

Mr Matt Benson  
Chief Executive, Newcastle Jockey Club  
C/- David Read  
Avid Project Management Pty Ltd  
PO Box 206  
CARRINGTON NSW 2294

14 June 2022

Dear Mr Benson,

**Newcastle Jockey Club Stable Development (SSD-12982045)**

**Request for Further Information**

I refer to the above proposed development at the Newcastle Jockey Club. Following the submission of the Response to Submissions package, the application was referred to Newcastle City Council for review and advice. Having carefully reviewed the proposal and the subsequent response from Council, the Department requires that further information also be provided to address the issues raised in **Attachment A**.

The Department requests that you provide a consolidated response to the issues raised in Attachment A by **14 July 2022**.

Please lodge your response by progressing the application on the major projects planning portal <https://majorprojects.planningportal.nsw.gov.au>. Council's comments can also be found on the portal.

If you have any questions, please contact Chris Eldred on (02) 8289 6855 at [Christopher.Eldred@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Christopher.Eldred@planning.nsw.gov.au).

Yours sincerely,



Kendall Clydsdale  
**A/Director Regional Assessments**  
**NSW Planning**  
**as delegate for the Planning Secretary**

## **ATTACHMENT A – REQUEST FOR INFORMATION**

### **1. Response to Submissions**

The submitted RTS package was referred back to Newcastle Council for comment. Whilst the package has addressed a number of the issues raised in the initial submission, there are still a number of outstanding issues that require consideration. The Department requests that you provide a response to the matters raised by Council. Please also see points 2-8 below in this regard.

### **2. Architectural Plans**

In reference to point 5 of Council's response relating to the prospective acquisition of land for the construction of a roundabout, the Department requests that revised plans be submitted to address how the proposed signage will be positioned in relation to the revised boundary post acquisition.

### **3. Vehicle Turning Paths**

The Department requests that consideration be given to the submitted turning paths and the concerns raised by Council on their usability and potential safety issues. The Department requests that the vehicle movements on the upper and lower concourses be quantified to ascertain the potential conflicts with traffic in the Equine and Goods Drop Off Loading Zone.

### **4. Stormwater Discharge**

The Department notes and agrees with Council's concerns with respect to the proposed discharge of stormwater from areas impacted by horse effluent. Any contaminated stormwater discharge from these areas should be directed to a reticulated sewer system as appropriate. Revised stormwater and sewer details to address this matter are required.

### **5. Traffic Impact Assessment**

The traffic impact assessment has left some ambiguity as to the projected traffic numbers and movements once the Stables are operational.

The Department is seeking the following information or points of clarification:

- a) Are horses to be floated in each day from off the site for trackwork each morning? If they are, how many are expected, where will they be dropped off and where will the float vehicles park for the duration of trackwork? Following trackwork, where are the horses collected to be transported off site? The Department requests a breakdown of the total vehicle movements associated with horses floated in for track work each day.
- b) Do the drivers of the horses that are floated in contribute to the 154 staff on site each day?
- c) A projected level of vehicular use for each access point is required. This should include the projected number of vehicles to enter and exit each access point, their purpose for accessing the site (staff for trackwork, deliveries, track maintenance etc.), as well as the anticipated split between heavy and light vehicles.

- d) Does trackwork occur as normal on a race day? Are there changes in traffic associated with track work on race days?
- e) Table 1 within the TIA identifies the additional peak traffic, as well as the overall additional traffic. The department seeks clarification if this should represent the total traffic (rather than additional) projected to be generated as part of the development. The Department requests that the current and projected traffic movements be quantified, including reference to point a) above.
- f) The architectural plans should indicate the proposed area to be utilised for infield parking.
- g) Will the total 161 car spaces be available for staff carparking each morning, or on mornings outside of a race day?

## **6. Preliminary Construction Management Plan**

The submitted Preliminary Construction Management Plan and preliminary Construction Traffic Management Plan have not provided an indication on the peak traffic volumes arising during construction works. In reference to point 4 of the issued SEARs, an assessment of the anticipated additional traffic generated by the construction phase of the development was required. The department requires a quantitative assessment of the anticipated construction traffic including the type of vehicles and the anticipated peak periods.

The CTMP makes reference to parking be available on site for construction vehicles. The Department requests confirmation whether this includes construction staff vehicles? In addition, does this location changed between the stages of construction?

The CTMP has provided heavy vehicle routes for the local road network. The department requests these routes be extended to demonstrate the paths that vehicles will take to the closest collector roads.

## **7. Noise Impact Assessment**

The submitted noise impact assessment appears to have misrepresented the location of sensitive receptors to the noise generators. Table 9 within the NIA appears to identify receptors considerable further away from the site than actual conditions. To the west of the site, residential allotments are located approximately 20m from the subject site boundary or as close as 27.5m from the proposed stables, however the NIA has identified this receptor as being 120m from the site. Whilst an average distance may have been utilised, this provides a significant variation in the potential impacts for a dwelling at 27.5m when compared to 120m.

The Department requires clarification of the distances used within Table 9. Should an average distance be utilised, the Department would request a further assessment of those dwellings that lie between 27.5m and 120m to ascertain the potential impacts to those receptors.

## **8. Air Quality Risk Assessment and the Operational Waste Management Plan**

It is noted that the submitted AQRA has made recommendations including the daily hosing out of stables and the use of odour neutralising agents when necessary, however these measures have not been incorporated into the OWMP. The OWMP states that soiled bedding only would be removed, with no indication of potential hosing out of each stable. In addition,

the frequency of pressure washers calculated within the NIA does not appear to have accounted for the daily cleaning of stables.

The Department requests confirmation of whether there would be daily washing of stables given the inconsistencies between the supporting documents provided. Should this be the case, the OWMP and NIA should be amended to reflect the proposed daily cleaning.