with a 2-lane bridge. Readheads Road should become 2-lane with proper turning at Atkins Road and South West Highway junctions at the company's expense.</p>	Refer to comments within submission 16.4.
	46.25	Suitable cash payments should be made to the affected communities, for example Alcoa makes grants of millions of dollars to the community. A minimum amount of one million dollars per Shire should be paid before mining commences, with ongoing payments.	This is an arbitrary request for money based on no policy with no indication of how the monies will be utilised. It is not a planning consideration.
	46.27	Owners of neighbouring properties should be compensated.	While there is no mechanism for compensation with the planning legislation there is no need for compensation as the proposal does not adversely affect the community.
	46.28	A minimum buffer of 500 metres should be made on the mining properties between mining and neighbouring boundaries.	The Ministerial Approval has made a determination on the distances between operations and noise sensitive premises. Where there is no noise sensitive premises these distances have not been applied.
	46.29	Owners that sign up to mining should have their rates adjusted to reflect the value of the resources that they claim ownership to, e.g. \$350,000 average per hectare.	Not a planning consideration.
	46.30	Owners that allow mining should have their property re-classified as a dried out tailings dam, totally unsuited to any future development and in need of ongoing checking for potential acid sulphate soils and nutrient re-mobilisation to the Peel waterways.	Not a planning consideration.
	46.31	<p>The EPA has previously failed the community of Esperance, and KNAG is in no doubt that it will fail to force the mining company to uphold conditions set for this project.</p> <p>The EPA approval was granted on the condition that a ratio of remnant vegetation in relation to cleared land was to be maintained and rehabilitation corridors for flora and fauna survival. The failure of the mining company to secure approval to mine that land means that the EPA condition cannot be met.</p> <p>Insist that an Independent Local Representative be employed by each Shire solely to enforce the stated conditions, with funding provided by the mining company.</p>	Refer to comments provided within submission 46.27.
	46.32	Without the plans related to Ministerial Approval, the public and the Shire cannot properly assess the impact of the proposal. The public need to see these plans. When these plans (signed and approved by the CEO Department	Refer to comments within submission 32.9.

			of Environment and Conservation) are made available, the proponent should resubmit the application and allow the public an extension of time to reassess the submission.	
		46.33	There is a world glut of heavy minerals, with enough reserves in outback Australia to supply the world for decades to come.	This is not a planning consideration.
		46.34	The company does not have the financial resources or the mining experience to remediate potential problems that could severely affect vast areas of the Shire and the already threatened waterways of Mandurah.	The Proponent is required to provide significant bonds which have been accepted. Refer to comments within submission 12.2. This demonstrates that the Proponent has the financial ability to meet its obligations.
47	Local resident	47.1	Strongly opposed to the proposed extractive industry. Moved to Keysbrook for country life - peace and quiet, nature, animals and beautiful countryside. It seems this is now under threat.	Refer to comments within submission 20.2.
		47.2	Very concerned about noise emanating from the proposed mine. Mining vehicles and mining operations create a continual drone and as the residence is located on the scarp, the noise is amplified.	Refer to the response relating to the Noise Management Plan.
		47.3	Residence and property looks directly over the proposed excavation area. The beautiful outlook (pictures provided) will be directly impacted.	Refer to the discussion relating to the Visual Impact Assessment. Refer to comments within submission 31.13.
		47.4	While dust can be minimised with dust suppression and watering, it will not be possible to contain the dust from the proposed large scale operation.	Refer to the discussion relating to the Dust Management Plan.
		47.5	There will be a direct impact on the value of our property. The value of properties in the region is based on rural lifestyle within reach of Perth. This is a difficult proposition when you marry this with a large open cut mine on your doorstep.	Refer to comments within submission 16.8.
48	Local resident	48.1	Opposed to the proposed extractive industry.	
		48.2	The proposal would result in noise, dust, sight, and heavy machinery impacts on the residence 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, and 365 days per year for a proposed 10 years. Sceptical that the company will limit night time operations.	Refer to the response relating to Dust and Noise Management Plan.
		48.3	Consider the statement that 30 hectares would need ongoing rehabilitation at any one time is incorrect. The figure is instantly doubled based on day and night operation, and taking into consideration summer months (3-4 months minimum, when rehabilitation could not take place due to high winds and lack of rain and that figure blows out to 100 hectares. (2 daytime/ night time operations X 12 hectares a month X 4 months = 96hectares, conservatively).	Within schedule 1 of the Ministerial Approval it is stated that an area of 30 ha will be progressively mined at any one time.
