



PRESERVE HILLS OF GOLD

HILLS OF GOLD PRESERVATION INC.

██████████ NUNDLE NSW 2340

August 8th, 2024

Independent Planning Commission

ipcn@ipcn.nsw.gov.au

Dear Commissioners,

Re: TfNSW Advice dated 21.09.23

Hills of Gold Preservation Inc members write to identify unresolved matters raised by Transport for NSW and to request that these issues are considered by the Commissioners as part of the Hills of Gold Wind Farm Case determination.

HOGPI members are concerned that the Transport for NSW correspondence to the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure was not published on the DPHI website until last month, despite being dated 21.09.23.

This correspondence contains significant information regarding concerns about incomplete information that has implications for the access, constructability, and viability of Hills of Gold Wind Farm. The concerns raised in the TfNSW correspondence mirror the concerns raised in Tamworth Regional Council, HOGPI and local community submissions.

The email received by the IPC on 26.07.24 requesting withdrawal of the submission states that the *"matters raised have been addressed through the process with DPHI"*. A thorough examination of the TfNSW letter and the current Draft Conditions of Consent demonstrate the opposite.

It is not clear whether the additional assessments requested by the TfNSW were carried out in a very short period of time between 21st of September and the DPHI recommendation on the 13th of December. What is clear is that **many** issues below remain unresolved.

NOTE: the early form of the Development Consent distributed to various agencies for comment numbered section **TRANSPORT - Heavy Vehicles Requiring Escort and Heavy Vehicles Routes** as condition B28. In the first public version of the Development Consent

published in December 2023 the same section became Condition B30. In the latest version of this Document provided to the IPC in July 2024 the same section is now B31.

It appears that the majority of the TfNSW letter as received by the IPC on the 15th of July continues to raise unresolved concerns from the earlier TfNSW advice, which is demonstrated by extensive referral to Condition B28. Clearly TfNSW is flagging the issues which remain unaddressed.

It is also evident that TfNSW has reviewed the latest form of the Development Consent, and added new information in point 3 (heavy vehicle route to switching station) referencing the updated designation of the Transport section as Condition B31.

HOGPI provides analysis of the TfNSW letter below:

TfNSW reasons for not supporting conditions of development consent

- 1. Strategic designs required for "hardstand" specifying scope of work and pavement treatment prior to determination.
- 2. Strategic designs required for George St onto Industrial Drive, and Industrial Drive onto Maitland Rd intersections scope of work prior to determination.
- 3. Modification, amendment, secretary approval required for additional road works identified in structural and detailed design post consent.
- 4. Strategic designs of swept paths and road works for largest OSOM ingress and egress of laybys within RJA Route Study prior to determination.
- 5. RJA Route Study to be reviewed to identify laybys for OSOM between Warkworth and Murrurundi to allow through traffic passing.
- 6. Inadequate assessment of proposed laybys on Lindsay's Gap Rd to accommodate OSOM movements.
- 7. No information provided regarding direct access to Lindsays Gap Rd re. intersection treatments, traffic volumes (AM/PM peaks).
- 8. Impacts during the construction and post construction of TfNSW projects on road network from Port of Newcastle to project area not adequately addressed by RFI and Draft conditions of consent.
- 9. Swept paths through Golden Hwy to Belford upgrade do not identify referenced vehicle or wheel tracking for proposed roundabout.

HOGPI comment: no updated RJA Route Study provided. Latest version of Route Study dated 23.05.23 predates TfNSW advice 21.09.23.

Resolved points:

Not addressed/not resolved: 4, 5, 6

Unable to comment at this time: 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9

TfNSW advice in relation to Condition A8- Site Access

1. Development consent does not authorise use of Happy Valley Road Bypass Route, inconsistent with Appendix 7 (pg 37), condition B28.

HOGPI comment: this has been addressed.

TfNSW advice in relation to Condition B28- Heavy Vehicle routes and Heavy Vehicle Routes requiring Escort.

