

**From:** Dennis Lee  
**To:** [Matthew Sprott](#)  
**Cc:** [Mike Young \(DPE-DASP\)](#)  
**Subject:** Rix's Creek South SSD 6300 Conditions and Mining Lease  
**Date:** Tuesday, 10 September 2019 2:31:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)  
[image002.png](#)  
[image003.png](#)  
[image004.png](#)

---

Hi Matt,

The Commission has some further questions on the Rix's Creek Continuation of Mining Project, SSD6300. Would it be possible to have a response to the Commission by COB Friday 13 September 2019?

### **Conditions**

The Commission notes the application contains two options for overburden emplacement: Option 1 (removes the requirement for the western overburden emplacement), and Option 2 (reduces the area required for the western overburden emplacement). The *Department's Final Assessment Report (SSD 6300) Rix's Creek South Continuation of Mining Project* discusses both options but the recommended conditions of consent (Appendix C) that relate only to Option 2. We would like to understand as well the Department's view on conditions for Option 1.

We suggest if the conditions for Option 2 were taken as a starting point, your proposed conditions for Option 1 would be as follows:

- Part A - Administrative Conditions: no proposed changes
- Part B - Specific Environmental Conditions:
  - Condition B42 - would need to be aligned with staging of Option 1. Option 2 is currently detailed.
  - Appendix 5 of the Recommended Conditions would also need aligning to Option 1 (Information to be utilised from the Applicant's Appendix H - Biodiversity Overburden Study by EMM and associated mapping).
  - Condition B49 - references to pre-clearing fauna surveys and requiring fauna habitat nest boxes (including the Squirrel Glider) to remain.
- All other conditions within Part B: no proposed changes
- Part C - Construction Specific Conditions: no proposed changes
- Part B - Additional Procedures: no proposed changes
- Part E - Environmental Management, Reporting and Auditing: no proposed changes

Is this correct? If not, could you please propose alternates.

### **MLA 487**

The Commission notes that the Application seeks the grant of a new Mining Lease: MLA 487. This Mining Lease is required to extend the western boundary of ML 1432 to store overburden material.

The Commission is seeking whether there are particular requirements that need further consideration from the Department before granting this Mining Lease? For example, Aboriginal heritage, a mining lease tender processes etc.

The Commission notes that section 65 of the Mining Act makes provision for a development consent to be considered prior to issuing a Mining Lease, and the Commission would like to ensure that tenure of the application under consideration is well understood.

Please feel free to drop me an email if you would like to clarify or further discuss this request.

Regards,

**Dennis Lee | Team Leader**

Independent Planning Commission NSW

Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street Sydney NSW 2000

e: [dennis.lee@ipcn.nsw.gov.au](mailto:dennis.lee@ipcn.nsw.gov.au) | p: +61 2 9995 6331 | [www.ipcn.nsw.gov.au](http://www.ipcn.nsw.gov.au)



**New South Wales Government**  
Independent Planning Commission

FOLLOW US ON:



Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.