

TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

RE: BOMBO QUARRY SITE REHABILITATION WORKS – REQUEST FOR MINISTERIAL CALL-IN

COUNCIL MEETING

PANEL: RICHARD PEARSON (CHAIR)

OFFICE OF THE IPC: KENDALL CLYDSDALE

TAHLIA HUTCHINSON

ISAAC CLAYTON

KIAMA MUNICIPAL

COUNCIL:

ED PATERSON

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE

DATE: 10:30AM – 10:45AM

WEDNESDAY, 10 SEPTEMBER 2025

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

5

30

35

40

MR RICHARD PEARSON: That's good. Okay, I'm just going to run through a brief introductory script and then we'll start the meeting. So, before we begin, I would like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you today from Yuin country on the south coast of New South Wales, and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the lands from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to Elders past and present.

- So, welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Bombo Quarry Site Rehabilitation

 Works Request for Ministerial Call-In currently before the Planning Commission for advice.
- The Applicant, NSW Transport Asset Manager and Boral, has requested the Minister for Planning and Public Spaces declares site rehabilitation works proposed for two hard-rock quarries located near Bombo on the south coast as a state significant development. The overall aim of the proposed call-in is to repurpose the precinct to accommodate future urban development, including the delivery of housing for the local area and the broader region.
- My name is Richard Pearson. I'm chairing today's single-member Commission Panel and also joined by Kendall Clydsdale, Tahlia Hutchinson and Isaac Clayton from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission.
- In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website.
 - This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its advice.
 - We have issued an agenda for today's meeting, and this will form the basis of our discussions today. I may also I'm sure I will ask questions of attendees and to clarify any issues, where considered appropriate. If there is something that we ask that you're not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide information to us in writing, which we will them put up on our website.
 - So, I know we only have one member attending from Kiama Council today, but if you could please introduce yourself before speaking for the first time, and please let's not talk over the top of each other, which should be pretty easy to organise given how few of us are in attendance today.
- So, I'll begin the meeting now. As I've said, have issued an agenda opening statement, which I've done, we can talk about the Applicant's request for call-in, the Department's consideration of that request, and we have a couple of letters from Council before us as well, and any other matters that you would like to raise with the Commission as part of this process.

So, with that introductory statement, I guess, maybe over to you, Ed, if you would like to introduce yourself and make any introductory comments from Council's perspective.

- MR ED PATERSON: Thank you, Chair. So, Ed Paterson, Director of Strategies and Communities at Kiama Council. By way of introductory statements, the Bombo Quarry site has long been recognised as an area of urban expansion both by Council and the State Government in various iterations of local housing strategies and regional plans.
- Council has recently adopted its contemporary local housing strategy at its June or July council meeting and it's currently going through the processes through the Department for certification. And again, the site is recognised as an opportunity for further urban development, particularly as I said, Chair, housing. We have expanded the area around it so that it can support a further growth precinct, and we're having conversations internally with the Department about working through structure planning for that.
- So, the rehabilitation of the quarry is very important for the local community, in that swings and roundabouts for the quarry, its two-year cycle of being the major source of hard-rock ballast on the south coast, and then the next two years it's ready for remediation. So, having some certainty on that is really important for us.
- In our submissions to the Minister's office, we have most recently indicated that we are not opposed to it being called in as SSD. I think my commentary says that a review of schedule 1 of the planning system SEPP, this could be almost considered SSD given its value of work. And we understand that the estimated development is approximately \$127 million and the base value in the SEPP is 30, if I read that correctly. So, yes, we're not opposed to the Minister declaring it as state significant.
 - **MR PEARSON**: Yes. That's what we got from your letters, so thanks for clarifying that. So, have you had discussions at all with the Department about how or if you will be involved through the development application stage as opposed to the planning proposal? Or are you just going to basically leave that to the Department to run?
 - MR PATERSON: I haven't had any verbal conversations but I think in the correspondence that we received and then my response back that we would be, one, advised of this sort of panel meeting and it would go to yourselves for consideration and we'd be consulted that way. But then we would also be consulted through the DA process as well.
 - **MR PEARSON**: Okay. So, you wouldn't be on a working group or anything like that, there hasn't been discussions about that?
- 45 **MR PATERSON**: No.

30

35

40

MR PEARSON: And I guess the main impacts in terms of the actual site rehabilitation works will be traffic, in terms of importing material to the site. I know

the Applicant has quantified the amount of material sort of timeframe, truck movements, etc. But there's not a lot of deal about source of fill. Have you had any discussions on that or is that something to be worked out down the line?

- MR PATERSON: Not recently. For full transparency, Boral did lodge a modification application with Council several years ago when all the fill was coming out of the WestConnex development in Sydney. That was then deemed not to be substantially the same as their historic consent, and they withdrew it.
- To your point and your comments around traffic movements, it's really promising to the local community and Council that this DA is coming in for both Boral and Transport's assets. Because previously they were two separate entities and there was a disagreement about who could get access over whose site. I think at the time that Transport wasn't allowing Boral to come via their land, which meant that all traffic would have to be funnelled through Kiama Downs residential area.

MR PEARSON: Oh, really?

MR PATERSON: Yes.

MR PEARSON: Okay.

20

MR PATERSON: Rather than using the M1.

MR PEARSON: Yes. Because there's a pretty logical entry point to the site from both the north and the south, which will avoid residential interface. And so, your understanding is there's now a kind of consensus between the two landowners that they – I think it's the flyover from the south, sorry, from the north, and I don't know, Kendall, you had a good site graphic of that we could have a quick look at? We don't need to get into the nitty gritty of this now, but I think clearly it's going to be the major issue for the community and Council, I think.

