

Archived: Monday, 7 November 2011 8:49:44 AM
From: [Ann Hobson](#)
To: [Environment, Agriculture, Resources and Energy Committee](#)
Subject: SCL and Springsure Creek
Importance: Normal

Dear Sir/madam,

I write to protest strongly at the exclusion of the Springsure Creek Coal project from the impact of the new Strategic Cropping land legislation. My thinking on this subject concurs with the following submission -

It is my opinion that we must protect good food-producing land against all other land uses.

Yours faithfully,

Ann Hobson



Theodore,Q 4719

The Springsure Creek Coal Project (EPC 891) should not be excluded from the Strategic Cropping Land legislation and Clauses 282 and 283 should be deleted from the Bill.

There is no justification for the special transitional arrangements given to Bandanna Energy and the inclusion of clauses 282 and 283 in the legislation:

- This is not a project of state or public significance
- This is not a project in an advanced stage of development
- This project did not have a final terms of reference on 31st May 2011
- An application for a Mineral Development Licence was made to the mining registrar on 17th October 2011. As of today 03.11.2011, Bandanna

Energy have not received a certificate of application for a Mineral Development Licence under the Mineral Resources Act 1989 (Qld)

- Despite public statements to the contrary this always was an underground project - there was no show of commitment to the SCL Policy by Bandanna Energy through a change of plans from open cut to underground.
- This is a decision made by a government who have not once been to visit the area and get an appreciation for what is at stake – despite numerous invitations
- Bandanna Energy have not done any community consultation
- Bandanna have not rehabilitated exploration holes in a timely manner – clearly demonstrating their disregard to existing government legislation
- The legislation in its current form as introduced to Parliament does not show any commitment to the protection of prime agricultural land
- It not acceptable under any circumstances to introduce legislation that clearly benefits an individual company.
- The inclusion of clause 282 and 283 are a complete contradiction of the fundamental principles of the legislation
- There is no basis for the claims of reclamation by Bandanna Energy
- Commercial viability must come into play when looking at rehabilitation options
- There is no justification for assuming that the subsidence can be overcome – there are no examples of this anywhere in Australia