

Mr Adam O'Connor
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO BOX 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Mr O'Connor

SSD 8640 – PICTON HIGH SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT – ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT (EIS)

I am writing to you in reply to Mr Beattie's invitation to the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) to make a submission concerning the above project EIS.

The EPA requests that the submission at Attachment A be read in conjunction with its letter dated 4 August 2017 in respect of the draft Secretary's environmental assessment requirements for the project.

The EPA emphasises that it does not review or endorse environmental management plans or the like for reasons of maintaining regulatory 'arm's length', hence, the EPA has not reviewed any environmental management plan forming part of or referred to in the EIS.

The EPA further notes that the development includes demolition of existing structures, infrastructure and underground services, and construction of new buildings.

The EPA has identified the following site specific concerns based on the project information available on the Department of Planning and Environment major projects web site:

- (a) the need for a detailed assessment of potential site contamination, including information about groundwater and a detailed assessment of the footprint and surrounds of existing buildings following their demolition;
- (b) construction phase noise and vibration impacts (including recommended standard construction hours and intra-day respite periods for highly intrusive noise generating work) on noise sensitive receivers such as surrounding residences;
- (c) construction phase dust control and management;
- (d) construction phase erosion and sediment control and management;

- (e) operational noise impacts on noise sensitive receivers (especially surrounding residences on adjoining and adjacent holdings) arising from operational activities such as public address/school bell systems, community use of school facilities, waste collection services and mechanical services (especially air conditioning plant);
- (f) the need to assess feasible and reasonable noise mitigation and management measures (including time restrictions on the use of the facilities proposed to be available for community use) to minimise operational noise impacts on surrounding residences;
- (g) the need to prevent pollution of waters, especially Stonequarry Creek (a tributary of the Nepean River);
- (h) the need to properly manage pesticides use, especially in the proposed 'agricultural field' within the school grounds;
- (i) the need to prevent odour emissions, particularly in relation to agriculture zone and grounds maintenance activities;
- (j) practical opportunities to implement water sensitive urban design principles, including stormwater re-use; and
- (k) practical opportunities to minimise consumption of energy generated from non-renewable sources and to implement effective energy efficiency measures.

Should you require clarification of any of the above please contact John Goodwin on 9995 6838.

Yours sincerely



SARAH THOMSON
Unit Head, Metropolitan Infrastructure
NSW Environment Protection Authority

Attachment A

Contact officer: JOHN GOODWIN

ATTACHMENT A

- ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY COMMENTS –

PICTON HIGH SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

1. General

The EPA considers that the project comprises distinct phases of construction and operation and has set out its comments on that basis.

The EPA notes the proximity of surrounding residences which may be adversely affected by noise impacts during demolition, site preparation, construction and operation phases of the project.

2. Construction phase

The EPA anticipates that site establishment, demolition, bulk earthworks, construction and construction-related activities will be undertaken in an environmentally responsible manner with particular emphasis on –

- the site contamination remediation action plan accompanying the EIS,
- compliance with recommended standard construction hours,
- intra-day respite periods from high noise generating construction activities (including jack hammering, rock breaking, pile boring or driving, saw cutting),
- feasible and reasonable noise and vibration minimisation and mitigation,
- effective dust control and management,
- erosion and sediment control, and
- waste handling and management, particularly concrete waste and rinse water.

2.1 Site contamination (incl. hazardous materials)

The EPA notes the location of the development site adjacent to a former section of the Hume Highway and the age of some of the structures. EIS Appendix V reports on a hazardous building materials survey which confirms the presence of asbestos cement sheeting, lead contaminated dust in ceiling voids, and the likely presence of lead-based paint and PCBs (in light fittings) in buildings identified for demolition. Accordingly, the EPA anticipates a detailed site investigation would be undertaken within the footprint and the immediate surrounds of structures demolished during the re-development.

2.1.1 *Site contamination assessment*

EIS Appendices J, U and W report various site investigations with Appendices J and U being of limited scope. For instance, Appendix J reports a preliminary assessment of 650 square metres of the 24,000 square metre development site.

