Mr Michael Young
Senior Planning Officer
Infrastructure Projects
Department of Planning
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY  NSW  2001

Dear Mr Young,

M5 WEST WIDENING (MP10_0052))
EXHIBITION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

I refer to your letter dated 20 September 2010 seeking submissions on the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed M5 West Widening project. Transport NSW (TNSW) appreciates the opportunity to comment.

TNSW has reviewed the EA prepared by the RTA and considers that the DGRs have been satisfactorily addressed in respect of the matters raised. TNSW, as a result, has no objection to the matter proceeding.

I trust that these comments are of assistance. Should you wish to discuss this matter further, please contact Chris Walsh on 9268 2222 or email chris.walsh@transport.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

David Hartmann
A/Senior Manager
Centre for Transport Planning

CD10/07519
As discussed, please find attached a copy of Council's letter dated 12 October 2010. Note that this letter was sent days after it was authored.

Further, at its meeting held on 18 October 2010, Council resolved to lodge a submission in regards to the exhibited proposal to widen parts of the M5 Motorway.

Council has resolved (inter alia) as follows:

1. To get noise walls on the bridge over the Georges River to protect residents of Liverpool, Moorebank and Casula from noise at all times. The noise wall over the Georges River will also allow protection from noise and related stress to Council's passive recreation areas along the Georges River. This matter has been outlined in Council's letter dated 25 October 2010.

2. Limit the hours of operation of road sheeting on the M5 to no later than 2.00am weekdays and 4.00am Saturday and Sunday.

3. It is understood that some works are required to be carried out outside standard work hours. It is requested that road sheeting is limited within the hours listed under point 2 above.

4. Monitor regular testing of construction sites along the M5 to monitor and ensure no dangerous dust particles are exposed or leach into the air during operations. Monitoring results should be published weekly in local newspapers. Regular inspections day and night by WorkCover to ensure noise levels, dust pollution and work related issues are adhered to in promoting safety for the community living along the M5 widening corridor.

5. Best practice options are adopted for break down lanes on the widening of M5, allowing safe room for semi and b-double vehicles to be parked along the break down areas in safety.

6. Bonus system be put in place to reward contractors for keeping work ahead of schedule and fines for falling behind schedule with the project.

7. Any other community concerns submitted to Council.

Many of the community issues have been outlined in our submissions dated 12 October and 25 October 2010. Be aware that many residents have indicated they are to submit their concerns throughout the exhibition period.

8. Makes a submission to the RTA incorporating issues in this recommendation.

I acknowledge that this submission is outside the stated exhibition timelines however Council should be considered a major stakeholder and these concerns be addressed accordingly. Further, Council requests that it is informed as to how the submissions have been considered.

Theo Zotos
Executive Planner
Liverpool City Council
33 Moore Street, Liverpool NSW 2170
Phone 6821 9137
Fax 6821 9599
Email t.zotos@liverpool.nsw.gov.au

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail.
Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: Proposed M5 West Widening September 2010

Thank you for the updated information regarding the M5 West Widening and for the meetings held during the investigations phase to discuss the proposed road upgrade. The following concerns have been raised following a review of the available documentation:

**Termination of additional eastbound lane at Fairford Road**

A significant proportion of the traffic using the M5 West uses the King Georges Road interchange. Ending the proposed eastbound third lane at Fairford Road could exacerbate the potential queuing that occurs on the M5 eastbound during morning peak periods. The third lane should be extended to King Georges Road and exit using a “left lane must exit”, of which examples already exist on the motorway network. Eg: Heathcote Road Interchange(M5), Hume Highway Interchange(M5), Pacific Highway interchange (F3), Moore Park interchange (M1), Pacific Hwy (M1), and various ramps on the Western Distributor (MR40), and Warringah Freeway (M1). These ramps set precedents which can be used to enable the extension of the third lane to King Georges Road.

Furthermore the Monash Freeway, M1 expansion in Melbourne, from South Gippsland Freeway to the start of the Citylink Tollway, had a left lane must exit onto Warringah Road which forms a similar mid-city bypass as King Georges Road in Sydney.

