22 July 2020

Ms Karen Harragon
Director, Social and Infrastructure Assessments
NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
320 Pitt Street
Sydney NSW 2000

Attention: Jason Maslen, Social and Infrastructure Assessments
jason.maslen@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Ms Harragon

Supplementary Response to Submissions
Multi-Trades and Digital Technology Hub, TAFE NSW Meadowbank Campus, Meadowbank Education and Employment Precinct (SSD 10349)

Introduction

This Supplementary Response to Submissions (SRtS) has been prepared by Keylan Consulting Pty Ltd (Keylan) on behalf of TAFE NSW (the Applicant).

The application seeks consent for a new Construction and Buildings Trade Facility (known as the Multi-Trades and Digital Technology Hub) and a separate two storey car park at the TAFE NSW Meadowbank Campus (the campus) in the City of Ryde local government area.

The Multi-Trades and Digital Technology Hub (The Hub) will be an active learning environment co-locating disciplines under building, construction, engineering and manufacturing that are united by a focus on new digital technologies.

The development forms part of the NSW Government's investment to transform the TAFE Meadowbank campus into a technology-focused campus and a key component of the Meadowbank Education and Employment Precinct.

Previous Response to Submissions

This SRtS follows lodgement of a Response to Submissions (RtS) in May 2020. The RtS provided a response to issues raised in submissions to the exhibition of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and outlined changes to the project comprising:

- inclusion of a multi-storey carpark in the project;
- reduction in the number of basement carparking spaces within the Hub; and
- removal of 113 trees on the site.

The RtS was publicly exhibited in June 2020 and further public and agency submissions were received. The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) subsequently wrote to the Applicant on 22 and 30 June 2020 requesting a SRtS.

Supplementary Response to Submissions

A response to the matters raised in the Department's requests for SRtS is provided at **Attachment A**.

We understand the Response to Submissions received a total of 14 submissions during the exhibition period including six submissions from five government agencies and eight submissions from the public.

The submissions received from government agencies include:

- Environment Protection Authority NSW
- Heritage Council of NSW
- Department of Planning, Industry and Environment - Environment, Energy and Science Group
- Government Architect NSW
- Transport for NSW

A response to the matters raised in the submissions from government agencies is provided at **Attachment B**, with a response to public submissions provided at **Attachment C**.

Further Project Amendments

The following minor amendments are proposed under this SRtS:

- Reduced building height to Hub building
- Reduced floor area to the Hub building
- Reduced glazing to the building facades of the Hub building
- Replacement of the two totem signs with a single digital plint sign
- Removal of one additional tree

As detailed below, the project amendments are minor in nature and do not warrant re-notification, particularly noting the scale of the development is reduced.

Revised Architectural Drawings for the Hub building, which reflect the proposed amendments, areprovided at **Appendix A**.

Building Height

The building height of the Hub is to be reduced slightly when compared to the original SSD application.

This is achieved by lowering the original floor to floor height across levels 1-2, 2-3, 4-5, 5-6 and Level 6 Roof as detailed below:

Level	Original SSD RL	Adjusted RTS RL	Change
One	+13.470	+13.870	+400mm
Two	+17.870	+17.670	-200mm
Three	+21.470	+21.470	0
Four	+25.470	+25.470	0
Five	+29.470	+29.270	-200mm
Six	+33.470	+33.070	-400mm
Top Of Skylight	+40.850	+40.800	-50mm

(All levels noted +/- 500mm tolerance to avoid issues as design develops)

The proposed changes have been carefully assessed with respect to the structural design, services design and internal ceiling heights and existing topography to ensure functionality and serviceability is not affected.

Reduced Floor Area

The building grid size adopted on the Architectural Plans is amended from an 8.4 metre grid to an 8.2 metre grid. This design change reduces the footprint of the Hub building by approximately 2% with minimal impact to functionality, serviceability, circulation or carparking.

The change results in an overall reduction in gross floor area by approximately 500m^2. Notwithstanding, the amended design for the Hub retains generous circulation that connect and create great social spaces, a variety of student, educator and industry social interactions, food and beverage offers and informal learning environments within this allocated space.

Reduced Glazing to The Hub Facades

The extent of glazing for sections of the Hub is reduced and replaced by solid façade in the form of cladding. This approach is primarily utilised around fire stair sections.

We note the amended design was forwarded to the NSW Government Architect on 8 July 2020 and no objections were raised.

Digital Plint Sign

Both of the proposed totem wayfinding signs for the Hub are to be removed. Instead a single digital plinth wayfinding sign, containing display screens, is now proposed as illustrated in Appendix H. This sign is to be located to the west of the Hub as per the signage location plan included at Appendix H. It is noted that the Hub will screen this sign from view from See Street.

It is considered that the proposed digital plint remains consistent with the assessment criteria included within Schedule 1 of SEPP 64. In particular, the sign will not result in light spill or glare to neighbours on See Street, nor will it adversely impact on the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.

Tree removal

Following a review of the footprint of the multi-storey car park it has been identified that one additional tree is required to be removed. This tree is located to the south-west of the car

parking and is identified as tree 202 in the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA). The AIA for the car park has been updated to reflect this change and is included at Appendix I.

This amendment brings the total number of trees to be removed from the site to 114.

It is noted that tree 219, which was proposed to be removed in the RtS, has been identified as a memorial tree. The location of this tree is identified on the updated landscape plans included at Appendix B. Unfortunately, this tree is located within the disturbance footprint of the new multi-stories carpark and has to be removed. However, TAFE is committed to work with the family concerned, to identify an alternative memorial location, within the TAFE Meadowbank Campus Site, that is acceptable to the family.

Conclusion

The SRtS provides a response to the matters raised in submissions received from NSW government agencies and the community following the exhibition of the amended SSD application and supporting EIS from 4 June to 18 June 2020.

It also outlines further design changes to the Hub buildings which have been made following lodgement of the previous RtS. The proposed project amendments within this SRtS are minor in nature and do not warrant re-notification, particularly noting the scale of the development is reduced.

