

25th July, 2013

Attention: Jessie Giblett,
Director Mining & Industry Projects, Development Assessment Systems and Approvals,
Dept of Planning & Infrastructure,
GPO Box 39,
Sydney,
NSW 2001

Objection to Application No. MP 07_0155 MOD.2
Ardmore Park Quarry

My objection to the modification to the EA, to allow trucks to turn left out of Ardmore Park, rather than right, are as follows:

1. A red gum that is growing directly at Ardmore Park gate is over 200 years old and will be historically signposted as follows

“The Larbert Tree”

‘This gum tree is known as “The Larbert Tree”. From the late 1880s a finger sign attached to the tree directed travellers on the Great South Road to Larbert where they crossed the Shoalhaven River on the way to the Braidwood Goldfields. Mail for residents along Tarago Road, now called Lumley Road, was left for collection in a hollow in this tree. Contact Goulburn Mulwaree Council prior to undertaking activities that may affect this tree’.

Now that Ardmore Park Quarry is wishing to transport quarry materials by turning left, rather than right, this will directly impact this tree. There is nothing mentioned, in the environmental assessment for the current modification, of this tree. There must be a directive from the Department of Planning that **no trucks should drive closer than 10m** because of possible impacts to the tree. We would maintain very strongly that, if allowed to carry out this modification, this tree must be protected as part of Bungonia’s natural and social heritage. If a merging lane is required to be put in, that lane must not impact this tree either.



Larbert Tree
growing
adjacent to
Ardmore
Park's
entrance.



2. As part of the Conditions of Consent to Multiquip’s previous EA, noise and dust monitors were to be put up to monitor the noise and dust produced by this quarrying enterprise. To my knowledge this has not been done even though the consent was given back in 2009. Part

of Justice Jagot's report was the following. If his modification is allowed to go ahead then this noise monitoring must be implemented as part of the Consent.

"Noise Monitoring Program"

The Applicant shall prepare and implement a Noise Monitoring Program for the proposal to the satisfaction of the Director-General. This program must:

- (a) be submitted to the Director-General for approval prior to the commencement of the development;*
- (b) be prepared in consultation with the DECC;*
- (c) include a combination of attended and unattended noise monitoring to monitor the performance of the proposal, and include a noise monitoring protocol for evaluating compliance with the relevant noise criteria in this consent; and*
- (d) report the results of the monitoring program to the Director-General every 12 months".*

3. As part of Justice Jagot's report was the following. If his modification is allowed to go ahead then this noise monitoring must be implemented as part of the Consent. Multiquip did ask for modifications to this, but essentially dust is still to be monitored.

"Air Quality Monitoring Program"

The Applicant shall prepare and implement an Air Quality Monitoring Program for the proposal to the satisfaction of the Director-General. This program must:

- (e) be submitted to the Director-General for approval prior to the commencement of the development;*
- (f) be prepared in consultation with DECC;*
- (g) use a combination of [real-time air quality monitoring (OR) high volume samplers] and dust deposition gauges to monitor the performance of the proposal, and include a protocol for evaluating compliance with the relevant air quality criteria in this consent; and*
- (h) report the results of the monitoring program to the Director-General every 12 months".*

4. Multiquip has not begun any quarrying , thus no road upgrades have been undertaken, since the company was given permission to start all those years ago i.e. 20th Sept, 2009. The proponent is now proposing to use more of our country roads to move his product without having to upgrade those roads. How can the proponent apply for a modification to his DA when he hasn't even started the original works he got permission to do? How is this modification State Significant? These roads were not built to carry a constant stream of haulage trucks. After good rain, holes quickly appear in the surface of the tar seal. Because the roads are not wide enough, vehicles move off the seal to make enough room to pass when trucks are coming towards them. When truck meets truck or truck meets bus, both vehicles have to move off the road, which over time causes gouging of the gravel and breaks along the tar seal edge, which is very dangerous for cars that may have to move off the road subsequently. In hot weather, the tar softens and breaks up under the weight of the loaded trucks. This causes huge road maintenance problems. How will the Dept. ensure that Multiquip will pay the S94 contributions due? Several deaths have already occurred on these local roads over the last few years without these extra trucks being on the road. A large section of Lumley Road is unsealed with dust from trucks being a big problem, especially if they travel in convoy. The long paddock, i.e. the road verges, are still being used by locals in

times when feed is short, to supplement fodder on farm by grazing sheep and cattle along the roads. This will conflict greatly if trucks are trying to keep to timetables.

Is the Department going to monitor if the proponent moves quarry product to Sydney via Windellama and then to the Hume highway at Goulburn, rather than directly along Jerrara Road, meeting the Hume highway near Marulan? Is the proponent going to move quarry product via the back door?

These are just some of the problems we can see in regard to this modification and thus we do not consider that this change is justified. The tonnages Multiquip is proposing are minor and something the Goulburn Mulwaree Council should be dealing with, not the Department of Planning and Infrastructure, they are certainly not State Significant.

Thus this Modification in my estimation is not in the public interest and should be denied. NSW Department of Planning must abide by the conditions of approval laid down in September 2009.