Extension of the third lane to King Georges Road would reduce the potential congestion caused by merging from three lanes to two lanes, particularly considering the additional lane merges in from the Interchange. This would then enable for the M5 East works to start from the King Georges Interchange, reducing the poor merge that occurs at the Motorway at this interchange.
Moorebank Intermodal Terminal

The Moorebank Intermodal Terminal is only peripherally mentioned within the document. Preliminary documents indicate that when operating at full capacity the Moorebank Intermodal is designed for more than 1,000,000 TEU's per year. This would provide for significant relief of the M5 Motorway in freight traffic from Sydney Ports if it is accurate, and may potentially lessen the freight needs of the M5 Motorway. The additional requirement that 40% of all freight is to be moved by rail in 2036, means that there is potential for more freight moving from Moorebank Intermodal to the west and south, rather than from the east, reducing the impact of freight on the M5 corridor east of the Georges River. This may increase the stress on the Moorebank Avenue Interchange, which is poorly designed to the west. Preliminary modelling of this impact should be undertaken prior to the upgrade of the M5 West to ensure that another upgrade is not required within a few years, as this will increase road user frustration and has cost implications.

M5 between Hume Highway and Heathcote Road

The proposed improvements to this interchange would not be required until at least 2016. However the completion of the M5 West Motorway Improvements is estimated to occur in 2013-2014. This means that within a couple of years of a major roadway upgrade the Motorway would require another upgrade, which would have significant costs; both opportunity and financial to undertake them after the upgrade works have started.

A simpler option would be to use a collector distributor system, by physically blocking off one or two lanes, to undertake the merge at a lower speed to the rest of the Motorway. Both bridges are approximately 16m in width, which means that two full width motorway lanes of 3.5m can be provided, with 0.6m on either side between concrete barriers. The collector lanes would then be 3.2m wide with a 0.6m on either side between the concrete barriers. This would remove the weave from the Motorway traffic at a fraction of the cost of building a new underpass at the Hume Highway, or potentially a new bridge across the Georges River.

Westbound Ramps at the Hume Highway Interchange

It is noted that the off ramp at this point was rejected due to the impact that this would have on the traffic flows on the Hume Highway, and that the on ramp was rejected as it was not a priority.

A significant proportion of the traffic on the Hume Highway between Terminus Street and the Crossroads intersection with Campbelltown Road, Glenfield Road and Camden Valley Way is traffic making its way to Liverpool from the Motorway.

Council would strongly urge that this be reconsidered, especially in light with potential improvements to the Hume Highway South of the interchange, such as permanent 24 hour bus lanes which would mean that the impact on the Hume Highway north of the interchange would be neutral – as there would still be the same amount of traffic in this section, even though there have been additional ramps provided at this intersection.

Noise Walls

It is noted that there is no proposal to construct noise walls on the Georges River Bridge at Casula. Council strongly urges that such noise walls are implemented due to the increased traffic volumes, and consequently noise that will be spread out into the residential flat buildings surrounding the Georges River valley.
Cyclists

This review provides an opportunity to continue the current M5 off road cycleway from where it currently finishes at Salt Pan Creek, to further west. The proposed extension of the cycleway from Salt Pan Creek to Prestons Interchange does not duplicate any proposed or existing cycleway route within Liverpool, and would provide for a high quality cycling link into the southern suburbs of Sydney, and with completion of small sections of Cycleway in Canterbury and Marrickville Councils, could form a strategic cycleway link from the South West all the way to Botany Bay and Sydney Airport.

It is noted that there are parallel cycleways proposed by Council, however these are generally shared paths or on-road facilities, whereas a dedicated cycleway along the M5 Motorway corridor would be for cyclists only. Generally on shared pathways, cyclists are limited to approximately 20km/hr to ensure pedestrian safety, and on road cycleways are slowed by general traffic and generally only reach this average speed in peak periods.

However a high quality cycleway along a motorway corridor, such as that along the Mitchell and Kwinana Freeways in Perth lead to a high speed commuting corridor, which is not possible along an arterial road, due to conflicts with driveways and cross streets.

Interstate in Melbourne and Perth such cycleways along Motorway corridors are very common, and well used. The Kwinana and Mitchell Freeway cycleways receive 1.3 million trips/year. The cost of providing this suggested link would be small, and would provide a valuable link across multiple rivers which act as a major barrier to cycling and walking, including Salt Pan Creek and the Georges River.

Speed and Congestion

It is noted that the modelling shows a significant increase in peak period average travel speeds. The potential for such reduction in travel times is limited, especially given the large land releases occurring out in the South West Subregion, as the population of Camden, Campbelltown and Liverpool Councils is expected to nearly double by 2031.

