

# Hanson Bass Point Quarry Community Consultative Committee

**TUESDAY 29TH MARCH 2022**

**MINUTES (Version 1.0)**

## **Location**

Site Office, Bass Point Quarry

## **Attendance**

Mike Archer (MA)	Independent Chairperson
Les Brooks (LB)	Community representative
Luke Daniels (LD)	Reflections Killalea
Mark Miller (MM) – <i>via MS Teams</i>	Shellharbour City Council
Vicki Steele (VS)	Community representative
Clint Canty (CC)	Links Shell Cove
Stephen Butcher (SB)	Hanson Quarry Manager
Chelsea Flood (CF)	Hanson Compliance Officer

## **Invited (Other)**

## **Apologies**

Robby Stephenson (CC)	GM - Links Shell Cove
-----------------------	-----------------------

## **Absent**

<b>Meeting Start Time</b>	15:05
---------------------------	-------

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Discussion Point</b>
<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction</b>
1.1	Acknowledgement of country (MA).
1.2	Welcome to all members (MA).
1.3	Housekeeping – expected CCC member conduct, management of minutes.
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Apologies/Absent</b>
2.1	RS – represented by CC.
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Confirmation of the Minutes of the Previous Meeting</b>
3.1	<p><b>Q4 2021</b> Confirmed – LB Second – LD</p> <p>Minutes from the previous meeting carried as confirmed.</p>
3.2	<p><b>Extraordinary meeting (Q1 2022)</b> Confirmed – N/A Second – N/A</p> <p><i>Confirmation of minutes from the previous (extraordinary) meeting deferred until the update has been implemented regarding Point 11(f).</i></p> <p>SB advised that he had been contacted by DPE regarding the extraordinary meeting. DPE directed that the extraordinary meeting minutes be amended to reflect that DPE <i>did not</i> undertake materials testing of the southern landscape mound as part of their investigation. Hanson’s response was that <i>at no stage</i> have Hanson conveyed to the CCC that DPE undertook materials testing of the southern landscape mound. The extraordinary meeting minutes therefore do not indicate that DPE undertook materials testing, and do not need to be amended.</p> <p><i>[Note: this correspondence with DPE occurred <u>after</u> the correspondence included as <b>Attachment A.</b>]</i></p>
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Business Arising from the Previous Minutes</b>
4.1	<p>Point 8.1 from Q3 2021: <i>On 04 or 11 September (Saturday) there was a truck traveling south on a hill on what seemed to be a dirt track (not the Quarry Rd), due to the prevalent winds the dust created by the truck was blown towards the Harbour Precinct. LB queried what it would have been doing at that time and noted that there did not appear to be dust suppression in place.</i></p> <p>CF advised that the investigation into works occurring on those dates suggests it would have been a contractor conducting maintenance activities. Comments on visible dust are noted, and it is acknowledged that Hanson can always aim to perform better, especially during periods where supervision is limited (e.g. weekends).</p>
4.2	<p>Point 6.6 from Q4 2021: <i>Hanson to investigate relocating E-BAM real-time dust monitor – to discuss at Q1 2022 meeting</i></p>

Item No.	Discussion Point
	<p>CF advised that the existing unit needs to be retrofitted so that it can operate without mains power. The Air Quality Management Plan would then need to be amended and approved by DPE before the unit could be relocated. Hanson are currently still at the retrofit stage. LB suggested to add this point to the operational section until closed out. SB agreed.</p>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Company Reports and Overview of Activities</b>
5.1	<p><u>Project Update</u> (SB)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project focus is still predominantly on Glebe Island <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Overland conveyor from crushing plant to ship loader (jetty) business case and scope is being prepared</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Bass Point Quarry Road entrance upgrade project is underway</li> <li>• Demolition of old plant and buildings commenced in early February 2022</li> </ul> <p>VS queried demolition end date. SB advised that duration is estimated to be 12 weeks.</p>
5.2	<p><u>Operational Report</u> (SB)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Major supplies are consistent with previous meetings. Addition of supplying flood repair projects.</li> <li>• Quarry development continuing in western pit RL18 and above, as well as south end of east pit RL45 due to heavy rain impeding access in western pit.</li> </ul> <p>VS queried what happens to flood water in west pit. SB advised that water is pumped from the west pit to the east pit, then pumped into a clearwater dam. Water can be discharged from the clearwater dam if water meets surface water quality requirements. There was one water quality issue (exceedance of Total Suspended Solids (TSS)) during recent heavy rainfall but it was during the waiver period issued by NSW EPA. The incident was reported as required to both NSW EPA and DPE. Water treatment is currently limited to acid dosing to reduce pH.</p>
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Environment &amp; Community</b>
6.1	<p><u>Modification 3 (MOD 3)</u> (CF)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• MOD 3 report submitted 01/09/2021</li> <li>• Application fee finalised 19/11/2021</li> <li>• Public exhibition from 15/12/2021 to 19/01/2022 [extended from typical 2 week period to 4 weeks due to holiday period]</li> <li>• Extraordinary CCC meeting held 02/03/2022 to discuss Response to Submissions</li> <li>• Response to Submissions being finalised</li> </ul> <p>SB advised that Australand [Frasers] have requested import of “other fill materials classified with a resource recovery order and exemption as approved by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA).” Limiting to VENM/ENM only may restrict import of material otherwise suited for the proposed use. See <b>Attachment B</b> for excerpt of submission presented to the CCC. Full submission is publicly available on the <a href="#">DPE website</a>.</p> <p>LB queried what this means – will NSW EPA permit asbestos importation?</p>

Item No.	Discussion Point
	<p>SB clarified Hanson have not raised this or requested it; it arose from the Frasers (/Australand) submission.            VS queried whether further submissions can be lodged to counter the Frasers submission.            SB advised that he is unsure.            CF advised that her understanding is that public submissions cannot be lodged in response to submissions, as per DPE process. Willing to stand corrected if needed. However, Hanson must respond to submissions as per DPE process.</p> <p>LB queried the addition of updates on materials imports as a recurring CCC agenda item e.g. volume imported, testing performed etc.            SB advised that the preference is to await outcome of MOD 3 before deciding on specific reporting parameters for CCC meetings. Hanson are willing to provide regular, general (high-level) updates to the CCC but do not want to be locked into rigorous updates to the CCC in addition to obligatory reporting to government agencies.            LB agreed that high-level updates should be sufficient; can review pending MOD 3 outcome.</p> <p>VS had been in contact with Carl Dumpleton (DPE), who then referred VS to Georgia Dragicevic (DPE) to discuss concerns with quantity and potential impacts of material emplaced at southern landscape mound.            SB reiterated that as was already discussed [<i>added: see section 3.2</i>], Hanson have responded to Georgia Dragicevic to confirm that at no point have Hanson stated that DPE undertook materials testing. The DPE review was a desktop review of documentation.</p> <p>VS read aloud the correspondence with DPE from 25/03/2022 – included as <b>Attachment A</b>.</p> <p>CF commented that this has been discussed numerous times prior and is already on the public record – does it value-add to the minutes to repeat these points?            MA directed that it has been discussed during this meeting so must be included in the minutes.            SB requested that the full correspondence be included in the minutes. Hanson have since responded to Georgia, so some of the correspondence is incorrect.</p> <p>VS queried whether Hanson have testing records.            SB advised that Hanson do not.</p>
6.2	<p><u>Sponsorships</u> (SB)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Donation of 50 t of aggregate to NSW SES – Shellharbour City Unit – for residents to use to fill sandbags during recent flood event</li> <li>• Donation of aggregate as railway ballast for Illawarra Light Railway Museum.</li> </ul>
7.0	<p><b>Complaints</b> [as per complaints register]</p>
7.1	<p><u>17 February 2022 – transport (driver conduct)</u> (SB)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As per the complaints register. No further discussion.</li> </ul>

Item No.	Discussion Point
7.2	<p><u>23 March 2022 – blasting (excessive ground vibration) (SB)</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As per the complaints register.</li> </ul> <p>MA noted that claim of multiple blasts appears to be an exaggeration. VS and LD noticed a large blast on Wednesday 23/03/2022. SB advised that blasting in the south pit is at a high level, which may be why it is more noticeable. Monitoring is conducted as required. MA queried whether there is a correlation between what people feel and how deep into the rock the blast is. SB advised that extensive data analysis (including the input of LB) was undertaken to investigate outcomes for particular areas. LB's conclusion was that less frequent blasts would have therefore been larger and yielded higher results. Hanson's finding was that higher results were more strongly linked to the orientation of blast, weather conditions, and the location of the blast. Multiple inputs may influence monitoring results. LB clarified that two blasts per week shifted to one blast per week. LB analysis was based on vibration (which is available on website). LB feels that vibration is the largest impact on people. SB advised that airblast overpressure sometimes gets confused with ground vibration. It can be hard to determine what different people interpret as problematic or disturbing for them. VS commented that it is disturbing when people experience windows rattling. SB confirmed that limits are set by government departments; Hanson's responsibility is to stay under those limits. LB noted that the difficulty is that the community has closed in around the quarry. VS noted that quarrying has changed over time, everything has changed. SB agreed that it is a unique and challenging situation here. The historically larger buffer zone was preferable. LD queried whether blast monitoring limits are renewed based on the smaller buffer zone. SB advised that this would have been considered in 2014 during the approvals process and has not been reviewed. CF advised that the blast limits are as monitored at the closest receivers; the limits are therefore not influenced by the buffer zone.</p>
<b>8.0</b>	<b>General / New Business</b>
8.1	<p>MM advised that there was no new business. LD advised that there was no new business. LB queried noise monitoring locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>R11 (7 Joondalup Pde) need to verify whether monitoring is being undertaken at that location; appears to be in a slightly different place.</li> <li>SB advised that Hanson will follow up with the consultant.</li> </ul> <p>VS queried whether the MOD 3 approval decision had been pushed back.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SB advised that no date / estimate has been provided.</li> </ul> <p>MA advised that there was no new business. CC advised that there was no new business. CF advised that there was no new business. SB advised that there was no new business.</p>

Item No.	Discussion Point
9.0	Next Meeting
9.1	MA: Next meeting to be held Tuesday 14 June 3:00pm, unless there is a need for another extraordinary meeting.
9.2	MA thanked all attendees for their time.

**Meeting Closed**

15:54

## Attachment A – VS correspondence with DPE

**From:** Georgia Dragicevic <[REDACTED]>  
**Date:** 25 March 2022 at 1:18:56 pm AEDT  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** Carl Dumbleton <[REDACTED]>, Katrina O'Reilly <[REDACTED]>, Benjamin Harrison <[REDACTED]>  
**Subject:** Bass Point Quarry material emplacement enquiry

Dear Vicki,

As discussed on Wednesday, I understand that:

- You have concerns with the quantity and the classification of the material emplaced at the Bass Point Quarry southern boundary and any associated impacts to the surrounding environment; and
- Nick Warren of Corkery and Stephen Butcher of Hanson Construction Materials advised that the material that was emplaced at the Quarry's southern boundary was tested by the Department's Compliance Team and that the Compliance Team held the data on whether the material was contaminated.

As advised on Wednesday:

- on 23 November 2020, the Department issued a \$15,000 Penalty Notice to Hanson Construction Materials Pty Ltd for allowing approximately 83,700 m<sup>3</sup> of material to be emplaced in the southern area of its Bass Point Quarry, in contravention of development consent MP08\_0143, as modified for the Bass Point Quarry;
- On 4 February 2021, the Department issued a Development Control Order to Hanson Construction Materials Pty Ltd requiring them to remedy this breach;
- The Department's Compliance Team did not undertake testing of the material. As indicated above, the material emplacement at the Quarry is a breach of development consent MP08\_0143 and is required to be remedied by Hanson. I have spoken to Steve Butcher and will request in writing that the CCC meeting minutes be amended to correct the advice given in relation to this matter;
- On 9 September 2020, Hanson lodged an application to modify development consent MP08\_0143 to allow for the material emplaced in the southern area of its Bass Point Quarry to remain onsite and for additional material to be emplaced at the site. Hanson is currently preparing response to submissions; and
- I understand you have also made a submission on the modification application outlining concerns regarding the quantity and the classification of the material emplaced at the Bass Point Quarry southern boundary and any associated impacts to the surrounding environment. The Department's Team Leader, Industry Assessments, Mr Carl Dumbleton (cc-ed to this email), has confirmed that your concerns will be considered during the Department's assessment of the modification application.

It was lovely chatting to you on Wednesday and I hope I have clarified the matter for you. Should you however have any further questions, please do not hesitate to email or call me on 4247 1852.

Kind regards,  
Georgia

**Georgia Dragicevic**

**Senior Compliance Officer**

Compliance | Department of Planning and Environment

T [REDACTED] | M [REDACTED] | E [REDACTED]

PO Box 5475, Wollongong NSW 2520

[www.dpie.nsw.gov.au](http://www.dpie.nsw.gov.au)



*The Department of Planning and Environment acknowledges that it stands on Aboriginal land. We acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land and we show our respect for elders past, present and emerging through thoughtful and collaborative approaches to our work, seeking to demonstrate our ongoing commitment to providing places in which Aboriginal people are included socially, culturally and economically.*

*Please note that I work flexibly. I'm sending this message now because it's a good time for me, but I don't expect that you will read, respond to or action it outside of your own regular hours.*

*If you are submitting a compliance document or request as required under the conditions of consent or approval, please note that the Department is no longer accepting lodgement via [compliance@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:compliance@planning.nsw.gov.au).*

*The Department has recently upgraded the Major Projects Website to improve the timeliness and transparency of its post approval and compliance functions. As part of this upgrade, proponents are now requested to submit all post approval and compliance documents online, via the Major Projects Website. To do this, please refer to the instructions available [here](#).*



**Attachment B – excerpt from Australand submission on MOD 3.**

On review of the proposed application to modify Project Approval (PA) 08143, Australand would like to seek consideration that the application includes the importation of other fill material classified with a resource recovery order and exemption as approved by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA).

The restriction of incorporating the importation of only Virgin Excavated Natural Material (VENM) and/or Excavated Natural Material (ENM) for use in landscaping and progressive rehabilitation at the Quarry may place unnecessary restrictions on material well suited for the proposed use, however does not meet the explicit criteria of the VENM and/or ENM resource recovery order and exemption.

\* *Full submission is publicly available on the [DPE website](#).*