



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 REPRESENTATIVE:	KATHRYN REYNOLDS
LOCATION:	CASSILIS COMMUNITY CENTRE BUCCLEUGH STREET, CASSILIS
DATE:	10:40AM – 11:15AM WEDNESDAY, 22 OCTOBER 2025

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

5 **MR TERRY BAILEY:** Kathryn, so good morning, and we're here today to discuss the state significant development application for the Liverpool Range Quarry, with state significant development number 68063715. And we're speaking to you from Wiradjuri land and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the countries from which we will be meeting today.

10 My name is Terry Bailey and I'm the Chair of the Panel, and joining me is my fellow commissioner, Sarah Dinning, and staff members from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission – there's Stuart helping with the recordings and Kendall helping with the project as well.

15 And as you'd be aware, Kathryn, in the interests of openness and transparency, we record the meeting today so that a full transcript is made available on the Commission's website in the next few days.

20 And today's focus is on the Liverpool Range Quarry and not the Liverpool Range Wind Farm –

MS KATHRYN REYNOLDS: I'm aware of that.

25 **MR BAILEY:** – which was approved in 2018. Just as do we begin, for the tape, so that we've got, if you just would do an introduction and then we'll get started.

MS REYNOLDS: My name is Kathryn Reynolds

MR BAILEY: Thanks, Kathryn. And happy to hand over to you for your ...

30 **MS REYNOLDS:** I would like, because of the omission in the procedures and text messages not being sent out to the participants in today's public meeting, or today's private meeting, and those text messages are always sent out before IPC meetings to the speakers, I would like you to make sure that you give John Duggan the opportunity to speak.

35 I think because you have omitted to follow the procedures that have always been followed in the past, I think then you should allow him to actually have his say. Now, I know that he is away at present, but I think you have his contact details, and I think you need to give him the benefit of having his say.

40 **MR BAILEY:** Thanks for that. We will do a follow-up with John, just so that you're aware of that.

45 **MS REYNOLDS:** Okay. I note in the Response to Submissions Report that there were four supporters for this project. What is disappointing is their omission in their declaration of conflict of interest.

One of the supporters was Precision Drill and Blast and they've also supported this IPC, they're supporters, I think, a supporter already. They are obviously a contractor to this job, that's why they support it. We get that. They should say that they're a contractor to this Applicant. They're listed on the Applicant's website, they're linked on the Applicant's website, and they're obviously very invested in this getting up. Fine. If you are going to support the project publicly, then you put that in your support.

The other one was a land host, he supports everything, that's a known in this area. Another one was a contractor who is also mentioned in the ARDG website, in the Applicant's website, he's obviously a contractor to this job as well.

And then there was one name withheld from Belmore, which quite obviously – Belmont, rather – which was quite obviously the Proponent, the Applicant themselves. That's fine. They support it. Don't be shy about it. Put your name on there.

Then the Applicant spends quite a bit of time actually focusing in the Response to Submissions on their supporters. That's disingenuous, because we know their supporters are financially linked to the project. One was the Applicant themselves, two were contractors, and one is a Tilt land host. So, don't spend – don't give heaps of time in your Response to Submissions Report addressing those supporters.

They seem to focus on the neighbours being within 5 kilometres from the project. Now, I myself am, according to that, not even would be considered a neighbour to my own boundary fence. That's not because I own a substantial amount of land; that's because of the shape of my property. So, you're applying metropolitan rules where you choose and then not where you choose.

MR BAILEY: Just to clarify, it's not – the Panel's not applying those.

MS REYNOLDS: I know. I want it stated.

MR BAILEY: No, I understand your concern. But just to separate out that the Panel's consideration is broad and as deep as we can.

MS REYNOLDS: Well, you need to just accept that you have more neighbours than the Department and the Applicant are actually divulging.

MR BAILEY: And it is an aspect that we've been looking in, we've certainly been looking at as a Panel, what is the proximity.

MS REYNOLDS: Okay. Well, the old guy that owns this block is 9 kilometres from his shed. So, he's not even a neighbour, if the project were at his shed.

So, the lot that this is on, 89DP750749, is 3.78 kilometres from the old Turee houses. Its closest point is 3.65 kilometres to the Quindalup homes. Its closest point is 2.12 kilometres to the Corinda home, 4.8 kilometres to the house out at Bedalla, and 4.86 kilometres to Rangeview home. Do any of these people know this? Have the neighbours been consulted?

