New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

RE: SANCROX QUARRY EXPANSION PROJECT (SSD-7293)

APPLICANT MEETING

PANEL:	JANETT MILLIGAN (CHAIR) MICHAEL CHILCOTT TERRY BAILEY
OFFICE OF THE IPC:	BRAD JAMES
APPLICANT REPRESENTATIVES:	TIM WARD ANDREW DRIVER BELINDA PIGNONE JEREMY JAGGER
LOCATION:	ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE
DATE:	3:30PM – 4:30PM FRIDAY, 23RD AUGUST 2024

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

MS MILLIGAN: Before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Cammeraygal land and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the country from which we virtually meet today and I pay my respects to their elders past and present.

Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Sancrox Quarry Expansion Project, currently before the Commission for determination. Sancrox Quarry is an existing hard rock quarry, located in the Port Macquarie-Hastings local government area. The quarry's been owned and operated by Hanson Construction Materials Pty Ltd since 1998.

The application in its current form seeks approval for the consolidation of existing development consents and the expansion of the quarry into new areas to extract, process and transport up to 530,000 tonnes per annum of hard rock material over a 30 year period.

The application also seeks approval to construct and operate a concrete recycling and batching facility that would recycle and produce up to 20,000 tonnes per annum and an asphalt production plant that would produce up to 50,000 tonnes per annum.

My name's Janett Milligan. I'm the chair of this Commission panel and I'm joined by my fellow commissioners, Michael Chilcott –

MR MICHAEL CHILCOTT: Good afternoon.

MS MILLIGAN: – and Terry Bailey.

MR TERRY BAILEY: Good afternoon.

MS MILLIGAN: And we're also joined by Brad James from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website.

This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its advice. It's important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it's considered appropriate. If you're asked a question and you're not in a position to answer it, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put on our website.

Just lastly, I request that all members here today introduce themselves before they speak for the first time and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over

the top of each other to ensure the accuracy of the transcript. So if we're all ready, let's begin. So I'm going to start by just throwing to Andrew. Andrew, first of all, would you like to introduce the team? We know who you are but we'd quite like you to sort confirm for us who's with us today and then I'll throw over to you to sort of guide us through the agenda.

MR DRIVER: Thanks, Janett. My name's Andrew Driver, I'm the development manager for Hanson in the eastern region, which covers New South Wales and also the ACT. With us today is Jeremy Jagger, he's our country operations manager. So he's primarily responsible for the operation of the Sancrox Quarry.

With us as well is Belinda Pignone from Hanson, she's our senior environmental compliance coordinator, and Tim Ward, who's from Ethos Urban, he's a director with that organisation and has been carrying out pretty much the planning on our behalf. In terms of the agenda, we've prepared a slide presentation which I think Tim will step through and then if you've got any questions along the way, any of the members of the team will jump in and answer those questions.

MS MILLIGAN: Okay. Thanks, Andrew. We'll try and let you work through the presentation just because we are just because we are all online and so we need to do it in an orderly fashion. If we do have questions, we'll sort of do it by raise of hands and I'll sort of just interrupt and ask you to address the question. Otherwise, we might sort of keep our comments and questions to the end to give you a clear run.

MR DRIVER: Understood. Okay, We'll make a start on it, I'll throw over to Tim and he can run through our presentation.

MR WARD: Okay. Thanks, Andrew. I'll just try and share my screen with you. So can you see the screen that I have up, which is the front page of our presentation?

MS MILLIGAN: We can. Thank you.

MR WARD: Okay, great. Okay, so I'm just going to run through and we've tried to follow the agenda items that were in the agenda that was issued for the meeting. So we've sort of got talking points against all those items and yes, we'll run through that and then if there's any questions, we're happy to answer them afterwards.

So just a very brief introduction to the proposal itself. So as you mentioned, Janett, it's an existing quarry. The proposal is to expand that existing quarry and to increase extraction up to 530,000 tonnes per annum. And in the images you can see there, the aerial photo on the lower part of the screen, that shows the existing quarry footprint and then the plan in the sort of top right-hand part of the screen, that shows the proposed future footprint of the quarry. So it's expanding out to the west from where the existing extraction pit is.

