



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

STONE RIDGE QUARRY PROJECT (SSD-10432)

COUNCIL MEETING

PANEL: JANETT MILLIGAN (CHAIR)
RICHARD PEARSON
TERRY BAILEY

OFFICE OF THE IPC: KENDALL CLYDSDALE
GEOFF KWOK

PORT STEPHENS
COUNCIL: RYAN FALKENMIRE
EMILY ALLEN
ISAAC LANCASTER

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 11:30AM – 12:15PM
TUESDAY, 5TH NOVEMBER 2024

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Morning.

5 **UNKNOWN SPEAKER:** Morning.

MR RYAN FALKENMIRE: Good morning, Commissioners.

MS JANETT MILLIGAN: Hello. Good morning.

10 **MR ISAAC LANCASTER:** Can you hear us okay?

MS MILLIGAN: We can hear you well and we can see you at the end of the table but [unintelligible 00:02:59]. You have other people joining?

15 **MR FALKENMIRE:** No, it's just us, Commissioners. I'll do introductions if you like to start with?

MS MILLIGAN: Okay. All right, so before we do that, let's get underway formally and I'd just like to make a short statement as we launch into the meeting. So let me do that first. So welcome. Before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Gadigal 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.

25 So welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Stone Ridge Quarry Project, which is state significant development 10432, which is currently before the Commission for determination. The applicant, Australian Resource Development Group Pty Ltd, is seeking approval to develop Stone Ridge Quarry, a new hard rock quarry to extract, process and transport up to 1.5 million tonnes per annum of hard rock material over a 30 year period in the Port Stephens local government area.

30 My name is Janett Milligan and I'm the chair of the Commission panel and I'm joined by my fellow commissioners, Richard Pearson and Terry Bailey. We're also joined by Kendall Clydsdale and Geoff Kwok from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. They're in the room with us.

35 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 it will form one of several sources of information upon which we will base its determination.

40 It's important for the Commission to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues where that's considered appropriate. So if you're asked a question and you're not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website.

I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure that they don't speak over the top of each other to ensure the accuracy of the transcript. So we'll now begin and may I first ask each member joining from Council to please introduce yourself and if applicable to provide a verbal declaration of any actual or potential personal interests that you may have in the project. That relates to if we have elected members with us. Thanks.

MR FALKENMIRE: Ryan Falkenmire, acting development and compliance manager. I have no conflict of interest in this proposal.

MS EMILY ALLEN: Emily Allen, acting planning coordinator. I have no conflict of interest in this matter.

MR LANCASTER: And Isaac Lancaster, acting senior development planner, I have no conflict of interest in this matter.

MS MILLIGAN: All right. So let's just look at the agenda and I thank you for those introductions. The first thing we have listed is an overview of the submission and it's an opportunity for you to make a statement or perhaps take us through the presentation, which I guess you will share but we also have it in front of us.

MR FALKENMIRE: Yes, thank you, Commissioner. Just there's a few apologies, so it'll just be the three of us attending today. Ash Bacales is our environmental planning team leader, who's an apology. Similar to mayor and councillors, they won't be in attendance although they may attend the public meeting next week. So it'll just be the three of us representing Council from a planning capacity this morning.

MR RICHARD PEARSON: Sure.

MR FALKENMIRE: Are we able to share the presentation? Would you prefer I share screen or are you happy to follow it on your hard copy?

MS MILLIGAN: Whatever's easiest for you. We do have a copy in front of us.

MR FALKENMIRE: Okay, well I'm happy – we've got another screen here, so I'm happy to speak to it from this screen here. So as a broad overview, we've completed introductions, I'll speak to Council's involvement in the project and speak to some key issues and then hand it over for any specific questions. Given we haven't got ecologist expertise here, we may need to take some on notice but I'll endeavour to provide an overview as best I can.

So Council's involvement to date, initially in March 2020 Council was requested for SEARs on the proposal. As part of that we reviewed a scoping report proposed for the Stone Ridge Quarry project prepared by Australian Resource Development Group, ARDG.

MS MILLIGAN: Can I just interrupt you for a minute? We're having a little trouble with fuzzy sound.

MR PEARSON: Kind of echoey, I suppose, but it might be the room you're in but maybe if you're just closer to a mic potentially.

5 **MR FALKENMIRE:** Is that better?

