

23 September 2025

Paul Scully MP
Minister for Planning
Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure
Locked Bag 5022
PARRAMATTA NSW 2124.

c/o Planning Portal

Dear Minister Scully

RE: SSD-27223807: MONARO ROCKS QUARRY

Reference is made to development application SSD-27223807 for the Monaro Rocks Quarry. I own two properties at Royalla.

I am objecting to the state significant development application SSD-27223807.

STRATEGIC CONTEXT

I refer to the Environmental Impact Statement ('EIS') and the "**Need for the Project**". The data implies that a hard rock shortfall will be experienced by 2030 if the project is not approved. The view put forward by the Proponent, is that the need outweighs the environmental constraints and its values at the proposed development site. Extractive industries are a prohibited use within the RU2 Rural Landscape and C2 Environmental Conservation of the Queanbeyan-Palerang Local Environmental Plan 2022 ('QPLEP').

The need for the project cannot outweigh the prohibition of extractive industries for this landuse under the QPLEP. It is noted that the EIS utilises the loophole of Clause 2.9(3) of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Resources and Energy) 2021 ('the SEPP') to justify its need described "by virtue" in the EIS.

Under Clause 2.9(3) of the SEPP outlines the following:

- (3) **Extractive industry** Development for any of the following purposes may be carried out with development consent—
- (a) extractive industry on land on which development for the purposes of agriculture or industry may be carried out (with or without development consent),
 - (b) extractive industry in any part of a waterway, an estuary in the coastal zone or coastal waters of the State that is not in an environmental conservation zone.

By virtue, under the C2 Conservation zone, the permissibility of 'oyster aquaculture' forms part of the reasoning that extractive industries can be wholly permitted with consent.

Under the Standard Local Environmental Plan template, 'oyster aquaculture' formed part of inland councils' standard local environmental plans in 2006 despite its inability to occur in inland councils. Based on this technicality, the Proponent justifies the project in going ahead because 'oyster aquaculture' is an agricultural purpose and thus the development is wholly permitted. This outlines the absurdity of the planning loophole because of oysters, to allow for the site to be wholly permitted with consent despite extractive industries being prohibited at a local level.

Ancillary Infrastructure

In 2021, the Proponent issued a scoping report (p. 3) to the Department which described the development as:

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

The Applicant is seeking development consent to develop the Monaro Rock Quarry which would include the following.

- The progressive development of the Project comprising an extraction area, processing and stockpiling area and Quarry Access Road.*
- Construction of two amenity barriers to mitigate potential environmental impacts.*
- Construction and use of a dedicated Quarry Access Road including a crossing of the Goulburn Bombala Rail Line and an intersection with the Monaro Highway.*
- A maximum extraction and processing rate of up to 750 000 tonnes per annum (tpa) at full capacity.*
- Product transportation involving a maximum of 20 laden trucks per hour and no more than 150 laden trucks per day.*
- Ongoing operations for a period of 30 years from the commencement of operations.*

The August 2025 Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARS) excerpt is shown below which outlines the significant change in proposal:

Monaro Rock Quarry Project, which involves:

- extraction of up to 1,000,000 tonnes per annum of hard rock aggregates and road construction materials for 30 years;*
- transporting products from the site via the Monaro Highway at a rate of 25 laden trucks per hour and no more than 200 laden trucks per day;*
- construction of site infrastructure, such as amenity barriers, internal haul roads and a level crossing of the Tuggeranong to Bombala railway corridor; and*
- progressively rehabilitating the site.*

Residents impacted by the proposed development were not appropriately informed of the additional development creep. The community has not been appropriately consulted on the *said* 'ancillary infrastructure'.

The Project now proposes 'ancillary infrastructure' described as:

- Concrete recycling processing 20,000 tonne per annum
- Concrete batching 50,000 cubic metres per annum
- Asphalt dispatch of 50,000 tonne per annum.

Thirty-five (35%) percent will make up the average daily trips associated with the ancillary infrastructure and development. While 47% will make up the maximum daily trips associated with the ancillary infrastructure and development. Despite the proportion of the heavy vehicle movements, this has not been appropriately consulted with the community.