		48.4	Suggest it is not possible to effectively rehabilitate the removal of 100 year old trees, or reintroduce the range of wildlife, including snakes, lizards, birds, frogs, that leave the area due to disturbance.	The Proposal has been assessed against the environmental legislation, taking into consideration those concerns, and been granted a Ministerial Approval.

		48.5	Question liability for future subdivision where new houses are built on mining lands which then subside due to poor compaction of rehabilitated areas. Is the Shire to accept responsibility?	Refer to comments within submission 37.15.
		48.6	<p>Existing large residential building projects in the Shire provide example of the dust problems in the local area, with dust storms and uncontrollable dust.</p> <p>High winds are very common during summer. Disagrees with the wind monitoring results regarding velocity and direction, as the roaring easterlies already have a huge impact on local residents and their livestock during the hot summer months.</p> <p>Does not believe dust can be controlled in the proposal, as despite how much and how often water is applied, trying to control a 10 hectare pit would be a massive undertaking of men, machinery, time and expense and still be likely to fail. If the pit was larger, which is likely due to the inability to undertake rehabilitation during the summer months, the control measures would be enormous and financially crippling.</p> <p>Observes soil erosion every summer and states "it's a well know fact that you break through the topsoil in summer you will have an erosion problem."</p> <p>Queries any compensation to local residents who will be affected by significant dust and sand. Has a 12 year old son with asthma and eczema. The current environment makes it difficult to ensure he does not suffer breathing difficulties. "It is a constant source of worry as he has been hospitalized in the past. It is inconceivable that he should be exposed to large scale sand mining operation and worse right in the middle of it."</p> <p>Queries the impact of dust on livestock, and the potential for livestock to become sick and lose value.</p> <p>Concerned that dust and sand will compromise income from quality meadow hay for horses and cattle as it will become covered with sand. Concerned there will be a loss of income for 10 years or a substantial amount of income that we return to the farm, as quality could not be guaranteed as it is currently.</p> <p>Queries who would take responsibility and pay compensation.</p>	Refer to the response relating to the Dust Management Plan.
		48.7	<p>Disagree that a substantial amount of water, a precious resource, should be utilised to separate a low value mineral.</p> <p>Questions where wastewater would go.</p>	The Ministerial Approval requires the preparation of a Water Management Plan that will address these concerns.

	48.8	Concerned that mining will impact natural watercourses, and the potential impact on the floodplain and potential for flood waters to affect adjacent properties as a result.	The Ministerial Approval requires the preparation of a Water Management Plan that will address these concerns.
	48.9	Based on drilling holes on adjacent properties in summer, the water table is within 2 metres of the ground surface all year and would require enormous pumping operations. Queries where the groundwater is to go. Concerned that high groundwater will result in heavy vehicles and machinery becoming bogged.	Refer to comments provided within submission 48.8.
	48.10	The road system to be utilised by enormous rigs with twin trailers (which require special permit) is narrow, poorly constructed, poorly maintained and, in some instances, unsealed. Experience as a police officer specialising in traffic operations and enforcements, considers the proposed haulage route is very dangerous and will lead to future tragedy.	Refer to comments within submission 16.4.
	48.11	The internal road system fails to take into consideration the enormous expense required to build a road sufficient to support large vehicles and machinery over soft soil in summer and flooded land in winter.	The cost of construction of any internal road networks is to be met by the Proponent.
	48.12	Mining proposal has resulted in a loss of value of one million dollars on the property, which was placed on the market in 2008 and still has not sold with significant reduction in asking price due to the area being affected by sand mining application. Disappointed that no acknowledgement of the substantial depreciation of land value is made by the applicant.	Refer to comments within submission 16.8.
	48.13	The original project proponent, Olympia, conducted core sampling of the property approximately 18 months ago and received data of the quantity and quality of the mineral sand deposited on our property. When naturally asked what the value of this mineral was, the company was vague, and we have never been able to determine what the value of the mineral we have on the property is worth. All comments are prefaced with "possibly, around, maybe" etc. Does not have any faith in the company to deliver the project or commitments. See them more as an opportunistic outfit, who hope to put the whole package together and on sell it to the highest bidder. As a consequence, believe that any promises made to landowners and shires will not be met and will be unenforceable. Once the income from the mining	Obligations within the Ministerial Approval and any planning approval are required to be met as a condition of operation.

