

# Appendix 3

## Record of Issues Raised through Consultation Undertaken by the Proponent, 2000 to 2006

(No. of pages excluding this page = 18)



This page has intentionally been left blank



**Table A3-1  
Consultation Summary**

Page 1 of 2

Year	Stakeholder	Frequency	Discussion
2000	Local Landowner	14	Introduce Proposal (see <b>Table A3-2</b> ).
2000	Government Agencies (Planning Focus Meeting)	1	Present Proposal (see <b>Table A3-3</b> ).
2001	Somersby Public School	1	Discuss Proposal (see <b>Table A3-4</b> ).
2002	Local Landowner	2	Groundwater
2002	Gosford City Council	2	Voluntary Conservation Agreement (Somersby Mintbush)
2003	Gosford City Council	6	Sportsfield
2003	Gosford City Council	1	Extraction
2003	Local Landowner	1	General Impact
2004	Gosford City Council	5	Sportsfield
2004	Gosford City Council	1	Voluntary Conservation Agreement
2004	Gosford City Council	1	Address Directors
2004	Gosford City Council	2	Somersby Mintbush
2004	Darkinjung Local Aboriginal Land Council	1	Archaeological
2004	Local Landowner	2	Water / Impact
2005	Local Landowners	15	Water / Dust / Noise
2005	Department of Primary Industries (Agriculture)	4	Water / Dust
2005	Somersby Public School	5	Liaison
2005	Department of Education	1	Impact
2005	Gosford City Council	5	Sportsfield
2005	Gosford City Council	1	Address Councillors
2005	Gosford City Council	1	Mayor – Sportsfield
2005	Somersby Public School	1	School Newslettter
2005	Somersby Public School	2	P & C Meeting
2005	Somersby Public School	1	General Update
2005	Somersby Business	2	General Update
2005	Community Information	2	Comprehensive Briefing
2005	Media Release	3	Proposal Outline
2005	Newsletters	2	General Update



**Table A3-1 (Cont'd)**  
**Consultation Summary**

Page 2 of 2

<b>Year</b>	<b>Stakeholder</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Discussion</b>
2005	State Member for The Entrance	1	General Update
2005	Central Coast Plateau Chamber of Commerce	1	General Update
2005	Central Coast Soccer Association	1	Sportsfield
2005	Central Coast Cricket Association	1	Sportsfield
2006	Community Meeting	1	Air Quality, Health Issues and Social Impacts.



**Table A3-2**  
**Responses Raised by 14 Local Residents and Public School During Community Consultation**  
**Undertaken August/September 2000**

Page 1 of 1

Resident No. <sup>1</sup>	Comments / Concerns	Section(s) in EA
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Little interest in the proposal.</li> </ul>	3.2.1
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No concerns.</li> </ul>	3.2.1
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dust not considered a problem as it is already generated from Dogtrap Road and noise was not seen as a problem as anything would be an improvement upon the Freeway being established and the old Pacific Highway (Peats Ridge Road) being superseded.</li> </ul>	4.4.2.1
4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hoped it would proceed on the basis it would provide employment for the area.</li> </ul>	2.10
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Totally opposed to the site being used for sand extraction.</li> <li>Would object strongly to the increase in road transport, noise and the potential for dust.</li> </ul>	3.2.1 4.3, 4.4, 4.5
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No objections on the understanding the impact would not be detrimental to his lifestyle.</li> </ul>	3.2.1
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst concerned about possible impact, they have remained open to discussion and resolution of those issues that may impact their on their lifestyle.</li> </ul>	2.10
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No noted concerns.</li> </ul>	3.2.1
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about water supply as the school is dependent upon their bore.</li> <li>Also concerned about other impact including noise and dust.</li> </ul>	4.2, 4.2.5, 4.2.8 4.3, 4.4
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No objection subject to no specific impact in future times.</li> <li>Concern over disruption to water.</li> </ul>	3.2.1 4.2
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sceptical of proposal as they suggest further dust and noise would be created.</li> <li>Concerns over granddaughter's asthma as she attends Somersby Public School.</li> <li>Concerns over impact (related to dust and road traffic).</li> </ul>	4.3, 4.4 4.4, SCSC Part 4 4.4, 4.5
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not concerned over sand removal.</li> <li>Expressed concern over water availability but thought there would be no impact.</li> </ul>	3.2.1 4.2
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns over impact on groundwater.</li> </ul>	4.2
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns over water and dust impact.</li> <li>Has children at local school and concerns over potential impact.</li> </ul>	4.2, 4.4 4.8