The ancillary infrastructure and development do not meet the definition of ancillary development. I refer to the Department's Planning Circular PS21-008 which states "***An ancillary use is a use that is subordinate or subservient to the dominant purpose. If a component serves its own purpose, it is not a component of the dominant purpose but an independent use on the same land. It is a dominant use in its own right and not an ancillary use. In such circumstances, the development could be described as a mixed use development. Each principal use in a mixed use development must be permitted with consent on the land.***"

The proposed ancillary infrastructure is not in fact 'ancillary'.

Throughout the SEARS process, it was clear that the project was focused on the 'extraction of *said* tonnes per annum of hard rock aggregates and road construction materials for 30 years'. 'Extraction' is the key word, noting that the *said* ancillary infrastructure and development requires significant amount of importation of materials. The concrete recycling plant requires importation of concrete. The asphalt plant requires importation of filler and bitumen.

Based on the above, at a minimum, the three ancillary infrastructure and development must be excluded from the process and separate development applications submitted. One cannot describe that haulage trips that make up nearly half of the project as '*subordinate or subservient to the dominant purpose*'. It simply is not.

Extraction of materials and laden trucks transporting product from the site is what has been publicly presented through the SEARS process and the community's understanding of the extent of the project. Not importation of materials which would result in returned laden truckloads. The community were not consulted during the SEARS process to comment on this.

Ancillary infrastructure such as the weighbridge, visibility barrier and roads meet the definition of ancillary infrastructure. The concrete recycling plant, the concrete batching plant and the asphalt plant do not meet the definition of ancillary infrastructure. The extraction of materials can occur without the three mixed use development described as 'ancillary infrastructure'. They are not subordinate. They are not subservient.

The objectives of the RU2 and C2 zonings

The EIS demonstrates that the development will conflict with the objectives of the zoning of this area. The proposal:

- Does not “encourage sustainable primary industry production by maintaining and enhancing the natural resource base” of the RU2 Rural Landscape zoning. It proposes to extract the resource and transport it outside of the site.
- Does not “maintain the rural landscape character of the land of the RU2 Rural Landscape zoning”. It proposes to extract the resource and impact on the rural residential amenity of nearby residents. It proposes to place a prohibited industry under the QRLEP in the area that would have clear landuse conflict with the area.
- Does not “provide for a range of compatible land uses, including extensive agriculture” of the RU2 Rural Landscape zoning. An extractive industry is not a compatible land use.
- Does not “protect, manage and restore areas of high ecological, scientific, cultural or aesthetic values” of the C2 Environmental Conservation zone. The extractive industry will do the opposite as demonstrated by the EIS that Aboriginal objects will be impacted.
- Does not “prevent development that could destroy, damage or otherwise have an adverse effect on those values” of the C2 Environmental Conservation zone. The extractive industry will destroy and damage the area and have adverse effects.
- Does not “encourage rehabilitation and regeneration of ecosystems” of the C2 Environmental Conservation zone. It proposes to destroy the ecosystems.
- Conflicts with “providing for a limited range of development and land use activities that support environmental conservation outcomes of the C2 Environmental Conservation zone. The zoning is a closed zone, outlining what is permitted with consent with all uses prohibited if not listed. The QLEP’s objective limited the range of developments however the development proposes to oppose this objective.
- Conflicts with “identifying and protecting escarpment areas that enhance the visual amenity of Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional local government area and possess special aesthetic or conservational value” of the C2 Environmental Conservation zone. An extractive industry will not protect these areas and destroy the visual amenity of the local government area and this is acknowledged in the EIS.
- Does not “protect water quality by preventing inappropriate development within catchment areas” of the C2 Environmental Conservation zone. The project proposes to use an excessive amount of water for its construction and operational phases. It proposes inappropriate water quality monitoring regime.

In the section outlining “**Surrounding Land Uses**”. The EIS acknowledges that proximity of privately-owned residences within 2km of the Project Site will have potential constraints of noise and vibration, air quality (including health) and visibility.

In the section outlining the “**Risk Hazards**”. I dispute the risk assessment of the project which downplays issues relating to noise, traffic and dust. This is further addressed in my submission.

The “**Cumulative impacts**” are assessed as acceptable. This is disputed based on the Road Transport Assessment and the Acoustic Report.