- 2. Resolve conflict within the condition for route via Thomas Mitchell Drive, Bell St, Victoria St and Market St.
- 3. Appendix 7 to identify heavy vehicle route for switching station consistent with B31. (c) d).
- 4. Condition B28 (b) should be limited further to prevent potential use of route for blade movements without consideration of civil works and consultation with council.
- 5. Condition B28 doesn't consider any weight limitations preventing use of roads for OSOM movements.
- 6. Amend condition to ensure the routes are captured for heavy vehicles (requiring NHVR permits that are exempt from the escort requirements).
- 7. Route implications north of Dartbrook Rd and New England Hwy intersection due to Muswellbrook Bypass work.
- 8. Update Appendix 7 for consistency with Condition B28 re use of Thomas Mitchell Dr.
- 9. Clarify Route for OSOM over 5.2m as Dartbrook Rd or Dartbrook Mine Access Rd.
- 10. Clarify whether Condition B28 applies to all vehicles or heavy vehicles and heavy vehicles requiring escort.
- 11. Revise Appendix 7 to align route with condition B28.
- 12. Clarify inconsistencies regarding OSOM vehicles and heavy vehicle routes use of Barry Rd and Morrisons Gap Rd (Condition B28 (b) and ©), TTP addendum two report, and RJA Revised Route Survey
- 13. Review Condition B28 against RJA Route Survey (revision 9 17/0502023) to ensure consistent OSOM routes.
- 14. Amend condition to limit OSOM movements via Barry Road/Morrison Gap Road.
- 15. Distinguish route for split blade versus single blade or clarify split blade no longer option.
- 16. The Verden Quarry route needs to be included within this condition.
- 17. Amend condition to address suitable return trips for trailers for nacelles, transformers, and tower sections, or clarify relevance.

HOGPI comment: we note that the Verden Quarry references are no longer relevant, however the source and transport impacts of quarry materials remains unknown.

Resolved points: 2, 6, 8, 10, 11, 16

Not addressed/not resolved: 3, 4, 5, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19,

Unable to comment at this time: 7, 9

TfNSW advice in relation to Condition B29- Road upgrades (now conditions B32 and B33)

- 18. Amend Condition B29 to reference Appendix 7, not Appendix 6.
- 19. Amend Condition B29 to state to the "satisfaction of the relevant roads authority and TfNSW".

- 20. Condition requires a statement that further civil works will potentially be required on the local and state classified road network to facilitate the heavy vehicles under escort beyond the scope identified within Appendix 7.
- 21. Review timing and required road works to facilitate all vehicle types in Condition B29.
- 22. Appendix 7 to identify required intersection treatments on the regional road network to permit light and heavy vehicles.
- 23. Appendix 7 to identify required works to facilitate heavy vehicle access to the substation.
- 24. Appendix 7 to identify Oakenville St intersection treatment to facilitate light and heavy vehicle movements.
- 25. Reference to Verden Rd quarry.
- 26. Revise Appendix 7 to align with RJA Route Assessment (17/05/2023) and road works to facilitate each OSOM load, specifying single or split blade.
- 27. Change Appendix 7 references from hardstand to permanent treatments (state classified road network).
- 28. Review amendment reports, additional information and addendums to TIA and RJA Route Survey to ensure all road work and routes accounted for in Condition B28 and B29.

HOGPI comments: Appendix 7 does not identify new intersections or proposed treatments of Oakenville St/new Innes St bypass (new private road), or Innes St bypass/ Jenkins St intersections required for blade transport.

Resolved points: 18, 19, 25,

Not addressed/not resolved: 20, 23, 26

Unable to comment at this time: 21, 22,

Condition B30 Transport Strategy

- 29. Correct first sentence to include B29 and Appendix 7.
- 30. Disclaimer required stipulating that further road upgrades could be determined in consultation with the relevant roads authority and TfNSW that would result in road upgrades being required in addition to the road upgrades identified within Condition B29 and Appendix 7.
- 31. Amend to consultation and approval with relevant road authority and TfNSW.
- 32. Amend to consultation, approval and concurrence with the Roads Act 1993 with the relevant roads authority and TfNSW.
- 33. Revise Condition B30 to include provide revised route study based on the chosen components and laden dimensions including swept path analysis into laybys, pullovers, rest areas, bridge assessments, culvert assessments and strategic designs for all the routes identified within B28
- 34. Change Condition B30 (b) references to relevant roads authorities and TfNSW.
- 35. Correct Condition B31 to reference Condition B29 and B30.