In addition to the quarry itself, there's a proposal, the proposal includes a concrete batching plant, a concrete recycling facility and an asphalt production plant as well, all located sort of within the eastern part of the existing – you know, mostly in the existing quarry area but an expansion of that processing plant also further to the west and sort of south of the existing pit.

The proposal would employ 25 people on site. In terms of hours of operation, this was in fact reduced during the assessment process, so the processing hours and extraction and vehicle deliveries is proposed to be 5 am to 10 pm and with blasting limited to 8 am to 5 pm Monday to Fridays. And we've also included in the proposal is for up to 20 days per year to have increased processing and truck deliveries overnight and that's to deal with sort of campaign events, when there's sort of major infrastructure projects where the construction process that the material is supporting, they need the material overnight. And then there's a closure and rehabilitation plan as part of the proposal as well.

So just in terms of the quarry products and the state of the market, the quarry is identified or the resource where the quarry is located is identified as a regionally significant quarry resource. There is strong long-term growth in the demand for these materials and the Sancrox Quarry has for many years been providing materials, these quarry materials to both public and private customers in support of major infrastructure projects but also a range of development projects, housing and commercial projects.

So there's a sort of well-known, well understood and demonstrable demand for these materials and there's an increasing population and an increasing demand for these materials as the development of the Mid North Coast sort of continues at pace. And that again is well documented in both the regional strategy for the Mid North Coast, which forecasts and additional 76,000 new residents and 46,000 new homes over the next sort of 20 odd years. And it's also supported by Port Macquarie Council's urban growth management strategy.

And just a few numbers here to put it all in context, the construction of a new house requires something like 110 tonnes of aggregates and 53 cubic metres of concrete. So that's obviously an average but if you're sort of talking about 46,000 new homes on the Mid North coast, then very quickly you can see the demand for these materials is there. And the Concrete Association estimates that we use approximately 7 tonnes of aggregate per person per annum.

So the demand is there and the current capacity at Sancrox is – it's been running down, it's only down to about 120,000 tonnes that's left under the current approval and at the current rate of use, that's approximately six months' supply. So it's getting very close to running out.

So some of the key issues that have been subject to the assessment over the last sort of few years, obviously the number one issue has been biodiversity and that's been subject to multiple rounds of correspondence between Hanson and the Department of Planning and the biodiversity and conservation division. There's

been about five or six iterations of the biodiversity assessment report, with the most recent version being submitted in April this year and the final version in April this year.

So in terms of the biodiversity assessment, the picture on the right-hand side – on the top right-hand corner of the screen, the blue line you can see there, that shows the original extraction area that was proposed in the EIS and you can see that extending out quite far to the western part of the site. And the picture beneath that, that shows the final extraction area that has been the subject of the final biodiversity assessment report based on the multiple rounds of negotiation that have happened over the last three or four years.

So what that has resulted in is a reduced area of habitat removal or native vegetation removal of 13.2 hectares or 31%, so down from 43 hectares down to approximately 30 hectares of habitat removal. So significant amount of reduction in clearing through that process. Also a commitment to avoid the endangered ecological community that was present on the site and if you can just see, I don't know if you can see my cursor, but there's a little missing piece in the figure at the bottom where sort of right in the centre of the area and there's a little missing piece that's been cut out.

That's – if you see in the picture above, there's a little area of the subtropical coastal floodplain forest and it was agreed to not do any works in that are to protect that particular community. There was a significant driver also to protect the biodiversity corridor and the western part of the site and that's informed the western extent of the extraction area that was sort of agreed in the final footprint and I'll talk more about that in a slide or two. And one of the outcomes of this process has been that ultimately there'll be a retention of over 63 hectares of native vegetation on the site.

So there's a clearing of approximately 30 hectares but there's a commitment to retain more than 60 hectares and in that context, there's also a rehabilitation proposal to revegetate and rehabilitate more than 25 hectares of vegetation and that's visible in this plan in the northwestern part of the site, that sort of yellow hatching. And then there's some smaller areas on the western and southwestern parts of the site.

