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Executive Summary

The Prison Bed Capacity Program is currently being managed by the Prison Bed Unit (PBU) of the NSW Department of Justice, for the delivery of additional capacity in NSW correctional centres. A number of capital works projects are planned across NSW, and pre-design activities are now required to progress planning and design of the Juniperina Juvenile Justice Centre (JJC) at Lidcombe.

The JJC at Lidcombe NSW was transferred to the Department of Justice on the 1st July 2016. The existing facility was commissioned to accommodate female juvenile detainees within four accommodation buildings comprising of 44 cells and four associated assessment cells.

The NSW Department of Justice is proposing to repurpose and upgrade the existing Juniperina JJC facilities to meet the needs of the State’s growing prison population for use as a maximum security female remand correctional centre, gazetted as Mary Wade Correctional Centre (CC). The repurposing and security upgrade works generally include;

- Upgrade of the existing facility to be repurposed and ‘hardened’ as a maximum security ‘front end’ remand centre for up to 94 female inmates.

This REF has been prepared to assess the potential impacts associated with the repurposing and upgrade works. The works would be undertaken within the existing CC complex compound and are summarised as:

- Fitout of all accommodation blocks, including Building C, D, F & G to accommodate 94 new maximum security beds;
- Redevelopment and configuration of the existing reception area of Building A;
- Redevelopment of the existing visits area of Building A to accommodate the additional inmate numbers;
- Fitout of the administration, stores, educational and vocational facilities of Building E;
- Upgrade of the electronic Security;
- Construction of new vehicle lock;
- Installation of two new transportable staff amenities buildings; and
- Construction of new maintenance shed.

The location and footprint of the proposed upgraded facilities is shown on the plans provided in Appendix A.

Planning Framework

The proposed works are permissible without consent pursuant to clause 26 of State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007, which allows development for certain works undertaken by a public authority in connection with an existing correction centre to proceed without the need to gain development consent.

This Review of Environmental Factors (REF) has been prepared to assess the potential environmental impacts of the proposed works in accordance with the requirements of Part 5 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act).

Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

A number of potential environmental impacts associated with the construction and operation of the Mary Wade CC maximum security female remand centre repurposing works proposed at the Juniperina JJC site have been identified and are briefly discussed below.

The Juniperina JJC site is highly disturbed having been mostly cleared of vegetation over many decades, although some localised natural vegetation is evident in some areas of the
Vegetation clearing is proposed as part of the construction works within the secure perimeter of the centre. The footprint of the new works involves mostly the internal re-fit of existing buildings and disturbed and cleared areas of the site adjacent to the JJC buildings. Approximately 80 trees would require removal within the CC site, to allow for the vehicle lock extension and to create a tree exclusion/tree clearance distance from the security perimeter fence in accordance with current Department of Justice security specifications.

Specialist ecological and heritage assessments were carried out in relation to certain trees on site which were identified as potentially significant during the preliminary arboricultural site assessment. The ecological assessment concluded that the trees identified for removal may proceed without significant impact. The heritage assessment also concluded the trees scheduled for removal which are located with the heritage curtilage onsite, may be removed without significantly impacting the heritage item on site.

The overall net amount of vegetation and habitat lost would be moderate, as the majority of mature trees within the site would remain intact. The trees located along the property boundary would be maintained to screen the site from surrounding properties. Mitigation measures proposed as part of this REF related to flora and fauna and landscaping will manage any impacts associated with the construction works.

The construction area is within close proximity to neighbouring residential properties along the western boundary of the site, and therefore it is likely that some inconvenience to residents would be expected during construction due to increased traffic, noise and other impacts to the local amenity.

No road closures or traffic detours will be required on the public road network during the construction phases. A transport and traffic assessment has determined that the increased traffic is not predicted to have an impact on local traffic flow and only a minor inconvenience to local road users is expected.

Mitigation measures proposed as part of this REF related to traffic and noise will manage any temporary impacts associated with the construction works.

A Services Investigation report undertaken for the proposal has confirmed that there would be no significant impact to services during construction activities, or during operation of the CC.

Prior to construction commencing, a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) would be developed by the construction contractor, to detail how the environmental management of the project would be implemented.

Whilst there are many perceived community concerns in relation to local correctional centres, based on the socio-economic assessment of other new or upgraded correctional centres, these issues are generally not valid in most cases. The change of use from juvenile justice centre to a female remand maximum security prison will have a number of social benefits to the local community such as additional employment for local residents. It is considered unlikely that those inmates (not previously residents of the Lidcombe region) would remain in the area post-release or that family members of inmates would move to the area.

Whilst there may be a small impact on increased demand for services such as health and social services, these would be managed through the Centre maintaining open lines of communication with the relevant agencies. There is the potential for improved benefits for the community, such as the maintenance of social networks, employment and training opportunities.

Community consultation undertaken as part of the proposal found that overall there were few concerns expressed by the local community in relation to safety and security.
The proposed development is within the confines of an existing correctional centre facility and is not expected to have a significant adverse impact on the amenity of the surrounding residential areas.

Post-construction, the repurposed Juniperina JJC would accommodate 94 female remand maximum security inmates. The provision of female maximum security accommodation at Mary Wade CC will assist in alleviating the current pressure on the State’s prison system and will respond to long term growth forecasts. The correctional facilities will assist in maintaining the social support networks of both current and future inmates from the western Sydney region of NSW.

Summary

Pursuant to the provisions of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* and *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000*, an environmental assessment of the proposed repurposing of the existing Juniperina JJC to the Mary Wade CC has been undertaken. Consideration has been given to the likely impact of the activity on the environment, having regard to all relevant factors. On the basis of the information presented in this REF, it is concluded that by adopting the safeguards identified in this assessment it is unlikely that there would be significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the proposed works.
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1 Introduction

This section provides details on the background of the proposal, its objectives, and site location.

1.1 Background and Purpose of the Proposal

The Juniperina Juvenile Justice Centre (JJC), henceforth referred to as the ‘Site’, at Lidcombe NSW was transferred to the Department of Justice on the 1st July 2016. The existing facility was commissioned to accommodate female juvenile detainees within four accommodation buildings comprising of 44 cells and four associated assessment cells.

The unprecedented and unanticipated rise in inmate numbers in recent years, which has exceeded previous inmate population projections, has placed demand pressures on the correctional system. This has resulted in a number of inefficiencies and operational challenges, particularly in metropolitan Sydney.

The NSW Department of Justice is therefore proposing to repurpose and upgrade (harden) the existing Juniperina JJC facilities for use as a maximum security female remand correctional centre for up to 94 female inmates known as Mary Wade Correctional Centre (CC). The Site was gazetted as Mary Wade Correctional Centre and Complex on the 16 September 2016, to allow for the repurposing of the site.

The repurposing of the Juniperina JJC site is required to meet the needs of the State’s growing prison population and to overcome the operational management challenges of the correctional system in the Sydney metropolitan area. The proposed upgrade works to the Juniperina JJC facilities are detailed below in Section 1.2.

This REF has been prepared to assess the potential impacts associated with the repurposing and security upgrade of the Juniperina JJC to Mary Wade CC, and associated works.

1.2 Project Summary

The proposal involves the repurposing and upgrade of the existing Juniperina JJC facility by 46 beds, from 44 to 94 (female) inmate capacity.

The following associated facilities are proposed as part of the repurposing works at the Site:

- Fitout of all accommodation blocks, including Building C, D, F & G to accommodate 94 new maximum security beds;
- Redevelopment and configuration of the existing reception area of Building A;
- Redevelopment of the existing visits area of Building A to accommodate the additional inmate numbers;
- Fitout of the administration, stores, educational and vocational facilities of Building E;
- Upgrade of the electronic security;
- Construction of new vehicle lock;
- Installation of two new transportable staff amenities buildings; and
- Construction of new maintenance shed.

The location and footprint of the proposed repurposed and upgraded facilities within the existing Site is shown on site plans provided in Appendix A.
1.3 Objectives
The objective of the proposal is to:

- Repurpose and upgrade (harden) the existing facility as a maximum security 'front end' remand centre for up to 94 female inmates;
- Provide additional prison accommodation and associated infrastructure to assist in alleviating the current state shortage; and
- Ensure compliance with legislation and conditions of approval, permits and licences.

1.4 Location and Land Use
The Juniperina JJC site (gazetted as Mary Wade CC on 16 September 2016) is located at 169 Joseph Street, Lidcombe, NSW within the Cumberland Local Government Area, approximately 15km to the west of the Sydney CBD (refer to Figure 1-2).

The operational Juniperina JJC facility had the capacity to accommodate 44 juvenile detainees. The complex accommodated female juvenile offenders who were on control orders or on remand under New South Wales and/or Commonwealth legislation. The JJC also provided a range of health, educational, vocational and spiritual services to the detainees, including individual case management, specialised counselling, and training in job and living skills. Additional associated infrastructure and administrative units of Juvenile Justice NSW and Corrective Services NSW were also located on-site.

The complex is currently non-operational and unoccupied. Prior to closure, the JJC facility was not functioning at capacity and accommodated only approximately eight inmates who were moved to an alternate juvenile justice centre in July 2016.

The Juvenile Justice Centre facility was originally built in 2005. The facility accommodation and administration buildings are located in western part of the property; with a large area of unmanaged cleared land in the eastern portion of the property underneath overhead powerlines, with a small pocket of remnant bushland classified as Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest in the Sydney Basin Bioregion located just outside the south-eastern site boundary.

The area surrounding the facility’s perimeter security wall and fence comprises a car park in the south-western area of the site and landscaped, planted vegetation and manicured grassed areas present around the facility and property perimeter.

The site frontage and site access driveway connects directly to Joseph Street via an ungated driveway located on the eastern side of the site.

Development in the area surrounding the proposal site typically includes low density residential development to the north and east of the site, a golf course to the northwest, and an industrial area is located to the south of the site. A train line is located immediately adjacent to the northern boundary of the property. The nearest resident to the eastern site boundary is approximately 30m.

A locally significant heritage-listed former residential cottage known as the ‘Minali Special School’ is located near the southern boundary of the property, to the east of the car park area. The cottage is an asset of Corrective Services NSW (CSNSW), listed on the Department of Juvenile Justice Section 170 Heritage Register; and is currently utilised as office space by the CSNSW Directors of the Silverwater Woman Cluster. This building is not anticipated to be directly impacted by the proposed works.
1.5 Land Ownership

The works are proposed within the Mary Wade CC (Lot 4, DP1046678), formerly the Juniperina JJC, which is owned by the NSW Department of Justice.

Figure 1-1 Location of the Mary Wade CC site, formerly known as the Juniperina JCC, in relation to Sydney

Figure 1-2 Aerial showing Juniperina JJC/ Mary Wade CC Layout and Lot Boundary (in red)
2 Statutory Considerations

2.1 Environmental Planning Instruments

The Site is located on land zoned SP2 - Infrastructure (Correctional Centre) under the Auburn Local Environmental Plan 2010 (LEP). Prisons (Correctional Centres) are permitted with consent in this zone.

The objectives of the SP2 zone are to:

- To provide for infrastructure and related uses.
- To prevent development that is not compatible with or that may detract from the provision of infrastructure.

Uses that are permitted within the SP2 Infrastructure zone are shown on the Auburn LEP Land Zoning Map (see Figure 2-1 below). The "use" or purpose is labelled "Correctional Centre" and it includes any development that is ordinarily incidental or ancillary to development for that purpose.

The Auburn LEP defines correctional centre as meaning:

(a) any premises declared to be a correctional centre by a proclamation in force under section 225 of the Crimes (Administration of Sentences) Act 1999, including any juvenile correctional centre or periodic detention centre, and

(b) any premises declared to be a detention centre by an order in force under section 5 (1) of the Children (Detention Centres) Act 1987, but does not include any police station or court cell complex in which a person is held in custody in accordance with any Act.

Clause 5.12(1) of the Auburn LEP states that the LEP does not restrict or prohibit, or enable the restriction or prohibition of, the carrying out of any development, by or on behalf of a public authority, that is permitted to be carried out with or without development consent, or that is exempt development, under State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 (see 2.2.1 below).

![Figure 2-1: Zoning Extract Auburn LEP 2010 showing the Mary Wade CC site and SP2 Infrastructure - Correctional Centre zoning](source: NSW legislation website, accessed 2017)
2.2 State Environmental Planning Policies

*State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007* (SEPP Infrastructure) aims to assist in the effective delivery of public infrastructure across the State by improving certainty and regulatory efficiency through consistent planning assessment and approvals regime for public infrastructure and services facilities.

Clause 26 of SEPP (Infrastructure) allows development for certain works undertaken by a public authority, in connection with an existing correction centre to proceed without the need to gain development consent in a prescribed zone (or equivalent zone). This includes:

(a) transitional group homes that each contain not more than 5 bedrooms and accommodate fewer residents than the number equal to the number calculated by multiplying the number of bedrooms in the home by 2,

(b) sporting facilities or additions to sporting facilities, if the development does not involve clearing of more than 2 hectares of native vegetation,

(c) demolition of buildings,

(d) replacement of accommodation, administration or other facilities in a correctional complex, and

(e) alterations of, or additions to, a correctional complex, and

(f) construction, maintenance or realignment of security fencing with a height of not more than 12 metres above ground level (existing).

The Mary Wade CC is defined as a Correctional Centre and is located within the Mary Wade Correctional Complex pursuant to Clause 24 of the SEPP (Infrastructure) and gazetted and declared as such. The Mary Wade CC is zoned SP2 Infrastructure (Correctional Centre) under the Auburn Local Environmental Plan 2010 (see above). SP2 Infrastructure is a prescribed zone under clause 24 of SEPP (Infrastructure).

The proposed repurposing of the Site as a maximum security female remand prison at Mary Wade CC including all associated is considered meet clause 26(d), 26(e) and 26(f) and is therefore permissible without development consent.

2.3 NSW Legislation

2.3.1 Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

The *Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act) provides a framework for environmental planning and assessment in NSW. The applicable environmental planning instrument for the works is the SEPP (Infrastructure) which removes the requirement to obtain development consent for the proposed works. The repurposing works have therefore been assessed under Part 5 of the EP&A Act. The Department of Justice would be the proponent and the determining authority for the works.

The REF has been prepared in accordance with Section 111 of the EP&A Act, which requires that the proponent take into account to the fullest extent possible all matters affecting or likely to affect the environment due to the proposed activity. These matters are assessed in Section 6 of this REF. The environmental impact of the works has been assessed against the factors listed under clause 228 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000* (EP&A Regulation) (Appendix B).
2.3.2 National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974

The National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 (NPW Act) provides for the statutory protection of Aboriginal cultural heritage places, objects and features. One of the objects of the NPW Act is the conservation of places, objects and features of significance to Aboriginal people (Section 2A).

Aboriginal objects and Aboriginal places are protected under Part 6 of the NPW Act and there are legislative penalties if a person harms or desecrates an Aboriginal place or object (s. 86). Harm to an Aboriginal place or object includes any act or omission that destroys, defaces or damages the object or place, or, in relation to an Aboriginal object, moves the object from the land on which it had been situated. It is a defence against prosecution for unintentionally harming Aboriginal objects if due diligence had been exercised to determine that no Aboriginal object would be harmed, or the harm or desecration was authorised by an Aboriginal heritage impact permit (AHIP).

A search of the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System (AHIMS) indicated that no Aboriginal places or sites have been declared or recorded in the vicinity of the proposal site. Furthermore, much of the area to be disturbed by the works has previously been disturbed due to the construction of existing facility. Therefore it is considered that the potential for Aboriginal objects to be present is low and the proposal can proceed with caution without an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) application.

2.3.3 Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995 (NSW)

The Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995 (TSC Act) protects species of threatened flora and fauna, endangered populations and endangered ecological communities and their habitats in NSW.

