



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

RE: LIVERPOOL RANGE QUARRY (SSD-68063715)

INDIVIDUAL COMMUNITY MEETING

PANEL: TERRY BAILEY (CHAIR)
SARAH DINNING (PANEL MEMBER)

OFFICE OF THE IPC: KENDALL CLYDSDALE
STUART MORGAN

COMMUNITY
REPRESENTATIVES: CAROL & JOHN RICHARD

LOCATION: CASSILIS COMMUNITY CENTRE
BUCCLEUGH STREET, CASSILIS

DATE: 10:15AM – 10:35AM
WEDNESDAY, 22 OCTOBER 2025

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

5 **MR TERRY BAILEY:** Good morning and welcome, John and Carol. Thank you for your time. And we're meeting today to discuss the state significant development application for the Liverpool Range Quarry (SSD-68063715). And speaking to you today from Wiradjuri land and I acknowledge the traditional owners of the country on which we're meeting today.

10 My name is Terry Bailey and I'm the Chair of the Panel, and joining me is fellow commissioner, Sarah Dinning. And we have some staff from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission joining us well – Stuart who's managing the communications, and Kendall who's helping out as well.

15 And so, in the interests of openness and transparency, the meeting will be recorded, so the recording equipment is on, and a full transcript of today's meeting will be made available on the Commission's website in the coming days.

20 And just a couple of quick reminders before we kick off. Today's discussion relates to quarry and not to the Liverpool Range Wind Farm, which was approved in 2018. And just one other request, before you do talk, if you could just introduce so that's captured on the tape, and the tape will match the voice for the transcribing purposes.

25 So, on behalf of the Commission, happy to hand over for your presentation, John and Carol.

MR JOHN RICHARD: Okay. Do you wish to go first?

MRS CAROL RICHARD: No.

30 **MR RICHARD:** No. We're still only objecting to the quarry in that it is within 20 metres of our boundary. That causes great trouble for us in that the area within our property, a big area, is going to be subject to dust and noise and then

35 It was suggested that the noise mightn't be an affect to our property, but I can assure you that that's not the case. My dog could pick up explosions and that, that are down at Uarbry, which is 40 kilometres away, so animals do/can affect that, and I do feel that that's going to be a problem with the area up there.

40 The other point I would like to bring up is the fact that the water effect, contrary to what they've suggested in the thing, is going to be –

MRS RICHARD: Diagrams

MR RICHARD: Sorry?

45 **MRS RICHARD:** Go through...

MR RICHARD: Yes. I'm not familiar with these meetings. Old farmers don't understand these.

MR BAILEY: Do it the way you'd like to, we do have copies in front of us as well.

MR RICHARD: Yes, yes, okay. Right-o. So, what was the first one I shuttered there was the noise, the 20 metres of noise from that affect.

The water impacts on the property are totally incorrect as per the diagrams in that the water from that area extended around and in the contours onto our property and just near there, we have a dam there that is fed by the conduit off that hill, and it runs down into a very nice little gully with a bit of a waterfall and orchids and all that sort of thing, which will be affected by that.

That also extends down into that gully into a dam down there in Tangaratta, which is all dependent on the contours from around that hill, in spite the suggestion that the water won't be affected.

As evidenced from this satellite imagery, significant runoff from the quarry site travels northwest to these dams. It does not at all travel northeast, as the Engeny report suggests. There are gullies and erosion on this slope leading into dams. There was also an additional dam on Tangaratta that is not referenced in the report, which is filled by contours circling the quarry site. Clearly, the Surface Impact Report is incomplete.

Climate. Area considers state significant agricultural land. The Engeny report further mentions that the 680 millimetres average rainfall suggests a typical dry climate. Australia's average annual rainfall surrounding the Bureau of Meteorology is 419 millimetres, with over 30% of the land receiving less than 600 millimetres annually and 50% receiving less than 300 millimetres.

Given the rainfall in this area is well above the Australian average, our area should not be classified as 'dry climate'. Furthermore, our property and Tangaratta where the quarry is proposed, are both considered biophysical strategic land and state significant agricultural land. To dismiss the importance of the impacts and disturbance to the surface water runoff in the area by claiming that the climate is typically dry, is a misnomer.

Biophysical strategic agricultural land and state significant agricultural land. Biophysical strategic agricultural land is land with high-quality soil and water resources capable of sustaining high levels of productivity. BSAL plays a significant role in sustaining the state's 12 billion agricultural industry. These lands intrinsically have the best quality land for soil and water resources, which are naturally capable of sustaining higher levels of productivity, and they require minimal management practices to maintain this high quality.

MRS RICHARD: Can I just here that they are not our words. That is on a report.