So the assessment has – there's sort of a few key aspects of the offset and mitigation strategy. So firstly there is a commitment to provide offset ecosystem credits for the clearing of vegetation but also species credits because the habitat that we're clearing is koala habitat. There is a commitment to establish a stewardship site on that portion of the site on the northwest corner, that sort of square that sits above the quarry. So that stewardship site includes vegetation that's being retained and protected as well as the revegetation area. And then there's a commitment to implement a vegetation management plan on those areas that are being retained outside of the quarry footprint.

In terms of koala specifically, Hanson engaged a koala expert, Biolink, and they

went out and did targeted surveys and vegetation mapping and koala feed tree mapping across the site and this just shows some of the areas that they focused on. The result of that assessment did identify an area of koala activity that's located quite close to the existing quarry footprint.

So as a result of that, Biolink made a set of recommendations which have all been accepted and adopted by Hanson in the final biodiversity assessment report. And that includes to implement a vegetation management plan, so as I've already mentioned, but it was also they establish revegetation standards for those revegetation areas in the western and northwestern parts of the site and that included revegetation with preferred koala feed trees, it specified a planting density and benchmarks for survival and use of those trees by koala.

A second key recommendation from Biolink was that the area of high koala activity that you can see there would be avoided during the first stage of the quarry expansion or until those revegetation standards were met in the revegetation areas. And that's expected to take approximately 10 years to get to that point for those revegetation standards to be met in terms of planning density survival and use by koala.

So the biodiversity sort of offset program for koala is both the retirement of the credits, as I mentioned, but also these onsite measures for the revegetation and the avoidance of the high koala activity areas in the short term.

In terms of the biodiversity corridors, so the figure on the right-hand side, I've really just put that there to show the context of the corridors that we're talking about. So the major regional biodiversity corridor in this area actually runs to the south of the site, south of Sancrox Road and that's connect the national park to the southwest up to an area of extensive vegetation that's up in the northeastern – sort of off the page there a little bit, up near the airport. So that's the primary corridor and what we're talking about really is a secondary corridor, subregional corridor that runs up through the site.

But as you can see in that photo there, that corridor sort of – it doesn't really go anywhere. North of the site, the corridor runs into either cleared pasture or to the extent that it moves off to the northeast, it hits cleared area but also the expanded Pacific Highway. So it doesn't perhaps have the same significance as the corridor to the south.

But notwithstanding that, the protection of a corridor through the site was of paramount importance during the assessment and was a key issue for BCD and as part of that process, there were both commitments made to reduce the western extent of the extraction area and that's informed the final extraction pit that you can see that's shown there in the figure to the left. But also a commitment to protect a minimum width of the corridor for different periods during the extraction process.

So whilst the cleared area west of the pit is being revegetated, there's a

commitment to keep a 250 metre wide remnant vegetation corridor between the cleared area, which would be revegetated straight away, but between that area and the edge of extraction for 10 years. So there's always going to be a corridor to the west of the pit until that revegetation occurs. So that's a commitment that came out of the Biolink recommendations and it was adopted by Hanson in the biodiversity assessment report and has been reflected in the draft recommended conditions of consent by the Department.

So just moving through some of the other issues mentioned in the agenda, in terms of sort of amenity generally and air quality and noise related issues, there were extensive air quality and noise studies done as part of the EIS and they were amended as part of the response to submissions process. The air quality assessment looked at both a typical day – a dust discharge, which was based on sort of just the average extraction rate, extraction average and delivery rate. But also looked at maximum day, so looked at sort of high peak intensity days, which were up to 2,600 tonnes of work in a day and that's sort of about a 60 or 70% increase on what would be a typical average day.

The air quality assessment showed that the air quality criteria were complied with under both typical day average activities but also a normal maximum day. The only time when there would be a possible exceedance of those criteria would be if there was a maximum day at the same time – that went for a 24 hour period. So it was one of those 20 days where the site worked for a 24 hour period. So that was sort of unlikely to coincide with the worst case meteorological conditions is sort of the outcome of that assessment and there's a commitment to implement a real time reactive management and air quality management plan to ensure that possible exceedance of air quality criteria doesn't happen, that the adverse meteorological conditions don't coincide with that double peak, as it were.

