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Declaration

As part of the NSW Government's Prison Bed Capacity Program, the NSW Department of Justice is proposing to expand the Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre (MRRC), located within the Silverwater Correctional Complex at Silverwater.

This Review of Environmental Factors (REF) has been prepared by Keylan Consulting Pty Ltd and presents an assessment of the early works to support the broader expansion of the MRRC site to increase prison bed capacity.

The NSW Department of Justice is a public authority and the determining authority for the proposal as defined by the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act). The proposal satisfies the definition of an activity under Part 5 of the EP&A Act, and as such, the NSW Department of Justice must assess and consider the environmental impacts of the proposal before determining whether to proceed with the activity.

This REF has been prepared in accordance with sections 5.5 and 5.7 of the EP&A Act and clause 228 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulations 2000 (EP&A Regulation). This REF provides a true and fair assessment of the proposal likely effects on the environment. It addresses, to the fullest extent possible, all matters affecting or likely to affect the environment as a result of the proposed activity.

By the information presented in this REF, it is concluded that:

1. The proposal is not likely to have a significant impact on the environment and therefore an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.
2. The proposal is not likely to significantly affect threatened species, populations, ecological communities or critical habitat. Therefore, a Species Impact Statement is not required.
3. The proposal is not likely to affect Commonwealth land, is not being carried out on Commonwealth land, and is not likely to significantly affect any matters of national environmental significance listed under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EP&BC Act).

Subject to implementation of the measures to avoid, minimise or manage the environmental impacts listed in this REF, the proposal is recommended for approval.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Background

This Review of Environmental Factors (REF) has been prepared to assess the environmental impacts of early works at the Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre (MRRC), Silverwater.

The proposed early works (i.e. the activity subject to this REF) will support the broader expansion of the MRRC referred to as the main works (i.e. new building works, refurbishment/expansion of existing buildings and ancillary infrastructure works) and which is subject to a separate REF process.

NSW Department of Justice (Justice) is the proponent and also the determining authority for the activity under Part 5 of the *NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act).

1.2. Proposal identification

The proposal forms part of the NSW Government’s Prison Bed Capacity Program, which was established in response to the high demand for prison beds in the Sydney Metropolitan area.

The objectives of the Prison Bed Capacity Program are to:

- provide additional capacity within the NSW correctional system in the medium term (next two to four years)
- increase the capacity of the NSW correctional system to meet demand, delivering on the NSW Government’s promise to maximise existing capacity and provide future long-term requirements
- reduce the reliance on high-risk beds in the correctional system
- deliver versatile physical assets that can be reutilised to meet future demands with minimal disruption or overcrowding
- enhance operational efficiencies across the broader correctional services network through reduction in prisoner transport
- ensure continuous access to custodial services that are geographically relevant.

The proposal largely relates to minor site preparation works to facilitate the main construction works associated with the expansion of the MRRC and include:

- site establishment activities
- installation of temporary fencing
- excavation works on the perimeter of the site for a temporary gatehouse.

Construction of the proposal is expected to commence in September 2018, subject to receipt of planning approval. It is estimated that the proposal would take approximately four months. Further details of the proposal and construction are in Section 5.
1.3. The scope of the Review of Environmental Factors

The REF has been prepared under Part 5 of the EP&A Act. It describes the early works proposal, assesses the likely impacts on the environment and whether they are likely to have significant effect and details protective measures to be implemented.

The REF has been prepared to meet the requirements of Sections 5.5 and 5.7 of the EP&A Act and clause 228 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000 (EP&A Regulation).

The findings of this REF will be considered when assessing:

- whether the proposal is likely to have a significant impact on the environment and therefore the necessity for an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) to be prepared and approval to be sought from the Minister for Planning under Part 5.1 of the EP&A Act (Note that the REF concludes that an EIS is not required).
- The significance of any impact on threatened species, populations or ecological communities or their habitats as defined by the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 and/or Fisheries Management Act 1994 and, therefore, the requirement for a species impact statement or biodiversity development assessment report.
- The potential for the proposal to significantly impact a matter of national environmental significance or Commonwealth land and the need to make a referral to the Australian Government Department of the Environment for a decision by the Commonwealth Minister for the Environment on whether assessment and approval is required under the Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

The design and construction of the proposal will need to implement the outcomes and mitigation measures as described in this REF. If any substantive changes to the proposal occur a consistency assessment and additional impact assessment (if required) may need to be undertaken.
2. The site

2.1. Location of the proposal

The site is known as the Silverwater Correctional Complex (the Complex), located at Holker Street, Silverwater, in the City of Parramatta Local Government Area (LGA). The Complex is approximately 21 km west of the Sydney CBD, 5 km east of Parramatta and 2 km north-west of Sydney Olympic Park.

The site is legally described as Lot 22 in DP 876995. It has an area of 2.11 ha and is bounded by Newington Armoury to the north, Jamieson Street to the east, Holker Street to the south and Newington Road to the west.

The Complex consists of three separate correctional facilities: the Silverwater Women’s Correctional Facility; Dawn de Iloas Correction Centre; and the MRRC. The early works relating to this REF will largely be undertaken within the boundaries of the MRRC (with the exception of site establishment activities which are located just outside of the northern boundary of the MRRC).

Figure 1 and Figure 2 illustrate the location of the site and regional context.