Road Transport Assessment

Reference is made to the Road Transport Assessment Report (RTA Report) undertaken by R.W. Corkery & Co Pty Limited. Comments are provided below:

- 2.6.2 (p. 8) - Traffic surveys were conducted in May 2021 to June 2021. Specifically, Thursday 27 May to Wednesday 9 June 2021 (inclusive) on the Monaro Highway north of Old Cooma Road.
- Table 2.2 (p.10) - Highlights that the traffic count were influenced by the ACT Public Holiday (31 May 2021) that inflated the numbers. This is disputed, noting that on 27 May 2021, Victoria went into lockdown. This public health order would have made people cautious to travel. Public health orders interstate does not deter caution given the period of time the world had gone through. The NSW Government applied restrictions to parts of Sydney from 21 June 2021 — outside of the traffic survey count timeframe but it would be reasonable to assume close enough to affect results. The RTA Report acknowledges this on p. 9 but implies “*It is further noted that the survey was conducted prior to the implementation of travel restrictions in NSW, as the lockdown restrictions commenced at the end of June 2021*”. The RBA information¹ shows the Delta wave during this period which would have cautioned people's necessity to travel well before NSW formally went into lockdown only days later.
- Figure 2.4 (p.11) - Commentary to support the table states that Monday and Friday are excluded because of the ACT public holiday as it “*displayed distinctly different data when compared to other weekdays*”. This does not accurately represent or acknowledge the snow traffic travelling south which sees an increase of vehicles on these days and should have been incorporated in for northbound and southbound lanes.
- The RTA Report does not consider the maintenance restrictions on the Monaro Highway that prohibits for traffic controlled maintenance, unless in the event of an emergency on Mondays and Fridays. General maintenance is limited on the Monaro Highway during snow season traffic that generally occurs from the June long weekend to the October long weekend. Works cannot occur before 12pm on Mondays and after 12pm on Fridays.
- The Snowy Monaro Regional Council limits their reactive maintenance to Wednesdays to avoid the snow traffic. The Monaro Highway is the gateway to the Snowy Mountains with traffic from Sydney and Canberra.
- The Transport for NSW Traffic Volume Counter (6114)² shows the following which is contrary to the Monaro Rock Road Transport Assessment for all traffic averages:

¹ <https://www.rba.gov.au/education/resources/explainers/pdf/the-covid-19-pandemic-2020-to-2021.pdf>

² <https://maps.transport.nsw.gov.au/egeomaps/traffic-volumes/index.html#/?z=6&id=6114&df=1>

Year	Monaro Rock Road Transport Assessment	NSW Traffic Volume Counter
2021	4,400	4,503
2022	5,783	6,092
2023	5,355	5,329
2024	5,316	5,303
2025 (limited data)	5,070	5,042

On the above, it is assumed that the RTA Report may have applied averaging on top of the data extracted from TfNSW Counter 6114 but not provide a clear methodology in the report. This is a comment on the validity of the data that requires further explanation.

- The TfNSW Counter 6114 displays daily information that highlights the pattern of peak traffic on Mondays and Fridays during the snow seasons. The report fails to address this.
- Table 2.3 (p. 12) further excludes the Monday and Friday data due to the ACT long weekend which skews the information presented. They describe their reason as inflating the data when in fact it would more accurately represent and model the real life experiences of commuters on the Monaro Highway.
- The 2025 snow season³ was one of the most successful seasons. It has been described as record breaking. TfNSW Counter 6114 has not produced data for this year's snow season.
- As a result of the above, the RTA Report does not address the impact of the traffic generated from this development during the snow season. Traffic counts should have been put near the Johnson Drive and Monaro Highway roundabout to monitor the bottleneck experienced by commuters in both the northbound and southbound lanes. This is not appropriately assessed in the EIS cumulative impacts.
- No traffic counts were put near the Johnson Drive and Monaro Highway roundabout to monitor the bottleneck experienced by commuters in both the northbound and southbound lanes to monitor the commuter travel in and out of Tuggeranong that will also be adversely impacted. This is not appropriately assessed in the EIS cumulative impacts.
- Table 2.1 (p. 8) shows a daily average of 4,400 vehicles in 2021 equating to an averaged weekly total of 30,800 vehicles. The TfNSW Counter 6114 shows that peak demand during winter in 2024 (week of 15 July 2024) reaching up to 61,510 vehicles in both directions and 58,007 (week of 3 July 2023). While the RTA report disputes the distance of the TfNSW Counter 6114, the estates between the project site to the traffic counter would not generate the additional numbers of traffic given the lack of population density. The population density between the project site and TfNSW Counter 6114 would travel northbound to Canberra where residents generally work or go to school rather than southbound towards Cooma.
- The NSW Government has invested funds into the Special Activation Precinct (SAP) to encourage all year round tourism at Jindabyne.