In terms of the noise assessment, the noise emissions are pretty similar to the current noise emissions and the noise impacts were shown to comply with the noise requirements under all the scenarios. There was a commitment to manage the noise – with the relocation of some of the noise processing to the south of the site created additional noise from the processing activities and there was a commitment to put a large noise bund along the southern side, on the south side of those processing activities and that would ensure noise doesn't exceed the noise criteria.

In terms of blasting noise, the major blasting issue was along the northern boundary of the site and Hanson sort of negotiated an agreed program for blasting in those areas during the early phases of the expansion. The area on the north of the site in that sort of L-shape corner, that's proposed to be developed for an industrial estate. It hasn't commenced yet, so there's an opportunity to undertake blasting there before there's sort of occupants there to create an issue.

In terms of water management, the site sits sort of on the boundary between two catchments and you can see those two catchments there. It's an existing quarry site, there's existing dams in the eastern part of the site and the proposal is to

essentially continue to use those existing onsite dams for the expanded quarry. A detailed groundwater model was prepared and was reviewed extensively by the Office of Water at the time.

The groundwater model was peer reviewed by an expert groundwater modelling company, Ren Consulting. They confirmed that the groundwater model was a class 1 model and could be relied upon for these sorts of assessments. The model confirmed that there was low hydraulic conductivity in the area and that there were minimal impacts to offsite groundwater users as a result of the extraction. There was a recommendation and a commitment to continue to refine the model as quarrying proceeded and to undertake ongoing refinement and monitoring to inform that.

And there's conditions of approval, recommended conditions from the Department around ensuring that if there are impacts to groundwater users, that they're managed appropriately. And we can confirm that there's sufficient water licences available for both the surface water and groundwater water that would be harvested onsite through seepage into the pit and that water would be reused on site as sort of dust suppression and in the processing activities.

In terms of the final landform, as you could see on the previous slide, the site does sit at the boundary of two – sort of at the high point across two catchments. So the pit will essentially sit at a high point in the landscape and will become like a lake. It will fill up with water eventually and will sit there fairly undisturbed. The void will be benched around the edges and those benches can be revegetated but where there will be sort of a mix of vegetated benches and water feature.

On the eastern parts of the site, the areas to the north and the east and the south are part of the Sancrox industrial estate, so the proposal is even at the completion of quarrying, that the concrete batching plant, the concrete recycling facility will continue to operate in the eastern part of the site and that the former processing areas would potentially become part of ongoing industrial activities, consistent with the surrounding area. But that's obviously beyond the life of the quarrying.

In terms of traffic and transport, look, the site is very close to the Pacific Highway and is well accessed from that point. There was a new – a relatively recent upgrade to the Pacific Highway in this area and there's a new interchange that's been put in place and the image there just shows that arrangement. The way it works for northbound vehicles, so either vehicles that are arriving from the south or departing to the north, they just do a left in and a left out at Sancrox Road.

For vehicles that are southbound, so either arriving from the north or departing to the south, they again do a left out or a left in on the eastern side of the highway at Fernbank Creek Road and then they have to access Sancrox Road via a sort of an interchange arrangement where they travel through a couple of roundabouts and to the south, crossover the Pacific Highway and then travel back up to the roundabout on Sancrox Road. And that arrangement is what's currently used to access the site and works well and the increased traffic that would be generated by

this proposal, all those roundabouts would still operate with an acceptable level of service.

And just to note there, there is a small amount of local road that the quarry vehicles would travel upon and Hanson's agreed a haulage levy with Council that would be applied for road maintenance purposes.

In terms of Aboriginal heritage, there's a potential scar tree located to the west of the extraction area but with the reduced extraction footprint, that will now be avoided and as work proceeds to the west, that area can be fenced off and protected, so there's no accidental damage to that tree. Hanson has committed to awareness training and using the Aboriginal groups to help inform training and awareness of Aboriginal items in the landscape and cultural sensitivity in the landscape and that would be standard for induction and training processes during works on site.

There was a former ceremonial site at the site, but that's previously been destroyed. But the significance of that will be recognised through interpretation or information within the quarry site office. And there's a – Hanson intends to local Indigenous land managers to help manage both the cultural aspects of the site, but also the biodiversity conservation on the site. So with the large areas of revegetation and rehabilitation, there's an opportunity to do that in a very integrated way with the Aboriginal land managers.

