



# APPENDIX A – SUBMISSIONS REGISTER

## 1.1. PUBLIC AUTHORITIES

Summary of Issue Raised	Response	Relevant Section
<u>Environment Protection Authority</u>		
<p>Based on the information provided, the proposed development does not appear to require an environment protection licence under the <i>Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997</i>.</p> <p>In view of the above information, the EPA has no comments to provide on this project and no follow-up consultation is required, Mosman Council should be consulted on the proposed development.</p>	No comments raised by EPA.	No further assessment or comments required
<u>Transport for NSW</u>		
TfNSW provided a collective response with Roads and Maritime Services	No comments raised by TfNSW	No further assessment or comments required
<u>Transport for NSW – Roads and Maritime Services</u>		
<p>It is requested that prior to the issue of the first Occupation Certificate, the applicant be conditioned to update the existing Green Travel Plan in consultation with TfNSW. The updated GTP would apply to all zoo staff and visitors and should include:</p> <p>Appointment and details of a Travel Plan Coordinator to oversee the implementation of the GTP;</p> <p>Inclusion of latest TAG version (which currently is reviewed every 6 months according to the Transport Impact Assessment);</p> <p>Details of mode shifts achieved since the first GTP was issued in 2015; and</p> <p>Details of how the GTP will be monitored and reviewed including Travel Surveys for Staff, Visitors, Students.</p>	This is noted and accepted by TfNSW as a condition of consent.	No further assessment or comments required
<p>It is requested that the applicant be conditioned to prepare a detailed Construction and Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), detailing construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control. A swept path diagram should be provided to demonstrate how the largest construction vehicles enter and exit the site in a forward direction.</p> <p>The CTMP should be submitted to TfNSW for review prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.</p>	This is noted and accepted by TSCA as a condition of consent.	No further assessment or comments required
<u>NSW Environment, Energy and Science Group</u>		
<p>EES has reviewed the Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) prepared by Narla Environmental Pty Ltd dated July 2021 and provides the following comments:</p> <p>The subject site described in the EIS includes some areas that were not assessed as 'subject land' in the BDAR. The EIS states the total project area is 2390sqm (approximately) and architectural plans identify the site area as 2600sqm, however the BDAR identifies the subject land size as only 0.12ha. EES recommends the extent of the subject land in the BDAR is reviewed. If any of the subject site area that was not assessed in the BDAR contains native</p>	The Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) has been updated by Narla Environmental to reflect EES comments.	Refer to <b>Appendix K</b>

Summary of Issue Raised	Response	Relevant Section
<p>vegetation to be removed, or contains human-made structures or non-native vegetation that provides habitat for threatened entities, then these areas need to be assessed as part of the BDAR. If these areas do not contain native vegetation or provide habitat for threatened entities, then the BDAR should include a statement to justify why the extent of the subject land in the BDAR differs to the subject site in the EIS.</p> <p>Table 12 of the BDAR states that if any microbats are found in human-made structures, they are to be captured and relocated to surrounding bushland. If capture and relocation is required, this should be carried out by the Project Ecologist and if the microbats are in torpor, this action should be delayed until a more suitable time. Table 12 is to be amended to reflect these requirements.</p>		
<p>Flooding/Floodplain Risk Management</p> <p>No comment or concern is raised in relation to flooding/floodplain risk management issues.</p>	<p>While no comments were raised by EES in relation to flood management, the Stormwater Management Plan prepared by Meinhardt Bonnaci has been updated to reflect refinements to the proposed development.</p>	<p>Refer to <b>Appendix J</b></p>
<u>Heritage Council of NSW</u>		
<p>An Unexpected Finds condition could be included to manage historical archaeology at the site, as 'relics' have statutory protection under section 146 of the Heritage Act 1977 and their discovery requires the Heritage Council of NSW to be notified.</p>	<p>This is noted and accepted by TSCA as a condition of consent. This was also noted in the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment prepared by Urbis as part of the EIS Package.</p>	<p>No further assessment or comments required</p>
<u>NSW Rural Fire Service</u>		
<p>The Taronga Zoo Emergency Response Plan must be updated to include the proposed reptile and amphibian centre, and contain a section consistent with the NSW RFS document <i>A Guide to Developing a Bush Fire Emergency Management and Evacuation Plan</i>.</p>	<p>This is noted and accepted by TSCA as a condition of consent.</p>	<p>No further assessment or comments required</p>
<u>NSW Department of Primary Industries</u>		
<p>No comments received</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>No further assessment or comments required</p>
<u>Fire and Rescue NSW</u>		
<p>It is deemed that the proposal has limited scope and application in regard to fire and life safety, and as such FRNSW submit no comments or recommendations for consideration, nor any requirements beyond that specified by applicable legislation.</p> <p>It is requested that the Applicant undertake consultation with FRNSW should more detailed information regarding the fire and life safety aspects of the development (Taronga Reptile and Amphibian Conservation Centre) become available.</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>No further assessment or comments required</p>
<u>National Parks and Wildlife Service</u>		
<p>No comments received</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>No further assessment or comments required</p>
<u>Animal Welfare</u>		
<p>No comments received</p>	<p>No comment</p>	<p>No further assessment or comments required</p>
<u>Mosman Council</u>		
<p>It is noted that the new replacement building for the display of reptiles and amphibians has been designed to be of a low scale and sit below the existing tree canopy cover such that it will not be highly visible from the Harbour. It is recommended that conditions of consent be imposed to ensure this outcome is</p>	<p>A condition of consent in relation to trees is not considered relevant for the proposed development.</p> <p>Refined landscape plans have been prepared by Context Landscape Architects which include the retention of 13 high value trees and the relocation of 6 additional high value trees within the RACC</p>	<p>Refer to <b>Sections 4.3 and 5.4</b> of the Submissions Report and <b>Appendix E</b> and <b>Appendix M</b></p>

