



Our reference: FIL07/10490-10, DOC12/47285
Contact: Samantha Wynn, 02 68 835 330

Team Leader Metropolitan and Regional Projects North
NSW Department Planning and Infrastructure
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Attention: Mr Ben Eveleigh

Dear Mr Gibson

I refer to the project application, Environmental Assessment (EA) and accompanying information provided for the proposed redevelopment of Dubbo Base Hospital – Stages 1 and 2 - received by the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) on 19 September 2012.

The EPA has reviewed the information in the EA and has determined that it is able to support the proposal subject to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure (DoP) seeking the important amendments to the conditions of consent, identified in **Attachment A** and subject to the proponent addressing the information requirements outlined below and in **Attachment B**. **Attachment B** also contains the EPA's assessment of the proposal, including justification for the amendments and request for additional information.

Hazardous Materials

The EPA notes that the site is contaminated with Asbestos. Appropriate disposal of all hazardous waste must be documented in the proposed Construction and Waste Management Plans.

Sediment, Erosion and Dust

The proponent and contractors should focus on achieving a high standard of sediment and erosion control for both pre and post construction activities. This should be addressed in all management and construction plans for the premises.

Drainage and Surface Water

All surface water on-site should be appropriately managed to ensure there are no offsite impacts and clearly mitigated and monitored during the project works.

Noise

Further assessment/information is required regarding the Noise Impact Assessment and impacts on local noise amenity.

It should be noted that adoption of the recommendations regarding the need for additional information are integral to the EPA's ongoing support for the proposal. The EPA recommends that the proponent be required to provide the additional information specified above relating to noise; and that the EPA is provided with a further opportunity to review this new information before the project proceeds to the determination stage.

The EPA would also appreciate receiving a copy of the submissions received by the DoP (or a report summarising these submissions) in response to the exhibition of the Environmental Assessment. This is to assist the EPA to review the draft Director-General's Report and to recommend additional conditions of approval, if required.

Should you have any further enquiries regarding this matter please contact Samantha Wynn at the Dubbo Office of the EPA by telephoning (02) 6883 5330.

Yours sincerely



13/11/12

BRADLEY TANSWELL
Acting Head Pesticides, Operations and Planning
Environment Protection Authority

Encl: Attachment A – Proposed Recommended Conditions of Consent

Attachment B - Assessment of the Proposal and Request for Additional Information

ATTACHMENT A

Proposed Recommended Conditions of Consent

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The EPA notes that the site is registered on Dubbo City Council's Contaminated Land Register; however, in this case, the EPA remains the Appropriate Regulatory Authority under the *Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997* as the works are being undertaken by a Public Authority and therefore provide the following comments regarding the disposal of asbestos contaminated material found at the site.

The EPA is aware that the premise has been contaminated by both friable and bonded asbestos due to previous dumping activities of building waste on-site. The EPA notes the presence of both bonded and friable asbestos in the existing maternity building scheduled for demolition as detailed in the EIS.

The EPA has reviewed the '*Hazardous Building Materials Assessment – Main Works*' report prepared by Douglas Partners (June 2012) and concurs that all material contaminated with asbestos that has been or will be excavated or disturbed during the works, be disposed of at a landfill that lawfully can receive such material and in accordance with Clause 42 of the *Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulation 2005*, WorkCover NSW and the National Occupational Health and Safety Commission's Code of Practice for the Safe Removal of Asbestos 2nd Edition.

The EPA recommends that the proponent discuss logistics around timing and volume of hazardous waste disposal with appropriate landfills to ensure they have sufficient capacity to cater for the proposed works. The EPA also recommends that records of disposal dockets for all excavated material should be kept and retained as proof that all material has been lawfully disposed.

The EPA also acknowledge the likelihood of the presence of Lead-based paints and electrical equipment containing Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCBs) as outlined in the EIS; and concur that appropriate storage and disposal mitigation measures will be utilised during the proposed works. The EPA advise that all waste must be appropriately classified in accordance with the EPA's Waste Classification Guidelines (DECCW, 2009) and disposed of at an appropriately licensed landfill.

The EPA would like to take this opportunity to reinforce the importance of proper care, handling and disposal of all hazardous waste. Clearly, it is critical that the health and safety of workers and the public are protected at all times and to ensure there are negligible impacts to the environment. The EPA concurs with the development of an Unexpected Finds Protocol (UFP) in construction management documents given the site history and contamination. The UFP should be utilised across all areas of the proposed works, including those areas that have not detected levels of concern such as the former coal bunker.

The EIS states that the contractor selected to carry out the works will be responsible for managing construction waste. The EPA concurs with the *Preliminary Construction Waste Management Plan (CWMP)* and acknowledges that this will be finalised prior to commencement of works with the contractor. The EPA recommends that the information outlined above is addresses in the CWMP, together with all WorkCover requirements in relation to the protection of the health and safety of workers and the public.

The EPA recommends that the DoP incorporate a condition of consent requiring that the proponent address the issues above via preparation of a UFP and CWMP.

SEDIMENT, EROSION AND DUST

The EPA recommends that the proponent and contractors focus on achieving a high standard of sediment and erosion control for both pre and post construction activities.