The pent-up demand that the upgrade of the Motorway may release will also eat into these travel time savings. Furthermore when the M5 opened originally there was a drop in patronage on the East Hills line that per capita basis has never really been recovered since the Motorway opened in 1995. A further drop caused by the enhancement of the Motorway may reduce the potential for the State Government to meet the State Plan targets. Having said that the need for this upgrade is clearly visible, however a drop of 0.2-0.6% of trips on public transport is a significant drop for an area that is rapidly expanding. Such a patronage drop could potentially reduce the viability of frequent public transportation services, as well as State Government Infrastructure such as the Kingsgrove to Revesby Quad, until large scale development happens in the South West Growth Centre.

Overall Council is supportive of the M5 West expansion; however the overall benefits can be increased with the suggestions outlined in this correspondence.

Should you require any further information on this matter, please do not hesitate to contact James Semple, Strategic Planner on 9821 9156 or at j.semple@liverpool.nsw.gov.au

Yours sincerely

Tanya O'Brien
Manager, Strategic Planning
Mr M Young
Infrastructure Projects
Department of Planning
GPO BOX 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Mr Young

M5 WEST WIDENING PROJECT - ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

I refer to your letter dated 20 September 2010 requesting the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Water (DECCW) provide comments on the M5 West Widening Environmental Assessment - September 2010.

DECCW has reviewed the Environmental Assessment (EA) and has provided detailed comments which are included in this letter (Attachment 1).

Specific areas of concern that have been identified by DECCW in the EA are:

- noise impacts on residential areas both in the construction and operational phase of the project;
- translocation of the Downy Wattle (Acacia pubescens) and development of a biodiversity offset package;
- impacts of flooding on safety, traffic movement and drainage;
- pedestrian and cyclist amenities in regard to signage and accessibility; and
- assessment requirements for any future ancillary facilities and construction compounds.

If you wish to discuss any of the issues raised in this letter, please contact Stephen McClure on 9995 6814.

Yours sincerely

GISELLE HOWARD
Director Metropolitan
Environment Protection and Regulation

Attachment 1: DECCW comments on the Environmental Assessment for the M5 West Widening Project
Attachment 1

DECCW comments on the Environmental Assessment for the M5 West Widening Project

1. Noise

DECCW has reviewed the M5 West Widening, Environmental Assessment, Volume 3 Working Papers, September 2010 – Noise & Vibration Assessment prepared by Wilkinson Murray (hereafter referred to as the NVA).

1.1 Operational Noise Assessment

The NVA proposes the ‘redevelopment of existing freeway / arterial road’ criteria under the Environmental Criteria for Road Traffic Noise (ECRTN). This assessment criteria is appropriate. The existing road generally exceeds this criteria at nearby sensitive receivers. The Roads and Traffic Authority (RTA) – Environmental Noise Management Manual indicates on page 98 that;

“For proposed redevelopments of roads where existing noise levels already exceed the ECRTN target noise levels, and all ‘feasible and reasonable’ traffic management and noise reducing design opportunities have been incorporated into the road design, the RTA believes it is generally not reasonable to apply additional treatments such as noise barriers/mounds, quieter pavement surfaces and architectural treatments of private dwellings if the predicted design year noise levels:

- do not exceed the ECRTN allowances (in column 4 of Table 1 in the ECRTN) over the “future existing” noise levels (the noise levels from existing sources of road traffic noise predicted for the time of opening); and,

- will not be acute (i.e. the noise levels are predicted to be less than 65dB(A) Leq(15hr) (day) and 60dB(A) Leq(9hr) (night).

Again, this approach is based on the insignificance of the change in noise levels involved, but recognises the increased importance of reducing noise levels where existing or predicted road traffic noise impacts are acute”.

Noise modelling has been undertaken on the basis of the United Kingdom, Department of Transport, Calculation of Road Traffic Noise (UK, DoT, CORTN) procedures, as modified for Australian conditions, and implemented using Cadsna Software. This procedure is regularly used in NSW for the assessment of noise for road projects. The NVA indicates that while low noise pavement - open grade asphaltic concrete (OGAC) is on the exiting roadway, the RTA advises that it is likely to be clogged and behaving more like dense grade asphaltic concrete (DGAC). Whilst the existing pavement, and proposed pavement, will be resurfaced with OGAC, the RTA instructed the noise consultant to model using DGAC, which essentially renders the modelling conservative in terms of pavement type.