Figure 1: The site and regional context (Base source: Google Maps)
2.2. Existing facilities of the MRRC

The MRRC is a maximum-security correctional facility for male offenders which opened in 1997. At the time of opening the operational bed capacity was 887 beds. This has since increased to 1,163 beds.

Facilities on the site include:

- inmate accommodation
- inmate recreation facilities, including a sports oval, gym and library
- clinic
- kitchen and laundry facilities (disused following damage by fire)
- mental health screening unit (40 beds)
- property store
- reception
- gatehouse
- master control room
- staff car park
- visit facilities.
Inmates who arrive at MRRC may come directly from the Court on remand, transferred from other NSW correctional facilities awaiting Court date or are housed at the facility until a vacancy is available at their centre of classification. Inmates generally leave within a few months of arrival, released on bail or transferred to another facility.

Figure 3: Internal fencing on inmate yards (Source: Keylan Consulting)
Figure 4: Perimeter security fencing and proposed location of the temporary gatehouse (Source: Keylan Consulting)

Figure 5: Oval – part of broader REF works (Source: Keylan Consulting)
3. Statutory considerations

This section provides a summary of the statutory planning context of the proposal, including consideration of the relevant provisions of the EP&A Act, other legislation and relevant environmental planning instruments.

3.1. Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

The EP&A Act provides the statutory framework for planning in NSW. Part 5 of the EP&A Act specifies the environmental impact assessment requirements for activities undertaken by public authorities, which are permissible without development consent under Part 4 of the Act.

In accordance with the provisions of State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 (see section 3.2 below), the proposal is subject to the environmental impact assessment and planning approval requirements of Part 5 of the EP&A Act. In accordance with Section 111 of the EP&A Act, Justice, as the proponent and determining authority, must examine and take into account to the fullest extent possible all matters affecting or likely to affect the environment because of the proposed activity.

Clause 228 of the Regulations defines the factors which must be considered when determining if an activity assessed under Part 5 of the EP&A Act has a significant impact on the environment.

Section 7 of this REF provides a full environmental impact assessment of the proposal in accordance with these requirements. Mitigation measures are provided in Section 8 and Appendix A provides a checklist assessment against clause 228 requirements.

3.2. State Environmental Planning Policies

The assessment of relevant State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPP) is provided in the Table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Environmental Planning Policy</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007** (ISEPP) aims to facilitate the effective delivery of infrastructure across the State. Clause 26 of the Infrastructure SEPP identifies development which may be carried out by, or on behalf of, a public authority without development consent on land within a prescribed zone if the proposal is in connection with an existing correctional centre or correctional complex. | The proposal is consistent with clauses 26(1)(b) and (c), 26(2)(c), (e) to (g) for the following reasons:  
- the site is within a prescribed zone (SP2 Infrastructure)  
- the development is within an existing correctional centre and correctional complex  
- it includes alterations of, or additions to, a correctional centre (cl 26(1)(b))  
- construction of security fencing, with a height of not more than 1.2 m above natural ground level (existing) (cl 26(2)(f))  
- the construction of a gatehouse (cl 26(2)(g)). |

In addition, Part 2 of the ISEPP contains provisions for public authorities to consult with local councils and other public authorities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Environmental Planning Policy</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Environmental Planning Policy No. 55 – Remediation of Land (SEPP 55)</strong> applies to NSW and establishes a planning approach to the remediation of contaminated land to minimise the risk of harm to human health or any other aspect of the environment.</td>
<td>before starting certain types of development. Consultation, as required by ISEPP (where applicable) is discussed in Section 6 of this REF.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Environmental Planning Policy (State and Regional Development) 2011</strong></td>
<td>Clause 7(1)(a) of SEPP 55 – Remediation of Land states that where a development application is made concerning land that is contaminated, the consent authority must not grant consent unless:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) It has considered whether the land is contaminated, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b) If the land is contaminated, it is satisfied that the land is suitable in its contaminated state (or will be suitable, after remediation) for the purpose for which the development is proposed to be carried out, and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>c) If the land requires remediation to be made suitable for the purpose for which the development is proposed to be carried out, it is satisfied that the land will be remediated before the land is used for that purpose.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant site investigations have been undertaken as part of the broader REF in accordance with SEPP 55 and the Managing Land Contamination – Planning Guidelines SEPP 55 Remediation of Land. A RAP will be implemented as part of the delivery of the main works associated with the expansion of the MRRC.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Regional Environmental Plan No. 24 – Homebush Bay Area (SREP 24)</strong></td>
<td>Clause 8(1) of the State and Regional Development SEPP provides that development is declared to be State significant development if it requires development consent and it is specified in the categories of development in schedules 1 or 2 of the State and Regional Development SEPP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As the proposal is permissible without consent, clause 8(1) does not apply, and the proposal is not State significant development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Consideration of relevant State Environmental Planning Policies
3.3. Auburn Local Environmental Plan 2010

The Auburn Local Environmental Plan 2010 (ALEP) is the local environmental plan applying to the site. The site is zoned SP2 Infrastructure – Correctional Centre, a prescribed zoned under the Infrastructure SEPP.

The land use zone permits the development of a “correctional centre”, including any development that is ordinarily incidental or ancillary to development is permitted with consent.

However, Clause 5.12 of the LEP states that:

*This Plan 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.*

The site is also recognised as a heritage conservation area with State significance under Schedule 5 of the ALEP 2012 as discussed in Section 7.