The last item on the agenda was whether we have any comments on the Department's assessment report and recommendations and I think really the main message here is that we're supportive of the Department's assessment report and the recommended conditions of approval. We have worked with the Department over the last three or four years to sort of get to this point and as part of that process, Hanson's made significant reductions and concessions over the extent of quarrying, the extraction rate and the mitigation measures that have been applied. So this is a recommendation that has been a long effort to achieve and we're supportive of those recommendations in terms of moving forward to an approval.

Yes, and just to say there, this outcome is really – it was a lot of work by Hanson to get to the point – this is essentially at the limit of what is economically feasible for the development of the quarry and we think it's a reasonable outcome in terms of minimising the environmental impact whilst also allowing the quarry to support that regional growth that I mentioned at the beginning. So on that, that's the end of my presentation. I'm happy to take any comments or questions and also offer for Andrew, if there's anything that I missed that he would like to add.

MS MILLIGAN: Okay. Thanks, Tim. So perhaps if we go to Andrew first. Andrew, anything you wanted to add to that before we have a discussion?

MR DRIVER: Yes, just a couple of things I picked up and I probably should've mentioned it before. Tim, on your slide, you talked about the blasting hours. I think on the slide you had 8 am to 5 pm. That was the original proposal on the EIS

but the conditions of consent, as recommended, are 9 am to 3 pm. So just a point of clarification on that one. Also, the noise bund to the south, it was protect a receiver labelled R13. Since the preparation of the EIS, Hanson has since acquired that receiver, so that bund is somewhat redundant but it still has some utility in separating the quarry from I guess the broader area.

Also, with the industrial area to the north, northeast, and you'll see this on your visit when you're up there I think week after next, the industrial area has already started commencing clearing of vegetation, so that's already progressing well and truly ahead, I think about half that area has already been cleared of vegetation.

And just on the final land form, yes, just a comment, like obviously if it's left untouched, it'll backfill with water but there are a number of opportunities to make use of that asset at the end of its quarrying life. Everything from potential hydro pump batteries and things like that have – you know, went around 30 years ago, but they're things that we've been approached on with our existing quarries a potential post-quarrying uses. So we didn't want to go into too much detail on what we would commit in the final landform other than that's what it would look like. If it suited no other purpose, then to be revegetated and allowed to fill with rainwater.

MS MILLIGAN: Okay. Thanks, Andrew. Look, just to start off, can I just ask a couple of questions and the first one's just a simple one. That comment you just made about the bund being pretty redundant, it's still part of the proposal even though the receiver has been – that site's been acquired by Hanson?

MR DRIVER: Yes, that's correct. In terms of its purpose for noise mitigation, that's now redundant. But it still serves some utility in terms of a visual screen and also providing a location to stockpile overburden and interburden and things like that.

MS MILLIGAN: Okay. Thank you. Can I ask a question about staging and maybe we can go to the slide, it was early in the pack, where you showed the reduced area surrounding the area of high koala activity and then you talked about maintaining a corridor to the left. I suppose with those two statements about at least a 10 year before you sort of come into the area to the right and then maintaining the corridor on the left, can you just stake us through the staging again and just be clear about the stages of the development, given that undertaking?

MR DRIVER: Tim, do you want to talk to that or you want me to talk to it?

MR WARD: I'm happy for you to do it if you're happy to.

MR DRIVER: Yes. Probably go to the slide that shows the offsets. I think it's the next one down, offset distances from the western boundary. Yes, that one there. Can you just zoom in on the left-hand picture?

MR WARD: Can you see that?

MR DRIVER: Yes, I can see that. Can you just pan down a little bit so we can just see the legend a little bit more? So effectively the staging working from east to west is to maintain that corridor, a minimum corridor width of 250 that reduces to 200. The 400 is there until we revegetate that western cleared paddock and then we don't come any further within that 400 metres until 10 years or that paddock has been fully revegetated. So that's the staging of the quarry and that's for the reason for those offsets, to maintain that corridor.