Noise model validation

Noise model validation has been performed by comparing modelled noise levels, based on 2009 Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) data, with measured levels acquired from a monitoring campaign in 2009. It is usual, and preferred practice, to validate a model using actual traffic data (counts) undertaken in parallel (synchronised) with the noise monitoring campaign. It does not appear that this has occurred in this assessment.

Not-with-standing the aforementioned concerns about the model validation methodology, the validation exercise did show significant variations between modelled versus measured noise levels for both day and night scenarios. As a consequence, a negative correction to modelled
noise levels in the order of 4dB for daytime and 3dB for night time is proposed. The reason presented in the NVA for the differences is that the model used posted speeds, however actual speeds, due to congestion are, and are predicted to remain, well below posted speeds for peak and inter-peak periods. This calibration approach essentially aligns with using a modelled traffic speed in the order of 60km/hr. DECCW has concerns as to whether reduced hourly traffic volumes outside of peak periods, with corresponding increases in traffic speed, have been adequately accounted for in the modelling approach. We acknowledge that the effects over a day / night assessment period are likely to be relatively minor, however minor increases in predicted noise levels can have a significant effect in terms of mitigation considerations and outcomes. It is recommended that the RTA provides additional justification that the model validation and calibration presented in the NVA is accurate, and reflective of future traffic noise levels, included actual traffic speeds versus posted, resulting from the project.

Noise barriers
The NVA identifies 286 receiver locations that either exceed the allowance criteria or are predicted to experience acute noise levels. As part of the project, additional barriers are proposed that total approximately 1.5km in linear length. After the affect of the additional barriers are taken into consideration, approximately 180 receivers require consideration of architectural acoustic treatment (AAT).

DECCW notes that increasing the height of existing barriers has been generically rejected on the basis of reasonableness, (other than existing barrier 29), in that only minor reductions can be achieved by increasing barrier heights. Although quantitative information has not been produced to support this, DECCW does acknowledge that a ‘law of diminishing returns’ does generally apply to noise barriers. It also needs to be borne in mind that the project generally does not result in an increase in noise levels of greater than 2dB(A), other than a relatively few number of receivers in Todd Circuit, Whitefield Parade and Louie Street. Despite this DECCW considers, there is a compelling basis to further consider increasing the height of existing barrier (EB) EB24 to provide additional noise mitigation to Whitefield Parade, where noise levels are predicted to be both acute and experience an increase in noise greater than 2dB(A).

DECCW also recommends that additional consideration be given to barrier noise mitigation measures at locations predicted to experience acute noise and an increase exceeding 2dB(A) from the project. For example an infill barrier between EB32 and EB34 would benefit receivers in Louie Place.

Validation of operational noise
It is normal practice for project approvals for road projects to include a requirement for the preparation of a ‘review of operational noise mitigation measures’ that demonstrates, on the basis of detailed design, the noise performance of the project, and the exact manner in which noise impacts are to be mitigated.

This is the current standard approach that affords DECCW a consultation role with respect to the project’s detailed acoustic design. This approach is recommended for this project, as our Environment Protection Licence (EPL) will not include operational noise requirements. It is however recommended that the condition be modified to include the following phrase; “The Review shall include confirmation from the RTA that they endorse, as correct, the traffic data used in the detailed noise modelling. Also, the Review shall include noise model validation that compares traffic noise measurements against modelled noise levels using traffic count data acquired during the noise measurement period”.

It is further recommended that the project approval include a requirement for compliance monitoring. DECCW notes that Statement of Commitments ON1 and ON2 commits to further
consideration of operation noise mitigation measures during detailed design, and post operational compliance assessment measures.

DECCW has not undertaken any detailed check calculations. This is not considered to be a significant risk given the post approval processes will include additional noise modelling using the detailed design, and standard requirements generally imposed in project approval relating to compliance assessment. DECCW does however reinforce that additional justification for the model validation and calibration presented in the NVA should be sought as part of the proponent's response to submissions.

1.2 Construction Noise Assessment

The construction noise assessment contained in the NVA has adopted the Interim Construction Noise Guidelines (DECCW, 2009).

The construction noise assessment is based on concept design information as detailed construction methods and compound operation and locations have not been fully finalised.