The site is identified as having Class 5 acid sulfate soils under the ALEP. Acid sulfate soils are not typically found in Class 5 areas (see Figure 6). Given the minor scale and extent of the proposal, the works are unlikely to disturb, expose or drain acid sulfate soils and cause environmental damage.

The site is not identified in a flooding planning area on the Flood Planning Map in the ALEP (see Figure 7)

As the proposal is permitted without consent under the ISEPP, the Auburn LEP does not apply to the proposal.
Figure 6: Class 5 Acid Sulfate Soils – in yellow (Source: DPE Planning Portal)

Figure 7: Flood Planning Area – in blue (Source: DPE Planning Portal)
3.4. Other relevant legislation

The Table below provides a list of other legislation that has been considered in relation to the proposal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contaminated Land Management Act 1997</td>
<td>A geotechnical and contamination assessment has been completed as part of the broader REF for the expansion of the MRRC. Presence of contaminated soil, groundwater and landfill gas were identified on site (see section 7.1).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage Act 1977</td>
<td>The Silverwater Correctional Complex is listed on the State Heritage Register (No. 00813). A HIS has been prepared to support the early works, which concludes that the works are of a minor nature and will have no adverse impact on the heritage significance of the site (see section 7.3). Notwithstanding, the proposed development does not require approval under section 57(1) of the Heritage Act as the Office of Environment and Heritage has granted an exemption under section 57(2) of the Heritage Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997</td>
<td>The proposal is not a scheduled activity under to POEO Act.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads Act 1993</td>
<td>The proposal does not include the construction or maintenance of a public road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</td>
<td>A review of the Office of Environment and Heritage’s Biodiversity Value Map, in accordance with the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016, was undertaken and indicates that there is no high value biodiversity on the site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Consideration of relevant State legislation

3.5. Commonwealth legislation

Under the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) a referral is required to the Australian Government for proposed actions that have the potential to significantly impact on matters of national environmental significance or the environment of Commonwealth land.

The site is highly modified, and the proposed works are of a minor nature. A review of the EPBC Act protected matters search tool identified no protected matters on the site. A referral is not required as the proposal will not affect nationally listed threatened species, populations, endangered ecological communities and migratory species.

Figures 8 – 10 illustrate the findings of the search tools for protected matters and areas of high biodiversity value.
Figure 8: No protected matters identified on-site or surrounding (Base source: Commonwealth search tool)

Figure 9: Nationally important wetlands identified north-east of the site (Base source: Commonwealth search tool)
3.6. Confirmation of statutory position

The proposal has been assessed as permissible without consent under Clause 26 of the Infrastructure SEPP.

Assessment under Part 5 of the EP&A Act is therefore required. Justice is both the proponent and the determining authority for the activity for the purpose of Part 5 of the EP&A Act.

The matters prescribed by clause 228 of the EP&A Regulation for consideration as part of the assessment under Part 5 are reviewed and included in Appendix 1.

No requirement for a referral under the EPBC Act has been identified.
4. **Need and options considered**

4.1. **Strategic need**

Between 2011 and 2016, the inmate population of NSW increased by 33 per cent. It is anticipated that the population will continue to grow placing further demand on existing correctional facilities.

As a result of forecast growth, the NSW Government adopted the Prison Bed Capacity Strategy (February 2016) to accelerate the implementation of Corrective Services NSW Infrastructure Strategy (CSIS).

The Prison Bed Capacity Strategy proposes a construction program to accommodate both the immediate and long-term need to increase bed numbers in the NSW prison system.

The NSW Government committed $3.8 billion to the prison bed capacity program, with many correctional centres in NSW to be expanded or recommissioned over the next four years. This will help accommodate the increasing prison population and continue the government’s focus on community safety, and also provide improved opportunities for rehabilitation.

The proposal forms part of the Prison Bed Capacity Program as it will contribute towards increasing prison capacity across the State by 440 beds in the long term. An increase in capacity also supports the Better Prisons program to lift standards, strengthen accountability and assist the NSW Government to meet the target to reduce adult reoffending by 5 percent.

4.2. **Options considered**

4.2.1. **Site options**

As discussed, the proposal forms part of the NSW Government’s Prison Bed Capacity Program to address prison bed shortage.

Justice undertook a rigorous evaluation process of all correctional facilities across NSW to rationalise those facilities that would be upgraded, expanded or repurposed. The following facilities were identified for expansion:

- Bathurst Correctional Centre
- Berrima Correctional Centre
- Cessnock Correctional Complex
- Dillwynia Correctional Centre (South Windsor)
- Hunter Correctional Centre (Cessnock)
- Illawarra Reintegration Centre (Unanderra)
- Junee Correctional Centre
- Macquarie Correctional Centre (Wellington)
- Mary Wade Correctional Centre (Lidcombe)
- **Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre (Silverwater)**
- Mid North Coast Correctional Centre (Kempsey)
- Parklea Correctional Centre
- Parklea Correctional Centre Area 4
- South Coast Correctional Centre (Nowra).
4.2.2. Preferred site option

The MRRC was identified as the preferred site for expansion as it meets the operational requirement for additional metropolitan remand beds as it is situated on existing Justice owned land within close proximity to Sydney CBD. It also has the potential to streamline the expansion process to the Prison Bed Capacity Program, providing the type of bed capacity where it is most urgently needed.

