



Resource Assessments

Contact: Margaret Kirton

Phone: 9228 6289

Email: Margaret.Kirton@planning.nsw.gov.au

Mr Ed O'Neil
Gunlake Quarry Pty Ltd
PO Box 209
Marulan NSW 2579

Dear Mr O'Neil

**Gunlake Quarry Extension Project (SSD 7090)
Request for Response to Submissions**

The exhibition of the Gunlake Quarry Extension Project ended on Friday, 20 May 2016.

To date, the Department has received seven submissions from government agencies in response to the exhibition, which have been sent to you via email. The Department is expecting further submissions from government agencies and these will be forwarded to you as soon as they are received

The Department also received 47 submissions from community members, one submission from Holcim (Australia) Pty Ltd and one submission from the Towrang Community Progress Association. These 49 submissions are available on the Department's website.

The Secretary now requires that Gunlake prepare a Response to Submissions report, detailing the company's response to the issues raised in agency, special interest group and community submissions, and submit this report at its earliest convenience.

The Department has reviewed all submissions and notes that the community's principal concerns relate to noise, dust, impacts associated with the proposed increase in truck numbers and the lack of detailed consideration of the potential for transporting quarry products by rail. In responding to these issues, the Department requires that Gunlake pay particular attention to the following.

Consideration of Rail Transport

The Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) required the identification and description of all reasonable options to reduce transport of quarry products on local roads, including extension of the bypass road or use of either existing rail infrastructure at the Lynwood Quarry or new rail infrastructure, and a detailed assessment of any such option which is potentially feasible.

Although Appendix D of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) includes identification and some analysis of available road and rail options, the Department is not satisfied that Gunlake has provided a detailed assessment of the rail options as required, particularly as it would appear that Gunlake has not approached Holcim regarding the potential for using its rail infrastructure at the Lynwood Quarry.

Although the Department accepts that there are logistical issues relating to the distribution of quarry products to Gunlake's concrete batching plants in Sydney, as well as issues relating to the non-homogeneous nature of the quarry products transported from the Gunlake Quarry, the Department

considers there is insufficient quantitative information in the EIS to substantiate Gunlake's position regarding the seven options considered.

Therefore, Gunlake is required to undertake further work to ensure it has identified the lowest-cost option for transporting all or some of its products by rail (following consultation with Holcim) and provide a detailed analysis of the costs and benefits associated with this option compared to the costs and benefits of transporting its products by road under the company's preferred option. The analysis should include a comparison of the costs of the two scenarios with regard to the full range of economic, social and environmental costs, including the external costs of traffic congestion, carbon emissions and road accidents.

Impacts associated with the increase in Truck Movements

The proposed increase in the number of truck movements along the Bypass Road to the Hume Highway is clearly of major concern to the community, which has identified numerous issues relating to both existing and proposed truck movements.

In its Response to Submissions report, Gunlake is therefore required to re-examine this issue in detail and demonstrate that it has identified and incorporated all possible measures to minimise the impacts of the proposed increased truck movements, including measures to reduce road noise such as the installation of sound barriers, and/or to reduce proposed peak traffic movements.

Noise

The SEARs for this project required Gunlake to consider the full range of reasonable and feasible noise mitigation measures and also to consider whether the noise measures proposed are consistent with industry best practice. The Department considers that the EIS has not given sufficient attention to identifying the full range of noise mitigation measures that potentially could be considered to be reasonable and feasible.

In its Response to Submissions report, Gunlake is required to consider whether there are any additional noise mitigation measures, including operational measures, that could potentially be incorporated into the project beyond those already proposed. Gunlake should clearly detail these noise mitigation measures (both for operational noise and for road noise), quantify the reduction in noise levels that could be achieved if these measures were put in place, and provide indicative costings of these measures to support Gunlake's position on whether or not these measures should be incorporated into the project.

Please note that, under clause 113(7) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000*, the days occurring between the date of this letter and the date on which your RTS report is received by the Secretary are not included in the deemed refusal period.

Finally, the Department is giving consideration to requiring further community consultation, possibly in the form of a community meeting at which both officers from the Department and representatives from Gunlake would be present. I will be in touch with you shortly to discuss potential options in this regard.

If you have any questions about this letter, please contact Margaret Kirton on 9228-6289.

Yours sincerely



Howard Reed
Director
Resource Assessments

25.5.16