The EPA concurs with the Erosion and Sediment Control Plans prepared by the Enstruct Group. The proponent, or any contractor engaged by the proponent, should develop and implement the proposal in accordance with relevant guidelines such as the EPA endorsed publication "Soils and Construction, Volume 1, 4th Edition," March 2004 by Landcom to reduce any inadvertent impacts from the proposal.

The proponent and all contractors should take all appropriate steps to ensure that sediment is controlled on site, and that no off-site impacts occur to the surrounding environment. The EPA recommends regular inspection of sediment traps and diversion structures on site during works.

The EA notes that the management of dust prevention is to 'be developed by the head contractor and agreed to by the project stakeholder', and that the proposed earthworks are likely to result in some dust generation. Dust is to be mitigated by the use of water spraying, covering of loads and monitoring of weather patterns.

The EPA recommends that the proponent pre-determine the trigger levels relating to the requirements of surface spraying and weather related mitigation measures, the measures to be implemented with each trigger, the expected outcomes, and evaluation protocol to ensure that mitigation of dust impacts is measurable and enforceable. All measures should be taken to ensure dust is managed onsite and from impacting nearby residents.

DRAINAGE AND SURFACE WATER

The EA notes that the stormwater infrastructure will be designed to cater for stormwater run-off up to 20 years design capacity, and that the Stormwater Design Statement prepared by Enstruct Group confirms that earlier works at the site has adequate stormwater capacity and infrastructure to cater for the proposed development in accordance with DGRs.

The EPA notes that an onsite wash bay will be utilised during the works. Surface water run off from all wash down areas should also be addressed in all Construction Management Plans.

The EPA recommends that the DoP incorporate a condition of consent requiring the proponent to prepare a detailed Stormwater Management Plan, Air Quality Management Plan and Construction Management Plan to address issues identified above.

ATTACHMENT B

Assessment of the Proposal and Request for Additional Information

NOISE

The EPA has reviewed the '*Dubbo Base Hospital Redevelopment - Acoustic Assessment*' (AA) prepared by Norman Disney & Young dated 11 July 2012 (Revision 3.0). This report forms part of the Review of Environmental Factors (REF) for the project prepared by JBA Urban Planning Consultants dated July 2012 (Ref. 12151).

In summary, the EPA considers that the AA and REF are not adequate for the reasons outlined below:

- Noise monitoring was carried out at only one location, shown in Figure 3-1 of the AA and on the hospital site. The resulting unattended noise monitoring results presented in Table 4-1 and Appendix A of the AA may be influenced by existing noise from the hospital operations. No operator-attended noise monitoring results are provided to gauge the existing level of noise from the subject site, any other existing industrial noise, and any other extraneous noise. The NSW Industrial Noise Policy Application Note titled 'Noise impact assessment for the modification of existing industrial premises' clearly states that noise from the existing premises should be excluded when quantifying background and existing industrial noise levels.
- Ordinarily, background noise levels would be measured in the vicinity of the surrounding sensitive receivers (eg. residences along Leonard Street and Morgan Street, etc.) rather than within the subject site. The EPA considers that the results from the noise logger location may not be adequately representative of these two (possibly different) noise environments.
- The EPA considers that additional monitoring should be carried out and presented to accurately quantify the existing noise environment at the sensitive receivers, excluding existing noise from the subject development, to determine appropriate project specific noise levels for the assessment.

The EPA would like to provide the following additional minor comments outlined below:

- The EPA notes that there is an existing child minding centre and doctor's accommodation on the site, as shown in Figure 3-2 of the AA. The EPA would typically not consider noise and vibration impacts from demolition, construction and operation to sensitive receivers such as these that are associated with a development. In this case, the EPA assumes that the proponent has considered these potential impacts and has taken adequate and appropriate measures to address them.
- The NSW Road Noise Policy should be included in Section 2.3 of the AA as a reference.
- Section 5.5.1 of the AA states that the development areas do not require a rail noise and vibration assessment due to significant offset distances. The Mental Health Unit site marked in Figure 3-1 is not discussed in this context, and appears close enough to the rail line to require assessment. This should be addressed in the AA.
- Section 6.3 of the AA presents a noise wall design to mitigate noise impacts from the revised car park arrangement. It appears to the EPA that the noise wall design may not sufficiently shield residences on the northern part of Leonard Street. An additional

length of noise wall extending west from the northern end of the designed wall, for the width of the car park, could assist in this regard, if required. Alternatively, the AA should explicitly show that all residences to the east of the development (including the full length of Leonard Street) are adequately protected by the noise wall shown in the AA.

- The noise management levels (NMLs) for residences in Table 7-2 of the AA should be revised, if necessary, to account for the results of any additional noise monitoring.
- The NML for offices in Table 7-3 of the AA should be 70 dBA.
- Table 9-1 of the AA lists the use of a 815 [vibratory?] compactor during construction works, however no sound power levels are shown for this item in Table 9-2, and no safe working distances with respect to vibration are shown in Section 10.2 of the AA.
- The AA predicts significant exceedances of the NMLs for some activities, with some receivers being highly noise affected during the earthworks stage. Noise control measures for highly affected receivers in Section 9.4 of the AA should include the provision of respite periods if appropriate, as well as individual consultation with affected parties.
- The measured noise level chart in Appendix A is difficult to read and should ideally be presented in a day to a page format to facilitate easier review.

The EPA recommends that the DoP request the proponent to address the inadequacies outlined above in relation to potential noise impacts on the surrounding environment.