

## Comments on Sydney Fish Markets Environmental Impact Statement

- SSD 8924 (Concept and stage 1)
- SSD 8925 (Stage 2 main works)

Comments prepared by Sydney Local Health District Public Health Unit

Page Number/Section	Comments/Recommendations
Appendix 4 Environmental Site Assessment: Page 39/6.3 potential and complete exposure pathways	We note that there may be a surface water feature or pool in place in the south-eastern portion of the site. It is noted that it is unclear if the pool will be lined as such that there will be no direct contact exposures to soils/sediments, and also if swimming will be permitted in this area. The report states that the only potential human health exposure pathways for commercial users of the site will comprise of inhalation (gas/vapour) pathways (p40), whereas on p39 it is stated all results identified below the adopted criteria under a recreational use scenario – would this include ingestion of water/sediment and dermal exposure? Not much information is given about this specific scenario. Should a pool/recreational water area be built, exploring this scenario in more detail is recommended. Further, it is important to keep in mind that splash parks and pools have to follow the relevant NSW Health guidelines: <a href="https://www.health.nsw.gov.au/environment/publicpools/Pages/default.aspx">https://www.health.nsw.gov.au/environment/publicpools/Pages/default.aspx</a> Further, the chemical risk assessment in this appendix does not mention dioxins, a well-known contaminant of Sydney Harbour. It is unclear whether dioxins have been included in one of the chemical groups tested.
Appendix 18 Air Quality Stage 1: Page 13/1.3 Sensitive Receptors	In order to categorise the sensitivity of an area to dust soiling effects, only the closest building corner Wentworth Park Rd and Bridge Rd has been taken into account. It is unclear whether this is the only residential building within <50m of the building site? Please clarify.
Appendix 18 Air Quality Stage 1: Page 33/ 3.2.4 Risk Assessment	The second paragraph states there is a ' <b>low risk</b> ' of adverse dust soiling and human health impacts – however Table 9 states the preliminary risk for both demolition and earthworks is classified as ' <b>medium risk</b> '. Please explain these discrepancies.
Appendix 18 Air Quality Stage 1: Page 35/ 3.2.6 Residual Impacts	Table 11 describes the residual impacts from earthworks and construction will be ' <b>low risk</b> '. In the paragraph below the table, the residual impacts post mitigation however is described as anticipated to be ' <b>negligible</b> '. Please explain these discrepancies.
Appendix 18 Air Quality Stage 2: Page 44/6.2.1	The nearest existing residential receptor has been identified as being located approximately 50m of the project site boundary, at the corner of Bridge Rd and Wentworth Park Rd. Are there any other sensitive receptors within 350m from the boundary of the site and within 500m from the site entrance? Please clarify.
Appendix 18 Air Quality Stage 2: Page	The risk assessment of odour impacts has been assessed as intermediate significance for cooking, intermediate to minor significance for handling/processing and storage of seafood and waste, intermediate

Page Number/ Section	Comments/Recommendations
51-54	significance for polystyrene recycling, and also intermediate significance for the wastewater treatment plant on site. In order to further reduce the impact of odours from all these sources, we strongly suggest additional mitigation measures be put in place to reduce or remove these impacts as discussed in section 7.4.
Appendix 19 Noise Impact Assessment: Page 33 including Table 17	Noise levels associated with construction are predicted to exceed NMLs for some nearby sensitive receivers including residences and commercial premises in NCA3, and a school and commercial premises in NCA4. It is appreciated, as outlined in Appendix 19, that the exceedances are modelled on the predicted worst case noise production on the most impacted receivers in each area, and that it is likely that these levels are expected to only be reached for a small number of short periods within the construction period. However, given that the predicted worst case construction noise is anticipated to exceed the “highly noise affected” NML of 75dB for the worst impacted residential receivers in NCA3, and that the predicted exceedances in NCA4 include a school, it is important that all feasible and reasonable noise mitigation strategies are applied to minimise the risk of adverse health impacts to sensitive people from excessive noise.
Appendix 19 Noise Impact Assessment: General comment - Operation	It is predicted that residences at 84 Wentworth Park Road will experience residual operational noise exceedances from the loading docks (and associated trucks) of up to 4dB at night even when accounting for the effect of noise mitigation strategies at the noise source. Elevated operational industrial night noise has the potential to chronically affect sleep. Therefore, as identified in Appendix 19, it is critical that the proponent work with residents of 84 Wentworth Park Road and investigate the current noise abatement features of the residences, with a potential view to additional noise mitigation treatment being applied to the building as required.
Appendix 19 Noise Impact Assessment: Page 28 Table 14 and Page 41 Table 22	The project noise trigger daytime noise trigger level for “Corner of Wentworth Park and Bridge Road, Glebe” (84 Wentworth Park Road) is listed at 59dB in Table 14 but 63dB in Table 22. This should to be reconciled or clarified. Also in the text below Table 22 it states that there was a minor exceedance of the PNTL at the nearest receiver in the NCA4 during the night-time assessment period, however in Table 44 there is no exceedance.
Appendix 19 Noise Impact Assessment: Page 22 Table 9	The results of the LO4 logger near the corner of Bridge Road and Wattle Street have been used as representative of 84 Wentworth Park Road as they are both on Bridge Road. As 84 Wentworth Park Road is predicted to be the most severely impacted sensitive receptor during both construction and operation of this project, we recommend considering collection of baseline noise measurements from that actual address. Accurate data for the address will increase the accuracy of noise exceedance predictions, and maximise the chances of successfully mitigating noise impacts from the project on that address.
EIS P165/6.12 Impacts on Water-Quality	We support the proponent’s aim to include water sensitive urban design features within this project, including bioretention systems. However, if not managed correctly, such features can become a habitat for mosquitoes and could increase the potential for mosquito-borne disease. We therefore recommend the proponent considers strategies to reduce, control and monitor potential mosquito breeding habitats when planning these features.