Summary of Issue Raised	Response	Relevant Section
achieved, i.e. require the provision of suitable locally indigenous large canopy trees around the building to maintain the dominance of landscaping over new built elements.	surroundings. The overall design includes additional landscaping elements incorporated into rooftop exhibits, the entrance portal and the southern façade. Overall, while the design does incorporate new built form onto the site, the proposed development is considered to retain the landscape character of the Zoo.	
A Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) should be required and this should consider the cumulative impact for all construction projects currently being undertaken at the Zoo. The CTMP should also be referred to Council's Local Traffic Committee for approval.  To maintain the amenity for surrounding residents, construction noise should be limited to the hours of 7am to 5pm, Monday to Friday and 8am to 1pm on Saturdays with no audible works at other times.	This is noted and accepted by TSCA as a condition of consent.	No further assessment or comments required

## 1.2. COMMUNITY GROUPS

Summary of Issue Raised	Response	Relevant Section
<u>Blacktown &amp; District Environment Group Inc</u>		
Community Consultation	At the Scoping Meeting held on 25 March 2021 with DPIE, it was agreed that the community consultation required for the RACC SSDA be similar to the most recent Upper Australia Precinct SSDA project. It was anticipated that the RACC would receive limited community interest, similar to the Upper Australia Precinct, African Savannah and other recent SSDAs for animal exhibits within the Zoo, which did not undertake targeted consultation with any community groups.	Refer to <b>Sections 3.1</b> and <b>4.1</b> of the Submissions Report
The proposal results in the removal of natural heritage values and replacement with bitumen, brick and concrete	The proposed facility is located in a portion of the site which was previously disturbed and used as part of the Seals pools. The site currently contains astro turf and recent plantings.  The proposed development incorporates natural elements including additional landscaping to reflect the eastern gully running through the site and the existing rock outcrop found on the site. Overall, the proposed development has been designed to blend into the existing canopy and does not result in the removal of remnant bushland.	Refer to <b>Sections 4.3</b> and <b>5.4</b> of the Submissions Report and <b>Appendices D, E and K</b>
Why must the RACC be located within the Zoo? Are they any potential brownfield sites.	The RACC will replace existing facilities on site. The current Reptile World does not reflect modern animal welfare requirements and requires replacement to reflect the Zoo's animal standards for conservation and education.  Taronga aims to be a leading edge in Zoo welfare and caring for wildlife. The site currently provides world leading pathology, nursing, educators bringing specialist skills together on the one site. Allowing animals to be housed in purpose built exhibits where they can be protected by the leading experts is the best outcome for animals.  The role of the 21 <sup>st</sup> century zoo is to be 'First responders and the last line of defence' to breed more resilient animal communities. Housing animals within one of NSW's largest tourist attractions also allows the public to see the work the Zoo is undertaking and learn about conservation.	No further assessment or comments required

<u>Headland Preservation Group</u>		
Headland Preservation Group were not consulted prior to the EIS	At the Scoping Meeting held on 25 March 2021 with DPIE, it was agreed that the community consultation required for the RACC SSDA be similar to the most recent Upper Australia Precinct SSDA project. It was anticipated that the RACC would receive limited community interest, similar to the Upper Australia Precinct, African Savannah and other recent SSDAs for animal exhibits within the Zoo, which did not undertake targeted consultation with any community groups.	Refer to <b>Sections 3.1</b> and <b>4.1</b> of the Submissions Report
<u>Mosman Parks &amp; Bushland Association Inc.</u>		
Mosman Parks & Bushland Association were not consulted prior to the EIS	At the Scoping Meeting held on 25 March 2021 with DPIE, it was agreed that the community consultation required for the RACC SSDA be similar to the most recent Upper Australia Precinct SSDA project. It was anticipated that the RACC would receive limited community interest, similar to the Upper Australia Precinct, African Savannah and other recent SSDAs for animal exhibits within the Zoo, which did not undertake targeted consultation with any community groups.	Refer to <b>Sections 3.1</b> and <b>4.1</b> of the Submissions Report
Further assessment of views is required	A Visual Impact Assessment Package has been prepared by DWP.	Refer to <b>Section 4.2</b> of the Submissions Report and <b>Appendix F</b>
Further discussion on biodiversity and tree removal	A meeting was held on Tuesday 21 September with Mosman Parks & Bushland Association Inc to discuss the RACC project and the future Wildlife Hospital. In this meeting, it was discussed that the site currently incorporates astro turf and recent plantings. The overall design has incorporated camouflage and plantings along to façade to reflect animals within the centre. Concrete has also been minimised to reduce heat load.	Refer to <b>Sections 4.3</b> and <b>5.4</b> of the Submissions Report and <b>Appendix K</b>

### 1.3. INDIVIDUALS

Summary of Issue Raised	Raised by	Response	Relevant Section
Supports the development	Phillip Enderby	No further assessment or comments required	No further assessment or comments required
Supports conservation, education, and research by the Zoo. The Research Centre is excellent.  The zoo's conservation of reptiles and amphibians has been successful. I also appreciate the need to update the Serpentaria and hospital.	Name Withheld	No further assessment or comments required	No further assessment or comments required
Community Consultation	Name Withheld Name Withheld Jane Hunter Linda Bergin Marta Mangold Lisa Harrold Michael Mangold	At the Scoping Meeting held on 25 March 2021 with DPIE, it was agreed that the community consultation required for the RACC SSDA be similar to the most recent Upper Australia Precinct SSDA project. It was anticipated that the RACC would receive limited community interest, similar to the Upper Australia Precinct, African Savannah and other recent SSDAs for animal exhibits within the Zoo, which did not undertake targeted consultation with any community groups.  Further consultation has been undertaken since the EIS was lodged.	Refer to <b>Sections 3.1</b> and <b>4.1</b> of the Submissions Report
Loss of Natural Character	Name Withheld	The proposed facility is located in a portion of the site which was previously disturbed and used as part of the Seals pools. The site currently contains astro turf and recent plantings.	Refer to <b>Sections 4.3</b> and <b>5.4</b> of the Submissions Report and <b>Appendices E</b> and <b>K</b>

Summary of Issue Raised	Raised by	Response	Relevant Section
		The proposed development incorporates natural elements including additional landscaping to reflect the eastern gully running through the site and the existing rock outcrop found on the site. Overall, the proposed development has been designed to blend into the existing canopy and does not result in the removal of remnant bushland.	
Cost of development	Name Withheld Annabella Fletcher	The project is partially funded by the NSW Government's COVID relief stimulus budget package which aims to promote tourism and jobs in NSW.	No further assessment or comments required
The Zoo clearly needs a masterplan which predicts all future developments.	Jeremy Eccles	The RACC aligns with the Taronga Zoo Urban Design Principles which form part of the Zoo 2000 'The View to the Future' Master Plan.	Refer to <b>Section 4.2</b> the Submissions Report
Potential to locate the RACC not at the Zoo	Annabella Fletcher	<p>The RACC will replace existing facilities on site. The current Reptile World does not reflect modern animal welfare requirements and requires replacement to reflect the Zoo's animal standards for conservation and education.</p> <p>Taronga aims to be a leading edge in Zoo welfare and caring for wildlife. The site currently provides world leading pathology, nursing, educators bringing specialist skills together on the one site. Allowing animals to be housed in purpose built exhibits where they can be protected by the leading experts is the best outcome for animals.</p> <p>The role of the 21<sup>st</sup> century zoo is to be 'First responders and the last line of defence' to breed more resilient animal communities. Housing animals within one of NSW's largest tourist attractions also allows the public to see the work the Zoo is undertaking and learn about conservation.</p>	No further assessment or comments required
Increase of hard surface in the Zoo and reduction of tree canopy	Name Withheld	While the proposal does result in tree removal, the proposed development does not result in the removal of any remnant bushland. The proposed development will retain 13 high value trees (Trees 1-6, 11, 12, 52, 53, 54, 55 and 58) with an additional seven high value trees (9, 10, 16, 21, 23 & 24) to be relocated within the RACC site or within the Zoo.	Refer to <b>Sections 4.3</b> and <b>5.4</b> of the Submissions Report and <b>Appendices E</b> and <b>K</b>
The footprint of the RACC is too big	Annabella Fletcher	<p>The RACC will replace existing facilities on site. The current Reptile World does not reflect modern animal welfare requirements and requires replacement to reflect the Zoo's animal standards for conservation and education.</p> <p>The proposed facility is located in a portion of the site which was previously disturbed and used as part of the Seals pools. The site currently contains astro turf and recent plantings.</p> <p>A Visual Impact Assessment Package has also been prepared by DWP.</p>	Refer to <b>Section 4.2</b> of the Submissions Report and <b>Appendix</b>
The RACC does not reflect the Taronga Zoo Urban Design Principles and is located in a 'do not build' area.	Linda Bergin Annabella Fletcher	The RACC is not located in a 'do not build' area in accordance with the Taronga Zoo Urban Design Principles.	Refer to <b>Section 4.2</b> of the Submissions Report and <b>Appendix</b>
Visual Impacts	Jane Hunter Linda Bergin Marta Mangold Lisa Harrold Michael Mangold	A Visual Impact Assessment Package has been prepared by DWP.	Refer to <b>Section 4.2</b> of the Submissions Report and <b>Appendix F</b>