³ <https://www.weatherzone.com.au/news/longest-aussie-snow-season-in-three-years/1890890>

- This shows that any traffic mitigation measures proposed has not been designed to consider the peak season and demand of winter nor the SAP at Jindabyne that will mean traffic experienced on the Monaro Highway will increase in the summer months.
- Though the TfNSW Counter 6114 is 60km south of Royalla at Bredbo, it shows that the Monaro Highway is the gateway to the snow. In order to fit the narrative, the report dismisses the use of the TfNSW Counter 6114 because of its distance to the development.
- As above, surveyed intersection results at Old Cooma Road were surveyed during a wave of the Delta strain and when working from home was an acceptable option for workers. Data from 2021 does not accurately reflect the current situation, the increased development at Googong and other subdivisions that have come online and utilise Old Cooma Road. The access by residents living in Googong and the other estates have not been factored in this report or influenced any potential mitigation options proposed. Cumulative impact has not been appropriately assessed.
- The proponent proposes 25 laden trucks per hour. The mitigation measures proposed through the Traffic Management Plan and the Driver Code of Conduct does not consider a time management system that manages the inbound and outbound. At an average, this would mean a truck every 2.4 minutes outbound or alternatively 1.2 minutes for both inbound and outbound movements. The report does not outline mitigation measures to prevent a truck from immediately exiting after another laden truck or an unladen truck inbound and consideration to the information above during peak demand of traffic, the report fails to address cumulative impacts.
 - It is further noted that the EIS (p. 2-31) that extended operating hours could be considered if truck movements are directed to the Monaro Highway. This has not been appropriately modelled or considered in the RTA Report. The RTA Report assumes standard operating hours and not an extended one.
- The report does not address the impacts on the school bus run.
- The report does not mention wet weather contingencies that should form part of a Driver Code of Conduct.
- The RTA Report does not address the noise impact from the traffic generated from this development. This is addressed in the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment by Octave Acoustics.
- The RTA estimates a maximum of 710 trips per day including quarry product dispatch, VENM/EMN importation, concrete and asphalt transportation. This introduces inbound laden truck movements which will have an accumulative impact on the Monaro Highway and the amenity.
- At 302 operational days, there will be 214,420 truck movements per annum. The project lifecycle is 30 to 35 years. This would see over 6,432,6000 truck movements over 30 years or 7,504,700 truck movements over 35 years.
- To recap, 35% will make up the average daily trips associated with the ancillary infrastructure and development. While 47% will make up the maximum daily trips associated with the ancillary infrastructure and development. This data is flawed and does not support that the concrete recycling, concrete batching plant and

asphalt plant are ancillary infrastructure. They must be lodged under separate development application processes.

Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment

It is noted in relation to the above, the report by the Octave Acoustics models noise based on the traffic figures from 2021. Octave Acoustics utilizes the minimum daily volume, specifically the date of Wednesday 9 June 2021, stating it would provide a “*conservative assessment from the perspective of relative change. The existing proportion of heavy vehicles used is also conservative, as heavy vehicles are likely to avoid peak hour delays where possible*”.

This modelling is flawed. The haulage operations are to begin at 5:00am to 6:00pm Mondays to Saturdays. As demonstrated above in my comments relating to the RTA Report, the model by Octave Acoustics selects data that is conservative. It does not accurately assess the maximum daily vehicle numbers as this is likely to reflect the traffic on the Monaro Highway during snow season or when the Jindabyne SAP comes online. The assumption that the operator will not commence heavy vehicle inbound and outbound movements during peak hour is not reflected in the RTA Report.

As such the cumulative impact assessment of noise relating to road traffic as well its operation is not supported.

Planning Agreement

The use of Old Cooma Road for both laden and unladen trucks should be prohibited. However, the prohibition should only be supported by the Driver Code of Conduct and appropriate traffic mitigation measures to ensure enough time between each inbound or outbound truck does not have an impact on road users on the Monaro Highway. The number of laden and unladen trucks are not acceptable impacts on traffic on the Monaro Highway and have adverse impacts if all traffic is directed this way. However, the option of Old Cooma Road is not supported.

Limiting truck movements from Queanbeyan-Palarang local roads will have unintended consequences onto road users on the Monaro Highway. Therefore the proposal should not go ahead.

Alternatives considered

The ‘alternatives considered’ provides a perception that the Proponent had undertaken their due diligence in considering the alternative options considered, when in fact, investigations are undertaken on land that does not allow for extractive industries under the QRLEP. Through a planning loophole of oysters and home industries, the state significant development, if approved, will have detrimental impacts to the environment and the people that live around and travel near the development.

Visibility Barrier

Despite the intentions of put forward in the EIS relating to the visibility barrier balancing the constraints of terrain, the biodiversity impact is undone by the *“need to balance visual mitigation with potential material storage and use needs for the operation”*. The mitigation measure is not balanced to consider the site constraints to adjoining and adjacent properties and is mainly influenced by the Proponent’s need.

The visibility barrier takes into consideration of infrastructure that the Proponent classes as ancillary to the development. This is incorrect. The information of the mixed-use development that must have its own development approval processes should have its own mitigations like visibility barriers considered for residents impacted by the development.

Use of VENM/ENM

The project will import VENM/ENM to the site. The EIS States that approval will be sought from the NSW EPA. This implies that VENM/ENM will be imported from NSW, meaning it would require haulage route from NSW. Based on what is written in the EIS, I have assumed this would come from the southbound lane on the Monaro Highway or traffic southwest along Old Cooma Road to take VENM/ENM from NSW to make its way to the project site. However the EIS (p. 3-25) contradicts itself that *‘where possible, material would be transported to the Project Site via trucks returning from the delivery of quarry products to customer’*. This statement is further repeated in the various studies that accompany the EIS. This implies that the customers are NSW customers when the EIS’ proposed market is to the ACT creating ambiguity in the assessment.

Importation of VENM/ENM from the ACT would require ACT EPA approval. This has not been considered in the assessment.

While the RTA Report makes recommendations to accommodate a right turn from Monaro Highway deceleration lane, the importation of VENM/ENM from NSW has not been appropriately modelled into this assessment process and further clarification is required.

The location of the project is selected based on a profitability distance to the ACT to reduce haulage cost and the market demand in the ACT. Distance from the project site to the south, there is limited NSW development that would generate the volume of VENM/ENM. VENM/ENM from NSW would need to be hauled from the east meaning heavy vehicles along Old Cooma Road or through other parts of the Queanbeyan-Palerang local government area before entering the Monaro Highway to the north of the development. Haulage routes are not provided on the laden truck movements of the various materials being exported and imported to the site. This needs to be clarified.

Clarity is required on the process of certification of VENM/ENM. At the quantity proposed, compliance burden will be added to the Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council, especially when it is not clear where this product will come from and who is approving the certification.

Compliance burden

On the above and for the general development, will the QPRC be appropriately resourced with compliance officers due to this type of development? Will NSW Police be resourced appropriately to monitor the heavy vehicle movement on the Monaro Highway? Will the NSW EPA be appropriately resourced to ensure that the project site meets its environmental obligations under NSW legislation?

Water consumption, water quality and silica dust

The project proposes to utilise an excessive amount of water to meet its environmental obligations if it were to be approved. No cumulative impact of the water usage of the development across the local catchment has been considered. For the Proponent to meet their obligations, it puts the local catchment at risk, given no assessment has been undertaken.

More information is required to consider the water consumption of the ancillary infrastructure and development that simply do not meet the definition of ancillary development. Impacts on water quality from the mixed-use development that is described as 'ancillary infrastructure and development' is not understood.

Water quality is proposed to be monitored monthly. Provisions should be put in place if approved that water quality should also be monitored after a storm event at the locations listed. Their proposed risk mitigation is flawed.

Monitoring of discharge from sediment basins (EIS p. 6-161) is proposed for within 24 hours of discharge. Provisions should be put in place, if approved, that monitoring happens within 12 hours of discharge. This is because if undertaken within 24 hours, the Proponent may choose to undertake the monitoring closer to the 24 hour mark where sediment has had time settle thus distorting the discharge data and potential compliance breach. Their proposed risk mitigation is flawed.

There is a further concern of water quality in the residents surrounding the development. This relates to silica dust particles entering water tanks. The development proposes to use water or dust suppression agents to suppress dust. The impacts of these agents are not widely understood and has potential to impact the water supply and human and animal health. It is also assumed that dust is suppressed at all times, which would limit the impact on local water tanks. Compliance breaches with quarry operations are inevitable, even under the best of operations. The health impacts of residents should not be put at risk due to the hope that compliance will be met 100% of the time, especially with a development so close to residences.

The capacity to resource compliance has been highlighted earlier.

Infrastructure and Utilities

The proponent proposes to connect electricity into the existing 11kV power supply. There is no consideration of the project on the load/capacity to service not only the development but the surrounding estate.

Operational employment

Profit for a few, will result in 14 to 20 jobs with a further 10 for transportation. While employment generating development is good for the economy, given the value of the development versus the total number of people employed, it is minimal when you consider the hazards and risks that this project brings.

Save Enchanted Hill

In 2008, Queanbeyan-Palerang Regional Council commissioned a report on Biodiversity. This report observed the importance of Enchanted Hill, describing it as *'remnant and regrowth Dry Forest, Native Grasslands and Grassy Woodlands associated with the Enchanted Hill area in the south-west of the LGA.'*

55.39 hectares of Monaro-Queanbeyan Rolling Hills Grassy Forest and 22.84 hectares Southern Tableland Grassy Box Woodland will be cleared.

The clearance of this vegetation will have detrimental impacts to our Pink-tailed Legless Lizard; Key's Matchstick Grasshopper, Pale Pamaderris, Small Purple-pea and Silky Swainson-pea. This is unacceptable mass destruction.

I queried why so much land needed to be cleared? The 2008 report clearly identifies that accessibility to Enchanted Hill was difficult at the time of surveying. The mass destruction is because the site has challenging terrain. Profit for a few, will result in flattening around Enchanted Hill before quarry materials are hauled is the reason. The project will compromise the importance of Enchanted Hill and why the QRLEP zoned the land locally as RU2 Rural Landscape and C2 Environmental Conservation.

Social Impacts

The EIS refers to other quarry developments within relative proximity to Royalla, stating that this socially influences the residents of Royalla. This is greatly disputed. Residents near Williamsdale are adversely impacted from the quarry operations. Prior to blasting events, my properties will be notified of such an occurrence through a mailbox drop. I am not impacted by the heavy vehicle movements of the Williamsdale quarry and therefore do not consider the Royalla estate characterized as being socially influenced by other quarry developments.

I am not socially influenced by concrete recycling, concrete batching or asphalt, as they are simply developments that do not occur in the area that I own properties in.

The Social Impact Assessment is flawed, given appropriate consultation with residents has not been undertaken. This has been demonstrated by the lack of knowledge of residents to the concrete recycling, concrete batching or asphalt plant that is proposed as 'ancillary development'. This is demonstrated by the lack of understanding by residents on the importation of materials to the project site versus the story told to residents of extracting materials from the site. This is demonstrated by the engagement activities undertaken in 2021, when the SEARS was updated after this time to increase the amount

of extraction from the project site thus increasing the number of laden truck movements outbound. The story of laden inbound truck movements was never told to residents.

Contributions for *inconvenience*

Contributions for inconvenience will never make up for the excessive water usage, biodiversity destruction, dust, traffic accidents that will result in fatality and the detrimental impact this will have on all Royalla residents and those residents who travel along Old Cooma Road to enter onto the Monaro Highway. No amount of money will ever take away the fact that this development will destroy the Royalla estate and those who commute along Old Cooma Road or out from Royalla Drive.

Thank you for taking the time to read my submission and to consider the points I have put forward. If you require any further clarification on the points I have put forward, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Kind regards