

## Appendix A

# Consideration of section 171 factors and matters of national environmental significance and Commonwealth land

## Section 171 Factors

In addition to the requirements of the *Guideline for Division 5.1 assessments* (DPE 2022) and the *Roads and Related Facilities EIS Guideline* (DUAP 1996) as detailed in the REF, the following factors, listed in section 171 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 proposal would reduce congestion at the existing roundabout and improve safety for road users.</p> <p>Construction of the proposal would result in traffic and noise impacts to the local community and road users. Potential traffic impacts include increased heavy vehicles and commuter delays. Construction impacts would be managed by preparation of a CEMP including measures identified in Section 6 of the REF.</p>	<p>Long-term positive</p> <p>Short term negative</p>
<p>b) <i>Any transformation of a locality?</i></p> <p>The proposal would reduce congestion at the existing roundabout and improve safety for road users.</p> <p>The proposal would result in transformation of small areas of rural residential land to highway. There is one property which requires strip acquisition. Part of the proposal would be constructed on fill embankment which would change the visual amenity of road users.</p> <p>Visual impacts of the proposal on the locality would be reduced through the implementation of safeguards identified in Section 6.7.</p>	<p>Long-term positive</p> <p>Long-term negative</p>
<p>c) <i>Any environmental impact on the ecosystems of the locality?</i></p> <p>The proposal would require clearing of about 7.19 hectares of vegetation of which 2.73 hectares is Flooded Gum - Tallowwood - Brush Box moist open forest of the coastal ranges of the North Coast. The remaining 4.93 hectares is exotic vegetation and a small farm dam (0.04 ha).</p> <p>The proposal would not have a significant impact on ecosystems within the locality. Impacts from the proposal would be minimised through the implementation of the safeguards summarised in Section 7.2.</p>	<p>Long-term 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 proposal would reduce congestion and travel times and improve safety for users.</p> <p>During construction there is potential for short-term impacts associated with traffic, visual, dust and noise. These impacts would be minimised through the implementation of the safeguards summarised in Section 7.</p>	<p>Long-term positive</p> <p>Short-term 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>The PACHCI completed for the proposal identified there are no registered sites within the proposal site and the area is unlikely to contain any previously unrecorded sites due to the history of disturbance.</p> <p>A review of the State Heritage Register and Port Macquarie-Hastings LEP did not identify any historic heritage items within the proposal site and the area is unlikely to contain any previously unrecorded sites.</p>	<p>nil</p>

Factor	Impact
<p><i>f) 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 require clearing of about 2.73 hectares of native vegetation. This includes preferred koala feed tree species Tallow wood (<i>Eucalyptus microcorys</i>) and Flooded Gum (<i>Eucalyptus grandis</i>). The proposal would remove habitat for a number of threatened species. The proposal would not have a significant impact on biodiversity and ecological integrity. A biodiversity assessment including mitigation measures are provided in Section 6.1.</p>	Long-term negative
<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 proposal would require clearing of about 2.73 hectares of native vegetation and 4.93 hectares of exotic grassland.</p> <p>The proposal will remove habitat for some threatened species of fauna. However the proposal is unlikely to have a significant impact of biodiversity within the locality, refer to Section 6.1.</p>	Long-term negative
<p><i>h) Any long-term effects on the environment?</i></p> <p>The proposal would reduce congestion on the existing roundabout.</p> <p>The proposal would require the clearing of about 2.73 hectares of native vegetation.</p>	<p>Long-term positive</p> <p>Long-term negative</p>
<p><i>i) Any degradation of the quality of the environment?</i></p> <p>The proposal would reduce congestion and travel times and improve road safety for road users.</p> <p>During construction there is potential for short term impacts associated with traffic, visual changes, dust, water quality, noise and vibration. These impacts would be minimised through the implementation of safeguards summarised in Section 7.2.</p>	<p>Long-term positive.</p> <p>Short-term negative</p>
<p><i>j) Any risk to the safety of the environment?</i></p> <p>The proposal would reduce congestion and travel times and improve road safety for road users.</p> <p>The proposal has the potential to reduce road safety during construction. However, traffic management safeguards including preparation of a traffic management plan would address safety risks. Refer to Section 6.4.</p>	<p>Long-term positive.</p> <p>Short-term negative</p>
<p><i>k) Any reduction in the range of beneficial uses of the environment?</i></p> <p>The proposal would reduce congestion and travel times and improve road safety for road users. The proposal is not anticipated to reduce the range of beneficial uses of the environment.</p> <p>During construction, minor traffic impacts due to an increase in heavy vehicle movements and potential interruptions to traffic flow would temporarily reduce the beneficial use of the local road network.</p>	<p>Long-term positive.</p> <p>Short-term negative</p>