Overall, the development will provide a significant public benefit through the provision of a major new tertiary educational facility. The development will contribute to the broader vision of the Meadowbank Education and Employment Precinct as a world-class education precinct that will provide a continuous pathway for students from school to vocational training or higher education.

Based on the above, the development is considered to be in the public interest and therefore warrants approval.

Please do not hesitate to contact Padraig Scollard on 8459 7508 or via email at padraig@keylan.com.au should you wish to discuss any aspect of this project.

Yours sincerely

Dan Keary BSc MURP MPIA
Director

Attachments

Attachment A:	Response to the Departments Request for Supplementary Response to Submissions Dated 22 June and 30 June 2020
Attachment B:	Response to Agency Submissions
Attachment C:	Response to Public Submissions

Appendices

Appendix A:	Revised Architectural Drawings – Multi-Trades and Digital Technology Hub (Gray Puksand)
Appendix B:	Updated Landscape Plans (Tract)
Appendix C:	Supplementary Response to Submissions – Transport Engineering Letter (GTA Consultants)
Appendix D:	Revised Preliminary Construction Management Plan (GHD)
Appendix E:	Demolition Plan – Car Park (Gray Puksand)
Appendix F:	Revised Noise and Vibration Assessment (JHA)
Appendix G:	Revised Heritage Impact Assessment (AMBS)
Appendix H:	Signage Plans (Gray Puksand and Minale Tattersfield)
Appendix I:	Revised Arboricultural Impact Assessment & Tree Protection Plan – Multi-Storey Car Park (Tree Survey Arboricultural Consultants)

Attachment A

Response to the Departments Request for Supplementary Response to Submissions dated 22 June and 30 June 2020

Ref.	Agency	Response
A	**Department of Planning, Industry & Environment dated 22 June 2020**	
General		
A1	Provide further detail of the use and operation of both the existing surface car parks (i.e. the two application sites) and proposed car parks including: • are the existing/proposed car parking spaces limited to students/staff only?	Yes, the existing/ proposed car parking spaces are proposed to be used by staff and students only. This is consistent with the operation of the existing car parks.
	• do the public have access to the existing/proposed spaces? If the public has access, how would the car parking facilities be managed to prevent them being used as commuter car parks?	The public will not have access to the car park. Boom gates are to be installed, with a payment scheme to limit access to staff and students only. This approach is similar to the current operation of the existing car park.
	• is the use of the existing/proposed car parking spaces managed and are the car parks entry controlled and/or time restricted?	There are currently boom gates provided at the access points to the existing car parks. The new car parks will also be controlled by boom gates.
	• is a fee charged for use of the existing/proposed car parking?	Yes, fees apply to both staff and students for both the existing and proposed car parks. TAFE 's general policy is to keep the carpark fees low for the staff and students to encourage them to utilise the TAFE carparks rather than on-street car parking spaces. Since April 2020, the use of TAFE carparks has been free of charge. Prior to that, the following fees used to apply: • Students $8 per day (discounted to $4 per day if the student is a member of the Students Association, noting the annual Students Association membership fee is approximately $20). • Staff $25 per annum It is expected that the parking fee charges would be resumed once the new carparks are open for use by the staff and students.

Ref.	Agency	Response
		Fees are charged for on-site car parking to discourage driving to TAFE and encourage other modes of travel including public transport and active travel. That said, as detailed in Section 3.6 of the TAIA, parking demand surveys indicate the on-site car parks are fully occupied by 9am on weekdays and therefore removing on-site parking fees would not result in a reduced on-street parking demand. Rather, this could actually cause more people to drive and therefore result in a higher on-street parking demand once the on-site car parks reach capacity.
A2	Provide a clearer, more precise statement of how many existing car parking spaces exist on the whole TAFE site. In addition, confirm the background for the approx. 100 new spaces recently provided (location, what do they relate to, purpose, etc).	There is currently a total of 379 at-grade car parking spaces on the whole of the TAFE site. These spaces are contained within three locations illustrated below:  TAFE NSW have been re-instating and expanding the existing carpark on the western side of the site as a part of prior minor works project. A total of 90 parking spaces have been re-instated and TAFE NSW are intending to install at least a further 10 spaces in the near future. These parking spaces are available to both staff and students. During the construction period for this project these spaces will be prioritised for staff and students with mobility concerns who may not be

Ref.	Agency	Response
		able to take advantage of the temporary parking and shuttle bus from Meadowbank Park.
A3	Confirm the proposed method of illumination for the signage. It is noted the RtS states the wayfinding (stacked cubes) signage would be 'backlit' (rather than uplit).	The Architectural Design Statement (Appendix C and dated October 2019) included with the original SSDA package described the method of illumination for the TAFE NSW and totem signage as follows. *Low impact local illumination is proposed. Selection will be carefully considered to avoid unacceptable glare and remove risks of affecting the amenity of the near by residences. The proposed signage is sufficiently illuminated to ensure pedestrian safety. No curfew is proposed to the illumination.* The proposed TAFE NSW signage is to be up-lit as illustrated in the below image (Figure 1). It is considered that the illumination will not result in unacceptable glare or light spill, nor will it adversely impact on the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.  Figure 1: Perspective of TAFE NSW signage (Source: Gray Puksand) Both of the proposed totem wayfinding signs for The Hub are to be removed. Instead a single digital plinth wayfinding sign, containing display screens is proposed as illustrated in Appendix H. This sign is to be located to the west of the Hub as per the signage location plan included at Appendix H. It is noted that the Hub will screen this sign from view from See Street.