The EPA notes that -

- (a) until existing structures, infrastructure and underground utilities are demolished and removed from the site, a detailed assessment of the nature and extent of site contamination is impracticable,

- (b) soil samples were only collected from 18 boreholes which is considered inadequate for proper assessment of the 24,000 square metre development site for which the Sampling Design Guidelines (NSW EPA, 1995) recommends a minimum of 30 to 35 sample locations,
- (c) although drawings appear to indicate significant excavation to accommodate lower ground floor levels, only shallow soil samples have been collected thus necessitating the need for deeper sampling to discount any potential for vapour intrusion,
- (d) the proponent has not provided adequate justification for not investigating groundwater contamination, albeit that groundwater was not encountered in the shallow boreholes (i.e. less than 2 metres),
- (e) the site has been filled at various times,
- (f) the site was previously used for agricultural purposes which is likely to have included pesticides use, and
- (g) the development site includes an existing 'agriculture zone' in association with which there is potential to be soil contamination arising from the storage, mixing or application of pesticides.

Accordingly, the EPA considers a more detailed site investigation is required to address those areas of the development site not yet fully investigated.

Recommendations

1. The proponent be required to ensure that following relocation or demolition of any existing structures, infrastructure and in ground utilities, further investigation be undertaken of soil contamination (including within the footprint and immediate surrounds of those structures, infrastructure and utilities prior to undertaking any construction) to address the contamination with proper regard to the -
 - (i) NSW EPA Sampling Design Guidelines
 - (ii) Guidelines for the NSW Site Auditor Scheme (3rd edition) 2017
 - (iii) Guidelines for Consultants Reporting on Contaminated Sites, 2011
 - (iv) The National Environment Protection (Assessment of Contamination) Measure.
2. The proponent should comply with the processes outlined in *State Environmental Planning Policy 55 - Remediation of Land (SEPP55)* when assessing the suitability of the land and any remediation required in relation to the proposed sensitive use.
3. The proponent be required (prior to commencing any work on the development site) to prepare and implement a procedure for identifying and dealing with unexpected finds of site contamination (including asbestos containing materials, lead contaminated dust and soil, lead-based paint and PCBs). That procedure should include details of who will be responsible for implementing the unexpected finds procedure and the roles and responsibilities of all parties involved.
4. The proponent be required to:
 - (a) engage a site auditor accredited under the *Contaminated Land Management Act 1997* (CLM Act) to review the adequacy of the site investigations, unexpected finds protocol, any

remedial works or management plan required and to confirm the suitability of the land for the proposed use;

- (b) implement the recommendations of the Remedial Action Plan as reviewed by the accredited site auditor;
- (c) prepare an Asbestos and Lead Works Management Plan (ALWMP) that includes stringent requirements for controlling dust emissions in the development site so as not to affect the adjoining land with ALWMP reviewed and signed off as appropriate by an accredited site auditor;
- (d) provide a site audit statement (SAS) and accompanying site audit report (SAR) prepared following completion of remediation and validation, certifying suitability of the development site for the proposed use prior to undertaking any construction;
- (e) ensure that any contamination identified as meeting the trigger in the EPA '*Guidelines for the Duty to Report Contamination*' is notified in accordance with requirements of section 60 of the CLM Act;
- (f) ensure the proposed development does not result in a change of risk in relation to any pre-existing contamination on the site so as to result in significant contamination.

Note: The EPA requires all reports submitted to the EPA to comply with the requirements of the CLM Act to be prepared, or reviewed and approved, by a certified consultant.

2.1.2 Asbestos waste

Since late 2015, clause 79 of the Waste Regulation has required transporters of loads of asbestos waste to provide certain details of the loads to the EPA using the "WasteLocate" system. These details include details of the source site, date of proposed transport, details of the proposed destination site and the approximate weight of asbestos waste in the load. The information must be provided to the EPA before transportation of the load commences.

