

30th November 2009

admin@appealsconvenor.wa.gov.au

Appeals Convenor Office of the Minister for the Environment; Youth Forrest Centre 221 St Georges Terrace PERTH WA 6000

APPEAL AGAINST LEVEL OF ASSESSMENT LOT 7 BUFFALO ROAD PARKFIELD: Urban Resources Pty Ltd proposal for Sand Mining

The Urban Bushland Council wishes to appeal against the level of assessment - 'not assessed' for the proposal as above. We recommend that the Minister directs the EPA to re-assess the proposal formally at PER level. Alternatively on advice from the DEC's Dawesville-Biningup study (to be the subject of a s16 EPA Bulletin next year), the proposal could be assessed as PUEA (ie rejected as environmentally unacceptable).

Please deduct the appeal fee from our account.

Grounds of appeal

1. Location immediately adjacent to Lechenault Conservation Park and the coast.

Being adjacent to a high conservation area the proposal warrants formal assessment and much more thorough review of the impacts.

The coastal zone to the west is also Public Open Space under the Bunbury Region Scheme and is vulnerable to changes in the shape of adjacent dunes in Lot 7 as a result of mining.

Also storm events may have an exaggerated impact where there are huge holes from mining. This should be modelled to assess possible impacts. Storm events and rising sea levels by 1.5m are likely to again compound impacts when the Quindalup dunes are removed by mining. We suggest that the mine is far too close to the ocean on a coastline which is naturally highly active.

2. Ecological linkage

The mine will destroy all the remaining vegetation on the Quindalup dunes in Lot 7 and this break the important ecological north - south linkage through these dunes. Of particular significance are the Tuart and Agonis woodland as habitat trees for movement north- south of Ringtail possums and other fauna. The possums are known to occur in the adjacent Conservation Park and are thus likely to at least move through or feed in Lot 7 from time to time. Loss of habitat for the possums is a significant issue in the region.

3. Vegetation and flora Survey

A thorough survey according to EPA Guidance 51 was not done. A 'walk through' is not an adequate survey. Although the vegetation is degraded in parts, the best areas are to be mined. Being surrounded by high conservation value areas makes the need for survey more important.

4. Clearing

The areas of best vegetation on Lot 7 will be completely removed. This is obvious from the air photos. It is much more prudent for coastal vegetation to remain to help protect the coastline. Erosion is likely to increase dramatically after mining.

The landforms and vegetation units are quite complex and diverse. Even though the woodlands have a degraded understorey, they still have significant values.

Use of the clearing regulations instead of the EIA process will not address the other significant issues such as groundwater hydrology and ASS.

5. Significant wetlands on Lot 7

There is a Conservation Category Wetland on Lot 7. While the proponent claims that this will not be disturbed, we find it impossible to suggest that this will not be affected by mining immediately adjacent. The maps show the mine right next to the wetlands. Detailed stratigraphy studies would be needed to show where the water table is and the soil structure at depth along the boundary of the mine and wetland. The wetlands are vulnerable to any drainage.

6 Acid Sulphate Soils

Again the proponent has done no site specific studies to map at the local site scale the existence of ASS. Saying these areas will not be disturbed on the basis of very coarse mapping is simply not adequate. Surely the history of acid damage at other sand mining sites such as Beenyup must be heeded. The EPA should call for detailed site assessment of hydrology and ASS. It only takes one acid event for the CCW and downstream areas to be destroyed.

Yours sincerely

C Mary Gray President