The preferred option will also allow for the ongoing operation of the correctional facility during construction, without a requirement to displace inmates or staff to alternatives facilities. This will contribute to operational efficiency and will be more long term by reducing the need to transport inmates between regional and metropolitan facilities.

The overall expansion works have been divided into two works packages, being the early works (i.e. the works described in Section 5 and addressed in this REF) and the main works (i.e. the works described in Section 1 and to be addressed in a separate REF).

The works have been categorised in this manner to enable efficient staging of works to facilitate implementation of appropriate implementation of appropriate security delineation between the construction site and the operational areas of the Complex.

4.2.3. The ‘do nothing’ option

The ‘do nothing’ option would involve not undertaking the proposal. The MRRC would maintain the existing bed capacity and would be unable to meet future demand.

This option is considered unacceptable and would not meet with the NSW Government’s target for increasing prison bed capacity within the NSW correctional system.
5. Description of the proposal

5.1. The proposal

The proposal involves early works to prepare the site for the broader construction activities associated with the expansion of the MRCC. The proposed works are outlined below and scope illustrated below.

Figure 11: Proposed scope early works inside the boundary of the MRRC (Source: Department of Justice)
5.1.1. Site establishment

Site establishment works comprise of civil works for the construction of a temporary carpark and the installation of a temporary demountable sheds on Lot 421 to be used as a site office throughout construction (located between Silverwater Women’s Correctional Centre and the northern boundary) (see Figures below).

![Proposed location of site office](image)

Figure 12: Proposed location of site office (Source: Department of Justice)
5.1.2. Fencing

The existing fencing on the outer exercise inmate yard and shade structures of Fordwick, Goldsmith and Hamden are to be removed. Proposed works include:

- installation of temporary secure fence compound and sheds on the oval
- demolition of existing fencing yards and chain wire fence (macem fencing and chain wire fence)
- piling matt excavation in accordance with the Early Works Heritage Management Plan (material stock piles and surrounding sediment controls will be in place)
- piling foundations - continuous flight auger piling rig to bore through the piling matt down to the socket in the bedrock*, to a depth of 12 m
- piling capping installation, involving excavating strip footing in piling matt, trim piles, tie reinforcement and place concrete
- installation of new macem fence 5m in height with a razor coil with a mobile crawler crane to manoeuvre in place, temporary prop and core holes, grout filled once they have reached required strength the temporary props will be removed
- excavation of service trenching in accordance with EWHMP.

*Note – it is likely that the soil will be contaminated and the groundwater, controls will be put into place to stockpile separately, and sediment control barriers will be used.
Figure 14: Proposed location of the temporary fencing – indicated by the red line (Source: Department of Justice)

Figure 15: Proposed location of the macom fence and lighting detail (Source: Department of Justice)
5.1.3. Temporary gatehouse

Proposed works include the construction of a temporary gatehouse and associated works including external retaining walls, involving excavation and shoring works directly outside the perimeter fence and sterile zone of the MRRC. External road widening will also occur.

![Figure 16: Area identified for the early works (Source: Department of Justice)](image-url)
5.2. Description of construction activity

This section provides a summary of the likely construction methodology, staging, work hours, plant and equipment and associated activities.

5.2.1. Construction hours and duration

The proposed works are anticipated to commence in September 2018 and take four months to complete.

The majority of construction works would occur during the recommended standard hours set out in the *Interim Construction Noise Guideline* (DECC, 2009):

- Mondays to Fridays between 7 am and 6 pm
- Saturdays between 8 am and 1 pm
- Sunday and Public holidays no work.

5.2.2. Construction resources

It is estimated there would be about 80 workers onsite for the proposed early works.

5.2.3. Temporary facilities

During construction, temporary facilities would be required on site. These facilities include temporary fencing, temporary site office, temporary gatehouse and ancillary facilities such as meal rooms, toilet/amenity blocks.

5.2.4. Plant and equipment

The proposed works will require the use of the following equipment:

- excavators or similar earthmoving equipment
- air compressor
- bulldozer
- concrete pump
- crane
- front-end loader
- grader
- concrete truck
- hand tools
- welding equipment.

5.2.5. Traffic management, access and parking

Construction traffic movements would primarily be associated with the transportation of construction machinery, building materials, staff (via shuttle buses), and equipment to and from the site.

The majority of traffic movements associated with the proposal would be undertaken during standard construction hours. All construction vehicles will enter and exit the complex through the MRRC Gatehouse and Sally Port (via Holker Street). Traffic management measures will be put in place to control the number of construction vehicles on site and reduce delays along Holker Street.
To further minimise vehicle movements on site, no on-site parking will be provided for construction workers. The appointed construction contractor would be responsible for managing construction workforce parking.

The appointed construction contractor will develop a specific Traffic Management Plan for the site and will submit, before the commencement of works, a detailed plan for managing construction traffic to Justice and Correctional Services NSW.

5.2.6. Waste

Construction waste will principally include building materials from demolition of existing fencing.

A Waste Management Plan will be prepared this plan will describe waste management policies and procedures that will apply to the construction and operation of the proposed works.