An Arboricultural Assessment Report has been prepared by Allied Trees Consultancy (2016) is provided in Appendix E. This assessment concluded that the proposal would not impact upon any threatened tree species provided that the mitigation measures proposed are implemented (refer to Section 6.6 for details) and on the basis that further assessment is carried out before any trees designated as significant in the Arboricultural Assessment are removed.

A Flora and Fauna Assessment Report has also been prepared by Biosis Pty Ltd (February 2017) and is provided in Appendix H. This assessment concluded that the proposal would not impact upon any threatened flora or fauna species, provided that the mitigation measures proposed are implemented (refer to Section 6.6 for details).

2.3.4 Native Vegetation Act 2003

The Native Vegetation Act 2003 regulates the clearing of native vegetation in NSW. However, this Act does not apply to any clearing that is, or is part of, an activity carried out by a determining authority within the meaning of Part 5 of the EP&A Act if the determining authority has complied with that Part. As such the Native Vegetation Act 2003 does not apply to the proposed works.

2.3.5 Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997

The Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 (POEO Act) regulates air, noise, land and water pollution, and is administered by the NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA).

Activities listed under Schedule 1 of the POEO Act are scheduled activities which require an Environment Protection Licence (EPL) to be issued by the EPA.

Other relevant provisions of the POEO Act, include:
• Section 115 – It is an offence to dispose of waste in a manner that harms or is likely to harm the environment.

• Section 124 - The occupier of any premises who operates any plant in or on those premises in such a manner as to cause air pollution from those premises is guilty of an offence if the air pollution so caused, or any part of the air pollution so caused, is caused by the occupier’s failure (a) to maintain the plant in an efficient condition, or (b) to operate the plant in a proper and efficient manner.

• Section 139 – The occupier of any premises who operates any plant (other than control equipment) at those premises in such a manner as to cause the emission of noise from those premises is guilty of an offence if the noise so caused, or any part of it, is caused by the occupier’s failure: (a) to maintain the plant in an efficient condition, or (b) to operate the plant in a proper and efficient manner.

The proposal will comply with the requirements of the POEO Act with regard to pollution, waste, noise and air quality and the proposed activity is not listed under Schedule 1 of the POEO Act.

2.3.6 Heritage Act 1977

The Heritage Act 1977 provides legislative protection of items or state or local historical heritage significance and establishes the Heritage Council of NSW. The Heritage Council’s role is to advise the government on the protection of heritage assets, make listing recommendations to the Minister in relation to the State Heritage Register, and assess/approve/decline proposals involving modification to heritage items or places listed on the Register.

Automatic protection is afforded to ‘relics’, defined as ‘any deposit or material evidence relating to the settlement of the area that comprised New South Wales, not being Aboriginal settlement, and which holds state or local significance’. Excavation of land on which it is known or where there is reasonable cause to suspect that ‘relics’ will be exposed, moved, destroyed, discovered or damaged is prohibited unless ordered under an excavation permit.

The Mary Wade CC facility is not listed as an item of local or state heritage. A heritage item (an historic cottage) listed under the Auburn LEP 2010 is located within the boundary of the Correctional Complex. In addition, the cottage is listed on the Department of Juvenile Justice section 170 Heritage Register as item number 3170001. This building is not anticipated to be impacted by the works. However, seven trees within the visual curtilage of the heritage site will need to be removed to meet the required tree exclusion/tree clearance distance from the security perimeter fence and vehicle lock.

A Heritage Assessment and Statement of Heritage Impact (SoHI) report was prepared for the proposal by Biosis Pty Ltd in March 2017 (refer to Appendix I of this REF). The report has concluded that the works would not significantly impact the heritage item onsite, and are in accordance with the policies of the CMP provided that the mitigation measures proposed are implemented.

The potential impact, conclusions and recommended mitigation measures of the report are discussed further in Section 6.7 of this REF.

2.4 Commonwealth Legislation

The Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) provides for Commonwealth involvement in development assessment and approval in circumstances where there exist ‘matters of national environmental significance’. Matters of national environmental significance include:

• World Heritage properties;
• National Heritage places;
• Wetlands of international importance (listed under the Ramsar Convention);
• Nationally threatened species and ecological communities;
• Migratory species;
• Commonwealth marine areas;
• Great Barrier Reef Marine Park;
• Nuclear actions (including uranium mining); and
• A water resource, in relation to coal seam gas development and large coal mining development.

The Site is not Commonwealth land, and the proposal would not have any significant impact on the environment of any Commonwealth land.

2.5 Summary of Approvals and Consents

Table 2-1 provides a summary of the approvals or consents required in relation to the works proposed at the Mary Wade CC.

Table 2-1 Summary of Approvals and Consents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice</td>
<td>Determination of the proposal</td>
<td>Pt 5 of EP&amp;A Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Consultation

Consultation with Cumberland Council and neighbourhood notification of the proposal was undertaken during the preparation of the REF.

The Department of Justice held a consultation meeting with the Cumberland Council Planning Team on 10 October 2016 to discuss the proposal.

Neighbourhood notification was undertaken for the proposal, in order to receive comments from the local community. Notification methods comprised of a notification letter regarding the proposal delivered via letterbox drop on 10 October 2016, which was distributed to approximately 500 surrounding residential dwellings. In addition, an advertisement was placed in the Auburn Review local newspaper regarding the proposal.

Table 2-2 provides a summary of the responses received, and indicates the sections in this REF where the raised issues have been addressed. Copies of the responses received are contained in Appendix C.

However, there are no statutory consultation requirements under SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007 for this proposal as, in accordance with Clauses 13-16:

• There would be no impact on Council-related infrastructure or services (Clause 13);
• Whether there would be an impact that is not minor or inconsequential on a local heritage item (other than a local heritage item that is also a State heritage item) or a heritage conservation area;
• There would be no impact on flood liable land (Clause 15); and
• The development is not specified development (Clause 16).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Where Addressed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland Council</td>
<td>No response was received from council. Two follow up requests for a response to the consultation letter were requested from council after the expiration of notification period. No reply was received.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood Notification</td>
<td>Respondent requested a copy of the site plan issued with the notification letter</td>
<td>Issued via email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respondent requested if there would be a public information session or public open day at the correctional centre site.</td>
<td>See Section 6.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Need for the Project

This section reviews the existing site infrastructure to serve the Mary Wade Correctional Centre and provides the context for the proposed works.

3.1 Existing Infrastructure

The Juniperina JJC was opened in 2005. When operational, the facility accommodated a total of 44 female juvenile detainees either under a control order or remanded in custody.

The main facilities at the site comprise;

- an 44-bed minimum security centre for juvenile detainees;
- vocational training, education and programs centre;
- clinic;
- visits centre;
- outside exercise/recreation areas and swimming pool; and
- associated infrastructure including administrative, fences and security facilities.

3.2 Project Justification

Juvenile Justice Centres in NSW have experienced a drop in numbers of young people in custody in the last five years. As a result, Juvenile Justice has been planning a reformation of Juvenile Justice Centres which includes the closure of some facilities.

The Juniperina JCC was subsequently identified as the optimum site for closure, as this facility would cause the least disruption to the Juvenile Justice system, while providing a metropolitan correctional centre for adults. The demands on the adult corrections system, and the availability of beds in the Juvenile Justice system led to a request for Juvenile Justice to assist by providing a site for adult inmates.

The NSW Government has announced a $3.8 billion prison bed capacity program with some correctional centres in NSW to be expanded or recommissioned over the next four years. The conversion of Juniperina JJC to Mary Wade CC is being undertaken as part of this program. New jobs would be created during the construction and operational phases of the proposal; including approximately 98 new staff positions (comprising full-time, part-time, shift and non-shift workers), and local businesses are also anticipated to benefit from increased trade.

Existing correctional centre facilities for female inmates in NSW are unable to meet the increasing and changing demands of the growing prison population. The Mary Wade CC maximum security prison would comprise a modern facility able to meet the needs of the Sydney metropolitan area.

The proposed development comprises the repurposing within the site of the existing Juniperina JJC to the Mary Wade CC to provide maximum security remand facilities for females. The maximum security complex can be adequately accommodated within the existing site. An internal refit and upgrade of accommodation and associated inmate and staff facilities will be undertaken within the existing buildings. In addition, security fencing and electronic security will be upgraded to meet the requirements of a maximum security facility.
The proposed repurposing of the former Juniperina JJC site to the Mary Wade CC will respond to long term growth forecasts through the provision of additional remand facilities, prison beds and associated infrastructure in the Sydney metropolitan area. Specifically, the maximum security remand centre will provide much needed support services and facilities for prisoners attending court, awaiting transfer or release.
4 Option Evaluation

This section briefly describes the option evaluation methodology and the options considered for the proposal.

4.1 Introduction

As discussed in Section 3, an urgent need for additional prison accommodation for adults in the Sydney metropolitan area has been identified. The following options were considered in relation to the proposal.

4.1.1 Option 1 – Repurposing of Juniperina JJC to Mary Wade CC with 94 beds and associated additional support facilities

Option 1 involves:
- A repurposed adult correctional centre facility (maximum security female remand centre) comprising 44 cells that can accommodate up to 94 inmates.
- Development of support facilities to adequately support the additional number of inmates, including clinic, administration, stores, kitchen, laundry and visits area.

4.1.2 Option 2 – Do Nothing Option

The Do Nothing Option would not address the identified deficiencies associated with the inadequate prison accommodation for female adult offenders in NSW which is unable to meet the current and projected inmate population. The Do Nothing Option is not considered to be acceptable in terms of meeting the objectives of the proposal.

4.2 Option Evaluation

The Department of Justice evaluated the two options on the basis of project costs, including the capital and operating costs.

4.2.1 Preferred Option

It was determined that in order for the Department of Justice to continue to deliver on the Government's policy objectives, and to ensure that the demand for adult female prison accommodation is met; that investment in the repurposing of the site to Mary Wade CC was required in order to address the current demand and network issues, it was therefore recommended that Option 1 be selected.

This REF has been prepared to assess the proposed works, this being the upgrade of the existing JJC facility to a maximum security remand correctional centre and associated facilities.
5 Description of the Activity

This section provides a description of the infrastructure to be provided for the Mary Wade CC repurposing works including relevant details relating to construction of the proposed works.

5.1 Description of the Proposed Works

The Department of Justice is proposing to repurpose the Juniperina JJC to the Mary Wade CC. This REF has been prepared to assess the potential impacts associated with the repurposing of the existing juvenile justice centre facilities, and ‘hardening’ of the security on site at the JJC to a maximum security prison and associated works as described below;

- 94 bed maximum security accommodation;
- Educational and vocational facilities;
- Visits/reception building;
- Vehicle lock;
- Security screening (hardened) for outdoor exercise recreation/areas;
- External site perimeter entry controlled boom gate;
- Transportable staff amenity and locker shed; and
- Maintenance shed.

The site plans are provided in Appendix A. More detailed description of the works are provided below.

5.1.1 Maximum Security Accommodation

The new maximum security accommodation is proposed to be housed in existing self-contained buildings (Buildings C, D, F, and G), each arranged in 44 double cells and four assessment cells. The facility would accommodate up to 94 inmates and include the existing internal living areas and external covered recreational areas, which would be upgraded with roof and wall security mesh panels.

5.1.2 Inmate Facilities

Building E would undergo an internal refit to upgrade facilities for inmates including providing a new general learning space, hairdresser and buy-ups area, a tea room, vocational induction area, staff office space and WC amenities.

5.1.3 Visits Centre

The upgrade of the existing visits building (Building A) would provide new purpose-built visitor, staff and inmate ingress and egress/processing facilities.

The existing visits building would comprise a new reception area; and a range of spaces in the building including staff and visitor entry foyer/processing area, two delivery areas, visitor waiting area, indoor and covered outdoor visits areas, legal visits, night watch room, officer post, interview rooms, WC amenities and lock in and out areas.

5.1.4 Vehicle Lock at Perimeter Macem Fence

A new secure vehicle lock area with anti-climb drum would be located in a section of the southern perimeter of the existing correctional centre perimeter security fence to provide a new secure vehicular access area to the correctional centre.
5.1.5 Site Entry Boom Gate
A new entry boom gate would be installed at the existing driveway entrance located on the western property perimeter of the correctional centre; to provide secure, monitored and controlled vehicular and pedestrian access to the correctional complex.

5.1.6 Staff Amenities Buildings
Two new staff amenities buildings (Building X1) would be transported to site and located on an existing slab to the east of Building H and to the south of the existing car park. These would comprise two single-storey transportable buildings to accommodate staff lockers, WC, and shower amenities.

5.1.7 Maintenance Shed
The new maintenance shed (Building M) would be constructed adjacent to an existing delivery dock at Building A. Approximate building dimensions would be (5m x 5m).

5.2 Construction Works

5.2.1 Construction Methodology
The proposed development is likely to include the following general activities by the contractor(s):

**General activities**
- Site establishment, construction compounds, fencing etc;
- Establishment of construction access points;
- Minor grading and levelling works for the construction of the small shed structure;
- Application of fill (if required) and compaction;
- Placement of transportable buildings on existing slab;
- Building services installation and fit-out; and
- Landscaping with native vegetation, where required.

5.2.2 Construction Equipment
The types of equipment likely to be required for the construction work would include the following:
- Small excavator or similar earthmoving equipment;
- Concrete agitator and pump;
- Lifting crane;
- Low loader transporters and delivery/material transport vehicles (waste materials);
- Light commercial and passenger vehicles;
- Small lifting machinery; and
- Pneumatic and general hand tools.

**Construction Site Layout**
The contractor would establish a compound area to accommodate construction facilities for the duration of the construction period. The compound areas are shown in the site plans provided in Appendix A and would accommodate the following facilities:
- Vehicle parking;
- Site Office;
• Amenities; and
• Stockpiles.

5.2.3 Construction timeframe
The construction works are predicted to take approximately five months, commencing in April 2017.

Working hours
The *Interim Construction Noise Guidelines* (DECC 2009) outlines recommended standard construction working hours as:

- Monday to Friday 7am-6pm
- Saturdays 8am-1pm
- No work on Sundays or public holidays.

The construction would comply with these recommended hours. However, if deemed necessary to undertake minor internal fit-out works outside these hours on Saturdays between 1pm-5pm and/or on Sundays (8am-5pm), prior approval would be sought from the Principal and notification to the affected community where construction activities will take place outdoors.

5.2.4 Construction Environmental Management Plan
The proposed works would be undertaken in accordance with a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) prepared by the construction contractor and approved by the Department of Justice prior to the commencement of works.

The CEMP would incorporate site specific management plans and would reflect all the mitigation measures identified in this REF, additional mitigation measures identified as a result of the contractors risk assessment and construction methodology and any conditions of the project determination and other licences/approvals.

5.3 Operation
The site is currently non-operational and has been unoccupied since July 2016.

Once Mary Wade CC is operational, the site would accommodate up to 94 female remand inmates.

Based on staffing projection, approximately 30 warden staff in total are anticipated to be onsite per day. A further 10 ancillary staff would also be onsite during the day, undertaking general activities including administration, educational and cleaning duties.

The operational CC would be staffed continuously by wardens with three shifts of 8 hours each. Staff numbers would typically vary depending on the shift times as follows:

- Day shift: 8am-2pm = 20 staff
- Evening shift: 2pm-10pm = 10 staff
- Night shift: 10pm-6am/8am = 10 staff

Inmate visiting hours would be limited to Friday, Saturday and Sundays, excluding Public Holidays. There would be two visitor sessions per day, comprising one morning and one afternoon session. It is estimated that there would be up to 20 visitors per session, per day.
This diagram has been removed for security reasons.

Figure 5-1  Works Site Plan displaying internal additions and new vehicle lock.
6 Environmental Assessment

This section identifies and characterises the likely potential impacts associated with the construction and operational phases of the project.

6.1 Assessment Methodology

The impacts of the proposed works have been assessed in the context of Section 228 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000 – “What factors must be taken into account concerning the impact of an activity on the environment?”. Appendix B addresses the factors requiring consideration under Section 228. Appropriate environmental management procedures and control measures are summarised in Section 7.

The key objectives of this assessment are to:

- Identify those facets of the environment likely to be affected by the proposal during both construction and operation;
- Identify the sensitivity of the site;
- Identify and characterise the associated impacts; and
- Identify and evaluate feasible mitigation measures for the identified impacts.

Environmental issues of relevance to the proposal include:

- Noise and vibration;
- Traffic and access;
- Air quality;
- Soils, erosion and water quality;
- Flora and fauna;
- Heritage;
- Hazardous materials;
- Waste management;
- Visual;
- Socio-economic; and
- Utilities and services.
6.2 Noise and Vibration

The immediate surrounding area to the east of the site is low density residential; a golf course, commercial premises and an area of residential development are located on the far side of train lines to the north, and a large industrial estate is located to the south. The land in the eastern section of the complex site and is vacant with the exception of two overhead powerline stanchions and a small area of remnant bushland. Background noise levels at the site are considered to be moderate.

Specialist background noise monitoring has not been undertaken as part of the REF. The daytime background level at the site has not been measured but is estimated to be approximately 50 dB(A). The nearest resident to the existing eastern site boundary is located 30m away and is separated from the site by Joseph Street, which is a six-lane dual carriageway main road, which is likely to increase background noise levels during peak traffic periods.

The construction site for the upgraded maximum security prison is located approximately 80m from the nearest resident.

6.2.1 Construction Impacts

Construction of the proposed development will result in short term noise impacts during the 5 month construction period. Construction management levels for noise at residences are listed in Chapter 4 (Table 2) of the *Interim Construction Noise Guideline* (DECCW, 2009). Under this guideline the construction noise criteria is determined as the rating background noise plus 10 dB(A), and plus 5 dB(A) outside of recommended standard hours. Therefore the construction noise level criteria would be 60 dB(A) and 55 dB(A), respectively, at the boundary of the nearest residence. It is expected that the equipment listed in Table 6-1 below would be required to undertake the construction works. The typical A-weighted sound power levels for the equipment are also listed (taken from the Australian Standard AS2436-2010 *Guide to Noise and Vibration Control on Construction, Demolition and Maintenance Sites*).

**Table 6-1 Likely construction equipment and sound power levels**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Typical Sound Power Levels (dB)</th>
<th>Sound Pressure Level at 20 m distance (dB(A))</th>
<th>Sound Pressure Level at 100 m distance (dB(A))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backhoe/Excavator</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck (&gt;20t)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand Tools (electric)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crane (mobile)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Vehicles</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max sound power level</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Noise would result from general construction activities including the movement and operation of heavy vehicles, staff transport vehicles and larger construction plant such as delivery trucks, concrete truck etc.

Using the methodology in the *Australian Standard Guide to Noise Control on Construction, Maintenance and Demolition Sites* and the *Interim Noise Construction Guideline* (DECCW, 2009) and based on maximum sound power levels of 108 dB(A) (for external works), the maximum predicted noise levels will be approximately 60 dB(A) at the nearest residence to the site. As such, construction noise resulting from
the proposed development is not anticipated to exceed the recommended noise criteria of 60db(A) during recommended standard hours of work.

Construction works carried out outside of standard construction working hours (if required) are anticipated to involve the use of electric hand tools indoors for internal fit-out works with a sound pressure level of 54db(a). As such, construction noise outside of standard construction hours resulting from the proposed development is also not anticipated to exceed the recommended noise criteria of 55db(A).

It is noted that these levels are considered to be a conservative estimate, as they are based on maximum noise levels assuming that all machinery/construction equipment will be used simultaneously. It is anticipated that this will occur rarely, if at all during the construction of the proposed development, and furthermore the actual noise levels experienced will vary depending on the nature of the activities being undertaken. Construction impacts will be temporary and construction hours will be restricted to the normal daytime construction hours as specified by the EPA. Overall the impact to neighbouring properties is expected to be low.

The *Interim Construction Noise Guideline* states that, where the predicted noise level is greater than the noise affected level, all feasible and reasonable work practices should be applied to meet the noise affected level. Furthermore, all potentially impacted adjacent properties should be informed of the proposed development, the expected noise levels and duration, as well as contact details. However, construction noise is not anticipated to exceed the recommended noise criteria.

Control measures to minimise noise impacts will be implemented during construction as part of the contractor's CEMP, which will be required to be submitted for approval prior to commencement of construction of the proposed development. This should include consideration of Tables 4 through to 10 of the *Interim Construction Noise Guideline*, which present a summary of options for work practices with lower noise impact. The CEMP for the construction of the proposed development will address site specific issues, including noise reduction practices, so as to minimise impacts to adjacent properties.

If construction works are required to take place outside of the recommended standard construction working hours, they will be limited to indoor works comprising internal fit-out activities using electric hand tools. Prior approval from the Principal would be required prior to commencement of any works.

Mitigation measures required to minimise noise impacts during construction are outlined in Section 6.2.3 below.

### 6.2.2 Operational Impacts

Noise associated with the operation of the maximum security prison is likely to be slightly higher than that previously emanated from the site due to the increased inmate population. Potential sources of noise include:

- Car parking and vehicle movements;
- General deliveries and waste handling; and
- General operational noise, including use of the outdoor recreational areas and public announcement (PA) system.

As discussed in Section 6.2 above, the existing maximum security facility property boundary is located within 30m of the nearest resident and it has been operated with minimum noise impacts to the surrounding residential area.

The operations of the facility are unlikely to have a significant adverse impact on the acoustic amenity of the surrounding area. The adult inmates in the correctional centre would be subject to similar routines as those in place at the juvenile justice centre facility, and all
inmates would be locked up at night. Furthermore, there would be no additional prison buildings and similar levels of mechanical noise and announcements to inmates emanating from the site during operation.

The activation of alarm systems is not anticipated to take place as part of the daily operation of the CC facility.

There is expected to be only minimal additional visitor traffic to the Mary Wade CC site due to the expanded inmate population, with visitor numbers limited to up to 20 vehicles each morning and afternoon. Visiting hours are restricted to Friday, Saturday and Sunday with no visits on Public Holidays.

Staff would continue to use the dedicated staff carpark. General start times for watch staff shifts are 8am, 2pm and 10pm (minimal staff start at 6am). Peak staff entry time will be at 8am, and inmate escort vehicles may arrive from 6am-8pm. They will enter main vehicle gate and go to the secure vehicle dock.

Whilst there may be a minor increase in deliveries to the site, these would be limited to between 6.30am-4pm into the centre, to the kitchen or vehicle point to load and unload pallets. It is therefore assessed that the overall operational noise impacts to surrounding residents due to traffic is expected to be minimal.

6.2.3 Mitigation

**Construction**

- Undertake community notification with adjoining and adjacent properties when it is planned to carry out construction of the development and where it is likely to cause vibration or offensive noise and impact the public and nearby residents, including truck entry and exit points to the site.

- Undertake construction works between 7am-6pm Monday to Friday; 8am-1pm Saturdays. No work will be undertaken on Sundays, Public Holidays. The construction would comply with these recommended hours. However, if deemed necessary to undertake minor internal fit-out works outside these hours on Saturdays between 1pm-5pm and/or on Sundays (8am-5pm), prior approval would be sought from the Principal; and notification to the affected community where construction activities will take place outdoors.

- Notification will provide the following details:
  - The locations and types of surrounding receivers likely to be affected;
  - The nature of the proposed works;
  - The noise characteristics of any powered equipment likely to be used; and
  - Measures to be taken to reduce noise emissions.

- Implement control measures to minimise noise impacts during construction as part of the CEMP. Site and project specific measures to control noise will be determined by the construction contractor based on the construction methodology, with the CEMP required to be submitted for review prior to commencement of construction works. The CEMP will include all reasonable and practical steps to reduce noise and vibration from the site. The Interim Construction Noise Guideline (DECCW, 2009) (in particular Tables 4 through to 10 of this guideline) should be referred to when considering appropriate measures, and may include:
  - Optimum siting of work areas, vehicle and plant parking areas, materials stockpiles and equipment storage areas in locations where potential acoustical impacts will be minimised;
  - Identify locations where noise is most intrusive and develop strategies to reduce impacts for these areas;
Operational

- Any complaints associated with the operation of the repurposed CC facility would be investigated as soon as practicable. Any practicable and feasible measures to minimise noise would be identified.

Public announcement system:

- Ensure the PA system is used only during the day time period;
- Minimise usage of PA system and only use when necessary for announcements;
- PA volume should be adjusted to a suitable level; and
- Do not use the PA system to broadcast music.

6.3 Traffic and Access

A Traffic and Parking Assessment was undertaken at the site by Samsa Consulting Pty Ltd (November 2016), a copy of the report is provided in Appendix D. The following information has been taken directly from this report.

Access

The site access driveway connects directly off the eastern side of Joseph Street via a T-junction. Right-turn movements from Joseph Street northbound into the centre are catered for by a protected right-turn bay along Joseph Street. Right-turn movements onto Joseph Street northbound are restricted by 'No Right Turn' signage when exiting the site.

Joseph Street is a sub-arterial route, which together with Olympic Drive to the north and Rookwood Road to the south, connects Parramatta Road to Hume Highway. In the vicinity of the subject site’s access, Joseph Street has an 80km/h speed limit in both directions and appropriate street lighting. The road is a two-way, six-lane, divided carriageway road with clearway restrictions during both peak periods.

Existing vehicular access to the subject site is via a dedicated access driveway off the eastern side of Joseph Street. The access driveway is over 5m wide (kerb-to-kerb) with a centreline on the approach to Joseph Street. The road has good pavement conditions and lighting. The driveway provides suitable access for both light and heavy vehicles.

The condition and alignment of the centre access driveway is considered to be suitable for the types of vehicles that currently use it, and the Joseph Street approaches are considered to be adequate for the 80km/h speed limit, with regard to sight distances and the road alignment.

Nearby public bus transport is available along Joseph Street with bus stops located on both sides of Joseph Street near the centre’s access driveway.

Pedestrian access from the visitor parking area to the administration offices and entry is informal and via the car park areas.

There are no formal on-road or off-road bicycle facilities along the road network in the vicinity of the subject site along Joseph Street; and there is no known formal bicycle parking on the subject site.

Parking

Parking is provided on site for staff and visitors to the centre. Onsite parking is spread across a number of areas to the south of the centre’s secured area. The total number of marked spaces is approximately 90, including three accessible parking spaces. This parking
provides some 28 spaces for visitors and the remainder for staff (including the accessible parking spaces). The existing car park areas would continue operating as per current layout and operations.

On-street parking is limited in the vicinity of the site. There are ‘No Parking/No Stopping’ restrictions along both sides of Joseph Street surrounding the site access location. On-street parking is available in nearby local streets on the western side of Joseph Street. However, this is considered impractical due to the lack of controlled pedestrian crossing facilities across Joseph Street.

**Deliveries**

Typically, a range of small to large sized delivery trucks (up to 22 tonne capacity) would service the centre up to four days per week delivering food, rations, buy-ups, technology, and other general freight between the hours of 7am and 8am.

Other smaller deliveries and internal maintenance would typically occur between 7am-10am approximately three days per week (maximum). There may also be some daily (weekday) small van deliveries to the front office / administration building.

There are a total of three designated delivery bays on site, with one sited externally by Building H and the other two to be sited internally. It is understood that there is limited manoeuvrability and safe loading/unloading of delivery vehicles internally when delivering goods.

In addition to general deliveries, inmate escort vehicles may access the site from between 6am-8pm, via the main vehicle gate and going to the secure vehicle lock. Escort vehicles for inmates would typically attend daily, picking up inmates for court from 6am-7am and returning them from 6pm-8pm. Inmate escort vehicles would be received up to three times per day in peak periods of prisoner movement.

**6.3.1 Construction Impacts**

Construction of new site facilities would occur over a five month period with some increase in traffic in the local area expected. Construction vehicles and staff would enter the site via the existing site access driveway off Joseph Street. The construction workforce would vary according to the work being carried out, the construction method and contractor’s program.

It is anticipated that the number of construction staff on site daily is expected to grow progressively as the work increases in scale and then decrease as the works near completion. It is estimated that an average of some 20 construction staff would be on site each month during the construction period. This average is likely to increase during peak construction periods when it is estimated that there may be a daily maximum of approximately 30 construction staff.

This number of staff would generate approximately 20 light vehicles (cars, utility vehicles) accessing the site (allowing for some car-sharing), resulting in 40 light vehicle trips per day. Construction staff vehicle parking would be made available on site off the existing access driveway so that impacts to on-street parking are minimised. It is understood that heavy vehicles and larger construction plant will be minimised, and that smaller construction vehicles and plant would be utilised during construction. This would typically include delivery trucks, generators, bobcats, scaffolding, utility vans, etc. It is anticipated that any heavy vehicles and construction plant will be able to be parked on site.

No road closures or traffic detours will be required on the public road network during the construction phases. A wide-load vehicle and lifting crane would be required for delivery and installation of the demountables. This would be a one-off occurrence and is not anticipated to have a significant impact on traffic or the road network.

The proposed increase in traffic in the road network during construction is considered relatively minor for the temporary nature of the construction activities. Importantly, the
additional construction-related volumes will be within any daily variations along the surrounding road network.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed repurposing of the Juniperina JJC into a Mary Wade CC would not result in any significant traffic and transport impacts during the construction phase.

There are no significant construction-related issues or impacts that would not be mitigated by an appropriate detailed Traffic Management Plan (TMP) which should be prepared and undertaken by the chosen contractor to address traffic, parking and construction issues.

6.3.2 Operational Impacts

The Juniperina Juvenile Justice Centre for the Repurposing into a Maximum Security Female Remand Correctional Centre Traffic and Parking Assessment (Samsa Consulting, 2016) found that the additional traffic generated due to the repurposing of the centre would be readily absorbed into the existing traffic flows on the surrounding road network.

There are no major events / activities during operation of the correctional centre that are envisaged may generate significant levels of traffic and increase on-site parking demand.

The level of traffic increase would be well within any daily variations that currently exist along the surrounding road network. Therefore, traffic impacts associated with the repurposing of the centre are considered to be minimal and will have an insignificant impact on road network and intersection operations.

It is currently estimated that there would be approximately 30 warden staff per day. This would typically increase to approximately 40 staff when including administration staff, cleaning staff, etc. The centre would be staffed continuously by wardens with three shifts of 8 hours each. Peak staff arrivals / departures would coincide with the three shift changeovers. The weekday (Monday to Friday) shift changeover at 8am would be the highest with the warden shift changeover and the arrival of other general staff.

Staff numbers would typically vary depending on the shift times as follows:

- Day shift: 8am-2pm = 20 staff
- Evening shift: 2pm-10pm = 10 staff
- Night shift: 10pm-6am/8am = 10 staff

The existing car park areas would remain essentially unchanged and continue operating as per current layout and operations with approximately 62 parking spaces. The 8am shift changeover would generate a maximum potential parking demand of some 30 parking spaces. These 30 vehicles would be readily accommodated within the site’s 62 staff parking spaces.

Additional visitor numbers of 20 vehicles per visitor session are able to be readily accommodated within the site’s 28 visitor parking spaces.

Assuming a car occupancy rate of 1.5 persons per car for inmate visitors and that they all arrive / depart within the same hour for a visitor session, peak period trip generation would be approximately 14 vehicle trips per hour.

The correctional centre will function as a short-term remand centre; whereby inmates would be transferred to and from the site under escort while awaiting or during trial. Inmate escort vehicles would access the site from 6am-8pm, entering the main vehicle gate and going to the vehicle dock. Escort vehicles for inmates would typically attend daily, picking up inmates for court from 6am-7am and returning them from 6pm-8pm. Inmate escort vehicles would be received up to three times daily in peak periods of prisoner movement.
Delivery trucks (up to 22 tonne) would service the centre up to four days per week delivering food, rations, buy-ups, technology, and other general freight between 7 am-8 am.

Other smaller deliveries and internal maintenance would typically occur between 7am-10am approximately three days per week (maximum). There may also be some daily (weekday) small van deliveries to the front office / administration building, as required.

Traffic generation attributable to the centre’s proposed repurposing would be readily absorbed into the existing traffic flows on the surrounding road network and the level of traffic increase will be well within any daily variations that currently exist along Joseph Street.

Overall, the repurposed facility would not result in any significant impacts to site access, road safety, public transport, bicycle or pedestrian facilities. Post construction, access to the site would not be excessive and no adverse impacts due to traffic and access during operation of the maximum security prison and car park are expected. Therefore, traffic impacts from the proposal are considered to be minimal and will have an insignificant impact on road network and intersection operations.

6.3.3 Mitigation

The following mitigation measures have been taken from Juniperina Juvenile Justice Centre for the Repurposing into a Maximum Security Female Remand Correctional Centre Traffic and Parking Assessment (Samsa Consulting, 2016).

Construction

• Prepare a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) based on the detailed construction methodology and use of specific heavy vehicles and construction plant. The TMP is to be approved by the Department of Justice prior to commencement of works. The TMP would include measures to minimise traffic impacts ensure public safety and would be prepared in accordance with:
  o Traffic Control at Work Sites Manual (RTA, 2010); and
  o Australian Standard 1742.3 - 2009 Traffic Control for Works on Roads.

• The TMP will be developed in consultation with the Department of Justice and approved prior to the commencement of construction.

• The TMP will detail hours of operation, heavy vehicle routes, construction staff parking, loading/unloading areas and site access arrangements, pedestrian/cyclist access, all temporary warning, guidance and information signage, and appropriate traffic control devices.

• Surrounding land owners will be notified at least one week in advance of the works.

• All roads would be kept clean and free of dust and mud at all times. Where material is tracked onto sealed roads at any time, it would be removed immediately so that road pavements are kept safe and trafficable.

• All roads, kerbs, gutters and footpaths damaged as a result of construction are to be restored to their pre-construction condition.

• All traffic would comply with all applicable traffic laws and regulations including speed limits. All construction vehicles would comply with the speed limits set for the roads accessing the site.

• All roads would be rehabilitated post-construction to a standard equivalent to or better than the pre-construction condition.

Operational

• Provide incentives for staff to use existing public transport (i.e. buses along Joseph Street) or to car pool, thus increasing car occupancy levels and reducing traffic generation / parking demand.
6.4 Air Quality
The existing air quality surrounding the site is considered to be relatively good and typical of a residential environment. A search of the National Pollution Inventory (NPI) indicates that there are three point sources of pollution in Lidcombe that report emissions to the NPI. While industry, commercial and house air emissions can be a source of pollution it is unlikely that these sources are significantly impacting on the ambient air quality levels at the proposed works site.

6.4.1 Construction Impacts
Vehicular emissions from construction traffic may intermittently affect local air quality. Construction works are likely to generate some airborne dust. These emissions would, however, occur only intermittently, and are expected to be minor and temporary. It would be unlikely that they would contribute to a permanent detectable reduction in local air quality. Appropriate and site specific measures will be required to be undertaken to ensure there is no significant impact on the surrounding environment.

Provided the mitigation measures detailed below are effectively implemented, potential air quality impacts during the construction period are unlikely to be significant.

6.4.2 Operational Impacts
Post construction, no adverse air quality impacts due to the operation of the female remand maximum security correctional centre are expected.

6.4.3 Mitigation

Construction
- Undertake community notification where work is likely to cause dust impact on the public and nearby residents.
- Construction contractors would monitor dust generation potential.
- Only spray paint and other materials with the potential to become airborne particulates in light wind conditions.
- The burning of waste materials will not be permitted on site or at the complex.
- Monitor weather conditions for the duration of the construction period and cover all stockpiles.
- Vehicles and equipment used during construction will be suitably serviced within the six-month period prior to commencement of construction activities and all necessary maintenance undertaken during construction period.
- All construction machinery would be turned off when not in use to minimise emissions.
- Secure all vehicles transporting loose materials and travelling on public roads (i.e. closed tail gate and covered) to minimise dust generation.
- Any stockpiled spoil/fill would be protected to minimise dust generation to avoid sediment moving offsite.

6.5 Soils, Topography and Water Quality

6.5.1 Existing Environment
The site is generally flat. The nearest watercourse is the Cooks River which is located approximately 500m away to the south-east (at its closest point). The Site has not been identified as flood prone by Cumberland Council.
The 1:100,000 Sydney Geological Map (9130) 1st edition, indicates that the site is underlain by Triassic age Bringelly Shale of the Wianamatta Group comprising shale, carbonaceous claystone, laminite, fine to medium-grained lithic sandstone, and rare coal.

Council acid sulfate soils mapping indicates that the site contains Class 5 acid sulphate soils. As such, works within 500 metres of adjacent Class 1, 2, 3 or 4 land that is below 5 metres Australian Height Datum (AHD) and by which the water table is likely to be lowered below 1 metre AHD on adjacent Class 1, 2, 3 or 4 land would require development consent. The proposal works do not meet the above criterion; therefore, development consent is not required.

A review of the Botany Bay Acid Sulfate Soils Risk Map - 2nd ed (1997) produced by the former Department of Land and Water Conservation indicates that there is no known occurrence of acid sulfate soils at the site. Therefore, specialist investigations for acid sulfate soils are not considered to be required.

6.5.2 Construction Impacts

The construction of the proposed perimeter roadway and maintenance shed will require shallow excavation or fill and regrading for the roadway, and minor excavation for the footings of the structure. The main potential for water quality impacts is through the movement of any spoil material offsite during the construction of the proposed roadway and shed.

Aspects of the proposal identified as potentially impacting on water quality includes:

- Shallow excavation for shed foundations and site levelling;
- Stockpiling and transportation of waste material; and
- General construction waste entering drainage lines.

However, there are no waterways in the immediate vicinity, and the site is not steeply sloped, thus reducing run-off and erosion potential at the site.

Given the relatively flat topography of the site, it is assessed that appropriate sediment and erosion controls can be implemented to effectively prevent runoff from entering drainage lines. Effective control measures will be established prior to commencement of construction to prevent any pollutants being washed into nearby waterways via stormwater drainage, as detailed in Section 6.5.4 below.

The development is considered insignificant in a regional water quality context.

6.5.3 Operational Impacts

There will be a minor increase in impermeable surface area at the site as the proposed development is being located on an existing grassed area. This change is unlikely to significantly increase runoff generated at the site during operation of the correctional centre.

The operation of the new infrastructure at the site is not expected to result in an adverse impact to water quality.

6.5.4 Mitigation Measures

- Prepare and implement a site specific Erosion and Sediment Control Plan for the entire construction period. This will incorporate erosion and sediment control measures which are appropriate for the site conditions and construction methodology in line with Landcom’s Managing Urban Stormwater, Soils & Construction Guidelines (The Blue Book).

- Maintain erosion and sedimentation control measures regularly and after rainfall events in accordance with The Blue Book.
• Do not remove erosion and sedimentation control measures until disturbed areas have stabilised.
• Stabilise disturbed areas during the construction of the proposed development where necessary in line with The Blue Book.
• Restore any damage caused to the ground surface to pre-construction condition upon completion of construction.
• Take all care and due diligence to minimise or prevent pollutant material entering drain inlets or waterways.
• Stormwater drainage for the shed will be connected to an existing stormwater connection on the site.
• Any excess spoil resulting from the works would be disposed of and be subject to testing in accordance with the Waste Classification Guidelines (DECCW 2009).
• No surplus construction spoil would be permitted for reuse on-site.
• All disturbed areas would be restored post construction.

6.6 Flora and Fauna

A Flora and Fauna Assessment was prepared by the DPWS Environmental Division for the Juniperina Juvenile Justice Centre development in 2005. However, this report is not available for reference purposes.

Based on the results of the Arboricultural Assessment for this proposal, further assessment was required by a suitably qualified ecologist to assess the impact of the removal of potentially significant trees identified onsite. Accordingly, a Flora and Fauna Assessment was carried out by Biosis Pty Ltd in February 2017. A copy of the assessment is provided in Appendix H of this report.

6.6.1 Existing Environment

The site is relatively flat and contains the existing JJC buildings with a large landscaped area located outside the prison security perimeter walls including several asphalted car park areas, an historic cottage, and a guard house. This area, although landscaped and mowed, has some areas around the site perimeter (along the northern, southern and western property boundary) where large mature trees have been retained, these trees are potentially representative of remnant native bushland.

The trees located along the western boundary of the property near Joseph Street form part of an avenue which has been classed as a 'biodiversity corridor' within the Parramatta River Catchment (Allied Tree Consultancy, 2016).

An Arboricultural Assessment was carried out in accordance with AS 4970-2009 - Protection of trees on development sites (Australian Standards 2009) to provide quantitative and qualitative information on the trees, based on their health and Safe Useful Life Expectancy (SULE) for the suitable retention of trees (Allied Tree Consultancy, 2016). The purpose of the tree assessment report (provided in Appendix E) was to comment on the health and condition of the subject trees, their value and significance.

The assessment included 56 trees in total which were assessed using the Significance of a Tree Assessment Rating System (S.T.A.R.S), which is a significance index value assessment criteria. Not all trees present within the site boundary have been assessed as they fall outside the impact footprint.

Of the 56 trees assessed, based on their landscape significance:
Eleven trees were assessed as potentially significant. These high value trees that are recommended for retention and protection during works due to either state/federal legislation or heritage listing (refer to Table 6-2 and Table 6-3);

36 were assessed as of medium value trees that can be retained as required based on the safe, useful life expectancy

Nine trees were assessed to be of low value trees that should be removed due to poor form or related risk.

A Flora and Fauna Assessment was subsequently undertaken by Biosis Pty Ltd in February 2017, to assess the vegetation onsite surrounding the facility, including the trees identified as of potentially high ecological significance in the Arboricultural Assessment. A copy of the report is provided in Appendix H.

The Flora and Fauna Assessment site investigation found that vegetation of the study area comprises four vegetation communities:

- *Cooks River Clay Plain Scrub Forest* conforming to Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest EEC (TSC Act).
- Planted Natives.
- Planted Natives and Exotics.
- Exotic Grassland.

The information in the following sections in relation to the trees evaluated onsite is taken from the Arboricultural Assessment, in addition to the findings of the Flora and Fauna Assessment.

**Threatened Flora and Fauna**

A search of OEH’s Atlas of NSW Wildlife indicates that 20 threatened flora species and 34 threatened or migratory fauna species and communities and which are protected under the NSW Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995 or migratory bird agreements have been recorded within a 10km x 10km radius of the proposed site. None of these species have been recorded within the proposal works area.

An EPBC Act Protected Matters Report for the site (with a 1 km buffer) identified three listed threatened ecological communities, 26 listed threatened species and 13 listed migratory species that may or are likely to occur or have habitat in the area. These search results are provided in Appendix F.

Overall the area of the site to be affected by the construction works has limited habitat potential due to its disturbed nature, and none of the threatened flora species or communities listed as occurring within a 10 km radius of the site are anticipated to be present on or utilising the site for primary habitat.

No threatened flora species were found during the Arboricultural Assessment or Flora and Fauna Assessment site surveys. However, 11 high significance trees were identified during the Arboricultural Assessment which required further assessment due to their potentially ecological and heritage significance (see Figure 6-2, Section 6.6.2, and Appendix E). The potential heritage significance of the trees is addressed in Section 6.7.3.

**Endangered Ecological Communities**

OEH vegetation mapping (see Figure 6-1) indicates that a patch of remnant bushland is located adjacent to the southern site boundary (in the south eastern corner of the property) approximately 200m away from the proposed works area, is classified as Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest of the Sydney Basin Bioregion which is listed as critically endangered ecological community (CEEC) under the EPBC Act and an endangered ecological community (EEC) under the TSC Act.
The Arboricultural Assessment identified several trees, in particular across the front of the site and fronting Joseph Street, which appear to pose remnant status, as shown in Figure 6-2 and Table 6-2. The species and age of these trees are representative of species that form part of the assembly of the Cooks River / Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and the Shale Plains Woodland (Cumberland Plain Woodland) CEEC’s. Based on vegetation mapping, remnants of both these communities exist adjacent to the site (see Figure 6-1). However, the trees along the western boundary and north-western corner of the site were subsequently classified as planted natives, not CEEC species in the Flora and Fauna Assessment.

The Flora and Fauna Assessment identified four small patches of Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest EEC (listed under the TSC Act) occurring in the north and north-east extents of the impact area. All four patches consist of secondary regrowth subsequent to c. 1943, and were assessed as meeting the listing criteria under the TSC Act. Two secondary regrowth Mugga Ironbark *Eucalyptus sideroxylon* grow along the western perimeter of the study area which have existed in situ prior to c. 1943. However, the two Mugga Ironbark trees do not meet listing criteria for this community under the TSC Act.

Prior to development of the Juniperina JJC, the site may have been vegetated by these EEC’s. As a result, a number of plants found within this region are present in patches within this area.

6.6.2 Construction Impacts

The proposed development will require the clearing of approximately 80 trees, and some landscaped and grassed areas so as to meet the design security specifications for tree exclusion areas surrounding and within maximum security correctional centre facilities. Specifically, the required design parameters in relation to tree exclusion/tree clearance distance from the security perimeter fence are as follows:

- All trees within the secure perimeter to be removed.
- All trees within 20m to the outside of the perimeter fence to be removed.
- Any tree that could fall on the perimeter fence to be removed (i.e. a 25m high tree 25m from the perimeter fence).

Tree clearing would also be required for the construction of the new vehicle lock and to provide clearance for the transportable staff amenities buildings.

The proposal site is located within a heavily disturbed and cleared area that was formerly a juvenile justice centre facility; and the majority of the new maximum security works would be located inside existing buildings, on existing vacant grassed areas, existing concrete slabs, or sealed courtyards. As a consequence, it has been mostly cleared of native bushland habitat and there are areas of minor disturbance and landscaped or manicured vegetation throughout the property.

There will be no high quality undisturbed native bushland removed as part of the proposal and it is considered that the proposal would not present any further barriers to the movement patterns of any native animals such that their local populations would be adversely affected. Overall, the net amount of vegetation lost onsite due to this proposal is relatively minor.

The trees identified in Table 6-2 and shown in Figure 6-2 below are likely to be removed as part of the proposal, to accommodate the new vehicle lock and security requirements. These trees were assessed by the arborist to have both potentially high ecological and heritage value. The ecological significance of the trees is discussed below and the heritage significance is addressed in Section 6.7.3.
**Tree Clearing**

The Flora and Fauna assessment indicates that the proposed works will involve the removal of 0.51 hectares of native vegetation, 0.83 hectares of exotic vegetation and 144 canopy trees (1.35 hectares in total) which includes:

- Loss of 0.15 hectares (including 26 trees) comprising the Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest EEC (TSC Act).
- Loss of 0.36 hectares of Planted Natives including removal of 87 canopy trees.
- Loss of 0.05 hectares (31 trees in total) of Planted Natives and Exotics.
- Removal of 0.79 hectares of Exotic Grassland.
- Removal of 2 habitat-trees containing stick nests.