MR PEARSON: Yes. I think so.

MS MILLIGAN: Yes, I think it's going to be better.

10

MR FALKENMIRE: I've relocated. Did you hear any of that?

MS MILLIGAN: Would you mind starting again?

15

MR FALKENMIRE: No worries. So I'll give you the overview of Council's involvement to date. Initially Council was requested for SEARs comments in March 2020. Council reviewed the relevant document being the scoping proposal proposed by ARDG, Australian Resource Development Group.

20

As part of this review, Council's planning, engineering and ecologist staff provided a broad range of comments and requirements for the preparation of the EIS and this is included importantly ecological impact, Aboriginal heritage, bushfire safety, traffic, acoustic impacts, air quality, water quality, visual amenity and social and economic impacts. In addition, detailed ecological advice was provided to assist in preparing the biodiversity development assessment report.

25

Following the SEARs, Council was provided with an opportunity in June 2023 to review the EIS prepared by ARDG and Umwelt Consultants. As part of this review, Council identified various issues. Importantly, one of them being cumulative impact of the three quarries operating concurrently, which is the Eagleton Quarry, which has been recently approved, the proposed Stone Ridge Quarry and also the expansion of the Seaham Quarry, which is with Boral as the operator of that quarry. This was in terms of noise, traffic, dust generation and also broad impact to local biodiversity.

30

There was also a comprehensive review undertaken of the consultant's BDAR, prepared by Umwelt. The principal concerns related to avoidance of [unintelligible 00:10:14] importantly for the koala and insufficient survey effort for the Balickera Tunnel, impacts to [unintelligible 00:10:21] drawdown zones and then cumulative and prescribed impacts in terms of offset mitigation.

35

40

Comments were also provided in terms of community engagement. Council did receive a lot of comments from local community groups about inadequate community engagement and importantly to extend the exhibition period, which wasn't supported by the Department of Planning. We reconciled that as part of our submission on the EIS comments which was provided to the Department of Planning.

45

Following those comments, a specific meeting was requested by ARDG and their consultants to speak through Council's comments on the EIS. Two meetings were

held, one in November 2023 – sorry, correction, two in November 2023. One of them was specifically in relation to traffic. The comments were around impact to the Italia Road Pacific Highway connection. Council has been working through the safety implications of [unintelligible 00:11:22] road. Council’s aware it is quite a dangerous intersection. We are currently assessing an application to the Regional Planning Panel for an upgrade to that intersection.

Given that had not been at that time determined and is still not determined, Council’s advice was that the quarry should not commence operations until those intersection upgrades had been completed and that was the core genesis of that discussion around some other comments around modelling and the like. Those traffic comments were largely resolved from that meeting and we believe the Department’s assessment has addressed those sufficiently.

MS MILLIGAN: Could we just jump in with a question?

MR FALKENMIRE: Yes.

MS MILLIGAN: Do you mind if we ask questions as we go?

MR FALKENMIRE: No, no, not at all.

MS MILLIGAN: Okay. So the question about the DA to upgrade the –

MR PEARSON: Yes, so what is the status of that? Is it imminently going to the Regional Planning Panel? Can you just advise us on that?

MR FALKENMIRE: Yes, the assessment’s very well progressed, Commissioner. It was intended to go into November this year but there was a delay for water quality comments from Hunter Water. Given those are still being resolved with the applicant, it’s likely that will be reported to the Regional Planning Panel next year.

MR LANCASTER: December 3rd.

MR FALKENMIRE: Correction, sorry. December 3rd, later this year we have a tentative meeting date.

MR PEARSON: Yes, so 3 December, likely to go to the Regional Planning Panel. Did you say Hunter Water had some outstanding comments that you’re dealing with?

MR FALKENMIRE: Correct, yes. It was in relation to some works on the nearby channel and potential impacts to water quality. It required some additional modelling.

MR PEARSON: Okay, thank you.

MS MILLIGAN: Thank you. Sorry.

MR FALKENMIRE: We believe there will be determination at December at this

stage, albeit we can't provide any certainty, but there has been ongoing assessment briefings with the Regional Planning Panel, so they are very well aware of the impacts and strategic merit of the proposal.

5 **MR PEARSON:** And do you have any idea what the construction timeframe would be if and when it's approved?

