

Liverpool Range Quarry

The IPC and Department have an **Obligation to Minimise Harm to the environment.**

- The neighbouring property has a farm dam and gully stream that are fed by rainfall runoff from the Quarry site and surrounding contours.

The surface water impact assessment is inaccurate in its description of the direction of water run off and the omission of a dam on the host landowners site.

The surface water impact assessment should be redone to address the omissions before the commission can finalise their assessment.

- The description of the land as “dry climate” is also erroneous. The applicant should be presenting high quality supporting documents, not templates used on other projects.
- There is BSAL land mapped on lot 89 DP 750749. It should be a condition of consent that the co ordinates/boundaries of the site are published prior to the IPC decision. Handing down an approval and then discovering BSAL land is impacted is unacceptable.
- Is there BSAL land mapped on the additional lot in this application? Until the correct lot number is supplied this is unknown. The commission cannot progress the case until the details and reports on the additional lot are known. It will be too late when BSAL land is destroyed by the project to report after the event.

It is noted that the applicant omitted to declare conflict of interest in the response to submission report. It would appear that 2 of the supporters of the project are contractors for ARDG (who will benefit financially from the project), 1 supporter appears to come from their own office at Belmont and the final and 4th supporter is a TILT land host.

Obviously the applicant and their contractors plus the TILT land hosts support the project. The response to submissions report by the applicant loses credibility when no conflict of interest is declared in the supporting comments.

2.2.2 Supporting Submissions

Key themes associated with the supporting submissions from the community generally related to the benefits of the Project in terms of its location within the Liverpool Range Wind Farm project area, the associated reduction in travel times and heavy vehicle traffic movements, and economic benefits in relation to direct employment and indirect flow-on effects.

A selection of quotes from supporting submissions is provided in the text box below. Supporting submissions are not addressed further in this report.

The quarry is inside the project which will cut travel time and the amount of trucks on the road and reduce the impact on local roads. 71

The proposed quarry would provide a local supply of high-quality quarry products for construction of the Liverpool Range Windfarm Project (LRWF) project and therefore not cause any extra haulage truck movements to the local and regional road network. It will only load construction materials to haulage trucks already approved under the LRWF project and will reduce construction traffic on the public road network associated with the LRWF project as construction haulage distances would be reduced. Consequently, the reduction in haulage truck movements would also reduce road safety risks, a reduction in road maintenance costs and produce lower greenhouse gas emissions. 72

I support the Liverpool Range Quarry Project as, if approved, the Project would provide a critical source of construction materials to support the construction of the Liverpool Range Wind Farm - all within the footprint of the wind farm. 73

A reduction in heavy vehicle haulage has flow on benefits to community amenity, improved road safety, reduction in road degradation and maintenance costs, and will improve the greenhouse gas footprint of the wind farm. 73

We support the proposed development of the Liverpool Range Quarry as a business. There is the potential for our services of drilling and blasting to be required in its operation. If the proposal was to proceed, there could be full time work over some years for a number of our employees as well as sub-contractors we engage to carry out our works. As a regular user of the Golden Highway, having fewer gravel trucks servicing this project from outside would be much safer, as there is already a constant stream of heavy vehicles travelling along this road. Our workers would require accommodation, food, fuels and mechanical services, all available in nearby local towns. This would see economic benefit to local businesses and families. Precision Drill and Blast Pty Ltd ORG012

Lot 89 DP 750749 is approximately 462 ha, roughly 3.5 km long, 1.5 km wide. (<https://portal.spatial.nsw.gov.au/explorer/index.html>). As the additional lot involved in the project is an invalid number, the area of the additional lot is unknown. If the additional lot is Lot 3 DP 1315388, this lot is over 8 km from one end to the other.

In the response to submissions report the applicant was focussed on downplaying the proximity of community members who neighbour the project.

We are not in a metropolitan area, many of us would not be considered 'local' to our back fence. As per the example above, the owners of associated neighbouring Lot 3 DP 1315388 are not 'local' to any of their boundary fences given the lot size is at least 8 km wide.

The above lot at its closest point is 3.78 km from Old Turee homes

The above lot at its closest point is 3.65 km to the Quindalup homes

The above lot at its closest point is 2.12 km to the Cooina home

The above lot at its closest point is 4.8 km to the house site at Bodalla

The above lot at its closest point is 4.86 km to Rangeview home

As the lot number 2 DP 747190 does not appear to exist this negates any owners consent advised by the applicant.

- In the departments condition of consent (A5) ARDG has one month before operation commencement to mark out the boundaries of the approved extraction area within the site.
- At present the community and neighbours, nor ARDG, know the co ordinates or boundaries of the site within the lots (of which does not appear to exist).
- The coordinates and survey boundaries should be advised to the neighbours and community before the commission finalises this case.

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 in each calendar year.

- Condition of consent should include the quarterly independent auditing of this extraction quota, this should be reported to Warrumbungle Council as well as Upper Hunter Council.
- Condition of consent should include installation of a weighbridge (calibrated by a third party quarterly) to confirm tonnages extracted.
- Tonnage extracted advised quarterly to both the community and the councils (both of them)
- It is apparent from previous projects that developers often do not adhere to consent conditions and it is left to the community to report known breaches as the Department has so many projects proceeding and no apparent ability to ensure consent conditions are met. (Eg Beryl Solar – no screening planted within the timeframe of consent conditions and no consequence)

A9 – limits the applicant (ARDG) to a set number of heavy vehicle movements from the site.

- Vehicle specific movement data needs to be audited and reported to the community regularly, quarterly.
- Each heavy vehicle working the site should be fitted with a tracker and the information reported monthly to the community. Not good enough that only company vehicles are fitted with a tracker. This information should be supplied to Warrumbungle council upon request.
- It should be a condition of consent that trucks cannot queue along 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...council?

It should be a condition of consent that hotline for complaints be set up direct to the applicant. This hotline should operate the same hours as the project itself.

- The project should have its own traffic management plan prior to construction given the use of Rotherwood road for an additional transportation of 2 million tonnes. This should be a consent condition and include monitoring of road haulage rates.

A10 - operating hours – these refer to the quarrying operations and construction, blasting plus maintenance and environmental management. Yet

A 11 notes that the police or other public authority can request that delivery or despatch of materials can be requested outside of the operating hours. Yet this application for

development is for the sole purpose of the construction of the TILT project? *Public authority* needs to be removed from the consent condition so as the material from this project can not be used for other purposes outside of times in the consent conditions.

A 11 advises that affected residents are required to be notified in if the above situation arises – given that the applicant could not determine the affected residents of the project itself this only looks good in writing.

It should be a condition of consent that any notification by the applicant be send to the all Cassilis and Coolah ratepayers.

An extra 2 million tonnes will be transported along Rotherwood Road – yet this is dismissed by the Planning Department and the applicant. We, the rate payers 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 Rotherwood road in order to accommodate the extra tonnage being hauled and payment contributions to Warrumbungle council for ongoing maintenance of Rotherwood road.

A15 A separate CCC should be established for the quarry, it is not appropriate that this project, that is a separate DA to the Tilt project, shares the same CCC. There are two distinct differently developers (Tilt and ARDG). The involved landowner of the TILT CCC is the landowner of the ARDG project. This is not appropriate. In addition, the independent chair of the CCC has some unaddressed complaints lodged with the NSW planning department over his role in the local Energy Co community meetings.

- It is noted that in the August 2025 minutes of the Tilt CCC, when discussing vacancies, the NSW Planning department had advised that no action should be taken to seek replacement members for the TILT CCC as it was unclear whether the committee would remain in operation following approval.
- It should be a condition of consent that a separate CCC be established for this project and operate for the life of the project.

B9 – the consent condition should be changed to “if the applicant receives a written request from the owner of any privately owned land within 5 kilometres of any approved extraction area on the site for a property inspection” 1 km will only benefit the land host who has willing provided his land for this project.

B11 consent condition should be changed to 5 km.

It should be a consent condition that only electric trucks and earthmoving equipment should be used on the site. Given the emissions and the do no harm focus of this project, no diesel should be used on site. All administrative and maintenance facilities should be run on solar power and batteries.

It should be a consent condition that accommodation and facilities for the truck drivers be provided on the site, given that there will be additional unaccounted for, heavy vehicle movements of empty trucks arriving at the site each day (from wherever they reside)

It should be a consent condition that in relation to B43 the Rehabilitation Management Plan is made publicly available to the community of Cassilis and Coolah and both councils.

D8 Annual review should be altered in the consent conditions to quarterly review. Copy of this review should be made available to Warrumbungle Shire Council in addition to Upper Hunter Shire Council. The Department is continually linking this project to the TILT project which sits in the Warrumbungle LGA therefore they should report to both councils.

In regard to D10 Independent Environmental Audit. The proximity of this project to the boundary of the unrelated neighbour (who is yet to be consulted) is unacceptable. The project cannot be approved before the buffer zone is disclosed and agreed with the neighbour.

Cumulative impact

No Cumulative impact study has been completed by the NSW Government. Projects are repeatedly approved with no cumulative impact study.

- Roads
- Environmental
- Social
- Financial – the ACE REZ project is significantly over budget (650 Million to now over \$5.5 Billion and growing). Electricity consumers

cannot afford this. Capacity investment schemes – taxpayers cannot afford this.

- Bushfire
- Agricultural

This project should not be finalised by commissioners until the State government cumulative impact report has been released and analysed by local government and local communities. All cumulative impacts whether raised (or omitted) by the report need to be addressed prior to further approvals and further erosion of trust in Governments/Government agencies.