Appendix A

Consideration of Clause 228(2) Factors and Matters of National Environmental Significance

Clause 228(2) Checklist

The following factors listed in clause 228(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000, have also been considered to assess the likely impacts of the proposal on the natural and built environment.

Factor	Impact
a. Any environmental impact on a community?	
The proposal would generate minor construction noise which would impact the local community	Minor short term negative impact
The proposal would activate the Bungarribee Precinct of the Western Sydney Parklands in accordance with the Plan of Management for the Parklands, through the provision of a major tourist attraction	Major long term positive impact
The proposal would increase the availability of tourist and recreational facilities situated within the wider western Sydney area	Major long term positive impact
b. Any transformation of a locality?	
During construction the proposal would involve the use of construction equipment, fences and establishment of a site compound.	Minor short term negative impact
The proposal would involve bulk earthworks and construction of new buildings and structures in a generally sparse and vacant parcel of land. The proposal would result in the provision of a new tourist attraction within the Bungarribee Precinct of the Western Sydney Parklands.	Long term positive impact
c. Any environmental impact on the ecosystems of the locality?	
The proposal is in a generally sparse biodiversity area, with the design of the proposed Zoo taking into consideration the retention of areas of biological significance where possible. Management and mitigation measures would be implemented to protect water and air quality during construction. The proposal is not expected to have any impact on the ecosystems of the locality.	Nil
d. Any reduction of the aesthetic, recreational, scientific or other environmental quality or value of a locality?	
During construction the proposal would involve the use of construction equipment, fences and establishment of a site compound.	Minor short term negative impact
The proposal would not reduce the aesthetic, recreational, scientific or other environmental quality or value of a locality. The proposal seeks to implement landscaping works that are contiguous with the existing environment to ensure the landscape character and visual amenity of the area is minimally affected.	Moderate long term neutral impact
e. Any effect on a locality, place or building having aesthetic, anthropological, archaeological, architectural, cultural, historical, scientific or social significance or other special value for present or future generations?	
There are no items of heritage significance identified within the site as outlined in the heritage assessment contained with the main EIS report and the relevant appendices.	Nil
f. Any impact on the habitat of protected fauna (within the meaning of the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974*)?	
The proposal will not impact on the habitat of protected fauna.	Nil
g. Any endangering of any species of animal, plant or other form of life, whether living on land, in water or in the air?	
The proposal will not endanger any species of plant, animal or other form of life.	Nil
h. Any long-term effects on the environment?	
The proposal will not have a long-term impact on the environment.	Nil
i. Any degradation of the quality of the environment?	
The proposal would not degrade the site or its surrounds but would improve the quality of the environment. While the construction of buildings and other structures on the site would introduce impermeable areas, the proposed landscaping will provide more vegetation than is currently present on the site, thereby improving the biodiversity values of the site.	Moderate long term positive impact

Factor	Impact
j. Any risk to the safety of the environment?	
During construction there would be potential for accidental spills.	Minor short term negative impacts
k. Any reduction in the range of beneficial uses of the environment?	
The operation of the proposal would not alter the potential for the environment to be utilised but would improve the local area through the introduction of a tourist attraction into the area in accordance with the wider Plan of Management.	Major long term positive impact
l. Any pollution of the environment?	
Accidental spills during construction and operation of the proposal may result in pollution of the environment. Appropriate mitigation measures identified in the EIS would be implemented to minimise the potential for this impact.	Minor short term negative impact
m. Any environmental problems associated with the disposal of waste?	
All waste including from construction and operation would be managed and disposed of in accordance with the *Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Act 2001*. The *OEH Waste Classification Guidelines 2008* would be used to classify the different types of waste.	Long term moderate negative impacts
n. Any increased demands on resources (natural or otherwise) that are, or are likely to become, in short supply?	
The proposal would not greatly increase the demands on resources for natural or otherwise that are likely to become in short supply. All resources required are readily available.	Nil
o. Any cumulative environmental effect with other existing or likely future activities?	
The proposed Zoo will introduce positive socioeconomic outcomes into the area through the provision of a new tourist attraction for western Sydney.	Long term moderate positive effect
p. Any impact on coastal processes and coastal hazards, including those under projected climate change conditions?	
The proposal would have no significant impact on coastal processes or hazards, under present or projected conditions.	Nil

Matters of National Environmental Significance

Under the environmental assessment provisions of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*, the following matters of national environmental significance and impacts on Commonwealth land are required to be considered to assist in determining whether the proposal should be referred to the Australian Government Department of Sustainability, Environment, Water, Population and Communities.

Factor	Impact
a. Any impact on a World Heritage property?	
The proposal would have no impact on a world Heritage property.	Nil
b. Any impact on a National Heritage place?	
The proposed will have no impact on a National Heritage place.	Nil
c. Any impact on a wetland of international importance?	
The proposal would have no impact on a wetland of international importance.	Nil
d. Any impact on a listed threatened species or communities?	
The proposal would have no impact on any threatened species or communities.	Nil
e. Any impacts on listed migratory species?	
The proposal would have no impact on listed migratory species.	Nil
f. Any impact on a Commonwealth marine area?	
The proposal would have no impact on a Commonwealth marine area.	Nil
g. Does the proposal involve a nuclear action (including uranium mining)?	
The proposal does not involve a nuclear action.	Nil
Additionally, any impact (direct or indirect) on Commonwealth land?	
There is one notice of Commonwealth land within a 10km buffer of the study area. The proposal does not have a direct or indirect impact on this land.	Nil