<sup>1</sup> Names / addresses removed for confidentiality reasons



**Table A3-3**  
**Issues Raised During Planning Focus Meeting on 22 November 2000**

Page 1 of 5

Issue	Government Agency / Local Stakeholder	Section(s) in EA
<b>Zoning and Permissibility</b>		
• Extraction permissible in 1(a) zone but not permissible in 1(b) zone.	DUAP Newcastle	1.1
• Lot 4, DP 214861 is included in REP 8 and REP 9, however, REP 9 requirements override REP 8 requirements because REP 9 was gazetted later. Therefore, extraction is permissible within Lot 4, DP 214861 with Minister's consent.	DUAP Newcastle	1.1
• Lot 1, DP 302768 is included in REP 8 but not REP 9. However, the resource is State significant, therefore extraction with Minister's consent is permissible.	DUAP Newcastle	1.1
• Permissibility and potential for future industrial type developments in area.	P & C	2.12.5
<b>Environmental Assessment – Public Exhibition and Assessment Process</b>		
• DUAP should consider increasing public exhibition period (beyond required 28 day period).	EPA	1.5
• Include description of integrated development assessment process for State Significant developments (including objection process) in EIS.	Gosford Council	1.5
• Proper advertising of Development Application and display of EIS to ensure local community is aware of Development Application.	Gosford Council, Residents	1.5
• Supply of EIS Summary with letter to affected / adjacent residences from Gosford Council.	Gosford Council	1.5
• Department of Education and Training would refer requests for specific requirements for EIS and specific concerns to School P&C.	Department of Education and Training, Sydney	3.2.4
<b>Transport</b>		
• Use of Wisemans Ferry Road by transport trucks.	P&C	2.7.3, 4.5
• Access by trucks to General Store.	P&C	4.5
• Define "truck movement".	P&C	2.7.4
• Number of truck movements to and from site.	P&C	2.7.4
• Ensure suitability of site access for B-doubles.	RTA	2.7, 4.5
• Speed of trucks on Peats Ridge and Wisemans Ferry Road.	P&C	4.5.4, 4.5.5
• Impacts of transport trucks on school children, safety near school.	P&C	4.5.5, 4.5.5.3.2
DUAP = Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, P&C = Parents and Citizens Association EPA = Environment Protection Authority, RTA = Roads and Traffic Authority, DLWC = Department of Lands and Water Conservation, NSW Ag = NSW Agriculture		



**Table A3-3 (Cont'd)**  
**Issues Raised During Planning Focus Meeting on 22 November 2000**

Page 2 of 5

Issue	Government Agency / Local Stakeholder	Section(s) in EA
<b>Transport (Cont'd)</b>		
• Site access.	Gosford Council	2.7, 4.5
• Acceleration lane and speed of traffic near entrance.	Gosford Council	2.7, 4.5
• Adequacy of Peats Ridge Road for the number and weight of trucks associated with the proposal.	Gosford Council	4.5
• Contribution to maintenance of Peats Ridge Road.	Gosford Council	-
• Refer to existing RTA standards re: sight distance etc. for design of intersection.	RTA	4.5.4, 4.5.5
• Impacts of truck movements on F3.	RTA	2.7, 4.5, 4.5.5
<b>Surface Water</b>		
• Diversion of clean water around extraction areas.	EPA	4.2
• Discharge water quality.	EPA	4.2
• Management of fuel storage, machinery and vehicle maintenance (to minimise impacts on surface water quality).	EPA	4.2, 4.2.5
• Prevention of erosion and sedimentation during high rainfall events.	EPA	2.4.2, 2.12, 4.2, 4.11.4
• Potential quality of water discharged from areas where fines have been used as fill.	EPA	4.2
• Quality of water leaving the site should be as good or better than pre-development water quality with respect to sediments and nutrients.	Gosford Council	4.2
• Clarify location of Project Site with respect to drinking water catchment.	Gosford Council	4.2.2
• Clarify whether drainage line on Project Site is a "watercourse" according to DLWC legislation.	DLWC	4.2.2
• According to the requirements of the Water Act 1912, a licence is needed to pump water from a watercourse on the Project Site.	DLWC	2.1.4
• Applicant can propose to capture more than the 10 per cent of surface runoff outlined in the Farm Dams Policy because of requirement to contain all dirty runoff on-site.	DLWC	4.2, 4.2.6
• Water balance. Consideration of losses to evaporation and fines disposal.	DLWC	2.9.2, Fig 2.15
DUAP = Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, P&C = Parents and Citizens Association EPA = Environment Protection Authority, RTA = Roads and Traffic Authority, DLWC = Department of Lands and Water Conservation, NSW Ag = NSW Agriculture		