10 **MR FALKENMIRE:** I don't. I do know that the proponent is Boral, so my understanding is [unintelligible 00:13:36] intersection upgrade, given it is a whole condition for the quarries. In terms of timing, I'd imagine it would be as quick as a road project could go through but 18 months at a guess, but that might be a question that would be better put to the proponent.

15 **MR PEARSON:** Sure. Okay, thank you.

20 **MR FALKENMIRE:** So following the traffic meeting, November 2023, a further meeting was held between Umwelt, ARDG and Council's planning staff and ecologist. Our ecologist discussed the extent of impact, including the project area and concerns raised with the EIS and the BDAR. The main concerns were around noise and vibration impact to the microbats around the nearby tunnel but also the extent of impact for local species, most notably the koala. There was a view that further avoidance would be required to address the impact on the local biodiversity species.

25 The meeting was fairly high level. We did speak to some extent on the comments but it was only a short meeting. We did not receive any other comments or conclusion on our input beyond that meeting. So it went from that meeting and then it went to the submissions report, so we didn't have any further consultation with ARDG or Umwelt.

30 Following from that, Council was requested in April 2024 to review the submissions report, which was sent to the Department of Planning by ARDG and their supporting consultants. The ecology issues remain unresolved in the opinion of Council staff, importantly to the long-term impacts to threatened and vulnerable species including the koala, brush-tailed phascogale, squirrel glider and other PCTs. The recommendation was still a reduction in the impact area. Those comments were provided to the
35 Department of Planning.

40 From then Council was requested to review draft comments on the conditions of consent which was in August 2024 this year. Council did provide a report outlining there remains a concern on the ecological items but did provide some comments on the conditions of consent if the IPC were to support it and this related to the condition relating to the biodiversity stewardship agreement, some other mitigation type conditions which I believe you should have been provided. And also specific conditions on how to manage traffic, including staging and hold points at the intersection upgrade and the inclusion of GPS tracking as part of the management plan.
45 That really concludes our involvement to date on the project.

MS MILLIGAN: Okay. Thank you for that. So shall we start with the ecology? Terry, did you want to start [unintelligible 00:16:50].

MR TERRY BAILEY: Yes, so just thanks for your presentation and for your time. Just impacts on fauna and flora, I'll start with the fauna and I'm noting your letter from 2 May where there's a reference to – and as you've pointed out, koalas, squirrels, phascogales in particular. I just wanted to check to see in the comprehensive koala plan of management for Port Macquarie, just to get a sense, the proponent points to 95% being marginal habitat and it was just to do a clarification on have you reviewed that and would you agree or disagree around the proponent's view that 95% of the area is actually marginal habitat for koala in the KPOM?

MS MILLIGAN: So can I just clarify, I think you might've said Port Macquarie [unintelligible 00:17:54] Port Stephens.

MR BAILEY: Sorry, I'm doing a few different things. I meant Port Stephens. Apologies.

MR FALKENMIRE: No worries, Commissioner, I understood the intent. So our Port Stephens comprehensive koala plan of management, it is our critical framework for assessing impact. It has legislative weight under the now Biodiversity SEPP. Through observations of the Umwelt response on behalf of ARDG and also the Department's assessment, we have a different approach. We know the mapping is very old, it is over 20 years old and when we're assessing local development applications, we use the mapping as a broad guide, more as a trigger to look at a more detailed assessment.

So we more relied on ground truthing, plot data, observations of plant community types to see what koala feed tree species are within a particular impact area. We don't rely our assessment on percentage impact based on that mapping because we know it is old. We then rely upon appendix 4 of our comprehensive koala plan of management, which provides a really detailed framework, similar to the mitigation hierarchy in the Biosecurity Conservation Act, the first step being minimising impact to preferred koala habitat and then the mitigation measures.

The observation from my perspective of the assessment is it does largely rely upon a percentage or a quantitative assessment of the mapping. We would have a different approach in terms of relying upon, as I said, ground truthing and trying to identify the plant community types there, relying upon surveys, whether it be through scat dogs or spotlighting or the like. So Council's approach is different.

MR BAILEY: Yes, I'm curious on how that approach though lines up with the KPOM as it stands, which is the instrument that's created and the claim that it's 95% marginal koala habitat, where I think you've just referred to preferred habitat.