Construction hours

The NVA indicates that the majority of works will be undertaken during standard construction hours, however there will be works required to be undertaken outside of standard construction hours. The NVA is not based on detailed information regarding construction practices, work methods, compound design etc. Also it is unlikely that the community has been consulted on the specifics of the construction process. DECCW acknowledges that out of standard hours works are routinely required for major infrastructure projects. The project approval, as with normal practice, can include a post approval process through the EPL that will be issued for the project for the proponent to seek, and have determined, requests for out of hours works.

1.3 Conditions of Approval

DECCW recommends the following requirements for inclusion in the Conditions of Approval.

Standard Construction Hours

Standard construction hours for the duration of construction are:

(a) 7:00am to 6:00pm Mondays to Fridays, inclusive;
(b) 8:00am to 1:00pm Saturdays; and
(c) at no time on Sundays or Public Holidays, except as expressly permitted by an Environmental Protection Licence issued for the project.

The following exceptions (without further approval) to standard construction hours apply:

(a) Construction work that causes LAeq(15 minute) noise levels that are:
   (i) no more than 5dB above rating background level at any residence in accordance with the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (DECC, 2009); and
   (ii) no more than the noise management levels specified Table 3 of the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (DECC, 2009) at other sensitive land uses; or
(b) for delivery of materials required outside these hours by the Police or other authorities for safety reasons; or
(c) where it is required in an emergency to avoid the loss of lives, property and/or to prevent environmental harm.
High noise impact activities and works
High noise impact activities and works occurring on the premises must only be undertaken:

(a) between the hours of 8:00am to 6:00pm Monday to Friday;
(b) between the hours of 8:00am to 1:00pm Saturday; and
(c) in continuous blocks not exceeding 3 hours each with a minimum respite from those activities and works of not less than 1 hour between each block,
except as expressly permitted by an Environment Protection Licence issued for the project.

For the purposes of this condition 'continuous' includes any period during which there is less than a 1 hour respite between ceasing and recommencing any of the work the subject of this condition.

Construction vibration goals
The proponent shall implement all reasonable and feasible mitigation measures with the aim of achieving the following construction vibration goals and ground-borne noise levels:

(a) for structural damage vibration, the vibration limits set out in the German Standard DIN 4150 Part 3:1999 Structural Vibration in Buildings - Effects on Structures; or
(b) for human exposure, the acceptable vibration values set out in the Environmental Noise Management Assessing Vibration: A Technical Guideline (DEC 2006), and

Noise barriers
The proponent should not remove existing noise barriers unless permanent or temporary noise barriers or architectural treatments have been installed so as to preserve the existing operational acoustic environment; or identify alternative arrangements to be adopted where physical barriers or treatments are not practicable.

Reversing alarms
The proponent is required to undertake a safety risk assessment to determine the availability of safe alternatives to 'beeper' type reversing or movement alarms on vehicles, plant and equipment used during the construction and operational phases of the project.

Operational Noise
Unless otherwise agreed to by the Director General, the proponent shall submit for the approval of the Director General a review of proposed operational noise mitigation within six months of commencing construction. The review shall take into account the detailed design of the project and, where feasible and reasonable, refine the proposed measures with the objective of meeting the criteria outlined in the Environmental Criteria for Road Traffic Noise (NSW EPA, 1999). The review shall be undertaken in consultation with the DECCW.

2. Biodiversity

DECCW recommends the following condition of approval:

Acacia pubescens
The RTA shall develop an Acacia pubescens translocation proposal as referenced in the Draft Statement of Commitments, Table 11.1 Reference FF4. The proposal shall include:

(a) provisions to translocate Acacia pubescens from the sites to be developed to at least four translocation sites;
(b) the translocations sites are to be at least 300m from other known Acacia pubescens sites;
(c) provisions for the security of the translocations sites, such as biobanking agreements or covenants under Section 88E of the Conveyancing Act 1919; and
(d) provisions for the management of the translocation sites, including management plans and funding.

**Biodiversity offset proposal**

The RTA shall develop a proposal to offset the clearing of native vegetation detailed in Table 13 of Appendix G of the EA. The proposal shall include:

(a) provisions for the security of the offset sites, such as biobanking agreements or covenants under Section 88E of the Conveyancing Act 1919;
(b) provisions for the management of the offset sites, including management plans and funding; and
(c) a clear timeframe for the implementation of the biodiversity offset package.

DECCW recommends the use of the Biobanking Assessment Method to estimate the size of the offset required.

3. Flooding

3.1 *During a design 1 in 100 year ARI flood event*

Preliminary modelling indicates that, during a design flood event 1 in 100 year Average Recurrence Interval (ARI), only one traffic lane in each direction would be available for use, as flows from pavement drainage would encroach onto the traffic lanes.

If the motorway is utilised in a flood evacuation strategy, then consideration should be given to the following issues:

(a) flood depth and velocity of flow in flooded traffic lanes, the extent and duration of inundation considering safety requirements for vehicles based on Appendix L in the Floodplain Development Manual (2005); and
(b) evacuation safety and available time when using one lane traffic. One traffic lane would severely constrict emergency response vehicles and tow trucks.

3.2 *For floods larger than 1 in 100 year ARI event*

Consideration should be given to the risk to life during a flood event larger than 1 in 100 year ARI. The most concern is the lack of warning, unsafe conditions and the risk that cars being swept away and carried downstream by floodwaters.

3.3 *Impacts on cross-drainage systems*

It is not clear whether the preliminary modelling for existing cross drainage considered a reasonable percentage of blockages of culverts that occurs during various events and if blockage occurs, whether it produces significant changes to the flood regime.

3.4 *Flooding under climate change scenarios*

The report indicates that the drainage basin sizes would need to be increased by about 10–15 per cent to accommodate potential climate change rainfall scenarios, however, constraints associated with the existing motorway and limited available land affect the feasibility of further increasing drainage basin sizes. Therefore, consideration should be given to the feasibility of larger capacity or alternative mitigation options in order to incorporate the longer term climate change impacts.
4. Transport

In Appendix E, Traffic and Transport, the report states that the final configuration of the motorway will maintain existing levels of access for bicycles along the corridor and for pedestrians and bicycles across the corridor. As such, the project will not significantly impact on pedestrian and bicycle safety and amenity (pg 133). DECCW supports the report findings undertaken by GTA Consultants on behalf of the RTA which identifies opportunities to integrate the M5 West Motorway with existing or proposed shared path and on-road bicycle and pedestrian networks in the vicinity of the Motorway. DECCW supports the recommendations listed under Opportunities for Integration and Opportunities for Enhancement to ensure connections from the M5 West to the surrounding cycle network. Particular attention should be given to river crossing points and motorway crossing points, which are major barriers to cyclists.

The recommendations listed under Other Considerations should be included in the Statement of Commitments in the EA. These include:

(a) better signposting of routes to help identify on-road routes and shared paths;
(b) improved directional signage provided on cycle routes, in particular to identify M5 crossing points;
(c) marked lanes for on-road facilities where possible to improve separation from vehicular traffic; and
(d) pedestrian signals on overpasses at on/off-ramp locations. Bicycle lanterns could be added at these locations and shared paths extended beyond these crossing points to improve accessibility for cyclists.

5. Ancillary facilities and construction compounds

EA Figure 6.3 (pg 6-10) and EA section 6.7 (pp 6-15 – 6-18) provides details of the location of proposed construction compounds, including some selection criteria for future compounds (Table 6.4). DECCW considers all construction compounds, including lay down and stockpiling areas, to be activities ancillary to scheduled activities and thus subject to licensing under the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997.

Ancillary facilities should also be located so that they avoid or minimise impacts on threatened species or endangered ecological communities and their habitat.

Prior to the establishment of any ancillary facility (not already assessed in the EA) and any location where rock crushing and screening is proposed, the proponent must obtain the Director General's approval. In obtaining this approval, DECCW suggests that the conditions of approval for the project require the proponent to submit an assessment of the ancillary facility and any proposed rock crushing and screening facility which provides:

(a) a description of the facility, its components and the surrounding environment;
(b) details of the activities to be carried out at each facility, including the hours of use and the storage of dangerous and hazardous goods;
(c) an assessment of the environmental impacts on the site and the surrounding environment, including, but not limited to noise, threatened species, vibration, air quality, traffic, heritage and light spill;
(d) details of the mitigation, monitoring and management procedures specific to the facility that would be implemented to minimise environmental impacts or, where this is not possible, measures to offset these impacts and an assessment of the adequacy of the mitigation or offsetting measures. This shall include restrictions on the hours of use or exclusion of certain activities; and
(e) identification of the timing for the completion of activities at the facility and how the site will be decommissioned (including any necessary rehabilitation).