Overall, this vegetation was assessed as having moderate biodiversity significance, forming moderate quality foraging and perching habitat for threatened and non-threatened fauna alike. Despite the above, it is recommended that vegetation clearance and associated impacts should be minimised to the fullest extent.

In addition, the Flora and Fauna Assessment recommended that the two Mugga Ironbark recorded in the western section of the site identified in Figure 6-3 should be retained, if possible. Recommendations have been included in Section 6.6.3 to ensure indirect impacts from the proposed vegetation removal do not result in a reduction of condition and viability of native vegetation to be retained within the study area. This includes the recommendation that, if feasible, compensatory revegetation should be undertaken to mitigate the loss of native vegetation removed.

Species used in compensatory revegetation should be indicative of the Cooks River / Castlereagh Ironbark Forest EEC and limited to native shrubs and small trees within 25 metres of the perimeter fence and a combination of canopy trees, small trees and shrubs at a distance of over 25 metres.

Furthermore, prior to removal of any trees, an assessment for any trees with hollows or nest sites should precede the removal. If any wildlife habitats are found; trees with hollows or nest sites are to be removed in accordance with the procedures specified the Flora and Fauna Assessment (refer to Appendix H of this REF), under the supervision of a suitably qualified ecologist.

**Threatened Flora and Fauna Impacts**

Background searches carried out for the Flora and Fauna Assessment identified 19 threatened flora species, 29 threatened fauna species and 19 migratory species recorded or predicted to occur within 5 kilometres of the study area.

However, no threatened flora or fauna listed under the EPBC or TSC Act were recorded within the site study area during the Flora and Fauna Assessment field investigation (see Appendix H). The assessment concluded that there is a low likelihood of occurrence of threatened species recorded or predicted to occur within 5 km of the study area; based on the non-cryptic nature of the species, the modified nature of the landscape and the ongoing disturbance regime at the site.

Whilst some listed fauna species may traverse over or occur on an occasional basis, due to the previous disturbance of the site, few fauna species are anticipated to utilise the site and therefore construction works are not anticipated to impact on any fauna habitat of conservation value. It is considered that the scope of the proposed works within the site would not have an adverse impact on any threatened species of state or national conservation significance.
Overall, the site has limited suitable habitat for threatened flora and fauna species. The proposed development is not anticipated to significantly impact on threatened species, populations or their habitats, which are listed under TSC Act.

Safeguards and mitigation measures recommended as part of the Arboricultural and Flora and Fauna Assessments are detailed in Section 6.6.3 below, which must be implemented for the proposal and prior to the removal of any vegetation.

**Endangered Ecological Communities (EEC) impacts**

The area within the proposed maximum security prison perimeter fence, exercise areas and area adjacent to the historic cottage where the vehicle lock and perimeter fence would be extended are not identified on OEH vegetation mapping as containing any endangered ecological communities (see Figure 6-1).

Six trees onsite were assessed by the arborist as potentially representative EEC species and therefore significant. These trees were identified as requiring further assessment by an ecologist prior to removal. This includes the trees identified in Table 1 of the Arboricultural Assessment (see Appendix E), as shown is in Figure 6-2 and in Table 6-2 below.

The six trees identified for further assessment by the arborist, were assessed during the Flora and Fauna Assessment and were subsequently classified as ‘planted natives’, not representative EEC species (see Figure 6-3).

The Flora and Fauna Assessment found that the proposal would require the removal of 26 canopy species comprising Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest EEC (TSC Act), which are located in the northern and north-eastern area of the site. The removal of these required an Assessment of Significance (AoS) under Past 5A of the EP&A Act to determine the severity of impacts. However, the AoS concluded that the removal of these trees is unlikely to affect the continued existence of Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest EEC (TSC Act) within the locality; based on the nearby presence of large areas of intact remnant patches adjoining the Cooks River riparian corridor (see Appendix H).

The removal of the 26 canopy trees (covering 0.15 hectares) forming Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest EEC (TSC Act) present within the site was also assessed as per the EPBC Act listing criteria. The Flora and Fauna Assessment concluded that no further assessment was required under the EPBC Act, as the trees on site, including the six trees listed below in Table 6-2, do not meet the listing criteria.

**Table 6-2 Trees identified as potentially significant EEC representative species in the Arboricultural Assessment.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Number</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>STARS Rating</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td><em>Eucalyptus tereticornis</em></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The species and age of this tree is representative of species that form part of the assembly of the Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and the Shale Plains Woodland (Cumberland Plain Woodland) EEC. This tree may also form part of a heritage curtilage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td><em>Eucalyptus fibrosa</em></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The species and age of this tree is representative of species that form part of the assembly of the Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and the Shale Plains Woodland (Cumberland Plain Woodland) EEC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td><em>Eucalyptus fibrosa</em></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The species and age of this tree is representative of species that form part of the assembly of the Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and the Shale Plains Woodland (Cumberland Plain Woodland) EEC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76</td>
<td><em>Eucalyptus fibrosa</em></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>The species and age of this tree is representative of species that form part of the assembly of the Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and the Shale Plains Woodland (Cumberland Plain Woodland) EEC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Tree Number** | **Species** | **STARS Rating** | **Assessment**
--- | --- | --- | ---
| | Red Ironbark | | Ironbark Forest and the Shale Plains Woodland (Cumberland Plain Woodland) EEC.
77 | *Eucalyptus tereticornis* Forest Red Gum | High | The species and age of this tree is representative of species that form part of the assembly of the Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and the Shale Plains Woodland (Cumberland Plain Woodland) EEC.
78 | *Eucalyptus fibrosa* Red Ironbark | High | The species and age of this tree is representative of species that form part of the assembly of the Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and the Shale Plains Woodland (Cumberland Plain Woodland) EEC.

**Matters of National Environmental Significance**
All of the migratory species that have been recorded, or are predicted to occur within the locality are unlikely to be impacted by the proposal.

Cooks River / Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and the Shale Plains Woodland (Cumberland Plain Woodland) CEEC’s mapped within the locality of the site does not meet the listing criteria under the EPBC Act, as discussed above.

The Flora and Fauna Assessment concluded that the proposal is not considered likely to have a significant impact on a matter of national environmental significance, or a significant impact on the environment in general. Therefore, the proposal will not need to be referred to the Commonwealth Department of the Environment for approval under the EPBC Act.

**Wildlife Corridor Impacts**
The trees located along the western boundary of the property, adjacent to Joseph Street were not assessed by the arborist for the proposal due to their location outside the impact footprint. However, these trees form part of an avenue which has been classed as a ‘biodiversity corridor’ within the Parramatta River Catchment and forms an integral link for surrounding remnant bush areas. As these trees are not scheduled for removal; the proposed works would not further fragment or isolate any habitat areas.

**Tree Hollow Impacts**
The Flora and Fauna Assessment identified that the removal of 6 hollow-bearing trees and stick nests will be required for the proposed works, which would result in the reduction of available breeding and nesting sites within the study area. As such, the assessment has recommended that each tree hollow to be removed should to be replaced with a nest box of similar dimensions to be installed in the nearest mature native tree before clearing of vegetation occurs to mitigate any impacts to hollow-dependent fauna in the vicinity of the site.

The location of the hollow bearing trees onsite are shown in Figure 6-3 and recommendations regarding hollow-bearing tree removal have been included below in Section 6.6.3.

**Noxious Weed Species**
Four noxious weed species listed within the Cumberland Council Local Control Authority Area including Asparagus Fern, Creeping Lantana, Pampas Grass and Broad-leaved Privet were recorded within the site during the Flora and Fauna Assessment (see Figure 6-3). These species will require management under the *Noxious Weeds Act 1993*. 
6.6.3 Mitigation

- Any construction works require the protection of surrounding trees should also utilise the requirements of the Tree Protection specification outlined in the Arboricultural Assessment (see section 8 and Appendix B within Appendix E) as inclusive of all works being conducted around trees that require retention. Trees that have not had a zone of protection nominated will require a protection zone of equivalent to the dripline of the tree to be used for protection of that tree with a minimum area of protection of 4m radius from the stem.

- No vegetation removal or modification is to occur beyond the proposed works areas shown on the plans.

- Trees that have not had a zone of protection nominated will require a zone of equivalent to the dripline of the tree to be used for protection of that tree with a minimum area of protection of 4 metres radius from the stem.

- Protective fencing would be required to protect trees not marked to be removed that may be impacted within or outside the construction area in accordance with AS 4970.

- During construction works, the works are to be undertaken in accordance with AS 4970-2009 Protection of trees on development sites (Australian Standards 2009).

- Newly exposed surfaces should be stabilised as soon as possible in order to reduce the potential for soil erosion. This should be done through the planting of native species endemic to the area or non-invasive grass species.

- The construction footprint would be minimised, with the construction works area and traffic routes to be clearly defined prior to commencing work. Construction activities would not disturb any areas of vegetation outside of the works area.

- All areas disturbed by the construction activities would be stabilised and reformed to facilitate natural rehabilitation, which may include seeding/grassing to protect against erosion.

- Revegetation at the site would be undertaken in accordance with the landscaping specification prepared for the works.

- Stockpiling of materials is to occur in cleared areas.

- Avoid stockpiling equipment or parking vehicles or plant within the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) of native canopy trees to be retained within or adjacent to the study area.

- Tree work (including trimming and removal) must be carried out, coordinated and supervised by a qualified Arborist or Ecologist. The specialist must be suitably qualified and employ qualified personnel consistent with the requirements of the Australian Standard AS 4373. All machinery used for tree trimming is to be cleaned and sterilised before and after use in accordance with Australian Standard AS4373 – 2007 Pruning of amenity trees.

- All green waste is to be disposed of at the nearest registered green waste facility.

- To the fullest extent practicable, minimise disturbance to any native vegetation surrounding the study area.

- If possible, retain the 2 Mugga Ironbark recorded in the western section of the site.

- In the unlikely event that unexpected threatened species are identified during the project, works should cease and an ecologist contacted.

- Minimise soil transportation within, into or out of the study area to reduce the spread of weeds.

- The 4 noxious weed species identified within the study area listed in Table 4 of the Flora and Fauna Assessment (See Appendix H) are to be removed from site and transported to the nearest registered green waste facility.
• Appropriate erosion and sediment control measures should be installed to avoid sedimentation of receiving water bodies or other indirect impacts to surrounding biodiversity values.

• Hollow-bearing trees to be removed in a two-stage process, as outlined in the recommendations section of the Flora and Fauna Assessment (see Appendix H) under the supervision and coordination of a suitably qualified ecologist.

• Each tree hollow to be removed should to be replaced with a nest box of similar dimensions to be installed in the nearest mature native tree.

• If feasible, compensatory revegetation should be undertaken to mitigate the loss of native vegetation removed. Species used in compensatory revegetation should be indicative of the Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest EEC and limited to native shrubs and small trees within 25m of the perimeter fence and a combination of canopy trees, small trees and shrubs at a distance of over 25+m. Species recommended for revegetation works are included in Appendix 6 of the Flora and Fauna Assessment provided in Appendix H of this report.
Figure 6-1 OEH vegetation mapping of the proposal site (site boundary outlined in yellow).

Vegetation identified as *Cooks River / Castlereagh Ironbark Forest the Sydney Basin* Bioregion endangered ecological community in the vicinity of the site is shown in Light Green (Red is listed as Urban Exotic / Native vegetation, White area is listed as Derived Grassland (Native / Exotic))

*Source: LPI SIX Maps, OEH VIS vegetation map 2016*
Figure 6-2  Site aerial showing the maximum extent of heritage curtilage area (green) and the Arboricultural Assessment area illustrating tree locations (Trees assessed as potentially significant by the arborist are circled in red).

Source: Allied Tree Consultancy 2016
Figure 6-3 Flora and Fauna Assessment site plan showing tree removal impact zone, onsite ecological values and vegetation classification.

Source: Biosis, 2017
6.6.4 **Operational Impacts**

The operation of the female remand maximum security correctional centre and associated infrastructure is not expected to result in any impact to flora and fauna.

6.6.5 **Mitigation**

No mitigation measures are proposed.

6.7 **Heritage**

6.7.1 **Aboriginal Heritage**

A search of OEH’s Aboriginal Heritage Information Management System (AHIMS) database indicated that no Aboriginal sites have been recorded and no Aboriginal Places declared within 50m of the site. It is considered unlikely that any intact Aboriginal heritage items are present on the site due to the previous development and high level of past disturbance.

6.7.2 **Historical Heritage**

The subject site includes an historic cottage building constructed in 1908. The cottage and surrounding the grounds are listed as a heritage item (item number 136) under the Auburn LEP (see Figure 6-2). The cottage is known as Minali Special School and is recognised for its local heritage significance. In addition, the cottage is listed on the Department of Juvenile Justice s170 Heritage Register as item number 3170001. Section 170 of the *Heritage Act 1977* requires that culturally significant items or places managed or owned by Government agencies are listed on departmental Heritage and Conservation Register.

The cottage initially formed part of the Lidcombe Hospital precinct located to the north, having been the residence of the hospital's medical superintendent (Mealing, 1988).

The cottage is an asset of Corrective Services NSW under the Department of Justice’s portfolio and is currently used as offices by the Corrective Services NSW (CSNSW) Directors of the Silverwater Women’s Cluster.

The Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for the historic cottage produced by the Department of Public Works and Services (DPWS) in 2002 recommended curtilage (boundary) several zones, including a primary minimal curtilage (Zone 1) as the physical setting of the residence; which allows sufficient area around the cottage to give it a meaningful and attractive setting, and associated outer curtilage zones. These include preferred additional curtilage zones 2a and 2b and an outer curtilage zone (Zone 3), which constitutes the visual curtilage of the residence within which shared uses with other developments are allowable with scale and height restrictions (DPWS, 2002).

The curtilage of the Minali Special School heritage site in the CMP shown in Figure 6-2 is based on the CMP’s proposed recommendations and includes the both the primary (Zone 1) and the additional preferred outer curtilage zones 2a, 2b and 3.

A Heritage Assessment and Statement of Heritage Impact (SoHI) report was undertaken by Biosis Pty Ltd in March 2017. A copy of the assessment is provided in Appendix I of this report.

6.7.3 **Construction Impacts**

**Aboriginal Heritage**

The new Mary Wade CC would be located on the site of the existing Juniperina JJC, the existing private roadway, or landscaped or vacant grassed areas which have been subject to a high level of past disturbance as a consequence of site development and vegetation clearing. No works are required outside of these disturbed areas. It is therefore unlikely that
the proposed works would disturb any undisturbed Aboriginal objects or sites or historical relics as defined under the *Heritage Act* 1977.

The *Due Diligence Code of Practice for the Protection of Aboriginal Objects in NSW* (DECCW, 2010) has been used in assessing the likelihood of encountering items of Aboriginal cultural heritage during the construction works at the site. It is considered that further archaeological investigations and/or an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit are not required and that the proposed works can proceed with caution, due to the previous development of the site.

Mitigation measures have been provided in Section 6.7.5 should any unanticipated Aboriginal objects be discovered during the construction works.

**Historic Heritage**

The historic cottage and garage structures will not be directly impacted by the proposal. However, the new vehicle lock will be located in proximity to the heritage cottage outside of the heritage curtilage, and security considerations will require the removal of seven trees located within the heritage curtilage.

Six of the trees (Trees 28, 33, 34, 35, 36, and 37 identified in Figure 6-2) located near the historic cottage were identified by the Arboricultural Assessment as potentially significant high value specimens, which may provide high aesthetic and historic value to the area and were therefore recommended for retention (Allied Tree Consultancy, 2016). As such, assessment by a heritage consultant was recommended prior to their removal of the trees identified in Table 6-3.

Four of the 6 trees identified as potentially significant by the Arborist have been identified for removal for the construction of the vehicle lock, or for security purposes (i.e. Trees numbered 33, 35, 36 and 37), these trees are located outside the primary (Zone 1) cottage curtilage.

The planned perimeter road would also be located outside of the primary curtilage, along the outer edge of Zone 3 of the heritage curtilage. The planned perimeter road is not considered unsympathetic to the Zone 3 visual curtilage objectives, as the CMP indicates that low-rise development is allowable within this curtilage area. Furthermore, this area would have previously been disturbed for the construction of the adjacent security fence; therefore, archaeological potential within this area would be minimal.

Due to the proximity of the new vehicle lock to the heritage curtilage, and the potential significance of certain trees within the heritage curtilage which require removal for the proposal; a Heritage and SoHI Assessment was carried out by an archaeologist from Biosis (see Appendix I) to evaluate the potential impact of the proposal on the heritage item onsite.

The SoHI Assessment found that the works will not have any direct impacts on the cottage structure itself. However, there will be some indirect visual impacts as a result of the construction works, but these impacts are limited to the construction phase. As such, the proposed works will not impact on the heritage significance of the structure, and the only items of heritage value which will be directly impacted by the proposed works would be the trees located within the minimum and preferred additional curtilage zones.

The assessment also found that the proposed works have the potential to negatively impact the significance of the heritage item onsite by removing portions of its fabric and disrupting its visual setting through the removal of a number of trees which form a part of the listing (including tree numbers 26, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, and 37 shown in Figure 6-2).

However, the impact that tree removal will have on the heritage item can be mitigated by the replacement of the trees with appropriate plantings in the same locations. This would ensure that a visual buffer is present separating the cottage from the surrounding correctional facility, and that the boundaries of the former garden are still marked. Provided that this measure is adopted, the proposed works are acceptable from a heritage perspective.
Furthermore, the assessment indicates that is a low potential for archaeological remains such as pathways, post holes or footings from fences, and the remains of curated garden to be encountered during construction works. However, given the age of the heritage cottage, it is considered that these features have a low research potential if present, as they have little potential to provide information about the history of the site or to answer meaningful research questions about its development.

Overall, the impacts of the proposed repurposing works were assessed against the significance of the heritage item and the conservation policies put forth in the CMP. The SoHI Assessment considered that the removal of the trees surrounding the cottage is a necessary impact under the proposal, and concluded that provided that the above recommendations and mitigation measures (see Section 6.7.5) are adopted for the proposal, the proposed works, including the tree required removal, may proceed with minimal loss of significance to the heritage item onsite.

Mitigation measures have also been provided with respect to any unexpected finds and to protect the listed heritage item in Section 6.7.5 and to protect trees not scheduled for removal within the site during construction within Section 6.6.5.

**Table 6-3 Trees assessed as potentially significant historic heritage representative species.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree Number</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>STARS Rating</th>
<th>Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Araucaria cunninghamiana</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>This tree forms part of the curtilage of the heritage listed estate under Auburn LEP and is considered to have formed part of the original landscape of the cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Olea europaea ssp cuspidata African Olive</td>
<td>Medium/High</td>
<td>This tree forms part of the curtilage of the heritage listed estate under Auburn LEP and is considered to have formed part of the original landscape of the cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Eucalyptus tereticornis Forest Red Gum</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>This tree forms part of the curtilage of the heritage listed estate under Auburn LEP and is considered to have formed part of the original landscape of the cottage. The tree is representative of species that form part of the assembly of the Cooks River/Castlereagh Ironbark Forest and the Shale Plains Woodland (Cumberland Plain Woodland) EEC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Eucalyptus microcorys Tallowwood</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>This tree forms part of the curtilage of the heritage listed estate under Auburn LEP and is considered to have formed part of the original landscape of the cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Eucalyptus microcorys Tallowwood</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>This tree forms part of the curtilage of the heritage listed estate under Auburn LEP and is considered to have formed part of the original landscape of the cottage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Eucalyptus microcorys Tallowwood</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>This tree forms part of the curtilage of the heritage listed estate under Auburn LEP and is considered to have formed part of the original landscape of the cottage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**6.7.4 Operational Impacts**

The operation of the Mary Wade CC is unlikely to impact significantly on any item or place having aesthetic, anthropological, archaeological, architectural, cultural, historical, scientific or social significance or other special value for present or future generations; however, this would be confirmed by the specialist heritage impact statement to be undertaken at the site.
There would be no impact to heritage items located in the vicinity of the site during operation of the CC.

6.7.5 Mitigation

- All workers/contractors are to be informed of their obligations under the *Heritage Act 1977* and *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974*, namely that it is illegal to disturb, damage, destroy an Aboriginal object, historic relic or heritage item without the prior approval of OEH.

- All workers (including contractors) should be inducted concerning Aboriginal cultural and historic heritage values and basic training should be provided for identifying Aboriginal objects and historic relics.

- Should any Aboriginal Objects be encountered during works associated with this proposal, works must cease in the vicinity and the find should not be moved until assessed by a qualified archaeologist. If the find is determined to be an Aboriginal Object the archaeologist will provide further recommendations. These may include notifying the OEH and Aboriginal stakeholders.

- In the event that known or suspected Aboriginal skeletal remains are encountered during the activity, the following procedure will be followed:
  a) all work in the immediate vicinity will cease;
  b) the find will be immediately reported to the work supervisor who will immediately advise the Environment Manager or other nominated senior staff member;
  c) the Environment Manager or other nominated senior staff member will promptly notify the police and the state coroner (as required for all human remains discoveries);
  d) the Environment Manager or other nominated senior staff member will contact the OEH for advice on identification of the skeletal material as Aboriginal and management of the material; and
  e) if the skeletal material is of Aboriginal ancestral remains, the Local Aboriginal Land Council will be contacted and consultative arrangements will be made to discuss ongoing care of the remains.

- The trees to be removed within the heritage curtilage (including tree number 26, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, and 37) should be replaced with appropriate plantings where possible. These should be planted at the locations of the removed trees, and should be compliant with any requirements that the department has to ensure the security of the adjacent facility.

- Specific protection measures such as perimeter fencing should be installed to protect the historic cottage at the site and its curtilage from construction activities and vehicles.

- All workers are to be advised of the local heritage significance of the cottage, and no alterations or additions works are to take place on the historic cottage.

- Should unanticipated relics be discovered during the course of the project, work in the vicinity must cease and an archaeologist contacted to make a preliminary assessment of the find. The Heritage Council will require notification if the find is assessed as a relic.

6.8 Hazardous Materials

A Section 149 Certificate issued by Council indicates that there are no matters arising under the *Contaminated Land Management Act 1997*. 
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A Hazardous Materials Risk Assessment of the JJC site was undertaken in February 2014 by Noel Arnold and Associates. The survey identified the following hazardous material in various areas of the JJC site:

- Synthetic mineral fibre products (SMF)

Lead paint and asbestos have been recorded in the heritage cottage building and garage, respectively. However, these buildings are located outside of the proposed works area.

The Hazardous Materials Risk Assessment is provided in Appendix F of this REF.

6.8.1 Construction Impacts
The proposed development will not introduce any hazardous materials to the site. The works are likely to encounter SMF in the Main Building and Detainee Blocks within compressed ceiling tiles, ceiling space ductwork and roof lining (sarking) insulation, and hot water service and air conditioning insulation material. The works are unlikely to disturb any other hazardous materials which have been identified on the building’s exterior and interior surfaces.

Management measures for hazardous materials encountered during construction are provided in Section 6.8.3 below.

6.8.2 Operational Impacts
The operation of the remand correctional centre on completion of the proposed works is not expected to introduce hazardous materials to the site or surrounding land.

6.8.3 Mitigation
- The CEMP will include measures to ensure compliance with all legislative requirements for the management and disposal of hazardous waste from the site during construction works. Relevant statutory requirements and current standards, codes and guidelines as published by WorkCover NSW and the National Occupational Health and Safety Commissions include, but are not necessarily be limited to:
  - Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997
  - Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulation 2014
  - Work Health and Safety Act 2011
  - Work Health and Safety Regulation 2011, particularly Chapter 7, Part 7.2
  - Environmentally Hazardous Chemicals Act 1985
- If works encounter any hazardous materials identified in the Hazardous Materials Risk Assessment (Noel Arnold and Associates, February 2014) for the JJC site or if any previously unidentified suspected asbestos or hazardous materials are encountered, work will cease pending further sampling and investigation, the site secured and a safe work method statement(s) and appropriate documented practices will be implemented. Any hazardous material will be classified first and then stored, transported and disposed of in accordance with EPA requirements at an EPA licensed waste facility.
- Provide a copy of the current Hazardous Materials Register for the Site to contractors undertaking construction works.
- Synthetic Mineral Fibre (SMF) materials should be removed under controlled conditions prior to demolition /refurbishment works, in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Practice for the Safe Use of Synthetic Mineral Fibres NOHSC:2006(1990).
6.9 Waste Management and Contamination

6.9.1 Construction Impacts
It is likely that some excess building materials would be produced due to the construction work such as miscellaneous waste associated with removal of existing internal building fittings, security mesh, packaging and transport of plant and equipment and various other manufactured items forming part of the repurposing fitout works. These would be recycled or reused where possible or where this was not possible, construction waste will be taken off site for recycling (where practicable) or disposal in accordance with the POEO Act and the Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulation 2014.

Very minimal other waste streams have been identified as part of the construction works. A small section of existing Macem fencing would also need to be removed for the new vehicle lock area.

The construction works at the site are not anticipated to produce any contaminated waste or cause contamination of the site or surrounding land; as the works would generally comprise internal fit out of existing buildings and limited ground surface disturbance. The works are not anticipated to expose any asbestos-containing material, as the centre was constructed in 2005.

It is assessed that construction waste can be adequately managed to avoid adverse environmental impacts.

6.9.2 Operational Impacts
There would be an increase in operational waste associated with the repurposed facility due to the increase in inmate population. Waste management procedures for the new maximum security infrastructure would be as per previous operations of the Juniperina JJC, which would include separation of waste for recycling and general disposal.

The operation of the site is not expected to produce any contaminated waste or cause contamination of the site or surrounding land. Any hazardous or potentially contaminating materials stored on site, such as fuel for lawn mowing, will be of a similar nature and quantity to those used in a typical domestic setting.

6.9.3 Mitigation

Construction
- A Waste Management Plan (WMP) will be prepared as part of the CEMP by the construction contractor for the management of waste generated during construction works. The WMP must be prepared in accordance with the applicable waste management provisions of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 and the Protection of the Environment Operations (Regulation) 2014. The WMP will include, but not be limited to, the following:
  - Waste management practices will follow the resource management hierarchy principles embodied in the Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Act 2001. These practices include avoiding unnecessary resource consumption, recovery of resources (including reuse, reprocessing, recycling and energy recovery); and disposal to a licensed landfill (as a last resort).
  - Where available, recyclable site and construction waste will be recycled in accordance with the NSW Government’s Waste Reduction and Purchasing Policy (WRAPP guidelines).
Non-recyclable waste and containers will be regularly collected and disposed of at a licensed landfill or other disposal site in the area. Waste oil will be sent to approved recyclers.

The worksite will be left tidy and rubbish free each day prior to leaving site and at the completion of construction.

Transportation of waste must be done in a manner that avoids the waste spilling, leaking or otherwise escaping from the vehicle or plant used to transport the waste. Waste will be transported to a place that can lawfully receive that waste.

- In the event that unexpected conditions are encountered during construction works which may pose a contamination risk, all works should stop and an environmental consultant should be engaged to inspect the site and address the issue.

6.10 Visual Amenity

The site is screened from the neighbouring residential area with trees and a wall along the eastern boundary and landscaped lawns and scattering of trees between the complex and the northern, western and southern boundaries (refer to Figure 6-2).

6.10.1 Construction Impacts

The main visual impacts during the construction period will be from a temporary site perimeter fence, equipment and vehicles used during construction works, a site compound and tree removal form the site for security purposes. Visual impacts resulting from construction will be short term, and the majority of the work would be undertaken indoors, within the existing fenced JJC; and outdoor works will be partially screened by the site fencing and existing trees at the site; therefore, the construction impact on the visual amenity of nearby properties is unlikely to be significant.

6.10.2 Operational Impacts

Post construction there would be two demountable buildings located adjacent to an existing building, a small shed, security fence re-alignment to a small section of the existing fence line, new security mesh installed in the existing recreational courtyards and associated upgraded internal re-fit of infrastructure at the site. The new buildings would be consistent with the existing prison infrastructure at the site. Site plans displaying the new buildings are provided in Appendix A.

The maximum security prison would be screened through existing man-proof security fencing and existing vegetation at the site, as vegetation removal for the proposal would target vegetation located within the centre’s security fence and within the central area of the site, not mature trees located along the site boundaries. The new facilities are predicted to have a minimal impact on the visible aesthetics of the area due to their small size and screened location. Post-construction the existing landscaping and new plantings would also assist in reducing any impacts to the aesthetic quality of the site.

The internal building fit out works are not visible from surrounding roads.

6.10.3 Mitigation

- Prepare and implement a Landscaping Plan to reduce the visual impacts of the development, and compensate for tree removal.

6.11 Socio-economic Impacts

The context of the site is described in Section 1.4 of this REF.
The Department of Justice held a consultation meeting with the Cumberland Council Planning Team on 10 October 2016 to discuss the proposal. No formal response was received from Council regarding the proposal despite two subsequent emails issued to Council in November 2016 requesting a response regarding the proposal.

Neighbourhood notification was undertaken to advise local residents and stakeholders of the proposed repurposing of the Juniperina JJC site for use as the Mary Wade CC.

Neighbourhood notification comprised a letterbox drop of approximately 500 consultation letters to local residents and businesses surrounding the site (distributed on 10 October 2016), and the placement of an advertisement in the local newspaper (The Auburn Review on 11 October 2016). A copy of the neighbourhood notification letter distributed to local residents, and the newspaper advertisement are provided in Appendix C.

No specific concerns were raised by the local community during the neighbourhood notification period. Overall, two telephone enquiries were received during the 21 day notification period. One respondent requested a copy of the proposed Mary Wade CC site map included in the notification letter, as it had not been included with the letter. The other respondent queried whether a public community meeting or open day would be held in relation to the proposal. Given, the small number of enquiries which resulted from the neighbourhood notification process; further community consultation was not considered necessary for the proposal.

6.11.1 Operational Impacts

A site specific Socio-economic Impact Assessment (SEIA) for the Juniperina JJC repurposing proposal was not undertaken. Information for this section has been drawn from previous SEIA undertaken for upgraded correctional centre projects within the Sydney metropolitan area (BBC Planners, 2016).

Social impacts in relation to new correctional centres are generally related to fear of escapees and the safety and security of residents of the adjoining neighbourhoods. Whilst there are many perceived community concerns in relation to local correctional centres, these issues are generally not valid in most cases. The following key points are noted for the proposed Mary Wade CC site;

- the proposed development is to redesign and security upgrade (hardening) to maximum security remand centre specifications within the site of an existing juvenile justice centre;
- the Centre is setback from the surrounding land and screened by infrastructure (major roads and rail);
- the remand centre will have a (hardened) high quality perimeter security zone in place and upgraded security monitoring system installed;
- activities will be managed by qualified NSW Department of Justice staff and the community will not be exposed to any undue risk;
- the proposed development is within the confines of an existing correctional centre and would not change the nature of the locality; and
- inmates will generally be awaiting trial or transfer, and there will a relatively small number of inmates accommodated at the facility.

It is considered that the proposed development will have a positive social benefit for the wider community as it will provide much needed relief for the already overcrowded adult female correctional facilities within the metropolitan area.

Some potential impacts, as well as community concerns of the impact, are discussed below.

Security

The proposed Mary Wade CC will be designed and managed to ensure there is a low risk of escapes. In addition to the physical security measures (i.e. security monitoring equipment,
controlled entry gate, new vehicle lock, recreational area security mesh and outer perimeter access roadway); there will be continued close case management and gathering of intelligence which will form an integral part to overall security at the centre and assist as a major deterrent to escapes.

Staff at all levels at the correctional centre will continue to receive comprehensive security training. In addition, it is recommended that an Emergency Response Plan is established to ensure the procedures are followed in the event of an escape or abscond and the notification procedure for neighbours and the surrounding community are reviewed and updated where necessary.

In the event that medical treatment is required which cannot be adequately treated onsite; it is anticipated that inmates would attend either Bankstown or Auburn Hospital for treatment, as these hospitals are located in close proximity to the site. Where inmates are required to travel offsite, they would be transported under supervision and treated whilst under guard by qualified security staff.

Crime
A commonly held fear is that the introduction of a correctional facility in an established community will lead to increased crime in the area, committed by prison escapees, families of inmates or by visitors to the centre or inmates choosing to remain in the area upon release.

There may also be a concern amongst the community and some service providers that the correctional centre would increase the likelihood of crimes being committed in the area by released inmates, either immediately after their release or if they chose to remain in the area for longer periods. However there are no apparent reasons for inmates, their family or associates to remain in the area upon release; as the function of the correctional centre is to accommodate individual inmates for a relatively short period while they are in the process of transfer to another prison or in remand awaiting trial.

It is noted that the majority of visitors to inmates are law abiding citizens; however notwithstanding this, visits to inmates are tightly controlled. All visitors to the Mary Wade CC must make appointments in advance.

Given the metropolitan location of the correctional centre, it is anticipated that inmates or visitors would return to their previous address or suburb.

Property and Land Values
Although not raised during the consultation period, there may be concerns within some sections of the Lidcombe community that property and land values in the area will be negatively impacted by operation of the Mary Wade CC.

The recently developed Botanica residential area located to the north of the Mary Wade CC was developed after the Juniperina JJC site was established and commenced operations. The Botanica development is a well-established and desirable residential area. However, it is considered unlikely, that the presence of the CC would impact on the rate of development or resale values due to the small scale of the proposal and pre-existence of the site.

Overall, it is expected that, following the Juniperina JJC repurposing works and commencement of the new Mary Wade CC maximum security female remand operations:

- the incidence of families moving to the Lidcombe area will remain low;
- the likelihood of released inmates (not previously residents of the Lidcombe region) remaining in the area will not increase;
- there will be no negative effect on the image of the local suburb, and there may be a positive impact through increased social and economic opportunities;
there will be a small impact on increased demand for services such as educational, health and social services, however these can be managed through the CC maintaining open lines of communication with the relevant agencies.

The social benefits of the proposed facility include:

- additional employment for local residents; and
- expansion of a stable industry, diversifying the economy of the region.

The previous SEIA has noted the potential economic impact of the expanded correction centre facility in providing secure local employment and additional annual local expenditure. The economic benefits during construction will also be positive. Aside from these direct benefits and the associated multiplier of flow-on effects in support of local industries, the continued presence of a major stable government employer will carry on supporting investor confidence.

6.11.2 Mitigation

- Centre management will develop a program of communication with neighbouring residents, including points of contact during any crisis situation at the Centre.
- Centre management will work through the correctional centre to report on security measures and action taken in relation to escape management.
- Centre management will work with police, Council and other community groups to ensure management of crime levels;
- Centre management will liaise with the Local Area Command to ensure staffing levels remain adequate and to continue to share information where relevant.
- Continued close integration with parole officers and other services will be established in order to ensure smooth transition of released inmates back to their home communities.
- Encourage social service providers to clearly articulate their policies on service provision, work with local service providers to ensure streamlined approach to service delivery and maximising opportunities.
- Mary Wade CC to increase awareness of support and assistance which is available through the Department of Justice to eligible visitors of inmates.
- Liaise with Council and housing providers during staff appointment and when staff take up positions at the CC, to monitor the demand for housing and means of maximising the number of staff who live locally.
- Department of Justice and Council will co-operate on addressing the community-wide issues surrounding women’s needs, particularly in areas such as access to short-term accommodation and transport.
- Mary Wade CC will work closely with local businesses and service providers, including schools, to ensure all possible opportunities for partnership and development are identified and addressed.
- Hold discussions about methods of ensuring maximum opportunities for local firms to win tenders under the Department of Justice centralised tendering process.
- Regularly publish a list of upcoming future tenders at Council and in the local area.
- Liaise closely with economic development groups to develop new ways to value add economically from the CC, e.g. attracting new industries, briefing sessions to assist the local community in the development of individual or consortium based approaches to bid for tenders.
A Community Consultative Committee (CCC) will be formed to establish communication with local schools and other community facilities during early operation of the new centre to identify initiatives which provide community benefit.

The Department of Justice, the Community Consultative Committee and Council will cooperate on addressing the community-wide issues surrounding women’s needs, particularly in areas such as access to short-term accommodation and transport.

6.12 Utilities and Services

6.12.1 Existing Environment

The existing site presently has connections to infrastructure services (i.e. mains water, sewer and stormwater drainage, electricity, telecommunications and security systems).

The high voltage electricity transmission tower on the western side of the Site would not be impacted by the works, as no new buildings or fencing would be erected in this section of the site.

A Services Infrastructure Report was undertaken at the site by WSP Parsons Brinckerhoff Pty Ltd (WSP) (February 2017), a copy of the report is provided in Appendix J. The following information has been taken directly from this report.

6.12.2 Construction Impacts

The Services Infrastructure report was prepared in consideration of existing infrastructure and utility connections onsite, and indicates that the proposed development should not have an adverse impact on authority services in the area.

**Electrical Services**

Generally, the system only requires minor modifications with some deletion of existing systems and some minor additions of new mechanical systems. The only significant change to the electrical services infrastructure is the introduction of a new 15kVA UPS unit, to replace the existing 10kVA unit located in the Equipment room of Block A, level 2 and a new 10kVA unit (which will have an actual load of 5.2kVA. It has been sized in this manner in order to eliminate the need to fire rate the room in which it is housed). Both of these loads are significantly offset by the demolition of the Training Kitchen in Block A.

In all other areas of works, existing fluorescent type lighting will be replaced with more efficient LED type and where possible the aim is to reuse any/all power outlets.

**Hydraulic Services**

Consultation with Sydney Water in relation to potential increased loads on the water and sewer system has been undertaken by WSP regarding the proposal. Sydney Water has advised that since no new or augmented service connections were required to the site, existing infrastructure would be adequate to support the repurposing works.

Although population numbers at the CC are expected to double; a limited number of new hydraulic fixtures such as laundry tubs, sinks, showers and WC’s in 3 new cells are being installed as part of the repurposing building works. Some existing hydraulic fixture will also be demolished during construction works.

The repurposing works do not include any new fire appliance fixtures, and therefore the existing fire services connection is considered adequate.

**Natural Gas**

Jemena Gas were advised of the proposal by WSP; however, they do not expect that any application for adjustment of the existing connection will be necessary for the repurposing works.
Existing drawings indicate that the site is serviced by a high-pressure natural gas connection, direct off an authority main in Joseph Street, at the intersection of Lewis Street. This connection was installed in 2005/6 and is expected to be in good condition.

No new gas connections will be installed during the proposed works.

**Stormwater**

No new stormwater connections would take place during construction works. Therefore, no impact to stormwater infrastructure onsite is anticipated.

Measures will be included in the CEMP to ensure that construction activities do not impact on existing utilities and services. All buried and above ground services in the vicinity of the site will be identified prior to commencement of construction and relocated where required.

### 6.12.3 Operational Impacts

The new staff amenities building will be connected to electricity supply, water and waste water services and three new cells would be installed for the proposal. However, this is not anticipated to significantly impact these services due to the small scale of this development.

**Electrical Services**

Calculations carried out for the Services Infrastructure report indicate that, as a worst case scenario, there would be an increase of approximately 15A over the site as a whole. As this increase in maximum demand, equates to less than 2% of the transformers capacity of 835A and based on the information available, the current electrical infrastructure provisions are considered suitable to accommodate the potential increases in electrical demand during operation of the CC.

**Hydraulic Services**

As there are only three new cells to be installed under the proposed works, the net addition of hydraulic fixtures has no impact on existing internal water reticulation, the capacity of which is determined from hydraulic fixture Loading Units, as per AS/NZS 3500.1. The existing 80Ø water connection is therefore considered adequate to supply any additional demand arising during CC operation.

The net addition of hydraulic fixtures has no impact on existing internal gravity sanitary drainage, the capacity of which is determined from hydraulic Fixture Unit Ratings, as per AS/NZS 3500.2. The existing 150Ø sewer connection is therefore considered adequate to receive any additional flows arising during operation of the CC.

**Natural Gas**

The proposed works would result in the net reduction of connected gas appliances during CC operation; with the removal of four existing gas heaters, and the addition of no new appliances, and therefore the natural gas services connection is considered adequate.

**Stormwater**

No significant increase to hardened or paved areas is anticipated during works. Therefore, the existing stormwater drainage system is therefore unaffected during CC operation.

Overall, existing infrastructure and utilities servicing this property and surrounding areas (including gas, mains water, sewerage, stormwater drainage, electricity, and telecommunications) will not be adversely affected during operation of the CC. However, it is anticipated that the increased inmate capacity at the site would result in a minor, insignificant increase in water and wastewater loads on the sewer system.
6.12.4 Mitigation

- Accurately locate any services near the proposed works which may be impacted by the construction activities prior to the commencement of construction. This may include contacting ‘Dial Before You Dig’ if relevant.
7 Environmental Management

Under the State Government’s policy to improve the performance of the NSW construction industry, preparation of a CEMP is mandatory for all projects undertaken by or on behalf of government agencies or where funding is being provided by the government. The Construction Policy Steering Committee and the then Department of Infrastructure Planning and Natural Resources have produced Environmental Management System and EMP Guidelines aiming to assist contractors both in complying with the Government’s policy and in demonstrating that compliance. The environmental management objectives and supporting actions presented in this section are intended to assist in this process.

The CEMP would include a risk assessment which ensures that the safeguards identified in this REF, as well as any others that are considered relevant, are effectively translated into actual construction techniques and environmental management activities, controls and monitoring/verification to prevent or minimise environmental impacts. The CEMP should also identify the requirements for compliance with relevant legislation and other regulatory any requirements to ensure environmental safeguards described throughout this REF are implemented. The environmental management objectives and supporting actions presented in this section are intended to assist in this process. The Department of Justice would review the CEMP.

The CEMP should generally conform to the structure shown in Table 7-1.

Table 7-1 Construction Environmental Management Plan Structure

| Background                        | Introduction to the document  
|                                  | Description of the proposal and project details  
|                                  | The context for the CEMP in regards to the overall project  
|                                  | The CEMP objectives  
|                                  | The contractor’s environmental policy  
| Environmental Management         | Environmental management structure of the organisation and specific team responsibilities with respect to the CEMP and its implementation  
|                                  | Approval and licensing requirements relevant to the project  
|                                  | Reporting requirements  
|                                  | Environmental training  
|                                  | Emergency contacts and response  
| Implementation                   | A project specific risk assessment  
|                                  | A detailed list of environmental management safeguards and controls  
|                                  | CEMP sub plans for specific environmental controls  
|                                  | A detailed schedule assigning responsibility to each environmental management activity and control  
| Monitor and Review               | Environmental monitoring  
|                                  | Environmental auditing  
|                                  | Corrective action  
|                                  | CEMP review and document control procedures  

7.1 Environmental Management Measures

Implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in Section 6 would be undertaken during a number of phases of the project. These phases comprise:

- Detailed design – refinement of the design details;
- Pre-construction – prior to the contractor arriving on site to carry out the works;
- Construction – during construction phase; and
- Operation – post construction.

7.1.1 Noise and Vibration

Objectives

- Compliance with relevant recommendations specified in the *Interim Construction Noise Guideline* (DECC, 2009).
- Avoidance/minimisation of noise impacts on nearby sensitive noise receivers.

Action(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action/Phase</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Construction</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake community notification with adjoining and adjacent properties when it is planned to carry out construction of the development and where it is likely to cause vibration or offensive noise and impact the public and nearby residents, including truck entry and exit points to the site.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation of a detailed Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (NVMP) by the successful construction contractor prior to commencement of works on site. This would be based on the proposed construction methodology, activities, durations and equipment type and numbers.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction activities shall be restricted to the normal EPA specified daytime construction hours (i.e. 7am to 6pm Monday to Friday, 8am to 1pm Saturday, no work on Sunday or public holidays). However, if deemed necessary to undertake minor internal fit-out works outside these hours on Saturdays between 1pm and 5pm and/or on Sundays (8am to 5pm), prior approval would be sought from the Principal; and notification to the affected community where construction activities will take place outdoors. Notification will provide the following details:</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The locations and types of surrounding receivers likely to be affected;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The nature of the proposed works;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The noise characteristics of any powered equipment likely to be used;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Measures to be taken to reduce noise emissions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implement control measures to minimise noise impacts during construction as part of the CEMP. Site and project specific measures to control noise will be determined by the construction contractor based on the construction methodology, with the CEMP required to be submitted for review prior to commencement of construction works. The CEMP will include all reasonable and practical steps to reduce noise and vibration from the site. The Interim Construction Noise Guideline (DECCW, 2009) (in particular Tables 4 through to 10 of this guideline) should be referred to when considering appropriate measures, and may include:

- Optimum siting of work areas, vehicle and plant parking areas, materials stockpiles and equipment storage areas in locations where potential acoustical impacts will be minimised;
- Identify locations where noise is most intrusive and develop strategies to reduce impacts for these areas;
- All plant and machinery used for the project would be well maintained; and
- Any noise complaint received would be investigated as soon as practicable. Any practicable and feasible measures to minimise noise would be identified.

### Operational

Any complaints associated with the operation of the repurposed CC facility would be investigated as soon as practicable. Any practicable and feasible measures to minimise noise would be identified.

**Public announcement/ alarm system:**

- Ensure the PA system is used only during the day time period;
- Minimise usage of PA system and only use when necessary for announcements;
- PA volume should be adjusted to a suitable level; and
- Do not use the PA system to broadcast music.

### 7.1.2 Traffic and Access

**Objectives**

- Ensure that construction vehicles do not cause excessive inconvenience to road and pedestrian users.
- Ensure the safety of road users, construction personnel, other workers and visitors to the site for the duration of the works.
- Minimise the pollution impacts resulting from the use of vehicles during construction.

**Action(s)**
Prepare a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) based on the detailed construction methodology and use of specific heavy vehicles and construction plant. The TMP is to be approved by the Department of Justice prior to commencement of works. The Traffic Management Plan would include measures to minimise traffic impacts ensure public safety and would be prepared in accordance with:

- Traffic Control at Work Sites Manual (RTA, 2010)
- Australian Standard 1742.3 - 2009 Traffic Controls for Works on Roads.

The TMP is to be developed in consultation with the Department of Justice and approved prior to the commencement of construction.

The TMP is to detail hours of operation, heavy vehicle volumes (numbers) and routes, construction staff parking, loading / unloading areas and site access arrangements, all temporary warning, guidance and information signage, and appropriate traffic control devices.

Surrounding land owners will be notified at least one week in advance of the works.

All roads would be kept clean and free of dust and mud at all times. Where material is tracked onto sealed roads at any time, it would be removed immediately so that road pavements are kept safe and trafficable.

All roads, kerbs, gutters and footpaths damaged as a result of construction are to be restored to their pre-construction condition.

All traffic would comply with all applicable traffic laws and regulations including speed limits. All construction vehicles would comply with the speed limits set for the roads accessing the site.

