SICEEP PPP – Response to Environmental Protection Authority Submission

Comment	Response
Licensing The EIS states that approximately 26,000m^3 of soil may require excavation and disposal from the site. On the basis of this information, it is unclear whether the proposal triggers the requirement for an environment protection licence (EPL) under the *Protection of Environment Operations Act 1997* (POEO Act). It is possible that the excavation of this volume of soil may fall within clause 19 of Schedule 1 of the POEO Act, which lists 'Extractive Activities' on land that extract more than 30,000 tonnes of extractive material (including soil) per year as a scheduled activity. To determine whether an EPL is required, the proponent will need to calculate the weight of soil to be excavated on the site over a year period. If an EPL is required, the proponent will need to make a separate application to the EPA to obtain this licence once planning approval is granted.	The excavation will be limited to fill and rock for new foundations, pile caps, lift pits, shallow services pits and minor cut in the public realm. The spoil will be removed, classified and disposed off-site as part of general construction activities and will be in the order of 48,000 tonnes. These activities are not "Extractive Activities" and the excavated material is not being sold or re-used for profit – the excavation is ancillary to the construction process. On this basis, it is not considered that an environment protection licence is required for this project.
The predicted construction noise levels in the ENVIA do not appear to include the addition of 5dB for annoyance from certain construction equipment/ activities (such as rock hammering or jackhammering), as required by Section 4.5 (page 16) of the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (DECC 2009). The EPA recommends that this issue should be addressed by the proponent prior to planning approval.	A Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP) prepared by Acoustic Logic Consultancy is attached at **Appendix O**. The CNVMP forms an addendum to the ENVIA, and incorporates the EPA's comments.
The ENVIA has proposed construction hours that do not comply with the standard construction hours contained within the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (DECC 2009). The EPA considers that construction should be limited to standard construction hours. Only construction activities that do not cause background + 5dB or more LAeq levels at residential receivers should be allowed outside standard construction hours, as permitted by the Guideline. The EPA recommends a condition of approval (CoA) requiring that construction works only occur within the standard construction hours of: • Monday to Friday 7am to 6pm • Saturday 8am to 1 pm • No work on Sundays or public holidays unless works do not cause background + 5dB or more LAeq levels at residential receivers.	It is proposed that the standard hours of construction for weekdays be amended to 7am to 7pm rather than 7am to 6pm as recommended by the EPA. This is based on precedence set on the following projects – Darling Quarter, Cockle Bay; Global Switch, Ultimo; The Brewery, Broadway; UTS FEIT, Broadway; UTS Chau Chak, Ultimo and 420 George Street, Sydney CBD; The construction hours proposed by DHL on weekdays are considered fair and reasonable. It is proposed that the standard hours of construction for Saturdays be amended to 7am to 5pm rather than 8am to 1pm as recommended by the EPA. In order to accommodate the longer construction hours on Saturday it is proposed that the following additional noise restrictions be adopted to limit noise during the non-

Comment	Response
	standard construction hours: • Between the hours of 7am and 8am on Saturday, only equipment and activities that complies with the "background + 5dB(A)" criteria at residential receivers will be permitted. • Between the hours of 1pm and 5pm on Saturday, noise emissions will be designed to comply with "background +10dB(A)". It is noted that the "background + 10dB(A)" will be a noise emission limit rather than a management level. The reasons for this variation to the standard construction hours is as follows: • The EPA guidelines are "catch all" guidelines that would be applicable in more sensitive situations - in quiet residential suburbs, for example. In this particular case, the affected properties are adjacent to a major entertainment precinct that is largely comprised of commercial premises with some residential receivers. We note City of Sydney guidelines are less stringent than standard EPA time restrictions and would permit the proposed noise controls for Saturday works subject to a site-by-site basis. • Adopting the proposed hours will allow for efficient construction on Saturdays and the entire construction timetable will be expedited which will benefit the surrounding community
Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan The proponent must prepare and implement a detailed Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP), prior to commencement of construction activities, that includes but is not necessarily limited to; a) identification of each work area, site compound and access route (both private and public);	Acoustic Logic has prepared a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan as an addendum to the ENVIA (refer to **Appendix O**). As a detailed review of construction methods has not been carried out, the prepared plan must remain a preliminary Plan that indicates the methodology that will be adopted to review and manage construction noise and vibration impacts. The details of the actions arising from the Plan's implementation will be revised throughout the project in response to more detailed information and site conditions. The preparation of a detailed CNVMP addressing each of the items recommended by the EPA is a matter appropriately

Comment	Response
b) identification of the specific activities that will be carried out and associated noise sources at the premises and access routes; c) identification of all potentially affected sensitive receivers; d) the construction noise objectives identified in accordance with the *Interim Construction Noise Guideline* (DECC 2009); e) assessment of potential noise and vibration from the proposed construction methods (including noise from construction traffic) against the objectives identified in (d); f) where the objectives are predicted to be exceeded an analysis of feasible and reasonable noise mitigation measures that can be implemented to reduce construction noise impacts; g) description of management methods and procedures and specific noise mitigation treatments that will be implemented to control noise and vibration during construction, including the early erection of operational noise control barriers; h) procedures for notifying residents of construction activities that are likely to affect their noise and vibration amenity; and i) measures to monitor noise performance and respond to complaints. The CNVMP should also include demolition methods that do not require the use of rock breakers or other similar high noise generating equipment, such as rock (or concrete) splitting of building sections for transport and break up off site, unless not feasible and reasonable. Where rock breakers or other high noise generating equipment are to be used such that the appropriate criteria are exceeded (given the comments made above about the nominated criteria), the hours of operation for high	dealt with via condition of consent. In regards to the EPA recommendation regarding rock breakers, it is proposed to utilise respite periods where exceedance of noise objectives is likely. Hydraulic hammering is likely to require respite periods. There will be few other construction operations affected.

Comment	Response
noise generating equipment must include respite periods.	
The ENVIA does not provide construction noise management levels for the educational sensitive receiver located at the University of Technology Haymarket Campus. It is not clear whether the ENVIA has considered construction noise impacts on this sensitive receiver. The EPA recommends that additional information is provided regarding noise assessment during construction on this receiver prior to planning approval.	The preliminary Demolition, Excavation and Construction Noise Management Plan prepared by Acoustic Logic (refer to **Appendix O**) identifies the UTS Haymarket Campus as a sensitive receiver, and assesses noise impacts at this receiver. This is addressed at Section 2.8 of the Response to Submissions report.
The EPA notes that the ENVIA provides an assessment of construction vibration through the use of safe working distances rather than vibration dose values, and that some sensitive receivers are located within these safe distances. The EPA considers that the proponent should ensure that no unacceptable impacts are experienced by surrounding sensitive receivers by applying reasonable and feasible mitigation measures to meet the vibration dose values contained with Table 2.4 of 'Assessing Vibration: a technical guideline' (DEC 2006). Where the values cannot be met and adverse impacts are experienced, additional measures such as respite may be appropriate.	The ENVIA does not advocate the use of the safe working distances as the sole management measure. The recommended safe working distances presented in the ENVIA can be regarded as a worst case scenario. Site testing and confirmation of actual "safe" working distances are likely to show they can be reduced. The site testing will also confirm if vibration levels exceed the goals and mitigation needs to be assessed. The analysis in the ENVIA indicates all sensitive residential receivers are outside the (conservative) zone of vibration impacts even for sources generating the highest levels of ground vibration. The structures and buildings that fall within the safe working distances are commercial in nature, and there are some structures (such as the road viaducts and columns) where tactile impacts do not need to be assessed, and only damage criteria will be applied to vibration producing activities occurring within the safe working distances. Additional mitigation will be applied to vibration producing activities occurring within the safe working distances. This will be established in the detailed CNVMP to be developed.
The operational noise criteria in Table 12 and Table 13 of the ENVIA for residential receivers are based on noise levels measured at the described monitoring locations, however, none of the monitoring locations appear to be residential. This means that the criteria appear to be based on background levels that may not be representative of those at residential receivers. The criteria in Table 11 may not be appropriate for residential receivers if the background levels were not measured at residential receiver locations. The EPA recommends that additional information be provided prior to approval regarding the locations where noise monitoring was undertaken, the land	ENVIA utilised a monitor in front of the Bullecourt Apartments on Pyrmont St, and while not strictly on the residential receiver's property, the monitoring location is considered to clearly adequately represent ambient noise conditions at Bullecourt. The Noise Catchment 1 monitor was located at the Novotel. While this is not immediately adjacent to the Goldsbrough Apartments, Acoustic Logic has advised that it would not be expected that noise monitoring at the Goldsbrough Apartments would yield significantly different background noise levels to those provided.

Comment	Response
use at these locations, and the proximity to the nearest residential receivers.	Notwithstanding this, it is intended to conduct further monitoring at the Goldsbrough Apartments at both ground level and roof level to confirm existing background noise levels in developing the detailed CNVMP.
Under clause 90 of *Protection of the Environment Operations (General) Regulation 2009* the EPA is the appropriate regulatory authority (ARA) for outdoor entertainment activities involving 200 people or more carried out within the Darling Harbour area. The ENVIA states that a noise management plan must be developed for Darling Harbour under this Regulation. Whilst the Regulation does not actually require a noise management plan to be developed, the EPA supports this strategy in managing noise from outdoor events held in the SICEEP precinct. The EPA therefore recommends a CoA requiring the proponent to develop an Operational Noise Management Plan for all outdoor events to be held on the Events Deck, to be submitted for the approval of the EPA The EPA recommends the following CoA: *Events Deck- Operational Noise Management Plan* The proponent must develop an Operational Noise Management Plan (ONMP) to be submitted to the EPA for approval. The plan must be approved prior to operations beginning at the Events Deck. The ONMP must apply to all outdoor events to be held on the Events Deck. The ONMP must contain, but not be limited to, the following: (a) The ONMP must be prepared in consultation with all relevant stakeholders, including the local community, EPA and City of Sydney Council. (b) In developing the ONMP, the proponent must take into account the existing requirements of any relevant development consent or approval and any noise monitoring data. (c) The ONMP must contain, but does not need to be limited to, the following:	DHL is committed to preparing an Operational Noise Management Plan for the Event Deck in consultation with the EPA. Recommendations of the EPA, acting reasonably, will be adopted, with appropriate management of operations to ensure compliance with EPA guidelines. The preparation of an Operation Noise Management Plan for the Event Deck is a matter appropriately dealt with via condition of consent. Events or functions will be undertaken between the hours of 7am and 10pm (including bump-in and bump-out) except for large celebratory events, such as Australia Day and New Years Eve. Low noise events or functions where there is no risk of exceeding the recommended noise level at the nearest residence at Night Time (after 10pm) will be finished by 11.00pm as recommended in the Environmental Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment prepared by AECOM. Notwithstanding the above, it is noted that the operations of the Event Deck cannot be subject to the approval of a third party, and there cannot be another party, such as OLGR, that imposes different requirements.

Comment	Response
(i) A brief description of each of Events Deck venue including: venue layout, description of permanent amplification systems and the types of activities to be held in the venue; (ii) Identification of noise sensitive receivers (such as residences, schools, hospitals, churches), existing and proposed, likely to be adversely affected by activities at the venue; (iii) Details of a noise monitoring program that monitors sound levels from outdoor entertainment activities held at the Events Deck, and retains records of the results and details of the monitoring equipment used, including its location and settings; (iv) Clearly defined noise management objectives for the Events Deck; (v) The maximum allowable sound levels and limitation level of excessive low frequency (bass) noise; (vi) A procedure or noise model (or other means of assessment) that allows for the prediction and assessment of noise levels for proposed activities; (vii) The operating hours for different events to be held at the Events Deck; (viii) A procedure for notifying potentially affected residents and other sensitive noise receivers of activities to be held at the venue; (ix) Details of a noise complaints handling procedure and actions to be taken at the time of each complaint to monitor and minimise noise impact; (x) Details of the community consultation procedure used after the event to obtain additional information relating to the noise impact as well as to provide	

Comment	Response
the complainant with information on proposed actions to prevent a recurrence of the impact; (xi) Identification and prioritisation of noise management problems and issues, including a summary of the outcomes from monitoring and community consultation, undertaken in preparing the ONMP; (xii) A mechanism for reporting the effectiveness of the ONMP to stakeholders, including the local community, the EPA and City of Sydney Council; and (xiii) A program for review of the ONMP, including ongoing assessment and improvement of the ONMP. The program must address the effectiveness of: • Community consultation (consultation prior to, during (complaints handling and response) and after outdoor events and consultation as part of the plan review process); • The use of technology or the set-up of equipment prior to events to mitigate or prevent noise impact; • The use of real time mitigation measures to mitigate or prevent noise impact; and • The use of monitoring programs, the monitoring data records and community consultation information to prevent or mitigate noise impacts from outdoor events. The program of review must also provide an Implementation Strategy that commits to specific management actions, including operational procedures to be implemented	

Comment	Response
along with timeframes. The specific management actions must incorporate best management practice that adequately addresses the identified problems and issues with both non-structural and structural aspects of noise management, such as community consultation, equipment set up, use of technology, real time noise mitigation measures, and monitoring program. The EPA recommends a CoA also requiring the facility operator/s to comply with the ONMP once the facility is in operation.	
The EPA has reviewed the proposed operation of the Events Deck for 'Large celebratory events'. While the EPA is the ARA for outdoor events within the Darling Harbour area, it does not currently have a policy or guideline regarding noise limits or hours for large cultural events. The selection of noise limits, operational hours and number of events permitted is a matter of balancing the achievement of cultural outcomes or requirements and minimising the impacts on surrounding sensitive receivers. The EPA recommends that the Department of Planning and Infrastructure (DP&I) consider this in making a decision as to whether the proposal for 'large celebratory events' is appropriate and, if so, set an appropriate CoA to regulate the noise levels, number, frequency and duration of these events.	DHL consider that large celebratory events are appropriate for the Event Deck and more broadly are compatible with Darling Harbour's role as as Sydney's prime event and entertainment destination. As above, the preparation of an Operation Noise Management Plan for the Event Deck (by condition of consent) will appropriately resolve this issue.
The EPA considers that the criteria of "background + 10dB" for emergency generators in Section 3.2.6 of the ENVIA is unnecessarily high and the need for this higher criteria has not been adequately justified. The EPA considers that emergency backup generators must be installed to meet "background+ 5dB," as required by the NSW Industrial Noise Policy (EPA 2000).	Acoustic Logic has confirmed that emergency back-up plant will be installed to meet "background + 5dB".
The EPA recommends that bump in / bump out for events at all venues should be limited to daytime only. The only bump in/ bump out activities permitted outside standard daytime hours should be those that do not cause background + 5dB or more LAeq levels, or background + 15dB LAmax levels, at residential receivers. The EPA recommends a CoA to ensure this limit is enforced.	DHL consider it unreasonable for bump in / bump out to only occur during the daytime as this will limit events within the Facilities. The existing facilities feature open loading docks that operate 24/7 each day of the year. Events or functions will be undertaken between the hours of 7am and 10pm (including bump-in and bump-out) except for large celebratory events. The proposed facilities are provided with internalised loading docks, or are acoustically screened and therefore will not produce noise exceeding EPA night-time

Comment	Response
	noise emission guidelines to surrounding residential receivers. DHL therefore consider that such a specific condition of approval is not required given the measures adopted. All bump-in /bump out activities will be reviewed with appropriate management of operations to ensure compliance with EPA guidelines.
The EPA considers that events (other than 'large celebratory events') must end at 10pm or 11pm as suggested, unless they do not cause the relevant Office of Liquor Gaming and Racing criteria to be exceeded at residential receivers, (noting the above issues identified with the criteria in Table 12 and 13 of the ENVIA). The EPA recommends a CoA to ensure this occurs.	DHL has reconsidered the use of the Event Deck to reduce noise impacts. The following precinct noise emission guidelines are proposed to determine noise emission limits covering the various noise sources and operating times. Noise emissions from exhibitions, concerts, functions and internal events shall comply with the following: • From 7am until 11pm – comply with NSW EPA Industrial Noise Policy guidelines • From 11pm to 7am – comply with NSW EPA Industrial Noise Policy and the requirements of the Office of Liquor, Gambling and Racing NSW Noise emissions from the events on the event deck and other external spaces shall comply with the following: • Events that may not meet EPA INP noise guidelines will terminate at 10pm. Events extending past 10pm must strictly comply with the EPA INP guideline between 10pm and 11pm. Events after 11pm are to comply with OLGR guidelines. • Up to 6 large celebratory events per year will be permitted that comply with the noise emission goal of RBL + 15 dB(A) • Operational Plan of Management should be developed to manage operation of the event deck and minimise noise emissions. Noise emissions from plant and equipment, bump in/bump out operations: • Comply with NSW EPA Industrial Noise Policy at all times.
The EPA recommends that specifications for event loudspeakers / amplification	DHL has no objection to EPA proposal.

Comment	Response
system design be obtained similar to those for the FIFA Fan Festival held in Darling Harbour and reported in: "Assessment of Environmental Noise Produced by the Sound System Used in the International FIFA Fan Fest". Report prepared by Acoustic Directions for Community Engagement and Events, Department of Premier and Cabinet. Report Ref: 100504 Fan Fest v1.0 May 2010.	
The Plan of Management contained within Appendix J of the EIS states that a heavy vehicle marshalling area may be required if the loading dock capacity is exceeded. The EPA considers that any truck marshalling area must be appropriately sited, designed and built to ensure that no unacceptable noise impacts occur. The EPA recommends that additional information regarding any proposed truck marshalling areas be provided prior to approval.	An off-site marshalling yard is not contemplated as part of this DA.
Section 3.2.3 of the ENVIA states that it has been assumed that activities at the loading dock will not contain any annoying noise characteristics. Operations of heavy vehicles around loading docks often involve the use of reversing beepers, which are considered to have annoying noise characteristics. It appears that the ENVIA has not considered this issue. The EPA recommends that additional information be provided prior to planning approval indicating either that reversing alarms have been considered in the loading dock design (e.g. through ensuring that reversing will not be required to reverse at any point in the loading dock area), or provide an assessment of the impact of reversing beepers on surrounding sensitive receivers.	Loading dock activities have been reviewed by Acoustic Logic and the appropriate modifying factors and a 5dB(A) penalty has been applied to the reversing alarms. Reasonable mitigation measures have been adopted with appropriate management of operations to ensure compliance with EPA guidelines. Mitigation measures have been included in the architectural design documentation. It is noted that as further operator information regarding the loading dock is received, further reviews will be conducted to ensure ongoing compliance with EPA noise emission goals.
The EPA recommends a CoA requiring the development of a Traffic Noise Management Strategy for the construction and operation of the SICEEP facility. The EPA recommends the following CoA: *Traffic Noise Management Strategy* The proponent must develop a Traffic Noise Management Strategy (TNMS) prior to commencement of construction and operation activities, to ensure that feasible and reasonable noise management strategies for vehicle movements associated with the facility are identified and applied, that include but are not necessarily limited to the following:	DHL is committed to developing a Traffic Noise Management Strategy prior to construction commencement. This is a matter appropriately dealt with via condition of consent.

Comment	Response
• driver training to avoid noisy practices such as the use of compression engine brakes near sensitive receivers, slamming or banging of tailgates / truck doors, loud radios or shouting during the night period; • best noise practice in the selection and maintenance of vehicle fleets; • movement scheduling where practicable to reduce impacts during sensitive times of the day; • design of the site layout and heavy vehicle movement paths so as to, as much as practicable, maximise forward movements and minimise reversing (to minimise potential impacts from reversing beepers); • implementation, as much as possible, of alternatives to tonal movement alarms ("reversing beepers") such as non-tonal reversing alarms, reversing cameras and/or proximity alarms; • appropriate speed restrictions on light and heavy vehicles to minimise noise impacts; • communication and management strategies for non licensee/proponent owned and operated vehicles to ensure the provisions of the TNMS are implemented; • a system of audited management practices that identifies non conformances, initiates and monitors corrective and preventative action (including disciplinary action for breaches of noise minimisation procedures) and assesses the implementation and improvement of the TNMS; • specific procedures for drivers to minimise impacts at identified sensitive	

Comment	Response
receivers; and • clauses in conditions of employment, or in contracts, of drivers that require adherence to the noise minimisation procedures and facilitate effective implementation of disciplinary actions for breaches of the procedures.	
The EPA considers that the characterisation of groundwater quality in the EIS is not adequate to enable an accurate assessment of the suitability of groundwater to be discharged from site via stormwater or directly to the Harbour. This is confirmed by the Site Audit Report, contained within Appendix E, which recommends additional groundwater monitoring be conducted prior to and after construction. In addition to the issues associated with the frequency and density of groundwater monitoring identified in the Site Audit Report, the EPA is concerned that that the groundwater assessments completed to date have not included any analysis for iron and manganese, which are commonly found at elevated concentrations in groundwater in the Sydney city area, and may have adverse water quality impacts if discharged to Cockle Ba.	In accordance with the Remedial Works Plan submitted with the DA, further groundwater testing will be carried out prior to and after construction. At this time further analysis will be undertaken for iron and manganese. As outlined in the Construction Management Plan, site waters will be tested and released to stormwater if it complies with certain quality criteria as discussed in the Flooding and Stormwater Report prepared by Hyder Consulting (Appendix U of EIS). On site treatment with discharge to stormwater may be implemented dependent on water quality.
Additional information is required prior to approval regarding the need for ongoing dewatering of basement areas during operation of the facility. In particular, information regarding whether it is likely that groundwater will be collected and discharged from basement areas, the location of any discharges, and details of any treatment required, and commitment to do so.	The proposal does not contain any basement areas. As a result, DHL do not consider this to be a relevant consideration.
If groundwater is proposed to be discharged to stormwater or Cockle Bay during construction or operation of the facility, additional groundwater monitoring is required prior to construction, through placement of an appropriate CoA. This monitoring should include (but not be limited to) analysis of iron and manganese concentration. The monitoring report should include: • An assessment of the background conditions of the proposed receiving environment with reference to the ANZECC (2000) Guidelines for Fresh and Marine Water Quality and the Marine Water Quality Objectives for NSW Ocean Waters;	In accordance with the Remedial Works Plan, no untreated groundwater generated during excavation or piling works, or sediment-laden surface water collected in stockpile runoff, is to enter Cockle Bay or the stormwater system, or is to be sprayed on other areas of vegetation. Any groundwater generated and pumped out during excavation will either be classified before disposal at an appropriately licensed liquid waste facility, or tested for contamination, treated if required and discharged from the site if it meets ANZECC (2000) marine water guidelines or in accordance with the relevant conditions of a Site Environmental Protection Licence (EPL). If seepage water is identified during excavation works, it will be assessed for heavy metals (arsenic, cadmium, chromium,

Comment	Response
• An assessment of the suitability of groundwater for discharge to the local receiving environment; • The proposed location of discharge points; • The volume of water expected to be discharged and the frequency of any discharges; • Any treatment required prior to discharge; and • Details of any proposed water quality monitoring.	copper, lead, nickel, mercury and zinc), TPH, BTEX and PAHs. The groundwater monitoring can include analysis of iron and manganese in addition to the proposed analytes.
The EPA recommends a CoA requiring that any water discharged from the site must comply with section 120 of the *Protection of Environment Operations Act 1997.*	DHL agrees that this is a matter appropriately dealt with via condition of consent, but notes it has obligation to comply with size even if not Condition of Consent.
With the exception of groundwater discharge (discussed above), risks to water quality during construction are generally associated with site management practices. The EPA recommends a CoA requiring preparation of a detailed Erosion and Sediment Control Plan for the project site prior to issue of the construction certificate. The plan should be prepared in accordance with Landcom (2004) 'Soils and Construction.' and should also address the water quality issues detailed above.	DHL has prepared the Sediment and Erosion Overall Concept Plan and this has been submitted with the Development Application. A detailed Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will be prepared prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate. This is a matter appropriately dealt with via condition of consent.
A CoA requiring the preparation of a Construction Air Quality Management Plan prior to construction works beginning on site, which should also address issues associated with odour; and A CoA requiring the proponent to minimise dust on site and prevent dust leaving the site during construction works.	DHL will prepare a Construction Air Quality Management Plan, prior to construction works beginning on site. This is a matter appropriately dealt with via condition of consent.
The EPA therefore recommends a CoA requiring the proponent to prepare an Acid Sulfate Soil Assessment and Management Plan in accordance with *Acid Sulfate Soils Manual* (Stone *et* a/. 1998), prior to construction. The EPA recommends that the CoA specify that laboratory testing of soil samples be completed. The EPA also recommends an additional CoA requiring that the proponent comply with the Acid Sulfate Soils Management Plan during construction works. In order to protect	An Acid Sulfate Soil Management Plan has been completed and included as an Appendix to the Remedial Works Plan. Compliance with the ASSMP is appropriately dealt with via Condition of Consent.

Comment	Response
surrounding water bodies from impacts associated with acid sulfate soils, the EPA considers that the CoA previously recommended, requiring any water discharges to comply with section 120 of the *Protection of Environment Operations Act 1997* is appropriate.	
The EPA recommends a CoA requiring that all waste generated on site must be classified and disposed of in accordance with the *Waste Classification Guidelines* (DECC 2008).	DHL confirms that all waste will be classified in accordance with relevant guidelines. This is a matter appropriately dealt with via condition of consent.
DGR 16 requires the EIS to address community notification and complaints handling. The EPA recommends a CoA requiring the development of a Community Consultation and Engagement Plan prior to construction beginning on site. The plan should include how notification of residents and complaints associated with other elements of the SICEEP project (i.e. The Haymarket and Hotel components) will be managed.	DHL is committed to preparing a Community Consultation and Engagement Plan prior to construction commencement. This is a matter appropriately dealt with via condition of consent. A Complaints Management Plan has been included in the Construction Management Plan submitted with the Development Application.
The EPA recommends a CoA requiring preparation of a Community Engagement and Consultation Plan for the operation of the facility prior to operations beginning at the site. The plan should ensure that the community is able to contact the SICEEP facility operators at all times that activities are taking place (including bump in/ bump out and during exhibitions and events) to make complaints and provide feedback *via* email and telephone. The plan should include a community complaints and feedback management procedure and procedures for notifying the community of events that are likely to cause concern due to noise, congestion or other issues. Community contact numbers and email addresses should be made publically available *via* the facility website.	DHL is committed to preparing a Community Consultation and Engagement Plan prior to operations beginning on site. This is a matter appropriately dealt with via condition of consent.
In the EPA's letter to DP&I dated 11 January 2013 regarding the request for DGRs for the project, the EPA recommended a DGR requiring the EIS to consider the cumulative impacts of project construction on the environment and local community, including impacts associated with the development of other components of the SICEEP precinct as well as external projects. Although the DGRs do not require consideration of cumulative impacts during construction, the EPA notes that the DGRs for the project specifically reference the EPA's letter, which is provided in Attachment 2 to the DGRs. The EPA considers that cumulative impacts are likely,	As required by Department of Planning and Infrastructure, DHL has provided a plan showing proposed traffic routes for construction based traffic, as well as a program outlining key construction projects in the vicinity of SICEEP. This is included in the Transport and Traffic Assessment Addendum Report prepared by Hyder (refer to **Appendix M**). It will be reviewed and updated in consultation with TfNSW prior to commencement of construction. This is a matter appropriately dealt with via condition of consent.

Comment	Response
particularly with regard to construction of different elements of the SICEEP project. The EPA recommends that additional information regarding cumulative construction impacts be provided prior to approval.	With regard to the cumulative impact of the PPP Site and The Haymarket Concept Proposal (SSDA2), the SSDA2 Noise and Vibration Assessment prepared by Renzo Tonin & Associates concluded that there were no common sensitive receptors identified other than the Novotel. However, as SSDA1 would potentially impact upon to the northern façade of the Novotel, and SSDA2 would potentially impact upon the southern façade, the two components of the SICEEP project are not expected to result in any adverse cumulative impact at Novotel site.