			starts the company would be able to tie the shire up in court for as long as it takes and the shire will not be in a position to bankroll a lengthy prosecution.	
		48.14	The proposal would have a massive impact on the health, lifestyle, and amenity of the family.	The proposal has progressed through an environmental process that has resulted in the Minister for the Environment granting approval.
49	Local resident	49.1	Object to the proposal.	
		49.2	Support the submission by the Keysbrook North Dandalup Action Group Inc.	
		49.3	Will be losing a bore allocation in 2012. Considers it outrageous that the applicant can extract 2 gigalitres from the aquifer whilst contributing nothing to the community.	The Proponent is currently progressing through the approval process with the Department of Water refer to comments submission 10.
		49.4	Fencing of remnant vegetation and rehabilitation	The Ministerial Approval requires the protection of 75 hectares of native vegetation (located in Shire of Murray) in perpetuity and the rehabilitation areas are to be protected from grazing stock.
		49.5	Protection of Westcott Road reserve	Westcott Road reserve will not be utilised except for the occasional crossing.
		49.6	Acid Sulphate increase	Refer to comments within submission 29.7.
		49.7	Nutrient run off	The Ministerial Approval requires the preparation of a Water Management Plan that will address these concerns.
		49.8	Radiation increases	Due to the absence of monazite from the tested mineral sand deposits the Proposal does not require licensing and registration under the Radiation Safety Act 1975 (WA).
		49.9	Noise excess	Refer to discussions relating to the Noise Management Plan.
		49.10	Dust levels	Refer to response relating to the Dust Management Plan.
		49.11	Rainwater collection pollution	Refer to response relating to the Dust Management Plan.
		49.12	Safe conditions of local roads	The local roads within not be utilised in the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale by heavy haulage trucks.
		49.13	Buffer zones from residents (500metres)	Refer to response relating to the Noise Management Plan.
		49.14	Ensure the protection of winter water and drainage routes	Refer to comments within submission 48.7.
50	Local resident	50.1	See submission 49. Submission submitted twice.	
51	Local resident	51.1	The proposed mining is in close proximity to property, with direct contact with the full length of southern boundary, with operations relatively close on the western property boundary, and potential future mining operations on the northern boundary.	Refer to comments within submission 31.13.
		51.2	Other like projects substantiate that there is no guarantee of a 10 year limit to this project which will continue until the last dollars are extracted and should within the starting time of this project a new process be found to extract more minerals more productivity it will without doubt continue whilst profitable.	Refer to comments relating to planning approval within submission 42.3.

		<p>51.3</p> <p>Already it is proven that current properties on the market within the vicinity of the mining are not attracting bids and owners should not be subjected to forced sales at undervalued prices.</p> <p>Landowners are currently paying rates on land values that are no longer achievable in the current market mostly in part because of the proposed mining.</p> <p>An example (in my case) we have about 10 years left at our age 61 and 62 years to end our lifelong commitment to breeding horses. That means that whilst mining is in existence it is most likely that we would be considering the sale of our stud/property. Our superannuation (the property and stud) will be at the best very much reduced if we are forced to sell and at the worst not saleable at all as present markets indicate.</p> <p>Queries who will accept responsibility for this, and who would pay compensation?</p>	<p>Refer to comments within submission 25.3.</p>
		<p>51.4</p> <p>During previous discussions with the mining company:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The company would not confirm what was being offered to mine the land and in what time frame mining would be commenced and land returned, leaving owners in doubt. • The company would not consider buying us out and were informed by us that our business could not be put on hold while they thought about it. • A proposal was put to them to re locate us for the period of mining and rehabilitation of the land. It was both more profitable to buy us out which they would not do, and extremely unlikely that they or us would be able to find a leasable viable property for the duration of mining and rehabilitation. <p>Queries what rights residents have to a stable viable financial future. Should some buyout be proposed by the miner, are residents expected to move at their own expense which would be considerable?</p> <p>This venture appears to be progressing in a manner that offers no regress to liability/redress.</p>	<p>Financial and legal arrangements between parties are not a planning consideration.</p>
		<p>51.5</p> <p>Mining operations will impact on livestock.</p> <p>In discussions with the proponent it was obvious that they either did not or would not understand that we have taken 25 years to acquire stud stock of irreplaceable value which cannot be sold and replaced after they are gone.</p>	<p>Refer to comments within submission 25.3.</p>

		<p>For example in our case it has been our good fortune that has enabled us to acquire two exceptional stallions and in the case of our mare band it has been the case that over the years drought and other reasons retirement etc have enabled the purchase of valuable proven stock.</p> <p>Query compensation.</p>	
	51.6	<p>The winds at and near our location are extreme. For example we put down a sand pad 300mm and within two weeks when the builder returned it had gone. We were accused of using it elsewhere.</p> <p>No amount of watering will control airborne dust which will affect our personal health and that of our livestock. Livestock that has a reduced ability to perform will have a very much reduced value for sale and in fact may not be saleable.</p>	Refer to response relating to Dust Management Plan.