All roads and access tracks would be rehabilitated post construction to a standard equivalent to or better than the preconstruction condition.

Provide incentives for staff to use existing public transport (ie. buses along Joseph Street) or to car pool, thus increasing car occupancy levels and reducing traffic generation / parking demand.

### 7.1.3 Air Quality

**Objectives**

- Avoidance/minimisation of off-site dust nuisance to neighbouring residences, workers, inmates visitors and the community.
- Minimisation of air quality impacts resulting from machinery and vehicle emissions.

**Action(s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action/Phase</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undertake community notification where work is likely to cause dust impact on the public and nearby residents.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction contractors would monitor dust generation potential.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only spray paint and other materials with the potential to become air borne particulates in light wind conditions.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Phase</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The burning of waste materials will not be permitted on site or at the complex.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor weather conditions for the duration of the construction period and cover all stockpiles</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles and equipment used during construction will be suitably serviced within the six-month period prior to commencement of construction activities and all necessary maintenance undertaken during construction period.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All construction machinery would be turned off when not in use to minimise emissions.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure all vehicles transporting loose materials and travelling on public roads (i.e. closed tail gate and covered) to minimise dust generation</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any stockpiled spoil/fill would be protected to minimise dust generation to avoid sediment moving offsite.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.1.4 Water Quality Impacts, Erosion and Sediment Control and Flooding

**Objectives**
- To effectively manage sediment and erosion control during the construction stage of the project.
- Prevention/minimisation of impacts to nearby water bodies and associated drainage lines during the construction and operation of the scheme.

**Action(s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action/Phase</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-construction</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare and implement a site specific Erosion and Sediment Control Plan for the entire construction period. This will incorporate erosion and sediment control measures which are appropriate for the site conditions and construction methodology in line with Landcom’s <em>Managing Urban Stormwater, Soils &amp; Construction Guidelines</em> (The Blue Book).</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain erosion and sedimentation control measures regularly and after rainfall events in accordance with The Blue Book.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not remove erosion and sedimentation control measures until disturbed areas have stabilised.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilise disturbed areas during the construction of the proposed development where necessary in line with The Blue Book.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore any damage caused to the ground surface to pre-construction condition upon completion of construction.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take all care and due diligence to minimise or prevent pollutant material entering drain inlets or waterways.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater drainage for the shed will be connected to an existing stormwater connection on the site.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any excess spoil resulting from the works would be disposed of and be subject to testing in accordance with the *Waste Classification Guidelines* (DECCW 2009).

No surplus construction spoil would be permitted for reuse on Site

All disturbed areas would be restored post construction.

### 7.1.5 Flora and Fauna

**Objectives**
- Avoidance/minimisation of impacts to flora and fauna.
- Minimise clearing of onsite vegetation.
- Avoid weed invasion.

**Action(s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action/Phase</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-construction</td>
<td>Dept. of Justice/Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any construction works require the protection of surrounding trees should also utilise the requirements of the Tree Protection specification outlined in the Arboricultural Assessment (see section 8 and Appendix B within Appendix E) as inclusive of all works being conducted around trees that require retention. Trees that have not had a zone of protection nominated will require a protection zone of equivalent to the dripline of the tree to be used for protection of that tree with a minimum area of protection of 4 m radius from the stem.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No vegetation removal or modification is to occur beyond the proposed works areas shown on the plans.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees that have not had a zone of protection nominated will require a zone of equivalent to the dripline of the tree to be used for protection of that tree with a minimum area of protection of 4 m radius from the stem.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective fencing would be required to protect trees not marked to be removed that may be impacted within or outside the construction area in accordance with AS 4970.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During construction works, the works are to be undertaken in accordance with AS 4970-2009 Protection of trees on development sites (Australian Standards 2009)</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newly exposed surfaces should be stabilised as soon as possible in order to reduce the potential for soil erosion. This should be done through the planting of native species endemic to the area or non-invasive grass species.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The construction footprint would be minimised, with the construction works area and traffic routes to be clearly defined prior to commencing work. Construction activities would not disturb any areas of vegetation outside of the works area.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All areas disturbed by the construction activities would be stabilised and reformed to facilitate natural rehabilitation, which may include seeding/grassing to protect against erosion.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revegetation at the site would be undertaken in accordance with the landscaping specification prepared for the works.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockpiling of materials is to occur in cleared areas.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action/Phase</td>
<td>Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid stockpiling equipment or parking vehicles or plant within the Tree Protection Zone (TPZ) of native canopy trees to be retained within or adjacent to the study area.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree work (including trimming and removal) must be carried out, coordinated and supervised by a qualified Arborist or Ecologist. The specialist must be suitably qualified and employ qualified personnel consistent with the requirements of the Australian Standard AS 4373. All machinery used for tree trimming is to be cleaned and sterilised before and after use in accordance with Australian Standard AS4373 – 2007 Pruning of amenity trees.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To the fullest extent practicable, minimise disturbance to any native vegetation surrounding the study area.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All green waste is to be disposed of at the nearest registered green waste facility.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If possible, retain the 2 Mugga Ironbark recorded in the western section of the site.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the unlikely event that unexpected threatened species are identified during the project, works should cease and an ecologist contacted.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimise soil transportation within, into or out of the study area to reduce the spread of weeds.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 4 noxious weed species identified within the study area listed in Table 4 of the Flora and Fauna Assessment (See Appendix H) are to be removed from site and transported to the nearest registered green waste facility.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate erosion and sediment control measures should be installed to avoid sedimentation of receiving water bodies or other indirect impacts to surrounding biodiversity values.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hollow-bearing trees to be removed in a two-stage process, as outlined in the recommendations section of the Flora and Fauna Assessment (see Appendix H) under the supervision and coordination of a suitably qualified ecologist.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each tree hollow to be removed should to be replaced with a nest box of similar dimensions to be installed in the nearest mature native tree.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If feasible, compensatory revegetation should be undertaken to mitigate the loss of native vegetation removed. Species used in compensatory revegetation should be indicative of the Cooks River / Castlereagh Ironbark Forest EEC and limited to native shrubs and small trees within 25m of the perimeter fence and a combination of canopy trees, small trees and shrubs at a distance of 25+ m. Species recommended for revegetation are included in Appendix 6 of the Flora and Fauna Assessment provided in Appendix H of this report.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1.6 Heritage

Objective(s)

- Minimise potential impacts to items and places of Aboriginal and historic heritage due to the works

Action(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action/Phase</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construction</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All workers/contractors are to be informed of their obligations under the <em>Heritage Act 1977</em> and <em>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</em>, namely that it is illegal to disturb, damage, destroy an Aboriginal object, historic relic or heritage item without the prior approval of OEH.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All workers (including contractors) should be inducted concerning Aboriginal cultural and historic heritage values and basic training should be provided for identifying Aboriginal objects and historic relics.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should any Aboriginal Objects be encountered during works associated with this proposal, works must cease in the vicinity and the find should not be moved until assessed by a qualified archaeologist. If the find is determined to be an Aboriginal Object the archaeologist will provide further recommendations. These may include notifying the OEH and Aboriginal stakeholders.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the event that known or suspected Aboriginal skeletal remains are encountered during the activity, the following procedure will be followed:</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) all work in the immediate vicinity will cease;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) the find will be immediately reported to the work supervisor who will immediately advise the Environment Manager or other nominated senior staff member;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) the Environment Manager or other nominated senior staff member will promptly notify the police and the state coroner (as required for all human remains discoveries);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) the Environment Manager or other nominated senior staff member will contact the OEH for advice on identification of the skeletal material as Aboriginal and management of the material; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) if the skeletal material is of Aboriginal ancestral remains, the Local Aboriginal Land Council will be contacted and consultative arrangements will be made to discuss ongoing care of the remains.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The trees to be removed with the heritage curtilage (including tree number 26, 28, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, and 37) should be replaced with appropriate plantings where possible. These should be planted at the locations of the removed trees, and should be compliant with any requirements that the department has to ensure the security of the adjacent facility.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific protection measures such as perimeter fencing should be installed to protect the historic cottage at the site and it’s curtilage from construction activities and vehicles.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All workers are to be advised of the local heritage significance of the cottage, and no alterations or additions works are to take place on the historic cottage.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Should unanticipated relics be discovered during the course of the project, work in the vicinity must cease and an archaeologist contacted to make a preliminary assessment of the find. The Heritage Council will require notification if the find is assessed as a relic.</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1.7 Hazardous Materials

**Objective(s)**
- Minimise the risk associated with potential hazardous materials during construction and operation of the correctional centre works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action/Phase</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-construction and Construction</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CEMP will include measures to ensure compliance with all legislative requirements for the management and disposal of hazardous waste from the site during construction works. Relevant statutory requirements and current standards, codes and guidelines as published by WorkCover NSW and the National Occupational Health and Safety Commissions include, but are not necessarily limited to:

- Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997
- Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulation 2014
- Work Health and Safety Act 2011
- Work Health and Safety Regulation 2011, particularly Chapter 7, Part 7.2
- Environmentally Hazardous Chemicals Act 1985

If works encounter any hazardous materials identified in the Hazardous Materials Risk Assessment (Noel Arnold and Associates, February 2014) for the JJC site or if any previously unidentified suspected asbestos or hazardous materials are encountered, work will cease pending further sampling and investigation, the site secured and a safe work method statement(s) and appropriate documented practices will be implemented. Any hazardous material will be classified first and then stored, transported and disposed of in accordance with EPA requirements at an EPA licensed waste facility.

Provide a copy of the current Hazardous Materials Register for the Site to contractors undertaking construction works.

Synthetic Mineral Fibre (SMF) materials should be removed under controlled conditions prior to demolition /refurbishment works, in accordance with the requirements of the Code of Practice for the Safe Use of Synthetic Mineral Fibres NOHSC:2006(1990)

7.1.8 Waste Management and Contamination

**Objectives**
- Maximise reuse/recycling of waste material and minimise waste disposed of to landfill.
- Minimise the risk associated with potential site contamination during construction and operation of the correctional centre works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action/Phase</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-construction and Construction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### A Waste Management Plan (WMP) will be prepared as part of the CEMP by the construction contractor for the management of waste generated during construction works. The WMP must be prepared in accordance with the applicable waste management provisions of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 and the Protection of the Environment Operations (Regulation) 2014. The WMP will include, but not be limited to, the following:

- Waste management practices will follow the resource management hierarchy principles embodied in the Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Act 2001. These practices include avoiding unnecessary resource consumption, recovery of resources (including reuse, reprocessing, recycling and energy recovery); and disposal to a licensed landfill (as a last resort).
- Where available, recyclable site and construction waste will be recycled in accordance with the NSW Government’s Waste Reduction and Purchasing Policy (WRAPP guidelines).
- Non-recyclable waste and containers will be regularly collected and disposed of at a licensed landfill or other disposal site in the area. Waste oil will be sent to approved recyclers.
- The worksite will be left tidy and rubbish free each day prior to leaving site and at the completion of construction.
- Transportation of waste must be done in a manner that avoids the waste spilling, leaking or otherwise escaping from the vehicle or plant used to transport the waste. Waste will be transported to a place that can lawfully receive that waste.

The Waste Management Plan would also need to be consistent with the Waste Classification Guidelines (DECCW 2009) in that all waste removed from the site is to be classified and disposed of appropriately.

### 7.1.9 Visual Amenity

**Objective**

- Minimise visual impact of the new infrastructure at the repurposed Mary Wade CC.

**Action(s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action/Phase</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepare and implement a Landscaping Plan to reduce the visual impacts of the development, and compensate for tree removal.

### 7.1.10 Socio-economic

**Objectives**

- Minimising the potential negative social impacts, particularly in relation to housing and community facility and welfare needs related to the repurposed correctional centre; and
- Enhancement of the positive economic and social impacts of the centre.
### Action(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action/Phase</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centre management will develop a program of communication with neighbouring residents, including points of contact during any crisis situation at the Centre.</td>
<td>Dept. of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre management will work through the correctional centre to report on security measures and action taken in relation to escape management.</td>
<td>Dept. of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre management will work with police, Council and other community groups to ensure management of crime levels;</td>
<td>Dept. of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre management will liaise with the Local Area Command to ensure staffing levels remain adequate and to continue to share information where relevant.</td>
<td>Dept. of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued close integration with parole officers and other services will be established in order to ensure smooth transition of released inmates back to their home communities.</td>
<td>Dept. of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage social service providers to clearly articulate their policies on service provision, work with local service providers to ensure streamlined approach to service delivery and maximising opportunities.</td>
<td>Dept. of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Wade CC to increase awareness of support and assistance which is available through the Department of Justice to eligible visitors of inmates.</td>
<td>Dept. of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaise with Council and housing providers during staff appointment and when staff take up positions at the CC, to monitor the demand for housing and means of maximising the number of staff who live locally.</td>
<td>Dept. of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Justice and Council will co-operate on addressing the community-wide issues surrounding women’s needs, particularly in areas such as access to short-term accommodation and transport.</td>
<td>Dept. of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Wade CC will work closely with local businesses and service providers, including schools, to ensure all possible opportunities for partnership and development are identified and addressed.</td>
<td>Dept. of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold discussions about methods of ensuring maximum opportunities for local firms to win tenders under the Department of Justice centralised tendering process.</td>
<td>Dept. of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly publish a list of upcoming future tenders at Council and in the local areas.</td>
<td>Dept. of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liaise closely with economic development groups to develop new ways to value add economically from the CC, e.g. attracting new industries, briefing sessions to assist the local community in the development of individual or consortium based approaches to bid for tenders.</td>
<td>Dept. of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Community Consultative Committee will be formed to establish communication with local schools and other community facilities during early operation of the new centre to identify initiatives which provide community benefit.</td>
<td>Dept. of Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department of Justice, the Community Consultative Committee and Council will co-operate on addressing the community-wide issues surrounding women’s needs, particularly in areas such as access to short-term accommodation and transport.</td>
<td>Dept. of Justice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.1.11 Utilities and Services

**Objective**

- Minimise the potential negative impacts to existing utilities and services including mains water, sewer and stormwater drainage, electricity, telecommunications and security systems during construction and operation of the proposal.

**Action(s)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action/Phase</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurately locate any services near the proposed works which may be impacted by the construction activities prior to the commencement of construction. This may include contacting 'Dial Before You Dig' if relevant</td>
<td>Contractor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 Conclusions and Recommendations

A number of short term impacts are associated with the repurposing of the Juniperina JJC to the Mary Wade CC proposal. Impacts such as noise, dust, traffic and waste management are predicted. However it has been assessed that these can be adequately managed through the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.

Some existing vegetation onsite would be directly impacted by the proposal. However, ecological and heritage assessments have concluded that there would be no significant impact due to their removal for the proposal.

The proposed works would not have impact on any known Aboriginal places.

The proposed repurposing of the existing Juniperina JJC to a maximum security female remand correctional centre would assist in the provision of adequate facilities to meet predicted growth forecasts due to the projected increase in the number of inmates. It is considered that the proposed development will have a positive social benefit for the wider community. It will provide much needed relief for the already overcrowded maximum security correctional facilities within the metropolitan area and the associated risks with overcrowding.

Pursuant to the provisions of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, and Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000, an environmental assessment of the proposed repurposing of the existing Juniperina JJC facility to the Mary Wade CC has been undertaken. Consideration has been given to the likely impact of the activity on the environment, having regard to all relevant factors. On the basis of the information presented in this REF it is concluded that by adopting the safeguards identified in this assessment it is unlikely that there would be significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the proposed works.

8.1 Recommendations

It is recommended that the proposed repurposing works of the existing Juniperina JJC facility for use as the Mary Wade CC be approved with the following conditions:

- A CEMP be developed for the proposed works incorporating the mitigation measures outlined in Section 7 of this report.
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