MR FALKENMIRE: So they've relied upon the mapping that we have. We know the mapping is old. So normally we rely on the surveys rather than doing assessment in a quantitative sense against the mapping. That's how Council approaches assessments of local development against that CKPOM. We wouldn't have done a similar approach to how the Department and Umwelt have done it.

5 So in terms of whether or not that percentage is accurate in terms of the mapping, that could be correct. I can't provide comment on that. I didn't undertake that assessment and I don't know the survey effort, I don't know the accuracy of the mapping in that area. It could be accurate, it may not be. I guess that's the message, we just know it's very archaic.

MR BAILEY: So a question on that is Council's comfort with the survey effort is part of the approval of the project?

10 **MR FALKENMIRE:** I believe so. I'd have to take that on notice and speak to our environmental planning team leader. I didn't see any concerns with the survey effort, more in terms of the impact area.

15 **MR BAILEY:** That'd be good if you could just – we'll take that. Can I move to the second part of the vegetation piece and I've got a curiosity because your letter of May refers to the vegetation community around the subtropical coastal floodplains and that we know that there are endangered ecological communities on the site. We know – I don't know if you've got a vegetation map in front of you but just to give you a sense, there is the plant community type in the kind of southern end of the project that is a significant plant community type. It's 762 from memory, the plant community type.

20 So I'm curious to know with that correspondence about impacts on there because we've heard from the proponent today that you've also given direction that the access to the site, to the quarry, should be through that plant community type which will further – runs a risk of fragmentation and impact and loss of that. So I'm curious to know your view on why the entrance to the site is through that plant community type and did you give that direction.

25 **MR FALKENMIRE:** So just to clarify, Commissioner, the view of ARDG was that Council gave a direction of where to locate the site access and it was through PCT762 if that's the correct PCT?

30 **MR PEARSON:** Yes, so essentially they –

35 **MS MILLIGAN:** Sorry, keep going.

MR PEARSON: Well, I think just to clarify, they said the access had to be opposite the Boral access and that was a requirement of Council.

40 **MR LANCASTER:** No, that was never I suppose explicitly confirmed by Council in my involvement of the project.

45 **MR FALKENMIRE:** Yes, I'm unaware of that. We may need to take that on notice and go back through that and there could've been some more informal discussions but it's not something that initially comes to mind. We can take that on notice further.

MR LANCASTER: My understanding, Commissioners, is there was an objective to avoid the koala corridor that runs I suppose further up from that proposed access via

the [unintelligible 00:23:39] trail into the quarry site and then avoiding the impacts to the Balickera Canal crossing. I think that was potentially where we've directed the proponent to sort of locate that access trail in a certain location to avoid those areas of outstanding biodiversity.

5

MS MILLIGAN: Thank you. We'll write to clarify that.

MR LANCASTER: Yes.

10

MS MILLIGAN: The applicant explained to us they had understood that it was Council's position that there should be only one access point for the quarries along Italia Road. So it was Council's preferred position that the access point coincide with the Boral access on to Italia Road. So in fact there were not two quarry access points on Italia within a short period of each other. That's as they understood Council's preferred position. So we'd be interested in having that clarified.

15

MR FALKENMIRE: Yes, Commissioner. We can confirm the exact advice given on that to make sure that that is accurate, definitely.

20

MS MILLIGAN: I suppose we could ask you at this point do you have a view on where the access point to the quarry is?

25

MR FALKENMIRE: There is logic to the advice given from ARDG on that, knowing that there is expanding quarries in the area. But I would need to look at – they would've looked at it from a structure specification and design perspective as to the most logical place to put these access points to mitigate impact on Italia Road. So I would have to just take that one on notice again.

30

MS MILLIGAN: Thank you. So biodiversity questions?

MR BAILEY: I think that covers critical parts.

MS MILLIGAN: Okay.

35

MR PEARSON: Yes, I mean just on biodiversity, you have a footprint that you believe should be the footprint of the project, which is different to what is being proposed but did you want to just talk to that? My understanding is they dropped about 10 hectares from the EIS to the current situation but that Council still thought there should be a further reduction in the quarry footprint. Am I correct in that?