HOGPI comment: The Transport Strategy section has disappeared altogether, it is unclear if any of the TfNSW requests have been addressed. This Section appears to be replaced with Condition B34 Road Maintenance and B35 Operational Conditions. There is no reference made in the new sections to *“relevant road authority, TfNSW or Roads Act 1993”*. No requirement to *“provide revised route study based on the chosen components and laden dimensions including swept path analysis into laybys, pullovers, rest areas, bridge assessments, culvert assessments and strategic designs”*

Condition B34 Traffic Management Plan (now Condition B36)

- 36. Revise B34(a) to specify details of the transport route to be used for all development related traffic as identified within the EIS and condition B28.
- 37. Revise B34 (b) to specify details of road upgrades required by Condition B29, B30 and B31.
- 38. B34(c) (viii) minimise potential conflict must also include road and rail projects.
- 39. B34(c)(ix) replace encourage with "measures to require employee use of the shuttle bus services as described in the EIS"
- 40. B34(c)(x) replace encourage with "Detail measures to require car pooling or ride sharing as described in the EIS"
- 41. B34 (c) amend to require TMP to include details of measures required as a part of the EIS to be included in the TMP or identify how TMP is consistent with EIS.

HOGPI comment: The latest Draft Development Consent reads: "details of the employee shuttle bus service (if proposed), including pick-up and drop-off points and associated parking arrangements for construction workers, and measures to encourage employee use of this service as described in the EIS". Clarification is required prior to the determination if the shuttle bus is proposed as it was a part of the EIS.

Resolved points: 38

Not addressed/not resolved: 39, 40

Unable to comment at this time: 36, 37, 41

HOGPI members remain concerned by the following:

- Transport for NSW clearly intended for the July 15th submission to be considered by the Commissioners. HOGPI is not comfortable with the subsequent request for removal. The TfNSW submission to the Commission makes it very clear that TfNSW staff were asking the Commission to take into account the issues it was highlighting as part of the decision making process;
- Many issues raised in the correspondence are not addressed by the Draft Conditions of Consent and remain unresolved;
- TfNSW agency advice was not published until July 15th on the IPC website and was moved to the DPHI website last month. The TfNSW agency advice was not available for public comment during the two exhibition periods.
- TfNSW concerns concur with Tamworth Regional Council, HOGPI and individuals' submissions raising unresolved obstacles to site access, constructibility and viability.

"TfNSW highlights that in determining the application pursuant to Part 4 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, it is **the consent authority's responsibility to consider** the environmental impacts of any road works which are ancillary to the development, the environment assessment and approval cannot occur post consent.

The inadequate assessment of the project will result in a substantial risk to the constructability of the project.”

IPC is the consent authority for the Hills of Gold project, not the DPHI. HOGPI members request that the Commission Panel confirms in writing that the TfNSW submission dated 21st of September 2023 will be considered in the process of determination of Hills of Gold Wind Farm.

Additional matters:

Appendix 1 General Layout of Development does not identify **any** laybys on Crawney Road. The chainage provided in Appendix 7 Table 7.2 appears to be incorrect and places three proposed laybys in the Crawney National Park. Rex Andrews Route Study (29.05.23) does not identify locations or presence of any laybys on Crawney Road.

Rex Andrews Route Study mis-identifies the location of the recommended Site Access Option B by providing the GPS link to the location of Access A. The chainage in the Appendix 7 Table 7.2 also points to Access A. The coordinates in Rex Andrews report can not be relied on as they are wrong.

The map of the project included in this Route Study is outdated and includes discarded access options including Head of Peel Road, multiple Devil’s Elbow bypass options, unassessed and unexhibited new intersection at Barry Road/Morrisons Gap Road.

Yours faithfully,

Hills of Gold Preservation Inc Executive

John Krsulja, Brian Tomalin, Selena Sylvester, Ian Worley, Teresa Eather, Natasha Soonchild, and Megan Trousdale