Factor	Impact
<p><i>l) Any pollution of the environment?</i> The proposal would reduce congestive and travels times and therefore result in improvements to the amenity (noise/ air quality) of this interchange.</p> <p>The proposal could potentially result in minor short-term water pollution from sediments, waste and spilt fuels/ chemicals.</p> <p>The proposal would result in minor short-term air pollution from plant and machinery and the generation of dust during construction. Management of air quality impacts would be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures outlined in Section 7.2.</p>	<p>Long-term positive</p> <p>Short-term minor negative</p> <p>Short-term minor negative</p>
<p><i>m) Any environmental problems associated with the disposal of waste?</i> The waste streams expected to be generated during construction are common and would pose no difficulty in their disposal. Waste would be recycled wherever possible.</p>	Short-term minor negative
<p><i>n) Any increased demands on resources (natural or otherwise) that are, or are likely to become, in short supply?</i> All resources required for the proposal are readily available and are not in short supply.</p>	nil
<p><i>o) Any cumulative environmental effect with other existing or likely future activities?</i> The long-term cumulative effect of the proposal would be positive due to improved travel times, road safety and efficiency.</p> <p>The proposed new service centre, which is in the south western corner of the existing interchange is not anticipated to result in significant cumulative impacts. Temporary potential cumulative impacts may occur as a result of construction activities occurring simultaneously with other projects in the local area. Cumulative impacts are not expected to be significant and would be minimised through the application of individual proposal specific environmental safeguards and management measures.</p>	<p>Long-term positive</p> <p>Short-term negative</p>
<p><i>p) Any impact on coastal processes and coastal hazards, including those under projected climate change conditions?</i> It is not expected that the proposal would significantly impact on coastal processes and coastal hazards.</p>	nil
<p><i>q) Applicable local strategic planning statements, regional strategic plans or district strategic plans made under the Act, Division 3.1, Review and briefly summarise how your project aligns to the applicable planning statements and plans for the area. Local plans can be found on Council websites. Regional and district plans can be found at Regional plans</i> The proposal is considered to be aligned with the Port Macquarie Local Strategic Planning Statement 2040 (LSPS). The LSPS highlights the need for Port Macquarie to “improve the safety, efficiency and environmental footprint of the road transport sector”. The proposal would contribute towards these objectives by facilitating a more efficient and safer road network.</p>	Long term positive
<p><i>r) Other relevant environmental factors.</i></p>	In considering the potential impacts of this proposal all relevant environmental factors have been considered, refer to Section 6.

## 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 Commonwealth land are required to be considered to assist in determining whether the proposal should be referred to the Australian Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water. An EPBC Act Protected Matters Report was generated for the proposal site on 5 March 2025.

A referral is not required for proposed actions that may affect nationally-listed threatened species, endangered ecological communities and migratory species. Impacts on these matters are still assessed as part of the REF in accordance with Australian Government significant impact criteria and taking into account relevant guidelines and policies.

Factor	Impact
a Any impact on a World Heritage property? The proposal would not have any impacts on World Heritage properties.	Nil
b Any impact on a National Heritage place? The proposal would not have any impacts on National Heritage places.	Nil
c Any impact on a wetland of international importance? The proposal would not have any impacts on wetlands of international importance.	Nil
d Any impact on a listed threatened species or communities? The proposal would have the potential to impact 98 threatened species and 6 threatened ecological communities known within the area surrounding the proposal site (refer to Section 6.1).	Nil
e Any impacts on listed migratory species? The proposal would have the potential to impact 65 migratory species known within the area surrounding the proposal site (refer to Section 6.1).	Nil
f Any impact on a Commonwealth marine area? The proposal would not have any impacts on a Commonwealth marine area.	Nil
g Does the proposal involve a nuclear action (including uranium mining)? The proposal does not involve any nuclear action.	Nil
h Additionally, any impact (direct or indirect) on the environment of Commonwealth land? All Commonwealth lands occur outside of the proposal site in the buffer area.	Nil