40

45

MR FALKENMIRE: Yes, we wouldn't have put numerical figures to it. It is a bit of a challenging [unintelligible 00:26:07] avoidance. Ecology is difficult to quantitate. We didn't put exact numbers. It would've just been to satisfy avoidance on the koala and those local species to an extent there wouldn't have been significant impacts. The view we had with the advice we had from our ecologist team was that there were significant impacts that should be reduced but wouldn't have got an exact footprint, so I wouldn't be able to say to you, Commissioner, 10 hectares addresses the matter for us.

MR PEARSON: Okay, so based on your ecological advice from within Council, you consider that further reduction of footprint is necessary to conserve the values, is that essentially encapsulating where you're at at the moment?

5

MR FALKENMIRE: Correct. And more in a broad cumulative sense, this is speaking specifically to the koala and that cumulative impact piece. We know we have the Eagleton Quarry approved, we have the Seaham expansion proposed and the ARDG quarry to the north. We also have a larger release area to the south known as Kings Hill. That's an identified area, identified for residential development. In that Balickera area, that is an important connectivity for the broader koala population.

10

There was some concern around interactive impacts on the Balickera Tunnel and that north-south connectivity and that really relates to if ARDG approval was granted and the potential expansion of the Seaham Quarry. Now, I appreciate that that is not before the Commission now but for Council, it is considering that broader north-south connectivity, we have an urban release area to the south and then three potential quarry operations operating concurrently and what impact that would have to that north-south connectivity.

15

20

MS MILLIGAN: Anything more on traffic?

MR PEARSON: No, I mean other than is Council satisfied with the left in, left out – that seemed to be, yes.

25

MR FALKENMIRE: Yes, correct. So Council is concerned with the right-hand turn and if it's southbound on Pacific Highway from Italia Road, that has been a long-term view of council that that right-hand turn is dangerous and that the movement should be left in, left out with relying on the Tarean Road turnaround point to the north at Karuah. So we are satisfied with traffic subject to the intersection upgrade being completed prior to the quarry operations commencing.

30

MR PEARSON: Thank you.

35

MR FALKENMIRE: And if possible, the amendment to I think it's condition 35, which was not taken up by the Department, was to include a requirement for GPS tracking to ensure trucks are adhering to the approved transport routes.

MR PEARSON: Okay, that's interesting. What would you see what would be done with that GPS tracking? Are you saying it should be uploaded somewhere?

40

MR FALKENMIRE: It's more of a compliance [unintelligible 00:29:12] it'd only be if we require it. If we have complaints from the community or we're being made aware of non-conformance with that transport route, we would request that GPS tracking.

45

MR PEARSON: Okay.

MR FALKENMIRE: Our experience with Boral on a [unintelligible 00:29:25] they

do have a quite sophisticated program to track their truck movement anyway. So it seems like they already have those measures in place but it would be, from Council's perspective, is compliance and if community complaints do come to us in the first instance, then I'd imagine it will be [unintelligible 00:29:43] us to adhere to that. If we don't have a tracking [unintelligible 00:29:46] it's very difficult for us to monitor that and we just don't have the capacity to have rangers out on that [unintelligible 00:29:55] monitoring numbers and –

MR PEARSON: Okay, thank you for that.

MS MILLIGAN: So you began to talk about cumulative impacts and I notice that that's the next on your list of key issues. Did you want to say more about cumulative impacts?

MR FALKENMIRE: Sure. It's probably we've touched on biodiversity enough. I would say that it was more of an observation rather than concern from Council and this speaks to some of the community concerns as well and that's more noise, dust generation with potentially having three quarries operating concurrently. We don't have a skillset in house to review air quality and noise and vibration impacts. We would largely rely upon the EP&A and the conditions of the environmental protection licence and also the assessment being quite robust. So that's more just a comment for the panel to please be mindful of as part of considering this determination.

MS MILLIGAN: And community consultation is your next listed issue.

MR FALKENMIRE: Again, more of a comment and an observation that there was feedback from the community that the consultation was inadequate. I understand the Department has fairly rigid timeframes which I do believe they adhered to but there was a request to extend the EIS review period, which was denied. That is up to the Department, completely within their process to do that but it is just a comment we feel we need to make that the community may feel as though the consultation wasn't robust and more likely than not, these are the comments that will be received from the Commission at the public meeting next week.

MS MILLIGAN: So are you able to sort of give us a sense of where Council thinks the community is or what Council has heard or is hearing from community?