5.2.7. Construction environmental management

The approach to environmental management during construction will be further defined by the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to be prepared by the construction contractor and approved by Justice.
6. Consultation

Part 2, Division 1, clause 13 to 16 of the Infrastructure SEPP contain the requirements for consultation with councils and public authorities where the proposed development is likely to have a significant environmental impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provision</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| *clause 13*  
Consultation with councils—development with impacts on council-related infrastructure or services | The proposal is of a minor nature and will not have a significant impact on infrastructure and public services. Therefore, no consultation requirement under this clause is triggered. |
| *clause 14*  
Consultation with councils—development with impacts on local heritage | The proposal involves minor, early works and will not have an adverse impact on the heritage significance of the site. The HIS concluded that the works meet the requirements for Standard Exemption 7: Minor activities with little or no adverse impact on heritage significance under the Heritage Act 1977. Therefore, no consultation requirements under this clause are triggered. |
| *clause 15*  
Consultation with councils—development with impacts on flood liable land | The proposal does not involve development on flood prone land. Therefore, no consultation requirements under this clause are triggered. |
| *clause 15A*  
Consultation with councils—development with impacts on certain land within the coastal zone | The proposal does not involve development within a coastal vulnerability area. As a result, there are no consultation requirements under this clause are triggered. |
| *clause 16*  
Consultation with public authorities other than councils | No consultation requirements under this clause are triggered. |

Table 3: ISEPP consultation

As the proposed development consists of minor works, no statutory consultation requirements are required.
7. Environmental assessment

This section provides an assessment of the key environmental and planning issues with the proposed early works, which are:

- noise and vibration
- traffic, access and parking
- air quality
- heritage
- contamination and hazardous materials.

7.1. Noise and vibration

7.1.1. Existing environment

This section provides a summary of the findings of the *Noise Impact Assessment* (GHD dated June 2018) undertaken as part of the main works associated with the expansion of the MRRC.

Noise and vibration impacts are considered relevant to all components of the early works, as these works will involve the use of heavy equipment and machinery.

The closest sensitive receivers to the site include residences, medical centres, educational institutes, hospitals, places of worship, recreational areas and commercial/industrial premises.

The residential receivers are located on Blaxland Avenue facing Holker Street (NCA1) and setback from Holker Street (NCA2) as identified in Figure 13. The ambient and background noise tends to significantly different at each location due to proximity to Holker Street, which is the main source of noise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of noise logger</th>
<th>Background noise level (dB(A) L_100(15 min))</th>
<th>Ambient noise level (dB(A), L_{Aeq(period)})</th>
<th>Road traffic noise level L_{Aeq(period)}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA1 Unit 17/3-5 Blaxland Ave, Newington(M1)</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCA2 Backyard 3 Cumberland Ave, Newington</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Average background and ambient noise levels
7.1.2. Potential impacts

The early works are likely to result in temporary noise and vibration impacts predominately associated with the demolition of existing fencing, construction of new fencing and site preparation works. There may also be some minor increases to noise levels associated with construction vehicle movements.

The Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) states that the residential noise management level of 61 dBA for NCA1 and 44 for NCA2 during standard construction hours is predicted to be exceeded at the majority of residential receivers during construction. However, it is noted that the NIA assessed construction activities relating to the main works, which is the worst case scenario.

The proposed early works include works associated with the security fencing which will require minimal excavation and bulky earthworks. It is therefore unlikely that the early works will result in extended periods of exceedance given the minor nature of works.

These works will only be undertaken in accordance with the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (DECC, 2009) and standard construction hours, i.e.:

- Mondays to Fridays between 7 am and 6 pm
- Saturdays between 8 am and 1 pm
• Sunday and Public holidays no work.

Other mitigation and management measures includes notification of residences of proposed scheduling of demolition activity and establishment of a contact phone number for any complaints or concerns during construction. The NIA states that:

...the predicted noise and vibration levels are generally considered conservative and would only be experienced for limited periods during construction. Impacts may be reduced through the introduction of feasible and reasonable mitigation measures which have been recommended within this report.

Given the minor scope of the proposed early works, it is considered that potential noise impacts to nearby sensitive receiver will be temporary and can be adequately managed and mitigated through the CEMP.

7.2. Traffic, access and parking

7.2.1. Existing environment

Traffic and access
This section provides a summary of the findings of the Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment (GHD dated 13 April 2018) undertaken as part of the main works REF.

Newington Armoury bounds the site to the north, Jamieson Street to the east, Holker Street to the south and Newington Road to the west. Holker Street provides signalised access to the site.

Holker Street functions as a sub-arterial regional road, running east-west, connecting Hill Road in the east and Silverwater Road to the west. Holker Street provides site access via a signalised intersection, has two-lane travel in each direction with a dedicated bus lane and a speed limit of 60 kilometres per hour.

Table 5 summarises the overall performance of the operational intersections on Holker Street. Daily vehicle numbers along Holker Street range from about 1,778 (AM Peak) to about 1,724 (PM Peak). Approximately 5 per cent of the traffic movements fall within the AM weekday peak period and 2 per cent in the PM weekday peak. The Holker St/Silverwater Correctional Complex intersection is performing well, with spare capacity during peak periods.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Morning peak period</th>
<th>Afternoon peak period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 am to 10 am</td>
<td>3 pm to 7 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>LoS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holker St/Silverwater Correctional Complex</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holker St/Avenue of Africa</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holker St/Jamieson St</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Existing intersection weekday performance
Parking
There are currently 656 car parking spaces within the Silverwater Correctional Complex, 70 of which are for visitors. There are approximately 122 informal parking spaces utilised during peak periods across the site.

7.2.2. Potential impacts
Traffic and access
Construction traffic movements would primarily be associated with the transportation of construction machinery, building materials and equipment to and from the site.

