

## Aaron Brown

---

**From:** Johns - Andrew [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 12 February 2019 11:08 PM  
**To:** IPCN Enquiries Mailbox  
**Cc:** Hudson - Wade  
**Subject:** Re: Vickery Extension Project

Dear IPC,

In response to Council's submission with respect to the above mentioned project and the subsequent IPC/Council meeting (and associated transcript), Council received some respectful feedback from the proponent. In response to the proponent's comments, we offer the following in addition to our submissions to date.

In respect to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Whitehaven Vickery Extension Project, Council made the initial submission to the development on the 19 October 2019. The matters raised within this submission outlined areas of concern regarding inadequate information and areas Council believed may require further consideration by the proponent.

Firstly, Council wishes to reiterate that it is not opposed to this development proposal. However, the matters raised within Council's submission are areas of consideration where further information should be provided, or alternate considerations should be made, prior to any determination being made.

In response to Council's meeting with the IPC, Mr Brian Cole, representing Whitehaven Coal, questioned some of the information provided on transcript by Council at this meeting. It should be noted that the exhibition timeframe for this proposal was tight and Council had, and still does, have resourcing constraints.

Upon further review, and with the benefit of time, Council would like to clarify the following information in relation to its submission, and Mr Cole's assertions:

- Social Impact Assessment (SIA): during the IPC meeting Council representatives made comment that only outdated census data, being 2011 data, had been used in the assessment. Council has reviewed the SIA and can confirm that this document makes references to both 2011 and 2016 data. The IPC should have regard to the fact that 2011, and the the most recent census data has been used.

- Water Resources: upon further review of the Surface Water Assessment, Council has identified information pertaining to management of water and resources within the Namoi River. This should be considered by the IPC.

In response to additional comments made to Council by Mr Cole, Council wishes to clarify the context within which it's comments and submission was made, in order to avoid any miscommunications:

- Council's submission makes reference to a lack of Lot and DP details. This reference is made to the lack of property information on the exhibition letter sent to Council during the exhibition period by the Department of Planning & Environment. Council confirms that the Lot and DP details of the properties, to which this development applies, were located within the EIS.

- Reference in Council's submission that biodiversity offset sites should be clarified. Council believes that there is potential for provision of offsets onsite during extraction works to assist in preservation of habitat for fauna populations, rather than providing offsets on an alternate site.

· With regard to the noise impact assessment and Council's comments in respect to the potential for exceedance of noise levels at five receptors, Council is not questioning the results of the assessment, but merely the acceptability of the exceedance of noise levels and the impact that this would have on privately owned land.

· Comments made by Council in the IPC/Council meeting regarding the omission of information relating to visual screening was in relation to this information not being contained within the Vickery Extension Project Preliminary Issues Report prepared by DPE. This was not a reference to the information being omitted from the EIS.

· Council's concerns regarding the flood modelling stems from the lack of information and detailed construction designs provided for the proposed rail spur. The flood modelling and plans have indicated changes to flood flows, however, vague comments and statements have been made regarding the final design. Council believes that this construction design should be formalised and flood modelling should be updated to reflect the final design to confirm potential changes to flood heights on surrounding allotments. Council's LEP mapping and studies should be amended only if a change to the flood modelling is identified upon final determination of designs for the rail spur.

Suggestions raised in our submission and the meeting with the IPC that inadequate consultation was held between the proponent and local Indigenous groups remains unchanged.

Finally, further to a matter that Council took on notice during the meeting with the IPC on the 19 December 2018, Council has confirmed that the Gunnedah Police Station supports, when fully staffed, twenty two staff. Information provided by Gunnedah Police notes that there have typically been 2-3 vacancies at this station at any given time.

Council trusts that this information and clarification is of benefit to the Commission.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Johns | Director Planning & Environmental Services, JP Gunnedah Shire Council

I acknowledge the Kamilaroi Aboriginal Nation as the traditional owners and custodians of the land on which I live, work and play. I pay my respect to Elders past and present.

PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE | The information contained in this email is intended for the named recipients only. It may contain privileged, private and confidential information and if you are not the named intended recipient, you must not copy, distribute or take any action in reliance on it. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by email or by the telephone number listed above.

This message has been scanned for malware by Websense. [www.websense.com](http://www.websense.com)