

Appendix B – Public Authority Response

A number of public authorities have been invited to provide input into the SEARs from DPIE prior to its issue on 11 August 2020. Their responses were identified as part of Attachment 2 of the SEARs. These comments have been summarised and described below.

Public Authority Response	Project response
TfNSW	
TfNSW sought that the EIS was to address a number of strategic planning documents, include a Navigation and Safety Assessment, a Traffic and Transport Impact Assessment and that TfNSW be included as part of the consultation process.	<p>The issues identified were generally consistent with what was required by the SEARs.</p> <p>The Strategic and Statutory planning context has been addressed in Section 5.1 of the EIS. The proposal is administrative in nature and does not involve building works.</p> <p>A Marine Safety Assessment has been prepared in Appendix I which concludes that the impacts of additional vessel movements associated with this proposal are acceptable.</p> <p>Traffic have prepared a Traffic Impact Assessment in Appendix F which undertakes a SIDRA analysis to determine that the traffic and movement related impacts of the proposal are acceptable. Swept path diagrams are also provided. Mitigation measures are also provided to further reduce the impact of additional truck movements associated with the proposal.</p> <p>Refer to Section 5 of the EIS for further detail.</p> <p>TfNSW was invited to consult with Cement Australia, with the outcomes of this consultation provided in Section 4 of the EIS.</p>
Heritage Council of NSW	
The Heritage Council of NSW sought that a Statement of Heritage Impact was prepared in accordance with NSW Heritage Manual guidelines.	Weir Phillips Heritage have prepared a Heritage Impact Statement in Appendix C in accordance with NSW heritage guidelines which has concluded that the heritage impacts of the proposal are acceptable, given that no works are proposed.
Port Authority NSW	
Port Authority NSW requires that an acoustic assessment be carried out with regard to the draft Port Noise Policy, the Vessel Noise Operating Protocol and the EPA's Noise Policy for Industry. They also requested that a Marine Navigation and Safety assessment be carried out for the proposal.	<p>An Acoustic Report prepared in accordance with Noise Policy for Industry, Vessel Noise Operating Protocol and Port Noise Policy has been prepared in Appendix H.</p> <p>A Marine Safety Assessment has been prepared in Appendix I.</p>
Environment, Energy and Science Group (EES)	
Environment, Energy and Science Group (EES) of the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment were consulted, with the EES providing no further comment to the SEARs.	n/a

Public Authority Response	Project response
Inner West Council	
<p>Inner West Council (IWC) sought a number of items to be incorporated into the SEARs, relating to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration of the Glebe Cement Silos into the broader Bays Precinct and consistency with State strategic direction for the broader precinct; • Noise impacts; • Traffic impacts; • Air quality impacts; • Light spill impacts; • Ecology impacts; • Marine safety; • Aboriginal heritage impacts; • Built form heritage impacts; • And other miscellaneous requirements. 	<p>Section 5 of the EIS relates to the consistency of the proposal with the strategic planning framework and concludes that the proposal is consistent with all relevant strategic documents at State level. Sections 5.2-5.6 of the EIS assesses the proposal in detail against specific SEARs requirements in relation to noise, traffic, air quality, heritage and marine safety.</p> <p>An Acoustic Report prepared in accordance with Noise Policy for Industry and Draft Noise Policy has been prepared in Appendix H. This report has taken into account relevant noise amenity criteria found within the Noise Policy for Industry and the Port Noise Policy. Assessment of noise impacts, both individual and cumulative was undertaken and taken from residential receptors in Rozelle, Balmain, Pyrmont and Glebe and included noise from truck movements and ship unloading.</p> <p>An air quality assessment has been carried out by ERM in Appendix G. It concludes that the associated increases in emissions are minor and are unlikely to lead to any local impacts on air quality or additional exceedances to air quality criteria. Current monitoring data has been summarised and show that concentrations of pollutants are at acceptable levels.</p> <p>No works are proposed and thus the proposal will have minimal impact on ecology, hydrology and land stability on the site and its surrounds.</p> <p>The facility currently operates 24/7 and there is no change to the existing lighting situation.</p> <p>Traffic have prepared a Traffic Impact Assessment in Appendix F which undertakes a SIDRA analysis to determine that the traffic and movement related impacts of the proposal are acceptable. Swept path diagrams are also provided. Mitigation measures are also provided to further reduce the impact of additional truck movements associated with the proposal.</p> <p>Refer to Section 5 of the EIS for further detail.</p> <p>No physical works are proposed and the proposal is not likely to uncover Aboriginal sites or artefacts.</p> <p>An Environmental Management Plan can be conditioned as part of any future consent.</p>
NSW EPA	
<p>The NSW EPA provided comments relating to noise and air quality impact assessment.</p> <p>In relation to noise, the EPA sought that cumulative noise impacts were considered against relevant guidelines including the Noise Policy for Industry, draft Port Noise Policy and Vessel Noise Operating Protocol.</p>	<p>An Acoustic Report has been prepared by ERM in Appendix H which considers noise impacts on sensitive receivers from proposed operational activities. A cumulative assessment of noise impacts has been provided which includes the Glebe Island concrete batching plant. This report assesses the proposal against the Noise Policy for Industry and the Port Noise Policy,</p>