

# **Appendix A** – Clause 228 matters for consideration

Factor	Comment	Impact
a. Any environmental impact on the community?	<p>The environmental impact on the community from the proposal would be minor and short term during construction. Impacts can be mitigated through the measures summarised in Section 7.2. Long-term positive impacts would include ongoing security of water supply in the proposal area.</p>	<p>Short term minor negative</p> <p>Long term positive</p>
b. Any transformation of a locality?	<p>Construction of the proposal would primarily occur via progressive open trench. Short-term noise, dust and aesthetic impacts may occur during the construction period.</p> <p>Post-construction, the land would be rehabilitated to pre-construction quality.</p>	Short term minor negative
c. Any environmental impact on the ecosystems of the locality?	<p>Three EECs listed under the BC Act occur within the proposal area and would be impacted by the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bangalay Sand Forest of the Sydney Basin and South East Corner bioregions EEC</li> <li>• Swamp Sclerophyll Forest on Coastal Floodplains of the New South Wales North Coast, Sydney Basin and South East Corner Bioregions EEC</li> <li>• Sydney Freshwater Wetlands in the Sydney Basin Bioregion EEC</li> </ul> <p>The biodiversity assessment found that the proposal would not cause significant impacts to these EECs (Section 6.3).</p> <p>The proposal would result in some unavoidable residual impacts on some elements of the ecosystem of the locality, including removal of native vegetation and associated fauna habitat resources. These residual impacts are small in extent and magnitude and would comprise a minor impact on the ecosystem of the locality.</p>	Short term minor negative
d. Any reduction of the aesthetic, recreational, scientific or other environmental quality or value of a locality?	<p>During construction, the proposal would result in a minor reduction in the aesthetic quality of the locality as a result of potential dust generation, noise and vibration, visual impacts and traffic movements. These impacts would be minimised through implementation of the management measures and safeguards summarised in Section 7.2.</p> <p>The proposal would not reduce recreational, scientific or other environmental qualities of the locality.</p>	Short term negative
e. Any effect on a locality, place or building having aesthetic, anthropological, archaeological, architectural, cultural, historical, scientific or social significance or other special value for present or future generations?	<p>As no AHIMS sites are located within the proposal area, impacts to previously registered Aboriginal cultural objects are not anticipated. An area of potential intact A horizon soils would be managed through the mitigation and management measures outlined in Section 6.4.3.</p> <p>The proposal is unlikely to impact on non-Aboriginal heritage.</p>	<p>Nil</p> <p>Nil</p>

Factor	Comment	Impact
f. Any impact on the habitat of any protected fauna (within the meaning of the <i>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</i> )?	The proposal would require clearing of 3.1 ha of native vegetation, which comprises potential habitat for a number of protected fauna species. The biodiversity assessment for the proposal (Section 6.3) found that this would not constitute a significant impact.	Short term minor negative
g. Any endangering of any species of animal, plant or other form of life, whether living on land, in water or in the air?	<p>Three EECs listed under the BC Act occur within the proposal area and would be impacted by the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bangalay Sand Forest of the Sydney Basin and South East Corner bioregions EEC</li> <li>• Swamp Sclerophyll Forest on Coastal Floodplains of the New South Wales North Coast, Sydney Basin and South East Corner Bioregions EEC</li> <li>• Sydney Freshwater Wetlands in the Sydney Basin Bioregion EEC</li> </ul> <p>No threatened flora species listed under the BC Act were recorded or are considered likely to occur within the proposal area.</p> <p>Tests of significance have been undertaken for eleven threatened fauna species and EEC's which are known to occur or may occur in the proposal area. The biodiversity assessment found that the proposal would not cause significant impacts to these fauna species or EECs listed above (Section 6.3).</p>	Nil
h. Any long-term effects on the environment?	There would not be any long term effects on the environment as a result of the proposal.	Nil
i. Any degradation of the quality of the environment?	<p>Construction would result in potential temporary traffic, noise and air quality impacts. Impacts on water quality are possible through erosion and sedimentation. These impacts would be minimised through the implementation of safeguards outlined in Section 7.2.</p> <p>The proposed activity would not result in permanent degradation to the quality of the environment.</p>	Short-term minor negative
j. Any risk to the safety of the environment?	<p>There is potential for road safety to be adversely affected during construction due to altered traffic conditions. There is also the possibility of pollution due to storage and use of hazardous material, erosion and sedimentation, dust and noise and vibration. These impacts would be minimised through the implementation of safeguards outlined in Section 7.2.</p> <p>The proposal does not pose a long term risk to the safety of the environment.</p>	<p>Short-term minor negative</p> <p>Nil</p>
k. Any reduction in the range of beneficial uses of the environment?	The proposal would not reduce the range of beneficial uses of the environment.	Nil

Factor	Comment	Impact
l. Any pollution of the environment?	<p>Construction of the proposal could potentially result in water pollution from sediments, soil nutrients, waste, and spilt fuels and chemicals. Management of water quality impacts would be undertaken in accordance with the mitigation measures outlined in Section 7.2.</p> <p>The proposal could result in minor short-term air, noise and vibration pollution from plant and machinery and the generation of dust during construction. Land contamination could result from incorrect storage or handling of hazardous materials.</p> <p>All waste produced would be disposed of appropriately and materials used on site would be managed effectively.</p> <p>Management of these potential impacts would be undertaken in accordance with the mitigation measures outlined in Section 7.2.</p>	Short-term minor negative
m. Any environmental problems associated with the disposal of waste?	<p>The proposal would generate wastes. The waste streams generated during construction are typical and would pose no difficulty in their disposal. Waste would be recycled wherever possible and would be managed in accordance with the waste management hierarchy.</p>	Nil
n. Any increased demands on resources, natural or otherwise, which are, or are likely to become in short supply?	<p>The proposal would not place increased demands on limited resources. All resources required for the works are readily available and able to be sourced from within Australia.</p>	Nil
o. Any cumulative environmental effect with other existing or likely future activities?	<p>There are no significant cumulative impacts anticipated with the proposal.</p>	Nil
p. Any impact on coastal processes and coastal hazards, including those under projected climate change conditions?	<p>The proposal is not located within land mapped as coastal wetlands or littoral rainforest, therefore Divisions 1 and 2 of Coastal Management SEPP do not apply. However, it is adjacent to mapped coastal wetlands and within the proximity area for coastal wetlands, coastal environment area and within coastal use area.</p> <p>The proposal is within mapped coastal environment area and coastal use area. Requirements for development in these areas are provided in Divisions 3 and 4. As development consent is not required for the proposed works, the provisions of Division 3 and 4 of the Coastal Management SEPP do not apply. However, these provisions have been taken into account in this REF in order to fully assess impacts to the environment. It is considered that the proposal is consistent with the provisions of Division 3 and 4 of Coastal Management SEPP regarding development within the coastal environment and coastal use areas</p>	Nil