Ref.	Agency	Response
		The digital plint wayfinding sign will utilise ambient lighting (i.e. spill/ exterior lighting already existing/ proposed to the area). No specific lighting is proposed to this piece of wayfinding signage. It is considered that the proposed digital plint is consistent with the assessment criteria included within Schedule 1 of SEPP 64. In particular, the sign will not result in light spill or glare to neighbours on See Street, nor will it adversely impact on the safety of pedestrians and cyclists.
A4	Provide an assessment of the proposed signage against SEPP 64 design criteria. Confirm how the proposed illumination would not result in adverse light spill or glare to neighbours on See Street.	An assessment of the proposed signage against the assessment criteria in Schedule 1 of SEPP 64 was provided as part of the original SSDA submission. This was included within the Architectural Design Statement (Appendix C and dated October 2019). This assessment confirms the illumination will not result in spill or glare to neighbours on See Street. The Architectural Design Statement submitted as part of the Response to Submissions (Appendix C and dated May 2020) is supplementary to the original submission. This statement confirms that the proposed wayfinding signage for the new carpark remains consistent with the provisions of SEPP 64.
A5	Confirm the number of replacement trees to be provided on the MTDTH site and the Car Park site.	A total of 66 replacement trees are proposed. The location of the replacement trees is as follows: • The Hub: 12 trees • Car Park: 15 trees • Replacement planting at the location of demolished Block D & E: 39 trees The demolition of Block D & E does not form part of this SSDA and will be covered under a separate REF to be prepared in the near future. Nonetheless, the replacement tree planting for this area is proposed under this application.
A6	Confirm the size (sqm) of the MTDTH site	The size of the site is 9,600m^2. This building is identified by the by the blue hatching on drawing DA03.
Drawings		

<table>
<tr><th>Ref.</th><th>Agency</th><th>Response</th></tr>
<tr><td>A7</td><td>Please correct inconsistencies in the drawing revision date (bottom left) and drawing date (bottom right) on the following landscape drawings: o 219-0066-02-SSDA_100. o TR-LA-DWG-C0100.</td><td>Tract have updated the landscape drawings to reflect the correct date and revision number (Appendix 2). For clarity the updated revision number and drawing date are provided in the below table.
<table>
<tr><th>Plan Number</th><th>Revision</th><th>Date</th></tr>
<tr><td>TR-LA-DWG-C0100</td><td>2</td><td>12/06/20</td></tr>
<tr><td>219-0066-02_SSDA_100</td><td>3</td><td>29/01/20</td></tr>
</table></td></tr>
<tr><td>A8</td><td>Confirm whether GFA Plan DA50 B needs to be updated.</td><td>Drawing No. DA50 has been updated (Revision C and dated 08/07/2020) to reflect the amended layout of the Hub due to the introduction of the multi-storey car park.

It is noted that the multi-storey car park is not included on this plan. In accordance with the definition of gross floor area included within the Educational Establishments and Child Care Facilities SEPP car parking is excluded for the purposes of calculating GFA.

gross floor area means the sum of the floor area of each floor of a building measured from the internal face of external walls, or from the internal face of walls separating the building from any other building, measured at a height of 1.4 metres above the floor, and includes—
a) the area of a mezzanine, and
b) habitable rooms in a basement or an attic, and
c) any shop, auditorium, cinema, and the like, in a basement or attic, but excludes—
d) any area for common vertical circulation, such as lifts and stairs, and
e) any basement—
(i) storage, and
(ii) vehicular access, loading areas, garbage and services, and
f) plant rooms, lift towers and other areas used exclusively for mechanical services or ducting, and
g) car parking to meet any requirements of the consent authority (including access to that car parking), and
h) any space used for the loading or unloading of goods (including access to it), and</td></tr>
</table>

Ref.	Agency	Response
		i) terraces and balconies with outer walls less than 1.4 metres high, and *j) voids above a floor at the level of a storey or storey above.*
B	**Department of Planning, Industry & Environment dated 30 June 2020**	
B1	An updated Travel Plan is required that includes a breakdown of the proposed mode share target for all modes (car, drop off, bus, train, ferry, motorcycle, cycle and walking) and that clarifies the timeframes for achieving the target mode share shifts.	An updated 'existing and targeted mode share table' has been provided in the Response to Submissions, prepared by GTA Consultants and dated 20 July 2020, included at Appendix C. This table sets out the mode share targets for each mode of travel recorded to the Meadowbank TAFE campus for both staff and students. Some of the mode share targets relate external measures that rely on other stakeholder including Local and State Government Agencies to improve broader active travel links to the site – something that is currently being developed as part of the Meadowbank Education and Employment Precinct Master Plan. Notwithstanding, increasing the mode share for public transport and away from travel by car towards the targets is expected to be achieved in a 5-10 year period, noting that the staff and student forecasts are a 10- year horizon.
B2	In the Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment (TAIA), the Level of Service (LoS) noted in intersection performance Tables 9.7 and 9.8 are inconsistent with the LoS noted in tables 9.11 and 9.12. Confirm which is correct and provide an updated TAIA.	GTA has reviewed intersection performance summary tables and corrected any inconsistencies, with updated tables provided in their Response to Submissions, dated 20 July 2020, included at Appendix C. GTA has confirmed that there is no impact on the outcome and conclusions of the TAIA.
B3	Provide an assessment of the proposed conversion of the eight existing on-street car parking spaces on See Street to pick-up/drop-off bays. Including: • the need / demand for such a facility. • why such a facility cannot be provided on-site within the TAFE Campus. • consideration of the impact on availability of on-street car parking spaces and the potential increase of parking pressure on surrounding streets. • the likely ongoing use of the former childcare centre See Street on-street (15min) pick-up/drop-off bays and whether they could be used	It is proposed that the pick-up and drop-off area which is currently located adjacent to the childcare centre on See Street be relocated further north (closer to the pedestrian entrance to the new multi-trades and digital technology hub) and extended in length slightly to increase its capacity by around four vehicles. The existing 1/4P parking restrictions for this pick-up and drop-off area allow parents/ carers to park and walk in or collect their child from the childcare. Given the change in use (removal of child care centre and focus on TAFE staff and student drop-off activity), it is proposed that this restriction be changed to 'no parking' which allows for vehicles to stand for up to two minutes to pick-up and drop-off passengers.

Ref.	Agency	Response
	for pick-up/drop-off purposes instead of further reducing on-street bays.	It is envisaged that the kerbside restrictions where the existing childcare pick-up and drop-off area is would be changed to allow for kerbside parking. It recommended that a 2P parking restriction is implemented in this regard, with exemptions for residents, consistent with the eastern side of See Street. This would reduce the immediate onstreet parking supply available to TAFE staff and students and encourage a mode shift towards sustainable modes of transport. Meadowbank TAFE currently does not have a formal pick-up and drop-off area for the campus. As can be appreciated, educational facilities including schools, universities and TAFE facilities often experience a level of pick-up and drop-off activity, which has the ability to reduce parking demand if planned appropriately. This is also evident for the Meadowbank TAFE campus from the existing mode share surveys for students. The increase in capacity for the pick-up and drop-off area from four spaces for the existing childcare to eight spaces for the multi-trades and digital technology hub seeks to encourage pick-up and drop-off activity which is currently relatively low due to the lack of facilities at Meadowbank TAFE. By encouraging staff and students to be picked-up and/ or dropped-off instead of driving, this in itself increases car occupancy, reduces car parking demand associated with the TAFE and also will likely reduce the number of vehicles on the surrounding road network as many staff and students would be travelling in vehicles that may have been already on the road network anyway. It is recognised that on-street parking in the area is in high demand throughout the day. However, the loss of four on-street spaces in the context of the total available onstreet parking supply in the area is considered minor. Further to this, while the pick-up and drop-off area is proposed to be located adjacent to the multi-trades and digital technology hub, it will accommodate activity associated with the whole TAFE Campus. It will also move some of the pick-up and drop-off activity currently occurring informally outside residential driveways and near Meadowbank Station to a formal location. As part of the travel plan, a lower private vehicle mode share is also being targeted which will result in a lower parking demand, therefore likely offsetting the loss of four on-street parking spaces.

Ref.	Agency	Response
		On-site pick-up and drop-off areas are not ideal as they increase the concentration of traffic around vehicles accesses to the site, increase the number of conflict points with vehicles and pedestrians, reduce the efficiency of the pick-up and drop-off activity and are less desirable to use as they result in a slower and longer detour for the driver. Further to this, the TAFE has limited area on the campus to provide such a facility onsite, with both development sites for the multi-trades and digital technology hub and the new multi-storey car park being largely built out to the boundaries of the site. Please refer to the Response to Submissions, prepared by GTA Consultants and dated 20 July 2020, included at Appendix C.
B4	The approved Review of Environmental Factors addresses site preparation works for the Northern (Hub Building) site. Please confirm whether there a separate approved REF for site preparation works for the Southern (Car Park) site or whether site preparation works form part of the SSD application.	Site preparation works for the multi-storey car park form part of this SSD application. An updated Preliminary Construction Management Plan, dated July 2020, has been prepared by GHD and now includes the site preparation works for the multi-storey car park (Appendix D). In addition, a demolition plan for the car park site is provided at Appendix E.
B5	Confirm whether construction vehicle loading/unloading will occur: • on-site or within an on-street works zone for the Car Park? • only within the on-street works zone for the Hub Building?	It is anticipated that construction vehicle loading/ unloading will occur on-site during the early stages of construction, however given the limited available area on the multistorey car park site, it is anticipated that an on-street works zone would be required to accommodate the delivery of materials for the main construction works. The multi-trades and digital technology hub site has the option of accommodating deliveries on-site in the location of the proposed access road along the northern boundary of the site. As such, it is not envisaged a works zone would be required for this site. Please refer to the Response to Submissions, prepared by GTA Consultants and dated 20 July 2020, included at Appendix C.
B6	Confirm whether the Hub and Car Park buildings would be constructed in stages or at the same time.	It is planned for both buildings to be constructed at the same time. A detailed Construction Traffic and Pedestrian Management Plan will be prepared prior to construction and will seek to minimise the cumulative traffic impact of construction of both sites at the same time as much as

Ref.	Agency	Response
		possible (e.g. coordination of concrete pours) with consideration also to the neighbouring MEEPSP construction site. Please refer to the Response to Submissions, prepared by GTA Consultants and dated 20 July 2020, included at Appendix C.
B7	Respond to the concern raised in public submissions about the adequacy of the: • setback of the Hub Building from the adjoining Substation Site. • height clearance to car parking areas for trades vehicles.	The project Architect (Gray Puksand) confirms that the building and its proximity to the adjoining substation site has been designed in accordance with statutory requirements and has been subject to liasion with Ausgrid through the design process. Furthermore, it is noted that an Electromagnetic Field Study was carried out by a specialist engineer and the report forms part of the original SSDA submission package. Gray Puksand can confirm that the car-parking structures have been built to comply with Australian Standard AS2890 Off Street Parking and will be able to accommodate utes and such with a comfortable slab to slab dimension to both the Multi Trades and Digital Technology Hub and New Car parking Structure, in excess of the minimum requirements noted in the standard.
B8	Confirm that the way-finding sign/column at the north-western corner of the Hub Building is located within the identified boundary of the site.	The project Architect (Gray Puksand) confirms that there is no project signage currently proposed outside of TAFE Meadowbank Campus Boundary. This boundary is identified on the detail survey documentation prepared by CMS Surveyors forming part of the original SSDA application.

Attachment B

Response to Agency Submissions (SSD 10349)

Ref.	Agency	Response
A	**Environment Protection Authority**	
Contamination		
A1	The EPA's submission on the EIS raised concerns about sampling data gaps in the detailed site investigation, and risks associated with the potential for unexploded ordnance (UXO) (albeit low). The EPA has reviewed the Detailed Site (Contamination) Investigation, prepared by Douglas Partners (dated 23 April 2020) and notes that analysis of soil samples were undertaken for various contaminants and three new groundwater wells were installed which did not find groundwater. The contamination report investigated only the proposed multi-storey carpark located in See Street Meadowbank and stated that the contaminants of concern in soil were below reporting limits for the adopted soil acceptance criteria. The EPA also notes that the RtS has committed to: • further testing and validation sampling being undertaken prior to bulk excavation and removal of material from the site as per the Remediation Action Plan (RAP); • the engagement of certified consultants; • the unexpected finds protocol in the RAP being updated following additional investigations; and • if remediation is required due to unexpected contamination finds, the applicant will engage a Site Auditor to provide increased certainty to the planning authority on the nature and extent of contamination, the appropriateness of the RAP, and the suitability of this site for the proposed use. The EPA recommends the following revised conditions be included in the consent:	Noted. No objection raised with the imposition of conditions.

Ref.	Agency	Response
	1. The applicant must conduct site investigations to determine the full nature and extent of the contamination at the project area. The site investigations must be undertaken, and the subsequent report(s), must be prepared in accordance with relevant guidelines made or approved by the EPA under section 105 of the Contaminated Land Management Act 1997. The reports must be prepared, or reviewed and approved, by consultants certified under either the Environment Institute of Australia and New Zealand's Certified Environmental Practitioner (Site Contamination) scheme (CEnvP(SC)) or the Soil Science Australia Certified Professional Soil Scientist Contaminated Site Assessment and Management (CPSS CSAM) scheme.	
	2. The Unexpected Finds Procedure and the Remediation Action Plan (RAP) must be updated following results of further site investigations and implemented throughout duration of project work.	Noted. No objection raised with the imposition of conditions.
	3. Prior to commencement of operation, the applicant must submit a Validation Report for the development. The Validation Report must: a. be prepared, or reviewed and approved, by consultants certified under either the Environment Institute of Australia and New Zealand's Certified Environmental Practitioner (Site Contamination) scheme (CEnvP(SC)) or the Soil Science Australia Certified Professional Soil Scientist Contaminated Site Assessment and Management (CPSS CSAM) scheme. b. be prepared in accordance with the relevant guidelines made or approved by the EPA under section 105 of the Contaminated Land Management Act 1997. c. include, but not be limited to: i. comment on the extent and nature of the remediation undertaken; ii. if material is to remain in-situ and capped, describe the location, nature and extent of any remaining contamination on site as well as any ongoing management requirements;	Noted. No objection raised with the imposition of conditions.

Ref.	Agency	Response
	iii. sampling and analysis plan and sampling methodology undertaken as part of the remediation; iv. if treated material is to remain on the subject site, results of sampling of treated material, compared with the treatment criteria in the most updated RAP; v. results of any validation sampling, compared to relevant guidelines/criteria; and vi. comment on the suitability of the area for the intended land use d. be submitted to the Planning Secretary for review one month after the completion of remediation works.	
	4. Prior to commencement of operation, the applicant must obtain confirmation from the Certifying Authority in writing that the requirements of condition 3 have been met.	Noted. No objection raised with the imposition of conditions.
	5. If, based on further site investigations, it is determined that ongoing on-site management of soil or groundwater contamination is required, then the following requirements will apply: a. the applicant must engage a NSW EPA-accredited Site Auditor to provide increased certainty to the Department on the appropriateness of the site for the proposed use. The applicant must obtain from a NSW EPA-accredited Site Auditor a Section A2 Site Audit Statement accompanied by an Environmental Management Plan prepared by a certified consultant, and submit it to the Planning Secretary and relevant Council for information no later than one month before the commencement of operation. b. the development must not be used for the purpose approved under the terms of this consent until a Site Audit Statement determines the land is suitable for that purpose and any conditions on the Site Audit Statement have been complied with.	Noted. No objection raised with the imposition of conditions.

Ref.	Agency	Response
Noise and Vibration		
A2	The EPA notes that while the RtS has responded to EPA's comments regarding noise in its submission on the EIS, the RtS also outlines amendments to the project since the EIS exhibition. The amendments comprise mainly the addition of a new multi-storey carpark to the south of the Hub building and the corresponding reduction of the car parking underneath the Hub building, to reduce the amount of sandstone excavation required. The EPA recognises that Appendix C of the revised Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (NVIA), prepared by JHA (dated 29 April 2020) has responded to the EPA's previous comments, however concerns remain that the main body of the NVIA retains some previously raised anomalies – as identified below – which may lead to misinterpretation of the NVIA and its outcomes. In summary, the EPA considers that some issues raised in its submission are yet to be satisfactorily addressed by the applicant: 1. The NVIA adopts project noise trigger levels (PNTLs) in Table 7, for both residential and educational receiver types, as per the Noise Policy for Industry (EPA, 2017). The residential PNTLs for the evening and night-time periods, and the educational PNTLs, are based on amenity criteria in this instance. The predicted noise levels in Table 15, Table 16, Table 17, Table 19 and Table 22 are not, however, assessed against these PNTLs. The criteria used in the assessment are from Table 8 and appear to comprise the intrusive noise criteria only. The main body of the NVIA should be revised to assess predicted noise levels against the derived PNTLs in Table 7. It is likely that additional feasible and reasonable mitigation measures, over those identified in the NVIA, will be required to address any exceedances of the PNTLs. All feasible and reasonable mitigation measures should be considered to achieve the PNTLs, even where predicted exceedances are only 1 or 2 dBA.	An updated Noise and Vibration Report, prepared by JHA dated 30/06/2020, has been prepared and is provided at Appendix F. The updated report adopts project noise trigger levels (PNTLs) across all assessments as required by the EPA.

Ref.	Agency	Response
	2. The noise from movement of vehicles within the car parks during the portion of the night-time period when the carparks are proposed to be operational (one half-hour from 10:00 pm to 10:30 pm) has been assessed using a time correction of 12 dB to reflect the assumption that a single vehicle will emit noise for a total duration of 1 minute within a 15 minute period. This suggests that only two vehicle movements in total during that half hour period have been assumed in the assessment. It is unclear how this low number of assumed vehicle movements relates to the assertion, raised previously by EPA, that 'noise levels have been considered as continuous over a 15-minute assessment period', stated in Section 5.6.1 of the NVIA. Response 5 of Appendix C also states that 'all car parking associated with the proposed development will be located in basement carparks', which is not the case for the above ground car park.	An updated Noise and Vibration Report, prepared by JHA dated 30/06/2020, has been prepared and is provided at Appendix F. The assumptions made for the assessment are consistent with the advice provided from the Traffic Consultants (GTA Consultants). Nonetheless, JHA have advised that an additional car exiting the car park is unlikely to have an adverse impact. JHA have considered all reasonable and feasible mitigation measures, however these are quite limited given the nature of the development.
	3. Response 5 in Appendix C of the NVIA identifies an 8 dB exceedance of the LAmax sleep disturbance criterion. No further action is considered in the NVIA to address this exceedance as guidance from the Road Noise Policy is put forward that concludes the predicted noise levels are unlikely to cause awakening reactions. While the EPA understands that awakening reactions are unlikely in this instance, it is important to recognise that awakenings are at the upper end of a range of sleep disturbance effects, and effects such as increased transition time to sleep, changes in sleep state and reduced duration of deep (slow-wave) sleep may occur at lower noise levels such as those predicted. In light of the identified 8 dB exceedance, the EPA recommends that the applicant consider whether any feasible and reasonable mitigation measures are able to be implemented at the design stage to minimise the potential for sleep disturbance due to short term noise events from car park use during the night-time period.	An updated Noise and Vibration Report, prepared by JHA and dated 30/06/2020, has been prepared and is provided at Appendix F. JHA confirms that they have considered all reasonable and feasible mitigation measures. However, the available mitigation options are very limited given that the identified exceedance is from a car exiting the site.
	4. The EPA recommends that construction activities take place during the recommended standard hours in the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (ICNG) (DECC, 2009). The Department of Planning may	The SSDA includes a request for extended hours of construction. This is discussed in detail in Section 3.3 of the updated Preliminary Construction Management Plan included at Appendix D.

Ref.	Agency	Response
	wish to consider any request to extend the hours of work as part of its consideration of the proposal.	The proposed hours of Construction are generally in accordance with Section 4.6 of Part 8.1 of the Ryde Development Control Plan 2014 which provides for: • Monday to Friday: 7:00 am – 7:00 pm • Saturday: 8:00 am – 4:00 pm • Sunday/Public Holidays – No construction work The construction hours specified in the RDCP 2014 permit longer hours than those specified in the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (ICNG), including an additional one hour on weekdays (up to 7:00 pm as opposed to 6:00 pm) and additional three hours on Saturday (up to 4:00 pm as opposed to 1:00 pm). The updated Noise and Vibration Report, prepared by JHA and dated 30/06/2020, provides an assessment against the extended hours of construction. In order to meet the noise limits for outside of standard work hours JHA have proposed the following: • Unattended noise monitoring at locations agreed with the project manager and acoustic engineer with realtime alerts to the builder/ site manager when the noise criteria are exceeded. • No noisy works during out-of-hours works i.e. excavation, rock-breaking, piling etc. • Provide acoustic screening of construction activities through the use of solid Class A hoarding, temporary acoustic curtains and/or careful construction site planning Further to the above, the detailed assessment in the form of a CNVMP shall be provided prior to Construction Certificate to ensure that the proposed construction works and the mitigation measures satisfy the aforementioned noise criteria.
	5. Any inconsistencies between the main body of the NVIA and the information in Appendix C should be resolved by the applicant.	For clarity, the updated Noise and Vibration Report has been amended to remove Appendix from the report.

Ref.	Agency	Response
B	**Heritage Council of NSW**	
B1	HNSW notes that there has been a change between the EIS and RTS Stages and that AMBS (2020) now advises that the change will result in likely disturbance to historical archaeological resources of local significance. The archaeological resources are argued to include a former tramway which is associated with the Mellor Meadowbank Manufacturing Company. Heritage Council for NSW has guidance on the assessment of significance for historical archaeological sites and relics. For archaeological resources to be considered relics and retain archaeological significance, they must demonstrate a level of research potential. Although the AMBS (2020) submission states that the tramway may demonstrate evidence of technological change, the submission has not been clear in how this could be the case for a later 19th century tramway. A full archaeological monitoring program is not supported, however a short program to identify the location of the tramway to guide the likely positioning of other archaeological features in other parts of the TAFE campus with archaeological potential and higher significance, may be warranted. As this is not considered to be an archaeological program, but an archival recording of the tramway, an archaeological research design and nominated excavation director are not recommended for this program. The following requirements are therefore recommended: Archival Recording of the Tramway A. The Applicant shall undertake a short archaeological monitoring program to enable an archival record of the location and survivability of the former tramway. This will enable its location and depth to be adequately recorded to assist the future management of associated archaeological resources within the broader TAFE site. B. A final archival recording report with the location plan, levels reduced to Australian height datum and photographic data shall be complied into a short report within 12 months of the of the monitoring program. A copy shall not be titled an excavation report, but an archival recording and shall be provided to the Department of Planning and	Noted. No objection raised with the imposition of conditions.

Ref.	Agency	Response
	Environment (DPIE), the Heritage Council of NSW and to the local Council's local studies unit.	
C	**Department of Planning, Industry and Environment - Environment, Energy and Science Group dated 28 May 2020**	
Aboriginal Cultural Heritage		
C1	It is noted that within the RtS table that the proponent has agreed that conditions recommended by the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report prepared by AMBS Ecology & Heritage dated October 2019 form conditions of consent.	Noted.
Biodiversity		
C2	There is no further comment in relation to biodiversity.	Noted.
Flooding		
C3	There is no further comment in relation to flooding.	Noted.
D	**Department of Planning, Industry and Environment - Environment, Energy and Science Group dated 29 June 2020**	
D1	Thank you for your email of 22 June 2020, requesting further input from Environment, Energy and Science Group (EES) on the final revised Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR) for the Response to Submissions (RtS) for Multi-Trades and Digital Technology Hub at TAFE NSW Meadowbank Education and Employment Precinct. EES notes that the final version prepared by AMBS Ecology & Heritage dated June 2020 includes the outcomes of consultation with Aboriginal parties, and still contains recommendations. It is assumed that the RtS table remains unchanged and that the proponent still agrees that conditions recommended by the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report prepared by AMBS Ecology & Heritage dated October 2019 and any further recommendations	Noted.

Ref.	Agency	Response
	contained in the final version as outlined above will form conditions of consent.	
E	**Government Architect NSW**	
E1	Additional materials to address previously raised queries have been submitted and we have no further comments on this application.	Noted.
F	**Transport for NSW**	
F1	The RtS has been reviewed and no further comments are raised. It is noted that the RtS includes suggestions in the form of mitigation measures or conditions in addressing issues previously raised in the submission to the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). Should the proposed development be approved, it is envisaged the RtS would become part of the EIA documentation under the conditions of consent that the proposed development be bound to carry out.	Noted.

Attachment C

Response to Public Submissions (SSD 10349)

Ref.	Agency	Response
A	**Public Submission**	
	Tafe meadowbank has been a very green campus and offered uniqe environment for the students and the community. I strongly disgree to remove hundreds of trees for the car park, especially coming on the heels of a record hot summer and bush fires. With modern technology, building multilevel car park, dig basement for carpark can be easily done while saving the trees that have been in that area for many years. With more people coming to the campus, it is more of reasons to keep the trees and offer shade and some nature on compus. Trees are hard to grow to the state as it is now, we can easily build carpark with multi levels that do not require to remove the trees.	The application proposes the removal of 114 trees from the site, including: • 97 trees to construct the Multi-Trades and Digital Technology Hub • 17 trees to construct of the multi-storey car park It is noted that two separate Arboricultural Impact Assessments (AIAs), prepared by Tree Survey Arboricultural Consultants, were provided as part of the Response to Submissions. These reports address tree removal to the north-eastern (The Hub) and south-eastern (multi-storey car park) areas of the campus respectively. A revised AIA for the multi-storey car park has been submitted as part of this SRtS to reflect the removal of tree number 202 (Appendix I). Due to the revisions to the project scope in the RtS, which included the revised development footprint to incorporate the multi-storey carpark, a new Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) waiver was required to be issued. A BDAR waiver was prepared by EMM (dated 9 April 2020) which concluded that the revised development footprint will not result in additional biodiversity impacts beyond those that were previously assessed and considered as part of the original BDAR waiver request. Overall, it was found that the revised project will not result in significant impacts on threatened species, populations or communities. The new BDAR waiver request was submitted to DPIE on 9 April 2020 and referred to the Environment, Energy and Science Group (EESG) for consideration and determination. EESG determined that the proposed development is not likely to have any significant impact on biodiversity values and therefore the amended proposal does not need to be accompanied by a BDAR. TAFE NSW was

<table>
<tr><th>Ref.</th><th>Agency</th><th>Response</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>
formally advised of the BDAR waiver in a letter received from DPIE and dated 6 May 2020.

It is noted, that EESG have not raised any further issues with the amended proposal in their RtS letter dated 28 May 2020.

66 replacement trees are proposed under this SSDA which replace the significant trees within the site. The location of the replacement trees are as follows:

• The Hub: 12 trees
• Car Park: 15 trees
• Demolished Block D & E: 39 trees

All new tree plantings will be of mature stock including:

• All trees except Livstona Palm: 150L stock
• Livstona Palm: Trunk size 5-7m caliper

Consideration has been given to both the Urban Forest Technical Manual (Tree Management Technical Manual, City of Ryde 2012) and the NSW draft Greener Places Design Guide. The below table provides an analysis of the existing and proposed tree coverage calculations for the site.

<table>
<tr><th>Description</th><th>Area and/ or percentage</th></tr>
<tr><td>Total Meadowbank TAFE site area</td><td>61,688.90m^2</td></tr>
<tr><td>Existing tree canopy
(total canopy of trees which trunks are within site boundary)</td><td>24,068.19m^2
39% of total Meadowbank TAFE site area</td></tr>
<tr><td>Tree canopy reduction resulting from proposed tree removal</td><td>6,514.05m^2
27% reduction of the total existing tree canopy area, or a reduction of approx. 10.6% of the total Meadowbank TAFE site area</td></tr>
<tr><td>Proposed total tree canopy post construction (66 new tree canopies at 6m diameter)</td><td>19,420.24m^2
31% of total Meadowbank TAFE site area</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

Ref.	Agency	Response
		The NSW Government's draft Urban Tree Canopy Guide suggests targets of 25% in urban residential areas (medium to high density and light commercial). The site is in a medium to high density urban area that is undergoing renewal and change and the proposed 31% tree canopy coverage after the construction exceeds the draft 25% target in such areas.
B	**Public Submission**	
	We are a long term residents at Meadowbank with my wife and 2 kids. Our family is very excited about the proposed education and employment centre. Especially, we look forward to the completion of the new primary school and high school. The facility will generate a number of new employment opportunities in the area. Also it will provide better education opportunities for my kids.	Noted.
C	**Public Submission**	
	I object to the removal of an additional 113 trees as I feel this provides valuable natural environment for the wildlife of Sydney	Please refer to above discussion regarding tree removal provided under Public Submission A.
D	**Public Submission**	
	I am objecting to the removal of 113 from the Tafe to make room for a car park. We have just had the hottest summer on record we need to keep as many mature trees as possible. The recent bush fires have made habitat for our native birds ever more important that is what the 113 trees can help with. We must look at the bigger picture removing these trees will have a real negative knock on effect with our Ryde community.	Please refer to above discussion regarding tree removal provided under Public Submission A.
E	**Public Submission**	
	"I raise this Objection to the Original plans to the Technology Builds changes to reduce the number of underground car parking spaces. The	The multi-storey carpark has been carefully designed to provide maximum efficiency, whilst respecting how it relates to the adjoining residential area

Ref.	Agency	Response
	Original plans had NO impact on residents and made practical sense. The revised plans to build a Multi story car park opposite 34 See Street and the Italian Bilingual School. I will only support on the conditions that changes are made: 1. the Lowest Floor of the Multi story Car park be below street level, so that the Upper level is only a single Story high. 2. the Up and Down Car Ramps are both located on the TAFE Building side and do not face the residents on See Street. (The V8 Cars will make too much noise going up and down the Ramps after 9pm at night) 3. the Building to set too close to the Boundary, this needs to be set back as far a the current Car Park is located and substantial trees and plant planted between the boundary and building the block the Building. I refute the statement that this will have little impact on the Heritage of the area because of the other Buildings being built in the Area. Why add to the horrendous eyesore issue we have now with another eyesore. Also your Heritage Impact Assessment is Flawed and out of date, the Laurel's Nursing Home has not been in operation since 2003, so your data is 17 years out of date."	to the east along See Street. The decision to omit a roof structure has ensured it presents at a similar scale to the proposed Multi-Trades and Digital Technology Hub to the north, echoing the architecture of the main building. This enables minimal impact to the amenity enjoyed by the adjoining residences, with overshadowing kept predominantly to See Street, utilising the favourable north to south orientation of the site. On this basis, the request to lower the height of the multi-storey car park is considered unnecessary. The access and egress points for the multi-storey carpark are located off an internal private driveway and do not directly front See Street as asserted in this submission. An updated Noise and Vibration Assessment, prepared by JHA and dated June 2020, is provided at Appendix F. This report provides an acoustic assessment for both car parks. With regard to sleep disturbance the report confirms that the sleep disturbance criteria to the most affected residents should be met. The proposed building setbacks provide for a suitable presentation to See Street with appropriate areas for landscaping, as illustrated in the landscape plans submitted with the RtS. It is noted that the Government Architect did not raise any issues with the proposed building setbacks, or the design in general, in their latest response dated 10 June 2020. A Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), prepared by AMBS Ecology & Heritage and dated May 2020, was submitted with the amended proposal. This report notes that the *"proposed multistorey carpark will not affect the physical fabric or historic significance of the built heritage items associated with the TAFE precinct or the adjacent heritage items"*. It is acknowledged that the HIA states that the proposed multistorey carpark would have minor impacts on the visual amenity of the immediate area of the two locally significant heritage items, the Fountain Monument and The Laurels. Nonetheless, these minor impacts are considered acceptable given the proposed multi-storey carpark will enable the continued development of the Meadowbank TAFE precinct with improved facilities and associated infrastructure.

Ref.	Agency	Response
		It is noted that the HIA has been updated to correctly reference that the 'The Laurels' was formerly used as a nursing home (Appendix G).
F	**Public Submission**	
	"Submission to Multi-Trades and Digital Technology Hub at Tafe Meadowbank Dear Jason Maslen We oppose the building of a new multi storey car park at the place of the current staff car park opposite 34 See St and ibs primary school. • It will completely destroy the street character of See Street between the intersections of Angas St and Constitution Rd where the oldest house in the area is a so called House of importance and heritage listed. • The location is adjacent to the relocated Tafe child care centre and opposite of the ibs primary school, and the increased traffic can not meet safety requirements for the hundreds of students, young children and their parents there. • There is also no Traffic Impact assessment done for the new proposed site. We strongly suggest to stick to the original plan of building the required car parks below the new technology hub with entrance and exit at Rhodes Street allowing easy access to underground parking. Alternatively, a more suitable location would be on the Western side of the Tafe campus along the rail tracks where ramps and multi storey car parks do not affect the residential street character. Thank you for your consideration. major residents affected opposite proposed multi story carpark."	As detailed under the response to Public Submission E, the proposal is considered acceptable from a heritage perspective. A revised Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment, dated 1 May 2020, was submitted with the amended proposal which takes into account the addition of the multi-storey carpark. Access to the proposed car park is via a private driveway and therefore is segregated from neighbouring land uses. In addition, boom gates are proposed to the entry/ exits of the car park. This minimises any potential conflict between vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists.

Ref.	Agency	Response
G	**Public Submission**	
	"The Original plans had minimal impact on residents and made practical sense. The revised plans to build a Multi story car park opposite 34 See Street and the Italian Bilingual School, Scout hall and daycare centre. There is a high level of pedestrian activity in the area The proposal could be less detrimental with the following modifications: 1. the Lowest Floor of the Multi story Car park be below street level, so that the Upper level is only a single Story high. 2. the Up and Down Car Ramps are both located on the TAFE Building side and do not face the residents on See Street in order to reduce noise and light pollution. 3. the Building is set back further and substantial trees are planted to provide visual screening. This is important to preserve the character of the neighbourhood."	The issues raised in this submission are consistent with those raised is Public Submission E and have been addressed.
H	**Public Submission**	
	"To whom it may concern The design has no fire compliance, surveillance report and also does not address the neighboring substation. the design also have too many blind spots thus creating areas for suspicious activity, its a heaven for homeless shelter in the public area , the large roof canopy does not address the local environment, bulk and scale far exceed the context of the site , absent setbacks for blast proof material requirements for neighboring substation, also absent of setback shown on the roof canopy create stress for neighbors across the road. Friendly Meadowbank Neighbors"	In relation to the safety concerns, it is noted that a Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) report, dated October 2019 was submitted as part of the application documentation for the Multi-Trades and Digital Technology Hub. As part of the revised proposal a CPTED Addendum, dated 5 May 2020, was submitted. This report covered both the amendments to the Multi-Trades and Digital Technology Hub and the multi-storey carpark and concludes that "*the proposed design is consistent with CPTED principles and is acceptable from a crime risk perspective*". Further, it is acknowledged that a fire safety report has not been submitted as it was not requested during the SEARs process or within the Department's Issues Letter dated 29 November 2019. Nonetheless, both the Multi-Trades and Digital Technology Hub and the multi-storey car park will be required to be constructed in accordance with

Ref.	Agency	Response
		the requirements of the Building Code of Australia, which contains fire safety regulations. The Multi-Trades and Digital Technology Hub is located outside of the electricity easement associated with the substation to the north. Finally, the project Architect (Gray Puksand) confirms that the building and its proximity to the adjoining substation site has been designed in accordance with statutory requirements and has been subject to liasion with Ausgrid through the design process. Furthermore, it is noted that an Electromagnetic Field Study was carried out by a specialist engineer and the report forms part of the original SSDA submission package. The proposed design of the multi-storey car park has been addressed under Public Submission E.