	51.7	<p>Were my property to be mined it would require some time to reclaim the land to a useable state. Horses are renowned for degradation of soils and the rehabilitated areas would require at least three years to settle, reseed and fertilise. It may take longer subject to other conditions and rainfall.</p> <p>It is interesting to note in proposers documents that 30 hectares only remains under excavation at any one time and is subject to continuous rehabilitation. This is not possible. Summer will impede rehabilitation and it will also be governed by the severity of the summer and the winds. So in essence it is most likely that 60 hectares or more at any one time in summer will be a sand pit way too much to manage rehab/dust etc.</p> <p>The excavation will occur across a number of pits and it will be easy to hide the extent of the operation and extremely difficult to manage maintenance of the project in a cost effective manner which is likely to lead to bad practice of management.</p>	Refer to comments within submission 12.2. Notwithstanding the concerns raised the Ministerial Approval requires certain actions that the Proponent is obligated to meet.
	51.8	<p>Tiger snakes are numerous to this area and will increase on properties like mine where little or no action takes place. They will seek a safe refuge. How many of my stock will suffer by being bitten?</p> <p>I have already lost valuable livestock to snake bite in the paddock and do not want to be over run and find them in out buildings. Tiger snakes can be extremely aggressive. Who will be appointed to regularly search and remove them?</p>	The Ministerial Approval has considered all fauna matters and granted approval
	51.9	<p>All land owners within the shire have trouble with the removal of just one tree. How come it is suddenly appropriate to strip land of some of the few remaining trees that support the endangered red and white tailed cockatoos?</p>	The Proposal has progressed through a rigorous environmental approval process culminating in a Ministerial approval, these matters have been taken into consideration during the approval process.

		51.10	<p>Holds the appropriate valid water reticulation licenses (2) for this property.</p> <p>Without doubt my water is going to be affected regardless of excavation distance and when it dries up HOW will it be replaced in a timely manner?</p> <p>There is a main water course on the southern boundary within the mining area with many small water courses feeding from it. I am not yet aware of where this main water course feeds to, however experience shows that should this and subsequent feeders be interrupted flooding will occur. Not just to my property but to others west, north and east of the watercourse. I have no personal knowledge of water courses to the south of my property.</p>	Refer to comments within submission 12.4.
		51.11	Quality farm land should not be mined.	Refer to comments within submission 40.9.
52	Local resident	52.1	Opposed to the proposed mineral sands mine.	** note, submission draft had skipped numbering jumping from 51 – 53 have re-ordered so as 53 was renumbered 52 and so on.**
		52.2	<p>Notwithstanding comments re environmental/dust and noise issues, rather sceptical given the horrendous seasonal easterly winds which occur during spring, summer and early autumn periods. This with the various other directional winds will ensure no one "misses out" even in the North Dandalup Township and school.</p> <p>All the watering in the world will not contain dust which is a health concern directly to family members and others who suffer from bronchial issues.</p> <p>Excavator noise will be "carried" by the wind.</p> <p>The fact that the proponent will install dust monitors is of little assurance after the fact local residents have had their health affected. Residence is only 400m from boundary of mine site.</p>	Refer to responses relating to Dust and Noise Management Plan.