WasteLocate is an online tool that allows the EPA to track the transport of asbestos waste. Transporters are required to use WasteLocate to report the movement of more than 100 kilograms of asbestos waste or more than 10 square metres of asbestos sheeting within NSW. The details can be reported on WasteLocate by using an app on a mobile phone or tablet or by using a computer.

Recommendation

1. The proponent be required to satisfy the requirements of the Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulation 2014 with particular reference to Part 7 'asbestos wastes'.

Note: The EPA provides additional guidance material at its web-site

<http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/waste/asbestos/index.htm>.

2. The proponent be required to consult with Safework NSW concerning the handling of any asbestos waste that may be encountered during the project.

2.1.3 Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) materials and waste

EIS Appendix V indicates that the likely presence of PCBs associated with electrical fittings and equipment in structures proposed for demolition. The *Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) Chemical Control Order 1997* sets out requirements for managing PCB materials and wastes, including activities such as processing, storage, transport, and disposal. The Control Order is made under

the *Environmentally Hazardous Chemicals Act 1985*. The proponent may readily obtain a copy of the Order on the EPA web site via the following link –

<https://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/your-environment/chemicals/chemical-control-orders>

Recommendation

The proponent be required to ensure that any PCB material or waste kept on the development site –

- (a) is stored and handled in accordance with the *Polychlorinated Biphenyl (PCB) Chemical Control Order 1997*, and
- (b) is assessed, classified and managed in accordance with the EPA “*Waste Classification Guidelines Part 1: Classifying Waste*” November 2014 and the 2016 Addendum thereto.

2.2 Noise and vibration

The EPA anticipates that demolition, site preparation (including tree clearing), bulk earthworks, construction and construction-related activities are likely to have significant noise and vibration impacts on surrounding residences, especially adjoining residences.

2.2.1 *General construction hours*

The EPA emphasises that demolition, site preparation, bulk earthworks, construction and construction-related activities should be undertaken during the recommended standard construction hours.

The EPA further emphasises that the proponent is a ‘public authority’ within the meaning of the *Protection of the Environment Administration Act 1991*. Further, that the EPA has general responsibility under that Act for amongst other things:

- (a) ensuring that the best practicable measures are taken for environment protection in accordance with the environment protection legislation and other legislation, and
- (b) coordinating the activities of all public authorities in respect of those measures.

Table 1 to the EPA’s Interim Construction Noise Guideline (ICNG) clearly identifies the best practicable measures in respect of the recommended standard hours of construction (absent strong justification for alternative hours in the particular case). However, section 4.13 of the EIS proposes Saturday construction hours (i.e. between 1.00 pm and 4.00 pm) that are inconsistent with the standard construction hours recommended in Table 1 to the ICNG.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to ensure that as far as practicable all demolition, site preparation, bulk earthworks, construction and construction-related activities likely to be audible at any noise sensitive receivers such as surrounding residences are only undertaken during the standard construction hours, being:

- (a) 7.00 am to 6.00 pm Monday to Friday,
- (b) 8.00 am to 1.00 pm Saturday, and
- (c) no work on Sundays or gazetted public holidays.

2.2.2 Intra-day respite periods

The EPA anticipates that those demolition, site preparation, bulk earthworks, construction and construction-related activities generating noise with particularly annoying or intrusive characteristics (such as those identified as particularly annoying in section 4.5 of the ICNG) would be subject to a regime of intra-day respite periods where –

- (a) they are only undertaken after 8.00 am,
- (b) they are only undertaken over continuous periods not exceeding 3 hours with at least a 1 hour respite every three hours, and.
- (c) ‘continuous’ means any period during which there is less than an uninterrupted 60 minute respite between temporarily halting and recommencing any of the intrusive and annoying work referred to in section 4.5 of the ICNG

The EPA emphasises that intra-day respite periods are not proposed to apply to those demolition, site preparation, bulk earthworks, construction and construction-related activities that do not generate noise with particularly annoying or intrusive characteristics.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to schedule intra-day ‘respite periods’ for construction activities identified in section 4.5 of the Interim Construction Noise Guideline as being particularly annoying to noise sensitive receivers, including surrounding residents.