MS MILLIGAN: Thank you. And to the east of that, the area of high koala activity is also an avoidance. So am I thinking that the first part of any expansion would be at the north of the site, directly to the west of current activities?

MR DRIVER: That's correct.

MS MILLIGAN: And then you'd move west from there?

MR DRIVER: And then we'd move west.

MS MILLIGAN: Yes. All right. Thank you for that. Just a couple of other quick ones from me. You talked about the fact that you've come to an agreement with Council about haulage levy. Has there been any other agreement with Council about payments or levies?

MR DRIVER: No, it's just the road contributions that we've only had discussions with Council about.

MS MILLIGAN: Okay. Thank you. And I read in the application that for the existing project, you have a community consultative committee of some variety. So I was interested just to know what part, if any, have they played in getting you to the point that you're at at the moment?

MR DRIVER: The CCC is the CCC that's set up under the Department of Planning guidelines. It's not attached to the existing consent. It's part of this SSD process. I think we meet with the CCC on a biannual schedule and we talk through the progress of the DA application. They provide input and their thoughts on various matters. Most of it deals in relation to blasting and noise and obviously the koala. I think we had our last CCC meeting some time ago. We unfortunately haven't had one since. We tried to get one in before our IPC meeting next week but that wasn't possible to occur.

MS MILLIGAN: Okay. Thanks. And then just a last quick one from me. I was interested to note your intention to use Indigenous land managers for the site and I was just wondering have there been any discussions with the Indigenous organisations to date or is that still to come on that proposal, on that specific proposal to engage Indigenous land managers?

MR DRIVER: That's still to come on this particular project. We've got another

project that's further south near Newcastle that we're in the process of starting to do land management practices for a stewardship site which is on part of our property down there and there's a commitment, similar to Sancrox, where we're going to revegetate part of the cleared paddocks with koala habitat. So we're adopting Indigenous land managers for that purposes and we want to duplicate this at Sancrox as well.

MS MILLIGAN: Okay. Thank you for that. Look, at this point I might hand over – Terry, did you have any questions or comments?

MR BAILEY: I think we'll come to a bit of discussion with Michael in a minute more deeply potentially on koalas, there might be some follow up. But the other I did just want to cover off, perhaps something for Tim, the scar tree and the reference to the scar tree, potential scar tree, acknowledging that, do you understand what curtilage has been set aside around the scar tree and what advice has been taken in terms of the management of that site? I recognise there's a reduction in the boundary to the west but is there a curtilage that's been set?

MR WARD: I wouldn't be able to tell you off the top of my head what that is or if there is indeed a curtilage. The issue arose early on in the assessment because the original extraction footprint went quite close to that potential scar tree and there was an issue around exactly what you're talking about, how to set a curtilage and how to manage that potential for sort of inadvertent impact during works.

Because the western edge of the extraction pit's been pulled back now quite significantly far away from that tree, I think it's not sort of a likely impact anymore or a possible impact anymore. But we'd have to look at what the recommendation was. I can't tell you off the top of my head what the recommendation was in terms of the curtilage.

MS MILLIGAN: That's okay. I'm happy for you to take that on notice. We'll write you and just specifically ask for that information. Terry, is there anything else you'd like to know in that question on notice?

MR BAILEY: No, well it's just in those parts of what's the curtilage, who advised and how do we say that it's retained in situ?

MS MILLIGAN: Thank you.

MR BAILEY: And that in situ is beyond construction development impacts but maintained in situ in the long term, Tim.

MR WARD: Yes, understood.

MS MILLIGAN: Okay. Thanks, Terry. If that's it from you, Michael, can I go to you for questions or comments?

MR CHILCOTT: Thanks, Janett. Yes. My first question just relates to noise

matters. You outlined a couple of the measures that have been taken in relation to mitigating noise impacts through the construction of the bund wall and the hours for blasting. The Department has made mention that the applicant has taken reasonable and feasible measures to mitigate noise. Is that the extent of the noise mitigation measures to which those matters are – they've referred?

MR DRIVER: Michael, I think the biggest noise mitigation measure was reducing house or operation from 24/7 to 5 am to 10 pm. So it carves out that night time period, which was probably where we were going to have the most significant impact on nearby receivers.