The TIA states that:

initial estimates for construction vehicle movements to the proposal site would involve a peak daily maximum of up to 40 (two way) heavy vehicle movements spread throughout the day and up to 16 (two way) daily shuttle bus movements to shuttle up to 100 construction personnel during the AM and PM peak periods to and from the site.

However, the traffic movements discussed above relate to the main works associated with the expansion of the MRRC. As such, its anticipated that traffic movements associated with the proposed early works will make up a relatively small component of the overall movements, with minimal impact.

The majority of traffic movements associated with the early works will be via the intersection of Holker St/Silverwater Correctional Complex. As identified in Table 5, this intersection is currently operating at level of service ‘A’ during peak weekday periods and the weekend.

When comparing existing traffic (Table 5) to proposed (Table 6), it is evident that construction traffic associated with the early works would have a negligible impact.

The intersection of Holker St/Jamieson St will not be impacted as a result of construction vehicles accessing the northern boundary in association with the construction of the temporary gatehouse. The impact would be more apparent if all traffic was to arrive and leave during peak hours, however this is unlikely as heavy vehicle movements would be spread out over the course of the day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Morning peak period 6 am to 10 am</th>
<th>DoS</th>
<th>Afternoon peak period 3 pm to 7 pm</th>
<th>DoS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holker St/Silverwater Correctional Complex</td>
<td>11 D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.67 D</td>
<td>12  A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holker St/Avenue of Africa</td>
<td>9 C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.51 C</td>
<td>13  A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holker St/Jamieson St</td>
<td>29 C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.24 C</td>
<td>39  C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Intersection weekday performance during construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Weekend peak period 6 am to 10 am</th>
<th>LoS</th>
<th>DoS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holker St/Silverwater Correctional Complex</td>
<td>10 D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holker St/Avenue of Africa</td>
<td>11 D</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holker St/Jamieson St</td>
<td>+100 D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Intersection weekend performance during construction
Parking
Construction workers will not be permitted to park on site throughout construction, however nearby parking is available at Newington Marketplace, Blaxland Riverside Park and Sydney Olympic Park.

Other
There will be no impact on pedestrians, cyclists or public transport in the area as a result of the early works.

Any impact associated with traffic, access and parking in relation to the early works can be satisfactorily managed and mitigated through a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP).

7.3. Air quality

7.3.1. Existing environment

This section provides a summary of the findings of the Metropolitan Remand and Reception Centre Expansion REF (GHD, dated August 2018).

That REF included a search of the Department of the Environment and Energy’s National Pollutant Inventory on 1 March 2018 which identified five sources of pollution for the 2015/16 reporting period, in the suburbs of Silverwater, Newington and Sydney Olympic Park. The closest identified sources are outlined in the Table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Silverwater Terminal</td>
<td>Corner of Holker and Newington Street, Silverwater</td>
<td>Mineral, metal and chemical wholesaling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lubrizol International Inc.</td>
<td>28 River Street, Silverwater</td>
<td>Petroleum and coal product manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniels Health</td>
<td>2 Wiblin Street, Silverwater</td>
<td>Waste treatment, disposal and remediation services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8: Identified sources of substance emissions

An updated search undertaken on the 28 August, which confirmed these 3 sites remain the main sources of pollution within the vicinity of the site.

The nearest sensitive receivers include:

- inmates and staff of the Complex
- residences located on Blaxland Ave (100 m south-east of the site) and Evans St Newington (100 m south of the site)
- staff of commercial properties located along Holker St
- visitors to Blaxland Riverside Park (200 m north of the site).

Other potential contributors to air quality in proximity of the site include passing motor vehicles, surrounding industrial land uses (south and west of the site) and odour from landfill.

7.3.2. Potential Impacts

Air quality impacts associated with the early works include dust generation during minor site preparation work, demolition and movement of vehicles and operation of machinery on site.
However, safeguards and mitigation measures will be implemented to minimise these potential impacts. These will be outlined in the CEMP and include:

- plant and machinery being fitted with emission control devices
- dust control measures such as water spraying
- any waste on site to be stored appropriately
- any materials transported to and from the site will be covered to reduce dust generation
- shade cloth fastened to perimeter fence to minimise dust generation
- fixed hoses would be used to dampen exposed surfaces.

Subject to the implementation of such measures, which will be refined in the CEMP, it is anticipated that residual dust impacts can be appropriately managed.

In addition, as the proposed early works includes minor excavation down to waste level which could breach the clay cap, there is potential for odour from the release of landfill gas. Therefore, an Odour Management Plan is to be prepared by the construction contractor outlining potential impacts and management and mitigation measures.

7.4. Heritage

7.4.1. Existing environment

This section outlines the findings of the Heritage Impact Statement (dated 14 September 2018) undertaken to assess the impacts of the early works.

The Silverwater Correctional Complex is listed on the NSW State Heritage Register (No. 00813). The Statement of Significance under the listing notes:

’Silverwater Correctional Centre is of exceptional significance as it is the core remaining part of John Blaxland’s Newington Estate and of the State Hospital & Asylum for Women, for its subdivision and subsequent use for a variety of institutional functions, as an expression of a philosophy regarding the care of the aged.’

Individual components of significance under the listing include: Newington House, St Augustine’s Chapel and surrounds (of the house and chapel), Irwin House, Engineer’s Cottage, Superintendent’s Cottage and landscaping.