2.2.3 Idling and queuing construction vehicles

The EPA is aware from previous major infrastructure projects that community concerns are likely to arise from noise impacts associated with the early arrival and idling of construction vehicles (including concrete agitator trucks) at the development site and in the residential precincts surrounding that site.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to ensure construction vehicles (including concrete agitator trucks) involved in demolition, site preparation, bulk earthworks, construction and construction-related activities do not arrive at the project site or in surrounding residential precincts outside approved construction hours.

2.2.4 Reversing and movement alarms

The EPA has identified the noise from ‘beeper’ type plant movement alarms to be particularly intrusive and is aware of feasible and reasonable alternatives. Transport for NSW, Barangaroo Delivery Authority/Lend Lease and Leighton Contractors (M2 Upgrade project) have undertaken safety risk assessments of alternatives to the traditional ‘beeper’ alarms. Each determined that adoption of ‘quacker’ type movement/reversing alarms instead of traditional beepers on all plant and vehicles would not only maintain a safe workplace but also deliver improved outcomes of reduced noise impacts on surrounding residents. Appendix C of the ICNG provides additional background material on this issue.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to consider undertaking a safety risk assessment of site preparation, bulk earth works, construction and construction-related activities to determine whether it is practicable to use audible movement alarms of a type that would minimise the noise impact on surrounding noise sensitive receivers, without compromising safety.

2.3 Dust control and management

The EPA considers dust control and management to be an important air quality issue during demolition, site preparation, bulk earthworks and subsequent construction.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to:

- (a) minimise dust emissions on the site, and
- (b) prevent dust emissions from the site.

2.4 Sediment control

Managing Urban Stormwater Soils and Construction, 4th Edition published by Landcom (the so-called 'Blue Book') provides guidance material for achieving effective sediment control on construction sites. The proponent should implement all such feasible and reasonable measures as may be necessary to prevent water pollution during developing the site.

The EPA emphasises the importance of –

- (a) not commencing demolition, site preparation, bulk earthworks, construction and construction-related activities until appropriate and effective sediment controls are in place, and
- (b) daily inspection of sediment controls which is fundamental to ensuring timely maintenance and repair of those controls.

2.5 Waste control and management (general)

The proponent should manage waste in accordance with the waste management hierarchy. The waste hierarchy, established under the [Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Act 2001](#), is one that ensures that resource management options are considered against the following priorities:

Avoidance including action to reduce the amount of waste generated by households, industry and all levels of government

Resource recovery including reuse, recycling, reprocessing and energy recovery, consistent with the most efficient use of the recovered resources

Disposal including management of all disposal options in the most environmentally responsible manner.

All wastes generated during the project must be properly assessed, classified and managed in accordance with the EPA's guidelines to ensure proper treatment, transport and disposal at a landfill legally able to accept those wastes.

The EPA further anticipates that, without proper site controls and management, mud and waste may be tracked off the site during the project.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to ensure that:

- (1) all waste generated during the project is assessed, classified and managed in accordance with the EPA "*Waste Classification Guidelines Part 1: Classifying Waste*", November 2014 and the 2016 Addendum thereto;
- (2) the body of any vehicle or trailer, used to transport waste or excavation spoil from the premises, is covered before leaving the premises to prevent any spill or escape of any dust, waste, or spoil from the vehicle or trailer; and
- (3) mud, splatter, dust and other material likely to fall from or be cast off the wheels, underside or body of any vehicle, trailer or motorised plant leaving the site, is removed before the vehicle, trailer or motorised plant leaves the premises.