5 **MR RICHARD:** Criteria. Land that falls under soil fertility high or moderately high under the draft Inherent General Fertility New South Wales OEH and land capability classes 1, 2 or 3 under the Land Capability Mapping of New South Wales OEH, and reliable water of suitable quality characterised by having rainfall of 350 millimetres or more per annum, Cassilis 609.6 millimetres, 9 out of 10 years of all properties within 150 metres of regulated river or unregulated rivers where there are flows of at least 95% of the time or groundwater aquifers that have yield rate greater than 5 litres and total dissolved solids less than 150 megalitres. Megalitres?

10 **MR BAILEY:** Milligrams.

MR RICHARD: Milligrams.

15 **MR BAILEY:** Per litre.

MR RICHARD: Good on you. I need help.

20 **MRS RICHARD:** This land is considered rare, in the Department's words, and should be protected.

MR RICHARD: There's another map on the next one there that indicates the area. The next one is another map, biophysical strategic land. I'll coach you afterwards, see if you're understanding this, because ...

25 **MR BAILEY:** No, I do understand it, and the BSAL

30 **MR RICHARD:** Yes, yes. Further comments. The Engeny report also states that, on page 16, when assuming the New South Wales Water Quality Objectives, that "no site-specific water quality data was available to inform this assessment." The Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development agricultural and biosecurity submission against the project stated that the EIS and associated documents provided have been reviewed.

35 We know that the site is located on land and soil capability ASLR 3 land, based on regional mapping, the EIS noted that the detailed assessment of the potential impacts of the project on soils and land capability was undertaken. This assessment relied on geotechnical information which is not suitable for an LSC determination.

40 Recommendation. The impacts on surface water runoff should not be downplayed in this way, and we recommend further environmental impact investigation occur. The project states that they will assess water WAL 2827888 for 13 megalitres per year. How this will be monitored? We suggest a meter system be installed on the bore, with a public disclosure of water usage to allow for monitoring of this project.

45 Next one. Harvestable water rights. The Engeny report on page 27, that "there will be no harvestable rights dams constructed as part of the proposed development." However, the remediation modelling for the project leave the main pit with a surface

area approximately 260 metres long by 90 metres wide and a depth of up to 30 metres in situ at the end of the project.

Maximum harvestable rights dam capacity. Information you provided, the approximate mid-point location of the landholding is latitude/longitude, the total landholding is 683 hectares. Result. The maximum harvestable rights dam capacity for a landholding is 44.4 megalitres.

Maximum harvestable water rights. The Engeny report further states that the surface water take associated with any final void or other water storages will remain after quarry closure, will be licensed as required with consideration to the harvestable rights entitlement for the landholding.

Maximum harvestable water rights, for Tangaratta is 44.4 megalitres, leaving a void of approximately 260 metres by 90 metres by 30 metres deep would be equal to a volume of 675 cubic metres, holding a capacity of 675,000 litres – or 675 megalitres of water. This exceeds the maximum harvestable water rights for the project by 630.6 megalitres, 15 times the allowable amount, which void would capture approximately 15,300 litres of water per year, based on the surface area of 22,500 metres square, and average rainfall of 680 millimetres.

How do they propose this void will ever be licensed as required, when it exceeds all of New South Wales water legislation meant for the property? The capture is 675 megalitres of water, putting dire consequences of all properties downstream to the project that rely on the Talbragar River for water.

Biodiversity. The biodiversity assessment of the quarry site was impacted by [REDACTED]. The next page, there's two side-by-side views of the site before and after tree removal. The next picture is a picture of the area to show that there has been considerable tree [REDACTED] on the area.

The proximity to the boundary, an alternate site. We have concerns regarding the proximity of the quarry project to our boundary, being a distance of only 20 metres. We are not participating in the LRWF Project as the turbines negatively affect land values. As such, the impact of the quarry on our property, the noise, visual degradation, blasting and water impacts is contrary to our decision to preserve our property.

There is a second hill in Tangaratta with similar soil types and topography. This hill has closer access to Rotherwood Road, decreasing the impact of their access road. This hill is a much better distance from our place and would reduce the impacts on our land. We would be interested to know if this hill has been considered for an alternative location of the quarry, or have they been forwarded to the hill closer to our property.

The next is a picture showing some contour effects there that, you know, are contrary to – oh, we're now on the alternate site there, which seems to us to be a more suitable site, and we'd request that that consideration be given for that site.

Just generally speaking on that, as neighbours to the project, we don't want it to happen on our boundary. Of great affect to our property, without consideration for any of the roads, traffic or noise etc. there on our place.

5 **MR BAILEY:** Thanks.

10 **MR RICHARD:** Blasting. That is an effect. Despite of their assurance that we won't hear it, I'm very sure that all the animals do, that's for sure. Yes. And the other effect too there, they said, "Oh, you won't hear at the house." But, I mean, farmers don't stay in the house all day. They might be up around the area there and, you know, the blasting on there, it's ...

MRS RICHARD: Its going scare to the cattle

15 **MR RICHARD:** Yes, well, we've had instances before of cattle being disturbed and running down the hill, splitting their legs and dying as a result.

MR BAILEY: Thanks, John. Thanks, Carol. Did you have additional, Carol?

20 **MRS RICHARD:** Well, I just wanted to reiterate that we honestly ask the Panel to question why the site next to our boundary was chosen over the adjacent hill. You know, it just seems that there was so much water impact from that point, it's going to affect not just our property, but all the properties downstream on the Talbragar.

25 **MR BAILEY:** Thank you for participating for this submission, and the points you've raised are points that are deep in our consideration and part of our thinking that we'll be looking at as commissioners as we consider this up-and-coming period, before we make a final determination.

30 And also, just to remind that in addition to your submission today and the materials that you've provided today, there is an opportunity for further written submissions into the process.

35 **MRS RICHARD:** Well, they can address our first submissions.

40 **MR BAILEY:** The separation, Carol, is our responsibility is quite different to everything that's been done to date, and that's part of why we have these hearings, so that we can talk with people and hear their concerns, and we give those consideration in the next ...

45 But we're completely separate in terms of the independence and the decision making we make, so the information that we have in front of us, the better the information that we have in front of us, the more informed we are, the longer and more deeply our deliberations can go before we take any decisions.

MRS RICHARD: So, when they didn't address our first submission, you're saying that there's no comeback to say, ask why they didn't address it.

5 **MR BAILEY:** It would be open to you to write to the Department or the Proponent to ask that question, but we work independently of the Department and the Proponent in the work that we review and the decision that we take. So, our consideration is completely independent. We have a report that's prepared for us by the Department, but we don't have to follow the report, and we don't have to agree with the report, and we can make independent determinations and findings. So, that's a big part of why we hold these sessions; so that we can hear directly from people.

10 **MR RICHARD:** I thank you.

MRS RICHARD: So, you're saying there's no comeback. We put in these submissions which we've been doing for a long time, and if their points are not addressed, it's not up to you mediate.

15 **MR BAILEY:** Well, we can ask questions around those points, and we'll give consideration to all those points before we make any decision. But we're actually the determining body, so it's not that we mediate with the Department or the Proponent, we actually make the determination. And so, we'll take into account the points you've raised before we make a determination.

20 **MRS RICHARD:** We couldn't hear what Linda said, but I think she spoke about the traffic impacts.

25 **MR BAILEY:** Yes.

MRS RICHARD: And we have a house off farm and we were told there would be 55 truck movements a day, which on a one-way road is 110, and I feel that because we haven't got a clear indication that they will take 110 trucks backwards and forwards through Cassilis.

30 **MR BAILEY:** And so, we're looking at all of those truck movements and all of those are parts of the considerations that we make before we're in a position to make the determination.

35 **MRS RICHARD:** There is another route.

MR BAILEY: So, we're looking –

40 **MRS RICHARD:** It takes you direct to Coolah where most of the building will be done.

MR BAILEY: So, we're looking at all of those components, there's been all the information in front of us before we make a determination. So, it's incredibly helpful to have these sessions and have those community discussions.

45 **MRS RICHARD:** Have you been aware of the other direct –

MR BAILEY: We're aware of all –

MRS RICHARD: From the quarry, the other road that goes through to Coolah.

5 **MR BAILEY:** We're aware of all the quarry options. We're also aware of the options that they presented for the original proposal, that brought quarry loads in from all around the district as well. So, we look across all that information, Carol, yes.

MRS RICHARD: They haven't told us anything about it.

10 **MR BAILEY:** I'm just conscious of time, because I've got a bunch of people still to talk to, and we're over. There is a lot of material that's available. All the material that we're considering is available on our website or available on the Planning website, and this goes into thousands of pages that we look at to help inform. But a critical
15 component of our informing is to actually sit and hear from community members as well, which is what we are doing this morning. So, it will come into our consideration.

MR RICHARD: A quick question, Terry. Our son is making a presentation, I think, by phone. Are we allowed to sit in on that?

20 **MR BAILEY:** Yes. Yes.

MR RICHARD: Can we let know when that happens and we'll ...

25 **MR BAILEY:** Geoff, by the look of it, is last on today.

MR RICHARD: He's last on?

MR BAILEY: Yes, last on. So, somewhere around 11:45.

30 **MR RICHARD:** Right-o. Time to go to the pub.

MR BAILEY: It's just there.

35 **MRS RICHARD:** Thank you.

MR BAILEY: Thank you.

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED