ETHOS URBAN

New Maitland Hospital Stage 2 SSI – Response to Submissions
Agency Submissions

Item	Issue	Response
Department of Planning and Environment		
1	Particular consideration should be given to the issues raised by Maitland City Council (Council) and the Roads and Maritime Services division of Transport for NSW in relation to traffic, access and parking impacts. Please ensure that the traffic modelling uses relevant surveys and the traffic impacts of the proposal can be adequately mitigated.	These issues are addressed below as part of the response to submissions below and responses prepared by: • Amended Architectural Drawings prepared by BVN **(Appendix B);** • Summary of Design Changes prepared by Multiplex **(Appendix C);** • Amended Landscape Plans prepared by Black Beetle **(Appendix D);** • Amended Traffic Impact Assessment prepared by GTA Traffic Consultants **(Appendix E);** • Revised Biodiversity Development Assessment Report prepared by Sclerophyll **(Appendix F);** • Site Investigation Report prepared by GHD **(Appendix G);** • Remediation Action Plan prepared by GHD **(Appendix H);** • Interim Site Audit Advice prepared by JBS&G **(Appendix I);** • Addendum Noise and Vibration Assessment prepared by Acoustic Logic **(Appendix J);** • Addendum Wind Assessment prepare by Windtech **(Appendix K);** • Addendum Aviation Report prepared by Avi Pro **(Appendix L);** • Amended Arborist Report prepared by Tattersall Lander **(Appendix M);** • Site Water Balance report prepared by GHD **(Appendix N);** • Stormwater Detention and Discharge Strategy prepare by TTW **(Appendix O);** and • Helipad Structural Statement prepared by TTW **(Appendix P).**
2	The Department also considers that the issues raised in submissions in relation to the contamination assessment of Part Lot 401 DP 755237, biodiversity assessment and industrial heritage require further consideration and further information or revisions to address these matters.	
NSW Government Architect		
3	The landscaping both outside the building and in the various courtyards was noted by the SDRP panel as critical to providing amenity to staff, patients and visitors. The landscape areas provide relief from the large internal floorplates, are an integral aspect of the design intent and crucial to achieving design excellence. Provide detail of landscaping to be incorporate to courtyards at north and south roofs on level 1 and level 2;	Courtyards are incorporated into the design in locations where needed for either patient, visitor and or staff access. These courtyards are located on; • Ground Level at the end of the public corridor and near the entry to the Medical Imaging department; • Level 1 servicing the ICU, Birthing and Operating Theatre departments; • Level 3 for the Rehabilitation inpatient unit. The Landscape Plans at **Appendix D** have been updated to show the landscaping arrangement in these courtyards.

Item	Issue	Response
		A detailed response to the minutes provided by the Government Architect is addressed in the Consultation Summary Report at Appendix E of the EIS. We note the design of the building has included structural upgrades that will support the weight of some additional courtyard-associated landscaping in the above-mentioned locations in the future. A conceptual design is shown (for information purposes only) within the Consultation Summary Report at **Appendix E** of the EIS and has been presented to the Government Architect to show how the roof spaces may be used, should funding become available in the future. These spaces provide a great opportunity for further community engagement to explore opportunities for third party input and charitable involvement to develop such spaces over time.
4	Provide detail of stormwater treatment and integration with proposed landscape at the northern carparking area;	Detail of proposed stormwater treatment using bioswales in the northern carparking area is shown in the Civil Statement at **Appendix O.** The Landscape Plans at **Appendix D** show the proposed planting schedule for these bioswales.
5	Provide detail and specification of high-performance glazing and other energy efficiency measures to be incorporated into the project;	The proposed high-performance glazing is a double glazed unit with the following performance criteria for the glazing only: – Visible Light Transmission: 52% – Reflectance: Indoor 11%, Outdoor 15% – Winter U-Value: 1.7 w / sqm – SHGC: 0.30 Provision for installation of photovoltaics has been made in the roof top electrical distribution board infrastructure to enable a future installation and connection without interrupting the hospital electrical supplies. At this point photovoltaics are not funded to be installed as part of the main works and remains subject to a separate feasibility study. Other energy efficiency measures supported by the Government Architect include: • design of air handling systems capable of operating as full outside air systems where beneficial to energy usage. This was supported over mixed mode ventilation. • systems designed to meet JV3 requirements plus 10% • water cooled chillers • significant AHUs to use fans with variable speed drives, variable speed pumping to heating and cooling systems
6	As noted during the State Design Review process the building should incorporate renewable energy such as solar panels at commissioning. Provide details of how this might be achieved.	
Office of Environment and Heritage		
7	BCD has no Aboriginal cultural heritage or flooding comments.	Noted.
8	Further details are required to demonstrate adequate survey of threatened species. The Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) relies on threatened flora and fauna surveys undertaken by General Flora and Fauna (2014), however lacks specific detail to demonstrate that these previous surveys have adequately surveyed	The BDAR at **Appendix F** has been updated to include an additional table in the Stage 2 BDAR listing all BAM-C Candidate species with details on survey methods and survey timing and demonstrating consistency with the Office of Environment and Heritage threatened species survey guidelines, with survey details extracted from the 2014 General Flora and Fauna report.

<table>
<tr><th>Item</th><th>Issue</th><th>Response</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>for threatened species identified in the BDAR. Further details describing previous surveys are required, including a
list of candidate threatened species identified for survey in the BDAR, any seasonality requirements for survey, description of survey method undertaken, date and weather conditions of survey, and figures showing location of transects/plots/traplines undertaken.

The Biodiversity Assessment Method (section 6.5) states that BDAR threatened species surveys must be undertaken in accordance with the Office of Environment and Heritage threatened species survey guidelines including ‘Threatened species survey and assessment guidelines for amphibians’ (DECC, 2009), and ‘NSW Guide to Surveying Threatened Plants’ (OEH, 2006). Should the previous surveys undertaken by General Flora and Fauna (2014) not comply with these survey guidelines, it is recommended that further survey work in accordance with the guidelines be undertaken to demonstrate adequate survey effort in the BDAR.</td><td>The Biodiversity Conservation Act came into force on 25 August 2017. The NMH Biodiversity Assessment prepared for the Stage 1 SSI 9022 was substantially commenced prior to 25 August 2017 and has been prepared under the previous legislation as this was applicable at the time that surveys, and the majority of the assessment was undertaken.

We note that Clause 32 of the Biodiversity Conservation (Savings and Transitional) Regulation 2017 applies to the NMH project. The projects consistency with Clause 32 is set out at Table X below.

Review of consistency with Clause 32
<table>
<tr><th>Provision</th><th>Comment</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Clause 32 - Data collected for BAM assessments before the commencement of the new Act</td></tr>
<tr><td>(1) For the purposes of Part 7 of the new Act, the use of data collected before the commencement of the new Act is taken to be collected in accordance with the Biodiversity Assessment Method if:</td><td>The Biodiversity Conservation Act came into force on 25 August 2017. The NMH Biodiversity Assessment prepared for the Stage 1 SSI 9022 was substantially commenced prior to 25 August 2017.</td></tr>
<tr><td>(a) the data was collected in a manner that is substantially consistent with the Biodiversity Assessment Method, and</td><td>The survey data was collected by General (2014) in a manner that is consistent with the current Biodiversity Assessment Method (BAM) (BAM requires targeted surveys for candidate species considered as possible occurrences on the subject site in accordance with relevant survey guidelines). The targeted Threatened fauna surveys undertaken by General (2014) were in accordance with DEC (2004) which were the current guidelines at the time and are substantially consistent with more current fauna guidelines (eg. 2009 amphibian guidelines). The targeted Threatened flora surveys undertaken by General (2014) were in accordance with Cropper (1993) which were the current guidelines at the time and again are substantially consistent with the more current 2016 plant guidelines (eg. parallel line transects). General (2014) presented locations of Threatened flora and fauna survey sites (refer Figures 4 and 5) of the Stage 1 Biodiversity Assessment Report.</td></tr>
<tr><td>(b) the data was collected by an accredited person.</td><td>The data was collected by an accredited person as defined and identified below.</td></tr>
<tr><td>(2) An accredited person is:</td><td>N/A</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
</table>

Item	Issue	Response
		(a) a person who was accredited under section 142B of the Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995 when the data concerned was collected, or *(b) a person who is accredited under section 6.10 of the new Act.* — Greg Little from General (2014) is a BAM accredited assessor under Section 6.10 of the new Act. The OEH Biodiversity Assessment Method Operational Manual Stage 1 outlines that *… field surveys (including targeted surveys for 'species credits species') less than five years old can be used in place of onsite survey*. The EIS was lodged on 21 June 2019 which is within 5 years of the completion of the October – December 2014 field surveys undertaken by General Flora and Fauna. The OEH has also undertaken its assessment within the 5 year period. The data collected as part of the Flora and Fauna assessment for Stage 1 SSI (9022) and in accordance with Clause 32 of the *Biodiversity Conservation (Savings and Transitional) Regulation 2017* and is accordingly appropriate for use as part of the NMH Stage 2 project.
9	The squirrel glider species polygon habitat map should include all vegetation zones subject to any clearing. The squirrel glider species polygon maps squirrel glider habitat onsite and is shown on Figure 6 in the BDAR (Sclerophyll dated 25/06/2019). The squirrel glider species polygon includes 0.55 hectares of native vegetation subject to full clearing, however excludes 0.21 hectares of native vegetation subject to partial removal (where the understorey is proposed for removal and trees retained). The species list from the plot undertaken within the area proposed for partial clearing includes Acacia parvipinnula and Acacia elongata in the understorey. Squirrel gliders were recorded onsite and are known to forage on understorey vegetation containing Acacia sp. All native vegetation proposed for clearing onsite should be included in the squirrel glider polygon and be offset.	The Squirrel Glider species credit requirements have been recalculated to include the additional 0.21 ha previously omitted. The revised biodiversity credit reports generated are shown in the updated BDAR at **Appendix F**
Heritage Council of NSW		
10	A review of the information supplied shows no comment is required and accordingly, no recommended conditions of consent are provided.	Noted.
Ausgrid		
11	Ausgrid consents to the above mentioned development subject to the following conditions:-	Noted. A response to each recommended condition is provided below.
12	**Proximity to Existing Network Assets**	This comment is noted. The design will accord with relevant requirements as outlined by Ausgrid.

Item	Issue	Response
	Safework Document – Work Near Overhead Powerlines outlines the minimum safety separation requirements between these overhead mains / poles to structures within the development throughout the construction process. It is a statutory requirement that these distances be maintained throughout construction. The "as constructed" minimum clearances to the mains should also be considered. These distances are outlined in the Ausgrid Network Standard, NS220 Overhead Design Manual. This document can be sourced from Ausgrid's website, www.ausgrid.com.au Ausgrid also requires any works undertaken adjacent to our underground assets to be undertaken with care in accordance with Safework Document – Work Near Underground Assets and Ausgrid Network Standard Document NS 156 – Work Near or Around Underground Cables.	
13	**Existing Electricity Easements** Should any existing Ausgrid easements be identified within the subject site during development any works proposed within the easements must be approved by Ausgrid. The purpose of easements is to protect Ausgrid assets and to provide adequate working space along the route of the line for construction and maintenance work and also to ensure that no work or other activity is undertaken under or near the assets which could either by accident or otherwise create an unsafe situation for persons or for the security of the assets.	This comment is noted. The design will accord with relevant requirements as outlined by Ausgrid.
14	**Relocating Electricity Assets** Should any existing Ausgrid assets require relocating to facilitate the development, this relocation work is generally at the applicants cost. These costs would not only include the cost of the works but also all costs associated with the creation of revised easements.	This comment is noted. The design will accord with relevant requirements as outlined by Ausgrid.
15	**Supply of Electricity** The Infrastructure Management Plan, included in the "Attachments and Resources" with the SSI-9775 information, indicate that preliminary arrangements have been made with Ausgrid for the provision of adequate electricity supply to the development.	The supply of electricity has been confirmed as part of investigations undertaken by JHA at Appendix U of the EIS.
NSW Rural Fire Service		
16	At the commencement of building works and in perpetuity the area surrounding the building for the following distances; • 40 metres to the south east • 50 metres to the east and • 68 metres to the west shall be managed as an inner protection area (IPA) as outlined within section 4.1.3 and Appendix 5 of 'Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006' and the NSW Rural Fire Service's document 'Standards for asset protection zones'.	The project includes an IPA that accords with these requirements as outlined in the Bushfire Assessment at Appendix R of the EIS.

Item	Issue	Response
17	At the commencement of building works and in perpetuity the area surrounding the building for the following distances; • 60 metres to the south and south west shall be managed as an inner protection area (IPA) and an additional • 10 metres shall be managed as an outer protection area (OPA) as outlined within section 4.1.3 and Appendix 5 of 'Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006' and the NSW Rural Fire Service's document 'Standards for asset protection zones'.	The project includes an OPA that accords with these requirements as outlined in the Bushfire Assessment at Appendix R of the EIS.
18	Water, electricity and gas are to comply with section 4.1.3 of 'Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006'.	The design of Water, electricity and gas will comply with the requirements of section 4.1.3 of 'Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006'.
19	The access road marked “Rural Fire Services Vehicle Access Track” as per the plan undertaken by Multiplex titled, Site Plan, Drawing Number 01A-AX0-002 Issue 7 shall comply with the following provisions; • All weather road with a width of 5.5 metres capable of a 15 Tonne loading. (It is noted the road will be unsealed). • Four metre vertical clearance to any overhanging obstructions, including tree branches. • A minimum distance between inner and outer curves to be 6 metres. • Crossfall of the road is to be no more than 10 degrees. • Traffic management devices are constructed to facilitate access by emergency service vehicles. All other access surrounding the site as displayed on the plan shall comply with the provisions of section 4.2.7 of 'Planning for Bushfire Protection 2006'.	These conditions are accepted.
20	A Bush Fire Emergency Management and Evacuation Plan shall be prepared consistent with 'Development Planning- A Guide to Developing a Bush Fire Emergency Management and Evacuation Plan December 2014'.	This condition is accepted.
21	New construction shall comply with Sections 3 and 5 (BAL 12.5) Australian Standard AS3959-2009 'Construction of buildings in bush fire-prone areas' or NASH Standard (1.7.14 updated) ‘National Standard Steel Framed Construction in Bushfire Areas – 2014’ as appropriate and section A3.7 Addendum Appendix 3 of 'Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006'.	The project complies with Planning for Bushfire Protection 2006 as outlined at Appendix R of the EIS.
	Landscaping within the asset protection zone shall comply with the principles as outlined within Appendix 5 of 'Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006'.	The landscape design complies with the principles as outlined within Appendix 5 of ‘Planning for Fire Protection 2006’.
Transport for NSW		
22	Further assessment of the bus bay requirements based on a more conservative assumption regarding dwell times should be undertaken in consultation with TfNSW. A sufficient allocation of space in the bus bay should be reserved – with a preferred outcome of at least two buses to be accommodated at any given time.	The design has been amended to include a partial open bus bay which allows buses to drive straight into the bus stop therefore not requiring the ‘draw in’ space. Based on this and allowing for long rigid (14.5m length) buses being able to exit independently a length of 42 metres is required to accommodate two buses at one time. Using the Bus Infrastructure Guideline (Section 3.10 Bus Stop

Item	Issue	Response
		Capacity), with a dwell time of 30 seconds this bus bay would be able to accommodate around 30 - 45 buses in the busiest hour. The bus frequencies /services to NMH are still being determined, however is likely to be around 2 to 4 per hour therefore significantly longer dwell times could be accommodated.
23	The EIS does not mention whether community buses will also be servicing the hospital. If community buses will be servicing the hospital, the EIS should include details of the pick-up/drop-off location. The pick-up/drop-off locations of any community buses also servicing the development should be identified.	It is anticipated that community buses will pick up/drop off at the new Maitland Hospital and they will utilise the bus bays to drop off / pick up. The expected number of community buses per hour / day is likely to be minimal and could easily be scheduled and accommodated in the proposed bus bay area.
24	The design and construction of the internal road network intended to be used by buses should be consistent with the *Guidelines for Public Transport Capable Infrastructure in Greenfield Sites*.	The design is in accordance with the documents, based on the following: • 3.5m lane widths, no medians are proposed. • Raised pedestrian crossings should not exceed 75mm height with ramp grades no greater than 1 in 16 (6.25%), central platform no longer than 5.5m and 3.5m travel lanes in each direction. • Turning path assessments have been prepared to confirm the roundabout layout. • The proposed canopy is not within the clear zone. The scheduling of actual bus routes and services is yet to be determined.
25	**Green Travel Plan** Recommended Condition: As part of the ongoing operation of the hospital, a detailed Green Travel Plan (GTP), which includes target mode shares for both staff and visitors to reduce the reliance on private vehicles, shall be prepared. The GTP must be implemented accordingly and updated annually.	This condition is accepted.
Roads and Maritime Service		
26	The intersections on the New England Highway need to run in Sidra at the same cycle time. There are variations in cycle time shown in the Sidra output files. Applying a user-given cycle time of 120 would be appropriate.	The existing condition SIDRA models for the intersections on the New England Highway were developed based on the phase times provided in the SCATS data for 26 July 2018, provided by RMS. The SCATS data indicated an AM peak average cycle time of 124 seconds and PM peak average cycle time of 120 seconds, as reflected in the SIDRA model. The future conditions (2026 and 2032) SIDRA model for the intersections on the New England Highway were run based on optimised cycle times to appropriately accommodate the changing demand patterns on the network. GTA acknowledge RMS comments regarding applying user-given cycle time and note that updating the models will not materially change the results/outcome.
27	The phasing is to match the SCATS output from the survey date. The report does not discuss whether this has occurred.	The existing condition SIDRA models for the intersections on the New England Highway were run based on the phase times provided in the SCATS data for 26 July 2018, provided to GTA Consultants by RMS on 20 September 2018. This is the same day as the surveys were undertaken.
28	**NEH/Chelmsford** • This intersection was reconstructed by Stockland Greenhills to make the through movement the primary movement, which has reduced right turn capacity and phase time for this movement. Adding traffic from the development may lead to re-phasing	The future conditions (2026 and 2032) SIDRA model for the intersections on the New England Highway were run based on optimised cycle times to appropriately accommodate the changing demand patterns on the network.

Item	Issue	Response
	this intersection to provide more right turn out capacity. The predicted volumes are showing an extra 100 v/hr turning right here. • The left slip lane from Chelmsford Drive to the NEH is short. The predicted volumes have an extra 100 v/hr for this movement. Whilst it models well, it is unlikely that the left turning vehicles will be able to readily access the left turn slip lane as it is short and the queues on the through movement exceed this length. • Notes from Level Of Service (LOS) / queueing tables – 2032: – The queue lengths and LOS improves post development (AM peak) on Chelmsford Drive north-west leg with more traffic on it. The report does not discuss this. – 435m of queueing on Chelmsford Dr north-west in PM peak post development. – The right turn queue from Chelmsford Drive onto the NEH exceeds the lane length, which will result in queuing into the through lanes.	A scenario has been tested in the 2032 with development SIDRA model, incorporating an increased left hand turn short lane length of 100m (therefore capturing the entire 95th percentile queue). The increased storage length had no impact to results. Note: RMS comments re: 435 metres queuing on Chelmsford Drive, should be New England Highway – the queues on Chelmsford drive do not exceed 180 metres in the PM peak. The 95th percentile right turn queue length from Chelmsford Drive is 176 metres, and the right turn lane length is 120 metres. The corresponding average right turn queue length from Chelmsford Drive is 108 metres. Therefore, on average the queue would be contained fully within the right turn bay.
29	**NEH/Chisholm** • Notes from 2032 PM peak: – The Degree Of Saturation (DOS) indicates that the nominated lanes are approaching saturation as a result of the development traffic. – Queuing increases from 230m pre-development to 460m post-development. The DOS on the south-east NEH leg increases from 0.77 to above 0.93. – The DOS on the right turn north-west NEH leg increases from 0.74 to above 0.92.	RMS have provided general notes regarding the future operation of this intersection. The intersection overall still operates satisfactorily. With background traffic growth to 2032 and the NMH development there will be more traffic through this intersection and therefore the queue lengths will increase.
30	**NEH/Mitchell Dr** • No comments.	Noted.
31	Roads and Maritime recommend that the above points be checked within the modelling to ensure its accuracy, with additional comments provided where required.	The RMS comments outline clarifications to SCATs data and cycle timing and provide general notes on future operation. There are no specific requirements to update the SIDRA models. GTA have provided responses to each item above.
Maitland City Council		
32	The traffic and transport impacts assessed in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Stage 2 and the Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) report prepared by GTA on 17/05/2019 (referred to as 'the GTA report') are considered in the context of the Department of Planning and Environment's conditions of approval for Stage 1. The Department's determination of the New Maitland Hospital (Concept and Stage 1 Early Works) (SSI 9022) detailed requirements for future stages, including traffic and transport, in the conditions of approval. Condition 83. - Part B Requirements for Future Stages, requires a detailed assessment of the traffic and transport impacts associated with: • Surrounding road network and intersection capacity	A response is provided below.

Item	Issue	Response
	• Sufficient access and car parking • Details to promote non-car t ravel modes • Cumulative traffic impacts, in particular Stockland Green Hills Shopping centre development, and undertaking additional analysis of the highway inclusive of New England Highway/Chelmsford Drive intersection • Scope and timing of road and intersection upgrades • Pedestrian access plan • Businesses fronting Metford Road, between Fieldsend Street and Chelmsford Drive Each of these points is considered separately below.	
33	**a. Surrounding Road Network and Intersection Capacity** Metford Road Capacity and Future Road Widening The summary for traffic capacity in 2022 and over the 10-year horizon to 2032 provided in Tables 6.13 and 6.14 of the GTA report demonstrate that Metford Road is reaching capacity. That is, • in 2022 AM for Westbound/Southbound a volume/capacity ratio 0.9 with development; • in 2032 AM and PM for Westbound/Southbound a volume/capacity ratio over 1 .0 with and without development. This confirms that further investigation is required for the future widening of Metford Road to four (4) lanes. This investigation should consider when the levels of service (LOS) indicate the need for an upgrade. It is noted that background traffic growth is considered by GTA through the Roads and Maritime Strategic Traffic Forecasting Model outputs for 2021, 2026 and 2031. The traffic volumes from 2022 to 2032 (Tables 6.13 and 6.14) suggest a background traffic growth rate of approximately 1.75% p.a. However, the Strategic Traffic Forecast Model indicates background traffic growth up to 1.87% p.a. on Metford Road in the PM period from 4pm to 6pm (refer to attachment). **Level of Service on the road network** The levels of service should be reviewed for Metford Road - Chelmsford Drive corridor from the NMH site to the New England Highway. This includes: • Metford Road/Chelmsford Drive roundabout intersection, in light of the increases in traffic Council has identified from 2019 traffic surveys, since the 2017 traffic surveys. • Chelmsford Drive approach to the New England Highway signalised intersection • Metford Road/Fieldsend Street roundabout intersection, as the primary access to the NMH site.	As outlined in Table 6.13 the 2022 AM westbound/southbound (without the NMH development) volume/capacity ratio is 0.88 and marginally increases to 0.9 with the development. Similarly, in Table 6.14 in 2032 it is over capacity without the NMH development. GTA has completed further investigation around the future performance of Metford Road. This includes updating the midblock analysis for Metford Road based on the updated traffic volume data provided by MCC and applying an annual growth rate of 1.87 per cent. The midblock analysis has considered each growth year between 2022 and 2032, with and without the development, and the results are provided at **Appendix E.** In summary, Metford Road would reach a volume/capacity ratio of 0.9 (Level of Service E) in 2024 with the hospital development in the PM peak. Level of Service E indicates that the traffic volumes are close to capacity and therefore minor disturbances within the traffic stream could cause breakdown. It is noted however that the traffic assessment assumes all traffic associated with the completed hospital development would occur from the year of opening (2022) however in reality, when considering the planned transition of existing services and establishment of new services by the Hunter New England Local Heath District, the hospital will not be operating at full capacity at the year of opening. Therefore, the year in which Metford Road reaches capacity would also be later. Regardless of the hospital development it is likely that Metford Road would not require upgrading prior to 2029. The Hunter and Central Coast Development Corporation (HCCDC) has established the East Maitland Catalyst Area Steering Group. This Steering Group has been established to support the work of Maitland City Council and key NSW Government agencies in achieving the vision and outcomes of the East Maitland Catalyst Area in accordance with the Hunter Regional Plan 2036 and Greater Newcastle Metropolitan Plan 2036. The Steering Group will be convened by the end of September 2019 and includes representatives from; - Maitland City Council - Department of Planning, Industry and Environment - Transport for NSW (including former RMS) - Health Infrastructure

Item	Issue	Response
		The Catalyst Area program will identify the need to plan for, fund and deliver the infrastructure (including Metford Rd) needed to support growth of new homes and jobs in the area.
34	**b. Sufficient Access and Car Parking** **Access Strategy** The Access Strategy for the NMH should consider emergency service access on the broader road network for peak traffic congestion and peak flood events, including consideration of Fieldsend Street and Chelmsford Drive/Ferraby Drive during these times. The acceptable level of service (LOS) should be considered in the context of type of development and emergency services accessing this development. Consideration should be given to the locations of the nearest ambulance stations, and where ambulances are travelling from within the region. Consultation should occur with ambulance stations in the region, as well as other emergency services.	Assessments have previously been prepared for emergency routes based on various flood events, including any closure of Metford Road rail underpass 100-year flood event and Raymond Terrace Road closure and Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) event. Access would be via Metford Road from either Chelmsford, Fieldsend or Raymond Terrace depending on ambulance locations. There are four ambulance stations within 18 kilometres of the site. Flood mapping in the Hunter River Floodplain Risk Management Study and Plan (FRMSP) for PMF flood event indicates that Raymond Terrace Road near Metford Road would be closed however vehicles could be diverted to access the site from New England Highway. The flood mapping provided in the FRMSP suggests that the section of the New England Highway north of Melbourne Street and towards Maitland will also be subject to flooding in the 100 -year flood event. Contrary to the above, the Flood Safe Guide, included in the FRMSP, identifies the New England Highway between Maitland and East Maitland as a flood evacuation route. On this basis, GTA has assumed that the New England Highway will remain open as an approach route to the Maitland Hospital site in the 100-year and PMF flood events. On the basis of the above, all ambulances could access the site from their respective stations during a PMF event. Notwithstanding, Ambulances approaching the site from the south along New England Highway during peak road network conditions would be diverted to travel via Anderson Drive or Weakleys Drive and will use Raymond Terrace Road to approach the site. SIDRA modelling indicates the south east leg of the Metford Road/ Raymond Terrace intersection is expected to operate well and with space capacity in the 2032 growth scenario, with development, with a left turn delay of 14 and 7 seconds respectively in the AM and PM peak hour (level of service A). Ambulances approaching the site from the north along New England Highway during peak road network conditions would be diverted to travel via Melbourne Street or Victoria Street, and will use Fieldsend Street to approach the hospital. SIDRA modelling indicates the north west leg of the Metford Road/ Fieldsend Street intersection is expected to operate well and with space capacity in the 2032 growth scenario, with development, with an overall delay of 14 and 18 seconds respectively in the AM and PM peak hour (level of service A and B).
35	**Car Parking Provision** Section 4.1 of the GTA report states that 682 car parking spaces (including 14 accessible parking spaces and 12 motorcycle spaces) will be provided on-site in the opening year (2021 /22). The 682 on-site parking spaces will include 515 staff parking spaces and 167 public/visitor spaces. In addition, the proponent is committed to delivering an additional 140 on-site car parking spaces to accommodate demand to the 1O year horizon (2031 /32), bringing the total on-site provision to 822 spaces. Council notes that almost the entire northern carpark is proposed to be located on Part Lot 401 DP 755237, which is in separate ownership to the main NMH site, (Lot 7314 DP1 162607). Lot 401 DP 755237 is Crown Land with a perpetual lease held by Monier PGH Holdings Limited. The northern carpark is proposed to accommodate the	The required parking spaces as set out in the Transport Impact Assessment at **Appendix E** and will be accommodated on the site including Part Lot 401.

Item	Issue	Response
	majority of on-site car parking for the NMH development (i.e. all 515 staff car parking spaces, as well as 78 visitor spaces, 2 accessible spaces and 8 motorcycle spaces). Accordingly, HI should be required to take the necessary action to acquire Part Lot 401 DP 755237 and consolidate the lot with the main NMH site, prior to construction works commencing.	
36	Further, Council notes that there is no mention of paid parking. This remains a concern for Council, as the introduction of any paid off-street parking scheme may increase demand for on-street parking in the locality, particularly around Fieldsend Oval. This could become a significant issue, particularly on weekends when the playing fields are in full use. Council also requests that the proponent be required to indicate the proposed location of "long-stay" and "short-stay" parking areas on the development plans.	The Hospital will provide paid parking. The availability and turnover of car parking is a key consideration for hospitals. The equitable availability of parking is also an important consideration for the proposed development. The proposed parking scheme for Maitland Hospital includes the implementation of paid parking, in accordance with *NSW Government policy (Hospital Car Parking Fees Policy PD2013_031*), which includes the NSW Government's Guiding Principles for pricing for hospital car parks. Pricing for car parking incorporates the following guiding principles: • Support a sustainable model for the procurement, funding and operation of new hospital car parks. • Support equitable, transparent and sustainable accessibility to health campuses for all users including patients, visitors and staff, including those with special needs. • Recognise that the parking needs of many patients and visitors need to be met on-site. • Ensure economic viability towards the development of new car park infrastructure. • Improve traffic management around health campuses. • Ensure the fees policy complements the Government's State Plan to encourage greater public transport usage, particularly increasing the proportion of total journeys to work by public. The proposed design provides the flexibility for allocation of staff / visitor car park parking "long-stay" and "short-stay' parking in any configuration to meet demand. This would be managed through signage and boom gate controls. We note that paid parking on weekends will be available for those attending the playing fields on the weekend, providing a convenient parking option, if required.
37	**Access grades** All internal paths from the hospital building to transport facilities should have accessible grades.	A review of the accessibility requirements of the BCA has been undertaken by Group DLA at **Appendix T** of the EIS. The assessment found the proposed design can achieve compliance with the statutory accessibility legislation. This will be achieved through a combination of compliance with the deemed to satisfy (DTS) provisions and the Performance Requirements of the BCA.
	c. Details to Promote Non-Car Travel Modes **Future Bus Stops/Services** Council supports Hunter Valley Buses request for the inclusion of a 3.5m layby on the northern side of the hospitals main entrance. This could become a productive area for staging buses, community transport, ride sharing or taxis. A bus bay capable of accommodating two (2) buses should be provided on the southern side of the building, as it possible that two (2) buses may arrive within the hospital grounds at the same time.	The project team met with representatives of TfNSW on 3 April 2019 and Hunter Valley buses in October 2018. TfNSW advised they had commenced bus network planning to provide direct connections from NMH to Victoria St Station and GreenHills shopping centre in both directions. The design has been amended to allow for two bus bays.

Item	Issue	Response
	The bus and train service frequencies reported in Table 2.8 of GTA report are currently not integrated and are relatively low in frequency. However, there are no recommendations in the GTA report for bus service wait-times or frequencies for t he NMH and no indication of the need for integrating train/bus service times. It is suggested that further investigations should be required into higher service frequencies (specified where possible) and integration of bus/train services.	
38	**Taxis** It is unclear from Section 5.2.1 of the GTA of the report as to the location of the actual taxi stand internal to the NMH site. In any case, it may be beneficial to separate taxi bays from the bus bays, if there is insufficient length on one side of the internal access road for both taxis and buses.	Drop off and taxi pick up is proposed on the western façade of the NMH, adjacent to the main Hospital entry. This is separate to the bus bays, which are on the northern side.
39	**Sustainable Transport** Council notes in Section 8.3 of the GTA report that a Green Travel Plan has been prepared, to identify opportunities to provide staff with incentives to consider alternative modes of travel to and from work. Council supports this approach.	Noted.
40	**d. Cumulative Traffic impacts in Particular Stockland Green Hills Shopping Centre Development and Undertaking Additional Analysis of the Highway Inclusive of New England Highway/Chelmsford Drive Intersection** *Metford Road/Chelmsford Drive Roundabout Intersection* Council has identified higher traffic volumes through the Metford Road/Chelmsford Drive roundabout intersection than the volumes included in the GTA report. Vehicle Tum Movements (on Approach Legs of Intersection): Council surveyed the Metford Road/Chelmsford Drive roundabout intersection on 16 May 2019 (to account for completion of the Stockland Green Hills redevelopment). The vehicle turn movements on approach to the intersection during the period 4:45pm to 5:45pm were as follows: • Chelmsford Drive - NW leg (Metford Rd to highway): Left 683, Through 388, U turn 55 • Metford Road - NE leg: Left 143, Right 588, U-turn 1 • Chelmsford Drive - SE leg (residential area): Through 295, Right 152, U-turn 3 The vehicle turn movements on approach to the intersection, provided in Figure 2.7 of the GTA report, however, are as follows: • Chelmsford Drive - NW leg (Metford Rd to highway): Left 585, Through 50, Uturn 0 • Metford Road - NE leg: Left 142, Right 467, U-turn 0 • Chelmsford Drive - SE leg (residential area): Through 293, Right 110, U-turn 0 The increases in vehicle movements from 2017 to 2019 are therefore as follows:	GTA has reviewed the recent traffic surveys undertaken by MCC and acknowledge that the traffic volumes do vary from data previously collated and projections from the RMS strategic model. Traffic volumes for Metford Road / Chelmsford Drive intersection are predominately less than those analysed in the AM peak and more in the PM peak. Updated analysis of the intersection Metford Road/Chelmsford Drive Roundabout Intersection performance is provided at **Appendix E**. The analysis indicates that with the recommended improvements to the Chelmsford Road/Metford Road roundabout, the proposed NMH would have an acceptable impact on the capacity of the surrounding road network.

Item	Issue	Response
	• Chelmsford Drive - NW leg (Metford Rd to highway): Left +98, Through +338, Uturn +55 • Metford Road - NE leg: Left +1, Right +121, U-turn +1 • Chelmsford Drive - SE leg (resident ial area): Through +2, Right +42, U-turn +3 The increases of particular note are for the vehicle movements on the Chelmsford Drive - NW leg (highway to Metford Rd), specifically, Left +98, Through +338, U-turn +55. The above comparison is over the same peak traffic period for Metford Road/Chelmsford Drive intersection as Council understands to be reported for the intersection in Table 2.4 of the GTA report.	
41	*Approach & Exit Flows (on Each Leg of Intersection):* For the same peak traffic period, Council found the 2-way flows to be as follows: • Chelmsford Drive - NW leg (Metford Rd to highway): Approach 1126, Exit 938, Two-way 2064 • Metford Road - NE leg: Approach 732, Exit 836, Two-way 1568 • Chelmsford Drive - SE leg (residential area): Approach 450, Exit 534, Two-way 984 Council's traffic volume data (surveyed May 2019) is significantly higher than the traffic volumes derived from Table 2.4 of the GTA report, as follows: • Chelmsford Drive - NW leg (Metford Rd to highway): Approach 636, Exit 761, Two-way 1397 • Metford Road - NE leg: Approach 61 0, Exit 696, Two-way 1306 • Chelmsford Drive - SE leg (residential area): Approach 404, Exit 193, Two-way 597	GTA has reviewed the recent traffic surveys undertaken by MCC and acknowledge that the traffic volumes do vary from data previously collated and projections from the RMS strategic model. Traffic volumes for Metford Road / Chelmsford Drive intersection are predominately less than those analysed in the AM peak and more in the PM peak. Updated analysis of the intersection Metford Road/Chelmsford Drive Roundabout Intersection performance is provided at Appendix XE The analysis indicates that with the recommended improvements to the Chelmsford Road/Metford Road roundabout, the proposed NMH would have an acceptable impact on the capacity of the surrounding road network.
42	*Chelmsford Drive/New England Highway Signalised Intersection* The GTA report details the traffic volumes for the Chelmsford Drive/New England Highway signalised intersection for the peak period determined relevant for the highway, that is 3:30pm to 4:30pm (presumably for travel time on the highway). However, consideration is also required for the traffic impact associated with the traffic flows on the Chelmsford Drive approach for the 4:45pm to 5:45pm period, to determine the level of service (LOS) and to ensure suitable infrastructure is provided to manage delays and queue lengths. The Chelmsford Drive approach traffic flows to the highway can be determined from the exit traffic flows from the Metford Road/Chelmsford Drive roundabout intersection, specifically, the Chelmsford Drive - NW leg (Metford Rd to highway), which are 938 vehicles per hour during the 4:45pm to 5:45pm period.	The peak period has been modelled based on the surveyed peak period. As the modelling was undertaken in two separate stages (1 – Metford Road Corridor) and (2. New England Highway) the current survey data for both intersections have been undertaken at different times and therefore would not correlate. However, as the peak on Chelmsford Drive approach is different to the peak on the NEH during the Chelmsford Drive peak there would likely be less vehicles on the NEH and therefore more green time may be allocated to Chelmsford Drive during this time.
43	*Metford Road/ Fieldsend Street Roundabout Intersection* The LOS and delays should be determined for the primary access (Metford Road/Fieldsend Street roundabout intersection) to the NMH site, particularly with regard to the northeast-bound traffic on Metford Road in the peak PM period, which is required to give way to traffic exiting from the NMH (and U-turns at the primary access	As per Figure 6.1 in the transport report all 454 vehicles are included. Those exiting from the secondary access are included in the roundabout modelling. As discussed in the Roads and Maritimes Guide to traffic generating developments (The Guide), the EVT corresponds to the commuter peak hour i.e. the peak hour experienced on the external road network,

Item	Issue	Response
	resulting from traffic exiting the secondary access). It is noted that the traffic generation from the NMH site is 454 vehicles/peak hour as listed in Table 6.1 of GTA report. However, the out/in traffic flow (derived) is 160/121, as shown in Figure 6.1 of GTA report, that is, a traffic generation of 281 vehicles/hour. It is unclear then the number of vehicle trips exiting from the primary access of NMH (at 454 vehicles/peak hour) travelling through to Fieldsend Street, right turns to Raymond Terrace Road and also, U-turns resulting from the secondary access to Raymond Terrace Road. It is noted in Section 6.3 of the GTA report regarding Metford Road/Fieldsend Street roundabout U-turns that" ... 50 per cent of staff exit from the secondary site access ... " and " ... all northbound vehicles would turn around at the Metford Road! Fieldsend Street roundabout' and that " ... 50 per cent of visitors (all visitors from the northern car park) exit from the secondary site access .... ". These vehicle turn movements should be considered in the assessment of levels of service at the primary access. It is also noted in Section 6.1.1 of the GTA report with regards to traffic generation that " ... the EVT has been utilised as the design traffic generation rate to overlap with the network peak." That is, the Evening Vehicle Trips (EVT) as listed in Table 6.1 of the GTA report overlap with the intersection traffic for the Peak Hours listed in Table 2.4 of the GTA report. However, in some cases, consideration should be given to the matching Peak Hours (when overlapping NMH development traffic), especially Metford Road/Chelmsford Drive roundabout intersection and Chelmsford Drive/New England Highway signalised intersection (4:45pm to 5:45pm for both intersections) to determine the actual development impact on the traffic network.	identified as 4:30pm to 5:30pm in Table 2.4. Furthermore, The Guide states the PVT is typically experienced between 3:00pm to 4:00pm during shift changeover time. Considering neither Metford Road nor New England Highway experience peak traffic flow during this time, it is considered unnecessary to model this scenario. The PVT results in the hospital generating an additional 54 trips over the hour when compared to the EVT. Notwithstanding the above, as part of the detailed design stage of the Metford Road / Chelmsford Drive roundabout it is proposed to model updated traffic volumes. This will be undertaken as part of a separate REF as agreed with Maitland City Council. As part of a sensitivity scenario, the PVT is proposed to also be modelled.
44	**e. Scope and Timing of Road and Intersection Upgrades** As previously stated, the surrounding road network should be reviewed for traffic volumes surveyed since the completion of the Stockland Green Hills redevelopment and background traffic growth sensitivity to determine: • the scope and timing of Chelmsford Drive/ Metford Road roundabout upgrade (NB: it is acknowledged that HI have committed to completing the upgrade of the Metford Road/Chelmsford Drive roundabout prior to the hospital becoming operational); • the scope and timing of Metford Road corridor planning and Metford Road widening to four (4) lanes; • the performance of Fieldsend Street/ Metford Road roundabout for 454 vehicles/peak hour t rips including U-turns from the secondary access; • the scope and timi ng of a shared path on the east side of Metford Road (with lighting) to provide connectivity with other paths to Green Hills precinct and to existing shared path on Fieldsend Street.	As stated above, all 454 vehicle trips, including u-turns, have been including in the traffic modelling for the Metford Road/ Fieldsend Street roundabout. As such, no updated modelling is required. As stated in response to (b) above, GTA has completed further investigation around the future performance of Metford Road, with the results being provided at **Appendix E**. In summary, Metford Road would reach a volume/capacity ratio of 0.9 (Level of Service E) in 2024 with the hospital development in the PM peak however that the traffic assessment assumes all traffic associated with the completed hospital development occurs from the year of opening (2022) however in reality this is not going to occurgiven the planned transition of existing services and establishment of new services by the Hunter New England Local Heath District. Therefore, the year in which Metford Road reaches capacity would also be later. Regardless of the hospital development it is likely that Metford Road would require upgrading prior to 2029. The Hunter and Central Coast Development Corporation (HCCDC) has established the East Maitland Catalyst Area Steering Group. This Steering Group has been established to support the work of Maitland City Council and key NSW Government agencies in achieving the vision and outcomes of the

Item	Issue	Response
	Council understands that Health Infrastructure will be making a separate application under Part 5 of the EP&A Act for road and intersection infrastructure upgrades. However, the scope and timing of these upgrades should be determined in the Stage 2 Traffic Impact Assessment report.	East Maitland Catalyst Area in accordance with the Hunter Regional Plan 2036 and Greater Newcastle Metropolitan Plan 2036. The Catalyst Area program will identify the need to plan for, fund and deliver the infrastructure (including Metford Rd) needed to support growth of new homes and jobs in the area. This primarily includes the upgrade to Metford Road. Health Infrastructure will be making a separate application under Part 5 of the EP&A Act for the upgrade of Chelmsford / Metford Road roundabout and shared path connection and is committed to completing these upgrades prior to the hospital becoming operational. The detailed design of these upgrades (including assessment of lighting requirements) will be done in consultation with MCC
45	**f. Pedestrian Access Plan** **Pedestrians/Cyclists** Section 5.2 of the GTA report states that " ... Metford Road upgrades included the construction of a pedestrian path on the north-western side of Metford Road between Fieldsend Street and the Council depot ... " This footpath has been built to support connectivity from Fieldsend Oval to new off-street parking available at Council's depot site for weekend sport, to compensate for the loss of on-street parking on Metford Road as a result of the NMH Stage 1 Enabling Works, including the new roundabout at Metford Rd/Fieldsend St plus No Stopping on Metford Rd. It is important that connectivity is provided for pedestrians/cyclist "off-road" along the Metford Road corridor from the NMH site to the Green Hills precinct. Council requests that a Shared Path be constructed on the east side of Metford Road, along the frontage of the NMH site, to provide connectivity from the pedestrian crossings at the Metford Rd/Fieldsend St roundabout to the existing shared paths on Chelmsford Drive, which in turn provide linkages to the Green Hills precinct. Section 5.5.10 of the EIS states that " it is noted that Health Infrastructure will be making a separate application under Part 5 of the EP&A Act for the installation of a footpath on Metford Road that will connect the NMH site with the existing footpath at the Chelmsford Drive roundabout." A shared path is required, not a footpath, to ensure pedestrians/cyclists are separated from vehicular traffic. It is noted that in Section 7.5 of the GTA report, consideration has been given to traffic management around the helipad on the NMH site.	A shared path on the east side of Metford Road is committed ahead of hospital opening and the detailed design will be done in consultation with MCC and will be subject to a separate REF under Part 5 of the EP&A Act as agreed with Maitland City Council. Helipad traffic management is no longer relevant as the Helipad has been relocated to the roof.
46	**g. Businesses Fronting Metford Road, Between Fieldsend Street and Chelmsford Drive** The impact on businesses fronting Metford Road, between Fieldsend Street and Chelmsford Drive, was raised previously in Council's letter dated 24 July 2018 in relation to SSI 9022 - New Maitland Hospital (Concept Proposal and Stage 1). However, this item has not been addressed in the Stage 2 Transport Impact Assessment report.	As traffic volumes increase on Metford Road it will become more difficult for businesses fronting Metford Road to undertake right turn movements. With the construction of the new roundabout at Fieldsend Road and with the proposed upgrade to Chelmsford Drive / Metford Road, these businesses will have the option to undertake left in/out manoeuvres and then use the roundabouts either end to undertake a u-turn as required.

Item	Issue	Response
47	**Recommended conditions of approval** Council understands that Health Infrastructure will be making a separate application under Part 5 of the EP&A Act for road and intersection infrastructure upgrades. However, Council requests that a condition of consent be included on any project approval issued by the Minister requiring the completion of following infrastructure prior to the hospital becoming operational. • Chelmsford Drive/ Metford Road roundabout upgrade; • Any identified upgrades to Fieldsend Street/Metford Road roundabout to cater for 454 vehicle/peak hour trips, including U-turns from the secondary access; • Provision of a shared path on the eastern side of Metford Road (with appropriate lighting) linking up with other existing paths, including the existing shared path on Fieldsend Street, to provide pedestrian/cyclist connectivity between the NMH site and the Green Hills precinct; and • Traffic management conditions around the helipad (Source: s7.5 GTA report). Council also requests that a condition of consent be included requiring the ongoing monitoring and submission of a Parking Demand Study addressing the demand and timing for the provision of an additional 140 on-site car parking spaces, to satisfy the NMH peak parking demand to the 10 year horizon (2031 /2032). In addition, Council requests that a condition of consent be included requiring the proponent to determine the long-term traffic impacts on Metford Road, reviewing the levels of service (LOS) and identifying the trigger points to determine when road infrastructure upgrades (e.g. road widening) are required. Note: A higher level of service (LOS) is expected for this State Significant development than what Council could reasonably deliver. The road upgrades should be delivered at a time to meet their level of service requirements. Council has no plans/funds at this stage to upgrade Metford Road to four (4) lanes.	Response provided in item (e) and (f) above. It is further noted that a review of parking demand is proposed to be undertaken within three years of opening to verify the parking demand as outlined at Section 5.5.3 of the EIS.
48	**2. Contamination** Information contained in the EIS in relation to survey is limited to: • a site audit statement for Lot 7314 DP 1162607 (having an area of approximately 17 hectares) certifying that the site can be made suitable for the proposed use, if the site is remediated/managed in accordance with the RAP/CMP prepared by GHD Pty Ltd on 4 July 2016, to address the SEARs for Stage 1; and • a scope and methodology proposal for a detailed site investigation over Part Lot 401 DP 755237 (having an area of approximately 2 hectares) to address the SEARs for Stage 2. GHD previously carried out a detailed environment al site (contamination) assessment and remedial action plan (RAP) for Lot 7314 DP 1162607 only, to address the Stage 1 SEARs, based on the understanding that Part Lot 401 would be used by CSR for storage of contaminated material found during the development of Lot 7314 and that no development/remediation/construction works associated with the NMH would be undertaken within Part Lot 401. However, as part of the Stage 2 works, HI now	In accordance with Clause 5.22(2) of the EP&A Act environmental planning instruments, including State Environmental Planning Policy 55 (SEPP 55) do not apply in respect of SSI. Notwithstanding, HI has undertaken an assessment of contamination that is consistent with the objectives of the SEPP 55. Additional information for Part Lot 401 has been prepared by GHD and JBS&G and is included in the updated Contamination Plan at **Appendix E.** It now includes; • Site Investigation Report • Remediation Action Plan • Interim Site Audit advice Health Infrastructure will undertake further site investigations as set out in the RAP prior to the commencement of site preparation works on Part Lot 401 as requested in the EPA submission ahead of preparing a Site Audit Statement and Site Audit Report by the Site Auditor (JBS&G).

Item	Issue	Response
	proposes to construct a carpark on Part Lot 401, which will likely require excavation and/or movement of existing stockpiled materials. Accordingly, in order to demonstrate that the site is (or can be made) suitable for the proposed use in accordance with SEPP 55, a detailed site investigation of Lot 401 will be required. In this regard, Council submits that the information submitted with the Stage 2 EIS in relation to contamination is inadequate. A detailed site investigation of Part Lot 401 should be carried out to assess and quantify any soil and groundwater contamination and demonstrate that the site is suitable for the proposed use in accordance with SEPP 55. The report should be submitted to OPIE and form part of the SSI application, to be properly assessed prior to any approval being granted.	We note that GHD have also confirmed that no materials have been relocated or stockpiled on Part Lot 401 as part of the Stage 1 works.
49	**3. Water Cycle Management** The Civil Infrastructure Report prepared by Taylor Thomson Whitting (Appendix M) refers to Council's DCP and Manual of Engineering Standards (MOES), which detail the requirements for the control, treatment and discharge of stormwater from development sites, including the requirement to consider upstream and downstream catchments in their ultimate developed state to achieve a total system which doesn't adversely affect existing systems or properties within the flow path and catchment. Council submits that in order to adequately address the above requirements, the report should properly consider the discharge impacts at the Metford Road culvert. The report states that the site is at the high point of the catchment and therefore no impact is created. However, there is an equal sized catchment of residential land to the south, which discharges through the same Metford Road culvert (see sketch below). The report should demonstrate that peak discharges for the 1, 10 and 100 year ARI storm events are not increased beyond that of the pre-development environment.	A further civil statement is provided at **Appendix O** further clarifying that peak discharges for the 1, 10- and 100-year ARI storm events are not increased beyond that of the pre-development environment.

Item	Issue	Response
50	**4. Noise and Vibration** Noise and vibration impacts are considered in Section 5.6 of the EIS and in the Noise and Vibration Assessment report prepared by Acoustic Logic in April 2019 and included as Appendix L. **General** Council submits that the Noise and Vibration Assessment prepared by Acoustic Logic (Appendix L) does not provide sufficient detail to adequately address the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) for Stage 2. In particular, the report does not include any details of attended/unattended noise monitoring undertaken, or quantitative data col lected during the surveys. Further, there does not appear to be any evidence of acoustic modelling (e.g. noise contour maps). The report appears to rely solely on the survey/modelling work done previously by Wood and Grieves Engineers for Stage 1 of the project. Without this detailed information, it is not possible to accurately determine the nature and frequency of potential noise and vibration impacts on surrounding occupiers of land. Further, a cumulative noise impact assessment for the entire development does not appear to have been undertaken.	**General** Both long term unattended noise logging and attended noise measurements were conducted to quantify the existing acoustic environmental and have been presented in the Noise & Vibration Impact Assessment for Stage 1 prepared by Wood & Grieves, dated 8 May 2018. The location of the monitors and measurements are outlined in Figure 1 of the Acoustic Logic Report at Appendix L of the EIS. The resulting long-term noise logging data is identified at Table 1 of Appendix L, establishing background noise levels to allow an assessment of the projects consistency with construction and operational noise criteria. The detailed background noise presentation is contained in Wood & Grieves Report (Project-No. 32489-1, dated: 08/05/18) Acoustic Report prepared for Stage 1. It is suitable to use the previous acoustic monitoring information as the site and acoustic conditions remain unchanged for the purpose of acoustic modelling between Stage 1 and Stage 2. Cumulative noise is addressed further below.
51	**Construction Noise** The EIS refers to a minor exceedance of the 65dB(A) Noise management level. However, the residential noise affected management level is 52 dB(A) and 47 dB(A) outside normal work hours (they have requested an extension to these hours to enable the hospital to be built in the quickest possible time). The community should be consulted in this regard.	**Construction Noise** The community will be consulted as part of the exhibition of the EIS. We note the feedback from NSW EPA regarding construction hours at Item 69 below.
52	**Helicopter/Ambulance** Very limited information is provided in relation to the potential noise impacts on adjoining residential areas from helicopter and/or emergency vehicle movements. No helicopter flight path has been provided - it is suggested that this will be identified when a contractor is engaged. Noise impacts from helicopter and ambulance movements on surrounding residential areas are considered to be of crucial importance and should be adequately addressed.	The relevant guidelines for noise emissions resulting from helicopter and emergency vehicles are identified in the Acoustic Logic Report at Appendix L of the EIS. The design has been updated to include a rooftop helipad in lieu of the on-grade helipad. The proposed helicopter flight path is described in the updated Aviation Report at **Appendix K**. A further assessment of the noise impacts associated with emergency helicopter movements is provided at **Appendix L.** See extract below; *"A worst-case helicopter movement is predicted to not exceed 85dB Lmax at the nearest residential receivers. Which is both 10dbless than the Air Services Australia noise guideline of 95dB(A) Lmax, and no higher than what was nominated in the original SSI2 report."*
53	Further, there does not appear to have been any consideration of the impact of the Model aircraft field on Raymond Terrace Road on the proposed helicopter flight path.	The updated Aviation Report at **Appendix X** outlines that the approach and departure paths have been considered to reduce confliction with model aircraft flights at the Don Macindoe Memorial Flying Field. It also outlines that operational procedures are to be agreed and documented between the club and helicopter operators as part of the commissioning of the Helicopter Landing Site (HLS).

Item	Issue	Response
54	**Mechanical Plant Equipment** Potential noise and vibration impacts of future mechanical plant have not been considered, as t he amount/type of plant equipment to be installed has not yet been decided upon. The report states that "it is not possible to carry out a detailed examination of the ameliorative measures that may be required to achieve the noise targets." However, the Minister's approval for Stage 1 of the project includes the following requirement: "Condition 85. - Part B Requirements for Future Stages - The SS/ application for the detailed design and construction of the NMH must be accompanied by a detailed noise and vibration impact assessment prepared by a suitably qualified person, which details the main construction and operational noise and vibration sources and activities, including future mechanical plant. Details are also to be included outlining all feasible and reasonable noise and vibration mitigation and management measures".	**Mechanical Equipment** An assessment of operational noise has been undertaken by Acoustic Logic at Appendix L of the EIS and at Section 5.6.2 of the EIS. The main operational noise sources associated with the development are expected to be: • Air handling units located on Level B1; • Cooling towers located on the southern end of the building; • Emergency generators located on the north-eastern side of the site; and • Supply / exhaust fans located within the Level B1 plant room or rooftop plant areas. The assessment confirms that while some of the mechanical plant equipment may emit high noise levels and require acoustic treatments such as silencers, internally lined ductwork and lightweight cladding, the requirement for these amelioration measures will be considered once the specific plant equipment is determined. Other minor plant items such as bathroom and kitchen exhaust fans may also be required. These items typically emit relatively low noise levels and may require standard acoustic treatments. The assessment confirms that subject to the determination of specific mechanical plant, the noise emitted from the equipment is capable of complying with the NSW EPA noise policy requirements subject to the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures (refer **Appendix L** of the EIS). **Cumulative Noise Impact** HI propose the following condition to address cumulative noise impact: *Acoustic assessment of building services equipment should be undertaken during the detailed design phase of the development to ensure that the cumulative noise of all equipment does not exceed the applicable noise criteria.*
55	**5. Biodiversity** The BOAR prepared by Sclerophyll Flora Surveys and Research Pty Ltd for Stage 2 (Appendix J2) re lies on fauna data collected during Spring and Summer of 2014. The report suggests that this is acceptable given investigations fall within the 5 year prescribed timeframe. However, the required methodology was different in 2014 to what is required now under the new biodiversity legislation. It should be demonstrated how this work meets the current methodology requirements and why back-up sampling of fauna was not undertaken at the same time as the more recent flora survey. This is pa rticularly important as the data is nearly over the prescribed 5 year timeframe.	The BDAR at **Appendix F** has been updated to include an additional table in the Stage 2 BDAR listing all BAM-C Candidate species with details on survey methods and survey timing and demonstrating consistency with the Office of Environment and Heritage threatened species survey guidelines, with survey details extracted from the 2014 General Flora and Fauna report. The Biodiversity Conservation Act came into force on 25 August 2017. The NMH Biodiversity Assessment prepared for the Stage 1 SSI 9022 was substantially commenced prior to 25 August 2017 and has been prepared under the previous legislation as this was applicable at the time that surveys, and the majority of the assessment was undertaken. We note that Clause 32 of the *Biodiversity Conservation (Savings and Transitional) Regulation 2017* applies to the NMH project. The projects consistency with Clause 32 is set out at Table X below.

Review of consistency with Clause 32

Provision	Comment
Clause 32 - Data collected for BAM assessments before the commencement of the new Act	
(1) For the purposes of Part 7 of the new Act, the use of data collected before the commencement of the new Act is taken to be collected in accordance with the Biodiversity Assessment Method if:	The Biodiversity Conservation Act came into force on 25 August 2017. The NMH Biodiversity Assessment prepared for the Stage 1 SSI 9022 was substantially commenced prior to 25 August 2017.
(a) the data was collected in a manner that is substantially consistent with the Biodiversity Assessment Method, and	The survey data was collected by General (2014) in a manner that is consistent with the current Biodiversity Assessment Method (BAM) (BAM requires targeted surveys for candidate species considered as possible occurrences on the subject site in accordance with relevant survey guidelines). The targeted Threatened fauna surveys undertaken by General (2014) were in accordance with DEC (2004) which were the current guidelines at the time and are substantially consistent with more current fauna guidelines (eg. 2009 amphibian guidelines). The targeted Threatened flora surveys undertaken by General (2014) were in accordance with Cropper (1993) which were the current guidelines at the time and again are substantially consistent with the more current 2016 plant guidelines (eg. parallel line transects). General (2014) presented locations of Threatened flora and fauna survey sites (refer Figures 4 and 5) of the Stage 1 Biodiversity Assessment Report.
(b) the data was collected by an accredited person.	The data was collected by an accredited person as defined and identified below.
(2) An accredited person is:	N/A
(a) a person who was accredited under section 142B of the Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995 when the data concerned was collected, or *(b) a person who is accredited under section 6.10 of the new Act.*	Greg Little from General (2014) is a BAM accredited assessor under Section 6.10 of the new Act.

Item	Issue	Response
		The OEH Biodiversity Assessment Method Operational Manual Stage 1 outlines that *… field surveys (including targeted surveys for 'species credits species') less than five years old can be used in place of onsite survey*. The EIS was lodged on 21 June 2019 which is within 5 years of the completion of the October – December 2014 field surveys undertaken by General Flora and Fauna. The OEH has also undertaken its assessment within the 5 year period. The data collected as part of the Flora and Fauna assessment for Stage 1 SSI (9022) and in accordance with Clause 32 of the *Biodiversity Conservation (Savings and Transitional) Regulation 2017* and is accordingly appropriate for use as part of the NMH Stage 2 project.
56	Further, it is not clear from the plans provided whether the extent of clearing calcu lations include all areas of impact, such as asset protection zones, fire trails, walking pat hs, noise fences, removal of trees for helicopter access etc. The BDAR should consider all vegetation removal. The report does not provide any detailed discussion on avoidance or mitigation of impacts, which is necessary to establish whether vegetation removal is actually necessary. The report states that details of mitigation measures will be included in a Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP) to be incorporated in the project Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which, it is assumed, will be submitted prior to commencement of construction. Council submits that this information should be provided up-front, as part of the application, to be assessed prior to any approval being granted.	The BDAR includes all the vegetation removal associated with all areas of impact of the proposal including footpaths, road batters and services reticulation. A development overlay is shown in Figure 2 of the BDAR at **Appendix F**. The BDAR has also been updated to clarify the avoidance measures employed by the project and the mitigation measures which will be utilised and documented in the CEMP. It is noted that trees identified for removal are identified in the Arborist Report which has also been updated to show the development overlay including APZ to identify the area of impact. This report also includes further mitigation measures to be utilised during vegetation clearing (refer to **Appendix F**).
57	**6. Landscaping** There is reference in section 3.6 of the EIS to making an existing chitter pile on the site into a landscaping feature by revegetating it with grass and native tree planting. However, given the issues with spontaneous combustion and the fact that the chitter is essentially a contaminant, Council submits that this is inappropriate and the chitter pile should just be removed from the site.	Works to the chitter pile will be undertaken in accordance with the Stage 1 SSI approval including the remediation action plan and long- term site management plan.
58	**7. Industrial Heritage** In December 2018, Council was asked to provide input into the SEARS for Stage 2 of the New Maitland Hospital. At Council's request the SEARs were amended to include the following requirement: "Detail how the design and construction of the hospital will incorporate heritage interpretation utilizing material and fabric savaged from the demolition of the former Brick Press Building associated with the former CSRIPGH Brickworks." Sections 3.8 and 5.16 of the EIS state that "the former Brick Press Building is located on Part Lot 401, outside of the SS/ site boundary of the NMH. These items will not be used as part of the NMH, however, these items are expected to form part of and be	The detailed design of the new Maitland Hospital recognises the importance of heritage interpretation, which has been a focus of the project team by obtaining community input and honouring the cultural and industrial history in the detailed design philosophy. This is demonstrated in Health Infrastructure's continued commitment under an established Memorandum of Understanding with both Maitland City Council and HNELHD to ensure place-based planning principles underpin the design approach at New Maitland Hospital. The project team are interfacing heritage across 3 interconnected layers: 1. **Partnership with Maitland City Council: 'Collected Memory Project'** – transferring memory from existing hospital to the new, celebrating the city's heritage and Gallery's Arts in Health programs for recurrent programming beyond the life of construction. Local historians, Dr Janis Wilton OAM and Joe Eisenberg OAM, have been engaged to review histories related to the existing and new hospital

Item	Issue	Response
	incorporated into the redevelopment of the other Metford Triangle land, where they were historically located." To date no application has been received for any other development on Lot 401. It is not considered appropriate for the SEAR's for the project to be ignored and the significant industrial heritage of the site overlooked. Accordingly, Council requests that further det ai led consideration be given to the retrieval and re-use of the salvaged heritage items and their incorporation into the redevelopment of the NMH site, as part of the Stage 2 SSI application. This could be in some form of heritage interpretation, either within the internal public spaces or external landscaped areas.	sites for reinterpretation in the new hospital building, from which the industrial heritage was identified. Maitland City Council supported the resulting report and forward approach in their August 2019 Council Meeting. The next stage focuses on community engagement to develop opportunities for related stories to be told/displayed in various forms across the new hospital. The project team look forward to engaging with Council's Heritage Advisor and the local community throughout this next stage to add value to staff and patient experience at the new hospital. 2. **Façade design**: Inspired by place both Indigenous and post-colonial, using bricks as a façade fabric was deliberately intended to reflect the heritage of the brick works. A Wonnarua artist and designer has been commissioned with the support of Mindaribba LALC to support the architectural design of the arbour including brickette materiality fronting the main entrance, and vehicle set down zones. 3. **Landscape design**: after prioritising clinical care spaces, there are opportunities to consider heritage interpretation over the longer term as part of the external grounds inclusive of Indigenous, industrial, social and other. For example, the open grassed area in front of the new hospital provides an open space / environment for story telling/lunch time performances, with internal accessible courtyards on Level 1 and 2 affording areas that independent community projects, and over the longer term, can further support dynamic heritage interpretations with a charitable focus for increased levels of engagement and ownership. In response to the SEARS, Section 3.8 and 5.16 confirmed that the former Brick Press Building is located on Lot 401, outside of the SSI site boundary of the NMH. It is not necessary to physically use the former brickwork material within NMH to interpret its history. We note that the broader Metford Triangle will be developed in the future as a new precinct and there is greater opportunity to utilise the salvaged materials within the new precinct in a variety of ways. As outlined above, significant effort has been given to incorporate heritage considerations by the project. Accordingly, as outlined above, all heritage elements will be evaluated based on clinical priorities, safety, visitor experience and value for money and HI look forward to continuing the Council partnership towards realising the objectives of the MOU.
Air Services Australia		
59	**Airspace Procedures** With respect to procedures designed by Airservices in accordance with ICAO PANS-OPS and Document 9905, at a maximum height of 56.3m (185ft) AHD the Development at New Maitland Hospital – Concept Proposal & Stage 1 will not affect any sector or circling altitude, nor any instrument approach or departure procedure at RAAF Base Williamtown, Maitland Airport or Newcastle Westpac Base helicopter landing site. Note that procedures not designed by Airservices at RAAF Base Williamtown, Maitland Airport or Newcastle Westpac Base helicopter landing site were not considered in this assessment.	Noted. The maximum height of the Stage 2 design is 34.15m or RL 54.45m and remains consistent with this advice from Stage 1.
60	**Communications/Navigation/Surveillance (CNS) Facilities** This for the development at New Maitland Hospital – Concept Proposal & Stage 1 will not adversely impact the performance of any Airservices Precision/Non-Precision Nav	Noted.

Item	Issue	Response
	Aids, Anemometers, HF/VHF/UHF Comms, A-SMGCS, Radar, PRM, ADS-B, WAM or Satellite/Links.	
61	Please note that associated plant and/or crane operations planned for the construction of this development higher than the assessed height will need to be assessed prior to construction commencing, and may present a constraint to the development.	We note that the tower crane would be to a height of RL82.37. The crane can be operated in accordance with a helicopter management plan if required. This may form a condition of consent.
CASA		
62	CASA has no issues with the Aviation Report and no objections to the helipad (or hospital). The Aviation Report provides a credible way ahead. As described in the Aviation Report, the appropriate legislation at present for the use of HLSs is Civil Aviation Regulation (CAR) 92 which places the onus on the helicopter pilot to determine the suitability of a landing site. CASA has Civil Aviation Advisory Publication (CAAP) 92-2 (2) Guidelines for the Establishment and Operation of Onshore Helicopter Landing Sites. But CASA has no standards / rules specifically for HLS, at this stage.	Noted.
DPIE - Crown Lands		
63	It seems that the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) - Crown Lands have not been included in the consultation thus far. This is of great concern as part of the proposal is taking place on land that remains a part of the Crown Estate.	Consultation with Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) - Crown Lands commenced in January 2018 following the request for SEARs for Stage 1 of the new Maitland Hospital development. Details of this consultation was included in the Stage 1 EIS by Pitt & Sherry.
64	Lot 4 DP 755237, which is included in this proposal, needs to be compulsorily acquired under the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991, having regard to all third party interests, before development takes place. The proponent should also note that the site is subject to restrictions on dealings in accordance with the certificate of title.	The development site located on Metford Road includes Lot 7314 DP1162607 and Part Lot 401 in DP755237 which has been designated as State Significant Infrastructure (SSI) through Schedule 4 of the *State Environmental Planning Policy (State and Regional Development) 2011*. Health Infrastructure through the NSW Health 'Health Administration Corporation' (HAC) intends to acquire Part Lot 401 as per DPIE – Crown Lands feedback, via compulsorily acquisition under the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991. Health Infrastructure notes Part Lot 401 is subject to existing restrictions on dealings in accordance with the certificate of title.
65	Due to the historical use of this site, DPIE Crown Lands notes that contamination liabilities may still rest with the tenure holder of the Perpetual Lease. Contamination should be addressed in the EIS to ensure that the site is suitable for the proposal and that there will be no detrimental impact to the proponent or surrounding landholders as a result of the use of the site or during construction of the proposed hospital and associated infrastructure.	Contamination is addressed at **Section 3.2** of the Preferred Infrastructure Report (PIR).
66	DPIE Crown Lands needs to be included as a Key Stakeholder, as both an adjoining landholder and as they are still currently the owner of land included in the proposal. It	Health Infrastructure have consulted and will continue to consult with DPIE - Crown Lands and CSR (perpetual leaseholder on Part Lot 401) as key stakeholders for the project.

Item	Issue	Response
	is requested that the SEAR be amended to include DPIE Crown Lands as a key stakeholder to ensure appropriate consultation and to avoid or minimise any potential risks to the project. It is also noted that no consultation has taken place with the current Perpetual Leaseholder of Lot 401 DP755237. DPIE Crown Lands is requesting a meeting to identify any issues and to minimise the risks that may occur as a result of consultation.	
NSW EPA		
67	**Inconsistency in proposed construction hours** Section 3.14 of the EIS proposes the following construction hours: • Monday to Friday 7am – 6pm • Saturday 7am – 5pm; and • No work on Sundays or Public Holidays However, the footnote to Table 7 in Section 6.1.1.2 of the "Noise and Vibration Assessment" (Appendix L of the EIS) states that "during the proposed extension on Saturdays from 1pm to 5 pm and 6 pm to 7 pm period on Monday to Fridays, all noise affected levels are to be background plus 5dB(A) instead of background plus 10dB(A)". This footnote does not mention the extension of construction hours from 8 am to 7am on Saturday mornings, and includes a proposed extension from 6 pm to 7pm on Monday to Fridays. The Interim Construction Noise Guidelines (DECC 2009) recommend standard construction hours of: • Monday to Friday 7am – 6pm • Saturday 8am – 1pm; and • No work Sundays or Public Holidays.	These comments are noted. NSW EPA has below recommended construction hours which HI accepts.
68	**Inadequate justification for non-standard construction hours** The Interim Construction Noise Guidelines (DECC 2009) state that works outside the recommended standard hours should only be permitted to shorten the length of the construction of public infrastructure where it is supported by the affected community. Where non-standard construction hours are sought, the proponent should provide clear justification for reasons other than convenience. The EIS provides the following justification for the proposed non-standard construction hours: • to enable efficient construction; • shorten the project's construction timeline to benefit the community; • economic benefit for local businesses and • the works area is "remote" and therefore the works will result in limited noise impacts.	These comments are noted. NSW EPA has below recommended construction hours which HI accepts.

Item	Issue	Response
	However, the hospital construction site within approximately 500 metres of the nearest residence and cannot be considered “remote”. To mitigate against the impacts of the proposed extension of construction hours, the EIS states: • “all noise affected levels are to be background plus 5dB(A) instead of background plus 10dB(A)”; and • “Low noise activities carried out (e.g. handheld tools (including power tools) painting etc) may be carried out at all times provided the activities do not cause offensive noise.” No details of mitigation measures are provided. Given the absence of detailed assessment and mitigation measures, the EPA has recommended only limited extensions to standard construction hours in the conditions recommended in Attachment A. The Recommended Conditions of Consent relate to the development as proposed in the documents and information currently provided to the EPA. In the event that the development is modified either by the applicant prior to the granting of consent or as a result of the conditions proposed to be attached to the consent, it will be necessary to consult with the EPA about the changes before the consent is issued. This will enable the EPA to determine whether its Recommended Conditions of Consent need to be modified in light of the changes.	
69	The EPA recommends that if the Department of Planning, Infrastructure and Environment grants project Approval, the following conditions be included: **Contamination** Prior to the commencement of any site preparatory works detailed in the Stage 2 proposal (SSI 9775), the proponent must provide a Detailed Site Investigation (DSI) report, which addresses potential contamination issues at the site. The DSI must be prepared in accordance with the requirements and guidance in the document ‘Managing Land Contamination: Planning Guidelines – SEPP 55 Remediation of Land’.	This condition is accepted.
70	**Construction Noise Mitigation** The proponent must implement reasonable and feasible noise management measures, to minimise off site impacts. The measures used must achieve the noise management levels in the EPA’s “Interim Construction Noise Guidelines” published by the department of Environment and Climate Change in 2009 (as may be updated or replaced from time to time).	This condition is accepted.
71	**Construction hours** The construction works permitted by this consent must comply with the following hours: • Monday to Friday 7 am to 6 pm	This condition is accepted.