Irwin House is considered to have the most significance. As the construction of the MRRC commenced in 1990, the MRRC precinct does not contribute to the significance of the Complex (see Figure 14).

The complex is also listed on the Corrective Services s170 Register and listed as a Heritage Conservation Area in Schedule 5 of the ALEP 2010 (see Figure 18).
Figure 18: The assessed heritage value of buildings (Source: Heritage Impact Statement)

Figure 19: Heritage Conservation Area (Base source: DP&E Planning Portal)
7.4.2. Construction impacts

The HIS concludes that there will be no adverse impact upon the heritage significance of the Complex or individual listings as a result of the early works.

The proposed works are considered to be sympathetic to the heritage significance of the site, are of a minor nature, temporary and will not adversely impact on landscape, archaeological remains, the fabric of heritage items, or views and vistas.

The location of the proposed works is within a precinct that has a low level of significance and is associated with buildings of low significance. Furthermore, the works will continue to support the ongoing sites use as a correctional complex.

Any impact associated arising from the early works can be satisfactorily managed and mitigated. It is recommended that if previously unidentified heritage archaeological items are uncovered during the works, all works must cease in the vicinity of the material/find and head contractor/site manager notified.

As noted in Section 3.4, the proposed development does not require approval under section 57(1) of the Heritage Act 1977 as the Office of Environment and Heritage has granted an exemption under section 57(2) of the Heritage Act.

7.5. Contamination and hazardous materials

7.5.1. Existing environment

This section provides a description of the MRRC site where the early works will be undertaken. The following information is taken from the Phase 1 Preliminary Site Investigation (GHD, dated 24 May 2018), prepared for the main works.

These investigations are relevant to all components of the early works, as the proposal will include minor disturbances to the ground conditions on site.

Actual and potential sources of contamination include:

- landfill waste beneath a clay cap across the site
- contaminated groundwater and soil gas
- potential migration of contamination from a former gasworks
- potential migration of petroleum hydrocarbon contamination associated with the adjacent fuel storage facility.

Soil

Environmental investigations and screening level exceedances were identified within the top two metres of soil across the site. Screening identified exceedances in the total recoverable hydrocarbons in the western portion of the site. Nickel and copper exceedances were also identified. The presence of zinc was also recorded, however unlikely to impact on development of the site.

Groundwater

Groundwater is likely to be encountered between 1.5 and 3.5 m below ground level. Screening identified contamination of freshwater and drinking water groundwater levels across the site. Exceedances of the following were noted for metals (arsenic, cadmium,
chromium, copper, mercury, nickel, lead, zinc, iron, manganese), ammonia, sulphate, cyanide, benzene, and PFOS/PFHpS and PFOA. The Phase 1 report states that, ‘it is assumed that the landfill is the primary source of contamination to groundwater’.

**Landfill gas**

Results from the landfill gas monitoring on-site recorded significant concentrations of methane being generated in landfilled wastes on site, particularly along the eastern boundary of the site where the proposed temporary gatehouse is to be constructed. The levels of methane on site exceed the acceptance criteria of 1.25% (volume/volume) methane in eight of the 11 boreholes.

**Hazardous materials**

Asbestos has been identified in fibre cement sheeting fragments, loose fibre bundles within landfill materials and soil across the site. It is highly likely that asbestos would be present in the fill on the site.

Investigations concluded that there is a high potential for exposure to contamination on the site, predominantly due to historical use as a landfill.

### 7.5.2. Potential impacts

The early works will involve minor disturbance to the ground surfaces during demolition of existing fencing and the installation of temporary security fencing and the works associated with the temporary gatehouse.

There is a risk that construction workers will be exposed to contaminants on site through soil, surface and ground water. Direct exposure is most likely through ingestion, dermal contact, inhalation and handling. Another feasible pathway is the transfer or migration of soil and groundwater.

Landfill gas identified on site is the main environmental concern associated with the proposed early works. Landfill gas is currently capped under clay, however, the installation of a temporary gatehouse and security fencing has the potential to breach the cap. Posing the risk of releasing an accumulation of gas under the surface.

Additionally, there is a risk to the surrounding community and environment associated with the mobilisation of contaminated soil through exposure of dust as a result of earthworks and demolition on site. However, water controls on site are expected to satisfactorily limit the potential off site impacts.

There potential risk would need to be managed during construction to ensure the required safeguards are implemented to avoid any risk to receptors on site, the public and environment.

Given the minor nature of the proposed early works, its considered that the risk of exposure to contaminants could be effectively managed and mitigated by:

- Occupational Work Health Safety protocols will be implemented on site to reduce the risk to construction workers from contaminants or hazardous materials.
- Preparation of a CEMP that includes an unexpected finds protocol in order to accommodate any potential contamination or hazardous materials issues not already identified on site.
8. Environmental management

As outlined in Section 7, the proposed works are generally of a minor nature and are unlikely to result in significant environmental impacts. Furthermore, any residual impacts can be appropriately managed through a range of safeguards and measures.

This section describes how the proposal will be managed via environmental management plans and specific safeguards to reduce the potential adverse environmental impacts throughout construction. Safeguards and mitigation measures have been developed, in having regard to clause 228 of the EP&A Regulation.

8.1. Construction environmental management plan

A CEMP will be prepared for the proposed early works and will provide the mechanism through which all potential environmental impacts relevant will be controlled. The CEMP will be prepared by the head contractor in consultation with Justice.

8.2. Safeguards and mitigation measures

The Table below lists indicative environmental safeguards and mitigation measures to be include in the CEMP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental safeguards</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A CEMP will be prepared prior to construction commence and implemented during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Waste</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A Waste Management Plan will be prepared prior to construction that describes the waste management policies and procedures applying to the early works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Erosion and sediment controls</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Erosion and sediment control measures will be implemented and maintained in accordance with Soils and Construction Guidelines (the Blue Book) throughout construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Noise and vibration</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Works are to be carried out during standard work hours.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Works to be undertaken in accordance with the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (DECC 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residents within 200 m of the site should be notified of construction, timing and duration of works and also provided with a contact phone number for any complaints or concerns during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Traffic, access and parking</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A detailed traffic management plan be prepared by the head constructor and implemented during construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Heavy vehicle traffic movements should be minimised, where possible, during the AM and PM peak hour periods when higher traffic volumes occur within the road network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Notification of surrounding properties of construction activities and the identified construction routes and site access points throughout construction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Air quality</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preparation of the CEMP shall include measures to minimise the potential air quality impacts associated with construction activities such as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o plant and machinery being fitted with emission control devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o dust control measures such as water spraying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o any waste on site to be stored appropriately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o any materials transported to and from the site will be covered to reduce dust generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o shade cloth fastened to perimeter fence to minimise dust generation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Environmental safeguards

- fixed hoses would be used to dampen exposed surfaces.
- Preparation of an Odour Management Plan.

### Heritage

- If previously unidentified heritage archaeological items are uncovered during the works, all works must cease in the vicinity of the material/find and head contractor/site manager notified.

### Contamination

- Occupational Work Health Safety protocols are to be prepared and implemented on site to reduce the risk to construction workers from contaminants or hazardous materials. The Plan will document the procedures to be followed to manage the risks posed to health of the remediation workforce.
- Preparation of a CEMP shall include an unexpected finds protocol in order to accommodate any potential contamination or hazardous materials issues not already identified on site.

Table 9: Environmental safeguards and mitigation measures
9. **Conclusion**

9.1. **Justification of the proposal**

The proposal forms part of the Prison Bed Capacity Program as it will contribute towards increasing prison capacity across the NSW correctional system.

The proposal involves early works required to facilitate the main works for the expansion of the MRRC to support the increase in inmate population and maintain safe, secure and efficient reception, assessment and screening of new inmates to the facility.

The overall expansion works have been divided into two works packages, being the early works (i.e. the works described in Section 5 and addressed in this REF) and the main works (i.e. the works described in Section 1 and to be addressed in a separate REF).

9.2. **Summary of REF findings**

The REF has considered the potential impacts of the proposal. It has been prepared in accordance with Part 5 of the EP&A Act, and in particular, the requirements of section 5.5 of the Act, and clause 228 of the Regulation.

The REF has documented the potential environmental impacts of the proposal, considering both potential positive and negative impacts, and recommending management and mitigation measures to protect the environment where required.

9.2.1. **Clause 228 considerations**

Clause 228 of the EP&A Regulation specifies the matters that must be considered, for the purposes of Part 5 of the EP&A Act, in assessing the likely impact of an activity on the environment.

The potential impacts of the proposal have been considered in Section 7 of the REF. The Clause 228 matters and how they relate to the proposal are considered in Appendix 1.

9.2.2. **Ecologically sustainable development**

Justice is committed to ensuring that its projects are implemented in a manner that is consistent with the principles of sustainable development. These principles would be incorporated into the management systems for the proposal. Appendix 1 provides a summary of how the principles of ecologically sustainable development have been adopted by the REF process.

9.2.3. **Significance of impacts**

While some potential minor negative impacts may result from the proposal, these impacts are considered to be temporary and are not considered to be significant. Section 8 of this REF provides the mitigation measures that should be implemented to reduce the potential impacts and manage the environmental performance of the proposal.

9.3. **Conclusion**

Environmental investigations undertaken during preparation of the broader REF for the expansion of the MRRC were used as the basis to assess the potential environmental impacts of the proposed early works.
The proposed early works will support the broader expansion of the MRRC and contribute to an overall increase in prison bed numbers across the NSW correctional system.

This REF has been prepared to assess the environmental impacts of proposed early works in accordance with Part 5 of the EP&A Act and has assessed those matters listed in Clause 228 of the EP&A Regulation.

The proposed works will not result in a significant impact on any declared critical habitat, threatened species, populations or ecological communities or their habitats. Therefore, a Species Impact Statement is not required.

The REF has been prepared in accordance with the ISEPP and key Commonwealth, State and local planning provisions, policy and strategy.

The REF has assessed key environmental and planning issues including geotechnical and contamination, traffic and access, noise and vibration and heritage based on a number of supporting technical studies. The REF includes mitigation measures and safeguards to ensure that construction occurs with minimal environmental impact.

The proposed works are generally of a minor nature and are unlikely to result in significant environmental impacts. Furthermore, any residual impacts can be appropriately managed through a range of safeguards and measures.

In this regard, an EIS is not required.

9.4. Recommendation

There are no known potential or adverse environmental impacts that are likely to prevent the approval of the proposal.

Accordingly, subject to the implementation of the safeguards and mitigation measures outlined in this REF, the proposal is recommended for approval.