2.6 Waste control and management (concrete and concrete rinse water)

The EPA anticipates that during the project concrete deliveries and pumping are likely to generate significant volumes of concrete waste and rinse water. The proponent should ensure that concrete waste and rinse water is not disposed of on the project site and instead that –

- (a) waste concrete is either returned in the agitator trucks to the supplier or directed to a dedicated watertight skip protected from the entry of precipitation, and
- (b) concrete rinse water is directed to a dedicated watertight skip protected from the entry of precipitation or a suitable water treatment plant.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to ensure that concrete waste and rinse water are

- (a) not disposed of on the development site, and
- (b) prevented from entering waters, including any natural or artificial watercourse.

3. Operational phase

The EPA considers that environmental impacts that arise once the development is operational should be able to be largely averted by responsible environmental management practices, particularly about:

- (a) feasible and reasonable noise mitigation measures;
- (b) waste management in accordance with the waste management hierarchy;
- (c) water pollution;
- (d) odour emissions;
- (e) pesticides use;
- (f) water sensitive urban design; and
- (g) energy conservation and efficiency.

3.1 Noise and vibration impacts

The EPA anticipates the proposed development (especially out of hours use of school facilities by external parties) may have significant operational noise impacts on nearby sensitive receivers, especially adjoining residences.

The EPA notes with concern the proximity of the surrounding residences and is aware from long experience of the need for appropriate operational noise mitigation and management measures, particularly regarding:

- (a) the nature of and times during which school facilities are made available for community use;
- (b) the design and operation of the school public address/bell system;
- (c) the design and location of waste storage facilities;
- (d) time restrictions on waste collection services;
- (e) design, selection and operation of mechanical ventilation plant and equipment; and
- (f) time restrictions on grounds maintenance using powered equipment (e.g. leaf blowers, brush cutters and lawn mowers).

Background noise measurement

The EPA emphasises that properly establishing background noise levels in accordance with guidance material in the New South Wales Noise Policy for industry (NPI) is fundamental to a consistent approach to the quantitative assessment of noise impacts of development.

The Noise Policy for Industry (NPI) specifies that at least a 'weeks' worth' of monitoring data is required to establish background noise levels and that noise levels measured during rainfall and wind speeds exceeding 5 metres per second (i.e. 18 kilometres per hour) should be excluded when deriving those background levels.

However, the EPA notes that section 2.2 to EIS Appendix Q –

- (a) background noise measurements were undertaken between 7 December 2017 and 15 December 2017,
- (b) meteorological data was sourced from the Bureau of Meteorology (BoM) observations at Camden Automatic Weather Station (AWS),
- (c) BoM observed 2 millimetres of rain at Camden AWS on 7 December 2017, and
- (d) BoM observed wind speeds in excess of 18 kilometres per hour at Camden AWS on the afternoons of 10 December to 14 December 2017 inclusive.

The EPA further notes that background noise measurements were undertaken at locations within the development site instead of at the most affected noise sensitive locations (i.e. adjoining residences) as prescribed in the guidance material to the Noise Policy for Industry. However, the EPA considers that in this instance the measured noise levels appear reasonably representative of existing noise levels.

Out of hours community use of school facilities

The EPA is aware of government policy to encourage out of hours community use of school facilities provided that use does not cause noise emissions that interfere unreasonably with the comfort or repose of persons not on the premises.

The EPA considers that, in relation to the school hall, noise from normal school activities in class hours would not be acoustically significant. However, the use of the hall for other events, particularly outside school hours, has the potential to adversely impact on residences.

The EPA considers the proposed community use of school facilities (especially the hall, sports field and outdoor sports courts) outside normal school hours needs to be carefully managed to ensure noise impacts on nearby residences are minimised. Table 5-2 to EIS Appendix Q recommends that the school hall should not be made available for community use after 10.00pm to avoid sleep disturbance impacts.

Recommendation

1. The proponent be required to ensure that the school hall, performance, fitness and music facilities are not made available for community use between 10.00 pm and 8.00 am.
2. The proponent be required to ensure that the sports field and outdoor sports courts are not made available for community use –
 - (i) during week day mornings,
 - (ii) later than 6.00 pm on week nights,
 - (iii) other than between the hours of 8.00 am and 6.00 pm on Saturdays, and
 - (iv) during Sundays and public holidays.
3. The proponent be required to –
 - (a) undertake comprehensive noise compliance monitoring of representative uses of the sports field and outdoor sports courts and associated facilities (e.g. parking) outside school hours to demonstrate that the level, nature, quality and character of noise emitted by those uses and the time at which and frequency of those uses would not interfere unreasonably with or be likely to interfere unreasonably with the comfort or repose of persons not on the development site, especially the occupants of nearby residences.
 - (b) submit a detailed noise compliance monitoring report with noise measurements reported against relevant noise criteria and the outcomes of appropriate community consultation together with detailed recommendations concerning any additional feasible and reasonable noise mitigation and management measures, including further (or more relaxed) restrictions on the times at which and the frequency of each type of use of the sports field and outdoor sports courts and associated facilities (e.g. parking) outside school hours.
 - (c) ensure that noise compliance monitoring referred to in paragraph (a) above, would include quantitative noise impact assessment to address noise emissions arising from amongst other things –
 - audience/spectator noise,

- referee whistle noise,
- training sessions as well as sporting events,
- any amplified sound during sporting events and any associated training sessions, and
- post-event audience/spectator noise, including vehicle door slamming and departure noise.

Mechanical plant and equipment

Section 4.3.4 to EIS Appendix Q states that “.. location and selection of mechanical plant and equipment are still in preliminary stages ...”.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to:

- (a) provide a comprehensive quantitative assessment of operational noise impacts on surrounding noise sensitive receivers, especially adjoining residences;
- (b) ensure mechanical plant and equipment (including agricultural plant and equipment) installed on the development site does not generate noise that –
 - (i) exceeds 5 dBA above the rating background noise level (day, evening and night) measured at the western boundary of the development site, and
 - (ii) exhibits tonal or other annoying characteristics.

Public address and school bell system

The EPA notes numerous reports of community concern arising from inadequate design and installation as well as inappropriate use of school public address and bell systems and considers that appropriate design, installation and operation of those systems can both –

- meet the proponent’s objectives of proper administration of the school and ensuring the safety of students, staff and visitors, and
- avoid interfering unreasonably with the comfort and repose of occupants of nearby residences.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to design, install and operate the school public address/bell system to implement all such other measures as may be necessary to ensure use of that system does not interfere unreasonably with the comfort and repose of occupants of nearby residences.

Waste collection services

The EPA notes numerous reports of community concern arising from waste collection services undertaken at schools and especially during evening and night times.

Recommendation

The proponent be required ensure waste collection services are not undertaken outside the hours of 7.30 am to 6.00 pm Monday to Friday.

Grounds maintenance using powered equipment

The EPA notes numerous reports of community concern arising from grounds maintenance involving the use of powered equipment (example: leaf blowers, lawn mowers, brush cutters) at schools during early morning and evening periods as well as on weekends and public holidays.

Recommendation

The proponent be required ensure grounds maintenance involving the use of powered equipment is not undertaken outside the hours of 7.30 am to 6.00 pm Monday to Friday.

3.2 Waste management

The proponent should manage waste in accordance with the waste management hierarchy mentioned earlier.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to identify and implement feasible and reasonable opportunities for the re-use and recycling of waste, including food waste.

3.3 Agricultural activities and grounds maintenance (water pollution)

EIS drawing AA-03-001 'Site Context Plan- Proposed' indicates that –

- (a) the 'Agriculture Zone' is proposed to be relocated from the south eastern corner of the development site northwards to a point 50 metres south of adjoining residences in Coachwood Crescent, and
- (b) a sports field is to be located in the south eastern corner of the development site adjacent to the eastern boundary.

The EPA notes that the development site drains east towards Stonequarry Creek (a tributary of the Nepean River). The EPA anticipates that any runoff from the 'Agriculture Zone' and sports field is likely to be nutrient rich and potentially contaminated with pesticides.

