

## Section 171(2) Checklist

In addition to the requirements of the *Is an EIS required?* (DUAP 1995/1996) guideline and the *Marinas and Related Facilities EIS Guideline* (DUAP 1996) as detailed in the REF, the following factors, listed in Section 171(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021, have also been considered to assess the likely impacts of the proposal on the natural and built environment.

Factor	Impact
<p>a) <i>Any environmental impact on a community?</i></p> <p>The make safe and retrieval of the wharf would result in a structural reduction of a locally historically significant landscape feature.</p> <p>The construction program would have minor impacts to the community.</p>	<p>Long-term moderate negative</p> <p>Short-term minor negative</p>
<p>b) <i>Any transformation of a locality?</i></p> <p>While the proposal would involve removing structures of a prominent landmark, the wharf is currently not used due to safety concerns. Its partial retrieval would not transform the locality.</p>	<p>Nil</p>
<p>c) <i>Any environmental impact on the ecosystems of the locality?</i></p> <p>The proposal may harm seagrass during the make safe and retrieval activities. Due to the temporary and small scale of the work, this is not expected to impact ecosystems reliant on seagrass.</p>	<p>Short-term, minor negative</p>
<p>d) <i>Any reduction of the aesthetic, recreational, scientific or other environmental quality or value of a locality?</i></p> <p>The wharf would undergo a reduction in heritage value with respect to the retrieval of structural elements to make-safe. The proposal aims to minimise this reduction while maximising public safety.</p>	<p>Long-term, moderate negative</p>
<p>e) <i>Any effect on a locality, place or building having aesthetic, anthropological, archaeological, architectural, cultural, historical, scientific or social significance or other special value for present or future generations?</i></p> <p>Refer to points (a), (b), and (d) above. While the proposal involves removal of fabric with heritage value, the bulk of the structure will remain. Mitigation measures described in Section 6.1.6 would reduce this impact and would not alter the heritage significance of wharf and surrounds.</p>	<p>Long-term, moderate negative</p>
<p>f) <i>Any impact on the habitat of protected fauna (within the meaning of the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974)?</i></p> <p>The proposal would remove some available man-made habitat for some aquatic species during make safe and retrieval activities. However, any identified fauna habitat during work would be retained. This impact would therefore be minor.</p>	<p>Short-term, minor negative</p>

Factor	Impact
<p><i>g) Any endangering of any species of animal, plant or other form of life, whether living on land, in water or in the air?</i></p> <p>The proposed scope of work is unlikely to endanger any species of animal, plant or other form of life, whether living on land, in water or in the air with the implementation of the identified safeguards in Section 6.2.5.</p>	Nil
<p><i>h) Any long-term effects on the environment?</i></p> <p>Refer to points (a), (b), (d) and (e) above.</p>	Long-term, moderate negative
<p><i>i) Any degradation of the quality of the environment?</i></p> <p>The proposal would improve navigational safety including public safety through the removal of a hazard.</p> <p>The proposed make safe and retrieval work would have an adverse impact on the landscape character and visual amenity of the locality. It is anticipated this would be offset by Transport's vision and future plans for the wharf.</p>	Long-term positive  Long-term negative
<p><i>j) Any risk to the safety of the environment?</i></p> <p>The make safe and retrieval of wharf structures may exacerbate release of hazardous substances to the environment as a result of disturbing chemically treated timber and steel. It should be noted that if present then these substances are already leaching into the environment and the proposal would enable the long term removal of the substances.</p>	Potential short-term moderate negative
<p><i>k) Any reduction in the range of beneficial uses of the environment?</i></p> <p>The wharf is not currently in use. Therefore, there would be no net change in beneficial use.</p>	Nil
<p><i>l) Any pollution of the environment?</i></p> <p>Potential accidental spills during the make safe and retrieval period may impact water quality. Management measures would minimise those risks.</p>	Potential short-term moderate negative
<p><i>m) Any environmental problems associated with the disposal of waste?</i></p> <p>A range of waste streams will be generated through the proposal. These will be managed to ensure problems are avoided. Refer to Section 7.</p>	Nil
<p><i>n) Any increased demands on resources (natural or otherwise) that are, or are likely to become, in short supply?</i></p> <p>There is unlikely to be an increased demand for resources that are likely to become in short supply.</p>	Nil
<p><i>o) Any cumulative environmental effect with other existing or likely future activities?</i></p> <p>Section 6.11 assesses the potential cumulative impacts with proposed developments surrounding the proposal site. Potential negative cumulative impacts may result, though these would be</p>	Potential short-term moderate negative

Factor	Impact
<p>minimised through the implementation of management measures detailed in Section 7.</p>	
<p><i>p) Any impact on coastal processes and coastal hazards, including those under projected climate change conditions?</i></p> <p>As the proposal is limited to salvaging existing structures, there is unlikely to be any discernible impact on coastal processes. Management measures would be implemented to minimise disturbance of the sea bed.</p>	<p>Nil</p>
<p><i>q) Applicable local strategic planning statements, regional strategic plans or district strategic plans made under the Act, Division 3.1</i></p> <p>The proposal is not applicable to plans made under Division 3.1 of the Act.</p>	<p>Nil</p>
<p><i>r) Other relevant environmental factors</i></p>	<p>In considering the potential impacts of this proposal all relevant environmental factors have been considered, refer to Section 6 of this REF.</p>

## Matters of National Environmental Significance and Commonwealth land

Under the environmental assessment provisions of the EPBC Act, the following matters of national environmental significance and impacts on the Commonwealth land are required to be considered to assist in determining whether the proposal should be referred to the Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Water and Environment.

Factor	Impact
a) Any impact on a World Heritage property?	Nil
b) Any impact on a National Heritage place?	Nil
c) Any impact on a wetland of international importance?	Nil
d) Any impact on a listed threatened species or communities?  Assessments of significance for threatened species/communities listed under the EPBC Act concluded that no significant impacts are likely to occur as a result of the proposal. Refer to Section 6.2.4 for details.	Nil
e) Any impacts on listed migratory species?  Potential impacts to migratory species listed under the EPBC Act concluded that no significant impacts are likely to occur as a result of the proposal. Refer to Section 6.2.3 for details.	Nil
f) Any impact on a Commonwealth marine area?	Nil
g) Does the proposal involve a nuclear action (including uranium mining)?	Nil
h) Additionally, any impact (direct or indirect) on the environment of Commonwealth land?	Nil