MR CHILCOTT: Great, thank you. And just in relation to the noise bund to the south, in terms of the long-term landscaping outcomes, you mentioned that that serves some potential – had some utility in the near term to do with being a location to be able to put certain materials. Does any of the landform restoration works that are proposed post-operation contemplate the restoration of that area and the removal of the bund or is it proposed that the bund remains?

MR DRIVER: At this stage, Michael, it's proposed that the bund will remain and form part of the final formation.

MR CHILCOTT: Thank you. My final question is just in relation to the koalas, you've read the Department's assessment report that they've provided to us in relation to all aspects of the project and particularly the biodiversity, do you have any observations on the Department's assessment?

MR DRIVER: Tim, I might throw to you on that one first.

MR WARD: I have to admit, I haven't actually read the Department's assessment in terms of the koala, so I can talk to the extensive discussions that we had to get to this point but I can't give you an opinion on that at this point.

MR DRIVER: My opinion on the Department's assessment, I think the last three years we've spent in the process of working with BCD and the Department were largely a facilitator of that discussion with the Biodiversity Conservation Division, I think we've got to a point where on balance the protection of the koala habitat and also the individual species of koala that's on the site, I think we've struck a balance there and I think what the Department have proposed to the Planning Commission is a sensible position.

MR CHILCOTT: Thank you. I don't have anything else, Janett.

MS MILLIGAN: I'm having trouble unmuting.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: You're good now, Janett.

MR JAMES: Yes, we can hear you okay, Janett.

MS MILLIGAN: You can. Okay.

MR JAMES: Now.

MS MILLIGAN: My screen says that I'm muted. I'm sorry. Okay, thank you, Michael. Okay, I just had one last question and then I think maybe, Andrew, I'll ask you if you want to make any final comments, and it's just a specific question, where you talked about air quality, you talked about a situation where the worst case meteorological conditions might coincide with one of your night time shifts. What would happen? What capacity do you have to respond to that?

MR DRIVER: Sorry, Tim, can I just jump in before you as that and I just want to make a point that the background levels for this project and they're taken for a lot of projects, it was taken from the Wyong OEH air monitoring station, so we're using that background data and that background data had high elevated levels for the background.

So if you have a look at the incremental increase due to the actual quarry activity, they're not large at all. In fact, they're only a fraction of what the background was that was adopted from the Wyong station. So Tim can talk about the double hit that we get when we overlay the background with the meteorological and then the incremental of the operations but I just wanted to make that point.

MS MILLIGAN: Thank you. Tim?

MR WARD: Yes, look, there's the reactive management program, it sets a series of triggers or sort of trigger level in terms of dust emissions from the site but also particular meteorological conditions, like if you have strong northeasterly wind blowing dust towards the sensitive receivers. So with those triggers, it does trip activities on site to reduce the nature of activities or to increase watering to reduce dust emissions and at an extreme level, to actually reduce the extent of activity on site if needed. So the program sort of foresees that but further to Andrew's point, the likelihood of those things all coming together at the same time is pretty low.

MS MILLIGAN: Thank you. I think we've come to the end of our questions. So Andrew, would you like to make any concluding remarks before we finish this afternoon?

MR DRIVER: No. Just thanks for the opportunity to meet one on one with yourselves. I think the point that we continue to stress is there's obviously a need for this quarry. It's been operating within Hanson's hands since 1998. The quarry has served the purpose of providing construction materials for the Mid North Coast region to the point where it's on the verge of being exhausted and the demand's still there, if not, it's continuing to grow. That's why we're looking for not only expansion in the resource but also an increase in the annual production.

It's getting to the point where if this isn't approved with the IPC, then not only does Hanson have to find another alternative, the entire construction industry in

the Port Macquarie region is going to find itself in a great deal of difficulty, not just in the short term. This expansion's been going for the best part of six years. To start something from a greenfield, you're looking at eight to 10. So definitely not in a desirable position from a proponent's perspective but also for I guess the regional perspective as well.

MS MILLIGAN: All right. Thank you. Thank you to the whole team for speaking with us this afternoon. Thank you very much.

MR DRIVER: Thank you.

MR WARD: Thank you.

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED