

Walcha Council May 2022 Ordinary Meeting Business Paper Attachments:

- 6.1 Quarterly Budget Review Statements as at March 2022
- 6.2 Attachment 1 Development Assessment Report
- 6.2 Attachment 2 Modification Request





Oxley Wild Rivers

Walcha Council Quarterly Budget Review Statement 31 March 2022

Report by Responsible Accounting Officer

The following statement is made in accordance with Clause 203(2) of the Local Government (General) Regulations 2005:

It is my opinion that the Quarterly Budget Review Statement for Walcha Council for the quarter ended 31 March 2022 indicates that Council's projected financial position at 30 June 2022 will be satisfactory at year end, having regard to the projected estimates of income and expenditure and the original budgeted income and expenditure

| IGNO | |
|------|--|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

Christian Martin

Date 20/05/2022

Responsible Accounting Officer



Index:

| Highlights | L. |
|-----------------------------|------------|
| Income Statement | 2. |
| Functions Summary | 3. |
| General Fund Summary | 1. |
| Water Sewer & Waste Summary | 5. |
| Capital Report | 5 . |
| Restrictions Summary | 7. |
| Performance Ratios | 3. |
| Contract register | Э. |



1. Highlights

| | 2021-2022 ORIGINAL BUDGET | 20 | 21-2022 AME | NDED BUDGI | ĒΤ | YTD ACTUAL | |
|--------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|---------------|---|
| INCOME STATEMENT | | QBRS Q1 Approved Variation | QBRS Q2 Proposed Variation | QBRS Q3 Proposed Variation | Total Amended | | Comment |
| General Fund | -1,755,200 | 660,908 | -27,680 | -40,000 | -1,161,972 | | Q3 - Reduce road base sales revenue of \$40,000 as no gravel won in 2022. |
| Water Fund | -138,500 | 0 | 0 | 34,985 | -103,515 | | Decrease forecast loss with removal of interest on loan that has not been taken up. |
| Sewer Fund | -27,400 | 0 | 0 | -90,213 | -117,613 | | Significantly higher than budgeted due to testing and instrumentation trials to reduce in the 2023 financial year |
| Consolidated Funds | -1,921,100 | 660,908 | -27,680 | • | -1,383,100 | -1,893,699 | |

Note: The forecast loss of \$1.383M does not include loss on disposal of assets. The bridge renewal program that is currently being undertaken will result in decommissioned bridges with high book values being written off to the Income Statement and while it will not have an effect on cashflow it will still impact our business performance and financial ratios. The loss on disposal is estimated to be between \$800K and \$1.1M depending on the number decommissioned by 30 June 2022.

| CAPITAL | | QBRS Q1 Approved Variation | QBRS Q2 Proposed Variation | | Total Amended | YTD ACTUAL | Comment |
|--------------------|------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|------------------|---------------|---|
| General Fund | 5,936,300 | 12,881,923 | 1,544,791 | -9,075,159 | 11,287,855 | 7,653,367 | Q3 - Move bridge renewal program into 2023 budget Q3 - Move urban roads rehab into 2023 budget Q3 - Move swimming pool upgrade into 2023 budget |
| Water Fund | 9,575,000 | 340,332 | 0 | -8,525,000 | 1,390,332 | | Q3 - Offcreek storage project moves majority to 2023 financial year |
| Sewer Fund | 200,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 200,000 | 41,809 | Q3 - No change with various small works |
| Consolidated Funds | 15,711,300 | 13,222,255 | 1,544,791 | -17,600,159 | 12,878,187 | 8,386,781 | |

Note: QBRS 1 indicates a \$12.9M variation as carry forward projects were not included in the original budget for the General Fund. With a review completed for Q3 as part of the 2023 budget process a significant value of project expenditure has now been moved to 2023 including the bridge renewal program, off creek storage project and various others.



| CASHFLOW | | QBRS Q1 Approved Variation | QBRS Q2 Proposed Variation | QBRS Q3 Proposed Variation | Total Amended | YTD ACTUAL | Comment |
|--------------------|--------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|---------------|---|
| General Fund | 8,900 | -227,994 | -27,680 | 159,396 | -87,378 | 2,826,632 | YTD includes capital grant funding received |
| Water Fund | -7,700 | 0 | 0 | 184,985 | 177,285 | -384,660 | YTD includes timing of water rates received |
| Sewer Fund | -1,300 | 0 | 0 | -182,213 | -1,300 | -24,478 | |
| Consolidated Funds | -100 | -227,994 | -27,680 | 162,168 | 88,607 | 2,417,494 | |

Note: The QBRS Q1 adjustment is largely due to overrunning projects from the prior financial year. Q3 is seeing an improvement on cashflow as Council reviews expenditure and takes measures to ensure cashflow does not fall. There is additional expenditure on chemicals and trials to limit algae in the treatment ponds which is expected to be reduced in the 2023 Financial Year.

| | Jun-21 | Mar-22 |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Total Cash & Investments | 5,575,603 | 9,262,259 |
| External Restrictions: | | |
| Specific Purpose Grants | 3,162,921 | 0 |
| Water Fund | 57,952 | -12,384 |
| Sewer Fund | 563,482 | 527,496 |
| | 3,784,355 | 515,112 |
| Internal Restrictions | 4,252,795 | 4,252,795 |
| Unrestricted Cash | -2,461,547 | 4,494,352 |

Note: Water fund is currently calculated as a negative reserve position. This was a likely scenario as the opening reserves were only \$58K. A review with Finance and Infrastructure will determine any contingency that can be taken to correct this prior to 30 June 2022 as the current. Sewer fund is using some reserves to cover the current loss which is forecast.

WALCHA COUNCIL - INCOME STATEMENT

| | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 0 4 0 T D E 0 T | | YTD ACTUAL | | | | |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------|--|
| | | .02 1-2022 ORIGI | NAL BUDGET | | | 2021-2022 AMEN | DED BUDGET | | | 2021-2022 FORE | CAST RESULT | | | YID AC | TUAL | | |
| | Consolidated | General Fund | Water Fund | Sewer Fund | Consolidated | General Fund | Water Fund | Sewer Fund | Consolidated | General Fund | Water Fund | Sewer Fund | Consolidated | General Fund | Water Fund | Sewer Fund | |
| Income from Continuing Operations | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates & Annual Charges B2-1 | 5,278,700 | 4,551,300 | 400,200 | 327,200 | 5,278,700 | 4,551,300 | 400,200 | 327,200 | 5,278,700 | 4,551,300 | 400,200 | 327,200 | 5,099,403 | 4,553,754 | 298,832 | 246,818 | |
| User Charges & Fees B2-2 Other Revenues B2-3 | 1,611,200 281,400 | 1,045,800 281.400 | 424,300 0 | 141,100 0 | 4,040,591 297,908 | 3,475,191 297.908 | 424,300 0 | 141,100 0 | 4,000,591 297,908 | 3,435,191 297.908 | 424,300 0 | 141,100 0 | 2,705,203 251,524 | 2,194,289 244,524 | 396,940 7.000 | 113,973 0 | |
| Grants & Contributions- Operating B2-4 | 4,498,600 | 4,498,600 | 0 | 0 | 7,616,702 | 7,616,702 | 0 | 0 | 7,630,596 | 7,630,596 | 0 | 0 | 4,057,682 | 4,110,520 | -26,419 | -26,419 | |
| Grants & Contributions - Capital B2-4-c Interest & Revenue B2-5 | 11,802,200 25,000 | 3,657,200 21,200 | 8,145,000 2,100 | 1,700 | 22,841,617 25,000 | 14,297,755 21,200 | 8,485,332 2,100 | 58,530 1,700 | 7,793,336 25,000 | 6,344,474 21,200 | 1,390,332 2,100 | 58,530 1,700 | 4,709,533 27,968 | 4,628,814 23,478 | 80,719 2,982 | 0 1,508 | |
| Other Income B2-6 | 43,800 | 43,800 | 0 | 0 | 43,800 | 43,800 | 0 | 0 | 43,800 | 43,800 | 0 | 0 | 19,458 | 19,458 | 0 | 0 | |
| Total Income from Continuing Operations | 23,540,900 | 14,099,300 | 8,971,600 | 470,000 | 40,144,318 | 30,303,856 | 9,311,932 | 528,530 | 25,069,931 | 22,324,469 | 2,216,932 | 528,530 | 16,870,771 | 15,774,836 | 760,054 | 335,880 | |
| Expenses from Continuing Operations | | U | | | | 0 | | | | | | | | · · | | | |
| Employee Benefits & Oncosts B3-1 | 5,735,850 | 5,401,150 | 179,000 | 155,700 | 5,737,850 | 5,403,150 | 179,000 | 155,700 | 6,418,100 | 6,073,200 | 179,000 | 165,900 | 4,812,257 | 4,523,897 | 155,491 | 132,869 | |
| Materials & Contracts B3-2 Borrowing Costs B3-3 | 3,608,350 113,100 | 3,004,950 69,900 | 400,800 38,200 | 202,600 5,000 | 8,478,595 113,100 | 7,875,195 69.900 | 400,800 38,200 | 202,600 5,000 | 7,907,452 73.115 | 7,219,039 69.900 | 400,800 3.215 | 287,613 | 6,159,809 8,993 | 5,679,073 6,610 | 295,056 2,383 | 185,681 | |
| Depreciation & Impairment B3-4 | 3,843,500 | 3,362,300 | 347,100 | 134.100 | 3.902.028 | 3.420.828 | 347.100 | 134.100 | 3.902.028 | 3,420,828 | 347.100 | 134.100 | 2.938.347 | 2.603.095 | 236.997 | 98.255 | |
| Other Expenses B3-5 | 310,700 | 310,700 | 0 | 0 | 310,700 | 310,700 | 0 | 0 | 310,700 | 310,700 | 0 | 0 | 50,773 | 50,773 | 0 | 0 | |
| Net loss from disposal of assets B4-1 | 48,300 | 48,300 | 0 | 0 | 48,300 | 48,300 | 0 | 0 | 48,300 | 48,300 | 0 | 0 | 84,756 | 84,756 | 0 | 0 | |
| Total Expenses from Continuing Operations | 13,659,800 | 12,197,300 | 965,100 | 497,400 | 18,590,573 | 17,128,073 | 965,100 | 497,400 | 18,659,695 | 17,141,967 | 930,115 | 587,613 | 14,054,936 | 12,948,204 | 689,927 | 416,804 | |
| Net Operating Result from Continuing Operations | 9,881,100 | 1,902,000 | 8,006,500 | -27,400 | 21,553,745 | 13,175,783 | 8,346,832 | 31,130 | 6,410,236 | 5,182,502 | 1,286,817 | -59,083 | 2,815,835 | 2,826,632 | 70,127 | -80,924 | |
| Net Operating Result before Grants & | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Contributions for Capital Purposes | -1,921,100 | -1,755,200 | -138,500 | -27,400 | -1,287,872 | -1,121,972 | -138,500 | -27,400 | -1,383,100 | -1,161,972 | -103,515 | -117,613 | -1,893,699 | -1,802,182 | -10,592 | -80,924 | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

WALCHA COUNCIL - FUNCTION SUMMARY

QUARTERLY BUDGET REVIEW AT 31 MARCH 2022 by Function

| | | | D) | Function | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---|---------------------------------|--|---|--|
| | Approved | QBRS YTD | Varied | Actual YTD | % | Domaining | Forecast to | |
| FUNCTION | Current Year | Adjust | | 2022 | achieved | Remaining Allocation | June 2022 | Variance |
| | Budget | Aujust | Budget | 2022 | acmeved | Allocation | June 2022 | |
| GENERAL FUND | | | | | | | | |
| INCOME | | | | | | | | |
| | 100 100 | | 100 100 | 115 165 | 0.40/ | 7.605 | 123.100 | |
| | 123,100 | | 123,100 | 115,465 | 94% | 7,635 | -, | - |
| Public Order & Safety | | - | 80,800 | 3,261 | 4% | 77,539 | 80,800 | - |
| Health 3 | , | - | 2,000 | 200 | 10% | 1,800 | 2,000 | • |
| Environment 4 | , | - | 988,600 | 957,486 | 97% | 31,114 | 988,600 | |
| Community Services & Education | | 220,000 | 1,158,300 | 890,871 | 77% | 267,429 | 1,172,194 | 13,894 |
| Housing & Community Amenities | | 51,508 | 155,508 | 124,537 | 80% | 30,971 | 155,508 | |
| | 136,800 | 221,120 | 357,920 | 355,194 | 99% | 2,726 | 357,920 | |
| Mining, Manufacturing and Construction | | | 52,000 | 13,096 | 25% | 38,904 | 12,000 | -40,000 |
| Transport & Communication | | 3,935,447 | 5,549,647 | 3,246,519 | 58% | 2,303,128 | 5,549,647 | |
| | 0 229,300 | 1,135,926 | 1,365,226 | 796,215 | 58% | 569,011 | 1,365,226 | |
| • | 3,657,200 | 10,640,555 | 14,297,755 | 4,628,814 | 32% | 9,668,941 | 6,344,474 | -7,953,281 |
| - | 4 6,173,000 | - | 6,173,000 | 4,643,179 | 75% | 1,529,821 | 6,173,000 | |
| General Fund Income | 14,099,300 | 16,204,556 | 30,303,856 | 15,774,836 | 52% | 14,529,020 | 22,324,469 | -7,979,387 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| EXPENDITURE | | | | | | | | |
| | 5 2,975,800 | | 3,015,800 | 2,415,347 | 80% | 600,453 | 3,015,800 | |
| , | 6 292,500 | | 296,500 | 72,856 | 25% | 223,644 | 296,500 | |
| Health 1 | | | 37,500 | 15,676 | 42% | 21,824 | 37,500 | |
| Environment 1 | 8 1,183,100 | 672,796 | 1,855,896 | 1,496,460 | 81% | 359,436 | 1,855,896 | |
| Community Services & Education | 998,300 | 220,000 | 1,218,300 | 889,385 | 73% | 328,915 | 1,232,194 | 13,894 |
| Housing & Community Amenities 2 | 0 439,100 | 96,508 | 535,608 | 402,930 | 75% | 132,678 | 535,608 | |
| Recreation & Culture 2 | 1,053,600 | 403,595 | 1,457,195 | 1,170,210 | 80% | 286,985 | 1,457,195 | |
| Mining, Manufacturing and Construction 2 | 49,600 | - | 49,600 | 58,237 | 117% | -8,637 | 49,600 | |
| Transport & Communication 2 | 3 4,730,400 | 2,260,000 | 6,990,400 | 5,751,029 | 82% | 1,239,371 | 6,990,400 | - |
| Economic Affairs 2 | 4 437,400 | 1,233,874 | 1,671,274 | 607,870 | 36% | 1,063,404 | 1,671,274 | - |
| Internal Plant 99 | | | - | 68,203 | | -68,203 | · · · | - |
| General Fund Expenditure | 12,197,300 | 4,930,773 | 17,128,073 | 12,948,204 | 76% | 4,179,869 | 17,141,967 | 13,894 |
| · | | , , | | , , | | , , | , , | , |
| GENERAL FUND OPERATING RESULT | 1,902,000 | 11,273,783 | 13,175,783 | 2,826,632 | 21% | 10,349,151 | 5,182,502 | -7,993,281 |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions | 3,657,200 | 10,640,555 | 14,297,755 | 4,628,814 | | 9,668,941 | 6,344,474 | |
| GENERAL FUND OPERATING RESULT | | | | | | | | |
| excl CAPITAL & R2R | -1,755,200 | 633,228 | -1,121,972 | -1,802,182 | | 680,210 | -1,161,972 | -7,993,281 |
| | | , | | | | | | |
| CASH MOVEMENT | | | | | | | | |
| Add: Book Value of Assets Sold | 150,400 | _ | 150,400 | | | | 150,400 | 0 |
| Add: Provision for Depreciation 74 | | _ | 3,320,400 | | | | 3,320,400 | 0 |
| Add: Lease Amortisation 74 | | | 41,900 | | | | 41,900 | 0 |
| Add: Lease Amortisation Add: Loan Repayments | 65,700 | - | | | | | 65,700 | 0 |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Naa: Upwind DV and Discounting 7 | | - | 65,700 | | | | | |
| | 33,000 | 2 807 257 | 33,000 | | | | 33,000 | 0 |
| Add: Unwind PV and Discounting Add: Decrease Restricted Assets | 33,000 520,600 | 2,897,257 | 33,000 3,417,857 | | | | 33,000 2,495,375 | -922,482 |
| | 33,000 | 2,897,257 2,897,257 | 33,000 | 0 | | 0 | 33,000 | -922,482 |
| Add: Decrease Restricted Assets | 33,000 520,600 4,132,000 | 2,897,257 | 33,000 3,417,857 7,029,257 | 0 | | 0 | 33,000 2,495,375 6,106,775 | -922,482 - 922,482 |
| Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets | 33,000 520,600 4,132,000 5,936,300 | | 33,000 3,417,857 7,029,257 20,363,014 | 0 | | 0 | 33,000 2,495,375 6,106,775 11,287,855 | -922,482 -922,482 -9,075,159 |
| Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets Less: Expenditure on Loans | 33,000 520,600 4,132,000 | 2,897,257 | 33,000 3,417,857 7,029,257 | 0 | | 0 | 33,000 2,495,375 6,106,775 11,287,855 88,800 | -9,075,159 0 |
| Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets | 33,000 520,600 4,132,000 5,936,300 88,800 | 2,897,257 14,426,714 - | 33,000 3,417,857 7,029,257 20,363,014 88,800 | | | | 33,000 2,495,375 6,106,775 11,287,855 88,800 0 | -922,482 -922,482 -9,075,159 0 |
| Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets Less: Expenditure on Loans | 33,000 520,600 4,132,000 5,936,300 | 2,897,257 | 33,000 3,417,857 7,029,257 20,363,014 | 0 | | 0 | 33,000 2,495,375 6,106,775 11,287,855 88,800 | -922,482 -922,482 -9,075,159 0 |
| Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets Less: Expenditure on Loans Less: Increase Restricted Assets | 33,000 520,600 4,132,000 5,936,300 88,800 6,025,100 | 2,897,257 14,426,714 - 14,426,714 | 33,000 3,417,857 7,029,257 20,363,014 88,800 20,451,814 | 0 | | 0 | 33,000 2,495,375 6,106,775 11,287,855 88,800 0 11,376,655 | -9.27.482 -9.27.482 -9.075,159 0 0 -9.075,159 |
| Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets Less: Expenditure on Loans | 33,000 520,600 4,132,000 5,936,300 88,800 6,025,100 | 2,897,257 14,426,714 - | 33,000 3,417,857 7,029,257 20,363,014 88,800 | | | | 33,000 2,495,375 6,106,775 11,287,855 88,800 0 | -9.27.482 -9.27.482 -9.075,159 0 0 -9.075,159 |
| Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets Less: Expenditure on Loans Less: Increase Restricted Assets | 33,000 520,600 4,132,000 5,936,300 88,800 6,025,100 | 2,897,257 14,426,714 - 14,426,714 | 33,000 3,417,857 7,029,257 20,363,014 88,800 20,451,814 | 0 | | 0 | 33,000 2,495,375 6,106,775 11,287,855 88,800 0 11,376,655 | -9.27.482 -9.27.482 -9.075,159 0 0 -9.075,159 |
| Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets Less: Expenditure on Loans Less: Increase Restricted Assets forecast cash de | 33,000 520,600 4,132,000 5,936,300 88,800 6,025,100 efficit 8,900 | 2,897,257 14,426,714 - 14,426,714 -255,674 | 33,000 3,417,857 7,029,257 20,363,014 88,800 20,451,814 | 2,826,632 | | 0 10,349,151 | 33,000 2,495,375 6,106,775 11,287,855 88,800 0 11,376,655 | -9.27.482 -9.27.482 -9.075,159 0 0 -9.075,159 |
| Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets Less: Expenditure on Loans Less: Increase Restricted Assets forecast cash december 1.5 CAPITAL WORKS Administration | 33,000 520,600 4,132,000 5,936,300 88,800 6,025,100 6,025,100 | 2,897,257 14,426,714 - 14,426,714 -255,674 | 33,000 3,417,857 7,029,257 20,363,014 88,800 20,451,814 -246,774 | 0 2,826,632 118,547 | 1185% | 0 10,349,151 -108,547 | 33,000 2,495,375 6,106,775 11,287,855 88,800 0 11,376,655 -87,378 | -9.075,159 -9.075,159 0 -9,075,159 159,396 |
| Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets Less: Expenditure on Loans Less: Increase Restricted Assets forecast cash december of the Capital Works Administration Housing & Community Amenities | 33,000 520,600 4,132,000 5,936,300 88,800 6,025,100 6,025,100 10,000 10,000 | 2,897,257 14,426,714 | 33,000 3,417,857 7,029,257 20,363,014 88,800 20,451,814 -246,774 | 0 2,826,632 118,547 23,748 | 44% | 0 10,349,151 -108,547 29,940 | 33,000 2,495,375 6,106,775 11,287,855 88,800 0 11,376,655 -87,378 | -9,075,159 -9,075,159 0 -9,075,159 159,396 |
| Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets Less: Expenditure on Loans Less: Increase Restricted Assets forecast cash december of the company of the c | 33,000 520,600 4,132,000 5,936,300 88,800 6,025,100 6,025,100 10,000 10,000 71,000 | 2,897,257 14,426,714 | 33,000 3,417,857 7,029,257 20,363,014 88,800 20,451,814 -246,774 10,000 53,688 2,934,616 | 0 2,826,632 118,547 | 44% 12% | 0 10,349,151 -108,547 29,940 2,571,744 | 33,000 2,495,375 6,106,775 11,287,855 88,800 0 11,376,655 -87,378 10,000 39,188 816,896 | -9,075,159 -9,075,159 -9,075,159 159,396 |
| Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets Less: Expenditure on Loans Less: Increase Restricted Assets forecast cash de CAPITAL WORKS Administration Housing & Community Amenities Recreation & Culture Mining, Manufacturing & Construction | 33,000 520,600 4,132,000 5,936,300 88,800 6,025,100 10,000 10,000 11,000 11,000 10,0 | 2,897,257 14,426,714 | 33,000 3,417,857 7,029,257 20,363,014 88,800 20,451,814 -246,774 10,000 53,688 2,934,616 90,000 | 2,826,632 118,547 23,748 362,872 | 44% 12% 0% | 10,349,151 -108,547 29,940 2,571,744 90,000 | 33,000 2,495,375 6,106,775 11,287,855 88,800 0 11,376,655 -87,378 10,000 39,188 816,896 20,000 | -9,075,159 -9,075,159 -9,075,159 159,396 -14,500 -2,117,720 -70,000 |
| Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets Less: Expenditure on Loans Less: Increase Restricted Assets forecast cash de CAPITAL WORKS Administration Housing & Community Amenities Recreation & Culture Mining, Manufacturing & Construction Transport & Communication | 33,000 520,600 4,132,000 5,936,300 88,800 6,025,100 5 10,000 1 10,000 1 71,000 2 90,000 3 5,755,300 | 2,897,257 14,426,714 | 33,000 3,417,857 7,029,257 20,363,014 88,800 20,451,814 -246,774 10,000 53,688 2,934,616 90,000 16,840,578 | 2,826,632 118,547 23,748 362,872 - 6,665,099 | 44% 12% 0% 40% | 10,349,151 -108,547 29,940 2,571,744 90,000 10,175,479 | 33,000 2,495,375 6,106,775 11,287,855 88,800 0 11,376,655 -87,378 10,000 39,188 816,896 20,000 9,918,140 | -9,075,159 -9,075,159 -9,075,159 159,396 -14,500 -2,117,720 -70,000 -6,922,438 |
| Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets Less: Expenditure on Loans Less: Increase Restricted Assets forecast cash de CAPITAL WORKS Administration Housing & Community Amenities Recreation & Culture Mining, Manufacturing & Construction Transport & Communication Economic Affairs | 33,000 520,600 4,132,000 5,936,300 88,800 6,025,100 5,900 10,00 | 2,897,257 14,426,714 | 33,000 3,417,857 7,029,257 20,363,014 88,800 20,451,814 -246,774 10,000 53,688 2,934,616 90,000 16,840,578 434,132 | 2,826,632 118,547 23,748 362,872 6,665,099 483,100 | 44% 12% 0% 40% 111% | 10,349,151 -108,547 29,940 2,571,744 90,000 10,175,479 -48,968 | 33,000 2,495,375 6,106,775 11,287,855 88,800 0 11,376,655 -87,378 10,000 39,188 816,896 20,000 | -9,075,159 -9,075,159 -9,075,159 -9,075,159 -159,396 -14,500 -2,117,720 -70,000 -6,922,438 49,498 |
| Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets Less: Expenditure on Loans Less: Increase Restricted Assets forecast cash de CAPITAL WORKS Administration Housing & Community Amenities Recreation & Culture Mining, Manufacturing & Construction Transport & Communication | 33,000 520,600 4,132,000 5,936,300 88,800 6,025,100 5 10,000 1 10,000 1 71,000 2 90,000 3 5,755,300 | 2,897,257 14,426,714 | 33,000 3,417,857 7,029,257 20,363,014 88,800 20,451,814 -246,774 10,000 53,688 2,934,616 90,000 16,840,578 | 2,826,632 118,547 23,748 362,872 - 6,665,099 | 44% 12% 0% 40% | 10,349,151 -108,547 29,940 2,571,744 90,000 10,175,479 | 33,000 2,495,375 6,106,775 11,287,855 88,800 0 11,376,655 -87,378 10,000 39,188 816,896 20,000 9,918,140 | -922,482 - 922,482 |

| FUNCTION | Approved Current Year Budget | QBRS YTD Adjust | Varied Budget | Actual YTD 2022 | % achieved | Remaining Allocation | Forecast to June 2022 | Variance |
|---|---|---|--|---|---------------|--|---|---|
| WATER SERVICES | | | | | | | | |
| Water Income 11 | 8,971,600 | 340,332 | 9,311,932 | 760,054 | 8% | 8,551,878 | 2,216,932 | -7,095,000 |
| Water Expenditure 25 | 965,100 | - | 965,100 | 689,927 | 71% | 275,173 | 930,115 | -34,985 |
| WATER OPERATING RESULT Less: Capital Grants & Contributions | 8,006,500 8,145,000 | 340,332 340,332 | 8,346,832 8,485,332 | 70,127 80,719 | 1% | 8,276,705 8,404,613 | 1,286,817 1,390,332 | -7,060,015 -7,095,000 |
| WATER SERVICES OPERATING RESULT | | ĺ | | · | | , , | , , | , , |
| excl CAPITAL GRANTS | -138,500 | 0 | -138,500 | -10,592 | | -127,908 | -103,515 | 34,985 |
| CASH MOVEMENT | | | | | | | | |
| Add: Provision for Depreciation 740 Add: Lease Amortisation 745 | 346,500 | - | 346,500 | 236,819 | | 109,681 | 346,500 | - |
| Add: Lease Amortisation 745 Add: Loan Proceeds | 1,430,000 | _ | 1,430,000 | 0 | | 1,430,000 | 0 | -1,430,000 |
| | 1,776,500 | 0 | 1,776,500 | 236,819 | | 1,539,681 | 346,500 | -1,430,000 |
| Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets | 9,575,000 | 340,332 | 9,915,332 | 691,605 | 0 | 9,223,727 | 1,390,332 | -8,525,000 |
| Less: Expenditure on Loans (GF) | 65,700 | - | 65,700 | , | | 65,700 | 65,700 | 0 |
| Less: Increase Restricted Assets (WF) | 150,000 | 0 | 150,000 10.131.032 | 691,605 | 0 | 150,000 | 4 450 022 | -150,000 |
| | 9,790,700 | 340,332 | 10,131,032 | 691,605 | | 9,439,427 | 1,456,032 | -8,675,000 |
| forecast cash surplus | -7,700 | 0 | -7,700 | -384,660 | | 376,960 | 177,285 | 184,985 |
| Water Fund Capital Works 25 | 9,575,000 | 340,332 | 9,915,332 | 691,605 | 7% | 9,223,727 | 1,390,332 | -8,525,000 |
| SEWERAGE SERVICES | | | | | | | | |
| Sewerage Income 12 | 470,000 | 58,530 | 528,530 | 335,880 | 64% | 192,650 | 528,530 | 0 |
| Sewerage Expenditure 26 | 497,400 | 0 | 497,400 | 416,804 | 84% | 80,596 | 587,613 | 90,213 |
| SEWER OPERATING RESULT | -27,400 | 58,530 58,530 | 31,130 | -80,924 0 | -260% | 112,054 58,530 | -59,083 58,530 | -90,213 0 |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions SEWERAGE SERVICES OPERATING | | 56,530 | 58,530 | U | | 30,330 | 36,330 | 0 |
| RESULT excl CAPITAL GRANTS | -27,400 | 0 | -27,400 | -80,924 | | 53,524 | -117,613 | -90,213 |
| CASH MOVEMENT | | | | | | | | |
| Add: Provision for Depreciation 740 | 134,100 | 334,118 | 134,100 | 98,255 | | 35,845 | 134,100 | 0 |
| Add: Loan Proceeds | 200,000 | 0 | 200,000 | 00.255 | | 200,000 | - | -200,000 |
| | 334,100 | 334,118 | 334,100 | 98,255 | | 235,845 | 134,100 | -200,000 |
| Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets | 200,000 | 167,059 | 367,059 | 41,809 | | 325,250 | 367,059 | 0 |
| Less: Expenditure on Loans | 8,000 100.000 | 167.050 | 8,000 | 0 | | 8,000 100.000 | - | -8,000 |
| Less: Increase Restricted Assets (SF) | 308,000 | 167,059 334,118 | 100,000 475,059 | 41,809 | | 433,250 | 367,059 | -100,000 -108,000 |
| forecast cash deficit | -1,300 | 58,530 | -109,829 | -24,478 | | -85,351 | -292,042 | -182,213 |
| | | | | | | | , | |
| Sewerage Fund Capital Works 26 | 200,000 | 167,059 | 367,059 | 41,809 | 11% | 325,250 | 367,059 | 0 |
| CONSOLIDATED | | | | | | | | |
| Consolidated income | 23,540,900 | 16,603,418 | 40,144,318 | 16,870,771 | 42% | 23,273,547 | 25,069,931 | -15,074,387 |
| Consolidated Expenditure | 13,659,800 | 4,930,773 | 18,590,573 | 14,054,936 | 76% | 4,535,637 | 18,659,695 | 69,122 |
| COMPONIDATED OPERATING PROUET | 9,881,100 | 11,672,645 | 21,553,745 | 2,815,835 | 13% | 18,737,910 18,132,084 | 6,410,236 | -15,143,509 |
| CONSOLIDATED OPERATING RESULT | 11 802 200 | 11 030 417 | 22 841 617 | A 700 533 | | | | |
| CONSOLIDATED OPERATING RESULT Less: Capital Grants & Contributions CONSOLIDATED OPERATING RESULT | 11,802,200 | 11,039,417 | 22,841,617 | 4,709,533 | | 10,132,004 | 7,793,336 | -7,095,000 |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions | 11,802,200 -1,921,100 | 11,039,417 633,228 | 22,841,617 -1,287,872 | 4,709,533 -1,893,699 | | 605,827 | -1,383,100 | -8,048,509 |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions CONSOLIDATED OPERATING RESULT excl CAPITAL & R2R | -1,921,100 | 633,228 | -1,287,872 | -1,893,699 | | 605,827 | -1,383,100 | -8,048,509 |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions CONSOLIDATED OPERATING RESULT excl CAPITAL & R2R Add: Book Value of Assets Sold | -1,921,100 150,400 | 633,228 | -1,287,872 150,400 | -1,893,699 | | 605,827 | -1,383,100 150,400 | -8,048,509 |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions CONSOLIDATED OPERATING RESULT excl CAPITAL & R2R | -1,921,100 150,400 3,801,000 | 633,228 | -1,287,872 150,400 3,801,000 | -1,893,699 | | 605,827 | -1,383,100 150,400 3,801,000 | -8,048,509 |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions CONSOLIDATED OPERATING RESULT excl CAPITAL & R2R Add: Book Value of Assets Sold Add: Provision for Depreciation Add: Lease Amortisation Add: Loan Proceeds (internal) | -1,921,100 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 | 633,228 0 334,118 0 0 | -1,287,872 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 | -1,893,699 0 335,074 0 0 | | 0 145,526 0 | -1,383,100 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 | -8,048,509 0 0 0 |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions CONSOLIDATED OPERATING RESULT excl CAPITAL & R2R Add: Book Value of Assets Sold Add: Provision for Depreciation Add: Lease Amortisation Add: Loan Proceeds (internal) Add: Unwind PV and Discounting | -1,921,100 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 | 633,228 0 334,118 0 0 | 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 | -1,893,699 0 335,074 0 0 | | 0 145,526 0 0 | -1,383,100 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 | -8,048,509 0 0 0 0 |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions CONSOLIDATED OPERATING RESULT excl CAPITAL & R2R Add: Book Value of Assets Sold Add: Provision for Depreciation Add: Lease Amortisation Add: Loan Proceeds (internal) Add: Unwind PV and Discounting Add: Decrease Restricted Assets | -1,921,100 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 520,600 | 633,228 0 334,118 0 0 0 2,897,257 | -1,287,872 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 3,417,857 | -1,893,699 0 335,074 0 0 0 | | 0 145,526 0 0 0 | -1,383,100 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 | -8,048,509 0 0 0 0 0 0 -922,482 |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions CONSOLIDATED OPERATING RESULT excl CAPITAL & R2R Add: Book Value of Assets Sold Add: Provision for Depreciation Add: Lease Amortisation Add: Loan Proceeds (internal) Add: Unwind PV and Discounting | -1,921,100 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 | 633,228 0 334,118 0 0 | 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 | -1,893,699 0 335,074 0 0 | | 0 145,526 0 0 | -1,383,100 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 2,495,375 | -8,048,509 0 0 0 0 |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions CONSOLIDATED OPERATING RESULT excl CAPITAL & R2R Add: Book Value of Assets Sold Add: Provision for Depreciation Add: Lease Amortisation Add: Loan Proceeds (internal) Add: Unwind PV and Discounting Add: Decrease Restricted Assets | -1,921,100 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 520,600 1,630,000 6,242,601 | 633,228 0 334,118 0 0 0 2,897,257 0 | 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 3,417,857 1,630,000 | -1,893,699 0 335,074 0 0 0 0 | | 605,827 0 145,526 0 0 0 0 1,630,000 | -1,383,100 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 2,495,375 0 | -8,048,509 0 0 0 0 -922,482 -1,630,000 |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions CONSOLIDATED OPERATING RESULT excl CAPITAL & R2R Add: Book Value of Assets Sold Add: Provision for Depreciation Add: Lease Amortisation Add: Loan Proceeds (internal) Add: Unwind PV and Discounting Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Add: Loan Proceed (external) Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets Less: Expenditure on Loans | -1,921,100 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 520,600 1,630,000 6,242,601 15,711,300 162,500 | 633,228 0 334,118 0 0 0 2,897,257 0 3,231,375 14,934,105 0 | 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 3,417,857 1,630,000 9,139,857 30,645,405 162,500 | -1,893,699 0 335,074 0 0 0 0 335,074 733,414 0 | | 005,827 0 145,526 0 0 0 0 1,630,000 1,775,526 9,548,977 73,700 | 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 2,495,375 0 6,587,375 | -8,048,509 0 0 0 0 0 0 -922,482 -1,630,000 -2,552,482 -17,600,159 -8,000 |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions CONSOLIDATED OPERATING RESULT excl CAPITAL & R2R Add: Book Value of Assets Sold Add: Provision for Depreciation Add: Lease Amortisation Add: Loan Proceeds (internal) Add: Unwind PV and Discounting Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Add: Loan Proceed (external) Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets | -1,921,100 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 520,600 1,630,000 6,242,601 15,711,300 162,500 250,000 | 633,228 0 334,118 0 0 0 2,897,257 0 3,231,375 14,934,105 0 167,059 | 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 3,417,857 1,630,000 9,139,857 30,645,405 162,500 250,000 | -1,893,699 0 335,074 0 0 0 0 335,074 733,414 0 0 | | 005,827 0 145,526 0 0 0 0 1,630,000 1,775,526 9,548,977 73,700 250,000 | -1,383,100 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 2,495,375 0 6,587,375 13,045,246 154,500 0 | -8,048,509 0 0 0 0 0 -922,482 -1,630,000 -2,552,482 -17,600,159 -8,000 -250,000 |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions CONSOLIDATED OPERATING RESULT excl CAPITAL & R2R Add: Book Value of Assets Sold Add: Provision for Depreciation Add: Lease Amortisation Add: Loan Proceeds (internal) Add: Unwind PV and Discounting Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Add: Loan Proceed (external) Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets Less: Expenditure on Loans | -1,921,100 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 520,600 1,630,000 6,242,601 15,711,300 162,500 | 633,228 0 334,118 0 0 0 2,897,257 0 3,231,375 14,934,105 0 | 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 3,417,857 1,630,000 9,139,857 30,645,405 162,500 | -1,893,699 0 335,074 0 0 0 0 335,074 733,414 0 | | 005,827 0 145,526 0 0 0 0 1,630,000 1,775,526 9,548,977 73,700 | 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 2,495,375 0 6,587,375 | -8,048,509 0 0 0 0 0 0 -922,482 -1,630,000 -2,552,482 -17,600,159 -8,000 |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions CONSOLIDATED OPERATING RESULT excl CAPITAL & R2R Add: Book Value of Assets Sold Add: Provision for Depreciation Add: Lease Amortisation Add: Loan Proceeds (internal) Add: Unwind PV and Discounting Add: Decrease Restricted Assets Add: Loan Proceed (external) Less: Purchase of Fixed Assets Less: Expenditure on Loans | -1,921,100 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 520,600 1,630,000 6,242,601 15,711,300 162,500 250,000 | 633,228 0 334,118 0 0 0 2,897,257 0 3,231,375 14,934,105 0 167,059 | 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 3,417,857 1,630,000 9,139,857 30,645,405 162,500 250,000 | -1,893,699 0 335,074 0 0 0 0 335,074 733,414 0 0 | | 005,827 0 145,526 0 0 0 0 1,630,000 1,775,526 9,548,977 73,700 250,000 | -1,383,100 150,400 3,801,000 41,900 65,700 33,000 2,495,375 0 6,587,375 13,045,246 154,500 0 | -8,048,509 0 0 0 0 0 -922,482 -1,630,000 -2,552,482 -17,600,159 -8,000 -250,000 |

WALCHA COUNCIL - FUNCTION DETAIL

QUARTERLY BUDGET REVIEW AT 31 MARCH 2022

by Function

| | | | | <u> </u> | y Function | II | | | | |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--|
| FUNCTION | Approved Current Year Budget | QBRS YTD Adjust | Varied Budget | YTD Budget | Actual YTD 2022 | YTD % achieved | Remaining Allocation | Forecast to June 2022 | Variance | Comment |
| GENERAL FUND | | | | | | | | | | |
| INCOME | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administration 1 | 123.100 | _ | 123,100 | 92,325 | 115.465 | 94% | 7,635 | 123,100 | _ | Checked OK |
| Public Order & Safety 2 | 80,800 | _ | 80,800 | | 3,261 | | 77,539 | 80,800 | _ | Timing of Rural Fire Service income not yet received |
| Health 3 | 2,000 | _ | 2,000 | | 200 | | 1,800 | 2,000 | _ | Checked OK |
| Environment 4 | 2,000 | | 2,000 | 1,000 | 200 | 1070 | 1,000 | 2,000 | | Ondition on |
| Noxious Plants, Insect & Vermin Control | _ | _ | - | | _ | 0% | 0 | _ | _ | |
| Waste Management Services | 988,600 | _ | 988,600 | 741,450 | 957,486 | 97% | 31,114 | 988,600 | _ | Checked OK |
| Community Services & Education 5 | 000,000 | | 000,000 | , | 00.,.00 | 0.70 | 0., | 000,000 | | One show on |
| Preschool | 503,400 | _ | 503,400 | 377,550 | 477,792 | 95% | 25,608 | 503,400 | _ | Checked OK |
| Early Intervention | 40,000 | _ | 40,000 | | 25,595 | | 14,405 | 40,000 | _ | Checked OK |
| WCCC | 390,500 | _ | 390,500 | | 339,061 | | 51,439 | 390,500 | _ | Checked OK |
| Community Recovery Officer | - | 220,000 | 220,000 | , | 32,142 | | 187,858 | 220,000 | _ | This had YTD actuals 124K in Q2 QBRS? |
| Other Community Services & Education | 4,400 | | 4,400 | | 16,282 | | -11,882 | 18,294 | 13.894 | Youth Week / Summer Break / Winter Break |
| Housing & Community Amenities 6 | ., | | ., | 0,000 | .0,202 | 0.070 | ,002 | .0,20. | .0,00. | Tourist Diouxy Times Dioux |
| Public Amenities | _ | 16,508 | 16,508 | 12,381 | 16,508 | 100% | 0 | 16,508 | _ | Checked OK |
| Cemetary | 35,000 | 35,000 | 70,000 | | 52,713 | | 17,287 | 70,000 | _ | Checked OK |
| Council Housing | 28.600 | - | 28,600 | , | 17,691 | | 10,909 | 28.600 | _ | Checked OK |
| Town Planning | 40,400 | _ | 40,400 | | 37,625 | | 2,775 | 40,400 | _ | Checked OK |
| Recreation & Culture 7 | 10,100 | | .0,.00 | 00,000 | 0.,020 | 0070 | 2,0 | .0,.00 | | |
| Parks & Reserves | _ | _ | _ | _ | 9,151 | 0% | -9,151 | _ | _ | Wages subsidies |
| Other Sport Ground & Recreation Facilities | _ | _ | _ | _ | 113 | | -113 | _ | _ | 114900 042014.00 |
| Other Sport & Recreation | 3,300 | _ | 3,300 | 2,475 | 905 | | 2,395 | 3,300 | _ | |
| Libraries | 68,500 | _ | 68,500 | | 68,548 | | -48 | 68,500 | _ | Checked OK |
| Swimming Pool | 40.000 | _ | 40,000 | | 30,185 | | 9.815 | 40.000 | _ | Checked OK |
| Walcha Community Gym | - | 26,000 | 26,000 | 19,500 | 26,793 | | -793 | 26,000 | _ | Checked OK |
| Halls & Community Centres | 25,000 | 195,120 | 220,120 | , | 218,103 | | 2,017 | 220,120 | _ | Checked OK |
| Australia Dav | | - | | - | 1,396 | | -1,396 | | _ | |
| Mining, Manufacturing and Construction 8 | | | | | ., | | 1,000 | | | |
| Quarries & Pits | 40,000 | _ | 40,000 | 30,000 | _ | 0% | 40,000 | _ | -40.000 | no gravel being won at quarries |
| Building Control | 12,000 | _ | 12,000 | | 13,096 | | -1,096 | 12,000 | | Checked OK |
| Transport & Communication 9 | 1=,000 | | , | -,,,,, | 12,000 | | ., | , | | |
| Bridges - Rural Sealed Roads | _ | 207,489 | 207,489 | 155,617 | 133,119 | 64% | 74,370 | 207,489 | _ | Checked OK |
| Bridges - Rural Unsealed Roads | _ | 702,430 | 702,430 | | 350,000 | | 352,430 | 702.430 | | Checked OK |
| y · | | | , | | , | | , , | , | | Timing - Roads to Recovery funding - December quarter to be |
| Urban Roads | 5,200 | 240,943 | 246,143 | 184,607 | 40,860 | 17% | 205,283 | 246,143 | - | lodged |
| Regional Sealed Roads | 771,000 | | 771,000 | | 771,000 | | 0 | 771,000 | | Checked OK |
| I | , | | , | , | , | | | , | | Timing - Roads to Recovery funding - December quarter to be |
| Sealed Rural Roads | _ | 177,098 | 177,098 | 132,824 | 50,677 | 29% | 126,421 | 177,098 | _ | lodged |
| | | , | , | , | | | , | , | | Timing - Roads to Recovery funding - December quarter to be |
| Unsealed Rural Roads | 232,500 | 347,487 | 579,987 | 434,990 | 35,000 | 6% | 544,987 | 579,987 | - | lodged |
| 2.1004104 1.4141 1.4040 | 202,000 | 0,.07 | 0.0,007 | ,500 | 23,000 | 0 /0 | 5,557 | 3. 5,561 | | \$1.2m WIP to be claimed on completion of RMCC ordered works |
| State Roads | 580,000 | 2,260,000 | 2,840,000 | 2,130,000 | 1,853,729 | 65% | 986,271 | 2,840,000 | _ | (We are covering this until claim) |
| RTA Inspection Bay | 3,000 | 2,200,000 | 3,000 | | 3,046 | | -46 | 3.000 | | (a. a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a a |
| Street Lighting | 11,000 | | 11,000 | , | - 0,040 | 0% | 11,000 | 11,000 | | |
| Aerodrome | 11,500 | | 11,500 | , | 8,750 | | 2,750 | 11,500 | | |
| Depot | ,000 | | ,500 | 3,020 | 338 | | -338 | ,500 | _ | |
| Берог | - | -1 | - | - | 330 | 0 /0 | -000 | -1 | - | |

| FUNCTION | Approved Current Year Budget | QBRS YTD Adjust | Varied Budget | YTD Budget | Actual YTD 2022 | YTD % achieved | Remaining Allocation | Forecast to June 2022 | Variance | Comment |
|--|---|----------------------------------|---|--|---|---|---|---|------------------|--|
| Economic Affairs 10 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Private Works | 100,000 | 108,391 | 208,391 | 156,293 | 40,488 | 19% | 167,903 | 208,391 | _ | Storm clean up costs + additional costs this year |
| Tourism | 100,000 | 223,340 | 323,340 | 242,505 | 263,253 | | 60,087 | 323,340 | | COVID funding & Soundtrails Project |
| Truck Wash Bay | 20,000 | | 20,000 | | 4,602 | | 15,398 | 20,000 | _ | |
| Other Land & Property | 9,300 | _ | 9,300 | 6,975 | 5,354 | | 3,946 | 9,300 | _ | |
| Economic Development | 3,000 | 804,195 | 804,195 | 603,146 | 482,517 | | 321,678 | 804,195 | | EPA Green Waste Grant Funding |
| Capital Grants & Contributions 13 | | 004,130 | 004,100 | 000,140 | 402,017 | 0070 | 021,070 | 004,100 | | Li // Orcen waste Grant randing |
| Waste Management Services | | | | | | 0% | 0 | | | |
| Recreation & Culture | _ | 2,135,990 | 2,135,990 | 1,601,993 | 414,380 | | 1,721,611 | 406,733 | 1 720 257 | 2022-23 budget |
| Bridges - Rural Sealed & Unsealed | _ | 4,981,571 | 4,981,571 | 3,736,178 | 611,256 | | 4,370,315 | 1,175,613 | | 2022-23 budget 2022-23 budget |
| Urban Roads | - | 298,481 | 298,481 | 223,861 | 87,281 | 29% | 211,200 | 87,281 | | 2022-23 budget 2022-23 budget |
| Regional Sealed Roads | 3,657,200 | 1,203,078 | 4,860,278 | 3,645,209 | 1,861,986 | | 2,998,292 | 4,342,412 | | 2022-23 budget 2022-23 budget |
| Sealed Rural Roads | 3,037,200 | 937,563 | 937,563 | | 588,985 | | 348,578 | 48,563 | | 2022-23 budget 2022-23 budget |
| | - | | | 703,172 | | | | | | |
| Unsealed Rural Roads | - | 841,407 | 841,407 | 631,055 | 492,369 | | 349,038 | 41,407 | -800,000 | 2022-23 budget |
| Other Transport | - | 31,264 | 31,264 | - | - | 0% | 31,264 | 31,264 | - | 0000 00 h |
| Aerodrome | - | 244 204 | 044.004 | 450 401 | 322,000 | | -322,000 | 044.004 | - | 2022-23 budget |
| Economic Affairs | - | 211,201 | 211,201 | 158,401 | 250,558 | 119% | -39,357 | 211,201 | - | • |
| General Purpose Revenues 14 | | | | | 0.044.554 | 4000/ | | | | |
| Rates Revenue | 3,650,300 | - | 3,650,300 | 2,737,725 | 3,644,571 | 100% | 5,729 | 3,650,300 | - | • |
| Investment Interest | 13,500 | - | 13,500 | | 14,181 | 105% | -681 | 13,500 | - | |
| FAGs - general purpose | 1,528,000 | - | 1,528,000 | 1,146,000 | 610,445 | | 917,555 | 1,528,000 | - | |
| FAGs - roads | 981,200 | - | 981,200 | 735,900 | 373,983 | | 607,217 | 981,200 | | |
| General Fund Income | 14,099,300 | 16,204,556 | 30,303,856 | 22,704,444 | 15,774,836 | 52% | 14,529,020 | 22,324,469 | -7,979,387 | |
| EXPENDITURE Administration 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 404.075 | 0 | 500/ | 0 | 0 | | |
| Elected Members | 242,500 | - | 242,500 | 181,875 | 128,487 | | 114,013 | 242,500 | - | · |
| Election Costs | 40,500 | | 40,500 | , | 5,147 | | 35,353 | 40,500 | | Legal Fees |
| Administration Operating | 1,722,100 | 20,000 | 1,742,100 | | 1,759,862 | | -17,762 | 1,862,100 | | HR Consulting |
| Human Resources | 424,800 | 20,000 | 444,800 | 333,600 | 222,395 | | 222,405 | 449,800 | 5,000 | |
| Workplace Health & Safety | 147,600 | - | 147,600 | 110,700 | 89,971 | 61% | 57,629 | 142,600 | -5,000 | |
| Engineering & Works Support | 297,300 | - | 297,300 | 222,975 | 122,848 | | 174,452 | 177,300 | -120,000 | Checked OK |
| Purchasing & Supply | 101,000 | - | 101,000 | 75,750 | 86,636 | 86% | 14,364 | 101,000 | - | |
| Public Order & Safety 16 | | | | | | | | | | Checked OK |
| Animal Control | 63,900 | 4,000 | 67,900 | 50,925 | 40,255 | | 27,645 | 67,900 | - | Timing of RFS payments |
| Rural Fire Services | 200,900 | - | 200,900 | 150,675 | 17,289 | | 183,611 | 200,900 | - | • |
| State Emergency Services | 11,000 | - | 11,000 | 8,250 | 3,564 | | 7,436 | 11,000 | - | • |
| Emergency Services Support | 1,000 | - | 1,000 | 750 | - | 0% | 1,000 | 1,000 | - | Checked OK |
| Urban Fire Brigade | 15,700 | - | 15,700 | 11,775 | 11,749 | | 3,951 | 15,700 | - | • |
| Health 17 | 37,500 | - | 37,500 | 28,125 | 15,676 | 42% | 21,824 | 37,500 | - | • |
| Environment 18 | | | | | | | | | - | • |
| Noxious Plants, Insect & Vermin Control | 85,300 | 672,796 | 758,096 | 568,572 | 742,139 | | 15,957 | 758,096 | | Checked OK |
| Stormwater Drainage | 110,100 | - | 110,100 | | 100,930 | | 9,170 | 110,100 | - | Checked OK |
| Waste Management Services | 987,700 | - | 987,700 | 740,775 | 653,390 | 66% | 334,310 | 987,700 | - | • |
| Community Services & Education 19 | | | | | | | | | - | • |
| Vauth Caminas | 05 400 | _ | 25,400 | 19,050 | 30,040 | | -4,640 | 39,294 | , | Funded holiday activities |
| Youth Services | 25,400 | | | | 450 000 | 76% | 144,668 | 594,700 | - | Checked OK |
| Preschool | 594,700 | - | 594,700 | 446,025 | 450,032 | | | | | |
| Preschool Early Intervention | 594,700 39,600 | - | 594,700 39,600 | | 32,906 | | 6,694 | 39,600 | | Checked OK |
| Preschool Early Intervention WCCC | 594,700 | - | | 29,700 | 32,906 277,728 | 83% 82% | 6,694 60,872 | 39,600 338,600 | | Checked OK Checked OK |
| Preschool Early Intervention | 594,700 39,600 | - - - 220,000 | 39,600 | 29,700 253,950 | 32,906 | 83% 82% | , | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | - | |
| Preschool Early Intervention WCCC | 594,700 39,600 | 220,000 | 39,600 338,600 | 29,700 253,950 | 32,906 277,728 | 83% 82% | 60,872 | 338,600 | - | Checked OK |
| Preschool Early Intervention WCCC Comnmunity Recovery Officer | 594,700 39,600 | 220,000 | 39,600 338,600 | 29,700 253,950 | 32,906 277,728 | 83% 82% 45% | 60,872 | 338,600 | - | Checked OK |
| Preschool Early Intervention WCCC Community Recovery Officer Housing & Community Amenities 20 | 594,700 39,600 338,600 - 45,000 | 220,000 | 39,600 338,600 220,000 | 29,700 253,950 165,000 33,750 | 32,906 277,728 98,679 26,362 | 83% 82% 45% 59% | 60,872 121,321 18,638 | 338,600 220,000 | - | Checked OK Checked OK |
| Preschool Early Intervention WCCC Community Recovery Officer Housing & Community Amenities 20 Street Tree Maintenance | 594,700 39,600 338,600 - 45,000 55,800 | - | 39,600 338,600 220,000 45,000 55,800 | 29,700 253,950 165,000 33,750 41,850 | 32,906 277,728 98,679 26,362 33,041 | 83% 82% 45% 59% 59% | 60,872 121,321 18,638 22,759 | 338,600 220,000 45,000 55,800 | - - - - | Checked OK Checked OK Checked OK Checked OK |
| Preschool Early Intervention WCCC Community Recovery Officer Housing & Community Amenities 20 Street Tree Maintenance Streetscape Maintenance | 594,700 39,600 338,600 - 45,000 55,800 84,600 | 220,000 - 16,508 30,000 | 39,600 338,600 220,000 45,000 | 29,700 253,950 165,000 33,750 41,850 75,831 | 32,906 277,728 98,679 26,362 33,041 82,694 | 83% 82% 45% 59% 59% 82% | 60,872 121,321 18,638 | 338,600 220,000 45,000 | - - - - | Checked OK Checked OK Checked OK |
| Preschool Early Intervention WCCC Community Recovery Officer Housing & Community Amenities 20 Street Tree Maintenance Streetscape Maintenance Public Amenities | 594,700 39,600 338,600 - 45,000 55,800 | 16,508 | 39,600 338,600 220,000 45,000 55,800 101,108 | 29,700 253,950 165,000 33,750 41,850 75,831 81,150 | 32,906 277,728 98,679 26,362 33,041 | 83% 82% 45% 59% 59% 82% 82% | 60,872 121,321 18,638 22,759 18,414 | 338,600 220,000 45,000 55,800 101,108 | - - - - | Checked OK Checked OK Checked OK Checked OK Checked OK Amenities repairs under insurance |

| FUNCTION | Approved Current Year Budget | QBRS YTD Adjust | Varied Budget | YTD Budget | Actual YTD 2022 | YTD % achieved | Remaining Allocation | Forecast to June 2022 | Variance | Comment |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--|
| Recreation & Culture 21 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Parks & Reserves | 284,000 | - | 284,000 | 213,000 | 249,370 | 88% | 34,630 | 284,000 | | - Checked OK |
| Other Sport Ground & Recreation Facilities | 168,600 | - | 168,600 | 126,450 | 108,023 | 64% | 60,577 | 168,600 | | - Checked OK |
| Other Sport & Recreation | 70,000 | - | 70,000 | 52,500 | 35,081 | 50% | 34,919 | 70,000 | | - |
| Libraries | 192,600 | 7,974 | 200,574 | 150,431 | 81,987 | 41% | 118,587 | 200,574 | | - |
| Swimming Pool | 278,700 | - | 278,700 | 209,025 | 240,306 | 86% | 38,394 | 278,700 | | - Checked OK |
| Walcha Community Gym | - | 51,010 | 51,010 | 38,258 | 45,300 | 89% | 5,710 | 51,010 | | - Checked OK |
| Halls & Community Centres | 35,000 | 318,931 | 353,931 | 265,448 | 358,587 | 101% | -4,656 | 353,931 | | - Mens shed costs correspond to funding to be received |
| Australia Day | 500 | - | 500 | 375 | 2,569 | 514% | -2,069 | 500 | | - |
| Regional Arts Development | 4,600 | - | 4,600 | 3,450 | 4,585 | 100% | 15 | 4,600 | | - |
| Junior Sports Development | 5,000 | - | 5,000 | 3,750 | 3,200 | 64% | 1,800 | 5,000 | | - |
| | | | | | | | | | | Insurance & Depreciation on public art is higher following asset |
| Public Art Maintenance | 12,200 | 25,680 | 37,880 | 28,410 | 39,195 | 103% | -1,315 | 37,880 | | - revaluation |
| Other Cultural Service | 2,400 | - | 2,400 | 1,800 | 2,006 | 84% | 394 | 2,400 | | - |
| Mining, Manufacturing and Construction 22 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quarries & Pits | 18,600 | - | 18,600 | 13,950 | 24,744 | 133% | -6,144 | 18,600 | | - Checked OK |
| Building Control | 31,000 | - | 31,000 | 23,250 | 33,493 | 108% | -2,493 | 31,000 | | - |
| Transport & Communication 23 | | | | | | | | | | |
| Bridges - Urban Roads | 10,200 | - | 10,200 | 7,650 | 5,679 | 56% | 4,521 | 10,200 | | - |
| Bridges - Rural Sealed Roads | 228,600 | - | 228,600 | 171,450 | 236,577 | 103% | -7,977 | 228,600 | | - Checked OK |
| Bridges - Rural Unsealed Roads | 282,300 | - | 282,300 | 211,725 | 194,727 | 69% | 87,573 | 282,300 | | - Checked OK |
| Bridges - Regional Sealed Roads | 218,000 | - | 218,000 | 163,500 | 166,521 | 76% | 51,479 | 218,000 | | - Checked OK |
| Bus Shelters | 15,000 | - | 15,000 | 11,250 | 7,317 | 49% | 7,683 | 15,000 | | - |
| Footpaths & Bike Tracks | 53,800 | - | 53,800 | 40,350 | 44,648 | 83% | 9,152 | 53,800 | | - Checked OK |
| Kerb & Gutter | 53,700 | - | 53,700 | 40,275 | 33,755 | 63% | 19,945 | 53,700 | | - Checked OK |
| Urban Roads | 264,300 | - | 264,300 | 198,225 | 260,621 | 99% | 3,679 | 264,300 | | - Checked OK |
| Regional Sealed Roads | 907,200 | - | 907,200 | 680,400 | 795,968 | 88% | 111,232 | 907,200 | | - Checked OK |
| Sealed Rural Roads | 675,800 | - | 675,800 | 506,850 | 510,956 | 76% | 164,844 | 675,800 | | - Checked OK |
| Unsealed Rural Roads | 1,127,700 | - | 1,127,700 | 845,775 | 1,014,720 | 90% | 112,980 | 1,127,700 | | - Checked OK |
| State Roads | 580,000 | 2,260,000 | 2,840,000 | 2,130,000 | 2,268,382 | 80% | 571,618 | 2,840,000 | | - Checked OK |
| Road Safety | 19,000 | - | 19,000 | 14,250 | 17,674 | 93% | 1,326 | 19,000 | | - |
| Other Transport | 82,000 | - | 82,000 | 61,500 | 63,977 | 78% | 18,023 | 82,000 | | - Checked OK |
| Street Lighting | 49,800 | - | 49,800 | 37,350 | 25,842 | 52% | 23,958 | 49,800 | | - Checked OK |
| Aerodrome | 26,100 | - | 26,100 | 19,575 | 13,553 | 52% | 12,547 | 26,100 | | - |
| Minor Plant & Loss on Sale of Plant | 48,300 | _ | 48,300 | 36,225 | 7,511 | 16% | 40,789 | 48,300 | | - |
| Works Depot | 88,600 | _ | 88,600 | 66,450 | 82,600 | 93% | 6,000 | 88,600 | | - Checked OK |

| FUNCTION | Approved Current Year Budget | QBRS YTD Adjust | Varied Budget | YTD Budget | Actual YTD 2022 | YTD % achieved | Remaining Allocation | Forecast to June 2022 | Variance | Comment |
|--|------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| Economic Affairs | 4 | | | | | | | | | |
| Private Works | 85,600 | 108,391 | 193,991 | 145,493 | 153,077 | 79% | 40,914 | 193,991 | - | Storm clean-up - AGRN987 \$65,626 & AGRN960 \$42,765 |
| Concrete Batching Plant | 2,600 | - | 2,600 | 1,950 | 1,767 | 68% | 833 | 2,600 | - | |
| Tourism Operation | 144,200 | - | 144,200 | 108,150 | 95,535 | 66% | 48,665 | 144,200 | - | Checked OK |
| | | | | | | | | | | COVID funding + Sound trails project should have been included |
| Tourism Development | 143,000 | 231,340 | 374,340 | 280,755 | 273,272 | | 101,068 | 374,340 | - | carry overs |
| Truck Wash Bay | 34,700 | - | 34,700 | 26,025 | 35,533 | 102% | -833 | 34,700 | - | |
| Other Land & Property | 26,600 | - | 26,600 | 19,950 | 21,903 | 82% | 4,697 | 26,600 | - | |
| Economic Development | 700 | 894,143 | 894,843 | 671,132 | 26,783 | 3% | 868,060 | 894,843 | - | EPA Green Waste clean up |
| Internal Plant 9 | 96 - | - | - | - | 68,203 | | -68,203 | - | - | |
| General Fund Expenditure | 12,197,300 | 4,930,773 | 17,128,073 | 12,846,055 | 12,948,204 | 76% | 4,179,869 | 17,141,967 | 13,894 | |
| | 0 | - | 0 | | 0 | | | - | - | |
| GENERAL FUND OPERATING RESULT | 1,902,000 | 11,273,783 | 13,175,783 | 9,858,389 | 2,826,632 | | 10,349,151 | 5,182,502 | -7,993,281 | |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions | 3,657,200 | 10,640,555 | 14,297,755 | 10,699,868 | 4,628,814 | | 9,668,941 | 6,344,474 | -7,953,281 | |
| GENERAL FUND OPERATING RESULT excl CAPITAL | -1,755,200 | 633,228 | -1,121,972 | -841,479 | -1,802,182 | | 680,210 | -1,161,972 | -40,000 | |
| | | | | | , , | | , | 0 | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | |
| CAPITAL WORKS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Administration | 5 10,000 | _ | 10,000 | | 118,547 | 1185% | -108,547 | 10,000 | - | |
| Public Order & Safety | 6 - | _ | - | | - | 0% | 0 | | | |
| Health | 7 - | - | - | | - | 0% | 0 | | | |
| Environment | 8 - | - | - | | - | 0% | 0 | | | |
| Community Services & Education | 9 - | - | - | | - | 0% | 0 | | | |
| Housing & Community Amenities | 0 10,000 | 43,688 | 53,688 | | 23,748 | 44% | 29,940 | 39,188 | -14,500 | |
| Recreation & Culture | 1 71,000 | 2,863,616 | 2,934,616 | | 362,872 | 12% | 2,571,744 | 816,896 | -2,117,720 | |
| Mining , Manufacturing and Construction | 2 90,000 | - | 90,000 | | - | 0% | 90,000 | 20,000 | -70,000 | |
| Transport & Communication | 3 5,755,300 | 11,085,278 | 16,840,578 | | 6,665,099 | 40% | 10,175,479 | 9,948,140 | -6,892,438 | |
| Economic Affairs | 4 - | 434,132 | 434,132 | | 483,100 | 111% | -48,968 | 483,631 | 49,499 | |
| General Fund Capital Works | 5,936,300 | 14,426,714 | 20,363,014 | | 7,653,367 | 38% | 12,709,647 | 11,317,855 | -9,045,159 | |

Waste, Water & Sewer Summary

QUARTERLY BUDGET REVIEW AT 31 MARCH 2022

| | | QUAITI | LIXL'I DO | JOE I K | | 01 11174 | KC11 2022 | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--|
| FUNCTION | Approved Current Year Budget | QBRS YTD Adjust | Varied Budget | YTD Budget | Actual YTD 2022 | YTD % achieved | Remaining Allocation | Forecast to June 2022 | Variance | Comment |
| WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICES | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Income | | | | | | | | | | |
| Domestic Waste Income | 519,900 | | 519,900 | 389,925 | 517,618 | 100% | 2,282 | 519,900 | | - Levied at 1 July 2021 |
| Other Waste Income | 468,700 | | 468,700 | 351,525 | 439,868 | 94% | 28,832 | 468,700 | | - Gate fees & sale of recyclates less than predicted |
| Total Income | 988,600 | - | 988,600 | 741,450 | 957,486 | 97% | 31,114 | 988,600 | | <u>-</u> |
| | - | - | - | | - | | -0 | | | |
| Operating Expenses | | | | | | | | | | |
| Domestic waste collections | 142.600 | _ | 142,600 | 106,950 | 168,193 | 118% | -25.593 | 142.600 | | - Checked OK |
| Domestic waste other costs | 4.700 | _ | 4.700 | 3.525 | 1.928 | 41% | 2,772 | 4,700 | | - |
| Domestic waste depreciation | 24,000 | _ | 24.000 | 18,000 | 18,524 | 77% | 5,476 | 24,000 | | - Checked OK |
| Drummuster / Chem Collect / Asbestos clean up | 2,800 | _ | 2,800 | 2,100 | 5,215 | 186% | -2,415 | 2,800 | | - |
| Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) | 117,800 | - | 117,800 | 88,350 | 60,653 | 51% | 57,147 | 117,800 | | _ |
| Walcha tip operations | 183,300 | - | 183,300 | 137,475 | 77,961 | 43% | 105,339 | 183,300 | | - Checked OK |
| Woolbrook tip operations | 33,000 | - | 33,000 | 24,750 | 31,370 | 95% | 1,630 | 33,000 | | - Higher than planned clean-up costs due to misuse |
| Nowendoc tip operations | 31,000 | - | 31,000 | 23,250 | 34,094 | 110% | -3,094 | 31,000 | | - Higher than planned clean-up costs due to misuse |
| Yarrowitch & Kangaroo Flat Rd Waste | 18,200 | - | 18,200 | 13,650 | 15,486 | 85% | 2,714 | 18,200 | | - Checked OK |
| Commercial Roadside Garbage Collection | 19,600 | - | 19,600 | 14,700 | 17,079 | 87% | 2,521 | 19,600 | | - Checked OK |
| Annual Compliance Survey | 13,000 | - | 13,000 | 9,750 | - | 0% | 13,000 | 13,000 | | - To be completed |
| Waste Engineering & Supervision | 48,500 | - | 48,500 | 36,375 | 45,800 | 94% | 2,700 | 48,500 | | - Checked OK |
| | | | | | | | | | | Additional clean-up costs posted to Woolbrook and |
| Illegal Dumping/Littering Clean Up | 30,000 | - | 30,000 | 22,500 | - | 0% | 30,000 | 30,000 | | - Nowendoc ops |
| Landfill Cell Operations | 50,000 | - | 50,000 | 37,500 | 42,421 | 85% | 7,579 | 50,000 | | - Checked OK |
| Waste Management Consultancy Remediation & Strategy | - | - | - | - | 173 | 0% | -173 | - | | - |
| Other waste collections | 37,000 | - | 37,000 | 27,750 | 22,968 | 62% | 14,032 | 37,000 | | - Checked OK |
| Waste transfer to Tamworth | 22,000 | - | 22,000 | 16,500 | | 0% | 22,000 | 22,000 | | - Checked not utilised |
| Walcha WTS Gate | 95,900 | - | 95,900 | 71,925 | 68,892 | 72% | 27,008 | 95,900 | | - |
| Other waste depreciation | 64,300 | - | 64,300 | 48,225 | 42,631 | 66% | 21,669 | 64,300 | | - Checked OK |
| Admin Overheads | 50,000 | - | 50,000 | 37,500 | - | 0% | 50,000 | 50,000 | | - Still to be allocated |
| Total Expenses | 987,700 | - | 987,700 - | 740,775 | 653,390 | 66% | 334,310 | 987,700 | | <u>-</u> |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Result | 900 | - | 900 | 675 | 304,096 | | -303,196 | 900 | | <u>-</u> |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 | 0 | 0 | <u> </u> |
| WASTE MANAGEMENT OPERATING RESULT | | | | | | | | | | |
| excl CAPITAL GRANTS | 900 | 0 | 900 | 675 | 304,096 | | -303,196 | 900 | 0 | |

Waste, Water & Sewer Summary

QUARTERLY BUDGET REVIEW AT 31 MARCH 2022

| | | 40, | | | | . • | | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|--------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|------------|--|
| FUNCTION | Approved Current Year Budget | QBRS YTD Adjust | Varied Budget | YTD Budget | Actual YTD 2022 | YTD % achieved | Remaining Allocation | Forecast to June 2022 | Variance | Comment |
| WATER FUND | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Income | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates & Charges | 402.300 | _ | 402.300 | 301,725 | 301.813 | 75% | 100,487 | 402,300 | _ | Checked OK |
| User Charges | 424,300 | _ | 424,300 | 318,225 | 396,940 | 94% | 27,360 | 424,300 | | Checked OK |
| Other Income | | _ | | - | 7,000 | 0% | -7,000 | | | wages subsidies |
| Operating Grants | _ | _ | - | _ | -26,419 | 0% | 26,419 | _ | | return unused funding - ACWSP (external restriction) |
| Capital Grants | 8,145,000 | 340,332 | 8,485,332 | 6,363,999 | 80,719 | 1% | 8,404,613 | 1,390,332 | -7,095,000 | , |
| Total Income | 8,971,600 | 340,332 | 9,311,932 | 6,983,949 | 760,054 | 8% | 8,551,878 | 2,216,932 | -7,095,000 | |
| | - | - | - | | - | | | | | |
| On another Francisco | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Expenses | 22.222 | | | 50.475 | 00.574 | 0.40/ | 4 000 | | | 0 |
| Engineering & Supervision | 66,900 | - | 66,900 | 50,175 | | 94% | 4,329 | 66,900 | - | Checked OK |
| Off Creek Storage, operations & maintenance | 29,600 | - | 29,600 | 22,200 | | 220% | -35,446 | 29,600 | - | |
| Water Mains, operations & maintenance | 49,800 6.800 | - | 49,800 6.800 | 37,350 | | 87% 4% | 6,596 6,529 | 49,800 6,800 | | Checked OK Checked OK |
| Water Reservoirs, operations & maintenance Pumping Station, operations & maintenance | 104,800 | - | 104,800 | 5,100 78,600 | | 4% 41% | 61,656 | | | Checked OK |
| Water Treatment, operations & maintenance | 289,700 | - | 289,700 | 217,275 | | 80% | 56,750 | 104,800 254,715 | | interest on loan no longer needed |
| Private Works | 6,000 | _ | 6,000 | 4,500 | 5,922 | 99% | 78 | 6,000 | -34,900 | interest on loan no longer needed |
| Depreciation | 346,500 | - | 346,500 | 259,875 | | 68% | 109,681 | 346,500 | - | Checked OK |
| Admin Overheads | 65.000 | | 65.000 | 48,750 | | 0% | 65,000 | 65,000 | | Charged annually |
| Total Expenses | 965,100 | | 965,100 | 723,825 | 689,927 | 71% | 275,173 | 930,115 | -34,985 | |
| | - | - | - | 1 20,020 | - | 1170 | 2.0,.70 | 000,710 | U-1,000 | † |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Result | 8,006,500 | 340,332 | 8,346,832 | 6,260,124 | 70,127 | | 8,276,705 | 1,286,817 | -7,060,015 | |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions | 8,145,000 | 340,332 | 8,485,332 | 6,363,999 | 80,719 | | 8,404,613 | 1,390,332 | -7,095,000 | |
| WATER FUND OPERATING RESULT excl | | | | | | | | | | |
| CAPITAL GRANTS | -138,500 | 0 | -138,500 | -103,875 | -10,592 | | -127,908 | -103,515 | 34,985 | |
| | | | | • | - | | | | | |

Waste, Water & Sewer Summary

QUARTERLY BUDGET REVIEW AT 31 MARCH 2022

| FUNCTION | Approved Current Year Budget | QBRS YTD Adjust | Varied Budget | YTD Budget | Actual YTD 2022 | YTD % achieved | Remaining Allocation | Forecast to June 2022 | Variance | Comment |
|--|------------------------------------|---|------------------|---|--------------------|----------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------|--|
| SEWER FUND | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Income | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rates & Charges | 328,700 | _ | 328,700 | 246,525 | 247,956 | 75% | 80,744 | 328,700 | _ | |
| User Charges | 141,300 | _ | 141,300 | 105,975 | 114,345 | 81% | 26,955 | 141,300 | _ | |
| Other Income | - | - | - | - | 0 | 0% | _ | - | - | |
| Operating Grants | _ | - | - | _ | -26,419 | 0% | 26,419 | | - | return unused funding - ACWSP (external restriction) |
| Capital Grants | _ | 58,530 | 58,530 | 43,898 | 0 | 0% | 58,530 | 58,530 | - | , |
| Total Income | 470,000 | 58,530 | 528,530 | 396,398 | 335,882 | 64% | 192,648 | 528,530 | - | |
| | - | - | - | | 1 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Operating Expenses | | | | | | | | | | |
| Engineering & Supervision | 66,000 | - | 66,000 | 49,500 | 57,294 | 87% | 8,706 | 72,100 | ., | asset revaluation |
| Mains, operations & maintenance | 33,600 | - | 33,600 | 25,200 | 28,135 | 84% | 5,465 | 42,400 | 8,800 | additional mains maintenance |
| Pumping Stations, operations & maintenance | 40,100 | - | 40,100 | 30,075 | 25,955 | 65% | 14,145 | 40,100 | - | |
| Sewer Treatment, operations & maintenance | 153,100 | - | 153,100 | 114,825 | 206,005 | 135% | -52,905 | 228,413 | 75,313 | algae control / additional testing |
| Private Works | 5,500 | - | 5,500 | 4,125 | 1,162 | 21% | 4,339 | 5,500 | - | |
| Depreciation | 134,100 | - | 134,100 | 100,575 | 98,255 | 73% | 35,845 | 134,100 | - | |
| Admin Overheads | 65,000 | - | 65,000 | 48,750 | - | 0% | 65,000 | 65,000 | - | |
| Total Expenses | 497,400 | - | 497,400 | 373,050 | 416,804 | 84% | 80,596 | 587,613 | 90,213 | |
| | - | - | - | | - | | | | | |
| Operating Result | -27,400 | 58,530 | 31,130 | 23,348 | -80,923 | | 112,053 | -59,083 | -90,213 | - |
| Less: Capital Grants & Contributions | 0 | 58,530 | 58,530 | 43,898 | 0 | | 58,530 | 58,530 | 0 | |
| SEWER FUND OPERATING RESULT excl | | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | -, | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | | | | , , , , , | | |
| CAPITAL GRANTS | -27,400 | 0 | -27,400 | -20,550 | -80,923 | | 53,523 | -117,613 | -90,213 | |
| | | | , | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

WALCHA COUNCIL - CAPITAL WORKS

| | | | | | | | | QBRS 3- MARCH 2022 | | | | |
|---|--------------|------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|---|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------------|
| | Asset Class | New / Renewal | Source of Funding | Work Order | Prior Year (WIP) | 2021-2022 costs | Actual Costs - LTD | Grant Funding | External Restrictions | Own Funding | Budget Changes | Amended Budget |
| Administration Capital Works | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Council Admin Building - Painting, blinds, carpets | Other Assets | New | Council | | - | - | - | | | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| Council Building - Foyer Reburbishment, ServiceNSW Relocation & F | Building | Renewal | External Restrictions/ ServiceNSW | 5497 | - | 11,743 | 11,743 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | 44.740 | 44.740 | | | 40.000 | | 40.000 |
| Administration Capital Works Total | | | | | - | 11,743 | 11,743 | - | | 10,000 | | 10,000 |
| Housing & Community Amenities Capital Works | | | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | | |
| Streetscape | Roads | Renewal | Council | | - | - | - | | | | - 10,000 | _ |
| Walcha Cemetery - install seating | Other Assets | New | Council | 5328 | 1,973 | 4,297 | 6,270 | | | 4,527 | - 4,500 | 4,527 |
| Walcha Cemetery - Niche Garden & Beams | Other Assets | New | Council | 5398 | | 4,790 | 4,790 | | | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| Croudace Street House - install fence | Other Assets | New | Council | 5414 | _ | 14,661 | 14,661 | | | 14,661 | | 14,661 |
| Housing & Community Amenities Capital Works Total | 011017100010 | ''' | o carron | " | 1,973 | 23,748 | 25,721 | _ | | 39,188 | - 14,500 | 39,188 |
| Jan a garanta a | | | | | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, | | -, | | | | , | , |
| Recreation & Culture Capital Works | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Public Art | Other Assets | New | Council | | - | - | - | | | | - 20,000 | - |
| Public Art - A Wing & A Prayer Sculpture (Donated) | Other Assets | New | Council | 5097 | 2,700 | 8,933 | 11,633 | | | 8,933 | 1,633 | 8,933 |
| General Renewal / Replacement | Other Assets | New | Council | | - | - | - | | | 10,000 | - 40,000 | 10,000 |
| Town Christmas Decorations - operating budget | Other Assets | New | Council | | - | - | - | | | | - 1,000 | - |
| Levee Bank - solar lighting installation | Other Assets | New | SCCF-3 | 5078 | 1,180 | 878 | 2,057 | 93,005 | 106,995 | | - 106,722 | 200,000 |
| Walcha Community Gym - Electrical/Safety/Signage/Painting | Buildings | New | LRCI round 2 | 5411 | - | - | - | 36,210 | 84,490 | - | - 80,000 | 40,700 |
| Walcha Community Gym - Gym Equipment | Other Assets | New | LRCI round 2 | 5412 | - | 65,401 | 65,401 | | | - | 80,000 | 80,000 |
| Walcha Pool Refurbishment - BLER | Other Assets | Renewal | BLER | 5354 | 24,624 | 136,122 | 160,746 | | 155,376 | | - 920,000 | 155,376 |
| Beautification capital works, Rose Garden | Other Assets | New | Council | 5291 | 24,678 | 17,720 | 42,398 | | | 18,000 | - 12,000 | 18,000 |
| Beautification capital works, Mill Hole Stage 2 | Other Assets | New | Council | | · - | - | | | | - | - 12,000 | · - |
| Beautification capital works, Hospital Wall Stage 2 & 3 | Other Assets | New | Council | | _ | _ | | | | _ | - 8,000 | _ |
| Beautification capital works, Crocodile Bridge | Other Assets | New | Council | | _ | | _ | | | _ | - 5,000 | _ |
| McHattan Park Access & Facility Improvements | Other Assets | Renewal | LRCI round 1 \$46,000 / Council | 5189 | 53,479 | 26,369 | 79,848 | | 21,000 | 5,369 | 5,369 | 26,369 |
| | | | \$21,000 | | | | | 440.554 | | | | 440 |
| Lions Park Upgrade - BLER | Other Assets | Renewal | BLER | 5433 | - | 42 000 | - 40.000 | 110,554 | | | - 300,000 | 110,554 |
| Skate Park Construction - BLER Recreation & Culture Capital Works Total | Other Assets | New | BLER | 5434 | 106,661 | 13,000 268,422 | 13,000 375,084 | 166,964 406,733 | 367,861 | 42,302 | - 700,000 - 2,117,720 | 166,964 816,896 |
| Recreation & Culture Capital Works Total | | | | | 100,001 | 200,422 | 373,064 | 400,733 | 307,001 | 42,302 | - 2,117,720 | 010,090 |
| Mining, Manufacturing & Construction | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quarries - Management Plans | Other Assets | Renewal | Council | 5527 | - | - | - | | | 20,000 | | 20,000 |
| Mining, Manufacturing & Construction Total | | | | | - | - | - | - | | 20,000 | - 70,000 | 20,000 |
| Transport & Communication Capital Works | | | | + | | - | | | | + | | |
| Bridges Rural Sealed | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Moona Plains Road, Elias Creek Timber Bridge - AM 5379 | Roads | Renewal | BRP \$207,489 | 3488 | 53,008 | 386,592 | 439,600 | 414,977 | | | | 414,977 |
| | | | R2R (#20) \$207,489 | | | | | | | | | |
| Niangala Road Timber Bridge - AM 5632 Dennis Walls | Roads | Renewal | Fixing Country Bridges \$415,256 | 5341 | 26,700 | 7,770 | 34,470 | | 17,550 | | - 470,000 | 17,550 |
| Bridges Rural Sealed Total | | | | | 79,708 | 394,362 | 474,070 | 414,977 | 17,550 | - | - 470,000 | 432,527 |

| | Asset Class | New / Renewal | Source of Funding | Work Order | Prior Year (WIP) | 2021-2022 costs | Actual Costs - LTD | Grant Funding | External Restrictions | Own Funding | Budget Changes | Amended Budget |
|---|----------------|--------------------|---|------------|---------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------|--------------------------|-------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| Bridges Local Rural Unsealed | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Old Brookmount Road Timber Bridge, Emu Creek - AM 5698 | Roads | New | Ext Restriction - Bushfire Recovery | 3497 | 153,998 | 41,508 | 195,506 | | 26,002 | - | | 26,002 |
| (Bushfire Recovery) | Doodo | Nour | Funding | 3501 | 424 720 | 200 074 | 445 600 | 400 500 | | 462.420 | 462.420 | 200.074 |
| Old Brookmount Road Timber Bridge, Dog Trap Creek - AM 5729 | Roads | New | Fixing Country Roads | 3501 | 124,728 | 290,971 | 415,699 | 128,532 | | 162,439 | 162,439 | 290,971 |
| Winterbourne Road Timber Bridge - AM 6214 Winterbourne | Roads | New | Fixing Country Bridges 588,711 | 3503 | 22,238 | 23,314 | 45,552 | 30,866 | | | - 590,000 | 30,866 |
| Tia Diggings Road Timber Bridge - AM 5852 (Bridge 1) | Roads | New | Fixing Country Bridges \$273,582 | 3506 | 16,383 | 2,622 | 19,004 | | 12,418 | | - 310,000 | 12,418 |
| Englefield Timber Bridge - AM 4878 | Roads | New | BRP \$268,884 | 3513 | 192,641 | 431,180 | 623,821 | 537,769 | | - | | 537,769 |
| Glen Morrison Road, Stephen's Timber Bridge - AM 5010 | Roads | New | R2R (#16) \$268,884 BRP \$433,546 R2R (#17) \$433,546 | 3705 | 128,922 | 458,461 | 587,383 | 867,092 | | - | | 867,092 |
| Niangala Road Timber Bridge - AM 5601 Keatons (Army) | Roads | New | Fixing Country Bridges \$1,928,455 | 5338 | 19,853 | 65,515 | 85,367 | 75,998 | | | - 1,955,000 | 75,998 |
| Mooraback Road Timber Bridge - AM 5414 Oldfields | Roads | New | Fixing Country Bridges \$483,964 | 5339 | 16,383 | 23,314 | 39,697 | 30,298 | | | - 480,000 | 30,298 |
| Tia Diggings Road Timber Bridge - AM 10811 (Bridge 2) | Roads | New | Fixing Country Bridges 253,152 | 5340 | 16,383 | 662 | 17,044 | | 7,118 | | - 290,000 | 7,118 |
| Bridges Local Rural Unsealed Total | | | | | 691,527 | 1,337,546 | 2,029,073 | 1,670,555 | 45,538 | 162,439 | - 3,462,561 | 1,878,532 |
| Urban Roads Local | | | | | | | , , | , , | , | | | |
| Heavy Patching | Roads | Renewal | Council | 5403 | - | 524 | 524 | - | | 75,000 | | 75,000 |
| Reseals | Roads | Renewal | Council | 5404 | - | - | - | - | | 75,000 | 20.000 | 75,000 |
| Kerb & Gutter Renewals Footpath Renewals | Roads Roads | Renewal Renewal | Council Council | | - | - | - | - | | - | - 30,000 - 20,000 | |
| Heavy Patching | Roads | Renewal | R2R (#5, 8 & 14) | 5049 | 97,807 | - | 97,807 | - 117,193 | | - | 20,000 | 117,193 |
| Heavy Patching - Roads to Recovery #8 | Noaus | Renewai | 1\(\frac{1}{4}\), \(\pi \& 14\) | 5450 | - | 103,041 | 103,041 | 117,193 | | _ | | 117,195 |
| Shared Pathways | Roads | New | Priority Cycleways | 5334 | 386,197 | 88,120 | 474,317 | 87,281 | | _ | | 87,281 |
| Middle Street Rehabilitation | Roads | Renewal | Fixing Local Roads \$111,375 R2R (na) \$123,750 | 5361 | - | 14,141 | 14,141 | , , | 20,000 | - | - 475,000 | 20,000 |
| Walsh Street Rehabilitation | Roads | Renewal | Fixing Local Roads | 5362 | - | 13,830 | 13,830 | | 20,000 | - | - 312,750 | 20,000 |
| Pedestrian Safety - Blue Hogan Bridge | Roads | Renewal | LRCI round 1 | 5192 | 68,301 | - | 68,301 | | | | | - |
| Urban Roads Local Total | | | | ļ | 552,305 | 219,656 | 771,961 | 204,474 | 40,000 | 150,000 | - 837,750 | 394,474 |
| Regional Sealed Roads TBW - Corridor Strategy Project 10 Seg 4370 | Roads | Renewal | Repair Grant | | | | | 141,800 | | | | 141,800 |
| TBW - Corridor Strategy Project 10 Seg 4570 TBW - Corridor Strategy Proj 5.1, seg 4540 | Roads | Renewal | Block Grant | | | | | 349,100 | | _ | | 349,100 |
| TBW - Corridor Strategy - various projects | Roads | Renewal | Fixing Country Roads | Claim #26 | 4,768,541 | 2,709,548 | 7,478,089 | 4,125,584 | | 592,894 | | 4,718,478 |
| TBW - Corridor Strategy - Resealing & Linemarking | Roads | Renewal | Fixing Country Roads | | 1,100,011 | _,, cc,c .c | 1,110,000 | - | | 332,531 | | - |
| TBW - Corridor Strategy - Reseal, Shoulder Grading & Linemarking | Roads | Renewal | Fixing Country Roads | | | | | - | | - | | - |
| Heavy Patching | Roads | Renewal | Block Grant | 5436 | - | 187,982 | 187,982 | 150,000 | | - | | 150,000 |
| Regional Sealed Roads Total | | | | | 4,768,541 | 2,897,530 | 7,666,072 | 4,766,484 | | 592,894 | - | 5,359,378 |
| Sealed Local Rural Roads | Doodo | Damassa. | Council | | | | | | | 40,000 | 45.000 | 40.000 |
| Culvert Renewals Heavy Patching | Roads Roads | Renewal Renewal | Council Council | | - | - | - | - | | 10,000 | - 15,000 - 75,000 | |
| Reseals | Roads | Renewal | Council | 5421 | | 34,648 | 34,648 | | | 35,000 | - 65,000 | |
| Reseals - Aberbaldie Road | Roads | Renewal | R2R (#19) | , | - | - | - | 103,421 | | - | 33,330 | 103,421 |
| Heavy Patching, Aberbaldie Road | Roads | Renewal | R2R (#6) | 5111 | 101,323 | _ | 101,323 | 23,677 | | - | | 23,677 |
| Road rehabilitation - Moona Plains Road | Roads | Renewal | Fixing Local Roads \$153,179 | 5195 | 526,821 | 21,538 | 548,358 | 25,179 | | | - 150,000 | 25,179 |
| Road rehabilitation - Glen Morrison Road | Roads | Renewal | Fixing Local Roads \$81,000 | 5196 | 15,629 | 2,437 | 18,066 | | 33,371 | | - 250,000 | |
| Heavy Patching - R2R | Roads | Renewal | R2R (na) | | | | - | | , | | - 50,000 | |
| Aberbaldie Road - 1.9km section rehab & widening (FLR300122) | Roads | Renewal | Fixing Local Roads | | | - | - | 23,384 | | | - 680,000 | 23,384 |
| Sealed Local Rural Roads Total | | | | | 643,773 | 58,622 | 702,395 | 175,661 | 33,371 | 45,000 | - 1,285,000 | 254,032 |

| | Asset Class | New / Renewal | Source of Funding | Work Order | Prior Year (WIP) | 2021-2022 costs | Actual Costs - LTD | Grant Funding | External Restrictions | Own Funding | Budget Changes | Amended Budget |
|--|---|------------------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Unsealed Local Rural Roads | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Gravel Resheeting | Roads | Renewal | Council | 3430 | - | 228,983 | 228,983 | - | | 182,513 | | 182,513 |
| Gravel Resheeting | Roads | Renewal | R2R (na) | | - | - | - | 317,487 | | | | 317,487 |
| Culvert Renewals | Roads | Renewal | Council | | - | - | - | - | | - | - 20,000 | - |
| Culvert Renewals - R2R | Roads | Renewal | R2R (na) | 4355 | 35,148 | - | 35,148 | | | - | - 47,127 | - |
| Chinooks Road widening (Bushfire Recovery) | Roads | Renewal | Ext Restriction - Bushfire Recovery | 5151 | 56,714 | 6,123 | 62,836 | | 5,786 | - | | 5,786 |
| Nugetty Gully Road widening (Bushfire Recovery) | Roads | Renewal | Ext Restriction - Bushfire Recovery | 5152 | 59,858 | 2,719 | 62,577 | | 2,642 | - | | 2,642 |
| Brackendale Road Bridge, heavy vehicle access (Bushfire Recovery) | Roads | Renewal | Ext Restriction - Bushfire Recovery | 5234 | 6,082 | 108 | 6,189 | | 23,918 | - | | 23,918 |
| Forest Way Road sealing works (Bushfire Recovery) | Roads | Renewal | Ext Restriction - Bushfire Recovery R2R (#15) \$30,000 | 5237 | 63,802 | 242,082 | 305,883 | 30,000 | 212,230 | - | | 242,230 |
| Forest Way Road sealing (FLR300282) Unsealed Local Rural Roads Total | Roads | Renewal | Fixing Local Roads | | 221,603 | - 480,014 | - 701,617 | 41,407 388,894 | 244,576 | 182,513 | - 800,000 - 867,127 | 41,407 815,983 |
| Other Transport | | | | | 221,003 | 400,014 | 701,017 | 300,034 | 244,370 | 102,313 | - 607,127 | 015,905 |
| Plant replacement | Plant & Equip | New | Council | | 0 | 132,932 | 132,932 | - | | 629,000 | | 629,000 |
| Works Depot | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Renewal Works | Roads | Renewal | Council | 4487 | | | 79,001 | - | | 50,000 | | 50,000 |
| Building Electrical Upgrades (TBD) | Buildings | Renewal | LRCI round 2 | 5380 | - | 43,250 | 43,250 | 31,264 | 72,950 | - | | 104,214 |
| Works Depot Total | _ | | | | 0 | 43,250 | 122,250 | 31,264 | 72,950 | 50,000 | - | 154,214 |
| Transport & Communication Capital Works Total | | | | | | | | 7,652,309 | 453,985 | 1,811,846 | - 6,922,438 | 9,918,140 |
| Economic Development Solar Power Project Truck Wash Bay | other assets other assets | New New | Council Fixing Country Trucks Washes \$135,601 LRCI round 2 \$75,600 | 5289 4340 | 3,469 651,629 | 6,000 477,100 | 9,469 1,128,729 | 211,201 | 176,400 | 6,531 89,499 | - 40,000 89,499 | 6,531 477,100 |
| | | | | | 655,098 | 483,100 | 1,138,198 | 211,201 | 176,400 | 96,030 | 49,499 | 483,631 |
| TOTAL OFNEDAL FUND | | | | | 7 704 400 | C 250 025 | 44 454 445 | 0.070.040 | 000.040 | 0.040.000 | 0.075.450 | 44 007 055 |
| TOTAL GENERAL FUND | | | | | 7,721,189 | 6,350,925 | 14,151,115 | 8,270,243 | 998,246 | 2,019,366 | - 9,075,159 | 11,287,855 |
| WATER FUND Water Mains Renewals Land Acquisition Off Stream Storage Project Design Off Creek Storage | Water Supply Operating Land Water Supply Water Supply | Renewal New New New | Water Short Term Emergency Drought Funding DPIE Short Term Emergency Drought Funding | 5244 | 2,200 67,468 1,140,823 | 19,526 653,620 31,844 | 21,726 721,088 1,172,667 | - 257,800 1,132,532 - | | | - 525,000 - 8,000,000 | 257,800 1,132,532 |
| TOTAL WATER FUND | | | | | 1,210,490 | 704,990 | 1,915,481 | 1,390,332 | - | - | - 8,525,000 | 1,390,332 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SEWER FUND Sewer relining STP Upgrade Projects | Sewer Network Sewer Network | Renewal Renewal | Sewer NSW Regional Water & Wastewater Backlog Program | 3817 | - 1,604,964 | - 56,214 | - 1,661,178 | - 58,530 | | 58,530 | - 200,000 | 117,059 |
| Sewer relining (2020-2021) | Sewer Network | Renewal | Sewer | 4875 | 41,215 | 9,608 | 50,823 | - | | 10,000 | - 40,000 | 10,000 |
| TOTAL SEWER FUND | | | | | 1,646,179 | | | 58,530 | | 68,530 | - 240,000 | 127,059 |
| GRAND TOTAL | | | | | 10,577,859 | 7,121,737 | 17,778,597 | 9,719,105 | 998,246 | 2,087,896 | - 17,840,159 | 12,805,246 |

GF WF SF TOTAL

 8,270,243
 2,019,366
 -9,075,159
 11,287,855

 1,390,332
 0 -8,525,000
 1,390,332

 58,530
 68,530
 -240,000
 127,059

 9,719,105
 2,087,896
 -17,840,159
 12,805,246

- 1,317,198

WALCHA COUNCIL - RESTRICTIONS SUMMARY QUARTERLY BUDGET REVIEW AT 31 MARCH 2022

| | | | | QE | RS 1 | QE | BRS 2 | QE | IRS 3 | |
|--|-----------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|
| EVERNAL RESTRICTIONS | | Budget | Budget | Budget Review | Budget Review | Budget Review | Budget Review | Budget Review | Budget Review | |
| EXTERNAL RESTRICTIONS | June 2021 | Transfers In | Transfers Out | Transfers In | Transfers Out | Transfers In | Transfers Out | Transfers In | Transfers Out | June 2022 |
| Meals on wheels | 786 | | | | | | | | | 786 |
| wccc | 5,587 | | | | | | | | | 5,587 |
| Early Intervention (EI) | 11,465 | | | | | | | | | 11,465 |
| Walcha community centre | 7,443 | | | | | | | | | 7,443 |
| Pre-school - operating funds | 95,696 | | | | | | | | | 95,696 |
| Pre-school - TARP bus hire (Transport for NSW) | 13,390 | | | | | | | | | 13,390 |
| DPC - Growing Local Economies, Business Case Development | 25,000 | | | | | | | | | 25,000 |
| OLG Innovation Funding - LG Solutions Implementation | 8,000 | | | | | | | | | 8,000 |
| Crown Lands Management Plan | 11,798 | | | | | | | | | 11,798 |
| ACWSP Training & Employment | 64,749 | | | | | | | | | 64,749 |
| | | | | | 270 577 | | | | | 04,749 |
| Bushfire Recovery Funding | 270,577 | | | | - 270,577 | | | | | - |
| Council Pounds | 4,000 | | | | - 4,000 | | | | | - |
| SCCF3-1290 - Walcha Men's Shed | 123,811 | | | | - 123,811 | | | | | - |
| Moona-Winterbourne Linear Barrier Fence | 573,438 | | | | - 573,438 | | | | | - |
| Moona-Winterbourne Linear Barrier Fence - Project Management | 99,358 | | | | - 99,358 | | | | | - |
| Woolbrook Cemetery Aboriginal Graves Project | 20,000 | | | | - 20,000 | | | | | - |
| NSW Planning Portal Implementation | 50,000 | | | | - 50,000 | | | | | - |
| BCRRF - Bushfire & Community Recovery & Resilience | 89,948 | | | | - 89,948 | | | | | - |
| Motorcycle Rally | 8,000 | | | | - 8,000 | | | | | - |
| Public Library Infrastructure Grant | 7,974 | | | | - 7,974 | | | | | - |
| SCCF3-1391 Levee Bank Lighting | 106,996 | | | | - 106,996 | | | | | - |
| LRCI Round 2 - Truck Wash Bay | 176,400 | | | | - 176,400 | | | | | - |
| LRCI Round 2 - Electrical Upgrades | 72,950 | | | | - 72,950 | | | | | - |
| LRCI Round 2 - Community Gym Upgrades | 84,490 | | | | - 84,490 | | | | | - |
| BLER - Bushfire Local Economic Recovery - Pool Upgrade | 415,376 | | | | - 415,376 | | | 260,000 | | 260,000 |
| FCB - Fixing Country Bridges - Niangala Road AM 5632 | 46,581 | | | | - 46,581 | | | 29,031 | | 29,031 |
| FCB - Fixing Country Bridges - Tia Diggings Road AM 5852 | 31,896 | | | | - 31,896 | | | 19,478 | | 19,478 |
| FCB - Fixing Country Bridges - Tia Diggings Road AM 10811 | 28,291 | | | | - 28,291 | | | 21,173 | | 21,173 |
| FLR - Fixing Local Roads - Glen Morrison Road Rehab | 173,371 | | | | - 173,371 | | | 140,000 | | 140,000 |
| FLR - Fixing Local Roads - Walsh Street Rehab | 232,925 | | | | - 232,925 | | | 212,925 | | 212,925 |
| FLR - Fixing Local Roads - Middle Street Rehab | 259,875 | | | | - 259,875 | | | 239,875 | | 239,875 |
| SPECIFIC PURPOSE CONTRIBUTIONS | | | | | | | | | | |
| Public Art Donations | | | | | | | | | | - |
| Justin King | 20,000 | | | | | | | | | 20,000 |
| Various Minor donations | 1,750 | | | | 0.070.057 | | | 222 422 | | 1,750 |
| | 3,141,921 | - | - | - | - 2,876,257 | - | - | 922,482 | - | 1,188,146 |
| Developer Contributions | 21,000 | - | | - | - 21,000 | - | | - | | - |
| Total External | 3,162,921 | | | | 2 207 257 | | | 022 402 | | 1,188,146 |
| Total External | 3,162,921 | - | - | | - 2,897,257 | - | - | 922,482 | - | 1,100,140 |
| | | Dudant | Dudust | Dudget Berieur | Dudget Devieus | Dudget Berieur | Dudget Deview | Budget Basiess | Dudget Devieus | |
| INTERNAL RESTRICTIONS | l 2024 | Budget Transfers In | Budget Transfers Out | Budget Review Transfers In | Budget Review Transfers Out | Budget Review Transfers In | Budget Review Transfers Out | Budget Review Transfers In | Budget Review Transfers Out | l |
| INTERNAL RESTRICTIONS | June 2021 | Transiers in | Transiers Out | Transiers in | Transiers Out | Transiers in | Transiers Out | Transiers in | Transiers Out | June 2022 |
| Plant & Vehicle Replacement | 899,158 | | - 520,600 | | | | | | | 378,558 |
| ELE | 647,000 | | - 520,000 | | | | | | | 647,000 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Tip Site Remediation Quarries Remediation | 295,926 | | | | | | | | | 295,926 |
| | 301,431 | | | | | | | | | 301,431 |
| Infrastructure Replacement | 2,044,280 | | | | | | | | | 2,044,280 |
| Project Development | 65,000 | - | =00.000 | - | | - | | | | 65,000 |
| Total Internal | 4,252,795 | - | - 520,600 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3,732,195 |

PERFORMANCE RATIOS

QUARTERLY BUDGET REVIEW AT 31 MARCH 2022 Forecast to June 2022

| | Benchmark | General Fund | Water Fund | Sewer Fund | Consolidated | Comment |
|---|-----------------------|------------------|--------------------|------------------|------------------|---|
| | | | | | | |
| Operating Performance Ratio | | | | | | |
| This ratio measures Council's acheivement of containing operating expenditure within operating revenue. | Min >0% Prior year | -7.01% -2.51% | -16.76% -14.19% | -5.83% -9.68% | -7.44% -3.17% | All funds are forecasting an operating deficit. This is not sustainable and Council must find ways to operate within its means. |
| Own Source Operating Revenue Ratio | | | | | | |
| This ratio measures fiscal flexibility. It is the | | | | | | This Council has recently struggled to meet this ratio |
| degree of reliance on external funding sources | Min >60% | 27.68% | 8.88% | 88.93% | 24.13% | due to high levels of funding for Drought and Bushfire |
| such as operating grants & contributions | Prior year | 41.82% | 42.14% | 87.24% | 42.68% | affected communities as well as increased infrastructure grant funding. |
| Unrestricted Current Ratio | | | | | | |
| To assess the adequacy of working capital and | Min >1.5 | 1.75 | 3.13 | 9.54 | 1.83 | Council needs to manage its cashflow, particularly with |
| its ability to satisfy obligations in the short term for the unrestricted activities of Council. | Prior year | 2.69 | 2.42 | 16.66 | 2.69 | several large projects in progress. |
| Debt Service Cover Ratio | | | | | | |
| This ratio measures the availability of operating cash to service debt including interest, principal | Min >2 | 405.00 | 04.04 | 24.05 | 05.55 | The ratios include the proposed borrowings included in |
| & lease payments. | Prior year | 105.02 18.06 | 84.04 54.00 | 34.05 na | 95.55 19.43 | the current budget. |
| Rates, Annual Charges, Interest & Extra Charges Outstanding | | | | | | |
| To assess the impact of uncollected rates and | Max <10% | 3.82% | 7.19% | 10.65% | 4.54% | Debt collection ratio is very good overall. High water |
| annual charges on Council's liquidity and the adequacy of recovery efforts. | Prior year | 5.62% | 0.00% | 0.00% | 4.90% | and sewer ratios arise from timing of water billing. |
| Cash Expense Cover | | | | | | |
| This liquidy ratio indicates the number of | | | | | | Water Fund ratio is a concern and needs to be |
| months Council can continue to pay for its | Min >3 | 4.28 | 4.57 | 8.95 | 4.40 | carefully managed as construction of the Off Stream |
| immediate operating costs without additional cash inflow. | Prior year | 3.85 | 1.23 | 17.92 | 4.08 | Storage gets underway. |
| Infrastructure Backlog Ratio | | | | | | |
| This ratio shows what proportion the backlog is | Min <2% | 0.639/ | 1 550/ | 2 600/ | 0.449/ | This ratio is dependant on Asset Management Plans |
| against the total value of Council's infrastructure value. | Prior year | 0.63% 3.85 | -1.55% 1.23 | -2.68% 17.92 | 0.44% 4.08 | which are currently out of date. |
| | | | | | | |

| Contract Ref | TRIM Ref | Directorate | Function | Contractor Name | Contract Title | Contract Description | | Annual | Estimated | Contract | Contract End | Contract | Available | Enter into | Additional | Re-tender |
|--------------|--|------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|------------|--|----------|---------------------|--------------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| | | | | | | | | tract Value at start) | Total Contract Value | Start Date | Date | Term | Extension Period | Extension Period | contract value | Date |
| NA | WI/14/2294 | Corporate Services | Administration | Civica | Cloud Solution Agreement | Supply of Authority Software and associated services on a Managed Services platform | \$ | 213,366 | \$ 1,066,831 | 1/04/2014 | 31/03/2019 | 5 years | Nil | | | |
| NA | WO/17/1029 | Corporate Services | Administration | Canon Finance | Pay per print agreement | 4 year agreement for rental of 8 multifunction machines at various Council locations, starting July 2017 | | variable | variable | Jul-17 | Jul-21 | 4 years | | | | |
| NA | WO/15/1082 | Corporate Services | Administration | SAF Australia | Microwave Wide Area Network Service Agreement | Provide radio links at an agreed speed and level of quality between specified sites | \$ | 10,550 | \$ 53,801 | 12/05/2015 | May-20 | 5 years | 5 years | | | |
| NA | WI/15/1080 WI/15/1081 WI/17/7230 | Engineering Services | Environment | Uralla Shire Council | Provision of Kerbside Waste Collection Services | Weekly collection of general waste bins, recycling bins & green waste bins | \$ | 163,191 | \$ 489,573 | 1/07/2014 | 30/06/2017 | 3 years | , | 1 July 2017 - 2 years | \$ 308,668 | 2019 |
| NA | WI/16/3696 | Environmental Services | Public Health & Safety | Uralla Shire Council | MOU - Ranger Services | Agreement to share ranger services - Adam Thurlow / Michael Lisle | Base | ed on wages, & sundry | oncost, vehicle expenses | Jun-16 | | Ongoing | | | | |
| | WI/16/8676 | Engineering Services | Transport & Communication | Waeger | Design & construct 5 bridges | Aberbaldie, Flags Niangala, Hartford (AM 5124), Hartford (AM 5159), Kangaroo Flat | \$ | 1,717,500 | \$ 1,717,500 | Nov-16 | project completion | na | na | | | |
| | WI/16/8677 | Engineering Services | Transport & Communication | Bridgebuild & Civil | Bergen Bridge Widening | Earthworks, abutments, deck & associated works to widen Bergen Bridge | \$ | 600,000 | \$ 600,000 | Nov-16 | project completion | na | na | | | |
| | WI/18/14906 | Corporate Services | Community Services | Boulus Constructions | Preschool Building | Demolition and rebuilding Walcha Preschool | \$ | 994,210 | \$ 1,065,294 | | 24 weeks from commencemen t of works | | | | | |
| WB19-1043 | w18/39 | Engineering Services | Transport & Communication | Waeger | Wollun Bridge | Design & construction of Wollun Bridge over Congi Creek | \$ | 659,500 | \$ 659,500 | 22/02/2019 | project completion | na | na | | | |
| | WI/19/7256 | Corporate Services | Recreation & Culture | RJ & JM Latham | Walcha Showground Function Centre | Design & construction of Function Centre | \$ | 899,131 | | 4/01/2019 | project completion | na | na | | | |
| | WO/19/2466 | Corporate Services | Recreation & Culture | Berry Bowling Systems Pty Ltd | Replacement of Bowling Green | Replacement of bowling green surface at the Walcha Bowling & Recreation Club Ltd with Dales "Pro-Green Plus V3" Beige Needle Punch Carpet - World Bowls Board approved bowls surface | \$ | 182,700 | \$ 182,700 | 18/09/2019 | Project completion - 30 April 2020 | N/a | N/a | | | |

| | | | | | WALCHA COUNG | CIL CONTRACTS REGI | ST | ER | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|------|--------------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| Contract Ref | TRIM Ref | Directorate | Function | Contractor Name | Contract Title | Contract Description | | Annual ntract Value (at start) | Total | timated I Contract Value | Contract Start Date | Contract End Date | Contract Term | Available Extension Period | Enter into Extension Period | Additional contract value | Re-tender Date |
| WAL-2018-02 | WINT/19/5818 | Engineering Services | Economic Affairs | McHattan Developments | Construction of Walcha Truck Wash Facility | Demolish existing truck wash facility and construct new facility | \$ | 522,006 | \$ | 556,172 | 16/07/2019 | Project completion | na | na | | | |
| WAL-2020-001 | WINT/20/8372 | Corporate Services | Community Projects | Swimplex Aquatics | Walcha Pool Upgrade | Design and construct structual repairs | \$ | 394,858 | \$ | 394,858 | 4/05/2020 | 31/10/2020 | n/a | n/a | | | |
| WAL-2019-009 | LEG-1188 / WO/20/2213 | Corporate Services | Community Projects | Rice Construction Group | Walcha Community Projects | Construction Walcha Community Gym as per tender WAL-2019-009 | \$ | 815,100 | \$ | 815,100 | 3/08/2020 | 28/02/2021 | n/a | n/a | | | |
| WAL-2020-002 | WO/20/2333 | Dpt Infrastructure | Community Projects | M&C Rose Building | Youth Hall Amenity Upgrade - | Drought Community Project - Walcha Showground Youth Hall amenity Upgrade | \$ | 157,092 | \$ | 157,092 | 8/07/2020 | 31/01/2021 | n/a | n/a | | \$1,430 | |
| WAL-2020-003 | LEG-1194 / WO/20/2564 | Dpt Infrastructure | Community Projects | M&C Rose Building | Youth Hall Roof Upgrade | SCCF3 - Youth Hall Upgrade | \$ | 40,909 | \$ | 40,909 | 24/08/2020 | 31/10/2020 | n/a | n/a | | | |
| WAL-2020-004 | LEG-1194 / WO/20/2934 | Dpt Infrastructure | Community Projects | M&C Rose Building | Lions Park Amenities Upgrade | Drought Community Project- Lions Park Amenities Upgrade | \$ | 69,631 | \$ | 69,631 | 8/02/2021 | 5/04/2021 | n/a | n/a | | | |
| | LEG-1053 WI/21/2534 | Corporate Services | IT Support | Tamworth Regional | Managed Services - Support & Maintenance IT End User Support | Managed Services - Support & Maintenance IT End User Support | \$ | 41,700 | \$ | 41,700 | 1/03/2021 | 1/01/2022 | na | na | | | |
| WAL-2020-005 | LEG-1194 / WO/20/4519 | Dpt Infrastructure | Community Projects | M&C Rose Building | Yarrowitch Hall Upgrade | Drought Community Project - Yarrowitch Hall Upgrade | \$ | 69,100 | \$ | 69,100 | 23/11/2020 | 31/01/2021 | n/a | n/a | | | |
| WAL-2020-012 | LEG-1192 / WO/20/2932 | Dpt Infrastructure | Transport & Communication | Stabilised Pavements of Australia | Rehabilitation of 3 Road Segments | Rehabilitation - Kangaroo Flat Road, Brackendale Road - Macleod's Creek & Brackedale Road - Eastern Hills | \$ | 658,708 | \$ | 658,708 | 10/08/2020 | 10/10/2020 | n/a | n/a | | | |
| WAL-2020-013 | LEG-1194 / WO/20/3292 | Dpt Infrastructure | Community Projects | M&C Rose Building | Walcha Mens Shed | Construction of Walcha Mens Shed SCCF3-1290 | \$ | 337,711 | \$ | 337,711 | 6/04/2021 | 20/09/2021 | n/a | n/a | | | |
| WAL-2020-014 | LEG-1194 / WO/20/4598 | Dpt Infrastructure | Community Projects | M and C Rose Building | McHattan Park Shelter | Drought Community Project- Mc Hattan Park Shelter | n \$ | 34,024 | \$ | 34,024 | 16/12/2020 | 14/02/2021 | n/a | n/a | | | |
| WAL-2021 | LEG-1194 / WO/21/1447 | Dpt Infrastructure | Transport & Communication | ETE Services | Walcha Shared Pathways | Construction of shared footpaths/ cycleways | \$ | 199,729 | \$ | 199,729 | 26/04/2021 | 30/06/2021 | n/a | n/a | | | |
| 1492714 | LEG-1196 | Dpt Infrastructure | Transport & Communication | Origin Electricity | Electricity Supply - Contestable Sites (Aberbaldie Road Pump) | Electricity Supply - Contestable Sites (Aberbaldie Road Pump) | \$ | - | \$ | - | 1/01/2021 | 31/12/2023 | n/a | n/a | | | |
| 1492723 | LEG-1195 | Dpt Infrastructure | Transport & Communication | Origin Electricity | Electricity Supply - Street Lighting | Electricity Supply - Street Lighting | \$ | - | \$ | - | 1/01/2021 | 31/12/2023 | n/a | n/a | | | |
| WAL-RFT-2020-02 | LEG-1210 / WI/21/4183 | Dpt Infrastructure | Transport & Communication | ТОВСО | Design & construction of 3 bridges | Englefied, Glen Morrison & Moona Plains Roads Bridges | \$ | 1,500,795 | \$ 1 | 1,500,795 | 10/02/2021 | 30 weeks from start | n/a | n/a | | | |
| WAL-2020-003 | WI/21/4082 | Economic Development | Truck Wash Bay | Washbay Specialists | Construction of Walcha Truck Wash Facility | Construction of Walcha Truck Wash Facility | \$ | 560,966 | \$ | 560,966 | 1/03/2021 | 23/04/2021 | n/a | n/a | | | |
| | WO/21/2674 | Community Services & Education | | Demonz Media | Disaster Dashboard | Emergency Management platform to provide emergency data and updates from a single point of reference to be easily accessed by Walcha residents | per | oopulation | | per year d on | 9/07/2021 | ongoing | n/a | n/a | | | |
| | WO/21/3145 | Corporate Services | Governance | NSW Electoral Commission | Conduct local elections | Conduct local elections | \$ | 25,829 | 1 1 | 25,829 | | Dec-21 | n/a | n/a | | | |
| | WI/21/15963 | Corporate Services | Rates Processing | Civica | On demand rates processing | Rates & water billing processing assistance as needed | \$ | - | \$ | - | 7/10/2021 | 6/10/2022 | n/a | n/a | | | |
| | LEG-1237 WI/21/16574 | Water Fund | Land acquisition | AC Ireland "Muluerindi" | Purchase of land for off stream storage | Purchase of land for off stream storage | \$ | 330,000 | \$ | 330,000 | | | n/a | n/a | | | |
| | LEG-1237 WI/21/16574 | Water Fund | Access to land | AC Ireland "Muluerindi" | Muluerindie access agreement | Allow Council staff & contractors access to construct off creek storage | s \$ | 150,000 | \$ | 150,000 | 28/07/2021 | | n/a | n/a | | | |
| | LEG-1244 WO/21/5090 | Corporate Services | Administration | Viatek | Rental Agreement - 48 months | Rental of 6 printers | \$ | 50,074 | \$ | 50,074 | | | n/a | n/a | | | |
| W21/208 | LEG-1253 | Dpt Infrastructure | Community Projects | Convic | Walcha Skate Park Predinct Renewal Design | Dessign of new Walcha Skate park preceinct | \$ | 52,866 | \$ | 52,866 | 3/03/2022 | | n/a | n/a | | | |
| | | | | | - | | | | \$ | - | | | n/a | n/a | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | \$ | - | | | n/a | n/a | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | \$ | - | | | n/a n/a | n/a n/a | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | 7 | | | | , 5 | , 🇸 | | | |

Development Assessment Report

DA Number:

10.2020.3

Council:

Walcha

Location:

1643 Oxley Highway, Walcha Road

Development Description:

Basalt Rock Quarry - 29,000m3/annum

Title Details:

Lot 103 DP753846, Lot 2 DP1173956, Lots 46 & 47 DP1082562

Proposal Overview

The proposed development is a production – total resource may consist of 450,000m³. Will be developed further if market demand is founded. This will require additional DA approval.

It is planned to market gravel and aggregate within a radius of about 100 kilometres of the quarry. More distant customers are unlikely given significant transport costs and the availability of alternative sources of quarry products.

Maximum disturbance areas arising from quarry related operations will be 1.9878 hectares.

| DOMAIN | DISTURBANCE | DIMENSIONS | AREA (Ha) |
|---------------------------|---|------------------------------------|-----------|
| Quarry | Quarry void, stockpiles, crushing equipment, office/amenities | Odd shape shown in Figure 3. | 1.6455 |
| Access track | Quarry access track from Brooklyn boundary to edge of | Existing 928m. 3.5m wide | 0.3248 |
| Access track passing bays | Passing bays at 185m intervals along quarry access track. | 50m long & 3.5m wide, Five bays | 0.0175 |
| | | TOTAL | 1.9878 |

Excavation of the basalt rock will be undertaken using earth-moving machinery such as an excavator, front-end loader and/or bulldozer, on a sporadic basis in response to customer orders. It will be necessary to drill and blast all rock prior to excavation.

The quarry void will reach a maximum:

- Depth of 30 metres.
- Surface extent about 100 metres (east-west) by 160 metres (north-south), with a roughly rectangular shape.

The maximum expected frequency of blasting is once per week. No on site explosives storage is proposed. All explosives will be delivered to the site for immediate, or following day, use. Delivery will be via a dangerous goods licensed, purpose built truck, operated by a commercial explosives supplier.

Initially it is proposed to establish quarry benches about 5 metres high by 5 metres wide, although it is expected that bench height will probably be increased over time to 10 metres. Bench heights will only be changed after consideration of all relevant factors, including:

- Geotechnical issues:- Ground stability is determined by a combination of factors including layering (thickness, composition & strength), jointing (natural crack patterns) and faults/fractures.
- · Worker safety.
- Productivity.

Most of the basalt excavated will be subject to processing, including one or more of the following:

- Using grizzly bars to separate over size boulders from soil and rock.
- Splitting over size boulders using hydraulic splitters and/or hydraulic hammers.
- Crushing and screening to produce a range of sized aggregates.

Material that may be stockpiled within the quarry site includes:

- Excavated basalt, gravel, soil and processed aggregate.
- Waste rock that is not suitable for sale. This material may be useful for rehabilitation, such as battering the edges of the quarry.
- Top soil, for future rehabilitation.

Initially staff amenities will consist of a portable toilet and/or ATCO style portable lunch room/amenities building (<25 square metres). If subsequent circumstances warrant, an office area (<25 square metres) may be added (or combined) with the amenities area.

Actual traffic volumes will depend on the demand for quarry products, which is expected to fluctuate significantly from year to year and cannot be reliably predicted at this time.

Estimated quarry traffic at various production levels.

| | | TRUCKS (2 way) | STAFI (2 wa | | CONTRCTR (2 way) | TOTAL | VEHICLES /WRK DAY |
|----------|--------|-------------------|----------------|-------|---------------------|----------|----------------------|
| LCM (m3) | TONNES | year | FTE | year | year | VEHICLES | 261/YR |
| 1,000 | 2,400 | 130 | 0.2 | 100 | 20 | 250 | 1 |
| 5,000 | 12,000 | 649 | 1 | 500 | 30 | 1,179 | 5 |
| 10,000 | 24,000 | 1,297 | 2 | 1,000 | 50 | 2,347 | 9 |
| 20,000 | 48,000 | 2,595 | 4 | 2,000 | 84 | 4,679 | 18 |
| 29,000 | 69,600 | 3,762 | 5.8 | 2,900 | 118 | 6,780 | 26 |

The applicants propose to establish a new access driveway from the Oxley Highway into Brooklyn that will improve vehicle visibility, access and safety. The existing access will be decommissioned and fenced off. The design has been developed to be consistent with Transport for NSW requirements documented in a letter to Walcha Council dated 26 May 2020.

The proponent is committed to establishing the new highway access consistent with Council and Traffic for NSW requirements within 6 months of the quarry achieving 5,000m³ in commercial sales.

The threshold is proposed on the basis that it would be unreasonable to require compliance with all Traffic for NSW standards prior to significant commercial activity, when:

- The initial impacts of the development on the highway will be relatively minor during the commencement phases of the development.
- Staged compliance will facilitate the viability of the development.

The 5,000m³ threshold is equivalent to about 12,500 tonnes of quarry product at a density of about 2.5 tonnes per cubic metre. If the product is shipped within a year, this equates to about 337 trucks per year (~37 tonnes each) or 1.3 trucks per working day (~250 work days/year).

Several trees in the immediate vicinity of the proposed new Oxley Highway access will impair visibility between the access track and Highway.

Clearing of trees for rural infrastructure, such as fences and tracks, is permitted on the "Brooklyn" holding without any other approval under Part 5A and schedule 5A of the Local Land Services Act 2013. Item 31(b) in schedule 5A allows 30m clearing for fence, effectively 15m within "Brooklyn" holding.

Initial activities will be undertaken on a sporadic basis in response to orders, hence there may be significant periods of negligible or relatively small scale activities. If a consistent demand for quarry products can be developed, then activities will be maintained in a manner consistent with the maximum hours in Table below.

Proposed maximum hours of operation.

| ACTIVITY | MON TO FRI | SAT & SUN | PUBLIC HOLIDAYS |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Blasting | 8:00 to 17:00 | No activity | No activity |
| Drilling, extraction & processing | Daylight hours | | |
| Loading trucks & product shipping | Daylight hours | | |
| Maintenance | 24 hours per day, when required | | |

| Property Details/History | | | | |
|--|--------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| | Checked | | Comments | |
| File History | Yes ⊠ No □ | | | |
| Title Plan | Yes ⊠ No □ | | nis has been checked by Council admin | istration staff at |
| Check Ownership | Yes ⊠ No □ | lodgement. | | |
| | | Applic | ation Type | |
| Is this application an Integrated Development Application? Yes □ No ⊠ | | | | |
| Is this applicatio | n a Designated [| Development Appl | ication? | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Is this applicatio | n for State Signif | icant Developmer | nt? | Yes \square No \boxtimes |
| Is this applicatio | n submitted by/o | n behalf of a Publ | ic Authority? | Yes \square No \boxtimes |
| Is this applicatio | n a staged Deve | lopment? | | Yes \square No \boxtimes |
| Is this applicatio | n a section 96 ar | nendment? | | Yes \square No \boxtimes |
| Date of original | l development c | onsent: | | |
| | | | ence/Referral 13 - EP & A Act | |
| Does this applic | ation require con | currence referral? | | Yes ⊠ No □ |
| Does this applica | ation require cou | rtesy comment? | | Yes \boxtimes No \square |
| Department | Concurrence | Courtesy | Comments/Issues Rai | sed |
| Geological Survey of NSW – Mining, Exploration & Geoscience | Yes □ No ⊠ | Yes ⊠ No □ | GSNSW has reviewed the Statement Effects for the above DA and have no concerns to raise. They requested the provide annual production data to the the site as a condition of consent. | issues or at the proponent |
| Transport for NSW | Yes ⊠ No □ | Yes □ No ⊠ | TfNSW highlights that in determining under the Environmental Planning Act 1979, it is the Consent Authority's consider the environmental impacts of which are ancillary to the development any works which form part of the proworks which are deemed necessal requirements in the conditions of proposection to the development with recommendations: The Consent Authorized should be satisfied that the sufficiently explained the impacts of and justified all proposed mitigation movements generated by the developments in accordance with the Authorized Management Part 6 and Authorized Management Part | and Assessment is responsibility to of any road works ent. This includes oposal and/or any ry to include as ject approval. No the the following ority: a application has the development heasures. aily and hourly oment. If turn treatment stroads Guide to estroads Guide to cocess, identifying turn treatments |

condition all redundant accesses to be legally and physically closed prior to commencement of use of the new access. prior to determination have strategic (2D) design drawings of all proposed improvements to public roads and the site access to mitigate the traffic and road safety impacts of the development. condition that a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) be developed addressing the construction, operation and decommission phases of the proposed development. consider the need for any regulatory signage (truck turning signs) and where necessary seek the endorsement of the Local Traffic Committee prior to Council approval the signage. any future roadwork on the classified (State) road will need to be designed and constructed in accordance with the current Austroads Guidelines, Australian Standards and TfNSW Supplements. The developer will be required to enter into a Works Authorisation Deed (WAD) with TfNSW for any roadwork deemed necessary on the classified (State) road. The developer will be responsible for all costs associated with the roadwork and administration for the WAD. The above response was forwarded onto the developer who included information to address these issues in the revised Statement of Environmental

Does this application require referral for decision by Council?

Yes ⊠ No □

Local Environmental Plan

Section 4.15(1)(a)(i) and Section 4.15(a((ii) - EP & A Act

This land is zoned:

RU1 Primary Production

Development as per Standard Definitions:

development?

This development is considered to be an extractive industry.

extractive industry means the winning or removal of extractive materials (otherwise than from a mine) by methods such as excavating, dredging, tunnelling or quarrying, including the storing, stockpiling or processing of extractive materials by methods such as recycling, washing, crushing, sawing or separating, but does not include turf farming.

Note — Extractive industries are not a type of **industry**—see the definition of that term in this Dictionary.

extractive material means sand, soil, gravel, rock or similar substances that are not minerals within the meaning of the Mining Act 1992.

| List the relevant clause/clauses applicable under the LEP | | | |
|---|------------|---|--|
| Clause | Compliance | Comment | |
| Land Use Table | Yes ⊠ No □ | This is permissible development. | |
| 6.1 Earthworks | Yes ⊠ No □ | An erosion & Sediment Control Plan was submitted as part of the application. It was reviewed by GSNSW who had not comment to make regarding any deficiency. | |

| Is there a draft LEP or draft LEP amendment which may affect this proposal? | Yes □ No ⊠ |
|---|------------|
| Do 'existing use' provisions (Sections 4.65-4.70 of the EP&A Act) apply to this | Yes □ No ⊠ |

Development Control Plan

Section 4.15(1)(a)(iii) & Section 4.15(3A) – EP & A Act

Is there a DCP which applies to this land/proposal?

Yes ⊠ No □

| 3,46 | List the relevant clause/clauses under the applicable DCP | | | |
|---------|---|------------|---|--|
| Clause | Control | Compliance | Comment | |
| 4.4(i) | Sewage | Yes ⊠ No □ | A Section 68 Application will be required. | |
| 4.4(j) | Bushfire | Yes ⊠ No □ | No residential use of the quarry site will occur, most of the provisions of Planning for Bushfire Protection, published by the NSW Rural Fire Service, are not relevant to this proposal. However those applicable have been complied with. | |
| 4.4 (1) | Koala Habitat | Yes ⊠ No □ | Site contains remnant mature Red Stringy Bark (Eucalyptus macrorhyncha) and woolybutt (Eucalyptus banksii) trees. Neither species identified as a koala feed tree in Schedule 2 of State Environmental Planning Policy 44. Highly disturbed nature of site means that site is quite unlikely to be used by species in any ongoing manner. | |
| 4.5 | Vehicular Access Requirements | Yes ⊠ No □ | Compliance can be achieved with the use of appropriate conditioning. See comments from TfNSW and Engineering Assessment | |
| 4.6 (a) | Slopes >20% | Yes ⊠ No □ | Maximum slope of site along southern boundary is 18% (10°). | |
| 4.8 | Land Use Buffers | Yes ⊠ No □ | The closest unrelated residences are: "Yarooga Park", more than 1,150 metres to the north. "Mt Pleasant", more than 1,500 metres to the north east. "Yarooga", more than 1,700 metres to the north west. Village of Walcha Road, more than 2,200 metres to the north west. The proposed quarry site is not visible from any dwelling or the Oxley Highway due to natural screening by a mix of topography (Appendix L) and vegetation (Appendix M & Appendix K). The NSW Department of Primary Industries recommends a minimum buffer of 1,000m between extractive industries using blasting and neighbouring unrelated residences as a conflict avoidance strategy. This proposal is clearly compliant with the NSW Department of Primary Industries recommendation. | |

Has a variation to the DCP been requested?

| Yes | П | No | \mathbf{x} |
|-----|---|----|--------------|

Is there a draft DCP which may affect this proposal?

Yes □ No ⊠

Regional Environmental Plan

There is no REP applicable to this area.

State Environmental Planning Policy

Is this proposal affected by a SEPP?

Yes ⊠ No □

| | List | all relevant SEPPs |
|--|----------------------------------|---|
| SEPP | Compliance | Comment |
| SEPP 19 — Bushland in Urban Areas | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | The SEPP aims to protect and preserve bushland within the urban areas because of its value to the community as part of the natural heritage, its aesthetic value, and its value as a recreational, educational and scientific resource. |
| SEPP 21 – Caravan Parks | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | The SEPP ensures that where caravan parks or camping grounds are permitted under an environmental planning instrument, movable dwellings, as defined in the Local Government Act 1993, are also permitted. |
| SEPP 33 — Hazardous and Offensive Development | Not Applicable □ Applicable ⊠ | The SEPP provides considerations for consent for hazardous & offensive development. |
| Complies | Yes □ No □ Comment Only □ | hazardous industry means a development for the purposes of an industry which, when the development is in operation and when all measures proposed to reduce or minimise its impact on the locality have been employed (including, for example, measures to isolate the development from existing or likely future development or other land in the locality), would pose a significant risk in relation to the locality— (a) to human health, life or property, or (b) to the biophysical environment. offensive industry means a development for the purposes of an industry which, when the development is in operation and when all measures proposed to reduce or minimise its impact on the locality have been employed (including, for example, measures to isolate the development from existing or likely future development on other land in the locality), would emit a polluting discharge (including, for example, noise) in a manner which would have a significant adverse impact in the locality or on the existing or likely future development on other land in the locality. |
| | | A hazardous industry' under SEPP 33 is one which, when all locational, technical, operational and organisations safeguards are employed continues to pose a significant risk. A proposal is 'potentially offensive industry' consent authorities need to determine whether, in the absence of safeguards, the proposal would emit a polluting discharge which would cause a significant level of offence. This development is not considered to be either offensively all hazardous as all impact can be controlled with mitigation measures. |
| SEPP 36 – Manufactured Homes Estates | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | The SEPP helps establish well-designed and properly serviced manufactured home estates in suitable locations. |

| SEPP 44 — Koala | Not Applied | This SEPP applies to land across NSW that is greater than |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| Habitat Protection | Not Applicable □ Applicable ⊠ | one (1) hectare and is not a National Park or Forestry Reserve. The SEPP encourages the conservation and management of natural vegetation areas that provide habitat for koalas to ensure permanent free-living populations will be maintained over their present range. |
| Complies | Yes ⊠ No □ Comment Only □ | This policy applies to this Local Government Area as it is listed in Schedule 1 of this SEPP and the property is more than 1 ha in area. |
| | | Site contains remnant mature Red Stringy Bark (<i>Eucalyptus macrorhyncha</i>) and woolybutt (<i>Eucalyptus banksii</i>) trees. Neither species identified as a koala feed tree in Schedule 2 of State Environmental Planning Policy 44. Highly disturbed nature of site means that site is quite unlikely to be used by species in any ongoing manner. |
| SEPP 47 – Moore Park Showground | Not Applicable ⊠ | Applies to the land shown edged heavy black on the map marked "Moore Park Showground Amendment No 1." |
| SEPP 50 Canal Development | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | This SEPP bans new canal estates from the date of gazettal, to ensure coastal and aquatic environments are not affected by these developments. |
| SEPP 55 — Remediation of Land | Not Applicable □ Applicable ⊠ | This SEPP applies to land across NSW and states that land must not be developed if it is unsuitable for a proposed use because of contamination. |
| Complies | Yes ⊠ No □ Comment Only □ | This SEPP requires consideration of whether there have been any activities carried out on land in the past that may have resulted in contamination. If contamination may be present, the proponent is required to undertake suitable investigation and, if necessary, remediation works. |
| | | It is considered that there have been no prior contaminating land uses and the site is suitable for the proposed use. |
| | | No significant sources of contamination were observed on the proposed development site or nearby during inspections. A targeted search was made for evidence of issues commonly associated with grazing land, such as: |
| | | Rubbish & rubbish dumps (eg tyres, lead batteries, wire, glass, car bodies, asbestos building materials, herbicide containers, pesticide containers, etc). |
| | | Sheep/cattle dips (contamination from arsenic, organophosphates, etc). |
| | | Fuel tanks/workshops (oil and diesel spills). |
| SEPP 64 — Advertising and Signage | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | The SEPP aims to ensure that outdoor advertising is compatible with the desired amenity and visual character of an area, provides effective communication in suitable locations and is of high-quality design and finish. |
| SEPP 65 — Design Quality of Residential Flat Development | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | The SEPP relates to residential flat development across the state through the application of a series of design principles. Provides for the establishment of Design Review Panels to provide independent expert advice to councils on the merit of residential flat development. |

| SEPP 70 – Affordable Housing (Revised Schemes) | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | This SEPP identifies that there is a need for affordable housing across the whole of the State and describes the kinds of households for which affordable housing may be provided and makes a requirement with respect to the imposition of conditions relating to the provision of affordable housing. |
|--|----------------------------------|--|
| Aboriginal Land 2019 | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | This SEPP provides for development delivery plans for areas of land owned by Local Aboriginal Land Councils to be considered when development applications are considered, and declares specified development carried out on land owned by Local Aboriginal Land Councils to be regionally significant development. |
| Affordable Rental Housing 2009 | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | The SEPP provides for an increase in the supply and diversity of affordable rental and social housing in NSW. |
| Building Sustainability Index: BASIX 2004 | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | The SEPP provides for the implementation of BASIX throughout the State. |
| Coastal Management 2018 | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | This SEPP promotes an integrated and co-ordinated approach to land use planning in the coastal zone in a manner consistent with the objects of the Coastal Management Act 2016, including the management objectives for each coastal management area. |
| Concurrences 2018 | Not Applicable ⊠ | This SEPP allows the Planning Secretary to act as a concurrence authority. |
| Educational Establishments and Child Care Facilities 2017 | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | This SEPP facilitates the effective delivery of educational establishments and early education and care facilities across the state. |
| Exempt and Complying Development Codes 2008 | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | The SEPP provides exempt and complying development codes that have State-wide application, identifying, in the General Exempt Development Code, types of development that are of minimal environmental impact that may be carried out without the need for development consent; and, in the General Housing Code, types of complying development that may be carried out in accordance with a complying development certificate. |
| Gosford City Centre 2018 | Not Applicable ⊠ | This SEPP applies to the Gosford City Centre. |
| Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability 2004 | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | The SEPP aims to encourage provision of housing for seniors, including residential care facilities. The SEPP provides development standards. |
| Infrastructure 2007 | Not Applicable □ Applicable ⊠ | The SEPP provides a consistent approach for infrastructure and the provision of services across NSW, and to support greater efficiency in the location of infrastructure and service facilities. |
| Complies | Yes ⊠ No □ Comment Only □ | The Oxley Highway is a NSW Roads and Maritime Services "classified road", hence Council is required to comply with clause 101 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 when considering this Developmen Application. Sub-clause 101(2) is the most relevant part, as reproduced below: |
| | | (2) The consent authority must not grant consent to development on land that has a frontage to a classified road unless it is satisfied that— |
| | | (a) where practicable and safe, vehicular access to the land is provided by a road other than the classified road, and |
| | | |

| | | (b) the safety, efficiency and ongoing operation of the classified road will not be adversely affected by the development as a result of— (i) the design of the vehicular access to the land, or (ii) the emission of smoke or dust from the development, or (iii) the nature, volume or frequency of vehicles using the classified road to gain access to the land, Matters arising from sub-clause 101(2) are: (2)(a) – There is no alternative road via which vehicular access is practicable. (2)(b)(i) – The proponent has outlined a proposal for improved Oxley Highway access in section 2.6 and provided preliminary designs (Appendix I) consistent with Transport for NSW requirements (Appendix H). (2)(b)(ii) – The proposed quarry site is located more than 700 metres (direct line) from the Oxley Highway at the closest point, hence significant dust impacts from quarry operations are quite unlikely. Potential dust from trucks transporting quarry products through the "Brooklyn" property onto the Oxley Highway will be managed as outlined in section 4.3.1. (2)(b)(iii) – Quarry traffic estimates have for various levels of production have been prepared and included as Appendix G. The actual number is expected to fluctuate significantly from year to year depending on the actual number of orders and the volume of product required, as noted previously. These estimates have been used to prepare appropriate designs for highway access (Appendix 1) |
|--|-------------------------------|--|
| Kosciuszko National Park – Alpine Resorts 2007 | Not Applicable ⊠ | This SEPP applies to part of Kosciuszko national park, and to Kosciuszko Road and the Alpine Way. The part of Kosciuszko Park to which the policy applies is the land described as the ski resort area in Part 8A of Schedule 6 to the Act. |
| Kurnell Peninsula 1989 | Not Applicable ⊠ | This SEPP applies to land within the Shire of Sutherland, known as Kurnell Peninsula, and adjacent waterways. |
| Mining, Petroleum Production & Extractive Industries 2007 | Not Applicable □ Applicable ⊠ | The SEPP aims to provide proper management of mineral, petroleum and extractive material resources and ESD. |
| Complies | Yes ⊠ No □ Comment Only □ | Clause 12 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Mining, Petroleum Production and Extractive Industries) 2007 requires the consent authority, Walcha Council, to consider the compatibility of the proposed quarry with existing, approved and likely preferred land uses in the vicinity, amongst other things. The proposal is compatible with such uses given that: The quarry is located within a RU1 Primary Production zone. Council does not have any publicly available planning proposals or policy documents indicating that it is considering rezoning any land in the vicinity. |

| | | On a local, regional and state wide basis quarries are predominantly located in RU1 Primary Production zones along with a mix of agricultural, forestry and resource extraction industries. |
|---|----------------------------------|---|
| | | The quarry will provide a source of gravel and aggregate for the local community. |
| | | The quarry has a substantial buffer of more than 1 kilometre to the nearest unrelated dwelling. |
| | | Clause 15 of the SEPP requires the consent authority to consider the efficiency the development in terms of resource recovery. The proposed quarry will extract rock in an orderly manner subject to demand, which is typical of such quarries in similar settings. |
| | | Clauses 14, 16 and 17 require the consent authority to consider the imposition of conditions relating to natural resource management, environmental management, transport and rehabilitation. |
| Miscellaneous Consent Provisions 2007 | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | This SEPP provides for the erection of temporary structures and the use of places of public entertainment while protecting public safety and local amenity. |
| Penrith Lakes Scheme 1989 | Not Applicable ⊠ | This SEPP applies to the land shown edged heavy black on the structure plan relating to Penrith Lakes. |
| Primary Production and Rural Development 2019 | Not Applicable □ Applicable ⊠ | This SEPP facilitates the orderly economic use and development of lands for primary production; reduce land use conflict and sterilisation of rural land. |
| Complies | Yes ⊠ No □ Comment Only □ | The development would meet the aims of this SEPP particularly (b) in that the site is located where there will be minimal land use conflict or sterilisation of primary production land. |
| State and Regional Development 2011 | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | This SEPP identifies development that is State significant development or State significant infrastructure and critical State significant infrastructure and to confer functions on joint regional planning panels to determine development applications. |
| State Significant Precincts 2005 | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | This SEPP facilitates the development, redevelopment or protection of important urban, coastal and regional sites of economic, environmental or social significance to the State so as to facilitate the orderly use, development or conservation of those State significant precincts for the benefit of the State, and facilitates service delivery outcomes for a range of public services and to provide for the development of major sites for a public purpose or redevelopment of major sites no longer appropriate or suitable for public purposes. |
| Sydney Drinking Water Catchment 2011 | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | This SEPP provides for healthy water catchments that will deliver high quality water while permitting compatible development. |
| Sydney Region Growth Centres 2006 | Not Applicable ⊠ | This SEPP co-ordinates the release of land for residential, employment and other urban development in the Orth West Growth Centre, the South West Growth Centre and the Wilton Growth Area. |
| Three Ports 2013 | Not Applicable ⊠ | This SEPP provides a consistent planning regime for the development and delivery of infrastructure on land in Port Botany, Port Kembla and the Port of Newcastle |

| Urban Renewal 2010 | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | This SEPP establishes the process for assessing and identifying sites as urban renewal precincts, and facilitates the orderly and economic development and redevelopment of sites in and around urban renewal precincts, |
|---|-------------------------------|--|
| Vegetation in Non- Rural Areas 2017 | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | This SEPP protects the biodiversity values of trees and other vegetation in non-rural areas of the State, and to preserves the amenity of non-rural areas of the State through the preservation of trees and other vegetation. |
| Western Sydney Employment Area 2009 | Not Applicable ⊠ | This SEPP protects and enhances the land known as the Western Sydney Employment Area for employment purposes. |
| Western Sydney Parklands 2009 | Not Applicable ⊠ | This SEPP puts in place planning controls that will enable the Western Sydney Parklands Trust to develop the Western Parklands into a multi-use urban parkland for the region of western Sydney. |

| <u>List all relevant Draft SEPPs</u> | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|--|
| SEPP | Compliance | Comment | | |
| SEPP 55 — Remediation of Land | Not Applicable □ Applicable ⊠ | The proposed SEPP will provide a state—wide planning framework for the remediation of land; require consent authorities to consider the potential for land to be contaminated when determining development applications; clearly list the remediation works that require development consent; and introduce certification and operational requirements for remediation works that can be undertaken without development consent. | | |
| Complies | Yes ⊠ No □ Comment Only □ | See Comment above. | | |
| SEPP - Environment | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | This consolidated SEPP proposes to simplify the planning rules for a number of water catchments, waterways, urban bushland, and Willandra Lakes World Heritage Property. Changes proposed include consolidating the following seven existing SEPPs: | | |
| | | State Environmental Planning Policy No. 19 – Bushland in Urban Areas State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Drinking Water Catchment) 2011 State Environmental Planning Policy No. 50 – Canal Estate Development Greater Metropolitan Regional Environmental Plan No. 2 – Georges River Catchment Sydney Regional Environmental Plan No. 20 – Hawkesbury-Nepean River (No.2-1997) Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005 Willandra Lakes Regional Environmental Plan No. 1 – World Heritage Property. | | |
| SEPP – Housing Diversity | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | This SEPP aims to facilitate the delivery of diverse and affordable housing to meet the needs of the State's growing population and support the development of a build-to-rent sector. It introduces new definitions for build-to-rent housing, student housing and co-living; • amends some state-level planning provisions, | | |
| | | particularly for boarding house and seniors housing development; amends some state-level planning provisions to | | |

| Walcha | | egic Planning Statement rategic Plan Alignment | Applicable | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Has a Planning Agreem | | | Yes □ No ⊠ | |
| Is there a Planning Agreement in force under section 93F of the EP&A Act? | | Yes □ No ⊠ | | |
| | | nning Agreement 4,15(1)(a)(iiia) = EP & A Act | | |
| | | Maintenance: include provisions under Clause 132 that permit routine maintenance of the fence to be carried out as exempt development. | | |
| | 2 2 | the fence to be considered as Stat Infrastructure (subject to a detailed replacing the need to seek multiple | tension: amend Clause 132 to allow an extension of fence to be considered as State Significant rastructure (subject to a detailed assessment) placing the need to seek multiple government provals for different parts of the fence. | |
| | | The proposed amendment includes: | | |
| SEPP (Infrastructure) | Not Applicable ⊠ Applicable □ | This amendment aims to clarify and s planning assessment for the extensio of the Wild Dog Fence. | | |
| | # | be assessed by water supply public a a longer State Significant Infrastructul process. Any new water treatment facilities will State Significant infrastructure. The p won't apply to desalination plants, net facilities or water storage facilities. | re assessment still be assessed as roposed changes | |
| | | The proposed changes will allow facil a significant environmental impact on | the environment to | |
| | | Fast-track the approval process so water treatment facility upgrades c quicker. Allow Sydney Water to respond to conditions. | an be delivered | |
| Regional Development) | Applicable □ | Remove the \$30 million capital invest for upgrades of water treatment facilit an existing facility. | | |
| SEPP (State & | Not Applicable ⊠ | The proposed changes will: | | |
| | | State Environmental Planning F Rental Housing) 2009 State Environmental Planning F Seniors and People with a Disa State Environmental Planning F Affordable Housing (Revised So | Policy (Affordable Policy (Housing for bility) 2004 Policy No 70 – | |
| | | support social housing developmer the NSW Land and Housing Corpo government-owned land; and consolidates three housing-related | ration (LAHC) on | |

Yes \boxtimes No \square

CSP 1.1 Walcha will be serviced by an integrated and efficient transport network.

| Business & Jobs | |
|--|---|
| CSP 2.1 - Commercial and tourist development will be promoted and encouraged to grow in harmony with the natural environment, to take maximum advantage of commercial opportunities and to increase local employment. | Yes ⊠ No □ |
| <u>Health</u> | |
| CSP 3.1 - Health services and facilities will be provided and where appropriate managed locally to meet the needs of the community. | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| CSP 3.2 - The public health and wellbeing of the community will be protected and enhanced. | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Education and Training | |
| CSP 4.1 - Education and training opportunities will be provided that deliver the skills and knowledge needed to advance the community. | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Stronger Community | |
| CSP 5.1 - Social services will be planned, maintained and coordinated so that they meet the current and future needs of all groups in the community. | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| CSP 5.2 - The existing strong community spirit and pride will be protected and promoted. | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| CSP 5.3 - Walcha's cultural identity will be enhanced. | Yes \square No \boxtimes |
| CSP 5.4 - Walcha's Aboriginal communities will be supported and strengthened. | Yes □ No 🛛 |
| CSP 5.5 - Young people will be retained and supported to live in Walcha. | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| CSP 5.6 - People of all ages and abilities will be encouraged to participate in cultural, recreational and sporting activities. | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| CSP 5.7 - Community members will be given the opportunity to develop their leadership skills so that they can better participate in the leadership of the community. | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Local Environment & Liveable Communities | denier wein |
| CSP 6.1 - Walcha's distinct and diverse natural and built environment will be protected and enhanced. | Yes ⊠ No □ |
| | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| CSP 6.2 - Solid waste will be managed in a sustainable manner with a continuing reduction in waste generation and disposal to landfill. | |
| | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| reduction in waste generation and disposal to landfill. CSP 6.3 - Water supply and sewerage services will be physically and environmentally | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| reduction in waste generation and disposal to landfill. CSP 6.3 - Water supply and sewerage services will be physically and environmentally sensitive. | |
| reduction in waste generation and disposal to landfill. CSP 6.3 - Water supply and sewerage services will be physically and environmentally sensitive. CSP 6.4 - Walcha will increase the use and production of renewable energy. | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| reduction in waste generation and disposal to landfill. CSP 6.3 - Water supply and sewerage services will be physically and environmentally sensitive. CSP 6.4 - Walcha will increase the use and production of renewable energy. CSP 6.5 - Agricultural activities will be environmentally sustainable. CSP 6.6 - The character of Walcha and its surrounding villages will be maintained while | Yes □ No ⊠ Yes □ No ⊠ |
| reduction in waste generation and disposal to landfill. CSP 6.3 - Water supply and sewerage services will be physically and environmentally sensitive. CSP 6.4 - Walcha will increase the use and production of renewable energy. CSP 6.5 - Agricultural activities will be environmentally sustainable. CSP 6.6 - The character of Walcha and its surrounding villages will be maintained while protecting the productivity of our rural land. | Yes □ No ⊠ Yes □ No ⊠ |
| reduction in waste generation and disposal to landfill. CSP 6.3 - Water supply and sewerage services will be physically and environmentally sensitive. CSP 6.4 - Walcha will increase the use and production of renewable energy. CSP 6.5 - Agricultural activities will be environmentally sustainable. CSP 6.6 - The character of Walcha and its surrounding villages will be maintained while protecting the productivity of our rural land. Keeping People Safe CSP 7.1 - Police stations and staff numbers will be provided to effectively control and | Yes □ No ⋈ Yes □ No ⋈ Yes □ No ⋈ Yes □ No ⋈ |
| reduction in waste generation and disposal to landfill. CSP 6.3 - Water supply and sewerage services will be physically and environmentally sensitive. CSP 6.4 - Walcha will increase the use and production of renewable energy. CSP 6.5 - Agricultural activities will be environmentally sustainable. CSP 6.6 - The character of Walcha and its surrounding villages will be maintained while protecting the productivity of our rural land. Keeping People Safe CSP 7.1 - Police stations and staff numbers will be provided to effectively control and reduce crime and antisocial behaviour and to keep our community safe. CSP 7.2 - Emergency Services will be provided to ensure the safety of our community | Yes □ No ⋈ Yes □ No ⋈ Yes □ No ⋈ Yes □ No ⋈ |
| reduction in waste generation and disposal to landfill. CSP 6.3 - Water supply and sewerage services will be physically and environmentally sensitive. CSP 6.4 - Walcha will increase the use and production of renewable energy. CSP 6.5 - Agricultural activities will be environmentally sustainable. CSP 6.6 - The character of Walcha and its surrounding villages will be maintained while protecting the productivity of our rural land. Keeping People Safe CSP 7.1 - Police stations and staff numbers will be provided to effectively control and reduce crime and antisocial behaviour and to keep our community safe. CSP 7.2 - Emergency Services will be provided to ensure the safety of our community and visitors. | Yes □ No ⋈ Yes □ No ⋈ Yes □ No ⋈ Yes □ No ⋈ |

CSP 8.3 - The boundaries of the Walcha Local Government Area will be modified to Yes \square No \boxtimes reflect existing and developing communities of interest.

| Tollook oxidening and activitying community | The second second second |
|---|----------------------------------|
| Planning Priority | Applicable |
| PP 1 - Encourage diversification in grazing agriculture, horticulture and agribusiness to grow these sectors and respond to domestic and international opportunities | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| PP 2 -Foster resilience and diversification in the agricultural industry to respond to the ageing farming workforce and climate change | Yes □ No ⊠ Yes □ No ⊠ Yes □ No ⊠ |
| PP 3 -Expand nature-based adventure and cultural tourism places and enhance visitor experiences | |
| PP 4 - Deliver a variety of housing options in Walcha and promote development that contributes to the unique character of Nowendoc, Walcha Road and Woolbrook | |
| PP 5 - Raise the area's profile and awareness of employment, business development and lifestyle opportunities, particularly for younger people and provide services for the ageing population | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| PP 6 -Continue to develop access and logistics infrastructure on appropriate sites to encourage new industry opportunities | Yes ⊠ No □ |
| PP 7 - Protect and celebrate our unique sense of place | Yes \square No \boxtimes |
| PP 8 - Identify and promote wind, solar and other renewable energy production opportunities; manage and support the transition to renewable energy | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| New England North West Regional Plan Alignment | Applicable |
| Direction 1 - Expand agribusiness and food processing sectors | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Direction 2 – Build agricultural activity | Yes \square No \boxtimes |
| Direction 3 - Protect and enhance productive agricultural lands | Yes ⊠ No □ |
| Direction 4 – Sustainably manage mineral resources | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Direction 5 - Grow New England North West as the renewable energy hub of NSW | Yes \square No \boxtimes |
| Direction 6 – Deliver new industries of the future | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Direction 7 - Build strong economic centres | Yes $oxtimes$ No $oxtimes$ |
| Direction 8 – Expand tourism and visitor opportunities | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Direction 9 – Coordinate growth in the cities of Armidale and Tamworth | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Direction 10 - Sustainably manage and conserve water resources | Yes □ No 🏻 |
| Direction 11 – Protect areas of potential high environment value | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Direction 12 - Adapt to natural hazards and climate change | Yes \square No \boxtimes |
| Direction 13 - Expand emerging industries through freight and logistics connectivity | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Direction 14 - Enhance transport and infrastructure networks | Yes ⊠ No □ |
| Direction 15 – Facilitate air and public transport infrastructure | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Direction 16 – Coordinate infrastructure delivery | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Direction 17 – Strengthen community resilience | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Direction 18 - Provide great places to live | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Direction 19 – Support healthy, safe, socially engaged and well connected communities | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Direction 20 - Deliver greater housing diversity to suit changing needs | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Direction 21 - Deliver well planned rural residential housing | Yes □ No ⊠ |

| Direction 22 | f Aboriginal Communities | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | | |
|-----------------|--|-------------------|------------|--|--|--|
| | Directions 23 - Collaborate with Aboriginal communities to respect and protect Aboriginal culture and heritage | | | | | |
| Direction 24 | 4 - Protect the region's historic heritage assets | | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | |
| | Strategy | Action | | | | |
| Go | ty of the road eight sector, commodate new ities. | | | | | |
| Has the appli | cant submitted any supporting planning assess | sments? | Yes ⊠ No □ | | | |
| Comment: | Statement of Environmental Effects – Version | n 1.2 August 2020 | | | | |
| | Subdivisio | n | | | | |
| Is this applica | ation for subdivision? | | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | |
| Comment: | Consolidation of lots will be required as a corensure that the quarry only sits on a single lo | | This is to | | | |

Environmental Impacts Section 4.15(1)(b) - EP & A Act

Does this proposal have any potential impact on:

| | Impact | Comment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|------------|--|--|--|--------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|-----|--|-------|-------|---|--|---|--------|-----|--|-------------|---------------|-----|-------|-------|--|---|--|--|
| Social | Yes ⊠ No □ | No signifi | cant nega | ative social impacts are expected given the: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Rural setting of the quarry, within a RU1 Primary Processore. Substantial distances between the quarry and resident neighbouring landholders. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Economical | Yes ⊠ No □ | vicinity of (LCM) of | rect emplo one full t annual pro | ime equivo | alent _i | the quarry are cosition, per 5,0 | 00 loose cubic | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | NUAL PROE | | erit eri | npioyees (FTE) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | LCM | to | nnes | QL | QUARRY FTE | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1,0 | 00 2 | ,400 | | 0.2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 5,0 | 00 12 | 2,000 | | 1 | | |
| | | 10,0 | 000 24 | 1,000 | | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 20,0 | 000 48 | 3,000 | | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 29,0 | 000 69 | 9,600 | | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Estimate | d contrac | tor days | per a | nnum. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | _ | ANNUAL PRODUC | TION | PLA MAINTEN | 200 | EXPLOSIVES USE | CRUSHING & | тот | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 3 | tonnes | CE | | & TRANSPORT | SCREENIN G | L | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | 1,000 | 2,400 | 4 | | 1 | 1 | 1 0 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1 | | | | | 1.5 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 5,000 | 12,000 | 8 | | 1.5 | 3 | 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | 20,000 | 48,000 | 1 | 6 | 2 | 4 |
|---------------------------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | 29,000 | 69,600 | 2 | 9 | 3 | 5 |
| | | cost of co | nstruction or road b anufactur | for any projec pase. For exan e concrete at V | luce freight cost ct requiring sign nple, transport Valcha are expe | ificant amounts costs for aggre | s of egate |
| Siting & Configuration | Yes □ No ⊠ | The prope | osal is co | nsistent with N | ISW Departmer f 1,000m betwe | nt of Primary I en extractive i | ndustries ndustries |
| Setbacks | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | neighbouring r | | | |
| Privacy | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | | | | |
| Overshadowin g | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | | | | |
| Solar Access | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | | | | |
| Visual | Yes □ No ⊠ | The quarry nearby dwellings of | ellings. W | hen standing i | xley Highway, r n the proposed | nor is it visible i quarry site, no | from any |
| Significant Views | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | | | | |
| Water | Yes □ No ⊠ | Significant quarry und expring surface. No routhe question of the quarry by the quarry by the quarry by the quarry by the surface of the quarry by the quarry by the surface of the quarry by the quarry developments of the quarry by the quarry by the quarry developments of the quarry by the quarry by the quarry developments of the quarry by the quarry developments of | groundwa er typical of are no ne is or other ise aquifer. ick units we uarry is lo part of the Groundwa been und been und octor Pty 20 inclusion enclusion enclusion in defined by inctor asse existing ensitive generative generative generative generative generative generation in from the ground and the ground the ground the ground the ground the ground the great | ter flows area operating concerning concerning concerning concerning permaner features suggith significant permaner features suggith significant permaner for approximate of approximate of approximate seed the site of groundwater roundwater feature featur | an Brooklyn for dunlikely to be enditions given that in watercourses gesting the presence of an elevating Range. The subject of a lawater Impact A lawater Imp | accountered by the strict of a near en identified or ted ridge that the ding the drilling a detailed report of the quarry foo AHD. The stantant and a near en aquifer into the proposed within a 2km ores were local enter the proposed within a 2km ores were local enter the proposed within a 2km ores were local enter the proposed within a 2km ores were local enter the proposed within a 2km ores were local enter the proposed within a 2km ores were local enter the bore of the proposed within a 2km ores were local enter the bore of the proposed enter the bore of the | of 5 bore of 5 bore of 1130 to of |

Five monitoring bores were installed within or close to the footprint of the proposed quarry excavation. Groundwater levels were measured at each bore. Failing head and rising head slug tests were performed on four of the five bores to assess hydraulic conductivity of aquifer material within and surrounding the proposed quarry excavation.

A conceptual site model was developed based on available groundwater and topographical data. The proposed quarry excavation would be located approximately 200m south of the Great Dividing Range. The ground surface around the proposed quarry falls steeply to the south east, south and west. The surface elevation was more than 100m below the base of the proposed excavation less than 500m to the south east and south of the quarry. Groundwater elevation data showed a steep groundwater gradient to the south east, south and west of the proposed quarry, consistent with steeply sloping surface topography.

An analytical model was adopted to predict steady state drawdown impacts and groundwater inflow to the open excavation at the completion of quarrying. The model predicted drawdown impacts would extend approximately 132m north of the proposed excavation. Groundwater inflow was estimated to be 1.16m³/day.

Model prediction showed good agreement with observed real world drawdown in basalt within the quarry footprint, which was already draining to the south due to the presence of natural void (a deep valley) to the south.

The modelled groundwater inflow to the excavation is less than the expected evaporation rate from the open excavation. There is also potential for any groundwater inflow to drain through the floor of the excavation, as the base of the proposed excavation remains elevated above the valley to the south. Mechanical dewatering of the excavation is unlikely to be required. Any water accumulation in the excavation could be used in quarry operations or used as stock water at the completion of the development.

Direct take (eg: pumping for beneficial use) or indirect take of groundwater (eg: losses to evaporation) are required to be licenced. The annual groundwater inflow to the open excavation would be less than 2ML. The Applicant would need to source commercial use entitlement to take 2ML from the New England Fold Belt (Murray Darling Basin) groundwater management unit prior to intersecting the water table. The NSW Department of Industry Planning and Environment website (https://www.industry.nsw.gov.au/water/allocations-availability/water-

accounting/usage-dashboard , 7 August 2020) indicates that there is 11384ML allocated within the New England Fold Belt (Murray Darling Basin) groundwater unit. It would be possible for the Applicants to obtain the required groundwater entitlement prior to intersecting the water table.

The project involves blasting, crushing and screening of excavated rock. The proposed activities have little if any potential to add contaminants that could adversely change groundwater quality. Operation of plant and machinery and use of nitrogen containing explosives poses a similar risk to groundwater quality as existing agricultural use of the Site and adjoining land. Potential risks to water quality can be managed by implementing appropriate procedures for storage and use of chemicals, refuelling and maintenance of plant and machinery and implementing appropriate spill response plans.

The information presented in this report indicates that the groundwater impacts associated with the proposed development would not exceed the Level 1 "minimum impact consideration" outlined in the NSW Aquifer Interference Policy (NSW DPI, 2012b). Therefore, groundwater impacts associated with the project are acceptable.

Dust

Yes ⊠ No □

NSW Health <u>advice</u> indicates that the vast majority of dust from mining/quarry activities consists of coarse particles (around 40 per cent) and particles larger than PM10, generated from natural activities such

mechanical disturbance of rock and soil materials, for example by blasting, crushing and vehicles driving on dirt roads. Particles are also generated when wind blows over bare ground and different types of stockpiles. Larger particles can have amenity impacts as well as health impacts.

Fine particles from vehicle exhausts and mobile equipment are also produced at mine/quarry sites, though they only account for about 5 per cent of the particles emitted during the mining process. Fine particles are manly from vehicle and mobile equipment exhausts.

It is expected that the primary sources of dust associated with the operation of the proposed quarry will be:

- Drilling rock.
- Blasting rock (see section 4.7 for more information).
- Crushing & screening rock.
- Transport trucks accessing the site.

Basalt will be the primary material being excavated, which is comparatively hard. There are no significant amounts of friable rock or earth present in the geological profile below about 2 metres.

To ensure worker safety a mixture of dust mitigation measures will be applied and amended in response to weather conditions, rock moisture content, plant location, etc. Those measures will be consistent with industry standards and include:

- · Application of chemical surfactants.
- Enclosing conveyor transfer points.
- Implementation of water truck procedures.
- Installation of sprays at conveyor transfer points.
- Operator training and fit testing for respiratory protective equipment.
- Programmed maintenance of spray nozzles, pumps and plumbing.
- Regular inspections of operating dust controls.

The performance objective will be to ensure that:

- Quarry operations are conducted in accordance with the NSW Resource Regulator's 2020 workplace safety standards specified in the "Dust Safety in the Metals and Extractives Industries" document.
- No significant dust resulting from quarry operations is present more than 500 metres from the site boundary.

Trucks hauling quarry products via the access track within the property is a potential source of dust that could impact residents of the "Brooklyn" dwelling. The proposed track passes within 290m of the dwelling, hence it will need to need to be used and maintained in an appropriate manner to avoid impacts, especially in dry and windy conditions.

Strategies that will be used to minimise potential dust impacts associated with the quarry access track include:

- Constructing and maintaining the track with a firm all weather surface.
- Signposting and restricting quarry truck speeds to a maximum of 20km/h on the track.
- Mandatory site induction for all staff which highlights compulsory signposted speed limit for quarry site and access road.
- If the above measures become inadequate during dry and/or windy conditions, then additional strategies will be applied, including one or more of the following:
 - Reducing quarry truck speeds to a maximum of 10km/h
 - Using a water cart to suppress dust along sections of the track which may impact the "Brooklyn" dwelling or neighbours.

 Applying a dust suppression coating to the track, such as a polymer or bitumen based emulsion.

The performance objective will be to ensure that no significant dust resulting from quarry traffic is present more than 500 metres from the quarry access track, or on the site of any dwelling.

Noise

Yes ⊠ No □

EPA Noise Policy

Noise associated with new developments is regulated under the 'Noise Policy for Industry', published in 2017 by the NSW Environmental Protection Authority (NSW EPA). A key intent of the policy is to apply all feasible and reasonable measures to reduce predicted noise levels to the "project noise trigger levels" when predicted noise levels are above these levels.

The "project noise trigger level" is the lower (most stringent) value of two different noise levels:

- An "intrusiveness noise level" which limits the extent to which a noise source can exceed the background level (that is, background plus 5 decibels [dB]) above a minimum threshold.
- A "project amenity noise level" provides an overall noise-level cap for different land uses.

In this case the levels are:

- 1. "Intrusiveness noise level" Determined by rating background level (RBL) plus 5 dBA. The minimum RBL is 40 dBA during daylight hours in a RU1 Primary Production zones (Policy Table 2.1). The final intrusiveness noise level in this case is 45 dBA.
- 2. "Noise amenity level" During daylight hours is 50dBA when measured at an unrelated rural residential dwelling (Policy Table 2.2). Cumulative industrial noise is not relevant in this case as further industrial development is unlikely in the area.

Ultimately the relevant "project noise trigger level" for this development, measured at unrelated rural dwellings, is the 45 dBA "Intrusiveness noise level".

It is relevant to note the NSW EPA 'Noise Policy for Industry' states:

"The reaction to noise varies widely from individual to individual. Because of this, it is not possible to set noise levels that will guarantee no one will experience an impact.

There will usually be some members of the community who find any noise unacceptable, regardless of whether it meets the project noise trigger level, and others who will not be bothered by noise even if it is above the project noise trigger level."

Access

At the peak level of quarry operations Over an 8 hour day this will result in about 1 truck movement each 30 minutes and occasionally multiple vehicles would use the access at a similar time.

Indicative maximum noise levels from single and multiple vehicles accessing the quarry are:

Maximum expected vehicle noise from quarry access

| EQUIPMENT USING ESS | SWL LAeq (dB(A)) | SPL @7m (dB(A)) | SPL @ 300m L Aeq (15 min) (dB(A)) |
|----------------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---|
| 1 Truck (>20 tonne) | 1 0 | 8 1 | 4 0 |
| 1 Light vehicle (eg 4WD) | 1 0 | 7 8 | 3 7 |
| 2 trucks & 1 light vehicle | 1 1 | 8 2 | 4 4 |

For this development the "Project noise trigger level" measured at unrelated rural dwellings is 45 L Aeq (15 min) (dB(A))

As noted in section 2.6.1, 2011 NSW Roads and Maritime traffic volume data for the Oxley Highway indicates that there are about 105 truck movements per day in either direction. If the quarry reaches peak production levels, then there will be an average of about 15 additional truck movements per day along the highway, increasing truck movements by up to 14%.

Overall the available information indicates that transport activities associated with the quarry on the access road and highway are quite unlikely to substantially increase existing noise levels in the vicinity.

Strategies that will be used to minimise potential noise impacts from use of the quarry access track include:

- Only transporting quarry products during daylight hours.
- Signposting and restricting all quarry truck speeds to a maximum of 20km/h on the track.
- Ensuring a consistent moderate gradient on the access track and highway access point to minimise the potential need for the use of exhaust braking.

Quarry Machinery

Quarry machinery and related noise will primarily arise from excavation, crushing and screening activities.

Expected quarry machinery noise levels

An estimate of maximum quarry noise level over a 15 minute interval at dwellings in the vicinity has been prepared using the NSW RMS Construction and Noise Estimator Tool

Maximum quarry noise at dwellings

| | DISTANCE | A | TTENUA | SPL L | |
|--|----------|---------------------|--------|----------|------------|
| SCENARIO / LOCATION | metres | TYPE | LIKELY | APPLIED | Aeq (15 |
| All quarry machinery listed in Table 12 operating simultaneously | | N i | Nil | Nil | 102 |
| "Brooklyn" dwelling | 660 | Ridge | 5-10 | Nil | 50 |
| "Yarooga Park" dwelling | >1,150 | Ridge | 5-10 | Nil | 43 |
| "Mount Pleasant" dwelling | >1,500 | Ridge & trees | 5-10 | Nil | |
| "Yarooga" dwelling | >1,700 | Ridge & trees | >10 | Nil | |
| Walcha Road village | 2,200 | Ridge & trees | >10 | Nil | |

The "Project noise trigger level" measured at unrelated rural dwellings is 45 L Aeq (15 min) (dB(A))

Based on the indicative modelling data within Tables 12 and 13, the "Intrusiveness Noise Level" specified by the NSW EPA will not be exceeded at any unrelated dwellings.

Furthermore, the modelled levels are likely to be significantly overestimated given that no provision was made for attenuation (reduction) of noise levels by land-form or vegetation. There is no line of sight between the quarry site and any dwellings, hence no direct path for sound to travel.

| | | Noise associated with the operation of quarry machine by: | ery will be mitigated |
|---------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| | | Only using excavating and processing n daylight hours, as outlined in Table 3. | nachinery during |
| | | Restricting days of operation, as noted previous | usly in Table 3. |
| | | Ensuring all machinery is fitted and maint mufflers. | ained with suitable |
| | | These strategies can be ensured by the use of conditingation measures and recommendations as stated Environmental Effects are undertaken. | ditioning in that the in the Statement of |
| Land Degradation | Yes ⊠ No □ | Upon cessation of quarry operations the void will be create a safe and stable landform consistent with requirements. This is expected to involve one or more strategies: | the landowner's |
| | | Pre-stripping and stockpiling top soil from the site. used to facilitate re-vegetation of disturbed areas. | |
| | | Battering the edges of the quarry void to reduce to either by excavation or by suitable placement of w | aste rock. |
| | | Ripping and/or applying a veneer of topsoil to compacted soil associated with the quarry void. | any areas of |
| | | Using the quarry void to retain water for domes drink from. This may require some earthwor | |
| | | appropriate access paths and slopes. | |
| | | Using appropriate earthworks to ensure surface of cause significant soil erosion after cessation of operations. | |
| Tree Loss | Yes □ No ⊠ | The proposed development will not significantly refragment any established vegetation as: | emove, modify or |
| Flora | Yes □ No ⊠ | No habitat of a threatened species or ecological been identified on the site or proposed access trace. | |
| Fauna | Yes □ No ⊠ | Less than 0.5 hectare of scattered mature tre | |
| | | cleared from a highly disturbed area. | |
| | | Existing isolated trees are quite vulnerable to diel various factors including insect attack, mistleto livestock, wind, altered soil structure & chemistry, e | e, ringbarking by |
| | | No significant fragmentation or isolation will occur the proposed development. | as a result of |
| | | A review of the Areas of Outstanding Biodiversity Valu on 31 January 2020 showed four areas, none of within 200km of the proposed development site. I proposal is very unlikely to have any adverse effect, indirectly. | which are located n that context the |
| | | Conclusion: The proposed development or active significantly affect any threatened species or ecological their habitats. In that context a biodiversity development is not warranted in this case. | ical communities, or |
| Has a Threatene | ed Species Impac | t Assessment been prepared? | Yes ⊠ No □ |
| Are there any sp | pecies/communitie | es listed under the TSC Act? | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Are there any ke | ey threatening pro | cesses? | Yes ⊠ No □ |

Comment:

Given the scale, type and context of the proposed development, it is unlikely to make any significant adverse environmental impact for a listed key threatening process.

| THREATENING PROCESS | COMMENTS |
|--|--|
| Aggressive exclusion of birds from woodland & forest habitat by abundant Noisy Miners, Manorina | I Develonment is unlikely to facilitate any cionificant conoctunities for this coocies |
| Anthropogenic Climate Change. | Currently all aggregate used in the Walcha Shire is transported via trucks from othe local government areas. A new local aggregate source will substantially reducing diesel fuel consumption associated with aggregate consumption in the Walcha Shire. In these circumstances the development is expected to make a small reduction in carbon dioxide and other diesel exhaust pollutants within the Walcha Shire. |
| | "Bushrock removal" involves the disturbance and extraction of weathered outcrops of rock that provide habitat niches for animals. The listing does not apply to "the removal of rock from approved mining or quarrying activities". The impact on bushrock and associated species will not be significant as: |
| Bushrock removal (as described in the final | There is no scree, sheet like rock, or other rock formations likely to provide significant shelter niches for flora or fauna. |
| determination of Scientific Committee). | Basalt rock does outcrop and occur loose in the soil, but it lacks significant cracks, voids, slab like structures or scree formations that provide significant habitat niches for vertebrate animals. |
| | No flora or fauna species listed in the final determination as threatened species which would be adversely affected by "bushrock removal" are known from the site. |
| Clearing of native vegetation (as described in the final determination of the Scientific Committee). | Proposed development will remove about 12 mature Eucalyptus sp. trees in a highle disturbed habitat. Overall this is unlikely to significantly increase the extent comagnitude of the impact of this key threatening process. |
| Competition and grazing by the feral European Rabbit, Oryctolagus cuniculus. | Development is unlikely to facilitate any significant change in existing local populatio of this species. |
| Invasion of native plant communities by exotic perennial | Of the exotic perennial grass species listed in the declaration, serrated tussoc (Nassella trichotoma) is the most significant one known to occur in the Norther Tablelands. Landholder advises that he is not aware of any occurrences of this species on "Brooklyn" or adjoining properties |
| grasses. | The proposed development is not expected to facilitate the establishment or spread of any exotic perennial grasses. |
| Loss of hollow-bearing trees. | Development will remove about 12 mature Eucalyptus sp. trees in a highly disturbed habitat. Overall this is unlikely to significantly increase the extent or magnitude of this key threatening process. |
| Predation by the European Red Fox, Vulpes vulpes. | Development unlikely to facilitate predation by this species. |
| Predation by the Feral Cat Felis catus. | Development is unlikely to facilitate predation by this species. |
| Removal of dead wood and dead trees | Development will remove a small amount of dead wood and trees in a highly disturbed habitat. Overall this is unlikely to significantly increase the extent of magnitude of this key threatening process. |

Does the proposed development require approval under the EPBC Act

| Yes | | No | X |
|-----|--|----|---|
|-----|--|----|---|

| Heritage | Impact | Comment |
|------------|------------|---|
| European | Yes □ No ⊠ | |
| Aboriginal | Yes □ No ⊠ | An Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System (AHIMS) search was carried for the land including a 50metre buffer. No sites are recorded or places declared either on the land or within the 50 metre buffer. See Attachment. |

| Is this land classified | Is this land classified as containing an item of environmental heritage? | | | |
|--|--|--|------------------------------|--|
| Is there an impact on heritage? | and adjoining or i | n close vicinity to an item of environmental | Yes □ No ⊠ | |
| Is this proposal in a h | eritage conservati | ion Zone? | Yes \square No \boxtimes | |
| Is this proposal in an | adjoining or in clo | se vicinity to a conservation zone? | Yes □ No ⊠ | |
| Has a Heritage Impac | t Statement been | prepared for this proposal? | Yes \square No \boxtimes | |
| Has an Archaeologica | al Survey been pro | epared for this proposal? | Yes □ No ⊠ | |
| | | Flooding Section 4.15(1)(b) – EP & A Act | | |
| Is this property flood a | affected? | | Yes □ No ⊠ | |
| | | Bush Fire Prone Land Section 4.15(1)(b) - EP & A Act | | |
| Is this property bush f | ire prone as per t | he Bush Fire Prone Map? | Yes ⊠ No □ | |
| Is this property bush f | ire prone as per a | ny draft Bush Fire Prone Map? | Yes ⊠ No □ | |
| Has a Bush Fire Mana | agement Plan bee | en Prepared? | Yes □ No ⊠ | |
| Does this developmen | Does this development comply with Planning for Bushfire 2019? | | | |
| Contaminated Land Section 4.15(1)(b) – EP & A Act | | | | |
| Has this land been ide | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | |
| Does this land require | | Yes □ No ⊠ | | |
| Has a Contaminated I | and Site Investig | ation been completed? | Yes ⊠ No □ | |
| Is a referral required t | o NSW Environm | ent Protections Authority? | Yes □ No ⊠ | |
| Is it a possibility this la | and may be conta | minated? | Yes □ No ⊠ | |
| Is this land in the clos | e vicinity or adjoir | ning a known contaminated site? | Yes □ No ⊠ | |
| | | Infrastructure Section 4.15(1)(b) – EP & A Act | | |
| Is an engineering asse | essment required | ? | Yes ⊠ No □ | |
| Has an engineering as | ssessment been o | completed? | Yes ⊠ No □ | |
| Who completed the E | ngineering Asses | sment? | | |
| Engineering Departme | ent 🛛 Assess | ing Officer □ Other ⊠ Peter Murray | | |
| Does this proposal ha | ve any potential i | mpact on: | | |
| | Impact | Comment | | |
| Sewer | Yes □ No ☒ | | | |
| Water | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | |
| Drainage | Yes ⊠ No □ | Minimal. Stormwater will be managed through out the s maintained by the use of appropriate conditioning Surface water drainage from the site flows to the site of the Surface water of the site flows to the site of the site | g. e east and south | |
| | | into the Surveyors Creek catchment, then the about 6.5km down slope of the site. The quarry access track through "Brooklyn" will from gravel and raised above natural ground le | ill be constructed | |

will be some change to natural stormwater flow paths. Table drains and culverts along the proposed access tracks will be used to direct stormwater flows into existing natural drainage hollows and existing dams on the "Brooklyn" holding. Diversion channels and/or earth bunds will be used to divert stormwater flows around the perimeter of the quarry into existing, and/or new, dams for domestic livestock. Stormwater redirection will be necessary to prevent the quarry void filling with water, as well as minimising potential soil erosion and sedimentation issues. Diversion channels and/or earth bunds will be used to divert stormwater flows around the perimeter of the quarry into existing, and/or new, dams for domestic livestock. Stormwater redirection will be necessary to prevent the quarry void filling with water, as well as minimising potential soil erosion and sedimentation issues. Key strategies that will be applied include ensuring that stomwater diversion channel: Beds are predominantly composed of bedrock, where feasible. Where bedrock is absent and the channel has a relatively high gradient, the bed and sides are lined with suitable rock. Flows into a dam, or existing gully with a natural base in bedrock. Stormwater within the quarry site may contain elevated levels of sediment derived from soil and aggregate stockpiles. No significant contaminants are known, or are likely, within the basalt rock or associated soils that will be disturbed by the quarry. All stormwater flows from the quarry site will directed to, and held within, a sump in the quarry floor. Sediment will be able to settle within the sump and the water used for dust suppression activities. The sump will be relocated within the site over time as quarry operations progress. See comments above from TfNSW. Engineering assessment Access Yes ⊠ No □ agreed with TfNSW and incorporated wording as per their recommendation. **Engineering Assessment** The SEE further proposes that: 1. Existing access continues despite the limited site distance on Oxley Highway until the 5000m3 threshold is reached. 2. The access is relocated to a location approximately 150m west of the existing within 6 months of achieving 5000m3 of quarry sales. With regard the access standard, the SEE states: "separate letter and plans from Planit Consulting dated 24-7-2020 providing Turn Warrants Assessment and 2D concept drawing for proposed site access into the proposed Brooklyn Quarry off the Oxley Highway in response to Transport for NSW letter dated 26 May 2020" Whilst an email was received on 7/9/2020, the attachments were not downloaded when TRIM'ed and are no longer available However given that the SEE states that the "Visibility between this access and the highway is partially obscured by trees and the rising slope will impede trucks entering the highway" it is difficult to support the proposed staging concept given the additional truck movements generated.

| | | Consequently, I recommend the folional those detailed in the Transport for 2020: 1. Prior to quarry production conducted at the location at appearisting access. 2. Within 6 months of the facility products from production communication at a Basic Right Turn AUSTROADS Part 4 of the Guide 2017a). | mmencing, a "Typical Rural I Driveways" access is to be proximately 150m west of the producing 5,000m3 of quarry mencing, the access is to be in (BAR) intersection meeting | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|---|--|--|
| Kerb & Gutter | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | | |
| Upgrade Existing Road | Yes ⊠ No □ | See Comment Above | | | |
| Road Network | Yes ⊠ No □ | Contribution applied to cater for the created by this development. See b | | | |
| Existing Easements | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | | |
| Electricity | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | | |
| Telecommunications | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | | |
| Pedestrian Access | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | | |
| Loading & Unloading | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | | |
| Parking | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | | |
| Energy Conservation | Yes □ No ⊠ | | | | |
| Does the developmen | t require any new | easements? | Yes □ No ⊠ | | |
| Has an Erosion and S | oil Control Plan b | een submitted? | Yes \square No \boxtimes | | |
| Comment: This will | l be conditioned. | | | | |
| | Co | onstruction Assessment | | | |
| Is a Construction Cert | ificate Required? | | Yes □ No ⊠ | | |
| | S | Section 68 Assessment | | | |
| Is a section 68 assess | ment required? | | Yes ⊠ No □ | | |
| Has a section 68 asse | essment been con | npleted? | Yes ⊠ No □ | | |
| Was a section 68 app | lication submitted | with this application? | Yes \square No \boxtimes | | |
| What is required? | | | Onsite sewer management | | |
| Does this system requ | uire connection to | a Council maintained system? | Yes □ No ⊠ | | |
| | D | eveloper Contributions | | | |
| Does this proposal rec | Does this proposal require any Developer Contribution? Yes \boxtimes No \square | | | | |
| Is the contribution for | a subdivision? | | Yes □ No ⊠ | | |
| Is the contribution for | a special purpose | relating only to this proposal? | Yes ⊠ No □ | | |
| Comment: Traffic (| Generation on Ox | ley Highway and local road. | | | |

| Contribution Plan | Levy | Rate (\$) | Comment | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|
| Not Applicable | Tonne or M ³ | \$0.20 Or \$0.60 | develop Oxley h | oment and is to Highway and in | npacted local roa | maintenance of |
| | | | Signag | je | | |
| Does this proposal | require signage | ? | | | | Yes ⊠ No □ |
| Has this application | included signag | je? | | | | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Should a restriction | be placed on th | e amount/ty | pe of sign | nage? | | Yes ⊠ No □ |
| 2 | Business Ide Emergency (B. Truck Enterio | Contact Sign | | | | |
| | | N | lotificat | ion | | |
| Does this application | on require notific | ation/adverti | ising? | | | Yes ⊠ No □ |
| Is this application a | n advertised de | velopment a | pplication | under the EP | & A Act? | Yes □ No ⊠ |
| Was this application ☐ EP& A | | ised as per t ⊠ CCP | , i | ions of? | | Yes ⊠ No □ |
| Was this application | n notified/advert | ised for publ | lic interes | t purposes onl | y? | Yes \square No \boxtimes |
| Dates Notification l | Jndertaken | Commer | nced 2 | 2 April 2020 | Finished | 29 April 2020 |
| Were there any wri | tten submissions | s received? | | | | Yes $oxtimes$ No $oxtimes$ |
| If Yes, what was th | e number of sub | missions re | ceived? | | | 4 |
| Did the applicant has submission/s? | ave the opportur | nity to respo | nd to the | issues raised v | within the | Yes ⊠ No □ |
| | odified Statemer ssues raised wit | | | fects was sub | mitted to Counci | which addressed |
| Submission Maker: | James Nort | | | Pleasant | | and they are the same |
| Issue: | Quarry will p | ose a risk of | f interfere | nce to the aqu | ifer that supports | s the Mt Pleasant |

| Submission Maker: | James Norton – Objection Lessee of Property Known as Mt Pleasant |
|------------------------|--|
| Issue: | Quarry will pose a risk of interference to the aquifer that supports the Mt Pleasant bore. |
| Applicant Response: | The quarry will have a maximum depth of 30m and will expose layers (flows) of basalt, possibly with minor volcanic ash and agglomerate, as indicated in section 3.2. Significant groundwater flows area unlikely to be encountered by the quarry under typical operating conditions given that: |
| | There are no nearby permanent watercourses, wetlands, springs or other features suggesting the presence of a near surface aquifer. |
| | No rock units with significant porosity have been identified on or near the quarry site. |
| | The quarry is located on the edge of an elevated ridge that forms part of the Great Dividing Range. |
| | A detailed Groundwater Impact Assessment, including the drilling of 5 bore holes, has been undertaken and is the subject of a detailed report. |
| | Ground Doctor Pty Ltd – Groundwater Impact Assessment – 11 August 2020 |
| | 5 Conclusion |
| | The proposed quarry will be excavated to a maximum depth of 1130 AHD. Groundwater was identified in basalt within the quarry footprint at a maximum elevation of approximately 1146m AHD. The proposed development would intersect the water table and is an aquifer interference activity as defined by the |

NSW Aquifer Interference Policy (2012).

Ground Doctor assessed the site setting and available groundwater data to identify existing groundwater users, environmental receptors and culturally sensitive groundwater features within a 2km radius of the site.

High priority groundwater dependent ecosystems or high priority cultural groundwater sites were not identified within 2km of the proposed quarry.

Four existing groundwater works were identified within a 2km radius of the proposed quarry excavation. The identified bores were located more than 1500m from the proposed excavation. Available data for the identified bores indicated that standing water levels in the bores were at least 20m lower than the maximum proposed depth of excavation. The bore identified within "Mt Pleasant" was separated from the proposed quarry by the Great Dividing Range and was within a different catchment and a different groundwater management unit to the proposed quarry.

Five monitoring bores were installed within or close to the footprint of the proposed quarry excavation. Groundwater levels were measured at each bore. Failing head and rising head slug tests were performed on four of the five bores to assess hydraulic conductivity of aquifer material within and surrounding the proposed quarry excavation.

A conceptual site model was developed based on available groundwater and topographical data. The proposed quarry excavation would be located approximately 200m south of the Great Dividing Range. The ground surface around the proposed quarry falls steeply to the south east, south and west. The surface elevation was more than 100m below the base of the proposed excavation less than 500m to the south east and south of the quarry. Groundwater elevation data showed a steep groundwater gradient to the south east, south and west of the proposed quarry, consistent with steeply sloping surface topography.

An analytical model was adopted to predict steady state drawdown impacts and groundwater inflow to the open excavation at the completion of quarrying. The model predicted drawdown impacts would extend approximately 132m north of the proposed excavation. Groundwater inflow was estimated to be 1.16m³/day.

Model prediction showed good agreement with observed real world drawdown in basalt within the quarry footprint, which was already draining to the south due to the presence of natural void (a deep valley) to the south.

The modelled groundwater inflow to the excavation is less than the expected evaporation rate from the open excavation. There is also potential for any groundwater inflow to drain through the floor of the excavation, as the base of the proposed excavation remains elevated above the valley to the south. Mechanical dewatering of the excavation is unlikely to be required. Any water accumulation in the excavation could be used in quarry operations or used as stock water at the completion of the development.

Direct take (eg: pumping for beneficial use) or indirect take of groundwater (eg: losses to evaporation) are required to be licenced. The annual groundwater inflow to the open excavation would be less than 2ML. The Applicant would need to source commercial use entitlement to take 2ML from the New England Fold Belt (Murray Darling Basin) groundwater management unit prior to intersecting the water table. The NSW Department of Industry Planning and Environment website (https://www.industry.nsw.gov.au/water/allocations-availability/water-

accounting/usage-dashboard, 7 August 2020) indicates that there is 11384ML allocated within the New England Fold Belt (Murray Darling Basin) groundwater unit. It would be possible for the Applicants to obtain the required groundwater entitlement prior to intersecting the water table.

The project involves blasting, crushing and screening of excavated rock. The proposed activities have little if any potential to add contaminants that could adversely change groundwater quality. Operation of plant and machinery and use of nitrogen containing explosives poses a similar risk to groundwater quality as existing agricultural use of the Site and adjoining land. Potential risks to water quality can be managed by implementing appropriate procedures for storage and use of chemicals, refuelling and maintenance of plant and machinery and implementing appropriate spill response plans.

| | The information presented in this report indicates that the groundwater impacts associated with the proposed development would not exceed the Level 1 "minimun impact consideration" outlined in the NSW Aquifer Interference Policy (NSW DPI 2012b). Therefore, groundwater impacts associated with the project are acceptable. |
|------------------------|---|
| Comment: | To quantify this concern, Geological Survey of NSW – Mining, Exploration & Geoscience were asked to review the full application and submissions. Their response was: GSNSW has reviewed the Statement of Environmental Effects for the above DA and have no issues or concerns to raise. It is therefore assumed that the applicant has adequately addressed this matter. |
| Submission Maker: | Janet Norton – Objection Resides on Property Known as Mt Pleasant |
| Issue: | Groundwater SEE fails to address risk to water supplies There is no hydrology report. No adequate consultation with local stakeholders in relation to the operation of the groundwater and aquifer systems in the area. |
| Comment: | Please see applicant response and comment above for James Norton. |
| Issue: | Soil Profiling No drilling had been undertaken to assess the actual depth and range of the basa cap, nor the quality and usefulness of the resource. |
| Applicant Response: | Drilling and costeaning work combined with geological and geophysical observations indicate there is a profile of usable rock of more than 30 metres. Under ideal circumstances there may be up to about 450,000 cubic metres of rock that could be extracted Trenching and drilling of the quarry site has a generally shallow reddish clay so immediately overlying relatively fresh (unweathered) Tertiary basalt, as represented in Figure 8 and Plate 3 below. Five drill holes were drilled during July 2020 at the locations shown Figure 7. They showed that the basalt is up to 37.0 metres (hole MB 1) in the immediate vicinity of the quarry site. |
| | All of the basalt is likely to be suitable for commercial use, unless there are significant geological variations. Known variations include some minor proportions of volcaniclastic/pyroclastic rocks (ash and agglomerate) exposed during test trenching and drilling. |
| | Drilling indicates there is a relatively persistent layer of clay underlying the basalt at about 1124m ASL on the quarry site. The clay typically shows a mottled colour and texture similar to highly weathered volcaniclastic rocks observed in excavator costeans. This clay layer is about 7m below the maximum depth of |

Comment:

To quantify this concern, Geological Survey of NSW – Mining, Exploration & Geoscience were asked to review the full application and submissions. Their response was:

GSNSW has reviewed the Statement of Environmental Effects for the above DA and have no issues or concerns to raise.

It is therefore assumed that the applicant has adequately addressed this matter.

Issue:

Duet

the proposed quarry.

SEE has only assessed impacts of dust and noise using data taken from the Woolbrook weather station. The Woolbrook weather station is 7.4km west of the proposed quarry site and over 200m lower in elevation. This data does not describe the wind conditions at the proposed site, nor indicate the likely impact of dust and noise that would be produced by the quarry.

Applicant Response:

NSW Health advice indicates that the vast majority of dust from mining/quarry activities consists of coarse particles (around 40 per cent) and particles larger than

PM10, generated from natural activities such mechanical disturbance of rock and soil materials, for example by blasting, crushing and vehicles driving on dirt roads. Particles are also generated when wind blows over bare ground and different types of stockpiles. Larger particles can have amenity impacts as well as health impacts.

Fine particles from vehicle exhausts and mobile equipment are also produced at mine/quarry sites, though they only account for about 5 per cent of the particles emitted during the mining process. Fine particles are manly from vehicle and mobile equipment exhausts.

It is expected that the primary sources of dust associated with the operation of the proposed quarry will be:

- Drilling rock.
- Blasting rock (see section 4.7 for more information).
- Crushing & screening rock.
- Transport trucks accessing the site.

Basalt will be the primary material being excavated, which is comparatively hard. There are no significant amounts of friable rock or earth present in the geological profile below about 2 metres.

To ensure worker safety a mixture of dust mitigation measures will be applied and amended in response to weather conditions, rock moisture content, plant location,

etc. Those measures will be consistent with industry standards⁹ and include:

- · Application of chemical surfactants.
- Enclosing conveyor transfer points.
- Implementation of water truck procedures.
- Installation of sprays at conveyor transfer points.
- Operator training and fit testing for respiratory protective equipment.
- · Programmed maintenance of spray nozzles, pumps and plumbing.
- Regular inspections of operating dust controls.

The performance objective will be to ensure that:

- Quarry operations are conducted in accordance with the NSW Resource Regulator's 2020 workplace safety standards specified in the "Dust Safety in the Metals and Extractives Industries" document.
- No significant dust resulting from quarry operations is present more than 500 metres from the site boundary.

Trucks hauling quarry products via the access track within the property is a potential source of dust that could impact residents of the "Brooklyn" dwelling. The proposed track passes within 290m of the dwelling, hence it will need to need to be used and maintained in an appropriate manner to avoid impacts, especially in dry and windy conditions.

Strategies that will be used to minimise potential dust impacts associated with the guarry access track include:

- Constructing and maintaining the track with a firm all weather surface.
- Signposting and restricting quarry truck speeds to a maximum of 20km/h on the track.
- Mandatory site induction for all staff which highlights compulsory signposted speed limit for quarry site and access road.
- If the above measures become inadequate during dry and/or windy conditions, then additional strategies will be applied, including one or more of the following:
 - Reducing quarry truck speeds to a maximum of 10km/h
 - Using a water cart to suppress dust along sections of the track which may impact the "Brooklyn" dwelling or neighbours.
- Applying a dust suppression coating to the track, such as a polymer or bitumen based emulsion.

The performance objective will be to ensure that no significant dust resulting from quarry traffic is present more than 500 metres from the quarry access track, or on the site of any dwelling.

Comment:

To quantify this concern, Geological Survey of NSW – Mining, Exploration & Geoscience were asked to review the full application and submissions. Their response was:

GSNSW has reviewed the Statement of Environmental Effects for the above DA and have no issues or concerns to raise.

It is therefore assumed that the applicant has adequately addressed this matter.

These strategies can be ensured by the use of conditioning in that the mitigation measures and recommendations as stated in the Statement of Environmental Effects are undertaken.

Issue:

Noise

No reasonable attempt has been made in the SEE to determine the actual noise impact on my property and whether it could be reduced to an acceptable level.

Applicant Response:

Access

At the peak level of quarry operations Over an 8 hour day this will result in about 1 truck movement each 30 minutes and occasionally multiple vehicles would use the access at a similar time.

Indicative maximum noise levels from single and multiple vehicles accessing the quarry are:

Maximum expected vehicle noise from quarry access

| EQUIPMENT G ACCESS | SWL LAeq (dB(A)) | SPL @7m (dB(A)) | SPL @ 300m L Aeq (15 min) (dB(A)) |
|-------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|
| 1 Truck (>20 tonne) | 106 | 81 | 40 |
| 1 Light vehicle (eg 4WD) | 103 | 78 | 37 |
| 2 trucks & 1 light vehicle | 110 | 82 | 44 |

For this development the "Project noise trigger level" measured at unrelated rural dwellings is 45 L Aeq (15 min) (dB(A))

As noted in section 2.6.1, 2011 NSW Roads and Maritime traffic volume data for the Oxley Highway indicates that there are about 105 truck movements per day in either direction. If the quarry reaches peak production levels, then there will be an average of about 15 additional truck movements per day along the highway, increasing truck movements by up to 14%.

Overall the available information indicates that transport activities associated with the quarry on the access road and highway are quite unlikely to substantially increase existing noise levels in the vicinity.

Strategies that will be used to minimise potential noise impacts from use of the quarry access track include:

- Only transporting quarry products during daylight hours.
- Signposting and restricting all quarry truck speeds to a maximum of 20km/h on the track.
- Ensuring a consistent moderate gradient on the access track and highway access point to minimise the potential need for the use of exhaust braking.

Quarry Machinery

Quarry machinery and related noise will primarily arise from excavation, crushing and screening activities.

Expected quarry machinery noise levels

An estimate of maximum quarry noise level over a 15 minute interval at dwellings in the vicinity has been prepared using the NSW RMS Construction and Noise Estimator Tool

| | | ATTENUATION dB(A) | | | | |
|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | SCENARIO/LOCATION | DISTANCE metres | | | SPL L Aeq (15 min) (dB(A)) | |
| | SCENARIO/LUCATION | metres | TYPE | LIKELY | APPLIED | MALE NEW |
| | All quarry machinery listed in Table 12 operating simultaneously | 7 | Nil | Nil | Nil | 102 |
| | "Brooklyn" dwelling | 660 | Ridge | 5-10 | Nil | 50 |
| | "Yarooga Park" dwelling | >1,150 | Ridge | 5-10 | Nil | 43 |
| | "Mount Pleasant" dwelling | >1,500 | Ridge & trees | 5-10 | Nil | 39 |
| | "Yarooga" dwelling | >1,700 | Ridge & trees | >10 | Nil | 37 |
| | Walcha Road village | 2,200 | Ridge & trees | >10 | Nil | 17 |
| | The "Project noise trigger le (dB(A)) | vel" measured | d at unrelate | ed rural dv | vellings is 45 | L Aeq (15 min) |
| | dwellings, hence no dire Noise associated with the | • | | | | |
| omment: | as outlined in Restricting day | Table 3. /s of operate achinery is n, Geologic | nd proces tion, as n fitted and al Survey | ssing ma oted pre d mainta r of NSV | achinery du viously in ined with s V – Mining | uring daylight hour Table 3. uitable mufflers. Exploration & |
| omment: | as outlined in Restricting day Ensuring all m To quantify this concerr Geoscience were asked response was: | Table 3. ys of operate achinery is achinery is a declogical to review aviewed the | tion, as no fitted and al Survey the full a | oted pred maintal of NSV pplication | achinery du viously in ined with s V – Mining on and sub | uring daylight hour Table 3. uitable mufflers. Exploration & |
| omment: | as outlined in Restricting day Ensuring all m To quantify this concerr Geoscience were asked response was: GSNSW has re | Table 3. ys of operate achinery is achinery is a chinery in the chinery i | nd procestion, as no fitted and al Survey the full a statemen or co | oted pred maintal of NSV pplication of Entoncerns | achinery du viously in ined with s V – Mining on and sub- avironment to raise. | uring daylight hour Table 3. suitable mufflers. Exploration & missions. Their |
| omment: | as outlined in Restricting day Ensuring all m To quantify this concerr Geoscience were asked response was: GSNSW has re above DA and it | Table 3. ys of operate achinery is achinery is a chinery in the chave no issue a chinery is a chinery in the chinery is a chinery in the chinery in the chinery in the chinery is a chinery in the chinery in th | tion, as no fitted and al Survey the full a Statement aues or co plicant ha | oted pred maintal of NSV pplication of Entoncerns as adequase of constant of c | eviously in ined with so and substitute raise. uately additioning and in and substitute raise. | uring daylight hour Table 3. uitable mufflers. Exploration & missions. Their al Effects for the ressed this matter. In that the mitigal |
| omment: | as outlined in Restricting day Ensuring all m To quantify this concerr Geoscience were asked response was: GSNSW has re above DA and all this therefore assumed These strategies can be measured and recommendation of the second that the | Table 3. ys of operate achinery is achinery is a confidence of the confidence of th | fion, as no fitted and al Survey the full a Statemen ues or co plicant ha by the u | oted pred maintal of NSV pplication of Enterns as adequate of the control of the | eviously in ined with so wironmentato raise. uately additioning and substitute in ine ine ine ine ine ine ine ine ine | uring daylight hour Table 3. suitable mufflers. Exploration & missions. Their al Effects for the ressed this matter. g in that the mitigatent of Environment |
| | as outlined in Restricting day Ensuring all m To quantify this concerr Geoscience were asked response was: GSNSW has re above DA and all this therefore assumed These strategies can be measured and recommendations. | Table 3. ys of operation operation of operation o | tion, as no fitted and al Survey the full a statement or complicant had by the uas statement of the qualification. | oted pred maintal of NSV pplication of Enterns as adequate of the control of the | eviously in ined with so wironmentato raise. uately additioning and substitute in ine ine ine ine ine ine ine ine ine | uring daylight hour Table 3. suitable mufflers. Exploration & missions. Their al Effects for the ressed this matter. g in that the mitigatent of Environment |
| | as outlined in Restricting day Ensuring all m To quantify this concerr Geoscience were asked response was: GSNSW has reabove DA and it is therefore assumed These strategies can be measures and recommendates are undertaken. Traffic & Road Safety The development and of | Table 3. ys of operation of the series general Table 3. ys of operation of the series general Table 3. Table 3. Table 3. Table 3. Table 3. Table 4. Table 4. Table 4. Table 4. Table 5. Table 6. Table 6. Table 6. Table 7. Table 7. | statement of the quality. The quality. The process of the quality. The quality. The quality. | oted pred maintal of NSV pplication of Entoncerns as adequate of certain the control of the certain of the cert | eviously in ined with so and substantially add onditioning the Statem so road safeter a concur | rang daylight hour Table 3. Euitable mufflers. Exploration & missions. Their al Effects for the ressed this matter. In in that the mitigate in that the mitigate in the fervironment of Environment of En |

- should be satisfied that the application has sufficiently explained the impacts of the development and justified all proposed mitigation measures.
- condition the maximum daily and hourly movements generated by the development.
- request an assessment of turn treatment warrants in accordance with the Austroads Guide to Traffic Management Part 6 and Austroads Guide to Road Design Part 4A for the site access, identifying the existence of the minimum basic turn treatments and addressing the need for any warranted higher order treatments.
- condition all redundant accesses to be legally and physically closed prior to commencement of use of the new access.
- prior to determination have strategic (2D) design drawings of all proposed improvements to public roads and the site access to mitigate the traffic and road safety impacts of the development.
- condition that a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) be developed addressing the construction, operation and decommission phases of the proposed development.
- consider the need for any regulatory signage (truck turning signs) and where necessary seek the endorsement of the Local Traffic Committee prior to Council approval the signage.
- any future roadwork on the classified (State) road will need to be designed and constructed in accordance with the current Austroads Guidelines, Australian Standards and TfNSW Supplements. The developer will be required to enter into a Works Authorisation Deed (WAD) with TfNSW for any roadwork deemed necessary on the classified (State) road. The developer will be responsible for all costs associated with the roadwork and administration for the WAD.

The above response was forwarded onto the developer who included additional information to address these issues in the revised Statement of Environmental Effects. Further the Engineering Assessment addressed these recommendations and the recommended conditions of development consent addressing these issues.

| Submission Maker: | Danielle Norton & Paul Chevrot – Objection Owners of Property Known as Mt Pleasant |
|------------------------|---|
| Issue: | Groundwater The potential impacts the proposed development could have on the aquifers in the region. |
| Comment: | Please see applicant response and comment above for James Norton. |
| Issue: | The SEE only briefly assessed the potential impacts of dust and noise using data taken from the Woolbrook weather station, a station that is 7.4km west of the proposed quarry site and over 200m lower in elevation. This data does not describe the wind conditions at the proposed site, nor does it indicate the likely impact of dust and noise that would be produced by the quarry. Any conclusions drawn from this data are therefore insufficient. |
| Comment: | See applicant response and comment above for Janet Norton. |
| Issue: | Project Duration and Size of Development The potential impacts of this proposed quarry development are unable to be assessed due to insufficient detail in relation to project duration (no end date), and size of development (depth of quarry, volume of aggregate to be extracted, and frequency of blasting etc). |
| Applicant Response: | See applicant response on soil profiling above for Janet Norton. Project Duration A specific end date for the operation of the quarry has not been proposed because: Rural quarries tend to have highly variable and sporadic rates of extraction. |

| | The actual end date will depend upon the rate of extraction of gravel/aggregate, which will vary from year to year, depending on demand. |
|------------------------|---|
| Comment: | Size of Development - Please see comment on soil profiling above for Janet Norton |
| | Project Duration – This is normal practice for the majority of quarries. |
| Issue: | Vague and Conceptual Information The limited information provided in the SEE is vague and 'conceptual' (using "ideal and best-case scenarios etc) which results in uncertainty as to what would actually come to pass (including the impact on our ground water and the noise and dus levels etc) should the quarry be allowed to be developed. |
| Comment: | The applicant was given the opportunity to address the issues contained within the submissions. This resulted in an expanded Statement of Environmental Effects. |
| Issue: | Impact on Proposed Future Development |
| | Have plans to further develop the business on the farm, all while respecting the food and fibre history of land use in the area. This may include truffle orchards grass fed pork, beekeeping, native tree plantations and foliage business, or woo fibre/yam production (or a combination of these). We are looking at a few possibilities but all these future plans are dependent on our secure and reliable aquifer fed bore watering system, and a dust free environment. Our plans also include on farm agritourism and/or eco-tourismwhich I would hope could delive benefits to the community with potential employment opportunities and additional tourism in the district. We fear that regular blasting and possible dust/noise pollution from a quarry are not favourable to developing a successful agritourism/eco-tourism business. |
| Comment: | This cannot be considered as part of this assessment. Development needs to be considered at the time of submission, and this is permissible development. If the developments as stated had been submitted and approved, the impact on that development could be assessed. Assessment cannot be made on proposed future development. |
| Issue: | Rural Land Character Conflict |
| | It is in conflict with the rural character of the land in the district. |
| Applicant Response: | APPENDIX A – Land Use Conflict Risk Assessment The aim of this Land Use Conflict Risk Assessment (LUCRA) is to identify and assess the potential for land use conflict issues and risk of occurrence before a proposed change in land use proceeds and disputes arise. LUCRA Process The approach taken in this LUCRA is based on the NSW DPI Land Use |
| | Conflict Risk Assessment Guide published in October 2011. This involved: gathering information about the site and locality; undertaking a site inspection; |
| | talking to neighbouring landholders within 1.5 kilometres of the proposed development site; undertaking a land use conflict risk assessment; and |
| | documenting strategies to reduce the risk or consequence of any conflicts. Recommended risk reduction strategies & performance targets |
| | In Table A3, a range of recommended management strategies and performance targets for the operation of the proposed Brooklyn Quarry are provided. These strategies are regarded as the most relevant to avoiding potential conflicts with neighbours and the public. Additional mitigation strategies are outlined in the section titled "4. Environmental Impact Mitigation" within the SEE. |
| | |

| | Table A3 – Recom | mended risk reduction stra | tegies & per | Tormance targets. | | |
|----------------------|--|---|---|---|--|--|
| | POTENTIAL CONFLICT | MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES | REVISED RISK RANKING | PERFORMANCE TARGET | | |
| | Noise from blasting | Do not blast during early moming, dusk or during temperature inversions. | (D 4) 5 | | | |
| | Dust from blasting | Ensure adequate depth & type of stemming in blast drill holes. | (D 4) 5 | | | |
| | Ground vibration from blasting | Dampening site to reduce dust, if dust issues arise. | (D 4) 5 | | | |
| | Flyrock from blasting | Provide "Highvale" property owner/manager with ≥ 48 hours notice of intended blasting dates and times. No blasting undertaken if any non-quarry person is present with a 500 metre radius of site. | (C4) 8 | No complaints to quarry operator, Council o Mines Inspectorate. | | |
| | Noise from excavation | Excavation only undertaken during daylight hours. | (D 4) 5 | | | |
| | Dust from excavation | Dampening site to reduce dust, if issues arise. | (D 4) 5 | | | |
| | Noise from transport | Haulage only undertaken during daylight hours. | (D 4) 5 | No complaints to quarr | | |
| | Dust from transport | Dampening access road, if dust issues arise. | (D 4) 5 | operator or Council | | |
| | | Ensure quarry related trucks are not over loaded or driven at excessive speed when entering the Oxley Highway. | | | | |
| | Traffic from transport | Maintain access drive way linking the Oxley Highway to the "Brooklyn" property with a firm all weather surface at same height as the highway. | (C 4) 8 | No complaints to quari operator, Council o NSW Roads & Maritim Services | | |
| | | Install & maintain quarry related signage requested by Council along the verge of the Oxley Highway. | | | | |
| | A2) provides a standard pr | tential conflict risk ranking for ructured assessment of the reeration. ks are typical for this type of arry manager and shotfirer velocities they are not appropriately manames are available to govern | nost likely co development ia the strate performand inaged, vario | enflict risks associated and can be manage gies listed in the table te targets" (Table A3 bus administrative an | | |
| Comment: | There will be no land use conflict if the strategies as listed in the SEE and relevan legislation are followed throughout the operation of the development. This will be conditioned. | | | | | |
| Issue: | Future Health Concerns Concerned for the health of the current and future occupants of the Mt Pleasant residents should this quarry development go ahead. | | | | | |
| Comment: | This is a personal and emotive comment. It cannot be taken into consideration as lacks a linkage to a planning merit that can be considered as part of this assessment. | | | | | |
| Submission Maker: | | n Planning - Objection rs and Occupiers of Property | Known as M | t Pleasant | | |
| Issue: | Aquifer Impact | t of the proposed quarry on lo | and nowlines | and the netential for | | |

this to have material adverse impacts on the reliable bore water that has continued to deliver good quality stock and domestic water to our clients' property (even during the drought) and adjacent properties in the locality Lack of test data for Aquifers Of perhaps most concern in this proposal, is the absence of any substantive test data on the presence (or otherwise) of aquifer(s) that could be at risk from the proposed quarrying operations......it fails to provide any adequate assessment of the groundwater and likely impacts associated with the proposal'. See applicant response and comment above for James Norton. Comment: Issue: DA should be refused The DA should be refused for the following key reasons: a) the proposed quarry will give rise to unacceptable adverse groundwater impacts, dust impacts, noise impacts and traffic safety impacts; the proposed quarry is not in the public interest; the DA is 'designated development' under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act); d) the DA contains insufficient information in relation to: extraction rates and area - there is uncertainty in relation to the maximum depth of the quarry and the lifespan of the quarry; ii. justification of the need for the proposed quarry - including the size and iii. quality of the basalt resource, market demand and alternative sites analysis: quantitative and qualitative impacts of groundwater impacts, dust impacts, İV. noise impacts and traffic safety impacts, and (iv) social and economic impacts in the locality. **Applicant** Please see applicant response above for James Norton. Response: b) Public interest This proposal has been developed on the basis that it should comply with all current land use planning standards and have no significant adverse impact on neighbours, the public the environment or public infrastructure. Mitigation measures have been also been proposed that are appropriate for the scale of the guarry and the context in which it will be located. The proponents believe that it is in the public interest that this development should proceed, given that it: Creates economic diversity via the establishment of a new extractive industry. Will reduce construction costs for local roads, buildings and infrastructure by enabling a local source of aggregate supply. Diversifies local employment opportunities. Creates additional local jobs. Reduces truck traffic on highways and regional roads to source aggregate and quarry products from elsewhere. It is quite unlikely to have any significant adverse impacts on the environment, neighbours, community or public infrastructure. designated development - SEE has shown that it will not exceed any local development standard that will turn the development into designated development. modified the SEE to ensure these issues were addressed. See applicant comment above for James Norton. Comment: The public interest is adequately dealt with by the applicant. This development is not designated development. There is enough information in the SEE to assess the application. Issue: Lack of Detail to SEE to determine resource Lack of geological investigations at the site and inadequate information provided by the Applicant on both the quantity of the purported basalt deposits as well as its quality.....the SEE does not sufficiently detail the quantity and quality of the

| | regarding the a | amount of cubi to the impacts | c meters to be extra of the proposal and | se ambiguity in the SEE acted further highlights the d the measures that would be | | |
|------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Comment: | | Size of Development - See applicant response and comment on soil profiling about for Janet Norton. | | | | |
| Issue: | property, Mour to attenuate no therefore great technical asses been provided | | | | | |
| Comment: | See applicant | response and | comment above for | r Janet Norton. | | |
| Issue: | The SEE sugg is economically safety impacts analysis has be not undertaker which would be | See applicant response and comment above for Janet Norton. Traffic safety and Consultation with TfNSW The SEE suggests that certain road safety upgrades will only occur once the quarry is economically viable (that exceeds 100,000 cubic metres). This approach to traffic safety impacts is not acceptable for a quarryNo adequate traffic safety analysis has been carried out by the applicantAdditionally, the Applicant has not undertaken any traffic surveys or provided a proposed traffic management plan, which would be necessary for a development of this nature. No consultation has been carried out with RMS even though the access road is a main road | | | | |
| Comment: | development. A copy of their | Transport for NSW (TfNSW) was consulted and are a concurrence authority for this development. This is due to the land fronting and accessing off the Oxley Highway A copy of their response is attached to this report. See applicant response and comment above for Janet Norton. | | | | |
| Issue: | economic bend quality of the r SEE to conside may arise from | alysis of this is efits — which a esource or ma er potential ao n the proposed of or impacts t | sue is limited to refi re not supported by irket demand in the lverse social and ed I quarry such as, ar | ierring to potential social and any empirical analysis of the areaThere is no attempt by the conomic impacts in the locality that mong other matters, sterilisation of a future land uses in the vicinity of | | |
| Applicant Response: | Rural Subs landh Economical In Initially direct e one full time e production. | negative social setting of the tantial distance tolers. mpact employment les equivalent posi | es between the qu vels at the quarry ar tion, per 5,000 loos | If Primary Production zone. arry and residences of neighbouring re expected to be in the vicinity of e cubic metres (LCM) of annual | | |
| | 1 | | ent employees (F1 | <i>E)</i> . | | |
| | ANNUAL PRODUCTION | | QUARRY FTE | | | |
| | LCM | tonnes | | | | |
| | 1,000 | 2,400 | 0.2 | | | |
| | 5,000 | 12,000 | 1 | | | |
| | 10,000 | 24,000 | 2 | | | |
| | 20,000 | 48,000 | 4 | | | |

| | 29,00 | 0 | 69,600 | 5 | | | | |
|------------------------|--|---|---|--|----------------------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| | Estimated | contra | | | | | | |
| | ANNUAL PRODUCT | F | | EXPLOSIVES USE | CRUSHING & SCREENING | TOTAL | | |
| | 3 | tonnes | | & TRANSPORT | | | | |
| | 1,000 | 2,400 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 10 | | |
| | 5,000 | 12,000 | 8 | 1,5 | 5 | 15 | | |
| | 10,000 | 24,000 | 12 | 3 | 10 | 25 | | |
| | 20,000 | 48,000 | 16 | 6 | 20 | 42 | | |
| | 29,000 | 69,600 | 20 | 9 | 30 | 59 | | |
| | construction For example are expect | n for a le, trans ed to be | ill substantially in any project require sport costs for a e reduced by mo | ing significant a ggregate used re than 80%. | mounts of aggr to manufacture | egate or road l | | |
| Comment: | The applic | ant has | adequately addr | essed both issu | Jes. | | | |
| | that extraction the potential or adverse | The SEE provides no comfort about the lifespan of the proposed quarry and no that extraction rates are likely to be highly variableThere is no consideration the potential adverse impacts of the sterilisation of the agricultural use of the law or adverse impacts to adjacent agricultural uses. | | | | | | |
| Comment: | See applic | ant resp | oonse and comm | ent above for N | Norton & Chevro | ot. | | |
| | assessme purposes o | The SEE's assessment of alternative sites is materially deficient. It is limited consideration of alternative sites within the "Brooklyn" property only. A property of alternative sites should not be limited in this manner for purposes of the EP&A Act. There is no consideration of alternative sites within locality, or analysis of the 'do nothing' scenario. | | | | | | |
| Applicant Response: | Several alternative sites were considered on the "Brooklyn" property but were rejected for one or more of the following reasons. • Resource deficiency - A significant volume of rock (ie >250,000 cub metres) with suitable engineering properties is required to enable the establishment of a viable aggregate quarry. Geological and geophysic observations indicate that other parts of the "Brooklyn" property law sufficient volumes of suitable rock. | | | | | | | |
| | • Highe veget as the • Topo more | er envii ation o ey have graphy cost ei | ntal values - Parts of the property with relatively intact nities and higher vegetation density have been avoided significant environmental values. blishing, operating and rehabilitating a quarry is typical on the side of a ridge or hill. Other parts of the "Brookly sidered and discarded on the basis that they had minima | | | | | |
| | or excessive slope. Consideration was given to establishing a quarry at various other sites within the Shire, but they were rejected for one or more reasons, including: | | | | | | | |
| | A lackNo evLikely | There were unrelated dwellings within 1 kilometre. A lack of reasonable proximity to Walcha township. No evidence of a significant volume of basalt rock. Likely access problems including public roads in poor condition and/or | | | | | | |
| | Highe outcre | located a significant distance from a public road. Higher environmental values with significant stands of native vegetation, rock outcrops or other factors. A "do nothing" scenario involves the quarry not proceeding which would involve | | | | | | |

| | various "opportunity costs", including losing a chance to: |
|----------|---|
| | Increase economic diversity via the establishment of a new extractive industry. Reduce construction costs for local roads, buildings and infrastructure by enabling a local source of aggregate supply. Diversify local employment opportunities. |
| | Create new local jobs. Enable a relatively isolated extractive industry proposal to proceed within a setting where it is quite unlikely to have any significant adverse impacts on the environment, neighbours, community or public infrastructure. |
| Comment: | The applicant has provided a comprehensive reply which addresses this issue. |
| Issue: | Weather Data Location Observations for wind speed and direction are provided from the Woolbrook weather station approximately 7km away. |
| Comment: | All weather data has been taken from the nearest weather station. It is considered that this location is adequate for this assessment. |
| Issue: | Dust There is potential for dust to adversely affect our clients' property because Mt Pleasant is located east by north east of the proposed quarry at a distance of around 1,500 metres. The Applicant has undertaken no adequate quantitative or qualitative analysis of dust impacts |
| | A new unsealed access road is proposed for hauling from the extraction site to the access road (Oxley Highway). It is proposed to employ four limited strategies to reduce dust generation including the use of a water cart during dry and windy conditions. However, higher traffic volumes during such conditions could generate quite a lot of dust and, as we have seen during recent drought conditions, water sources can be compromised such that no water is available for such purposes. This could lead to significant dust plumes being created and transported during dry and windy weather. |
| Comment: | See applicant response and comment above for Janet Norton. |
| Issue: | Noise No attempt has been in the SEE at undertaking quantitative or qualitative assessment of the likely noise impacts. Blasting and the use of rock crushing/processing equipment will generate significant noise. |
| Comment: | See applicant response and comment above for James Norton. |
| Issue: | Consultation No meaningful consultation with our client has occurred. |
| Comment: | The applicant is not legislatively required to consult with neighbours. Council did undertake neighbour notification as per the Walcha CPP and extended the time period for submissions as requested by this submission writer and Janet Norton. |
| | "Meaningful consultation" with neighbours does not mean they have to give their permission for the development. |
| Issue: | Mining SEPP 2007 Assessment No adequate assessment of impact on land uses has been undertaken for the purposes of the Mining SEPP 2007is materially deficient for the following key reasons: |
| | it fails to identify: 1. existing, approved and likely preferred land uses in the vicinity; 2. whether or not the development is likely to have a significant impact on the uses that, in the opinion of the consent authority having regard to land use trends, are likely to be the preferred uses of land in the vicinity of the development; |
| | 3. any ways in which the development may be incompatible with any of those existing, approved or likely preferred uses; fails to evaluate and compare the respective public benefits of the development |

| | and the land uses referred to above; and fails to put forward and evaluate any measures proposed to avoid or minimise any incompatibility. |
|----------------------|--|
| Comment: | Adequate assessment has been undertaken throughout the SEE. |
| Issue: | Legal Advice Sought Have sought legal advice form Gilbert + Tobin Lawyers with respect to the propos quarry. The advice provided has raised 2 key legal issues of concern for Council is assessment. |
| Issue: | DA not Designated Development That the DA is not a form of 'designated development' for the purpose of the EPA Act and the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000 (EPA Regulation). |
| Issue: | Application fails to provide sufficient information |
| | Gilbert + Tobin have separately advised that the development application, currently put to Council, fails to provide sufficient information on the nature of the proposed quarry and associated impacts Specifically, the proposal detailed in the SEE fails to provide sufficient information on how the proposal operate, and associated impacts, relating to: |
| | the quality and quantity of the basalt resource proposed to be extracted; extraction methods and processing; traffic; |
| | dust emissions; groundwater; and noise. |
| Comment: | The applicant has provided a comprehensive reply which addresses all issues as raised within the submissions, and has provided adequate information for an appropriate level of assessment to be undertaken. |
| Submission Maker: | Strathleigh Grazing Pty Ltd – Support |
| Issue: | Both Directors (Nathan Gilbody and John Boughton) have are in agreement with tinformation as provided by the applicant and support the development. |
| | Section 88b Instrument |
| Does Counc | il require a Section 88b instrument to be prepared? Yes □ No ▷ |
| | Public Interest |
| Does this pro | oposal have any construction or safety issues? Yes □ No ▷ |
| Is there any | public health issues? Yes □ No ▷ |
| Are there an | y other public interest issues? Yes □ No ▷ |
| | Site Suitability Section 4.15(1)(c) – EP & A Act |
| Is this a suita | able site for this development? Yes ⊠ No □ |
| | Assessing Officer General Comment |
| Comment: | There are no outstanding issues that cannot be dealt with by the use of appropriate conditioning. |
| | Recommendation |
| | |

This development application be approved subject to the following conditions:

Nil

GENERAL CONDITIONS

- 1. The development shall be implemented in accordance with:
 - (a) All documentation and correspondence submitted by the applicant, or their agents, in support of the Development Application,
 - (b) the details set out on the plans approved and stamped by authorised officers of Council, except as amended by the conditions of this development consent.

Note: Any proposal to modify the terms or conditions of this consent, whilst still maintaining substantially the same development to that approved, will require the submission of a formal application under Section 4.55 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 for Council's consideration. If amendments to the design result in the development not remaining substantially the same as that approved by this consent, a new development Application will have to be submitted to Council.

- A copy of all stamped approved plans, specifications and documents must be kept on site at all times so as to be readily available for perusal by any officer of Council or the Principal Certifying Authority.
- 3. All management recommendations contained within the Statement of Environmental Effects by Matthew Goodwin, Version 1.2 dated August 2020 are to be complied with.
- 4. Annual production from the quarry is not to exceed 29,000m³ per year of extractive materials. Any increase in production or alteration to operations is to be the subject of a further Development Application.
- 5. The total surface area of the quarry shall not exceed 2 hectares of land including clearing or excavating, roads; or storing or depositing overburden, extractive materials or tailings.
- 6. A contribution is to be paid to Council on a quarterly basis and will be subject to annual CPI adjustment. This is calculated at \$0.20 per tonne or \$0.60 per m³ of gravelled hauled from site. The proponent is responsible for the provision of an annual audited Statement of Compliance from a qualified auditor.
- 7. The applicant must keep a legible record of all complaints made to the developer or any employee or agent of the developer in relation to dust or any activity to which this development consent relates. The record must include details of the following:
 - a) the date and time of the complaint;
 - b) the method by which the complaint was made;
 - c) any personal details of the complainant which were provided by the complainant or, if no such details were provided, a note to that effect;
 - d) the nature of the complaint;
 - e) the action taken by the developer in relation to the complaint, including any follow-up contact with the complainant; and
 - f) if no action was taken by the quarry operator, the reasons why no action was taken.

The record of a complaint must be kept for at least three (3) years after the complaint was made. Records of complaints must be produced on demand to authorised officers of Council or State Government authorities.

- 8. The use and occupation of the site, including that of construction plant and equipment being installed thereon, shall not give rise to any offensive noise or vibration within the meaning of the *Protection of the Environment Operations Act, 1997.*
- 9. The rehabilitation of the site will be as per the approved rehabilitation plan including:
 - a) No external material will be brought to site for rehabilitation.
 - b) Topsoil will be stored within the bounds of the development and managed to maintain quarry hygiene with regard to environmental weed species.
- The applicant is to prepare a Quarry Management Plan for the site to summarise NSW Government legislative requirements, guidelines, and the conditions of this development consent. The Quarry Management Plan shall identify operational requirements relating to matters such as noise, water and erosion, air quality, vibration, access, traffic, transport, bushfires, hazardous

materials, noxious weeds, rehabilitation, land care, community relations, monitoring and auditing, and waste; including measures to mitigate any adverse impacts to the environment, nearby residents and road users. This plan is to be available upon request of Council, and any other relevant state agency.

- All erosion and sediment controls are to be designed and implemented in accordance with the publication *Managing Urban Stormwater, Soils and Construction, Volume 2E Mines and Quarries* published by the NSW Department of Environment and Climate Change in 2008.
- 12. Compliance with all requirements of the SafeWork NSW in relation to the transport, storage and handling of dangerous goods associated with the development is to be undertaken.
- 13. Compliance in relation to the *National Parks and Wildlife Act*, 1974 with regard to Aboriginal relics is to be ensured at all times.
- If any Aboriginal archaeological relics are found or uncovered during the course of the work, then all works shall cease immediately in that area and the applicant shall contact NSW Environment & Heritage, and Council. Depending on the possible significance of the relics, an archaeological assessment and an excavation permit under the *National Parks & Wildlife Act 1974* may be required before further works can be considered in that area.
- Signage will be required to be installed at the expense of the developer for the developer. The nature and location is to be approved by Council prior to installation and is to consist of:
 - One business identification sign,
 - A 24 hour emergency contact detail, and
 - Truck entering and exiting signage as required.
- Prior to quarry production commencing, a *Typical Rural Access Standards Articulated Driveways* access is to be constructed at the location at approximately 150m west of the existing access.
- Within 6 months of the facility producing 5,000m³ of quarry products from production commencing, the access is to be upgraded to a Basic Right Turn (BAR) intersection meeting AUSTROADS Part 4 of the Guide to Road Design (Austroads 2017a).
- The access is to be constructed at the expense of the developer prior to quarry production commencing, and is to be approved by Transport for NSW and Council. It is to:
 - a "Typical Rural Access Standards Articulated Driveways" access
 - be located approximately 150m west of the existing access
 - not block the existing table drain, in order to ensure this a reinforced concrete pipe must be provided.
 - the installed culvert must have a minimum diameter of 375mm, with sloped headwalls in order to facilitate the continued effective drainage of water.
 - water runoff from the access structure is to be directed away from the access into the table drain of the Oxley Highway.
 - be a sealed pavement surface from the boundary to the edge line of the Oxley Highway.
 - have no permanent objects installed that will inhibit sight distance.
 - have any disturbed ground or vegetation suitably reinstated.
- Within 6 months of the facility producing 5,000m3 of quarry products from production commencing, the access is to be upgraded to a Basic Right Turn (BAR) intersection meeting AUSTROADS Part 4 of the Guide to Road Design (Austroads 2017a).

CONDITIONS AS REQUESTED BY TRANSPORT FOR NSW

- 20. A Traffic Management Plan (TMP) be developed addressing the construction, operation and decommission phases of the proposed development. It is recommended that any TMP include a Driver Code of Conduct that includes;
 - A map of the primary haulage route/s highlighting critical locations.
 - Safety initiatives for impacts residential areas and/or school zones.
 - An induction process for vehicle operators and regular toolbox meetings.
 - A complaint resolution and disciplinary procedure.
 - Any community consultation measures proposed for peak periods.

- 21. The maximum daily traffic movements are to be undertaken as per the those contained within the Statement of Environmental Effects by Matthew Goodwin, Version 1.2 dated August 2020.
- 22. The existing access is to be closed prior to the commencement of the new access.

CONDITION AS REQUESTED BY GEOLOGICAL SURVEY OF nsw – MINING, EXPLORATION & GEOSCIENCE

A register of sales of aggregate is to be maintained to verifying quantities transported and to ensure annual reporting is met as per requirements of the NSW Resource Regulator.

CONDITIONS TO BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO OPERATION COMMENCING

- The site access is to be upgraded and maintained throughout the life of the quarry operation. The access must meet the required standard as approved by Council's Director of Engineering.
- Prior to commencement of any physical works within the road reserve of the Oxley Highway, approval is to be gained under S.138 of the *Roads Act 1993*.
- The applicant is to make contact with the local 'Inspector of Mines', NSW Department of Industry and Investment, Mine Safety Operations Branch, prior to the commencement of operations or activities at the guarry. This is to ensure registration through the NSW Resource Regulator.
- 27. Approval to carry out onsite sewer disposal work must be obtained, in accordance with section 68 of the *Local Government Act 1993*, before works commence.
- 28. Lot 103 DP753846, Lot 2 DP1173956, and, Lots 46 & 47 DP1082562 are to be consolidated a single lot to ensure the guarry is contained within a single lot.

CONDITIONS TO BE COMPLETED PRIOR TO SUBDIVISION COMMENCING

- 29. A Subdivision Certificate must be obtained, in accordance with cl.157 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000, before work commences.
- 30. A surveyor's plan must be submitted to Council prior to the expiry date of this development consent so that the subdivision certificate on the plan can be signed by an authorised officer.

CONDITIONS RELATING TO ONGOING OPERATIONS

- A further application is to be made for any change, enlargement or intensification of the land use, including the display / erection of any new structure such as signage, partition walls or building fit-out (unless the proposed work is exempt from the need for consent under State Environmental Planning Policy (Codes SEPP) 2008).
- 32. Whilst the quarry is not in operation the site access should be physically closed to restrict vehicle movements from the public.
- Trucks entering and leaving the premises that are carrying loads must be covered at all times, except during loading and unloading.
- All vehicles are to enter and leave the site in a forward direction with no tracking of materials onto Oxley Highway for the duration of quarry life.
- The hours of operation must be limited to 7.00am and 5.00pm, Monday to Friday and 8.00am to 1.00pm Saturday. No work is to be carried out on Sunday or public holidays.

COUNCIL ADVICE ONLY

- 36. Covenant/s: The applicant / owner has the responsibility of being aware of any covenant which may affect the proposal.
- Dial Before You Dig: Underground assets may exist in the area that is subject to your application. In the interests of health and safety and in order to protect damage to third party assets please contact Dial Before You Dig at www.1100.com.au or telephone on 1100 before excavating or erecting structures (This is the law in NSW). If alterations are required to the configuration, size, form or design of the development upon contacting the Dial Before You Dig service, an amendment to the development consent (or a new development application) may be necessary. Individuals owe asset owners a duty of care that must be observed when working in the vicinity of plant or assets. It is the individual's responsibility to anticipate and request the nominal location of

plant or assets on the relevant property via contacting the Dial Before You Dig service in advance of any construction or planning activities.

- Telecommunications Act 1997 (Commonwealth); Telstra (and its authorized contractors) are the only companies that are permitted to conduct works on Telstra's network and assets. Any person interfering with a facility or installation owned by Telstra is committing an offence under the Criminal Code Act 1995 (Cth) and is liable for prosecution. Furthermore, damage to Telstra's infrastructure may result in interruption to the provision of essential services and significant costs. If you are aware of any works or proposed works which may affect or impact on Telstra's assets in any way, you are required to contact: Telstra's Network Integrity Team on phone number 1800 810 443.
- 39. New residential development and significant dwelling alterations should provide measures such as self-closing doors, fencing and gates (to prevent children from entering the garage and driveway from the house.

Reasons For Conditions

- 1. To confirm and clarify the terms of Council's approval.
- To comply with all relevant legislation.
- 3. So that the impacts of any increase in the scale or duration of operations may be assessed and appropriately controlled. Section 19 (1) (b) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000*, as amended.
- 4. To prevent and/or minimise the likelihood of environmental harm and public nuisance.
- 5. To ensure the rehabilitation of the site.
- 6. To minimise the potential for adverse impacts on the environment or public as a result of the development.
- 7. To ensure waste is disposed of in an appropriate manner.
- 8. To ensure that public infrastructure is maintained.
- 9. To minimise the potential for detrimental impacts to buildings or neighbouring properties.

Conclusion

I confirm that I am familiar with the relevant heads of consideration under the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act and Local Government Act (if applicable) and have considered them in the assessment of this application.

I certify that I have no pecuniary or non-pecuniary interest in this application.

Additional Notes Attached

Yes ⊠ No □

- Engineering Assessment
- Aboriginal Heritage Information Management Search

Signed:

Clizabet Cumming

Elizabeth Cumming, Consultant Town Planner

Date: 11 April 2021

29 Gould Road, BONVILLE NSW 2450

23 November 2021

The General Manger Walcha Council P.O. Box 2 WALCHA N.S.W. 2354

RE. DEVELOPMENT CONSENT 10.2020.3 - BROOKLYN QUARRY

We are making application to modify development consent 10.2020.3 for the Brooklyn Quarry under sub-section 4.55(1A) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.

Sub-section 4.55(1A) provides that a consent authority (Council) may modify a development consent if it is satisfied that, amongst other things;

- (a) The proposed modification is of minimal environmental impact,
- (b) The development is substantially the same development as the development for which the consent was originally granted.

REQUESTED MODIFICATION (A) – Articulated Driveway

Existing Condition 17

17) Within 6 months of the facility producing 5,000m³ of quarry products from production commencing, the access is to be upgraded to a Basic Right Turn (BAR) intersection meeting AUSTROADS Part 4 of the Guide to Road Design (Austroads 2017a).

Issue

Based on our extensive recent consultations with staff of Transport for NSW (TfNSW), Council and road design consultants we expect that it will take a substantial period of time for the approval process for the "Basic Right Turn" process to be completed, including:

- Preparing preliminary designs, traffic management plan, environmental assessment and works authorisation applications.
- Have the preliminary documents reviewed by TfNSW and Council.
- Amend preliminary documents and seek a Works Authorisation Deed from TfNSW.

It has now also come to our attention that TfNSW requires a security bond that is 100% of the cost of the driveway upgrade. This is in addition to all work being undertaken at our cost. This security deposit will be held for 12 months after the completion of the driveway upgrade.

In recent months we have undertaken extensive planning for the commencement of drilling, blasting and crushing on the quarry site, including modelling:

- Drill hole depths, diameters and patterns.
- Bulk explosive transport requirements.
- Crusher flowchart, transportation, establishment, processing and expected yields of various aggregate sizes.
- Staffing arrangements.
- Indicative costs and income.

The modelling work has shown that it is not practical or economically viable to:

- 1. Drill, blast and crush less than 15,000 BCM (Bench Cubic Metres) at a time.
- 2. Fund the "Basic Right Turn" upgrade and security bond without significant prior sales of quarry product.

Requested Modified Condition 17

We request that Walcha Council modify development consent condition 17 so that an "Basic Right Turn" driveway is required to be completed within 12 months of production exceeding 15,000 bench cubic metres.

REQUESTED MODIFICATION (B) – Hours of Operation

Existing Condition 34

34) The hours of operation must be limited to 8.00am and 5.00pm Monday to Friday and no work is to be carried out on Saturdays, Sundays or public holidays.

Issue

The approved hours of operation (*condition 34*) are substantially different to those sought in the Statement of Environmental Effects (*Table 3, section 2.8, page 20*) lodged with the Development Application, as reproduced below.

Table 3 – Proposed maximum hours of operation.

| ACTIVITY | MON TO FRI | SAT & SUN | PUBLIC HOLIDAYS | | |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------------|-----------------|--|--|
| Blasting | 8:00 to 17:00 | No activity | No activity | | |
| Drilling, extraction & processing | | | | | |
| Loading trucks & product shipping | | Daylight hour | S | | |
| Maintenance | 24 h | nours per day, whe | n required | | |

Table 3 was reproduced in the April 2021 Extra Ordinary Council Meeting Business Paper (*Page 9*) and associated Development Assessment Report (*Council Meeting - Item 3.1 Attachments, page 43*) where Council considered the application. The Assessment Report recommended a Development Consent condition with reduced operating hours without analysis or any prior discussion with us.

It is our understanding that quarry operating hours in NSW are not subject to any mandatory restrictions or guidelines issues by NSW Planning Industry & Environment. Furthermore, operating hours are usually set by the Council through Development Consent conditions after appropriate consideration of the context and scale of the proposed quarry. Generally the most significant typical restrictions are that:

- Blasting is limited to 'business hours' on week days (eg 8:00 to 17:00).
- Noise producing activities are not permitted on Sundays, public holidays or outside daylight hours.

Overall the quarry cannot be operated on a practical or economically viable basis if operating hours remain restricted to those required under condition 34. Our ability to service customers would also be substantially impaired compared to similar quarries operating in the wider region.

Based on the assumption that Council would prefer reduced operating hours to those proposed in the initial application, we have reviewed Table 3 and submit an amended proposal below.

Item 6.2 - Attachment 2

Proposed Modified Condition 34

We request that Walcha Council modify development consent condition 34 to specify the following operating hours.

| ACTIVITY | MON TO SAT | SUN | PUBLIC HOLIDAYS |
|-----------------------------------|--|-------------|-----------------|
| Blasting | 8:00 to 17:00 | No activity | No activity |
| Drilling, extraction & processing | 7:00 to 19:00 | No activity | No activity |
| Loading trucks & shipping | 7:00 to 19:00 | | No activity |
| Maintenance | 24 hours per day, provided there is no significant noise at an unrelated dwelling. | | |

Conclusion

We are committed to complying with Council's conditions of development consent, but respectfully request the above modifications to enable the quarry to be operated in a more practical and financially viable manner.

Yours faithfully,

Scott Blake

Brian Blake