So, this is it. And Kendall, maybe you can, using your cursor, let us know ...

35 MR KENDALL CLYDSDALE: Sure.

MR PEARSON: ... what we're talking about.

MR CLYDSDALE: My understanding is that vehicles travelling from the north can come along and take this slip lane and then at this roundabout come down and into the site in this direction.

MR PATERSON: Mm-hm.

45 **MR CLYDSDALE**: And then from the south, there is a slip lane here which would interface with this residential area. So, I think the preference would be to come up a little bit further and take the next exit point through here. So, as you mentioned before, understanding that there's two separate entities that there would have to be some sort

of agreement that they can come through to this northern part of the site and then access the other southern part. So ...

MR PATERSON: Yes, and the northern part of the site is the Transport-owned land and that was previously the contention, and as you said, it then meant that for Boral they had to, if they were coming from the south, could take that southerly slip road. But if they were coming from the north, there was no way for them to get access to the site, so they would need to come all the way through the residential development to the north and take that slip road that that goes underneath the M1. Yes, where your cursor is there.

MR PEARSON: Okay.

MR PATERSON: It's really promising that both entities are working together now to avoid ...

MR PEARSON: Yes.

MR PATERSON: Yes.

20

15

30

35

40

45

MR PEARSON: And we can reinforce that through our advice that, you know, that that will obviously be an important issue and that there appears to be a fairly straightforward pathway to avoid any residential amenity impacts from traffic.

25 **MR PATERSON**: Yes.

MR PEARSON: Which will be quite considerable. So, that, I think, Kendall, we can reinforce that in our advice. So, that's good. Is there anything else we should talk about on that map? I don't think so, especially since we don't have it anymore, that's good. So, Ed, is there anything else you want to bring to our attention from Kiama Council's perspective or the community's perspective?

MR PATERSON: No, I think it's pretty straight forward for us with this one. We're just really pleased to see things moving, and as I said, moving in such a constructive and collaborative way. I understand that both Boral and Transport have also worked together on scoping proposals for rezoning the site, so it's really promising that this rehabilitation work's progressing as well.

MR PEARSON: Yes. And what do you feel is the timing for all this? You know, if you had a crystal ball, when do you think we might start to see some actual housing and infrastructure on the site? Are we talking five years plus?

MR PATERSON: Well, you'd probably have more knowledge than I do, because it's always around the truck movements, how much rehabilitation is required. There are components of the site that are below sea level. We're working with the Department of Planning on how we best progress with the rezoning of the site. And obviously, that can occur probably quicker than all the rehabilitation, so I think that's the ...

Similar to what you said before, Chair, I've heard 10 years' worth of truck movements, I've heard 5 years, I've heard 20 years, so it's really going to be important where they can get that quantum of fill.

MR PEARSON: Yes, well that's something that they will have to work up as part of the development application for the project. So, at this stage, as you know, our advice is in relation to state and regional planning significance of what's proposed and whether the Minister should call-in the project or not. But we will be making some comments on other matters like truck movements, etc., as part of our advice.

Sorry about that. Okay. Look, that's good, Ed. I just wanted to touch base with Council and make sure that you're across what was being proposed and understand our role, which you clearly do. We'll be aiming to provide advice to the Minister in a pretty short period of time.

MR PATERSON: Yes.

10

15

20

30

35

40

45

MR PEARSON: After which it's the ball's in his court, he'll make the decision, you know, Council will be informed obviously. And I think it will be good for the Department to turn its mind to how it will interface with Council and the community and that they have their statutory steps, but maybe they might, you know, those options for being a little bit more fulsome in their involvement with Council, given the links to the rezoning process as well.

25 **MR PATERSON**: Yes.

MR PEARSON: Yes. And I understand you'll have resourcing issues as well to deal with – and they need to carry the brunt of the work, but I think it's important for them to stay in step with you guys as well through the process. So, again, we might make some comments on that.

MR PATERSON: That's probably some good advice, particularly as it would appear that both the rehabilitation and the rezoning processes will have similar start dates, they'll probably have very different finish dates, but you can be doing that consultation as one piece, it might work out well.

MR PEARSON: I think so, because, you know, as you're well aware working in local government, you need to be streamlined in your consultation with the community as well.

MR PATERSON: Yes.

MR PEARSON: So, they won't necessarily understand why are you talking to me about urban development ...

MR PATERSON: Yes.

MR PEARSON: ... and why are you talking to me about truck movements, bringing in material, you know, they need to understand the total picture, which, I guess, you've set through your housing strategy work and consultation on that. But I think this process needs to pick up on that and just, you know, keep everyone in the same room moving forward.

MR PATERSON: Yes. We talked about exhibition of the state significant rezoning project as a possibility for mid to early 2026, so that might tie itself nicely with an SSD exhibition.

10

5

MR PEARSON: Yes. Okay. Well, that sounds good, Ed. Kendall, Tahlia or others, anything you want to raise with Kiama Council's representative today?

MR CLYDSDALE: No, nothing from me, thank you, Chair.

15

MS TAHLIA HUTCHINSON: Me neither, thanks.

MR PEARSON: No, all good? Well, thanks very much, Ed, for attending and clearly you're well across what's being proposed, which is great. So, as I say, we'll finalise our advice quite quickly to the Minister and then you'll hear, I imagine, quite quickly regarding the call-in request. So, thank you.

MR PATERSON: All right.

25 **MR PEARSON**: Nice to meet you.

MR PATERSON: Thank you very much, you guys have a good day.

MR PEARSON: Thanks Ed, see you.

30

MR PATERSON: Thank you. Bye.

MR PEARSON: Bye.

35 >THE MEETING CONCLUDED