



DOC18/217489
SSD 8544

15 May 2018

Mr Cameron Sargent
Team Leader – Key Sites Assessments
Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Dear Mr Sargent

PROPOSED CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT ON GLEBE ISLAND – COMMENTS ON EIS

Thank you for providing the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) with the opportunity to comment on the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Glebe Island Concrete Batching Plant proposed by Hanson Construction Materials Pty Ltd (SSD 8544).

In summary, the EPA considers that further information regarding construction and operational noise impacts and assessment is required from the proponent before the EPA can support the proposal and provide recommended conditions. The EPA's detailed comments are attached.

An environment protection licence under the *Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997* may be required for this facility.

Should you require clarification regarding the contents of this letter, please contact the undersigned on 9995 6953 or mike.sharpin@epa.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M. Sharpin'.

MIKE SHARPIN
Unit Head - Metropolitan Infrastructure
Environment Protection Authority

Attachment A

Phone 131 555
Phone +61 2 9995
5555
(from outside NSW)

Fax +61 2 9995 5999
TTY 133 677
ABN 43 692 285 758

PO Box 668
Parramatta
NSW 2124 Australia

Level 13
10 Valentine Av
Parramatta NSW
2150 Australia

info@epa.nsw.gov.au
www.epa.nsw.gov.au

ATTACHMENT A

– THE ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION AUTHORITY’S COMMENTS – PROPOSED CONCRETE BATCHING PLANT ON GLEBE ISLAND

1. Construction phase

The EPA anticipates that construction and construction-related activities will be undertaken in an environmentally responsible manner with emphasis on:

- compliance with recommended standard construction hours;
- feasible and reasonable noise and vibration minimisation and mitigation;
- effective dust control and management;
- erosion and sediment control; and
- waste handling and management.

1.1 Air impacts

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

The EPA notes the EIS conclusion that dust impacts on surrounding sensitive receptors caused by construction works are generally negligible and low. A review of the air assessment supports this conclusion as the EPA notes;

- the assessment of impacts was a semi-quantitative risk assessment of potential dust impacts, carried out in accordance with the methodology described in *Guidance on the assessment of dust from demolition and construction* (IAQM 2014), and
- mitigation measures are described, and shall be implemented as part of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

1.2 Noise impacts

The EPA emphasises the importance of properly managing noise and vibration impacts during site preparation, construction and construction-related activities, especially in regard to high noise impact activities, such as grinding, jack hammering, rock breaking and hammering, rock drilling and saw cutting.

The EPA notes that the accompanying Notes to Tables 14 and 15 of the Noise Impact Assessment (NIA), forming Appendix D of the EIS, introduces a ‘negligible’, ‘moderate’, and ‘appreciable’ rating for residual noise impacts above the relevant Interim Construction Noise Guideline (ICNG) noise management levels. This is inconsistent with the ICNG where specific actions are detailed where the noise management level is exceeded (ICNG, Table 2). The NIA mitigation actions should align with the ICNG specific actions.

The EPA **recommends** that further information be provided in the ‘response to submissions report’ for this EIS where the proponent:

- (a) propose mitigation actions for during construction that align with the ICNG specific actions, and
- (b) presents detailed information on feasible and reasonable mitigation to manage construction noise from the proposal, and also cumulative construction noise impacts from the neighbouring Glebe Island Multi-User Facility.

2. Operational phase (on-shore facility)

2.1 Air impacts

The EPA notes the EIS conclusion that particulate matter, Nitrogen Dioxide, and Sulphur Dioxide caused by facility operations, vehicle exhaust, and berthed ships shall not exceed the EPA air quality criteria as defined in the *Approved Methods for Modelling and Assessment of Air Pollutants in NSW* (EPA 2017). A review of the air assessment supports this conclusion as the EPA notes;

- AERMOD was used to model the dispersion of off-site particulate matter (PM) and gaseous air quality metrics for a peak 24-hour operational day scenario (worst case), and an average production day,
- a contemporaneous assessment of cumulative PM₁₀ concentrations, and use of the Ozone Limiting Method for cumulative NO₂ concentrations predicted no exceedances of the air quality criteria at surrounding sensitive receptors,
- mitigation measures are described, and shall be implemented as part of an Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP), and
- ongoing management practices and performance monitoring shall be implemented.

2.2 Noise impacts

The EPA notes the NIA suggestion to apply a noise management precinct approach in the assessment of operational noise from this proposal. Applying the precinct approach to industrial activities at Glebe Island however, requires further specific detail on how it will function in this instance, in accordance with Section 2.8 of the EPA's Noise Policy for Industry (NPfI). Without this necessary detail, the EPA cannot support a noise management precinct approach and can only consider the proposal in a standalone manner. Refer to Recommendation (a) of this part.

The EPA notes that the NIA predicts a 2 dB exceedance of the sleep disturbance noise level at Pyrmont (Table 19). Although this is classified as a negligible increase, the events are associated with truck start ups and compressed air releases, with the potential to occur frequently. The exceedance is justified by referencing an external building façade criteria of 63 dB(A) for a development at Jackson's Landing (Pyrmont). The EPA does not consider this appropriate as a justification for residual noise impacts because feasible and reasonable mitigation should be investigated at the noise source, and transmission path before any consideration of mitigation at the receiver. Refer to Recommendation (b) and (c) of this part.

It is unclear to the EPA whether the proponent has used the noise mitigation design at the façade of properties at Pyrmont to justify increasing the noise amenity trigger levels at that location, in turn permitting higher operational noise levels. If this is the intent of Table 8 and the accompanying Notes 6 and 7, the EPA considers such an approach to be inappropriate. Also, Notes 5 and 7 to Table 8, which gives the amenity and intrusiveness noise levels and resulting project trigger noise levels, suggest these have been influenced by façade noise attenuation design levels at Jackson's Landing, Pyrmont. It is inappropriate for these to be used to derive assessment criteria or to justify an increase in noise emissions, and is inconsistent with the NPfI. The NIA must derive project noise trigger levels in accordance with the NPfI. Although there is a case to be made about façade noise levels in the context of discussion about the *impact*, and feasible and reasonable mitigation to manage that impact, façade mitigation should not be used to justify a higher noise trigger level setting. Refer to Recommendation (d) of this part.

The EPA notes that beneath Table 8, the NIA quotes how the NPfI characterises residual noise impacts. However, this implies that it can be interpreted as a means of assessing the significance of operational noise against a noise trigger level. This is not as intended, which is to guide decision-making around what constitutes feasible and reasonable mitigation.

The EPA notes that Section 6.2.1 of the NIA refers to mitigation which has been identified and applied to the modelled noise sources used in the operational noise model detailed in Table 13. These assumed mitigation measures should be detailed. Refer to Recommendation (e) of this part.

The EPA notes that Section 6.2.2 of the NIA provides no evidence to support its claim that no corrections are required for annoying noise characteristics. Refer to Recommendation (f) of this part.

The EPA **recommends** that further information be provided in the 'response to submissions report' for this EIS, specifically;

- (a) provide further specific detail on how the proposed noise management precinct will function in accordance with Section 2.8 of the NPfI,
- (b) carry out a detailed assessment of maximum noise level events as required by and in accordance with Section 2.5 of the NPfI,
- (c) provide detailed information on feasible and reasonable mitigation measures to address the predicted 2 dB exceedance of the sleep disturbance noise level at Pyrmont (Table 19),
- (d) derive project noise trigger levels in accordance with the NPfI,
- (e) provide detailed information regarding the assumed mitigation measures listed in Table 13 of the NIA,
- (f) provide evidence to support the claim that no corrections are required for annoying noise characteristics as per Section 6.2.2 of the NIA, and
- (g) clearly state whether the source sound power levels (SWLs) and assumptions on the number of deliveries / volume of concrete represent the maximum capacity of the proposal. If not, predictions must consider future growth of the project.

2.3 Stormwater impacts

The EPA notes the EIS conclusion that stormwater run-off can comply with the water quality provisions and objectives of the Leichhardt Development Control Plan (DCP) 2013. A review of the watercycle management plan supports this conclusion as the EPA notes;

- proposed stormwater quality improvement devices (SQIDs) (i.e. rainwater tanks, enviropods, and stormwater collection tank) are described, and shall be implemented as part of a stormwater treatment system,
- MUSIC modelling showed that the proposed stormwater treatment system shall enable the premises to comply with the water quality objectives of the Leichhardt DCP 2013,
- monitoring of stormwater run-off water quality shall be carried out as part of a Water Quality Monitoring Plan, and
- mitigation measures are described, and shall be implemented.

3. **Operational phase (vessel operations)**

3.1 Air impacts

The EPA acknowledges that 1 January 2020 has been set as the global implementation date under MARPOL for a significant reduction in the sulphur content of the fuel oil used by ships, from 3.5% to 0.5%.

The EPA **recommends** that the 'response to submissions report' for this EIS include a commitment by the proponent to an interim requirement for ships berthing at the Concrete Batching Plant to use low sulfur until 1 January 2020 (should operations commence before this date), unless the ship operator can demonstrate that this is not technically feasible for a particular ship.

3.2 Noise impacts

The EPA recognises that Glebe Island is a long-standing working port but anticipates changes in vessel movements associated with the proposed development may have significant operational noise impacts on nearby sensitive receivers.

The EPA notes the NIA inference that the NSW Industrial Noise Policy (INP) and its successor, the NPfI, are not appropriate to assess noise from vessels at berth. The EPA's expectation is that noise from vessels at berth must be assessed in the NIA against the requirements of the NPfI.

The EPA is unclear on whether the SWL of 106 dB(A) for the vessel, CSL Rhine (NIA Table 13) is fully appropriate and representative of the type of loading/unloading expected. The EPA notes the NIA suggestion that there could be different ships and hence noise emissions:

“Hanson advised that they will co-ordinate with the ship operator(s) to ensure that the ship’s engine, raw material unloading conveyor mechanism and associated ventilation systems...are minimised where feasible and reasonable to do so” (p.29)

The EPA **recommends** that further information be provided in the ‘response to submissions report’ for this EIS where the proponent;

- (a) assess noise impacts from vessels at berth in accordance with the requirements of the NPfI,
- (b) provide information on SWLs from potential vessels to be used for loading/unloading, and other types of loading/unloading equipment, e.g. crane and bucket, other than the CSL Rhine,
- (c) make clear whether the modelled noise sources from loading/unloading include noise from the vessel, or just the loading/unloading activities, and
- (d) clarify the modelled scenarios by providing noise contour maps of all scenarios in the NIA clearly showing the location of noise sources, buildings, structures, terrain, and receivers.