**Table A3-3 (Cont'd)**  
**Issues Raised During Planning Focus Meeting on 22 November 2000**

Page 3 of 5

Issue	Government Agency / Local Stakeholder	Section(s) in EA
<b>Groundwater</b>		
• Management of groundwater intercepted while extracting in groundwater / perched water table zone.	EPA	4.2
• If use of groundwater from a deep aquifer is proposed, approval under Part 5 of the Water Act 1912 is required.	DLWC	4.2
• Effect of using groundwater on groundwater table, surrounding groundwater bores and spring flow.	EPA / DLWC / NSW Agriculture/Resident	4.2
• Effect of using groundwater on ecosystem (e.g. worms)	DLWC	4.2, 4.2.6
• Prevent contamination of groundwater through disposal of contaminated material in void.	DLWC	4.2
• Groundwater monitoring required.	DLWC	4.2, 4.2.11.2
• Compensation to residents for any adverse effects on groundwater availability (may include deepening bores).	Resident	4.2.5, 4.2.8
<b>Noise</b>		
• Amount of plant and machinery to be used on site at one time.	P&C	4.3
• Noise from processing plant.	P&C	4.3
• Assessment of background noise levels and predicted noise levels for the full range of seasonal wind directions.	P&C	4.3
• Background noise measurements and time frame and time of measurements and exclusion of windy and rainy days from measurements.	P&C	4.3
• Acoustic treatment of on site mobile machinery.	EPA	4.3
• Installation / construction of sound buffers.	P&C	4.3
• Use of air brakes.	EPA	4.5.5.4
• Hours of operation.	EPA	2.8.2
<b>Air Quality</b>		
• Dust and risks to asthmatics and sufferers of chronic lung disease.	P&C	4.4
• Dust and risks of silicosis.	P&C	4.4
• Effect of dust deposited on rooves on drinking water, especially at Somersby Public School.	P&C	4.4.7.1
• Maintenance of haul roads to reduce dust generation.	EPA	4.4.5
• Height of noise buffers.	EPA	4.3.5
• Height of exhausts on mobile machinery.	EPA	4.3.6.2, 4.4.5
DUAP = Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, P&C = Parents and Citizens Association EPA = Environment Protection Authority, RTA = Roads and Traffic Authority, DLWC = Department of Lands and Water Conservation, NSW Ag = NSW Agriculture		





**Table A3-3 (Cont'd)**  
**Issues Raised During Planning Focus Meeting on 22 November 2000**

Page 4 of 5

Issue	Government Agency / Local Stakeholder	Section(s) in EA
<b>Monitoring</b>		
• Results of independent monitoring during project life to be made available to all government departments and Council.	Gosford Council	Section 5
<b><i>Prostanthera junonis</i> – Somersby Mintbush</b>		
• Thoroughness and methodology of <i>Prostanthera junonis</i> survey.	Gosford Council	4.6, 4.6.2
• Potential <i>Prostanthera junonis</i> seed source at eastern end of Project Site.	Gosford Council	4.6
• Need to consider requirements of the Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act, 1999.		4.6, 4.7
• Potential for relocation of <i>Prostanthera junonis</i> plants in extraction area.	EPA	4.6
• Proposed removal of approximately 10 per cent of <i>Prostanthera junonis</i> population on the Project Site could be considered to be significant.	Gosford Council	4.6, 4.6.6.2
• Recommend a Species Impact Statement be prepared.	Gosford Council	Not Relevant
• Objective for minimising impact on <i>Prostanthera junonis</i> population is that a viable and manageable population remains.	NPWS	4.6
<b>Site Buffer Zone</b>		
• 15m wide buffer zone between extraction boundary and fence may not be sufficient.	Gosford Council	2.4
<b>Aboriginal Cultural Heritage</b>		
• Location and description of Aboriginal heritage site(s).	P&C	4.10
• Assessment of Aboriginal Cultural heritage may be required.	NPWS	4.10
<b>Sand Resource and Project Life</b>		
• Depth and extent of resource and full potential for extraction.	Resident	2.2, 2.4
• Proposed depth of extraction.	Resident	2.2, 2.4
• Markets for extracted sand.	Resident	2.2.2
• Provide details of resource assessment including geological assessment (clay %, grain size, laboratories and methodologies used for geological assessment), sand quality, potential uses, production rates, life of mine, assessment of alternative sources, transport routes, markets, waste, impacts, rehabilitation and sustainability.	DMR	2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.8.3, 4.5, 2.12
DUAP = Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, P&C = Parents and Citizens Association EPA = Environment Protection Authority, RTA = Roads and Traffic Authority, DLWC = Department of Lands and Water Conservation, NSW Ag = NSW Agriculture		



**Table A3-3 (Cont'd)**  
**Issues Raised During Planning Focus Meeting on 22 November 2000**

Page 5 of 5

Issue	Government Agency / Local Stakeholder	Section(s) in EA
<b>Extraction Sequence and Overburden Removal</b>		
• Depth of overburden across site.	EPA	2.2
• Staging of overburden removal, extraction and rehabilitation.	Gosford Council	2.4, 2.12
<b>Management of Production Wastes and Process Water</b>		
• Management of fines.	EPA	2.6.4
• Re-use and recycling of process water.	EPA and P&C	4.2
• Potential for re-use of fines.	Resident	2.6.4
• Potential for additional truck movements as a result of transport of fines for re-use.	P&C	Not relevant to project
• Source of process water, requirements for use of surface water and/or groundwater for processing.	Resident	2.9.2, 4.2
<b>Landscaping Rehabilitation and Final Landform</b>		
• Construction and vegetation of landscaped earth mounds.	Resident	2.3, 2.12.2.2
• Filling of final void during construction of final landform and source of fill.	P&C	2.12.3
• Consideration of management of Prostanthera junonis in final land use and final landform.	NPWS	4.6.6.2
<b>Vegetation Clearing</b>		
• Potential for removal of weed species.	P&C	4.6.5
• Native Vegetation Act needs to be considered.	DLWC	4.7
<b>Safety</b>		
• Security fence to restrict site access.	P&C	2.11
• Site safety must be in accordance with Mines Inspection Act 1992.	DMR	2.11
<b>Processing Plant</b>		
• Processing plant location.	NPWS	Figure 2.2 and 2.8
• Noise levels.	P&C	4.3
<b>Miscellaneous</b>		
• Appearance of site and scale of project – comparable existing extraction operations.	P&C	4.9
DUAP = Department of Urban Affairs and Planning, P&C = Parents and Citizens Association EPA = Environment Protection Authority, RTA = Roads and Traffic Authority, DLWC = Department of Lands and Water Conservation, NSW Ag = NSW Agriculture		