		52.3	<p>The loss of surface water is an issue, as notified in the proposal, which will affect watering of stock and supplementing domestic water supplies. Whilst it is noted there is a commitment to replenish supplies, who will strictly monitor this? Our last source of water for stock and keeping down dust is our bores and if affected will prove disastrous.</p> <p>Possible leaching of acid sulphate soils leaching into surrounding water ways is a real concern in view of the above.</p>	<p>Licensing of water extraction. Refer to comments within submission 12.4.</p> <p>Compliance. Refer to comments within submission 28.6.</p> <p>Acid Sulphate Soils. Refer to comments within submission 29.7.</p>
		52.4	McMahon Road will further suffer from an increase in traffic, and is already affected by traffic issues. Readheads Road is also a problem. These roads must be repaired as buses in particular utilise McMahon Road four times per day.	The traffic associated with the proposal will not utilise McMahon Road, located in the Shire of Murray

		52.5	Purchased the property as a nest egg for retirement. In recent rezoning proposals, the area abutting the proposed mineral sands mining area has been left out while land opposite McMahon Road (Western side) has been included in proposals. This obviously puts adjoining landowners at serious financial disadvantage in the future.	Refer to comments within submission 31.13.
		52.6	Questions who will be responsible for inevitable compensation issues should the company go into liquidation.	Refer to comments within submission 12.4 relating to bonds.
		52.7	Urges Council to decline the application and ultimately look after the people that elect them.	Consideration each application for development must be assessed on its merits in accordance with current planning legislation. The policies of the local, State and federal government is taken into consideration when assessing a development application.
53	Local resident	53.1	<p>Has followed the process and considers there are already gaps between promise and reality. For example, all plantings were to be local providence, indigenous species and designed to break the wind and create screens. Planting along Elliott road is only part indigenous, unlikely to be local providence, not dense enough to suit the criteria, runs parallel to the main winds and full of weeds that are being eradicated elsewhere.</p> <p>Considers that in the light of this alone if the proposal is granted, any revegetation program must be strictly monitored and have a bond held for a minimum of 5 years after the mine is finalized to ensure the success of the planting and the weed management of these areas. This bond should be realistically high enough to repair any failings at future costs.</p>	<p>The Ministerial Approval requires the Rehabilitations Management Plan will revegetate areas, including the use of local species of local provenance, and establishment of middle storey and understorey species with a revegetation monitoring programme.</p> <p>Refer to comments within submission 12.2 relating to bonds.</p>
		53.2	<p>Concerned that the areas of operation that can create dust, noise, pollution, or public nuisance of any type are not being managed in such a way that rectification of any of these can happen immediately. Mining areas are small, short term events that can be done, closed and started at another site before any complaint can be made and acted upon. With operations in close proximity to individual homes and the town site of North Dandalup, there needs to be an instant reporting method that can shut down the offending section within hours.</p> <p>Has not seen who anybody is to report incidents to; there must be an effective contact at all times that the company is working. There must be access to monitoring devices for people with concerns to use to prove claims.</p>	Refer to comments within submission 28.6.
		53.3	<p>Astonished to see local farmers being refused access to water, but a mining company of questionable origin and ownership, can firstly draw 2 gig of water per annum and then claim not to have any downstream effect as after they use it, it no longer exists.</p> <p>Concerned regarding the compounding effect that mining will prevent the water</p>	The Proposal is currently being assessed by the Department of Water in relation to the extraction of water. Refer to comments provided by the Department within submission 10.2.

			pooling and seeping into the lower aquifers giving rise to future local problems. The effect on the already miniscule amount of remaining vegetation of a further lowering of the water table will be disastrous.	
		53.4	The possible effect of acid soil and the general risk to downstream Ramsar wetlands has been all too lightly treated as any pollution of these areas is next to impossible to rectify and have a massive environmental and financial effect on these areas.	Refer to comments within submission 12.4 and comments within submission 29.7.
54	Local resident	54.1	Runs an audited cattle production business, supplying high quality beef.	Noted.
		54.2	Concern regarding ongoing availability of water to the property, as mineral sands mining is highly water intensive.	Refer to comments within submission 12.4.
		54.3	Concern regarding the effect of windblown sand from the mining operation especially over the drier summer months with the potential damage to livestock.	Refer to responses relating to Dust Management Plan.