MR FALKENMIRE: In two words, strong opposition. We went through this with another quarry in [unintelligible 00:31:54] Hill. We obviously went through all the Eagleton, there was fairly strong opposition. Council staff's perspective is we don't overtly object to SSD proposals, we provide comments as requested. So we weren't form a point of view of oppose or support, as I said. As we've said in our submissions, we always provide a matter of fact, whereas the community sentiment, which we've said is fairly strong opposition. There may be some elements of the community that do support it, but they have not come through to the staff or the elected Council, as far as I'm aware.

MR PEARSON: Do you have any view on how the community consultative

committee is working for the project?

5 **MR FALKENMIRE:** I think – again, I haven’t sat in those meetings but I think the initial ones, there was some effectiveness, I believe. I believe ARDG, elected councillors and community members did have early meetings and I think it was a good opportunity, a good platform to provide information on the proposal. I’m not sure the last time that consultative committee met though.

10 **MR PEARSON:** I think it’s about to meet this week.

MR FALKENMIRE: Okay.

MR PEARSON: Tomorrow actually we were told by the applicant, they’re meeting.

15 **MR FALKENMIRE:** Okay.

MR PEARSON: Yes. But I think –

20 **MR FALKENMIRE:** I think it has been effective, so I’ll say that.

MR PEARSON: Okay. Thank you.

25 **MS MILLIGAN:** Okay. And on your agenda you have listed – in your presentation you’d listed conditions.

30 **MR FALKENMIRE:** Yes, and I believe you would have our last submission, which we spoke about that and that was just if you have any questions on Council’s recommended conditions and that was around the GPS tracking, the amendment to the condition requiring intersection at Italia Road and Pacific Highway to be upgraded and also some ecological based conditions, which Council recommended, which included the remaining residual lands to be managed through a conservation agreement.

MR PEARSON: Have we received a copy of this document?

35 **MR BAILEY:** What’s it dated?

MR FALKENMIRE: Dated 14 August 2024.

40 **MR PEARSON:** And this was correspondence with the Department regarding the draft conditions. That’s not a document I’ve seen.

45 **MR FALKENMIRE:** Yes, so we were asked to provide comment on the draft conditions on 2 August. We provided those on the 14th. It’s noted that I don’t believe any of the conditions that we recommended have been included in the recommended conditions before the Commission. So we would ask for the Commission to review that submission from Council and consider those conditions.

MR PEARSON: Would that be something you maybe provide that as part of the

submissions process that we're in now, if you were to make that as a submission to the IPC in terms of changes you'd like to see to the consent? We need to get it into the public domain, I think, if the Commission is going to have to regard to it.

5 **MR KENDALL CLYDSDALE:** It's not on the major projects website.

MR PEARSON: Yes, because it's effectively internal consultation with the Department, I guess, but if you wanted to make a submission to the IPC, saying you'd like to see these changes to the conditions, it's obviously something we could consider.

10

MR FALKENMIRE: So just for Council's understanding, Commissioner, of the process, so we [unintelligible 00:35:23] the Department, that informs our assessment, but you're saying beyond that submission to the Department, we could write a separate submission to the IPC –

15

MR PEARSON: Yes, submissions on this project are open at the moment to the IPC and I'm not sure of the closing date, Kendall or Geoff?

MR CLYDSDALE: It's 21 November.

20

MR PEARSON: 21 November. So you could make that submission in relation to the conditions that you want to see amended. That would enable us to [unintelligible 00:35:57] that document in front of us and consider it as part of our determination process.

25

MR FALKENMIRE: No, thanks, Commissioner. I will seek executive direction on that but I suspect we will provide some recommendations on those conditions.

MR PEARSON: Great. Thank you.

30

MS MILLIGAN: Okay. Thank you. So having worked our way through your presentation, I'm just coming back to the agenda and we've dealt with most of the issues listed but there are a couple of things still to go. So the heading I'm looking at is "Social and economic issues." Is it possible for you just to summarise Council's position on the topic of social and economic impacts and I suppose the balance between the two and what Council's view of that balance is.

35

MR FALKENMIRE: So social and economic benefits of the proposal versus the adverse impacts [unintelligible 00:36:51].

40

MS MILLIGAN: Yes, just social and economic issues, benefits, positive impacts, negative, where does Council feel the balance sits?