Item	Issue	Response
	• Saturday 8 am to 5 pm • No work on Sundays or public holidays Low noise activities may be carried out may be carried out at any time provided the activities do not cause offensive noise.	
72	**Air Quality** All reasonable steps must be taken to minimise dust generated during construction works.	This condition is accepted.
73	**Water Quality** • The development must comply with Section 120 of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997. (POEO Act) which prohibits the pollution of waters. • Prior to the commencement of any construction or other surface disturbance the applicant must install and maintain suitable sediment and erosion controls onsite, in accordance with the revenant requirements of the Managing Urban Stormwater: Soils and Construction – Volume 2A Installation of Services (DECC 2008).	This condition is accepted.
DPIE - Water and Natural Resources Access Regulator (NRAR)		
74	The SEARs requested a detailed and consolidated site water balance. This does not appear to be addressed in the EIS. It is noted that potable water will be used when the hospital is operational, but a better understanding of the proposed water used on site during the construction process is required. The proponent will need to provide a detailed and consolidated site water balance. Note: disposal of produced groundwater may require EPA approval due to the presence of background heavy metals.	We note that the SEARs issued by the DPIE did not require an assessment of site water balance. Notwithstanding, a site water balance has been prepared by GHD and is provided at **Appendix N**.
Hunter New England Local Health District		
75	Any installation and operation of a regulated system, such as a cooling water system and warm water system in New South Wales (NSW), needs to comply with the Public Health Act, Public Health Regulation 2012, Public Health Amendment (Legionella Control) Regulation 2018 and with relevant industry standards and guidelines. It is important that all relevant managers and employees are aware of their roles and responsibilities in managing regulated systems, as this will prevent the growth and transmission of Legionella bacteria.	All cool and warm water systems will comply with all relevant regulations, and standards including Public Health Act, Public Health Regulation 2012, Public Health Amendment (Legionella Control) Regulation 2018 and with relevant industry standards and guidelines.
76	A mosquito risk assessment should be undertaken of the hospital's terrain features to ensure any potential mosquito breeding sites are identified. A mosquito management plan should also be developed incorporating the artificial wetland and detention basin site. Effective mosquito management will reduce both nuisance biting and disease transmission to the local population.	This matter will be considered further as part of the detailed design of the landscape plan to ensure that water features of open water bodies are designed to ensure water flow will not allow for mosquito breeding sites. It is noted that the detention basin has been designed as dry basin, I.e. it catches water during rainfall events but drains fully to prevent stagnant water collecting.

Item	Issue	Response
77	It is also recommended that the proponent seeks additional specialist advice in relation to ensuring genuine community engagement and consultation processes.	Extensive community consultation has been undertaken for the NMH project including with various Agencies, Hospital users groups and the local community. A summary of the consultation undertaken is provided at **Appendix E** of the EIS.

Response to Public Submissions

Item	Issue	Response
1	**Kim Plaizier**	
	Concerns regarding access and increase to traffic on the surrounding road network.	Section 6 of the Transport Impact Assessment at Appendix H of the Stage 2 EIS sets out the anticipated impacts of traffic associated with the proposed hospital development. Health Infrastructure has recently completed an upgrade the Metford Rd / Fieldsend St roundabout and is committed to upgrading the Chelmsford Rd/ Metford Rd roundabout ahead of the hospital opening. The assessment concludes that with these mitigations in place, the hospital development will have an acceptable impact on the capacity of the surrounding road network.
	Concerns the traffic lanes can cope with volumes of staff exiting at peak times. Query if the Metford Road roundabout is the only entry and exit point.	Section 7 of the Transport Impact Assessment at Appendix H of the Stage 2 EIS sets out the proposed vehicular access points to the site including; • Metford Rd / Fieldsend St roundabout • Northern car park entrance off Metford Rd • Emergency Vehicle entrance off Metford Rd Table 6.3 shows that with the proposed NMH development traffic the hospital access points will continue to operate well and with spare capacity.
2	**Name Withheld**	
	I am requesting that strong consideration be placed on following points. 1) Lymphoedema Clinic to be included in the hospital. 2) Hospice for palliative care located at or near the hospital site. 3) Dedicated oncology ward with free and dedicated parking for oncology patients. 4) Public (free) facility for the harvesting and storing of sperm and eggs for young cancer patients who face infertility due to their treatment.	The services plan for the NMH has been developed in response to the requirements of the Hunter New England Local Health district and was approved by the Ministry of Health in March 2019. The project team continues to monitor and review any changes to this plan with the project's various governance forums and outside of the SSI application process.
3	**Two More Trains For Singleton**	
	Concerns over adequate alternative methods of travel being incorporated into the project. The project does not adequately address the local rail line. It should be better incorporated to access a future Maitland Hospital station 300m away.	The NMH supports a range of alternative travel methods including walking, cycling and public transport options directly to the Hospital. Victoria Street Railway Station is located around 1.5 kilometres from the NMH site. It is part of the Hunter Line, with services alternately running from Newcastle to Telarah, Dungong and Scone. Services at Victoria Street Railway Station are generally provided every 30 minutes. Two bus parking bays will allow frequent bus services to be provided directly to the Hospital. HI are in consultation with TfNSW and Hunter Valley Buses to provide direct connections to Victoria St station and Green Hills shopping centre. It is also anticipated that community buses will pick up/drop off at the new Maitland Hospital and they will utilise the bus bays to drop off / pick up. A shared path connects the site with the existing pedestrian / cycle network surrounding the site. A further connection from the site to Chelmsford / Metford Rd roundabout is committed ahead of the hospital

Item	Issue	Response
		opening. 23 secure bicycle storage spaces and 12 bike racks are proposed in the west carpark. Shower and locker facilities are located on the lower ground floor.
	The Green Travel Plan is insufficient to drive sustainable outcomes.	The GTP provides measures to reduce the environmental impact of travel during the operation of the NMH. The plan aims to encourage more efficient use of motor vehicles and alternative solutions to single occupant private vehicles. The GTP details a range of strategies aimed at encouraging walking, cycling, public transport and car-pooling for travel to and from the NMH. The GTP will be monitored and updated by the Hunter New England Local Health District following hospital opening.
	Suggests changes to the design including: • Separated, covered pedestrian access linking to bicycle paths to link to railway stations	The NMH has been designed to ensure appropriate facilities to encourage alternative transport methods and connections to the local transport network, whist delivering a fit for purpose facility. The EIS, Design Report at Appendix C and Transport Report at Appendix H, each demonstrate that the project has considered how to ensure the design integrates the hospital well with its site and surrounds. This will further ensure the hospital will serve its primary function as an Acute Services facility. This includes pedestrian, cyclist and public transport options. The design seeks to ensure a high-quality outcome within the allocated project budget and to provide value for money.
	• Bridge/walkway over Metford Rd	
	• Request Transport for NSW undertake a concept design for a layout for a New Maitland Hospital Railway Station, and linked pedestrian and disabled access to integrate with the final hospital layout and building design.	
	• Identify bus route options and preferred routes for linking the hospital to Victoria Street Station, not relying on existing bus routes.	
	• Provide shade for pedestrians and cyclists along connecting routes accessing the site	
4	**Upper Hunter Cancer Action Network (UHCAN)**	
	Include a Lymphoedema Clinic in the design Many cancer patients develop lymphoedema as a result of surgery or radiation therapy, but there is no public lymphoedema service in the Hunter outside Newcastle. Oncology patients being treated at the New Maitland Hospital will require access to a public lymphoedema clinic, staffed by Lymphoedema-trained Occupational Therapists and physiotherapists.	The services plan for the NMH has been developed in response to the requirements of the Hunter New England Local Health district and was approved by the Ministry of Health in March 2019. The project team continues to monitor and review any changes to this plan with the project's various governance forums and outside of the SSI application process.
	2. Include Cancer Information Service, in consultation with CCNSW The Calvary Mater Newcastle is the main oncology treatment centre for the Hunter New England (HNE) Health District. It has a Cancer Information Service operated by Cancer Council NSW (CCNSW) volunteers, which provides important information to cancer patients and their families when they need it most. It also provides a quiet, private place for families to sit when they have received bad news; are suffering side-effects for their treatment; or are just stuck in the hospital between appointments. The volunteers provide a friendly face, but are also trained in accidental counselling, and can give people the time to just listen that busy health professionals cannot. The inclusion of a dedicated Cancer Information Service space located near the chemotherapy centre is an essential part of a 21st century, patient-centred hospital and must be included in the plans.	The services plan for the NMH has been developed in response to the requirements of the Hunter New England Local Health district and was approved by the Ministry of Health in March 2019. The project team continues to monitor and review any changes to this plan with the project's various governance forums and outside of the SSI application process.

Item	Issue	Response
	3. Include culturally appropriate gathering areas for families HNE has an Aboriginal population above the NSW average and an unacceptable gap in their health outcomes, including for cancer. Involvement of indigenous artists in the design of the façade is supported, but more needs to be done to involve the local community in the physical design of the spaces. The plans for the New Maitland Hospital should include outdoor areas such as a sensory garden and a civic square and permit natural ventilation and access to outside areas from palliative care rooms. Maximising the use of shade trees to car parking areas will be appreciated by those stuck at the hospital for long periods of time during the summer and will make the area less sterile.	The Landscape Plans at **Appendix D** incorporate outdoor areas for rest, reflection and amenity, including various landscaped rooftop terraces / courtyards. The main entry has been designed as a civic square with retail amenity, seating and weather protection. The arbour and emergency entry provide further external weather protected waiting / gathering areas. The entry garden to the north of the west car park provides a larger open space for staff and patient access. HI are considering further consider heritage interpretation and incorporation into the landscape through the established Memorandum of Understanding with both Maitland City Council and HNELHD, which will be obtaining further community input and honouring the cultural and industrial history in the detailed design philosophy.
	4. Include location of future services in the plans There is currently a palliative care service provided from Maitland Hospital and we are pleased that this will continue. However, in the long term, HNE residents deserve the co-location of a palliative care hospice on the Metford site. All residents of HNE could be treated at the New Maitland Hospital, and whilst free transport-to-treatment is provided, for those further away it would be much easier to stay near the hospital. For families from rural areas of HNE, they will need access to accommodation when their loved one is admitted to the hospital, including oncology and palliative care. Patient and family accommodation should be co-located on the New Maitland Hospital site.	The services plan for the NMH has been developed in response to the requirements of the Hunter New England Local Health district and was approved by the Ministry of Health in March 2019. The project team continues to monitor and review any changes to this plan with the project's various governance forums and outside of the SSI application process.
	5. Include extra psychosocial support services for oncology patients and families Whilst there are Social Workers currently at Maitland Hospital, they do not have time allocated to oncology patients, who have on-going, long-term needs that are different to emergency patients. Cancer patients also require access to psychologists at different times in their cancer journey and particularly after treatment finishes. Their families need access to grief support when end-of-life approaches. These services are not yet provided in Maitland but are a necessary part of any oncology service and must be accommodated in the plans for the New Maitland Hospital.	The services plan for the NMH has been developed in response to the requirements of the Hunter New England Local Health district and was approved by the Ministry of Health in March 2019. The project team continues to monitor and review any changes to this plan with the project's various governance forums and outside of the SSI application process.