		54.4	Questions who will provide compensation for damage to high quality product should it be compromised as a result of mining operations.	Refer to comment within submission 46.27
		54.5	This is beautiful farming land that is highly sensitive to environmental conditions. In the winter months it becomes extremely wet and difficult to operate heavy machinery on. Notes an example of a vegetable grower excavating a trench in the local area, states that the remains of a travel irrigator still there, and the land still bearing scars after investment of millions into rehabilitation.	Refer to comments within submission 48.7.
		54.6	Concerned that dust and erosion cannot be controlled. Notes regular work to push topsoil back into holes, and re-seed with grass to stop wind erosion, and a recent A recent 6 day bout of easterly winds caused breakouts whereby small holes in the top soil were made into very large ones. How are mining operations going to deal with this issue, when some 30 hectares at a time are going to be exposed? The proposal, which suggests erosion and dust will be controlled with water trucks, is ridiculous and shows how naive to the local conditions the proponent is.	Refer to responses relating to Dust Management Plan.
		54.7	Refers to an urban development in the Busselton area located over an area sand mined approximately 8 years ago. Subsurface investigations identified a fine residue below the entire site, linked back to previous mining which removed larger sand grain, leaving only smaller particles, similar to clay. The residue formed an impermeable layer and the area was inundated during winter. Believes similar mining process is proposed, and concerned for future adverse effects.	Refer to comments within submission 16.8
		54.8	Believe only self interest is at stake, for the mineral sands company to acquire permission to operate, so ultimately corporate giants can get in and do as they	Refer to comments within submission 12.2.

			please. Suggest it is an exercise in environmental exploitation that will benefit few people and leave behind a legacy of environmental degradation that will become someone else's problem to solve.	
		54.9	Hope that the shire can see past the short term promises and assurances, to the real consequences of allowing this to proceed and as custodians of this beautiful land, see fit to do the right thing by it and the local people trying to earn a sustainable living from it.	Refer to comments within submission 12.2.
55	Federal member for Canning	55.1	Object to the development application and extractive industry licence.	
		55.2	9km extractive industry site would have a detrimental impact throughout the Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale and dramatically impact on the rural idyllic lifestyle of local residents, while at the same time force a heavy burden to businesses and local tourism.	Refer to comments within submission 20.2.
		55.3	A mineral sands operation goes against the grain of the established Keysbrook lifestyle and natural environment. The area has long and proud history as farming land, successful stud farming operations and produce businesses. The impact of mining operations would ultimately result in destruction of this very land that is one of the locality's key benefits.	Refer to comments within submission 16.8. Refer to comments within submission 20.2.
		55.4	A Heavy Mineral Sand mine would not only detrimentally affect the coastal plain, but put water supplies and electricity supplies under immense pressure.	The Department of Water has assessed the Proposal, refer to comments provided within submission 10. Western Power has not expressed any concern in relation to the electricity supply. Refer to comments provided within submission 57.
		55.5	Well established homes would be devalued and the potential for subdivision would be sizably reduced.	Refer to comments relating to subdivision within submission 29.12.
		55.6	The destruction of quality farming land and vegetation and the potential risks to waterways would inevitably result in the loss of local industry, jobs and productivity.	Refer to comments within submission 40.9. The Ministerial Approval considered the protection of the watercourses and wetlands and determined that no mining should be undertaken within 20m of identified watercourses or 100m of a conservation category wetland.
		55.7	Any deliberations on the outcome of this application must weigh the viability of the proposal against the destruction of the areas industry and amenity. What is being proposed by Olympia Resources Limited Is a low grade heavy mineral sand mining project. In fact, as I understand It would be the lowest grade sand mine in Australia, meaning that there is little long term profitability in the mine. This must be considered in line with the expensive long term destruction of the natural environment.	The profitability of the Proposal is not a planning consideration.
		55.8	It is important to note that the State Government would not reap any royalties from the "extractive licence" on private land. KNAG estimates this to be a loss of \$25 million to Western Australia over the life of the mine, which is money that could otherwise be invested in crucial community and transport infrastructure	The local roads will not be utilised within the Shire of Serpentine Jarrahdale for heavy haulage purposes.

			that is highly valued and much needed within the growing Shire of Serpentine-Jarrahdale. The costs to both the Shire's of Murray and Serpentine-Jarrahdale would appear to far exceed the lost opportunity to share in royalties, but extend to the huge financial burden of maintaining local roads that would be heavily utilised by haulage vehicles to and from mine, adjusting local road access and upgrading existing bridges.	