We know that there's no onus on the Applicant to actually even state the coordinates for this project. They don't have to do that, according to the conditions of consent, until just prior to starting construction. So, we don't know the coordinates. If you look at the conditions of consent, there are no coordinates for the project, and they do not have to be done and the survey boundary does not have to be marked until just prior to construction. That is inadequate.

It should be a condition of consent that the coordinates and the survey boundary be publicly known prior to this process.

MR BAILEY: And again, from a Planning Commission aspect, there are a draft set of conditions for which we can make alteration or a consideration around.

MS REYNOLDS: Now, the Department has shown that the landowners from lot DP750749 and lot DP747190 consent to this development. I am not sure that lot DP7, that lot 7, that lot 2DP747190 actually exists. I don't know if that's an oversight of the Applicants or whether that's something that is not available in the publicly available maps. Because I can see no existence of lot 2DP747190. So, I'm not sure how valid that consent is, if that lot doesn't exist.

So, as we said, it's in the Department's conditions of consent A5 that the Applicant has one month before operation commencement to mark out the boundaries of the approved extraction area within the site. That is inadequate. The community and the neighbours need to know now the coordinates of the boundaries of the site within the lots. And remember, one of those lots doesn't appear to exist. I may be wrong on that, but I can't find that lot on any map.

MR BAILEY: There is a clarification that we have sought on that as well, on the lot numbers.

MS REYNOLDS: Okay, well, that needs to be made publicly available.

MR KENDALL CLYDSDALE: That's on the Commission's website.

MS REYNOLDS: It's on the website, publicly available? Okay. When did that go up?

MR CLYDSDALE: It was published this week.

MS REYNOLDS: Okay. So, what is the amendment for that lot?

MR BAILEY: You're encouraged to have a look online, but my understanding in short form is that there was some change because there was a consolidation of lots and variations in lots, and that's been updated.

MS REYNOLDS: That is what I suspected, from looking at the maps.

MR BAILEY: But we did – just to confirm, that anomaly was something that we have looked into.

MS REYNOLDS: Okay. There's a BSAL map which you've probably seen.

MR BAILEY: Yes.

MS REYNOLDS: And there's BSAL land. This is the map, this is the lot I don't know, so until that was published, I don't know what the correct lot, the second lot is. So, I've come unprepared in knowing where that lot is. That second lot. I only know where lot 89-whatever is.

So, this is the lot here, right. This is the lot where the quarry will be. We don't know the coordinates or the exact location of that extraction pit. This is the neighbour here. This is the BSAL map. If we don't know the coordinates for the extraction pit and the survey boundary hasn't been marked out, how do we know it's not on BSAL land? How do you know that you're signing off on a project that is on BSAL land, when you don't know the exact location of this extraction pit? It'll be too late, a month prior to construction, when they say, "Oh, oops, sorry, that's strategic agricultural land. And we're taking out more."

We're going to have more seriously irreversible impacts.

Okay. A8 in the conditions of consent indicates, "The Applicant must not extract more than 700,000 tonnes of hard rock quarry products at the site each calendar year." A condition of consent should include the quarterly independent auditing of this extraction quote. This should be reported to the Warrumbungle Council as well as the Upper Hunter Council.

A condition of consent should include the installation of a weighbridge. There's no mention of whether there will be a weighbridge at all. This weighbridge needs to be quarterly calibrated by a third party, will need confirmation that the tonnages that they're extracting are actually measured, they're not arbitrary, 'Oh, we sent 20 trucks out an hour over the last 7 days.' Everybody else has to use an accredited weighbridge; these guys need to have one as well.

The tonnage extracted should be advised quarterly to both the community and the councils. I can see that there's an annual review for most things. An annual review is inadequate. We have so many projects going on in this area. It should be a quarterly review, not an annual review, and it should go to both councils. You're very keen to avoid any contact with – or Department – and the Applicant. They're very keen to avoid any contact with Warrumbungle Council, and they say, "Oh no, it was all done in the approved project of Tilt." But we know that's not 100% the case. And where they want to wrap it up with Tilt, they then don't want to wrap it up with Tilt, because they don't want to do the reporting. They need to report quarterly, not annually, and it needs to be done to both councils.

It's apparent from previous projects that applicants do not always adhere to their conditions of consent, and it's left to the community to report known breaches. The Department has so many projects on the go, they're obviously under-resourced in dealing with all of this.

5

Recently, we've seen Beryl Solar, which has no excuse, plant no screening when they had three years to get screening established in their conditions of consent. My understanding is that screening is still being undertaken and that project has been up and running for some time.

10

So, we don't want to wait for the annual review to hear that conditions of consent haven't been met. We want quarterly reviews, and we want those publicly available, and we definitely want the Warrumbungle Council included in that. Because, as with Beryl Solar, five years on, and still no condition of consent regarding the screening there. You can look it up yourself on the state major project portal.

15

At the consent A9, limits the Applicant's number of heavy vehicle movements from this site. The vehicle-specific movement data needs to be audited and reported to the community quarterly. Each heavy vehicle working truck should be fitted with a tracker. It's not going to be good enough to have only company vehicles fitted with a tracker. Each vehicle needs to be fitted with a tracker, and that information needs to be recorded and reported monthly. Otherwise, this business of 20 truck movements per hour can never be measured. It sounds good, but it can't be followed up.

20

It should be a condition of consent that trucks cannot queue along the Rotherwood Road awaiting access to the site. When the Proponent exceeds the 20 per hour in the consent conditions, where do the complaints get reported? It should be a condition of consent that a hotline for complaints be set up direct to the Applicant. This hotline should be available the same hours as the project itself, otherwise you're putting all these conditions of consent there and we've got no method of reporting it. Every other project, quarry project has a hotline. We want a hotline, and we want it manned the same hours as the quarry.

25

30

The project should have its own Traffic Management Plan prior to construction, given that we're using Rotherwood Road for an additional 2 million tonnes of product. It should be a consent condition that includes the monitoring of the road haulage. So, you have no consent condition there, that there's any monitoring of the road haulage rates.

35

A10 – operating hours. These refer to the quarry operations and construction blasting plus maintenance and environmental management, yet in A11, the Police or other public authority can request the delivery or dispatch of materials outside of operating hours. Well, that's a bit ambiguous. Who is a public authority? Would that be the Department wanting to push this project on a bit faster and saying we override that?

40

The public authority needs to be removed from the condition consent, so as the material from this project cannot be used for purposes outside the times in the consent conditions.

45

A11 advises that affected residents are required to be notified if the above situation arises, whereby they're delivering and dispatching outside of the hours. Given that the Applicant could not determine the affected residents because they're only looking within a kilometre or two of the project, I don't actually think that that is a good enough – I think that needs to be tightened up as to A11 with the affected residents being notified if this quarry needs to dispatch or deliver goods outside of the hours. Because I can see none of us actually knowing that, when we're all within a 10-k radius.

As you know, an extra 2 million tonnes will be transported along Rotherwood Road. Yet this is dismissed by the Planning Department and the Applicant. We, the ratepayers, do not want to be paying for the upkeep and damage of the Rotherwood Road, given the additional 2 million tonnes from the project. The consent conditions should include an upgrade to the Rotherwood Road in order to accommodate the extra tonnage being hauled, and the continued maintenance for the life of the project, ongoing maintenance of Rotherwood Road.

I personally would support and encourage the Warrumbungle Council to ensure that they get that condition of consent, and I would back any further court action that they wish to take, if they don't get that condition of consent. That's my personal view.

A15. There's talk about a community consultation committee. And there's talk about sharing the Tilt CCC. Yet in the Tilt minutes, latest minutes, it says that the CCC won't continue, quite likely won't continue now the project is approved. So, how is this project going to share the Tilt CCC when there isn't going to be a Tilt CCC?

There should be a separate CCC, this is a separate project, there should be a separate CCC. There are two distinct developers – Tilt and ARDG. That means there should be two separate CCC's. The involved landowner in the Tilt CCC is the owner of this land for this project. I don't think it's appropriate that this project be put in the CCC where the landowner who owns the land in its entirety is on that CCC.

We also have an independent chair of the Tilt CCC. Clay Preshaw, of the Department, is aware of unaddressed complaints lodged with the NSW Planning Department over the chair's role in the chairing of various EnergyCo meetings in the area. Again, if Tilt want to keep him as a chair of the CCC, that's their issue. But if we do not have a consent condition that a separate CCC be set up for the life of this project, we do not want that same chair. And I think you need to discuss with Clay what the issues were surrounding that chair.

It is noted in the – yes, it was noted in the August '25 minutes of the Tilt CCC that it was unclear whether the committee would remain in operation following approval. So, you've got a consent, you're looking at a consent condition that the Department has advised that this be wrapped in the Tilt CCC. The consent condition should be that there is a separate CCC for this project for the life of this project.

MR BAILEY: I understand.

MS REYNOLDS: B9. The consent condition should be changed to, “If the Applicant receives a written request from the owner of any private land within 3 kilometres of any approved extraction area ...” We’ve already talked about distance. One kilometre doesn’t benefit anybody. It may only benefit the land host who has willingly provided his land for this project. One kilometre is inadequate.

Same with B11. The consent condition should be changed to at least 3 kilometres, possibly 3 kilometres isn’t even enough.

It should be a consent condition that only electric trucks and earthmoving equipment should be used on this site. Your obligation to minimise harm to the environment, yet you’re using an undisclosed – the Applicant is using an undisclosed amount of diesel on this site. All administrative and maintenance facilities should be run on solar and batteries.

We’re farmers, we use a lot of diesel at certain times of the year – planting and harvest. I can see a time coming where we will not get diesel deliveries, because there are so many projects in this area and we don’t have unlimited sources of diesel available. As it is now, we get regular diesel deliveries, we don’t have electric tractors and harvesters, for a very good reason – because we don’t want compaction of our soils, and we also in wet season don’t want to bog everything, because batteries are incredibly heavy.

This is a dry site, it’s rock, presumably, so I think they should use all electric trucks and earthmoving equipment.

MR BAILEY: I’m just very conscious of time, Kathryn, that’s all.

MS REYNOLDS: I’m nearly done. It should be a consent condition that accommodation facilities for the truck drivers be provided on site. We only talk about the movements of the trucks to and from the site laden. What about when they arrive for work – where are they coming from, how far are they travelling? There’s a lot of trucks going to be involved in this quarry, there should be accommodation and facilities provided for these truck drivers on site.

During harvest, I provide those facilities for our contract truck drivers and harvest drivers on site. They should be doing that too, so they’re not using the road unnecessarily. They should all be housed there.

It should be a consent condition in relation to B43 that the Rehabilitation Plan is made publicly available prior to consent for the communities of Cassilis, council, Coolah, and both councils. There is talk of a Rehabilitation Management Plan but there are no details. It should be a consent condition that that is done prior to this IPC approval, which will undoubtedly take place.

D8. The annual review should be altered in the consent conditions to quarterly. We’ve talked about that. And copies of that should be made available to the Warrumbungle as well as the Upper Hunter shire council.

5 The independent environmental audit, D10. The proximity of this project to the boundary of the unrelated neighbour is unacceptable. This project cannot be approved before the buffer zone is disclosed. I've seen maps of where the buffer zone is, and I do not know what that distance is. So, there it is there. Because we don't have the coordinates, what is the buffer zone to the neighbour? How can the EPA sign off on this or the independent environmental audit be done when there's no buffer zones disclosed?

10 There's also no disclosure on the source of the water. They have labelled a couple of the irrigation bores, but they obviously don't have an arrangement in place for water. So, I don't see – it should be a consent condition that those arrangements be in place and the quantities known prior to approval.

15 There's been no cumulative impact study completed by the NSW Government. It should be a consent condition that no further projects in this area or facilitate projects in this area are approved until a cumulative impact study is done. We want a cumulative impact study on the roads, the environment, the social aspects, the financial – the ACERZ project is over-budget, \$650 million it started at, \$5.5 billion and growing. We can't afford this project.

20 We can't afford it on a bushfire stance as well. It contributes to our whole bushfire risk by putting – you're approving the state's so-called energy sources in a bushfire zone and then negating all of our ability for aerial firefighting. We can't afford – we want the cumulative impact on bushfire, we want the cumulative impact on agriculture, we want cumulative impact on water.

Thank you.

30 **MR BAILEY:** Thanks, thanks, Kathryn, for your input and participating. And just a reminder –

MS REYNOLDS: Thanks for the opportunity.

35 **MR BAILEY:** In addition to the –

MS REYNOLDS: It wasn't cancelled in total.

40 **MR BAILEY:** In addition to the submission today, we do welcome further submissions, and the submission period is open to 5 o'clock next Wednesday, the 29th.

MS REYNOLDS: Yes.

45 **MR BAILEY:** If there's any additional material that you want to put.

MS REYNOLDS: Do I need to do an additional one, how ...?

MR BAILEY: Not in addition to that. I'm just letting you know it's entirely up to you.

MS REYNOLDS: Okay.

5 **MR BAILEY:** That's clear, the material that you've provided, it's very welcome and very grateful for that. So, thank you, and enjoy the rest of the day, and stay out of the sun.

>THE MEETING CONCLUDED