

J.J. & C.B. Dunn
c/o Locked Bag 7
WAUCHOPE NSW 2446

11 December 2019

Attention: Ms. Melissa Anderson
Major Projects
NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

By email: melissa.anderson@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Ms. Anderson,

RE: Hanson Sancrox Quarry SSD Application No. 7293

We have no objection to the continued use of the quarry and an expansion of the quarry in appropriate circumstances, in an appropriate scale, design, with a reasonable contribution to the broader community and without impacts on neighbouring properties or the environment.

Whilst we have lived adjacent to the existing quarry for over 30 years, we have development approval for an industrial subdivision on our property and the DA process involved a long and detailed engagement with Hanson Quarry over a number of years.

This process resulted in a tripartite voluntary planning agreement (VPA) between the neighbours and Port Macquarie Hastings Council. This VPA is attached at "A".

Additionally, in the justification of our industrial development, we were required to complete a process where assessment of the existing quarry air quality, noise and fly rock was calculated in detail and the SKM/Terrock report in that regard is attached at "B".

As discussed further in this submission the SKM/Terrock report calculated an appropriate buffer for flyrock at 90m and the industrial development along the boundary of the existing pit is deferred until 1 July 2020 as agreed by the parties to the VPA.

That said we are very disappointed with the proposal on exhibition and we are compelled to provide this submission given what we believe is a fundamentally flawed design that adversely affects our property and our development approval already in place.

Additionally, we are quite disappointed with the lack of detailed engagement by Hanson and their consultants and the first time we saw the proposal's detail was when it was put on exhibition.

Given the history as neighbours we would have preferred a more open and engaging process with us, however, Hanson has chosen not to proceed in that manner with regard to this application.

We have no issue with Hanson's local staff, and we try to engage with them as good neighbours should do, however, we feel that at a corporate level Hanson do not act in a positive way for our local community and the local staff are somewhat 'stuck in the middle' in this situation.

Accordingly, we wish to make the following submission on the proposed Hanson Sancrox Quarry expansion SSD No. 7293 documentation:

Volume

The temporary 5-year increase to 455,000 tonnes, essentially for the Pacific Highway upgrade, ended on 14 March 2019.

As such the current approval is for an extraction of 185,000 tonnes per annum and the inference in the documentation that the current approved rate is 455,000 tonnes is disingenuous and inaccurate.

The justification to increase the demand and the output of Sancrox Quarry by 4 times to go to 750,000 tonnes per annum is not clear. If the demand and output is not there, then the scale of the proposal and the need to go to a 24hr operation is not there.

We submit that the scale of the proposal is not justified by the exhibited documentation and there is scant to no analysis of local supply and demand.

Noise

The exhibited noise modelling provided does not provide noise level contour diagrams and it is not clear how noise will be received by neighbouring properties.

We hear the existing crushing plant at our house, but having lived with that for 30 years, we accept that level of noise during the current hours of operation which are during daylight hours.

We could not accept nor be expected to accept the same sort of noise 24 hours a day. This would be an impost on our home and the application does not adequately substantiate how our house might be affected by night-time noise with the proposed development.

With the scale of the excavation proposed and timeframe (30 years) of the development we would have expected a noise/screen bund along the entire boundary with our property and in fact with all neighbouring properties, in order to appropriately to deal with this issue.

Blasting

We are very disappointed that there is no detailed flyrock assessment within the exhibited documentation. There is a comment that the blasting will comply with AS2187-2006 however there is no detail as to how that will occur.

The detailed assessment undertaken by SKM/Terrock for our industrial development application is more pertinent than any of the information contained within the exhibited documentation and that should be an embarrassment to Hanson and their consultants, especially given the proposed scale of the quarry expansion.

We submit that a detailed flyrock assessment for the proposed Sancrox quarry expansion be carried out by Hanson which reflects the detail of the expansion project.

More importantly, the proposal does not provide any flyrock buffers and these must be contained within quarry property. The SKM/Terrock report calculated a 90m buffer for flyrock and accordingly any proposed blasting should be at least 90 metres from the Southern boundary of our property and the proposal should be modified accordingly.

Our property has experienced flyrock in the past (see recent photos attached at "C") and that is part of the reason why development along our Southern boundary is deferred in accordance with the VPA. That said, exporting flyrock onto the neighbour's property is in effect a cost shifting onto someone else's property and that is not appropriate nor acceptable to us.

We submit that all buffers for flyrock be contained within the Hanson property. In accordance with the SKM/Terrock report, we submit that any blasting be at least 90m from our property boundary.

Air Quality & Dust

There appears to be no modelling of air quality for the current and proposed quarry and its equipment and the SKM/Terrock report again would be more detailed in this regard.

We experience dust at our home and similar to the noise we experience, we've come to deal with it over the last 30 years.

That said, the existing crushing plant and any new crushing plant could be contained in order to mitigate dust export to neighbouring properties.

We submit that any crushing plant be made to be fully contained in order to mitigate dust.

Hydrology

This is one issue that has caused us a lot of grief over the years. The existing 'sales floor' or area that stores the crushed rock at the quarry has been artificially filled over a number of years.

It is now some 5 metres above existing ground levels and depending on the prevailing weather/rain, we get large volumes of stormwater runoff that goes for days and weeks after large rain events.

The VPA in place has a mechanism to provide for a solution to the issue, however, there has been no detailed engagement by Hanson with respect to this issue and no attempt by their consultants to finalise an agreed outcome as part of this development application. We expected Hanson to engage with us on this issue as part of this application and we submit that this issue be dealt with now.

Attached at "D" is a section completed by our consultants King & Campbell showing how the run-off issue has been created over time.

Attached at "E" are photos of the stormwater runoff issues on our property. These photos show the water issues despite the recent and prolonged drought conditions we have experienced.

There is vague reference to a 'spring' in the hydrology material exhibited but this is an embarrassing assessment of what is a manmade issue created over a number of years. A site inspection and an explanation as to how this has developed over the years would easily clarify the issue.

We submit that there be engagement with us to resolve an agreed outcome regarding this stormwater issue on our property as part of this DA assessment.

Groundwater

The groundwater modelling figure 8.4 is a real concern.

This indicates significant drawdown on our property (up to 40m from the contours provided) and especially in areas that are to be dedicated to Council as E2 habitat.

What is also a concern is how the groundwater drawdown will affect our residence, dam and orchard.

It might seem like a minor issue in the context of a proposal like this, but we are concerned about how the change in groundwater may affect our property in the longer term.

How is this order of groundwater drawdown justified on neighbouring properties? We do not understand how this extent of groundwater drawdown can be either justified or simply forced onto neighbouring properties? How is this to be offset?

Visual Amenity

The visual assessment is poorly done and the photographs and visibility model provided in the EIS documentation are not a true reflection of the existing quarry operation.

Some of the photos are of vegetation not actually on the quarry property and are put forward as the quarry's screen which is disingenuous.

There is no coordinated assessment of how the quarry and the quarry's new plant will look when already approved development proceeds to the North, East and South of the quarry.

Attached at "F" are recent photos taken of the existing quarry operations from our property and from Winery Drive.

There appears to be an expectation with the way the proposal is formulated that a visual screen ought to be provided on neighbouring properties and this is unacceptable to us and ought to be unacceptable to the assessor of the application.

We submit that a decent and permanent visual screen be provided along the whole of the Northern boundary of the quarry so that as our development (as already approved) proceeds and the quarry expansion occurs that the quarry operations are appropriately screened within its own property boundaries.

Social & Economic

There are no developer contributions proposed in the application.

For the industrial development approved under Port Macquarie Hastings DA #2012/305 substantial contributions towards the Sancrox overpass arrangement and local roads were made and the total land and cash contribution was in the order of \$4.5M.

For a development of this scale it would be expected to see a substantial contribution to local roads and local road maintenance and this should be assessed by Port Macquarie Hastings Council. For example 750,000 tonnes is approximately 18,750 dog and trailer truck movements per annum if you assume 40 tonnes per truck and trailer movement.

There is limited to no discussion or consideration of the Council's Urban Growth Management Strategy or the future urban investigation area of Fernbank Creek and Sancrox. Quarried rock is important to our local area, however, with a range of quarries in the LGA, protecting the future growth areas is a significant consideration in the assessment of the application and there appears to have been little coordination with Port Macquarie Hastings Council in this regard.

The Ethos Urban 2019 report says: *"The quarry site is remote and rural with no social infrastructure within walking distance of the site that would be affected by the expansion of quarry operations"*. The quarry is effectively in the centre of our LGA and our future growth areas and there needs to be a balance as to the scale of the proposal and its potential impacts on surrounding properties and their future. Additionally the Ethos report ignores the potential impacts of dust, noise, flyrock, runoff and vibration on the surrounding properties.

We submit that a significant contribution be made to Port Macquarie Hastings Council and that this be negotiated by the Council directly.

Quarry Closure & Rehabilitation

There is a lack of detail about how the quarry will be rehabilitated or for what use the massive hole in the ground will be utilised. As proposed the hole is approximately 500 metres wide, around 1 kilometre long and to a depth of RL-40, it is difficult to see how no rehabilitation plan can be acceptable.

We submit that a final use/rehabilitation plan be provided now.

Property Title Issues

We own Lot 1 DP 1144490. The proposal, in various diagrams/drawings, indicates that the proposed development of the quarry carries over the boundary and onto our land.

This is another indication of the lack of care and detail by the consultants acting for Hanson.

How can a proposal actually suggest that the development occurs on a neighbour's property?

For example see attached at "G" is a marked-up Proposed Study Area – Figure 5.1 and a marked up Quarry Staging – Figure 2.3. Both these figures clearly indicate excavation on our property.

This is obviously unacceptable and requires amendment.

Further to the comments made above regarding flyrock, we would expect any excavation is well away from our boundary and approximately 90 metres away unless no blasting is required.

Corridor Plans – SLR Assessment

The connectivity plans or corridor plans (marked-up copies attached at "H") created by SLR show a distinct lack of understanding of what is already approved and what is reality on neighbouring properties.

There is no long-term ability for a corridor through the middle of our industrial subdivision. This needs revision.

There is no ability for a corridor on Expressway Spares property and that would be obvious by the approvals in place and what is 'on the ground' at the moment.

There appears to be no coordination with the Greater Sancrox ecological work previously undertaken by Council and the Greater Sancrox work better deals with issues of corridors.

Consultation

As noted at the start of this application, we have been disappointed by the lack of direct and detailed engagement by Hanson with us regarding all of the neighbourly issues raised above.

The documentation and proposal exhibited is so poor in terms of detail, in our view any revised proposal should be made to be put back on exhibition for public consultation and comment.

Current Operations

The quarry has not met existing consent conditions with respect to establishing and maintaining a vegetated screen along its Northern and Eastern boundaries.

None of the existing quarry boundaries have any safety fencing.

The stormwater issue that has been raised by us over a long period of time has been ignored in this application.

The 'exporting' of flyrock risk onto neighbouring properties in the past appears to have been continued with this application. This is patently unacceptable and no approval can allow this.

We will continue to work with the local staff, however, given the history and the nature of this application we have limited confidence in Hanson as an organisation meeting an acceptable standard of development with respect to this proposal.

The scale of the proposal is such that we would have expected that a number of these issues were dealt with up front and we are frankly disappointed to have to lodge a submission of this nature.

Conclusion

We submit that the application is deficient in terms of detail and the scale of the proposal exceeds any local demand and the expansion design and scale has a significant impact on neighbouring properties which must be refused or must be addressed in a revised proposal.

Attached at "I" is a series of plan and sections indicating the issues of flyrock buffer and screen and how we suggest they be addressed.

We recommend a site visit by Department of Planning staff to clearly understand the issues we have raised. We can be contacted at casunn@bigpond.net.au if need be.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Jim Dunn', followed by the date '11/12/19' also in blue ink.

Jim Dunn for and on behalf of
J.J. & C.B. Dunn