		55.9	Supports the submission made by Keysbrook North Dandalup Action Group (KNAG) Inc. It's clear within the local Keysbrook community that the proposal always has been, and remains, strongly opposed with public meetings and information sessions being both extremely well attended and vocal.	
		55.10	Urges all relevant planning agencies and affected local governments to consider this proposal in its entirety and weigh up the negligible benefits of such an operation in Keysbrook compared to the irreparable damage it would cause to the local environment, established lifestyle and industry.	Refer to comments within submission 20.3.
56	Community Group: Dandalup-Murray Land Conservation District Committee	56.1	Opposed to the development application for the extraction of heavy mineral sands across the Shires of Murray and Serpentine-Jarrahdale.	
		56.2	Not satisfied with the level of community consultation undertaken by Matilda Zircon Limited, which has made no effort to contact local groups informing them of plans and processes. The only means by which communication has been received is through local media reports and opportunistic updates from Shire Council representatives on community groups.	Refer to comments within submission 20.9.
		56.3	The Swan Coastal Plain is a highly cleared landscape and further clearing of any scale will have a significant impact on the area of remaining remnant vegetation, as well as its health and resilience into the future. Rehabilitation and/or 'off-sets' do not make up for the loss of existing remnant vegetation.	There will be limited clearing as predominately the Proposal is located on land that has been subject to grazing.
		56.4	Loss of vegetation also has an effect on local fauna species. For example, the Carnaby's and Baudin's Black Cockatoo species are listed as endangered and vulnerable respectively under the <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (1999)</i> and as such are considered species of <i>national environmental significance</i> . Their status has been brought about by a reduction in habitat, which centres on the Swan Coastal Plain. Mature marri trees are the main feeding and nesting trees for these species, and if the mining is allowed to proceed, a significant number of trees will be removed from an already diminished landscape, thus having a proportionally large impact on black cockatoo habitat.	The Ministerial Approval has contemplated these issues and granted approval to the development.
		56.5	Highly supportive of setting aside suitable land for agriculture, to ensure that development does not proceed at the expense of agricultural land, particularly in areas close to the centre of population in the State. The mining proposal as it stands will result in the most suitable farming land being in direct competition with future areas for development. Does not see benefits of a future landscape with houses where agriculture should be, and mining and farming where fragile	Refer to comments relating to the strategic importance of this area within submission 20.7.

			soils should be managed carefully, preferably with areas of natural vegetation. Presumably there are hectares and hectares of land suitable for sand mining, and companies will continue to apply for licenses for extraction. There is an opportunity to ensure that a precedent is not set for such activities.	
		56.6	The Peel Region has a beautiful environment and areas such as North Dandalup and Keysbrook are viewed as desirable, semi-rural destinations that also have the advantage of not being too far from the centre of population. There is no doubt that the majority of people that live in the area do so for the reasons of peace, quiet and a beautiful natural and agricultural environment. Sand mining operations do not fit with this picture and would impact greatly on future tourism opportunities. Particularly if a precedent is set, and mining extraction licenses continue to be applied for into the future.	Refer to comments relating to precedent within submission 20.3.
		56.7	Understands that up to 2 gigalitres of water will be extracted annually from the groundwater in the area. In the context of a drying climate and a diminishing supply of water, the precautionary principle would suggest that a large spike in ground water extraction should be avoided at all costs. This water use, not to mention the alteration to the landscape by the operation itself, would have an impact on the surrounding hydrology of the area, including streams and wetlands.	Refer to comments within submission 12.4.
		56.8	Does not see benefits outweighing the costs of allowing this mining operation to go ahead. There are too many question marks and potential long-term impacts on the social and environmental landscape to allow it to proceed.	The Ministerial Approval has contemplated the long term affects on the environment and granted approval.
		56.9	Would like to see a precedent set where such activities are discouraged in this unique and beautiful region.	Refer to comments within submission 20.3.
57	Utilities provider Western power	57.1	Western Power have high voltage transmission and distribution overhead powerlines in the areas highlighted for mining. It is requested that the developers contact Western Power to discuss working in proximity requirements prior to commencement.	Noted.