

Hanson Bass Point Quarry Community Consultative Committee

WEDNESDAY 2ND MARCH 2022
[EXTRAORDINARY MEETING]

MINUTES (Version: Final)

Location

Site Office, Bass Point Quarry

Attendance

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
Robby Stephenson (CC)	GM - Links Shell Cove
Stephen Butcher (SB)	Hanson Quarry Manager
Chelsea Flood (CF)	Hanson Compliance Officer

Invited (Other)

Nick Warren (NW) <i>via MS Teams</i>	R. W. Corkery
Samuel Rosek (SR) <i>via MS Teams</i>	R. W. Corkery
Belinda Pignone (BP) <i>via MS Teams</i>	Hanson Environmental Planning & Compliance Coordinator

Apologies

Mike Archer (MA)	Independent Chairperson
------------------	-------------------------

Absent

Meeting Start Time	15:04
--------------------	-------

INTRODUCTION

- NW – presentation to be delivered, then discussion afterwards.

PRESENTATION by NW

QUESTIONS / COMMENTS

1. **LB** The new diagram clearly identifies where new barriers will be constructed.
2. **VS** If unapproved barriers at southern end of site must be removed, where will they be placed?
 - a. **SB** DPIE will advise how to proceed.
3. **LB** Concerned about end date for importation – even 4.5 years of dust generation is unacceptable for the community.
 - a. **SB** Not specifying an end date enables use of imported materials to meet our revegetation requirements and for positive rehabilitation outcomes into the future.
4. **VS** Are barriers permanent once rehabilitated, or could the material be moved again?
 - a. **SB** Understanding is that the barrier locations are permanent.
 - b. **CF** It depends on the final landform. Currently, the landscape mounds would be retained. This may be subject to change based on DPIE feedback and closer to end of operation life in 2044.
5. **VS** Is end of life confirmed as 2044 or will it be extended?
 - a. **SB** Projections indicate the reserve will be exhausted when the consent lapses in 2044. Unlikely the consent would be further extended.
6. **LB** Is the VENM/ENM supply in Shellharbour or elsewhere? Materials associated with the Marina appear to be only a small part of 900,000 t required to completed landscape mounds.
 - a. **SB** Agreed that the Marina materials are a small proportion of the 900,000 t required for the landscape mounds. However, in the future there may be a requirement to bring in excess topsoil to meet revegetation and rehabilitation requirements.
 - b. **LB** Queried transport implications (vehicle movements) and use of public roads.
 - c. **NW** There will be ongoing compliance with transport limits at the quarry regarding maximum number of trucks permitted to use the public transport route.
7. **VS** What does the community gain from the modification?
 - a. **NW** Beneficial reuse of material rather than deposition to landfill. The developments generating the materials will have lesser costs. There is an

opportunity for Hanson to put barriers in place where there may be visual impacts in the future, to obscure views.

8. **VS** and **LB** Concerned about the volume of complaints about dust received to date, particularly in the last few years.
 - a. **CF** Investigation associated with each complaint, including identified likely source, is documented on the publicly available complaint register.
9. **LB** The benefits of the modification to the community, when considering the dust impacts on the community, are not clear.
 - a. **SB** A targeted dust reduction campaign is ongoing, with an aim for continuous improvement. Hanson understand that dust is one of the community's biggest concerns.
10. **LB** Who is responsible for dust – and complaints – associated with importation campaigns.
 - a. **SB** If the activity is on our site, we are responsible for implementing or requiring implementation of controls.
 - b. **NW** A resident's experience of dust may be difficult to attribute specifically to the quarry.
 - c. **VS** Suggested independent overseer not associated with Hanson or a regulator.
 - d. **NW** This level of oversight is not applied elsewhere in the industry. A monitoring program is already in place to identify non-compliances.
 - e. **VS** An independent overseer could be warranted given the unique location of BPQ and interaction with local population.
 - f. **NW** Disagreed; quarries are built in various locations. In the case of Bass Point, the quarry existed first, and then residential development was built in the vicinity.
11. **VS** How many tonnes of material were placed in southern landscape mound is unclear, as is whether the soil was tested and approved.
 - a. **SB** Investigation was undertaken by DPIE.
 - b. **VS** Should the investigation be made public?
 - c. **SB** Cannot comment on DPIE processes.
 - d. **CF** DPIE would have advised Hanson of any non-compliances.
 - e. **VS** Did not receive notification of the outcome of the DPIE investigation.
 - f. **NW** The public (including VS) should contact the compliance section of the NSW Department of Planning and Environment regarding release of information from their investigation if that is a concern.

- g. **Post 29 March CCC meeting commentary:** DRE have directed that the Extraordinary Meeting Minutes be amended to reflect that DPE *did not* undertake materials testing of the southern landscape mound as part of their investigation. Hanson advises further that *at no stage* have Hanson conveyed to the CCC that DPE undertook materials testing of the southern landscape mound.
- 12. **VS** The southern landscape mound has not been adequately rehabilitated.
 - a. **SB** The rehabilitation process is ongoing. Initial plantings were in drought and were not overly successful. Plantings in the area have recommenced and are continuing.
- 13. **VS** Terminology in the report is worth noting. It is a landscape mound because it is manmade, but it was previously a natural formation.
 - a. **SB** The area was previously an overburden dump.
- 14. **VS** Overall concern about openness and honesty of Hanson about the southern landscape mound.
- 15. **LB** Hanson are to monitor and report importation documentation – will that be part of CCC meetings?
 - a. **SB** General updates can be included as a regular agenda item at CCC meetings.
- 16. **LB** Queried the timeline for next steps in the approval process.
 - a. **NW** The deadline for lodgement of Response to Submissions is 18/03/2022. Consultation with businesses and government agencies that made submissions is to occur within the next week.

Meeting Closed

16:00