Recommendation

The proponent be required to ensure that runoff from the 'Agriculture Zone' and sports field does not pollute Stonequarry Creek and any other waters, including any artificial watercourses such as stormwater drainage channels.

3.4 Agricultural activities and grounds maintenance (odours)

The EPA acknowledges that agricultural activities would be expected to generate odours consistent with a rural setting. However, the EPA is aware from long experience that certain agricultural activities (e.g. pig keeping, application of processed poultry manure) carried on in an 'environmentally unsatisfactory manner' are likely to generate significant odour emissions on school premises adjoining residences.

The EPA anticipates that livestock pens and enclosures would be regularly mucked out and accumulated manure and food waste stored in weather and vermin proof bins for later composting or other re-use.

Recommendation

1. The proponent be required to ensure that livestock are housed in such a manner and at such distance from adjoining residences as may be necessary to minimise the emission of odours at the development site.
2. The proponent be required to ensure that any highly odorous fertilisers (e.g. aged/processed poultry manure) are applied to the development site by such means as may be necessary to:
 - (a) minimise the emission of odours at the development site, and
 - (b) prevent the emission of odours from the development site.

3.5 Agricultural and grounds maintenance activities (pesticides)

The EPA anticipates that the school is likely to apply pesticides from time to time, particularly to those parts of the school grounds designated on the site plan as 'Agriculture Zone' and 'sports field'.

A pesticide includes any –

- (a) agricultural chemical product (within the meaning of the Agvet Code), and
- (b) veterinary chemical product (within the meaning of the Agvet Code) for the external control of ectoparasites of animals.

The proponent should be aware that pesticide use includes -

- (a) applying, spraying, spreading or dispersing the pesticide by any means,
- (b) storing the pesticide, and
- (c) preparing the pesticide for use.

The EPA anticipates that pesticide use on the grounds of the development site would be undertaken by such means as may be necessary to avoid –

- (a) injury to any person
- (b) damage to the property of another person
- (c) harm to a non-target animal or
- (d) harm to a non-target plant.

The EPA emphasises that the grounds of the development site are a 'prescribed public place' in respect of the use of any pesticide and that the proponent as a public authority has obligations concerning the notification of use of any pesticide on those grounds. The EPA is aware that the proponent has finalised a Pesticide Use Notification Plan to ensure that those who have a potentially high sensitivity to exposure to pesticide are appropriately notified to avoid or minimise risk of exposure.

Recommendation

1. The proponent be required to ensure that any pesticide, including any insecticide, herbicide, fungicide, and any veterinary chemical used for external control of ectoparasites of animals, is

only stored, prepared for use or used on the development site in such manner as may be necessary to prevent –

- (a) injury to a person,
- (b) damage to the property of any person other than the proponent,
- (c) harm to a non-target animal, and
- (d) harm to a non-target plant.

2. The proponent be required to ensure that all pesticides on the development site are stored and prepared for use in a dedicated weather-proof structure designed and constructed –

- (a) to prevent unauthorised access to any stored pesticide,
- (b) to prevent overheating of any stored pesticide,
- (c) to prevent any spilled pesticide being released to the environment,
- (d) to be adequately ventilated for pesticide storage in accordance with relevant material safety data sheets and pesticide labelling, and
- (e) to be adequately ventilated for pesticide preparation in accordance with relevant material safety data sheets and pesticide labelling.

3.6 Water sensitive urban design and energy conservation and efficiency

The EPA acknowledges that EIS section 4.10 outlines proposed sustainability measures and that Appendix M comprises an environmentally sustainable development report, that propose –

- (a) a range of water sensitive urban design measures, including –
 - (i) rainwater harvesting and re-use, and
 - (ii) water efficient fixtures; and
- (b) a range of measures to maximise energy efficiency and minimise energy consumption, including –
 - (i) natural ventilation and lighting of all teaching and learning spaces, and
 - (ii) installation of solar photovoltaic arrays.