MR FALKENMIRE: I'm speaking anecdotally on behalf of Council's planning staff, not the broad community, I just think it's important to predicate that. But in terms of –

45

MS MILLIGAN: Okay, so before you state, so your answer is on the public record, so if you're wanting to answer, that's fine, but it's sometimes helpful for us to understand

the thinking that Council has been through to weigh up some of those issues and if there's anything useful you would like to say to us, we'd be very happy to have that.

5 **MR FALKENMIRE:** Absolutely. Of course with any quarry project, there is an economic benefit in terms of providing additional resource for major infrastructure projects in the local and broader state. We certainly do accept that. Also the importance of ongoing local jobs through the construction and operational phase. In terms of the adverse impacts, it's speaking to those issues that we've already addressed in terms of localised impacts in terms of air quality, noise, dust emissions and the like.
10 The better test of those impacts, I believe, is the community view as opposed to that of Council's planning staff. So I'll probably leave it on that note.

15 **MS MILLIGAN:** Okay. All right, that's great. Noise and blasting, do we have any residual questions or concerns on noise and blasting?

MR PEARSON: No, only I guess the cumulative impact issue is the need for the quarries to coordinate blasting and I think they've committed to a protocol on that. They estimate maybe a couple of blasts a month, so it's not every day for sure. But I think some coordination on that issue would be important. Do you have any comments
20 on blasting or other noise impacts?

MR FALKENMIRE: Not beyond a coordination between the three to manage those cumulative impacts. I think that approach is reasonable if it is adhered between the three quarry operations.
25

MS MILLIGAN: And we understand that you've had a conversation with the applicant about development contributions and is there anything you wanted to say to us about that? We understand that that's in hand.

30 **MR FALKENMIRE:** We adopt the rate from our local infrastructure contributions plan. That information would've been provided to the applicant in terms of our haulage rates and that's with a standard condition imposed that we do with those, it is a standard rate. So there's probably not much detail to provide beyond that. If it is changed, it is through our update to our infrastructure contributions plan, which will be
35 through the elected council.

MS MILLIGAN: Okay, thank you. All right. So that brings us to any other matters. Is there anything Council would like to say to us before we finish?

40 **MR FALKENMIRE:** No, I think we've had a good opportunity and platform to provide an overview of our involvement with the project. It's probably a point of procedural clarification. We will come back to you on the survey effort and comment on the access location impact on the PCT. Who is the best point of contact for us to provide that information?
45

MS MILLIGAN: So we actually will write to you and pick up those points that we've talked about today where you wanted to come back with further information. So that'll make it really clear what exactly we're asking and it will give you the process for

responding. That request and that response would also be made public through our website.

5 **MR FALKENMIRE:** I understand. Thank you.

10 **MR BAILEY:** Just to give you the heads up before the letter arrives, just to remember that the actual PCT is recognised, the cabbage gum is recognised as one of the preferred habitats of koalas. So that question of yours on where you should or shouldn't base on koalas is recognising in OEH guidance from 2019. It's got to be the top 10 for trees in northern New South Wales in that PCT. So there is a strong koala connection to that as well.

15 **MS MILLIGAN:** Okay. So we'll ask you some clarifying questions when we write to you.

20 **MR FALKENMIRE:** No, thank you, and the only other point of clarification is the submission, which will be specifically the conditions. I imagine we'll provide that separate to those points of clarification. That will be a submission to the IPC recommending some modification to those conditions.

25 **MR CLYDSDALE:** Yes, Ryan, I'm off screen. Kendall here from the Office of the Commission, there's a link on our website where you can make written submissions and there's an opportunity for you to update – sorry, to upload any attachments. So that's the best way to do it, as a separate document.

30 **MR FALKENMIRE:** Okay, thank you.

35 **MS MILLIGAN:** All right. So let me just ask the panel, are there any other questions for Council? You're good?

40 **MR PEARSON:** No, I'm good.

45 **MS MILLIGAN:** So Ryan, thank you, and team, thank you very much. That was a really useful conversation and thank you very much for making yourselves available.

50 **MR FALKENMIRE:** Thank you, Commission. We'll be in touch on those other items and all the best for the decision and the next steps.

55 **MS MILLIGAN:** Thank you.

60 **MR PEARSON:** Thank you. Thanks for your input.

65 **MR BAILEY:** Thank you.

70 **MR FALKENMIRE:** Bye.

75 **MR PEARSON:** See you.

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED