

## Sancrox Quarry Expansion

### Summary of Issues Raised in Submissions

| Issue Name Summary of issues  |   | No. | %  |
|-------------------------------|---|-----|----|
| Noise<br>(Transport/<br>Road) | <p>Sleeping at night with our windows open is already hard with the sound of trucks screaming up the highway.</p> <p>We are already experiencing extra noise and traffic on Sancrox Road with the new industrial area being built, Sancrox Road has a large number of pot holes and two low level bridges which barely handle the current traffic let alone more trucks.</p> <p>Truck activity broadly will increase and along with it noise, thus there is 796 truck activities adding to the overall sound scape in the local area and along the highway, 24 hours a day.</p> | 7   | 3% |

| Issue Name Summary of issues |   | No. | %   |
|------------------------------|---|-----|-----|
| Hours of Operation           | <p>Operation hours - are stated as 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Due to noise generated I believe 24 hour operations at this site, close to rural residential areas, is inappropriate.</p> <p>Local residents can expect their sleep will be disrupted from noise from the quarry 24/7. Sleep deprivation can adversely impact health.</p> <p>No 24/7 operation</p> <p>Land/Home owners entitled to "peace &amp; quiet" (back to reasonable work hours)</p> <p>I am concerned about the proposed operation of quarry activities to operate on a 24/7 basis.</p> <p>I am also worried possible sleep deprivation it will cause local residents.</p> <p>The works were expanded and ran 24 hours a day it would definitely disturb my family and business.</p> <p>I am also extremely concerned about the increased blasting and crushing, and proposed 24/7 operation of the rock crushing plant, and the associated level of noise pollution, ground vibration and air quality from the operation.</p> <p>This degradation of quality of life will be caused by the proposed 24 hr. a day operation (light pollution at night as well as dust and machinery noise).</p> <p>Daytime operation excluding Sundays is the maximum that should be allowed in a community precinct. The processes carried out do not have to run at night and can be easily shutdown/restarted.</p> <p>I am totally against any further operating hours or days for this current operation.</p> <p>A quarry operating 24/7 will negatively impact on our peaceful lifestyle</p> <p>There will be no respite from constant noisy plant and equipment.</p> <p>Despite noise mitigation measures, the rural ambience is already reduced and any extra noise generation, especially at night, will only make it worse. The noise impact of a 24 hour, 7 days a week operation is particularly concerning. There will be no respite from constant noisy plant and equipment.</p> <p>The extra blasting and 24 hour working in the quarry is totally unexceptionable for the local residents who have built in this area.</p> <p>24 hour operation should be absolutely rejected, these processes do not need to run throughout the night.</p> <p>There is no need for a 24/7 operation. The current demand for building materials for this area is more than adequately catered for by current suppliers operating in normal hours. The plant and equipment required can readily be shut down and restarted; there is no continuous type of process that requires a 24/7 operation.</p> <p>I strongly object to its proposed operating hours of 24/7. As a nearby resident, I feel that if this quarry is approved as advertised, my peaceful lifestyle will be significantly impacted by this quarry operating around the clock seven days a week particularly with increased noise, dust, truck movements and blasting.</p> <p>Facility operating 24hrs per day is not an appropriate development to be located right in the middle of the fastest growing residential area in one of the fastest growing regional LGA's in NSW.</p> <p>The noise impact of a 24 hour, 7 days a week operation is particularly concerning. There will be no respite from constant noisy plant and equipment. Daytime operation excluding Sundays is the maximum that should be allowed in a community precinct. The processes carried out do not have to run at night and can be easily shutdown/restarted.</p> <p>We could not accept nor be expected to accept current noise levels 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.</p> | 190 | 71% |

| Issue Name Summary of issues |  | No. | %   |
|------------------------------|--|-----|-----|
| Noise<br>(Operational)       | <p>The noise and ground shaking.</p> <p>Major concern of noise pollution hours of operation and devalue of properties in surrounding areas</p> <p>The noise from blasting and crushing of rocks will be unbearable. Noise, smell, dust and the increase in traffic will be highly criticised in light of the devastation around Port Macquarie that has been all across the media.</p> <p>I am also worried about the noise ... will cause local residents.</p> <p>We can currently hear the quarry works: trucks reversing, crushing, loading...and if the works were expanded and ran 24 hours a day it would definitely disturb my family and business.</p> <p>This noise pollution ...would also lower our property value</p> <p>I am also extremely concerned about the increased blasting and crushing, and proposed 24/7 operation of the rock crushing plant, and the associated level of noise pollution, ground vibration and air quality from the operation. It is not possible to make an assessment or form a judgement on the impacts of this issue on receivers.</p> <p>The documentation has not established appropriate buffers for noise, vibration, dust and flyrock are available within the quarry land.</p> <p>There would be some noise and vibration that would impact me and other residents of Sancrox.</p> <p>Despite noise mitigation measures, the rural ambience is already reduced and any extra noise generation, especially at night, will only make it worse.</p> <p>I currently hear the operation during daylight hours, so for this to operate on a 24 hour 7 days a week basis would be totally intolerable.</p> <p>generate substantial noise pollution and vibration with the potential to create annoyance and disrupt sleep/rest patterns for the nearby residents, especially given the proposed 2417 scale of operations.</p> <p>Noise and vibration pollution that will worsen with a 24/7 operation as proposed</p> <p>How can you expect a quarry less than 1 km away operating 24/7 not to result in considerable noise pollution?</p> <p>concerns about the noise issues for locals as this area becomes more of a suburban populated area</p> <p>We object to the noise pollution due to blasting.</p> <p>noise and dust and health impacts from same are unacceptable for this residential location.</p> <p>Despite noise mitigation measures, the rural ambience is already reduced and any extra noise generation, especially at night, will only make it worse.</p> <p>The extra blasting and 24 hour working in the quarry is totally unexceptionable for the local residents who have built in this area.</p> <p>Potential significant local noise pollution from proposed 24/7 operations.</p> <p>a. As stated in the report, this is a rural area. The area has a quiet disposition, with some impact of the highway. The highway is sporadic (NOT constant), and thus having another sporadic or even constant noise emission is of great significance. This cumulative effect cannot be misunderstood. This will become a 24/7 noise source with the only requirement that Hansen laughably 'procure quietest machinery', but as long as it still fulfils the machine function. This is a ridiculous and insulting mitigation strategy and only speaks to the lack of accountability to the residents should noise levels be breached.</p> <p>Residents do not have complex or expensive monitoring equipment to be able to test and monitor noise emissions. Equipment should be supplied to residents and reports made public with strict penalties to exceeding acceptable levels.</p> <p>Comment that cumulative noise levels are 'beyond control of Hanson' is not true. If Hansen is contributing to the cumulative noise, then they are totally in control of the overall output. This should be corrected and refactored in control strategies prior to any further consideration.</p> <p>According to the submission noise levels are going to exceed acceptable levels for properties South of the mine. This alone is enough to reject the proposal.</p> <p>Report only indicated maximum background noise. It is possible that the noises were made from bird calls. It should be reported as to the cause of the peaks of the noises recorded. There is a significant difference between rural animal noises and mining activity, thus all noise cannot be treated equally.</p> <p>It is entirely inadequate for the mitigation strategy to for the impact of noise pollution to 'reduce by feasible and reasonable measures'. This is another example of unenforceable control measures plaguing this report and submission. Residents need a much greater objective understanding of the measures and fallbacks for this project prior to any further consideration.</p> <p>Noise impacts only considered the 'average person' and has not taken into account the noise (and light) impact on local animals, including nesting, breeding,</p> | 197 | 74% |

| Issue Name Summary of issues  | No. | % |
|---|-----|---|
| <p>hunting.</p> <p>Adoption of sleep disturbance levels is high and over exaggerated given rural nature of the area. This should be refactored and reassessed.</p> <p>We find that identified sleep disturbance levels south of the site for 12 months an incredible admission. This is a very long time and is totally unacceptable.</p> <p>Controls and mitigations such as 'Good practice construction necessary', such that 'ICNG focuses on minimising noise impacts rather than achieving numeric noise levels' is inadequate.</p> <p>Findings 'noise emissions would exceed the PSNL during all modelled conditions' excluding the additional cumulative road noise from trucks at 792 movements a day should mean rejection of the proposal.</p> <p>Admission and context that 'noise from construction sites is inevitable' provides an automatic 'out' for any noise pollution at any time with no recourse.</p> <p>The background noise that has been generated already by the upgrading of the highway to a motorway is there 24/7 and can be heard kilometres away due to the terrain and tree clearing associated with the upgrade. At a recent Christmas get together of local people, the unanimous opinion was that the ambient noise from the highway had substantially increased. The Sancrox Quarry operation will exponentially add more to the already increased background noise. I acknowledge that noise monitoring has been done as part of the EIS and may be within "perceived" tolerances but when this noise is there all day, all night and every night, it will become intolerable</p> <p>My peaceful lifestyle will be significantly impacted by this quarry operating around the clock seven days a week particularly with increased noise</p> <p>The Sancrox area has already had a substantial increase in noise (24/7), due to the upgrading of the highway to a motorway. Despite noise mitigation measures, the rural ambience is already reduced and any extra noise generation, especially at night, will only make it worse</p> <p>The exhibited noise modelling provided does not provide noise level contour diagrams ad it is not clear how noise will be received by neighbouring properties. We do not accept 24 crushing plant noise 24 hours a day. With the scale of the excavation proposed and timeframe of the development we would have expected a noise/screen bund along the entire boundary with our property and all neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Given the scale of the proposed development and the nature of the crushing and processing equipment, it is submitted that a bund wall be placed along the Eastern boundary adjacent to Expressway Spares property in order to deal with noise issues. we submit that a bund along the Eastern boundary could also be utilised as a visual screen.</p> <p>Exhibited noise modelling provided does not provide noise level contour diagrams and it is not clear how noise will be received by neighbouring properties.</p> |     |   |

| Issue Name Summary of issues |   | No. | %  |
|------------------------------|---|-----|----|
| Vibration (Operational)      | <p>The noise and ground shaking.</p> <p>We can feel explosions literally shake the earth and our house through the day and if the works were expanded and ran 24 hours a day it would definitely disturb my family and business.</p> <p>Vibrations would also lower our property value.</p> <p>I am also extremely concerned about the increased blasting and crushing, and proposed 24/7 operation of the rock crushing plant, and the associated level of noise pollution, ground vibration and air quality from the operation.</p> <p>There would be some noise and vibration that would impact me and other residents of Sancrox.</p> <p>Noise pollution and vibration with the potential to create annoyance and disrupt sleep/rest patterns for the nearby residents, especially given the proposed 24/7 scale of operations.</p> <p>Noise and vibration pollution that will worsen with a 24/7 operation as proposed</p> <p>The only vibration aspects sufficiently addressed are those related to blasting, as this is a statutory requirement. No mention is made within the EIS in respect of clearing, ripping and any other operations. No risk assessment is sighted within the EIS to address other potential matters.</p> <p>The EIS has no consideration in respect of real / potential changes in zoning and is also devoid of such exposure modelling</p>           | 16  | 6% |
| Vibration (Blast)            | <p>No blasting or vibration</p> <p>Increased blasting that can be heard 2kms away in the Sancrox community</p> <p>We object to the risk to buildings from blasting vibrations, once again this is a rural lifestyle area that does not need blasting of the earth.</p> <p>Noise and vibration can easily travel that distance when blasting in the quarry ... not conducive to a healthy environment.</p> <p>My peaceful lifestyle will be significantly impacted by this quarry operating around the clock seven days a week particularly with increased blasting.</p>   | 18  | 7% |
| Blast (safety)               | <p>Twice daily blasting will impact traffic on Sancrox Rd and may impact the Pacific Highway, every blast. How this will be managed is uncertain but there is a code of conduct for blast guarding which has been developed by the Australian Explosives Industry and Safety Group which Hanson should consider adopting.</p> <p>The current freedom of movement of local residents may be impacted twice daily, from blasting.</p> <p>There is no mention of fly rock control and management of post blast gases that in sufficient concentrations are harmful. It is stated that a contractor will carry out the blasting with no explosives kept on site. However the EIS does not cover off on how the management of ammonium nitrate, emulsion, detonators and other matters are carried out so as to prevent a catastrophic explosion that could impact upon and beyond the PSA. There is no information in respect of controls, response plans etc. in the case of an incident. It is almost incomprehensible that this has not been satisfactorily addressed due to the potential for high loss of life and destruction. There is no apparent Principal Hazard Analysis (PHA) / Principle Risk Assessment (PRA) study within the framework of a recognised high to extreme risk activity. No comfort can be given the proponent's culture and record of poor performance.</p> | 11  | 4% |

| Issue Name Summary of issues |  | No. | %   |
|------------------------------|--|-----|-----|
| Blast (flyrock)              | <p>Blasting from the current operations are already impacting on the local businesses of Cassegrain Winery and Expressway spares, as debris is regularly raining down on their respective rooves, (as reported by them).</p> <p>We also understand that Flyrock may occur during blasting; we do not accept this risk.</p> <p>Rock-fly can be a danger and risk to nearby people, businesses and properties.</p> <p>There is no flyrock assessment within the EIS. There is comment that blasting will comply with AS2187-2006 however there is no detail as to how that will occur. 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 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.</p> <p>Neighbour reported that fly rock fell onto Cassegrain Winery on regular basis from blasting at the existing operations. Reference to EXPLO Conference presentation notes every blast should be guarded for a distance, in every direction on a radius of 800m and to a standard such as Code of Good Blast Guarding Practice issues by AEISG.</p> <p>No detailed fly rock assessment. No flyrock buffers. All buffers for flyrock be contained within the Hanson property, noted within SKM/Terrock report states any blasting be at least 90m from property boundary.</p>   | 18  | 7%  |
| Water use (mitigation)       | <p>Water use - The EIS states that dust will be mitigated mainly through the use of water. We are experiencing water restrictions at this time, and the excessive use of scarce water to suppress dust in dry periods is inappropriate.</p> <p>The report states that the quarry will have a groundwater inflow are between 40,000 and 60,000 litres per day which equates to 15 - 22 megalitres per annum.</p> <p>There are no mitigation measures proposed within the EIS for the loss of this volume of water from the groundwater aquifer.</p>   | 4   | 1%  |
| Surface water impacts        | <p>The natural water on the site, currently supporting native flora and fauna, will be diverted to industrial use and North and west alluvial flood plains of the Hastings River and Haydons Creek will be impacted.</p> <p>Pollution (air and waterway disruption to the natural landscape (surface and groundwater)</p> <p>Increasing industrial use of water is inappropriate in a period of drought and climate change</p> <p>The proposed development will also affect the local water system. In a time of drought it is unacceptable that the local watercourse that currently supports native flora and fauna will be diverted to industrial use. PMHC councillors have also noted possible risk to local water security if pollution from the project were to enter the water supply that has been carefully planned over decades.</p> <p>The development will divert a native flora and fauna watercourse to industrial use</p> <p>The proposed land-clearing will also contribute to climate change and to the reduction of local rainfall. It will also involve diversion of natural water flows for industrial use.</p> <p>There is no consideration of the impact of the loss of water from the environment that will occur due to the expansion of the quarry;</p> <p>The removal of water from the upper reach of the Fernbank Creek catchment and how that affects the longer-term viability of the creek. In brief there is no mitigation for the loss of this surface water from the environment provided for in the EIS and the documentation has not established that there will not be impacts on the environment from changes in hydrology extending beyond the quarry landholding.</p> <p>Existing sales floor area that stores crushed rock at the quarry has been artificially filled over a number of years. It is now some 5m above existing ground levels and results in large volumes of stormwater runoff into our property during prevailing weather/rain that goes for days and weeks after said event.</p> | 161 | 60% |

| Issue Name          | Summary of issues   | No. | %  |
|---------------------|---|-----|----|
| Groundwater Impacts | <p>A mining project of this size is not appropriate for the location.</p> <p>In the many years since the quarry was first commenced, the growth in residential population of Port Macquarie has been significant, to the point where the quarry in its current operations is surrounded by newly-developing residential property and tourism-related businesses.</p> <p>A small increase in the size of the current quarry should not cause too many problems, but this proposal is to triple the size of the existing quarry and increase its operation to 24hrs per day with all the accompanying adverse impacts on local residential amenity.</p> <p>There are issues with water supply and the potential impact on groundwater that are not adequately addressed by the EIS.</p> <p>There are massive environmental problems that the EIS does not adequately address - including the proposed destruction of up to 60Ha of core kola habitat in a significant regional wildlife corridor. Our local koala population and its habitat has been decimated since the recent bushfires, and more loss of habitat will have disastrous long-term impacts on the local koala population.</p> <p>A large mine with concrete batching plant and bitumen manufacturing facility operating 24hrs per day is not an appropriate development to be located right in the middle of the fastest growing residential area in one of the fastest growing regional LGA's in NSW.</p> <p>There is no consideration of the impact of the loss of water from the environment that will occur due to the expansion of the quarry; The proposed quarry expansion has the potential to have a significant impact on the groundwater in the locality. The information provided with the application does not consider the impact of this on the environment;</p> <p>Groundwater modelling figure 8.4 indicates significant drawdown on our property (up to 40m) and especially in areas that are to be dedicated to Council as E2 habitat. How will the groundwater drawdown affect our residence, dam and orchard. How is the order of groundwater drawdown justified on neighbouring properties. How is it being offset?</p> <p>There is a 'base case' but there is no comparative modelling between the "Base Case" and the predevelopment and post development scenarios. The documentation has not established that there will not be impacts on the environment from changes in groundwater levels extending beyond the quarry landholding and in particular for Fernbank Creek.</p> <p>The groundwater drawdown maps show an impact on our property and a drawdown of some 4 metres or so. Given the distance we are away from the quarry we would have expected no impact to groundwater on our property.</p> | 19  | 7% |

| Issue Name                  | Summary of issues   | No. | %   |
|-----------------------------|---|-----|-----|
| Air Quality<br>(Dust, PM10) | <p>The dust from the plant is more than enough now.</p> <p>It will probably not be advisable for local residents to drink their tank water because of the dust impact.</p> <p>The efficiency of solar panels for hot water heating and electricity will diminish significantly over time because of a build-up of dust.</p> <p>Costs of home maintenance will increase with more frequent painting, cleaning of roof and down pipes and windows, all from a build-up of dust.</p> <p>There may be a higher concentration of dust particles within the air within the region for the next 10 to 30 years.</p> <p>Noise, smell, dust and the increase in traffic will be highly criticised in light of the devastation around Port Macquarie that has been all across the media.</p> <p>I am also worried about the dust... will cause local residents.</p> <p>I am also extremely concerned about the increased blasting and crushing, and proposed 24/7 operation of the rock crushing plant, and the associated level of noise pollution, ground vibration and air quality from the operation.</p> <p>Dust both from the quarry and vehicles transporting the mined materials.</p> <p>Pollution (air and waterway)</p> <p>Serious concerns regarding air quality (dust and odour)</p> <p>24/7 operations will affect air quality of Sancrox.</p> <p>The fine dust that will be released into the air may not be seen but can still reach our airways, potentially resulting in cancer or chronic illness that may not present for decades.</p> <p>Noise and dust and health impacts from same are unacceptable for this residential location</p> <p>Regularly, when westerly winds blow across the quarry, dust clouds have formed which has a significant impact on visibility on the Pacific Highway.</p> <p>Dust and particles that will be carried on the wind are not conducive to a healthy environment.</p> <p>The dust and particles will create more breathing difficulties for people suffering with breathing issues, asthma and bronchitis.</p> <p>There will extra dust and dirt from the 24 hour works.</p> <p>My peaceful lifestyle will be significantly impacted by this quarry operating around the clock seven days a week particularly with increased dust.</p> <p>The receptor areas as indicated in the EIS are not well founded and only notional. It appears some likely critical receptor areas have been excluded from the EIS. With prevailing wind and wind speeds the plumes of dust and fumes are more than likely to extend beyond the identified receptors and pass permissible limits well beyond those identified in the EIS. The EIS makes no mention of effective real time 24/7 monitoring at multiple locations and required action in respect of exceedances.</p> <p>There appears to be no modelling of air quality for the current and proposed quarry and its equipment. We submit that any crushing plant be made to be fully contained in order to mitigate dust.</p> <p>Tank water will likely be adversely affected by dust.</p> <p>Home maintenance will be increased as a result of quarry dust.</p> | 44  | 16% |



| Issue Name Summary of issues          |   | No. | %  |
|---------------------------------------|---|-----|----|
| Air Quality (emissions)               | <p>Emissions - Excessive fossil fuel emissions, including a high level of carcinogenic diesel emissions, and bitumen fumes</p> <p>I also have concerns about the pollution and what this may do to the air quality.</p> <p>Noise, smell, dust and the increase in traffic will be highly criticised in light of the devastation around Port Macquarie that has been all across the media. Increased emissions from a quarry mining the environment and the activities directly related to that, has to pollute on a large scale more than it did previously.</p> <p>Carbon emissions associated with this proposal place an unacceptable risk to our communities safety</p> <p>The unacceptably high level of CO2 emissions over the project lifecycle</p> <p>To what extent does this proposal require the purchase of certified carbon offsets to mitigate high-level carbon emissions?</p> <p>It is propose to construct and operate an Asphalt Plant. These plants are known sources of hazardous air pollutants (HAP's) that are semi volatile, volatile and metal. Some consist of known Class One carcinogens (cancer causing agents) and other agents deleterious to health. The EIS does not appear to set up a real time monitoring regime to ensure that emissions including fugitive emissions plumes are detected and alarmed for automatic plant shutdown to prevent plumes affecting the residents in the area. With the prevailing winds residents in the areas are downwind are potentially exposed.</p> | 16  | 6% |
| Transport (Traffic/noise)             | <p>I am a neighbouring property and there are a lot of truck movements as it is.</p> <p>Noise, smell, dust and the increase in traffic will be highly criticised in light of the devastation around Port Macquarie that has been all across the media. Increased volume of traffic with accompanying noise and fumes on Rawdon Island Rd (Sancrox Road).</p> <p>Expansion will further exacerbate the increased traffic of heavy vehicles and their associated noise congestion on residential street networks.</p> <p>A significant increase of approximately 158 additional heavy vehicle trips per day on Sancrox Road. This represents a dramatic increase and consequentially a higher level of risk to motorists in the local area. In particular during night-time hours with reduced visibility.</p> <p>The EIS does not take into account graduated and total traffic increases due to the present and ongoing increase in respect of the growing industrial area at Sancrox both east and west of the Pacific Highway. This is a major omission.</p> <p>No consideration has been given to feed in from Sancrox Road in respect of proposed, planned or on-the-radar changes in zoning and population density.</p> <p>The study looks at the past not the future. This would most likely include school buses in the mix of increased traffic. This is a major omission.</p>  | 9   | 3% |
| Transport (increased truck movements) | <p>Increased risk to native animals from the increased truck volume. We are in a koala transit area. We have many other native animals near the roadway.</p> <p>We object to the Quarry and proposed increased traffic, both heavy and light vehicles as it poses a safety risk to us our family and our friends.</p> <p>I also worry about the increased truck traffic using the site and potential for more fatal accidents in the area</p> <p>There is a significant 24 hour a day increase in movement of trucks to almost 800 per day. This will have an incredible impact on the safety of Sancrox Road, and also push more local traffic to other local roads to avoid this heavy vehicle bottleneck. Data obtained for this report is inaccurate or old, given accident along Bushland Drive in 2019 was not in place. Not only will this have a safety impact as there is an increased population in Sancrox (which was NOT modelled properly), but it will have a cumulative noise impact in the entire area.</p> <p>My peaceful lifestyle will be significantly impacted by this quarry operating around the clock seven days a week particularly with increased truck movements</p>   | 13  | 5% |
| Community Impacts (Health)            | <p>Community would likely suffer from increased anxiety around the perceived health effects on their families.</p> <p>Is the mental health and well-being of residents who pay a premium for a quiet lifestyle less important because there are fewer of us?</p> <p>Noise and dust and health impacts from same are unacceptable for this residential location</p> <p>It will probably not be advisable for local residents to drink their tank water because of the dust impact</p> <p>There may be a higher concentration of dust particles within the air within the region for the next 10 – 30 years.</p>  | 5   | 2% |

| Issue Name Summary of issues   | No. | %   |
|--|-----|-----|
| <p>Community Impacts (Social and economic)</p> <p>The community need for good quality quarry material must be in balance with the social and economic costs of its extraction.</p> <p>A "new" quarry at Sancrox will deliver Hanson all the upside, and PMHC and existing and future communities all the downside. An approval for a "new" quarry also gives Hanson a significantly enhanced competitive position.</p> <p>Concerns of devaluation of surrounding homes &amp; land</p> <p>This noise pollution and vibrations would also lower our property value.</p> <p>My concern is that we will lose clients as a direct result and make our business no longer sustainable which would leave eight employees out of work.</p> <p>Sancrox and the noise, dust, vibrations &amp; truck traffic throughout the area will be detrimental to all the new houses in this residential area.</p> <p>This expansion will also affect quality of life for current residents and future residents who have purchased land in the new Riverside Park estate contribute to a loss of identity and by extension a perceived depreciation of land value, thus causing further anguish to residents.</p> <p>Should the expansion of quarry be approved, there is no foreseeable way this development would proceed based on all the concerns aforementioned. This would be at great loss to the economic growth of port Macquarie with regards to significant job creation and stimulation of the local construction industry, as well as the wider progression of the district's property market.</p> <p>The efficiency of solar panels for hot water heating and electricity will diminish significantly over time because of a build-up of dust.</p> <p>Costs of home maintenance will increase with more frequent painting, cleaning of roof and down pipes and windows, all from a build-up of dust.</p> <p>The report's conclusion and discussion was based off the premise that "does not involve significant change to land uses at this location". This is incorrect as the operations at the site would include an additional concrete batching and asphalt plant. Further operations of the site from business hours to 24 hours 7 days a week constitutes a significant change in usage. What follows is an incorrect assessment and inaccurate submission.</p> <p>That the "efficient and cost effective delivery" is of social benefit. Rather this statement is misleading and false, as this is a business benefit to Hansen. This should be removed from consideration as to the social benefits of the proposal. Rock mining, asphalt and concrete crushing is and can be done at other sites, it is an additional service not a sole service in this area.</p> <p>It must be noted that impact of this project is 'likely to be positive' provided that the localised 'negative social impacts are mitigated and monitored', whilst there is only broad non-specific statements as to how these significant negative effects will actually be mitigated. Objective measurements must be undertaken, objective reporting and consequences for breaches must also be part of any project review for all parties. References such as 'beyond control of Hansen', 'feasible and practical efforts' only demonstrate the inadequate means to which residents will be able to hold Hanson to account if/when they breach their requirements.</p> <p>The economic advantages to the community, cited in the application are invalid and should be ignored. The "job creation" that is touted for this site will be at the expense of current jobs in other local businesses that will be forced to close or reduce operation by this development. There will be NO net gain in employment, it will in fact, lead to a reduction in jobs</p> <p>Loss of the PM koala population will have detrimental flow-on economic effects – koalas are worth around \$50 million to the local economy annually (PMHC Draft Koala Recovery Strategy 2017).</p> <p>The EIS information is highly predictive is supposition only and is tied to the opinion of a consultancy service paid by Hanson.</p> <p>The EIS states that their supply is required for the Pacific Highway upgrade. This has been completed from Sydney to Coffs Harbour and locations beyond. This is a false claim. Within the EIS other quarries in the area have been identified that can satisfactorily maintain supply. It is nonsense within the EIS to suggest cartage would be required from Newcastle from another Hanson quarry.</p> <p>There is no community advantage by increasing output from this quarry and alternatively and more importantly, there will be no community disadvantage if this mine ceases operation. The "job creation" that is touted for this site will be at the expense of current jobs in other local businesses that will be forced to close or reduce operation by this development. There will be NO net gain in employment, it will in fact, lead to a reduction in jobs.</p> <p>The growth in residential population of Port Macquarie has been significant, to the point where the quarry in its current operations is surrounded by newly-developing residential property and tourism-related businesses.</p> <p>There are no developer contributions proposed in the application. 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.</p> <p>The proposed expansion creates 10 jobs which is good, however, the impact of the proposed expansion is not commensurate with the jobs created. There is no justification that the capital investment required for this development is such that it requires an approval of 30 years to amortise the investment.</p> <p>There are no developer contributions suggested in any of the exhibited documentation.</p> | 32  | 12% |

| Issue Name Summary of issues      |  | No. | %   |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----|-----|
| Community Impacts (Environmental) | <p>There is a natural water course and koala habitat running directly through my property through my neighbours and down to Sancrox road. Port Macquarie, which is undergoing significant residential development that will be directly affected by the increased environmental impact of this quarry expansion.</p> <p>Negative impacts on our collective human rights ... the right to pass land and resources down through the generations and the right to a healthy environment are not being met.</p> <p>the expansion of this quarry would be in direct violation with community interests (Sancrox and Surrounding Areas) in recent light of the Climate Change Emergency.</p> <p>I moved to this area to enjoy the tranquillity of the natural environment while still being close to town.</p> <p>undergoing significant residential development that will be directly affected by the increased environmental impact of this quarry expansion.</p> <p>Clearance for commercial &amp; developers purposes benefit only those developers &amp; businesses not the greater community.</p> <p>We object to the clearing of land, both as to the visual view of landscape scarring as well as native animal habitat.</p> <p>My surrounding residential development will be directly affected by the increased environmental impact of the proposed quarry expansion</p> <p>Eucalypt trees were removed for the development of the soon to be released Industrial Site, they also removed the buffer between the Sancrox Quarry and the Pacific Highway</p> <p>Our community greatly values its koala population and does not want to see them offset away from the Port-Macquarie Hastings region.</p> <p>The removal of Spotted Gum (winter flowering), Grey Ironbark (winter, spring and summer flowering), Blackbutt (spring - summer flowering) and Pink Bloodwood (summer - autumn flowering) species from the local area will result in the loss of crucial winter and autumn flowering species.</p> <p>The loss of native forest vegetation, adversely impacts unique local biodiversity</p> <p>The right of quiet enjoyment of local properties will be destroyed by this development.</p> <p>There are real actual and potential negative social impacts associated with the proposed project inclusive of but not limited to increased traffic and heavy vehicle movements, increased noise and vibration, impacts to air and water quality and clearing of bushland, which have not been appropriately mitigated to prevent impacts to the sense of place and amenity of the surrounding area</p> <p>The right of quiet enjoyment of local properties will be destroyed by this development. The quarry was originally only intended for a life until approximately 2005, when the estimated winnings were forecast to be exhausted.</p> <p>The Port Macquarie region is expanding rapidly. This development is in the Sancrox area, approximately 6km west of Port Macquarie, which is undergoing significant residential development that will be directly affected by the increased environmental impact of this quarry expansion.</p> <p>The Port Macquarie region is expanding rapidly. This development is in the Sancrox area, approximately 6km west of Port Macquarie, which is undergoing significant residential development that will be directly affected by the increased environmental impact of this quarry expansion.</p> <p>Limited discussion of closure and management of void.</p> | 154 | 58% |

| Issue Name Summary of issues |   | No. | %  |
|------------------------------|---|-----|----|
| Amenity                      | <p>significant loss of amenity for residents<br/>will reduce amenity and house value for neighbouring properties</p> <p>We moved to Port Macquarie as part of our retirement plans. This area was chosen because of its proximity to our nearby hinterlands and quick access up and down the coast to accommodate our love of travelling.</p> <p>No consideration has been given to feed in from Sancrox Road in respect of proposed, planned or on the radar changes in zoning and population density. The study looks at the past not the future. This would most likely</p> <p>This expansion project is smack bang in the middle of our future growth area. With prevailing winds being very variable in this area and with potential growth areas surrounding this quarry the expansion will totally ruin the amenity of the precinct.</p> <p>This proposal is to triple the size of the existing quarry and increase its operation to 24hrs per day with all the accompanying adverse impacts on local residential amenity.</p> <p>Visual assessment is poorly done, and the photographs and visibility model provided in the EIS documentation are not a true reflecting of the existing quarry operation.</p> | 16  | 6% |

| Issue Name Summary of issues  | No. %          |
|---|----------------|
| <p>Quality of EIS</p> <p>Page 39 of the EIS shows the bitumen plant being coal fired. Page 40 of the EIS says the bitumen plant is gas fired, therefore how can this information be relied upon.</p> <p>insufficient field work conducted in 2015, four years ago. Current, independent and comprehensive field surveys are required to validate the report.</p> <p>The EIS states that no evidence for the threatened plant species likely to occur on the site was recorded during field surveys undertaken as part of the BAR. However SLR ... concluded that until a positive identification can be made, it is recommended that the Dendrobium specimen recorded should be treated as the threatened species D. melaleucaphilum, which is listed as endangered in NSW under the (former) Threatened Species Conservation Act.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Report has not considered the cumulative impact of vegetation clearance within a regional context and the continued fragmentation of remaining vegetation across the landscape.</p> <p>the Biodiversity Assessment Report is woefully inadequate, based as it is on inadequate field work conducted 4 years ago.</p> <p>Annex C and the BAR are flawed, formulated on inadequate field surveys and limited data which is now four years old. The EIS and BAR lack currency, objectivity and rigor.</p> <p>Annex C, 'Biodiversity Assessment Report', is based on field work four years old, prior to the NSW State of Emergency from bush fires. The subject land requires current assessment as surviving animals forced to relocate may have moved onto these 43 hectares of native bushland.</p> <p>The EIS is seriously flawed and fails to properly assess or describe the likely impacts across a whole range of environmental, social and economic factors, at local, state and federal levels. There has been a very poor consultative process, not least the Community Consultation Committee failure to fulfill its role I believe that the Hanson Environmental Impact Statement (ERM Ref. 0418291) currently on exhibition does not properly address the issues arising from its proximity to a significant residential development.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Assessment Report downplays the importance of corridors in the area to be cleared. At the very least, field surveys should be redone, given that it is 4 years since they were completed and much has changed since that time. As well, as the habitat burnt since then, several species have been added to the threatened species list in NSW.</p> <p>The noise modelling provided does not show any noise level contour diagrams as they affect residential receivers, either with or without mitigation.</p> <p>No noise level contours for both daytime and night-time noise levels as they affect residential receivers.</p> <p>The bund walls shown on the plans, south of the quarry processing area and to the west of the quarry excavation, appear to ignore the underlying topography.</p> <p>While length, width and height of the walls are provided, no datum is shown to enable the RL of the top of each wall to be determined.</p> <p>The single line drawing of the quarry processing area does not show any internal roads or RL's to determine the height of this area and that of potential noise generators, to allow any independent assessment of the effectiveness of the walls as a mitigation measure.</p> <p>There is no flyrock assessment within the REF. The only reference to blasting is that "Blasting practices at the quarry are to be undertaken in accordance with AS 2187.2".</p> <p>The proposed quarry does not provide any flyrock buffers. There is ample evidence on the adjoining properties of flyrock from the quarry lying on the surface of the ground.</p> <p>There is no modelling of air quality for the current and proposed quarries or the mitigated scenario.</p> <p>The photographs and visibility model provided in the EIS are not a true reflection on the visibility of the quarry operation. In some cases they are not current, in other cases that have been taken from relatively close low elevation position.</p> <p>No RLs have been provided for the quarry operational areas and the proposed noise and visual screen bund walls.</p> <p>There is no details on how the proposed quarry is to be rehabilitation... virtually no mitigation strategies in place to address the environmental impacts and no rehabilitation plan.</p> <p>The EIS is in part notional, therefore not fully factual and as above without responsibility for implications. The EIS is at best speculative.</p> <p>Insufficient field work was conducted in 2015, four years ago. A major flaw of the EIS is that it fails to record koalas at six locations and the presence of habitat critical to the endangered Swift Parrot. (Refs: Office of Environment and Heritage Records, 2008 -2013.Ref. DA Annex C</p> | <p>163 61%</p> |

| Issue Name Summary of issues  | No. % |
|---|-------|
| <p>Inadequacy and lack of integrity of the Environmental Impact Statement</p> <p>The EIS fails to identify and properly examine the impacts of the proposal both within and external to the site or provide any meaningful mitigation for those impacts. No Quarry Rehabilitation Plan has been provided as part of the EIS to allow for any estimate of the volume or overburden required for this purpose. On this basis, the overburden will add a further 260,000 tonnes per annum to the above 1,473,333 tonnes per annum of production, assuming a 30-year life. The EIS document makes use of the Biodiversity Conservation (Savings and Transitional) Regulation 2017, using the definition of a “pending or interim planning application”. It is difficult to see how this EIS meets the requirements of Clause 27 (1) (b) and Clause 27 (2) of the Regulation with the last re-issued SEARs dated 18 September 2017 and the SSD Application lodged on 10 July 2019. The Biodiversity Assessment Report (BDAR) does not meet the requirements of Part 6.15 (1) in terms of the date of the report being 17 June 2019. Application of Part 6.15 will require the re-application of the Biodiversity Calculator (and depending on the output of re-application of the Biodiversity Calculator) re-submission and potentially re-exhibition of the BDAR. The Biodiversity Values field studies were completed in 2015, while the Biodiversity Credits Report is dated 4 July 2017. The current EIS proposal also varies from the concept used in the Credits Report.</p> <p>The EIS and associated biodiversity report makes limited references to previous ecological assessments completed as part of various urban growth and development proposals in the immediate area and including this site. The report assessments outcomes differ significantly from those carried out previously. The 2011 Biolink report prepared for Port Macquarie-Hastings Council (PMHC) as part of the Greater Sancrox Structure Plan, identified the majority of the area proposed for the quarry expansion as being part of a Sub-regional Corridor (Fig 10). (Refer Attachment 2). In terms of ecological values, the area proposed for quarry expansion was mapped as either “irreplaceable” or be “value managed”. The Connectivity Links provided with the EIS (Appendix E), have not been placed over aerial photographs to allow the proposal to be assessed, in the context of the overall area. Table 5.7 in the EIS proposes mitigation measures including “Design and implement a planting plan for corridor of native vegetation east and west of proposed quarry pit, to maintain north south corridor link of trees, as per sub-regional corridor in the Biolink Greater Sancrox Structure Plan (PMHC 2015)”.</p> <p>The ecological report within the EIS has not identified any of the Hollow Bearing Trees within the quarry footprint previously identified in the Biolink report. (Refer Attachment 3). The quarry excavation contours and infrastructure areas proposed, do not relate to the surrounding topography and therefore it is not possible to determine the actual extent of clearing proposed. Both the existing and proposed vegetation in the offset area will be compromised by the changes to both the surface water and groundwater regimes created by the quarry development. The biodiversity report does not discuss the impact on flora, fauna and riparian water quality from the changes in hydrology and groundwater created by the impact of the quarry on surface water and ground water flows.</p> <p>The ecological report with the EIS acknowledges that the site is “potential koala habitat” in accordance with SEPP 44 and that 805 records exist of koala in the search area but does not reference the approved KPOMs adjoining the southern and northern boundaries of the proposed quarry expansion.</p> <p>There is a large existing large farm dam within the proposed quarry footprint which is not mentioned in the ecological report. There does not appear to be any ecological assessment of this aquatic habitat in respect of two threatened species, the Green and Golden Bell Frog and the Green-thighed Frog known to occur locally.</p> <p>Threatened Species Likelihood of Occurrence outcomes, based upon the OEH Wildlife Atlas search, do not appear to be relevant for a number of species, e.g. koala, powerful owl, masked owl, all of which have been identified on adjoining areas in the Biolink Report for the Greater Sancrox Structure Plan.</p> <p>The application does not provide sufficient information to allow for an assessment of the acoustic impacts due to the expansion of the quarry;</p> <p>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.</p> <p>We own Lot 1 DP 1144490, in various diagrams/drawings, indicates that the proposed development of the quarry carries over the boundary and onto our land.</p> <p>Our understanding is that the Biodiversity Assessment Report (BAR) included in this EIS does not meet the requirements of Part 6.15(1) in terms of the date of the report, being 17 June 2019.</p> <p>The EIS document makes use of the Biodiversity Conservation (Savings and Transitional) Regulation</p> |       |

| Issue Name Summary of issues  | No. | % |
|---|-----|---|
| <p>2017, using the definition of a “pending or interim planning application”. It is difficult to see how this EIS meets the requirements of Clause 27 (1) (b) and Clause 27 (2) of the Regulation with the re-issued SEARs date 18 September 2017 and the SSD Application lodged on 10 July 2019.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Values field studies were completed in 2015, while the Biodiversity Credits Report is dated 4 July 2017. The current EIS proposal also varies from the concept used in the Credits Report.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Strategy adopted by Port Macquarie Hastings Council (PMHC) must govern decision-making rather than information from the Sancrox Quarry Expansion Project proponent, which includes a biodiversity assessment report that is not current, relies on insufficient fieldwork and fails to acknowledge historical records of koalas on the subject land.</p> |     |   |

| Issue Name Summary of issues      |  | No. | %  |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----|----|
| Conflict of land use in Community | <p>Would not make it a nice place to live.</p> <p>Allowing this to go ahead would ruin the properties around it.</p> <p>I object to the expansion of the Sancrox Quarry as it will strongly impact on my home and the environment around me including the wildlife.</p> <p>With the beautiful tranquil community that has been built in the Thrumster and Sovereign Hills area, the last thing that is needed is an expansion of a quarry creating dust, noise and potential health impacts. In light of recent events in the area with fires, we don't need more forestry demolished, more wildlife habitat destroyed and negatively impacting the environment. Being so close to a housing area, surely the noise and pollution would not be good for the community, let alone the nearby schools, child care centres and future generations.</p> <p>None of these (surrounding) industries are going to see an advantage to having an expanded quarry, which uses explosives, operating 24 hours a day, seven days per week in such close proximity. The significant increase in heavy vehicles will also not support these employers.</p> <p>The development of adjacent land for rural residential use was made prior to the operation of the quarry. It was made on the premise that the quarry would cease operation ~2005.</p> <p>The agreements made at the mines' inception, to cease operation, are testament to the fact that the surrounding rural residential development was forecast and approved to expand.</p> <p>The expansion of the quarry does not appear consistent with Council's Urban Growth Management Strategy which envisages future urban expansion in this locality.</p> <p>After many years of planning and expenditure, approval was granted for the area to be subject of industrial development creating more employment than the proposed project, taking pressure off the Port Macquarie area meaning that social and economic ramifications going beyond the immediate vicinity.</p> <p>There is a 15-year supply of residential land in PMHC LGA is a myth - it's only 7 years and most likely less with impact of 2017 Biodiversity Legislation consideration.</p> | 25  | 9% |



| Issue Name Summary of issues                                     |   | No. | %   |
|--|---|-----|-----|
| Justification of project (need for expansion/increase in volume) | <p>Port Macquarie is the fastest growth area in NSW and all future development is to the west, it has less residential Lots than it has quarry rock</p> <p>There are already other concrete and asphalt plants in the region that have the capacity to service the demand.</p> <p>The supply of all rock aggregates (both current and future), produced at this site can be sourced from alternative quarries in the local area. These alternate quarries are better environmentally suited to this operation and do not impact the environment to the extent that this new development will.</p> <p>The proposed extra operations of finished product supply, (concrete and asphalt), is currently satisfied by other local businesses.</p> <p>No data on historic production from the quarry has been provided. This temporary approval of increased production under the current approval ceased on 14 March 2019. None of the above changes in production approvals are discussed in the EIS which suggests the current extraction licence continues to allow 455,000 tonnes per annum production as part of the context for the current application for an increase to 750,000 tonnes per annum.</p> <p>No quantifiable justification for the increase to 750,000 tonnes per annum has been provided. There is no data on the demand for quarry resources across the region or projections of demand into the future. The proposed quarry void is estimated to generate 52 million tonnes of material, which, even allowing for 15% for overburden, over the proposed 30 years, will generate 1,473,333 tonnes of quarry material per annum. (Refer Attachments 1a &amp; 1b). This is nearly double the proposed 750,000 tonnes per annum sought in the current application, or alternatively, at 750,000 tonnes per annum, the proposed quarry extent will provide a life almost double that requested.</p> <p>The EIS does not provide any information to demonstrate that a quarry of this scale is required to meet the current and projected demands for quarry materials within the region. The lack of justification for the 400% increase in annual production also then relates to the proposed extension of operating of the quarry hours to 24 hours per day and 7 days per week. Without verifiable justification for the significant increase in the proposed annual output, the extension of operating hours can also not be supported.</p> <p>The scale of the proposed expansion appears to be excessive. No justification is provided for an increase in production of 400% to that allowed under the current quarry licence;</p> <p>The justification to increase the demand and output of Sancrox Quarry by 4 times to go to 750,000 tonnes per annum is not clear. If demand and output is not there, then the scale of the proposal and the need to go to a 24hr operation is not there.</p> <p>We have no objection to the quarry continuing at the same level of operation that it is now during normal business hours. The proposed scale of the expanded quarry operating 24/7 is neither justified nor appropriate for this location.</p> <p>Why are Hanson allowed to make a claim that there is no quarry within 200km when there are up to six quarries well inside that radius.</p> <p>The justification in increase the demand and the output of Sancrox Quarry by 4 times to go to 750,000 tpa is not clear.</p> | 29  | 11% |

| Issue Name Summary of issues                  |   | No. | %  |
|---|---|-----|----|
| Justification of project (resource available) | <p>Quarry operation within the PMHC area are quite competitive.</p> <p>I do not understand the need for extra crushing materials, as the Pacific Hwy has already been upgraded 100km in each direction of this plant, so the extra material extracted is clearly not for this use, nor am I aware of any project nearby that would require that quantity of materials so its location does not seem a viable one.</p> <p>The Pacific Highway upgrade has been completed for well over 100km in either direction from Sancrox making the carting of product for the highway unviable.</p> <p>The EIS does not provide any examination or assessment of the existing quarry resources available within the region.</p> <p>The scale of the Project is vast. The quarry footprint to be increased by 182%. Its extraction limit to be increased by 65%. No longer just a mine - offers additional concrete batching, recycling and asphalt production services.</p> <p>A mining project of this size is not appropriate for the location. Hanson themselves have a future quarry site on Milligans Road at Wauchope which is not mentioned, let alone the remaining four existing and operating hard rock quarries in the region. The EIS is presented as if the Sancrox quarry is the only local supply of hard rock material.</p> <p>The geology of the site is known to be volatile in places and highly weathered. No details have been provided on the drilling exploration program to prove up the resource, in terms of the various classes material the quarry is projected to produce or the volume of overburden or unsuitable material.</p> <p>Within the documentation on exhibition, there is no assessment of resources within the Port Macquarie Hastings region and no data on historic production rates from the quarry has been provided.</p> <p>Quarries in the region are owned by Hanson, Hytec, Boral, Holcim, PBM and others and it is difficult to see an expansion of this scale justified on any commercial basis.</p> <p>The current approved rate of extraction is for 185,000 tonnes per annum and any change to this rate should be in the context of overall supply within the region.</p> <p>Applicant has not reported the conduct of a drill program to evidence 30 year quarry life at extraction rate 750,000tpa. Equates to 22.5M tonnes of resource.</p> | 22  | 8% |

| Issue Name Summary of issues   | No. | %   |
|--|-----|-----|
| Biodiversity<br>(Habitat loss,<br>hallow-bearing<br>trees and<br>Biodiversity<br>Corridor)   | 208 | 78% |
| <p>A subregional biological linkage corridor runs right through the centre of the proposed new pit location.</p> <p>Hanson has not made appropriate recognition of the biological community corridor nor identified how to manage its removal and create alternatives.</p> <p>This expansion will have a HUGE NEGATIVE impact on our local environment ... and a subregional biological linkage corridor.</p> <p>The clearing of the land to expand the quarry will have a significant negative impact on our local flora and fauna that we are already seeing suffer due to drought and fires. ...the tree clearing have a large negative impact on moisture levels and air quality</p> <p>I am extremely concerned about the clearing of 40 hectares of native bush land and the effect it will have on our native wildlife due to habitat loss.</p> <p>Recent bushfires make this native bushland valuable to ... fauna &amp; flora.</p> <p>Flora clearance and endangered or vulnerable wildlife, both under enormous pressure caused by urban expansion as well as industrial expansion.</p> <p>There is an Endangered biological corridor (identified in 2015) which runs right through the middle of the new quarry pit</p> <p>Undeveloped bush land we have remaining in the area need to be maintained for native species that we have put under so much stress.</p> <p>We cannot afford to lose another 40 hectares for this expansion.</p> <p>Conserve as much native forest as possible</p> <p>We cannot support the removal of more trees in our region</p> <p>This project has significant biodiversity impacts on a number of native flora and fauna populations.</p> <p>The proposed development will irreversibly impact the biodiversity existing on the mid-north coast, which has already been severely depleted by recent bush fires in the region.</p> <p>Clearing of 43.1 ha of native forest vegetation...loss of hollow-bearing trees...removal of foraging habitat for locally occurring native fauna</p> <p>No mention of the provision of nest boxes as part of the proposed offset strategy.</p> <p>Loss of crucial winter and autumn flowering species (feed species)</p> <p>It is absurd to suggest that the loss of vegetation in the project area will not result in habitat fragmentation or the loss of connectivity between the proposed offset area and the remaining vegetation south of the project area.</p> <p>The Biodiversity Report has not considered the cumulative impact of vegetation clearance within a regional context and the continued fragmentation of remaining vegetation across the landscape</p> <p>The further destruction to native habitats, essential to the survival of our native animals would see results such as fauna drop into the endangered species area</p> <p>Our biodiversity cannot cope with further clearing of habitat.</p> <p>This development will place even more stress on these (koalas) and other animals, whose status is tenable at best.</p> <p>Particularly the issues of which food trees flower seasonally to our massively compromised wild life which rely on these few remnants of native flowers trees</p> <p>This depletion of forested land has had a serious impact on a wide range of native animals, with Koala being the most noticeable.</p> <p>A major flaw of the EIS is that it fails to record the presence of habitat critical to the endangered Swift Parrot.</p> <p>Unacceptable biodiversity loss from cutting down native forest</p> <p>The clearing also destroys an identified critical link needed to maintain vegetation connectivity for animal movement.</p> <p>It is absurd to suggest that the loss of vegetation in the project area will not result in habitat fragmentation or the loss of connectivity between the proposed offset area and the remaining vegetation south of the project area.</p> <p>The removal of the vegetation in the project area will effectively isolate fauna that remain in the proposed offset area and the disconnection the offset area will greatly reduce its ecological viability.</p> <p>It takes approximately 75-100 years for a eucalypt to form a hollow. The majority of hollow bearing trees recorded in the Biodiversity Assessment Report occur in the Spotted Gum - Grey Ironbark open forest - this association does not occur in the proposed offset area. Furthermore, no hollow-bearing trees were recorded in the proposed offset area and there is no mention of the provision of nest boxes as part of the proposed offset strategy.</p> <p>Clearing of trees, hollowed trees and vegetation is pushing koalas, snakes, lizards, flying foxes and many other species towards extinction with habitat destruction, we will leave our children with nothing.</p> <p>Project area falls directly within a sub-regional biodiversity corridor. It is absurd to suggest that the loss of vegetation in the project area will not result in habitat fragmentation or the loss of connectivity between the proposed offset area and the remaining vegetation south of the project area. The figures in Appendix E of the Biodiversity Assessment are incomplete - widths are missing, and they seem to suggest that Connecting Link 2 will persist despite the clearance of all vegetation and the presence of machinery. The removal of the vegetation in the project area will effectively isolate fauna that remain in the proposed offset area and the disconnection the offset area will greatly reduce its ecological viability.</p> |     |     |

| Issue Name Summary of issues   | No. | %   |
|--|-----|-----|
| <p>Biodiversity Impacts (Koala habitat)</p> <p>The noise and dust pollution will affect all the residents and animals that chose to call this area our home. The Koala population has been decimated in this area due to the recent bushfires so they can't afford to lose any more habitat.</p> <p>A core koala habitat of high use level exists in the centre of the proposed new quarry, and a very large portion is medium use koala habitat. Given the devastating bushfires currently threatening this already endangered species, now more than ever we need to protect their habitat.</p> <p>Previous studies revealed 5 hollow bearing trees for koala habitat in the proposed pit area. The EIS prepared by Hanson says there is 1.</p> <p>With the devastation of the koala and other wildlife populations due to the fires and their habitat there will be much interest from local and worldwide media on this site.</p> <p>This expansion will have a HUGE NEGATIVE impact on ... our already devastated Koala population,</p> <p>Recent bushfires make this native bushland valuable to koalas ...</p> <p>the new pit will wipe out a 'high and medium use' koala habitat</p> <p>The Greater Sancrox Area Structure Plan ... identifies the land to be cleared as medium to high activity koala habitat...Draft Coastal Koala Plan of Management 2018 (CKPOM) produced by PMHC identifies the area as core koala habitat.</p> <p>he clearing also destroys an identified 'critical link and vegetation connectivity in the immediate, and the Greater Sancrox Structure Plan, eliminating traverses by animals south-north through the centre of the Development Site</p> <p>I know my concerns over our Koala population are shared amongst many.</p> <p>This project will destroy 40ha of prime habitat for koalas.</p> <p>40 hectares of koala habitat to be destroyed for a quarry mining is unbelievable and unacceptable.</p> <p>40ha of prime koala habitat that hasn't been affected by the recent bushfires that is going to be cleared</p> <p>The proposed removal of trees is within an area that has been identified* as a medium high koala activity corridor which would be extremely detrimental to the preservation of this already threatened species</p> <p>, this land has potential to become critical koala breeding habitat and therefore be essential for the continuation of the local population.</p> <p>native food sources and vegetation have been extremely impacted, which makes the existing vegetation encompassed in the suggested development area extremely important for the rehabilitation of the iconic species.</p> <p>he proposed quarry expansion of 40 hectares into native bushland further depleting koala corridors</p> <p>The extraordinary fund raising success of the Koala Hospital highlights the international attention currently being focused on this region and koalas in particular. This is certainly not the time to be considering an application that requires habitat removal.</p> <p>A major flaw of the EIS is that it fails to record koalas at six locations and the presence of habitat critical to the endangered Swift Parrot.</p> <p>proposal will involve clearing valuable koala habitat this is particularly disgraceful considering the bushfire crisis and threat to this endangered species as a result of nearby bushfire</p> <p>Injured and now homeless koalas may migrate to, or have to be moved onto, the proposed development site. It is unbelievable that proponent wishes to clear a viable patch of intact koala habitat when so much habitat in the region has been recently lost to fire.</p> <p>The Greater Sancrox Structure Plan (Port Macquarie Hastings Council, 2014), identifies a portion of the land to be cleared as medium to high activity koala habitat. The Urban Growth Management Strategy 2017-2036(PMHC 2017) classifies the area as a 'medium biodiversity asset/constraint' and identifies that the site could provide a 'major conceptual habitat link'. The Draft Coastal Koala Plan of Management 2018 (CKPOM) produced by PMHC identifies the area as core koala habitat.</p> <p>With what has already taken place in the area, which cannot be reversed, Hanson Constructions proposal to destroy a further 29.63 ha of koala habitat is disturbing.</p> <p>With recent bushfires decimating large areas of Koala habitat it is imperative that any remaining areas are saved from development.</p> <p>Genetic diversity: the importance of different genomes for koalas is widely understood for disease resistance. Removal of koala habitat, and its impact on local populations already decimated by the November 2019 bushfires, results in a failure to protect genomes in areas of high development pressure.</p> <p>With the recent bushfires, the land which is to be cleared is a crucial wildlife habitat for koalas that have been decimated along with other animals and their habitat in the surrounding area within 10 - 20km and further afield.</p> <p>The development will likely remove medium to high activity/core koala habitat</p> <p>Given the extent of bush loss recently with fires and extreme koala population pressure, bush such as this should be retained for potential resettlement.</p> <p>Given the significant concern at all levels to the destruction of Koala habitat and the decline of yet another species, it's not logical to proceed any further with destruction of this habitat</p> | 215 | 81% |

| Issue Name                   | Summary of issues  | No. | %   |
|------------------------------|--|-----|-----|
| Biodiversity<br>Impact (EEC) | <p>An Endangered Ecological Community (EEC) of Flax leaved paperbark, prickly-leaved tea tree is located in the area of the new pit.</p> <p>Significant swamp oak and mixed eucalypt open forest areas will have to be destroyed.</p> <p>It will also have a direct impact on our endangered ecological community of paperbark ...</p> <p>Destroy significant swamp oak and eucalypt open forest areas which include several ecologically sensitive hollow bearing trees.</p> <p>Clearing 43.1 hectares of native forest vegetation, 0.55 ha of which is identified as the threatened ecological community Subtropical coastal floodplain forest (NR117) with serious and irreversible environmental impact.</p> <p>Stripping of 0.55 ha of the Subtropical coastal floodplain forest Threatened Ecological Community;</p> <p>In this habitat is Eucalyptus teriticornis, Forest Red Gum, an important feed and forage tree for the Critically Endangered Swift Parrot.</p> <p>The project includes “clearing 43.1 hectares of native forest vegetation, 0.55 ha of which is identified as the threatened ecological community Subtropical coastal floodplain forest (NR117)” with serious and irreversible environmental impact. (Ref: DA, Annex C)</p> | 169 | 63% |

| Issue Name     | Summary of issues  | No. | %   |
|----------------|--|-----|-----|
| Use of offsets | <p>Proposed "Ecosystem credits" system of payment by the developer to offset destruction of threatened species does not compensate for the serious and irreversible impact on the natural environment.</p> <p>The proposed offset site is a mere 49 hectares - not even a 2:1 offset, proposed offset doesn't include two vegetation associations (Tallowwood - Small-fruited Grey Gum dry grassy open forest)</p> <p>Offsets cannot replace the biodiversity values of existing trees.</p> <p>The proposed offset site is a mere 49 hectares.</p> <p>The lack of adequate "equivalence" in the proposed offset area</p> <p>A 2:1 offset ratio is not observed</p> <p>Of the vegetation associations identified in the project area, two are not included in the proposed offset area and a third is inadequately represent – tallowwood/small-fruited grey gum/dry grassy open forest</p> <p>No hollow-bearing trees are recorded in the proposed offset area, but are present in the development area</p> <p>An offset area of land will NOT provide the critically important ecosystem services that are needed in this time: the land must be in proximity to the burnt sites. A payment to a Biodiversity fund will NOT reseed and repopulate our lands.</p> <p>Grossly inadequate and unsuitable biodiversity offsets are suggested, particularly relating to koala habitat. Offset plantings are not acceptable as compensation for koala habitat clearing. "Like for like" offset i.e. mature trees of the same vegetation species composition, capable of sustaining live adult koalas today, must be achieved before the project is approved.</p> <p>Koalas are already at risk of functional extinction (PMHC Draft Koala Recovery Strategy 2017).</p> <p>Offsetting does not increase populations. The offset will be secured either through purchasing and retirement of 2,449 ecosystem credits from the credit market (with some ecosystem credits to be generated by potential offset lands within the study area) or payment of an equivalent monetary value into the recently established Biodiversity Conservation Fund. Offsetting at a State level via payment into a fund has several issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Genetic diversity: the importance of different genomes for koalas is widely understood for disease resistance. Removal of koala habitat, and therefore likely destruction of local populations, results in a failure to protect genomes in areas of high development pressure.</li> <li>- Resistance to Climate Change: research has predicted that koalas on the coastal floodplain will be much more resistant to climate change than koalas in other areas (e.g. western NSW). The viability of coastal populations is much higher than western populations.</li> <li>- Community Value: Our community greatly value their koalas and do not want to see them offset away from the Port-Macquarie Hastings region. The offset is not largely "like for like", as only one vegetation community in the offset site is also represented in the proposed quarry site. And the 49 hectares that constitute the proposed offset for the quarry expansion, as shown in the Biodiversity Assessment Report, has a very large area of cleared habitat, with seemingly no plan to replant it. Even if it is replanted, it will not provide food resources for the two critically endangered birds for decades. And there is always the option for the developer to simply pay into the Biodiversity Conservation Fund, which may not protect local biodiversity at all.</li> </ul> <p>Proposed "Ecosystem credits" system of payment by the developer to offset destruction of threatened species does not compensate for the serious and irreversible impact on the natural environment.</p> | 164 | 61% |

| Issue Name Summary of issues                          |  | No. | %   |
|---|--|-----|-----|
| Climate Change/Greenhouse gas emissions/CO2 emissions | <p>This deforestation and forest degradation will contribute to global greenhouse gas emissions and fewer trees in a region can contribute to drought by reducing the amount of local rainfall.</p> <p>The project “over its entire life cycle is estimated to release approximately 48.4 million tonnes of CO2-e into the atmosphere” 2.5 million tonnes less than Sweden’s total emissions in 2017(1).</p> <p>This project should not be given permission to proceed due to a failure to locally commit in the EIS to a plan for the reduction of GHG’s in keeping with the Heidelberg statement and a failure to clearly indicate a fully detailed and costed offset plan inclusive of location and monitored results within the EIS that are factually beneficial in respect of all considerations.</p>  | 151 | 57% |
| Management of mitigation measures                     | <p>Evidence is that the culture at the Sancrox Quarry is not capable of managing mitigation measures for existing operational conditions. There is no indication that Hanson proposes significantly different behaviours to support the management of mitigation measures in the proposed new quarry.</p> <p>Hanson has not adhered to approval conditions for operations at the existing Sancrox quarry why expect a different outcome with a substantially more difficult to operate quarry?</p> <p>no bund is proposed to be built to protect any development to the south (i.e. on Le Clos Sancrox). Will any proposed bund be sufficient anyway to mitigate the noise and dust? quarry's ability to mitigate any detrimental impacts on the environment, especially given their incidence of non compliance and subsequent fine by the EPA in 2016</p> <p>The Proponent - Hanson Construction Materials Pty Ltd was fined \$15,000 in 2016 for breaching the conditions of its Environment Protection Licence at the Sancrox Quarry. It is unacceptable that the NSW Government is even considering a proposal from a company with an existing record of environmental breaches at the site in question.</p> <p>Hanson has not been able to comply with the screens of trees conditional requirements for the existing quarry. How therefore will they cope with the requirements of significantly higher standard mitigation measures given the dimension of the proposed larger new pit?</p> <p>With the scale of excavation proposed and timeframe of the development we would have expected a noise/screen bund along the entire boundary without property and all neighbouring properties.</p> | 19  | 7%  |

| Issue Name Summary of issues           |   | No. | %   |
|--|---|-----|-----|
| Hanson track record/current operations | <p>The company operating this site has a poor track record of environmental compliance and were fined \$15,000 by the Environmental Protection Authority in 2016 for breaches of their water management operational obligations.</p> <p>Finally, I understand that Hanson Construction Materials Pty Ltd were fined \$15,000 in 2016 for breaching the conditions of its Environment Protection Licence at the Sancrox Quarry. While the fine at worst is simply “business” cost (were the “gains” from this breach ever monetized?). It highlights a flagrant disregard for environmental considerations by this business, and an inherent/proven “untrustworthiness” of this business being given approval for further development in this sensitive area</p> <p>It is unacceptable that the NSW Government is even considering a proposal from a company with an existing record of environmental breaches at the site in question.</p> <p>The company has a poor record of groundwater management and was fined in 2016 for breaches (ref: EPA 24.03.2016). There is a low level of trust that the company would honour ‘make good’.</p> <p>The proponent has recently incurred a substantial fine by the EPA for breaches of their environmental compliance obligations.</p> <p>This quarry has a history of not meeting it's obligations in relation to it's impact upon adjoining properties.</p> <p>None of the boundaries have been provided with safety fencing.</p> <p>The current EMP requires the revegetation around the boundaries, which has not happened.</p> <p>The development consent included a condition requiring a Quarry Rehabilitation Plan to be submitted within 6 months of the Consent being issued. There is no evidence that any of this plan, if it exists, has ever been implemented.</p> <p>A poly pipe siphon hose has been placed from one of the quarry water storage dams across an adjoining owner's property to the south without any form of consent.</p> <p>The quarry was fined in 2015 by the EPA for failing to carry out water sampling required within it's EPL.</p> <p>(examples of past environmental NSW EPA fines (as well as examples from news articles re BHQ) Given the record of the proponent I submit that the Heidelberg Group inclusive of Hanson does not prequalify for a social licence or formal governmental approval to proceed with the Sancrox Quarry Expansion Project.</p> <p>Quarry has not met existing consent conditions with respect to establishing and maintaining a vegetated screen along its Northern and Eastern boundaries.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>One of the license conditions is that there should be maintained a screen of trees immediately to the east of the existing quarry. There is no such screen. This is not an onerous requirement but Hanson has chosen not to comply with the screen of trees conditional requirement for the existing quarry.</p> | 159 | 60% |
| Heritage                               | The proposed works impact Aboriginal heritage sites, including a Scar Tree and ceremonial site of high cultural significance.   | 11  | 4%  |



| Issue Name Summary of issues |  | No. | %  |
|------------------------------|--|-----|----|
| Visual                       | <p>Hanson has not been able to comply with the screens of trees conditional requirements for the existing quarry. How therefore will they cope with the requirements of significantly higher standard mitigation measures given the dimension of the proposed larger new pit?</p> <p>The trees around the quarry have already be bulldozed so now the quarry is fully exposed from the highway ( you could not see it before) so already we have lost Koala habitat.</p> <p>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. No assessment on how the quarry and the new plant will look when already approved development proceeds to the North, East and South of the quarry. A decent and permanent visual screen should be provided along the whole Northern boundary of the quarry so that as our development (already approved) proceeds and the quarry operations are appropriately screened within its own property boundaries.</p> <p>The visual assessment and visibility model contained in the EIS are not a true reflection of the visibility of the quarry operation. A detailed visual assessment needs to be completed to show how the new equipment (particularly the concrete batching plant which looks to be some 20m high?) and the proposed expanded quarry operations are to be appropriately screened from neighbouring properties and from public roads. Any screens ought to be provided for within the quarry property and the suggested noise bund noted earlier could also provide such a visual screen.</p> | 14  | 5% |

| Issue Name Summary of issues        |  | No. | %  |
|-------------------------------------|--|-----|----|
| Engagement Process                  | <p>All residents should be notified of this in writing not by flyer in mail.</p> <p>The project has been kept quiet from the local community and councils.</p> <p>This development proposal has so far attempted to fly under the radar for local residents. Proper consultation and acknowledgment of the impacts of the development is required and we call for the rejection of the proposal in its current form. Objective actions and penalties also need to be considered as it is significantly lacking in this submission</p> <p>There is already poor record by the company in community consultation. Residents only found out about this by another residents letterbox drop. Hansen was not proactive or open about the plans. Submission time frames have been quick and does not allow residents proper scrutiny or response to the 1500+ page report. A proper consultation process should begin and submission time frames restarted. If this is the beginning of the process, Hansen have already demonstrated their contempt for the local residents and there is concern that they will only continue with this degree of engagement during the construction and into the future mine site.</p> <p>The requirements of the advertised Public Exhibition period for SSD 7293 were seriously breached.</p> <p>The advertised exhibition of documents in the local region, Port Macquarie, did not occur. The documents (DA/EIS and Annexures) were NOT available from Port Macquarie Hastings Council (PMHC) office for half of the advertised exhibition period. The Community Consultative Committee (CCC) does not appear to have fulfilled its legal role and this should be investigated. The CCC, led by independent chairperson, Lisa Andrews, had one meeting on 6.7.2018. The CCC minutes from that meeting state that the CCC will, “act as a conduit to the community”, and, “schedule their next meeting to occur in the exhibition period” (DA p 527).</p> <p>The Community Consultative Committee (CCC) does not appear to have fulfilled its legal role and this should be investigated. The CCC, led by independent chairperson, Lisa Andrews, had one meeting on 6.7.2018. The CCC minutes from that meeting state that the CCC will, “act as a conduit to the community”, and, “schedule their next meeting to occur in the exhibition period” (DA p 527).</p> <p>Most stakeholders in the Primary Study Area (PSA) have been denied or severely constrained by a failure of the proponent to properly advise of and execute a consultation process that is open, transparent and professional. This is inclusive of the notification and deployment of details and information to the greater Primary Study Area (PSA) community. It appears no information or invitation to take part in the consultative process was issued or delivered to the balance of the PSA / Sancrox area that has the potential to be significantly impacted by this project. This has resulted a high percentage of the landowners and residents of Sancrox being denied the opportunity to present their views and cases within the framework of an honest, effective and meaningful consultation process.</p> <p>Until 3 weeks ago when a neighbour alerted us of the quarry expansion plans I had no idea of the proposal and had ZERO correspondence or consultation regarding this from the Hanson Group or anyone else. It is my belief that if any one of the stakeholders being neighbours or otherwise should have been notified regarding this project it should have been us.... who live next door. The consultation process regarding this expansion process has been as non-transparent as anything I’ve ever seen. As mentioned above, as a direct neighbour of this site...we have not been notified as part of any consultation at all. We have been disappointed by the lack of direct and detailed engagement by Hanson with us regarding all of the neighbourly issues raised in the submission. We were aware of the intention to expand the quarry but many of our neighbours were not. We do not believe the consultation process was appropriate given the scale of development proposed. If there is a revised proposal, then this should be taken through a proper consultation process.</p> | 11  | 4% |
| high speed rail corridor            | <p>No mention is made of the high-speed rail corridor which goes right through the middle of the deepest part of the quarry. This will require the high-speed corridor to be moved onto the adjoining land owned by Jeff Freeman.</p> <p>No mention is made of the fact that the corridor for the proposed East Coast High Speed Rail line runs right through the middle of the new quarry pit.</p>  | 13  | 5% |
| Impact on Billabong Koala Sanctuary | No mention is made of the impact upon the Billabong Wildlife Park and Koala Sanctuary less than 1 km from the pit.   | 8   | 3% |

| Issue Name Summary of issues                                       |   | No. | %   |
|--|---|-----|-----|
| Surrounding land sterilization                                     | <p>Hanson claim in their submission that Port Macquarie has a 15 year supply of Residential land. It is worth noting that the Council has acknowledged that the new Biodiversity Legislation introduced in 2016 has meant that the estimated 15 year supply of Residential land as stated in the UGMS and referred to in the Hanson letter, may be grossly overestimated. It is believed by the local Land Development experts, including LDA, that the amount of Residential land remaining in Port Macquarie is only approx. 5-7 years. This figure is to be confirmed by a study currently being conducted in conjunction with the PMHC. Possibly the impacted areas cannot be contained within the Hanson owned land simply via management of mitigation measures.</p> <p>The new Sancrox quarry project will fragment and alienate land and result in conflict with adjoining land uses.</p> <p>I see that voluntary acquisitions can be made for their properties so I take from that the fact that the expansion of this quarry could make those properties unliveable.</p>  | 9   | 3%  |
| Alternative site (Herons Creek, Bago) / alternative material usage | <p>Hanson describe the resources found in their existing quarry and potential new quarry is in short supply. What they fail to disclose is the true number of quarries located in the local area with the similar material. Hanson claim they don't own other resources in the area, but in fact they own Lot 2 DP 814356 at Milligans Road, Bago where there are ample Reserves closer than the 200km claimed in their submissions. This quarry also contains high quality rhyolite daicite. Hanson claim that transport costs will be excessive because of 200km haulage distance. More accurately the supply from Bago is only 20km from Sancrox, so this would be negligible.</p> <p>Hanson states that there are no supplies of similar rock in the area or a quarry within 200km. That is patently untrue and in fact Hanson owns land within 20km which contain adequate high quality rock which is adjacent to a recently approved new quarry. There are also many other competitor's quarries in the close vicinity</p> <p>We have Bago Quarry to the south west and Hytec Quarry at Bonny Hills on the coast to the south. This project is simply not needed for this area</p> <p>Rather than quarry road base materials, a better option is to utilise plastic bags, recycled glass and printer toner in the construction of new roads. Following China's ban on foreign waste imports in 2018, Australia now has a glut of recyclables of which only a small fraction is repurposed. Through crushing glass back into sand, it is possible repurpose not only glass bottles and jars, but also plate glass, drinking ware, crockery and Pyrex into road base. As well as ensuring more glass can be recycled, transforming glass back into sand reduces the need to mine virgin material for road base and asphalt, decreasing road resealing costs and limiting truck movements on the road. Making road base and fill material from recycled products, rather than mining virgin materials, uses considerably less energy and water, and creates less air pollution.</p> <p>The claim that lack of alternative sources or outlets justifies the expansion, is not supported: e.g. Hanson operates Ready Mix Concrete at 14 Blackbutt Road, Port Macquarie. Hanson is only one part of the global Heidelberg Cement Group, the largest supplier of aggregates and third largest supplier of cement in the world.</p> <p>Proponent owns lands adjacent to Bago State forest which contains high and consistent quality hard rock in large quantities.</p> | 41  | 15% |

| Issue Name Summary of issues |  | No. | %   |
|------------------------------|--|-----|-----|
| New Quarry/not expansion     | <p>The proposed expansion is to be located on a new Lot and DP and all plant is to be moved, and therefore it would be best described as a new quarry, especially given that the existing quarry was to be closed last century.</p> <p>Hanson states that this application is for an extension of the existing quarry. In reality it is for a NEW quarry on adjacent land owned by Hanson. The operation of this quarry from establishment was located on Lot 353 DP 754434 prior to licensing regulation. A condition of the continuing operation of the quarry was that the operation would cease in approx. 2005 and the pit be converted to a water storage dam at cessation.</p> <p>The quarrying operation at this site has continued past the agreed closure date and it is obvious by the application that the resource on Lot 353 is now, or soon to be, exhausted.</p> <p>Commencement of mining on another separate parcel of land that has not previously been approved must surely constitute a new and distinct development. Any new development should be subject to the appropriate approval process with the checks and balances that would apply to any new development. This new development should not be touted merely as an expansion to an operation (that should have been closed years ago)</p> <p>These are additional operations and are not part of the current operation and are not a state significant development. They should be treated as a new development and sited on appropriately zoned industrial land.</p> <p>The proposed 'quarry expansion' is more than that! It also includes two new additional operations, concrete batching and asphalt production which should be required to undergo individual Development Applications under Local Government planning instruments. There are already other concrete and asphalt plants in the region that have the capacity to service the demand.</p> | 150 | 56% |

| Issue Name Summary of issues   |   | No. | %   |
|--|---|-----|-----|
| Current (Le Clos) and Future (Le Clos Verdun, Le Clos Sancrox) rural residential impacts/house value | <p>The quarry is not ideally situated. In every direction over the range of 300m - 1,300m, there is both current and potential residential development and this new proposal is not consistent with the needs for this local government area.</p> <p>No mention is made of the currently being constructed 142 Lot Rural Residential sub-division to the west of the site (Le Clos Verdun), the eastern boundary of which is only 600m from the western edge of the new quarry.</p> <p>No mention is made of the existing houses located on Le Clos Sancrox, the nearest of which is less than 1km from the edge of the proposed new quarry and the proposal currently being considered by PMHC to rezone the whole Le Clos Sancrox as residential, the closest parts of which will be approximately 300m from the southern edge of the proposed new quarry.</p> <p>No mention is made of any bund to the south of the last stage of the new quarry which is essential to protect anything on Le Clos Sancrox. Furthermore, will any bund be effective anyway?</p> <p>Hanson states that the new quarry will not impact on any local existing and future land uses. This is a gross mistruth. Currently there are many houses situated within 300m to 1000m of the edge of the new quarry pit.</p> <p>A change in traffic volume will lessen my enjoyment of my property, and cause a deterioration of my property's value.</p> <p>Close proximity of Riverpark Sancrox to the Sancrox quarry and its proposed expansion would cause adverse effects to the amenity of residents and the surrounding community</p> <p>Will reduce amenity and house value for neighbouring properties</p> <p>This area has been earmarked by Port Macquarie-Hastings Council as a future residential development opportunity. The significant increase in heavy vehicle movements can only have a negative impact on road safety along this narrow road.</p> <p>Currently there are many houses situated within 300m to 1000m of the edge of the new quarry pit. In addition, no mention is made of the 142 Lot Riverpark Sancrox Estate, the eastern edge of which is only 600m from the edge of the proposed new quarry pit. No mention either is made of the proposed new residential sub-division proposed on Le Clos Sancrox, the edge of which will be only 300m away, nor of the need for expansion of residential development being proposed by the Port Macquarie Hastings Council in the Port Macquarie to Wauchope corridor of which Le Clos Sancrox is the first part</p> <p>Coordination with Council's Urban Growth Management Strategy and mitigating impact on future growth is an important aspect and one that this application fails to address in detail.</p> <p>My land is part of an estate of some 51 lots of approx. 2ha each. All lot owners have combined to make an application to the Port Macquarie Hasting Council, at their request, to rezone the land from Rural to Residential.</p> <p>Existing rural residential development at Le Clos Verdun will be adversely impacts by this proposed development from a noise and dust viewpoint.</p> | 35  | 13% |

| Issue Name Summary of issues           |   | No. | %   |
|--|---|-----|-----|
| Lack of Consultation                   | <p>there are many other people in this area that would be negatively impacted by the proposed expansion ... and I am not sure if they have been consulted or are aware of the Quarry's desire to expand.</p> <p>how does a project such as this reach this level of approval, without proper community/rate payer consultation?</p> <p>completely inadequate community consultation</p> <p>I am only aware of this proposal through one of my neighbours informing me of the planned expansion...I am yet to meet a local resident that has been contacted.</p> <p>There has been insufficient consultation on this development. In fact, the documents required for exhibition during SSD 7293 were not available from Port Macquarie Hastings Council for the first two weeks of the initial four week exhibition period, and the wider community was not aware of the meetings, actions or intentions of Community Consultative Committee responsible for this project.</p> <p>the process of this development approval is not acceptable and the fact that State Government, not Local Council, assess this Development Application is very inappropriate and concerning. On 20.11.19 Councillors of PMHC unanimously agreed on their own URGENT Submissions to the State Government highlighting very serious issues including: lack of transparent consultation with the broader community;</p> <p>The CCC met only once at the beginning of the process, there has been no consultation during the preparation of the EIS and the CCC has now met again following the exhibition of the EIS.</p> <p>Expressway Spares preference is that a more direct engagement take place so that the neighbourly issues be addressed in a more detailed manner.</p>  | 16  | 6%  |
| Impacts on roads/ degradation of roads | <p>Increased 24/7 heavy vehicle movements on the light duty local roads will compromise road safety and accelerate pavement failure.</p> <p>Rawdon Island Rd. The road is in poor shape now and increased volume of heavy vehicles will cause its further deterioration.</p> <p>The design of the road is not appropriate for increased vehicle volume.</p> <p>Both Sancrox and Rawdon Island Road are very unsuitable roads to cater for trucks and heavy traffic flow, especially truck and dog vehicles, these roads are designed for light rural traffic.</p> <p>It is already too dangerous a road to walk, ride a bike or a horse safely, the roads (Sancrox and Rawdon Island Road) are too narrow.</p> <p>Despite the construction of Winery Road we consistently see heavy vehicles from the quarry using Fernbank Creek Rd as the preferred and shorter route in Port Macquarie.</p> <p>This road is a popular route for the local cycling community and residents from Wauchope and Sancrox and it is only a matter of time before we have a serious accident on this narrow, twisting road.</p> <p>Sancrox Road</p> <p>there is no mention of road pavement destruction / wear and tear and the cost/recompense to ratepayers as not all traffic is on the Pacific Highway.</p> <p>One major issue is that of existing (never mind increasing) 'truck and dog' type traffic. We refer to the to heighten traffic and safety risk posed by quarry "Truck and Dog" type traffic to our family and friends and visitors in motor vehicles, bicycles, jogging or on horseback being met on Sancrox Road, Frogs Road round-a-bout, at the Le Clos Sancrox and Sancrox Road intersection, at the Sancrox and Rawdon Island Roads intersection, along Sancrox, Rawdon Island and Fernbank Creek roads.</p> <p>We have already had a family member have a serious motor vehicle accident with a Quarry truck on Sancrox Road.</p> | 142 | 53% |
| Support                                |   | 3   | 1%  |

| Issue Name Summary of issues       |  | No. | %   |
|------------------------------------|--|-----|-----|
| Aboriginal impacts                 | <p>Quarry expansion of 40 hectares ... negative impacts on the rights of indigenous peoples to land and resources held collectively</p> <p>Impact on Aboriginal heritage sites, including a Scar Tree and ceremonial site of high cultural significance</p> <p>There will also be an impact on Aboriginal heritage sites, including a Scar Tree and ceremonial site of 'high cultural significance'</p> <p>Identified Aboriginal heritage sites will be adversely impacted, including a Scar Tree and ceremonial site of "high cultural significance"</p>  | 142 | 53% |
| anticipation of closure of Sancrox | The quarry was originally only intended for a life until approximately 2005, when the estimated winnings were forecast to be exhausted.  | 8   | 3%  |
| RU1 land zoning                    | <p>There are approved substantial subdivisions (some 142 allotments) on adjacent land that this development will negatively affect.</p> <p>The objectives of the RU1 zoning state: "To minimise conflict between land uses within this zone and land uses within adjoining zones."</p> <p>A large and noisy mining operation on nearby land will only generate conflict and is directly in contradiction of the objectives of the zoning.</p> <p>The 2011 Port Macquarie Hastings Local Environmental Plan zoning prohibits the proposed activities. The area includes an RU1 zone (RU1 - Primary Production) under which the quarry industry should not operate, and Environment Protection Zones E2 (E2 Environmental Conservation zone) and E3 (E3 Environmental Management zone). The 'State Significant Development' status given this application for quantitative extraction of raw materials from the quarry, should not vary the terms of local zoning.</p> <p>Application No. SSD-7293 by Hanson Construction Materials Pty Ltd for Sancrox Quarry Expansion Project is clearly not in keeping with the Port Macquarie Hastings Council Urban Growth Management Strategy so as to minimise conflict. Refer LEP 2011 and Sancrox Structure Plan 2014 – 2035. Port Macquarie Hastings Council is currently moving to reconsider zoning of the Sancrox area for other than rural residential e.g. Le Clos with a likely leaning to residential as seen at the Sovereign Hills area. Therefore, any current studies embodied in the EIS should be rendered invalid.</p> <p>The SSD designation, apparently applied because of the size of the proposal, is inappropriate and should not be used to vary the terms of RUI zoning to allow the project.</p> <p>The zoning of the subject land should not be changed because it accurately reflects the rural quality of its location, history and future. The quarry has outlived its approval which should not be renewed or extended. The surrounding area is now on a rural residential trajectory accommodating native plant communities and native animals.</p> | 7   | 3%  |