

Our ref: OUT23/85

Paula Bizimis

Planning and Assessment Group
NSW Department of Planning and Environment

Email: paula.bizimis@planning.nsw.gov.au

10 January 2023

**Subject: Sydney Olympic Park Metro Station – Over & Adjacent Station Development (SSD-35283699)
Environmental Assessment**

Dear Paula Bizimis,

I refer to your request for advice sent on 11 November 2022 to the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) Water about the above matter.

This concept State Significant Development application is for an over station development and an adjacent station development at Sydney Olympic Park metro station. The concept plan forms part of the staged approval approach of the Sydney Metro West. The key issue of relevance to aquifer interference is the car parking for up to 358 vehicles in a basement below Buildings 2 and 3.

DPE Water advises that the concept proposal does not provide adequate information to understand water entitlement requirements and impacts to groundwater. Water take volumes and the ability to account for this take needs to be clearly understood as it can pose a significant risk to the project. Please note detailed advice in Attachment A.

Should you have any further queries in relation to this submission please do not hesitate to contact DPE Water Assessments water.assessments@dpie.nsw.gov.au, or the following coordinating officer within DPE Water:

Liz Rogers – Manager Assessments

E: liz.rogers@dpie.nsw.gov.au

M: 0428 600 421

Yours sincerely



Simon Francis
Senior Project Officer, Assessments, Knowledge Division
Department of Planning and Environment: Water

Attachment A

Detailed advice to DPE Planning & Assessment regarding the Sydney Olympic Park Metro Station Development (SSD-35283699)

1.0 Water entitlements

1.1 Recommendation – Post approval

That the proponent ensures that the EIS for the final detailed design:

- a) quantifies the maximum annual volume of water take due to aquifer interference activities when undertaking the final detailed design of the basement levels as required for the project, and
- b) demonstrates sufficient entitlement can be acquired in the relevant water source unless an exemption applies.

1.2 Recommendation – Post approval

That the proponent ensures sufficient water entitlement is held in a water access licence/s to account for the maximum predicted take for each water source prior to take occurring unless an exemption applies.

1.3 Explanation

Insufficient information has been provided in this concept proposal to confirm the potential inflow volumes during construction and operation. Water take volumes and the ability to account for this take needs to be clearly understood as it can pose a significant risk to the project.

2.0 Groundwater management

2.1 Recommendation – Post approval

That the proponent ensures that the EIS for the final detailed design of the basement levels includes an assessment against the Aquifer Interference Policy (2012), and if impacts exceed the minimal impact considerations that a tanked basement is adopted.

2.2 Explanation

The EIS for the Concept State Significant Development application does not provide enough information to understand the impacts to groundwater. The geotechnical report provides a short summary of previous reporting and concludes that the box and tunnel will likely underdrain the basement. Given the lack of current detailed design, modelled drawdown for additional structures and impact assessment, it is unclear whether the addition of the basement levels as a drained structure would cause more than minimal impacts to groundwater.

A finalised design or impact assessment is not available in the Concept State Significant Development application for this development.

DPE Water recommends that the EIS for the final detailed design include an assessment against the Aquifer Interference Policy (2012). This assessment should consider the additional cumulative impacts of the drained basement against the Minimal Impact Considerations for Aquifer Interference Activities in table 1 of the Aquifer Interference Policy (2012). If impacts exceed the minimal impact considerations a tanked basement should be adopted.

End Attachment A
