416

Business Support Officer
Mining Regulation Branch
Department of State Development
GPO Box 320
Adelaide SA 5001

RE: Submission of Objection - Kara Resources Pty Ltd dolomite deposit MC4322 Amended Mining Proposal/response document dated July 1916

I strongly object to the above-mentioned amended mining proposal for the following reasons.

1. COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

a) Open and advertised community consultation has not occurred.

b) Light Regional Council were presented with a presenation by Groundwork Plus which stated that they had community approval for their proposal. This was presented in early stages of informal discussions with a (select) very small number of the community. Six to seven people does not constitute community consultation.

c) Groundwork Plus indicated, and gave the impression to some of the "community" that discussions were held with, that the community was in full support of the mine. This was despite being told directly by community members that they did not support the mine and despite many key stakeholders not supporting the proposal.

d) On page 4 of the proposal in section 2.1 it states that "A community consultation group has since been developed with Groundwork Plus engaged to facilitate discussions between Kara Resources and the affected adjacent landowners and local community within close proximity to the site who have participated in gathering and collating concerns from the wider community." Key local stakeholders were not informed, or aware, of an apparent consultation process occurring.

2.. **VISUAL AMENITY**

a) As the proposed mine site is in a large natural depression comparable to an amphitheatre/bowl, there is no way that this mine can ever be screened either by bund walls or trees to block receptor views. Thereby ruining the natural, beautiful visual amenity of the area enjoyed by all of the locals and those who travel and tour the area.

3.. **LOCAL BENEFITS**

a) There are no local benefits from this mining proposal

b) Any jobs created will come at the cost of a job at another quarry as Kara Resources and its parent company purchase materials from other local quarries already in the region.

c) Several local chaff millers would be shut down if dust contamination occurs in their product. These chaff millers are large local employers.

d) Jersey Fresh Milk (based in Greenock) rely solely on the underground aquifer for their water. Any damage to the fault llne that the aquifer follows would shut their business down. Their business is a large local employer.

e) The plans for a supported employment/training centre at Nain for young adults with special needs are still on hold as this business cannot proceed if the mine goes ahead. The natural peace and quiet and visual amenity of the area equates with best practice to working with those with special needs. It is vital to the well-being of those employed and impacts on successful, achieveable outcomes in the future. This centre is vital as they are unable to access other supported employment services, they would have difficulty with open employment. Again, this business would be a large local employer if it was allowed to proceed.

4. **NOISE**

a) On page 9 of the proposal, "Locating/orientating plant and equipment away from noise sensitive receptors where practical", This indicates that if not practical, no noise buffering will occur and the local community will be blasted with the full noise levels of the proposed mine.

4. **NOISE**

b) Also on page 9, "Scheduling particularly noisy activities to commence after 8.30am where reasonabe and practicable to do so". Many local residents will be inflicted with high levels of noise all day. These are totally unrealistic outcomes.

5. **AIR QUALITY/DUST**

a) There are no acceptable outcomes. It is a known fact that no quarry can stop dust on average to high wind days without natural barriers. There are no natural barriers around the proposed mine site. With dust micron sizes as small as 75 microns, no amount of dust suppressions or bunds will stop the movement of dust off the site.

6. **WATER USE**

a) The proposal contains an unrealistic estimation of daily water use. Similar mines of this size use up to 600,000 litres a day - 300,000-500,000 of this is for dust suppression. This is to come predominantly from mains water, followed by bore as there is no regular surface water to be used - Kara Resources/Groundwork Plus estimation of 60,000 litres per day is ludicrous. To deplete the local water main and/or the local acqifer will severely impact on other local business and residents.

7. **BLASTING VIBRATION**

a) Testing and reporting done by Groundwork Plus as outlined on page 22 is suspect. Testing was done in mostly soft soil. There is no mention in the proposal of the severe vibration felt at some local homes during the blast testing.

b) All homes and buildings within a 6km radius of the proposed mine would require full building inspections at the cost of Kara Resources prior to commencement of operations (if approved). Any further damage ie wall cracks, damage to foundations etc would be the responsibility of Kara Resources and/or its parent companies.

a) Refer 4.6 page 17 of document. This conceptual plan does not return the land to its original slopes. It states a 1V:3H slope which is very steep is not consistent with the gentle rolling agricultural country it is currently and would make it very difficult to crop, which is what the land is predominantly used for. Therefore this is not a suitable outcome for prime cropping land.

CONCLUSION

1. This proposed mine should not proceed as it is totally at odds with the current use of the area and is against the majority of the community wishes. It will be of severe detriment to the local communities that surround this proposed site. Kara Resources have the ability to extract their desired product in already established local quarries.
2. That DSD rejects Kara Resources AMLP on the grounds that community consultation did not involve all landowners within the 2km radius of the proposed site.
3. I request that Kara Resources Pty Ltd MC4322 be rejected by the SA Government.

Print name JAMES STACK

Address 22 Edward St

Norwood SA 5067

Date 4/9/16 **Sign** [signature]