**Table A3-4**  
**Issues Raised During Somersby Public School Information Evening - March 2001**

Page 1 of 2

Issue	Section(s) in EA
A wide range of issues were discussed with the parents and other representatives of Somersby Public School, including the following.	
– Relationship between Dr David Douglas, a specialist health consultant, and R.W. Corkery & Co. Pty. Limited and Vulcan Materials.	3.2.2
– Ownership and length of registration of Vulcan Materials as a Company.	1.2
– Will Vulcan Materials actually operate a sand extraction operation after Development Consent is granted.	1.1, 2.1
– Ownership of Project Site and purchase of surrounding land.	4.1.4, Figure 4.4
– Reason for draft EIS prepared by CSR in 1996 not being finalised, and proposal to extract sand on Project Site not going ahead.	1.4
– Length of time for background wind and dust monitoring – need for 12 months of data to obtain information on all seasons.	4.1.3, 4.4
– Estimated dust levels during proposed activities and how they are estimated.	4.4
– Requirement for information on relationship between total suspended particulates and health risks, including long term exposure (years).	4.4
– Requirements for information on potential sources of fine respirable dust from the proposed activities (on-site and transport) and mitigation measures to prevent dust leaving site.	4.4
– Requirement for information on size of sand particles to be extracted.	2.2
– Potential for fractured sand particles to be created during proposed activities.	4.4.4
– Nature of fine particles within sand.	4.4.2.4
– Requirement for information on effect of digesting dust that may potentially enter drinking water via rooves and tanks.	4.4.7.1
– Size and location of product stockpiles.	2.5
– Requirement for excellent quality wind and dust data.	4.1.3, 4.4
– Development Application process, length of time between granting of Development Consent and operation start-up.	1.5
– Description of monitoring to be undertaken – especially dust.	4.4
– Day to day evaluation of monitoring results during proposed activities.	Section 5
– Independent evaluation of monitoring results during proposed activities.	4.2.11, 4.3.7, 4.4.9
– Impacts of exhaust emission from transport vehicles and measures to mitigate impacts.	4.4



**Table A3-4 (Cont'd)**  
**Issues Raised During Somersby Public School Information Evening - March 2001**

Page 2 of 2

<b>Issue</b>	<b>Section(s) in EA</b>
– Chemicals to be used on site and potential environmental impacts and health risks associated with those chemicals.	2.9, Table 3.1
– Source of water for processing and dust control.	2.9
– Will all runoff from the Project Site be retained on site.	4.2
– Impact of proposed activities on surface and groundwater quality and quantity.	4.2
– Potential impact of runoff from Project Site on Forest of Tranquility and its habitat value (especially Platypus).	4.6, 4.7
– Potential health risks associated with dust from proposed activities, apart from asthma and silicosis, such as eye and skin irritations.	4.4
– Occupational health risks associated with proposed activities.	2.11
– Possibility of operational activities changing (e.g. sand extraction method) after approval is granted or if another Company operates the project.	1.1, 2.1
– Sources and types of noise to be generated and impacts.	4.3
– Opportunities for the general community to discuss health concerns with Dr David Douglas.	3.2
– Quality of any surface water leaving the Project Site and health risks associated with any poor water quality leaving the Project Site.	4.2
– Fuel storage on Project Site.	2.9



**Table A3-5**  
**Issues Raised During Somersby Community Meetings on 30 March 2005 and 2 April 2005 and**  
**Coverage in *Environmental Assessment***

Page 1 of 3

Issue	Section(s) in EA
<b>Groundwater</b>	
• Impacts on groundwater supplies for stock, domestic and commercial use.	4.2
• Will non-registered bores be considered in the same manner as registered bores?	4.2
• What groundwater monitoring will be done and can residents get results and who will do it?	4.2
• What compensation will be paid if businesses depending on groundwater (eg. nurseries) are unable to operate because of reductions in groundwater availability?	4.2
• What will be the effect of sand removal on the natural springs around the Somersby Fields site?	4.2
• How much water will the operation use / how does this compare with what Coca Cola purchases from the Plateau?	2.9, Figure 2.15
• Will the operation change the quality of the groundwater extracted from surrounding bores, ie. will it be muddy?	4.2
<b>Noise</b>	
• Noise from earthmoving equipment and trucks on site.	4.3
• Noise from trucks travelling on Peats Ridge Road and impacts on residents along Dog Trap Road.	4.3
• What noise monitoring will be done?	4.3
• Will the processing plant operate on a Saturday when the fields are being used on Stage 1 and then Stage 1? How noisy will it be on those fields if processing operations occur on a Saturday?	No Longer Applicable
• Noise impacts when gentle winds are present (other activities in Somersby area clearly audible, eg. equipment near chook sheds, School band practising).	4.3
• Will reversing beepers be used on site – if not, what will be used to satisfy safety requirements?	4.3
<b>Operational</b>	
• Long-term ownership of the project and lack of commitments of new owners.	Section 5
• What earthmoving equipment will be used and what vibration will it cause?	2.4.5
• Proposed hours of operation – sand removal / trucks.	2.8.2
• Will the whole site be fenced and will Stage 1 be fenced off after it is converted to playing fields to separate ongoing activities?	2.11



**Table A3-5 (Cont'd)**  
**Issues Raised During Somersby Community Meetings on 30 March 2005 and 2 April 2005 and Coverage in *Environmental Assessment***

Page 2 of 3

Issue	Section(s) in EA
<b>Air Quality</b>	
• Dust impacts particularly relating to health issues.	4.4
• Dust impacts upon local nurseries and reduction in presentation / saleability of plant stock.	4.4.7
• How much dust will be generated from stockpiles and can it be controlled?	4.4
<b>Ecological</b>	
• Has <i>Persoonia isophylla</i> been identified on the subject site?	4.6
• What will be the effect of site operations on vegetation on the eastern side of the property, eg. runoff, sedimentation?	4.6
• Principles of Ecologically Sustainable Development.	6.3
• How much buffer will be around the Somersby Mintbush?	4.6, 2.4.1
<b>Road &amp; Traffic</b>	
• Interaction between trucks travelling on Peats Ridge Road and vehicles turning right into Dog Trap Road.	4.5
• Range of daily truck movements.	2.7, 4.5
• What guarantees can be given that truck drivers won't travel to the Somersby shop or the local fuel outlet?	4.5
• All alternative sand sources should be considered.	Section 6
<b>Rehabilitation/Fields Proposal</b>	
• Will a performance bond be placed on the project to ensure the playing fields are completed if the operator doesn't complete the fields?	No Longer Applicable
• Will the Partnership contribute to funding the completion of the sporting fields?	No Longer Applicable
• Will the operator develop a seed bank from seed collected on site for rehabilitation?	2.12
• Ownership of the land at the end of the project – Council / sporting groups?	2.12.5
• Will the land be sold off progressively eg. at 5 years / 10 years?	2.12.5
• What fill materials will be used to backfill the land to create the playing fields and where will it come from?	2.6.4
• Will trees on the edge of the land be removed for noise earth mounds to be built?	4.3, 4.6
• What emphasis will be placed on achieving the same species diversity when bushland is replaced?	2.12
• Will the airstrip section of the property be rehabilitated?	2.12
• How much of the final site will be restored to bushland?	2.12, 4.6
• Will local species be used in regenerating bushland?	2.12, 4.6



**Table A3-5 (Cont'd)**  
**Issues Raised During Somersby Community Meetings on 30 March 2005 and 2 April 2005 and Coverage in *Environmental Assessment***

Page 3 of 3

Issue	Section(s) in EA
<b>Somersby Public School</b>	
• Impacts upon student's learning at Somersby Public School.	2.3.2, 4.3
• How dusty will it be at the school?	4.4
• Will any activities be seen from Somersby Public School.	4.9
<b>Aboriginal Heritage</b>	
• Have there been any Aboriginal relics identified on site?	4.10
<b>Other</b>	
• Impacts of the project upon local land values.	4.8
• Consider alternative sites with access to rail.	Appendix 4
• Consider alternative sites for sand closer to Sydney.	Appendix 4
• What proportion do all the existing and future sand quarries represent of the whole Somersby Plateau?	Figure A4.1
• Will the sand removal area increase runoff and increase flooding potential in Narara Creek?	4.2



**Table A3-6**  
**Issues Raised for Consideration at the Planning Focus Meeting on 31 May 2005**

Page 1 of 5

Issue	Requirement	Section(s) in EA
<b>Department of Education and Training</b>		
Noise & Dust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Address Noise &amp; Dust Issues.</li> </ul>	4.3, 4.4
Social impact	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Somersby is a strong school and an integral part of the community. Ensure there is no loss in current service and address: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>stress in the community</li> <li>affect of parents attitudes on children</li> <li>threatened withdrawal of students</li> <li>impacts on funding etc.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	4.8
<b>Department of Primary Industries (Minerals)</b>		
Geology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide a geological description, including size of resource, possible sterilisation, and rationale for non-extraction of par-ts of the resource.</li> </ul>	2.2
Safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety issues under Mines Inspection Act.</li> </ul>	2.4
Justification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential utilisation and markets.</li> <li>Detail the value added to existing extractive industry on the Somersby Plateau. Justify in both a local and regional context.</li> <li>Provide an analysis of sand consumption and therefore need for proposal.</li> </ul>	Appendix 4 Appendix 4 Appendix 4
<b>Department of Primary Industries (Agriculture)</b>		
Water Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the possible impact on supply of water (quantity) to the DPI Research Station.</li> </ul>	4.2
Dust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the dust impacts on experiments on plant growth (field and greenhouse experiments).</li> <li>Assess the dust impacts on rainwater from rooves.</li> </ul>	4.4 4.4.7.1
Water Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the water quality of runoff, both during and post extraction, that would enter the DPI Research Station.</li> <li>Investigate effects on spring water supply to the research station and any interference of aquifers.</li> </ul>	4.2 4.2
<b>Wyong Council</b>		
Water Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Detail any impacts on the Ourimbah Creek water catchment both during operation and as part of end use.</li> <li>Provide an assessment of groundwater impacts.</li> </ul>	4.2 4.2





**Table A3-6 (Cont'd)**  
**Issues Raised for Consideration at the Planning Focus Meeting on 31 May 2005**

Page 2 of 5

Issue	Requirement	Section(s) in EA
<b>Gosford Council</b>		
Flora/Fauna	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Determine whether an SIS is required for any threatened flora.</li> <li>Provide details on any agreements on a Voluntary Conservation Area reached with NPWS.</li> </ul>	4.6 2.4.1, 4.6, Figure 2.5
Water Resources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess impacts on groundwater with reference to the Kulnura – Mangrove Mountain water sharing plan.</li> </ul>	4.2
Justification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Justify site selection.</li> </ul>	Section 6
Referrals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Contact the Civil Aviation Authority over ongoing lease of airstrip.</li> <li>DA to be referred to Department of Health.</li> </ul>	4.1.4.2 Noted
Land Use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final land use cannot be seen as a foregone conclusion – other options should be assessed.</li> </ul>	2.12.5
Meteorology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to address blustery conditions from the southeast.</li> </ul>	4.1.3, 4.3, 4.4
<b>RTA</b>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess the impact on the surrounding road network, especially Peats Ridge Road which is a regional road (Council owns land)</li> </ul>	4.5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prepare a Traffic Impact Study detailing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>existing environment;</li> <li>predicted new levels; and</li> <li>direction of entry/exit.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	4.5
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide detail on the transport layout within the site</li> </ul>	Figure 2.8, 2.11, 2.12
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Obtain Landowner consent to lodge (Gosford City Council)</li> </ul>	2.1.2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Section 138 of <i>Roads Act 1993</i> approval required</li> </ul>	2.1.4
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess road safety especially as it relates to speed zones.</li> </ul>	4.5
<b>DIPNR (Hunter Region)</b>		
Approvals	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Four integrated approval issues to be addressed.</li> </ul>	2.1.4, 3.4
Watercourses	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess requirement for <i>Rivers and Foreshores Improvement Act 1948</i> (Part 3A Permit) especially in the northeastern corner of Project Site (Ourimbah Creek Catchment unlikely to be relevant as disturbance &gt;40m from the edge of the creek).</li> </ul>	3.4
Vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Address requirements under <i>Native Vegetation Conservation Act 1997</i>. Not relevant as proposal is designated development.</li> </ul>	4.6, 4.7



**Table A3-6 (Cont'd)**  
**Issues Raised for Consideration at the Planning Focus Meeting on 31 May 2005**

Page 3 of 5

Issue	Requirement	Section(s) in EA
<b>DIPNR (Hunter Region) (Cont'd)</b>		
Surface Water use	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Prepare a site water balance and determine the maximum harvestable right. Assess against requirements under the <i>Water Management Act 2000</i>.</li> </ul>	Figure 2.15, 4.2.6
Groundwater	(i) Aquifer Interference <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Determine whether a Licence under Part 5 of the Water Act is required. Water Act applies where aquifer interference under the Water Management Act 2000 is not yet operational.</li> </ul>	3.4
	(ii) Consumptive Use <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Dams may access perched groundwater and therefore Water Management Act Approval required.</li> </ul>	3.4
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Determine the interrelationship between different aquifers of the region.</li> </ul>	4.2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>♦ Convene meeting between Hydrogeologist and DIPNR (Hunter).</li> </ul>	Meeting held
<b>DIPNR (Sydney Office)</b>		
Administrative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State significant development. Consider against new SEPP gazetted 27/05/05.</li> </ul>	1.5, 3.4
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Integrated development approvals include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Environment Protection licence under <i>Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997</i>.</li> <li>– Water licence under <i>Water Act 1912</i>.</li> <li>– S.138 permit under <i>Roads Act</i>.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2.1.4, 3.4
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference all relevant planning instruments.</li> </ul>	3.4
Project Description	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide greater detail on design and operation of mobile plant.</li> <li>• Proven case studies on proven filter press technology.</li> </ul>	Section 2
Justification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not assume benefits. Clear justification based on strategic development in local and regional context.</li> </ul>	Section 6
Noise	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unless justification provided, construction of bunds will be considered operational noise under INP.</li> </ul>	4.3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide specific attention to truck noise between 5:00am and 6:00am.</li> </ul>	4.5

**Table A3-6 (Cont'd)**  
**Issues Raised for Consideration at the Planning Focus Meeting on 31 May 2005**

Page 4 of 5

Issue	Requirement	Section(s) in EA
<b>DIPNR (Sydney Office) (Cont'd)</b>		
Dust	• Address concerns at Somersby Public School.	4.4
	• Assess against all relevant DEC criteria.	4.4
	• Assess silica and silicosis issues.	4.4
	• Assess impacts on surrounding land uses and include logic and background research.	4.4
	• Assess impacts on rainwater harvest against ANZECC criteria.	
Groundwater	• A peer review of final groundwater report is highly likely.	Noted
	• Negotiated agreements with affected landowners may be necessary.	4.2.8
	• Assess impacts on groundwater dependant ecosystems.	4.2
Surface Water	• Identify surface water – groundwater interaction.	4.2
	• Provide a site water balance.	Figure 2.15
	• Investigate the legal position or Caveats placed on the use of the lower dam (Dam A).	Licence Required
	• Provide detail on erosion & sediment control and flooding of Narara Valley.	4.2, 4.4.10.4
	• Demonstrate that the filter press process is proven technology.	-
Flora / Fauna	(i) Threatened species	4.6, 4.7
	– Provide draft of 8-part test to DIPNR prior to submission.	Not Relevant
	– Determine whether an SIS is required.	Not Relevant
	– Consider Federal legislation.	2.1.4
	– Provide justification for choice of Somersby Mintbush conservation area:	2.12.8
	• Minimum like for like protection.	
	• Address the principle of “no net loss of habitat”.	
	• Consider the zoning of the area (Zone 1b) and therefore long-term stability of conservation area.	
	• Be guided by recovery plan for Somersby Mintbush.	



**Table A3-6 (Cont'd)**  
**Issues Raised for Consideration at the Planning Focus Meeting on 31 May 2005**

Page 5 of 5

Issue	Requirement	Section(s) in EA
<b>DIPNR (Sydney Office) (Cont'd)</b>		
Flora / Fauna (continued)	(ii) Vegetation clearing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Appears to be a net-loss of vegetation.</li> <li>– Provide accurate estimates of clearing, rehabilitation and biodiversity offsets.</li> <li>– Assess Somersby landscape and relationship between this and threatened species in conserved areas.</li> <li>– Provide detail on proposed biodiversity offsets</li> <li>– Address the long-term conservation of vegetation.</li> </ul>	2.12.8, 4.6, 4.7
Visual	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider lighting issues.</li> </ul>	4.9
Final Landform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consult with Council,</li> <li>• Provide detail on how fields will be managed and when will management change hands from Somersby Fields to Council or sporting bodies.</li> <li>• Ensure no ongoing public liability created over land management.</li> </ul>	3.2  2.12.5  2.12.5
Socio-economic setting.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Address concerns over the potential loss of students.</li> <li>• Detail the involvement of Somersby Fields in school and community.</li> <li>• Consultation imperative – continue right through to lodgement.</li> </ul>	4.8  4.8  3.2, 4.8
Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consult with agencies throughout EIS preparation to ensure all issues are address in EIS.</li> </ul>	3.2, 4.8
Miscellaneous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The EIS should provide a detailed description of monitoring and management.</li> </ul>	Section 4 and Section 5

