

State Significant Development Application – SSD 7262 Response to Submissions

March 2016 | Prepared for Health Infrastructure



Westmead Hospital Darcy Road Multi Storey Car Park and Associated Works

Architectus Group Pty Ltd
ABN 90 131 245 684
Level 18 MLC Centre
19 Martin Place
Sydney NSW 2000
Australia
T 61 2 8252 8400
F 61 2 8252 8600
sydney@architectus.com.au
www.architectus.com.au

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Purpose	3
1.2	Background	3
1.3	Authorship	4
2	Changes to development and impacts	5
2.1	Proposed changes to development	5
2.2	Impacts of proposed changes	6
2.3	Plans and documentation	7
3	Public exhibition outcomes	11
3.1	Themes raised in submissions and responses	11
3.1.1	Heritage	11
3.1.2	Site investigation and remediation	12
3.1.3	Asbestos	12
3.1.4	Waste control and management	12
3.1.5	Dust control and management	13
3.1.6	Erosion and sediment control	13
3.1.7	Water quality and conservation	14
3.1.8	Noise and vibration	14
3.1.9	Energy efficiency	15
3.1.10	Traffic	15
3.1.11	Accessibility	20
4	Mitigation measures	22
5	Conclusion and recommendation	23

Tables

Table 1	Numerical Summary	5
Table 2	List of Plans and Drawings for Project	7
Table 3	Key Issues and Mitigation Measures	22

Appendices

Appendix A	Submissions	24
Appendix B	Response to individual submissions	25
Appendix C	Architectural drawings	26
Appendix D	Civil drawings	27
Appendix E	Civil statement	28
Appendix F	Landscape plans	29
Appendix G	BCA statement	30
Appendix H	Services infrastructure	31
Appendix I	Heritage statement	32
Appendix J	Traffic statement	33
Appendix K	Acoustic statement	34
Appendix L	Acoustic report	35
Appendix M	Contamination and waste statement	36
Appendix N	Arborist statement	37
Appendix O	Hospital car parking fee policy	38
Appendix P	Site Auditor's Letter	39
Appendix Q	Statement of Heritage Impact	40

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose

This Response to Submissions (RTS) has been prepared for the State Significant Development Application (SSDA) for Darcy Road Multi Storey Car Park (MSCP) and Associated Works at Westmead Hospital. The application was publicly exhibited for a period of 4 weeks between 19 November 2015 and 18 December 2015. An extension was granted to government agencies, concluding on Thursday 28 January 2016.

This RTS has been prepared on behalf of Health Infrastructure (HI), the Applicant.

The purpose of the RTS is to:

- Provide a response to submissions received;
- Identify minor changes to the proposed development attributed to design development; and
- Assess the impact of the proposed changes.

A total of six submissions were received on the SSDA.

1.2 Background

State Significant Development Application No. SSD 7262 was lodged with the Department of Planning and Environment on 13 November 2015. The Application seeks approval for:

- Demolition of the following existing items and/or structures:
 - On-grade car park number 7;
 - Existing column lighting;
 - Fire services building;
 - Former Coroner's Court building slab;
 - Eastern part of Institute Road; and
 - Trees.
- Construction of 1,253 space multi-storey car park (MSCP) (8 levels) at the corner of Institute and Darcy Road, associated access and egress, and pedestrian bridge link connecting to the Oral Health Building;
- New at-grade car parking area (47 car spaces) east of the MSCP;
- Extension of Institute Road to the east to connect to new road approved under Part 5;
- Widening of Institute Road on approach to Darcy Road to provide two traffic lanes (55m long second lane) for intersection improvements; and
- Landscaping works including creation of a park and new pedestrian connections.

The site of the proposed works straddles two lots, legally described as Lot 1 in DP 1194390 and Lot 4 in DP 1077852, and is owned by NSW Health Administration Corporation and The Minister for Disability Services, respectively.

Refer to the EIS for further background information about the site and the proposed development.

1.3 Authorship

This RTS has been prepared by:

- Matt Kelly, Graduate Urban Planner
- Jane Anderson, Graduate Urban Planner
- Jane Fielding, Associate & Urban Planner

The RTS has been reviewed by Michael Harrison, Director, Urban Design and Planning.

2 Changes to development and impacts

2.1 Proposed changes to development

Amendments to the exhibited SSDA are proposed as an outcome of design development. Proposed changes include:

- Moving the MSCP building and Institute Road entrance driveway 1800 mm northward;
- Reducing floor to floor heights to 2.6 metres (Levels 1 to 5), and therefore reducing the overall building height by 1370 mm;
- Relocating the overland flow path from between the MSCP and Oral Health Clinic Building to the west of the MSCP adjacent to Darcy Road;
- Enlarging the landscape mounds in the park to accommodate more contaminated spoil from the excavation;
- Additional entry lane and boom gate off Institute Road (note, the proposed Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) will not be provided for access control, with traditional boom gate infrastructure and card access now included);
- Minor geometrical changes and provision of pedestrian crossings at the access to the MSCP via Institute Road;
- Moving the proposed substation from the interior to the exterior of the MSCP building; and
- Removal of trees attributed to new substation location.

A numerical summary of the proposed drawings, compared to the exhibited drawings, is shown below.

Table 1 Numerical Summary

	Lodged Architectural Drawings – SSD Application	Amended Architectural Drawings
Number of car spaces	1,254 space multi-storey car park 47 space at grade car park	1,253 space multi storey car park 47 space at grade car park
Floor to floor heights (mm)	Level 6: NA Level 5: 2900 Level 4: 2900 Level 3: 2900 Level 2: 2900 Level 1: 2900 Ground: 2900 Lower Ground: 2900	Level 6: NA Level 5: 2600 Level 4: 2600 Level 3: 2600 Level 2: 2900 Level 1: 2600 Ground: 2900 Lower Ground: 2900
Height in storeys	8 storeys	8 storeys
Building height	25.37 metres	24 metres
Lower ground level	RL 18.000	RL 18.300
Ground level	RL 20.900	RL 21.200
Building height (top of building RL)	RL 43.370	RL 42.300
Proximity to existing Oral Health building (mm) (Distance from car park lift lobby exit to internal door to Oral Health building)	16,500 mm	18,300 mm

Arboriculture	47 trees will require removal to accommodate the car park 29 trees will require removal to accommodate modification of Institute Road	<u>Building and entrance drive relocation:</u> No further trees require removal (other than those identified in initial Arboricultural Impact Assessment). <u>Substation relocation:</u> One mature tree appears to conflict and would require removal. Part of two young tree groups may be affected, but as the excavation for the base of the substation is unknown, their removal will be subject to detailed design.
----------------------	---	--

2.2 Impacts of proposed changes

Since the lodgement and exhibition of the SSD application, design development has resulted in the following amendments:

Overshadowing

The height of the MSCP building has reduced from 25.37 metres (RL 43.370) to 24 metres (RL 42.300), resulting in a marginal reduction in overshadowing of the adjacent Oral Health clinic building and Catherine McAuley High School car park.

Earthworks and contamination

The amount of excavation will reduce attributed to the building moving northward and the topography. This will result in a significant reduction of the amount of spoil to be disposed of offsite to an approved land fill site. It also means less contaminated soil needs to be dealt with, thereby reducing environmental impacts and project costs (ie. using less public funding).

Bulk and scale

The bulk and scale impacts of the proposed MSCP will marginally reduce attributed to the reduction in height of the building.

Tree removal

One mature tree and some young trees will require removal as a result of the substation being relocated into the park area.

Area of park

There will be a slight reduction in size of the proposed new park attributed to moving the MSCP northward and relocation of the substation into the park. However there will be an increase in the landscaped area between the MSCP and the Dental Building.

Landscaping

The proposed landscape mounds will be enlarged to accommodate more spoil.

Refer to the revised Landscape Plans at **Appendix F**.

Stormwater

The overland flow path has been relocated from between the MSCP and Oral Health building to the west of the MSCP adjacent to Darcy Road. This combined with other changes to MSCP building and surrounds has resulted in the drainage being adjusted accordingly. Refer to the revised Civil Plans at **Appendix D**.

Traffic

Vehicular entry

An additional vehicular entry and boom gate has been provided to the Institute Road driveway.

Parking

There will be the loss of one parking space attributed to the insertion of additional boom gate and access for the MSCP. This results in a total of 1,253 spaces for the multi storey car park and 47 spaces for the at-grade car park.

Hydraulic services

The Hydraulic and Fire Services Statement prepared by Warren Smith and Partners notes the movement of the MSCP building 1830mm northward will have little or no impact on the capacity of the Authority Sewer and Water mains.

BCA and accessibility compliance

Steve Watson and Partners has provided a BCA / Accessibility Statement at **Appendix G**.

Response to legislative requirement for re-exhibition

Section 89F(4) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 provides that if a development application for State significant development is amended, or substituted or withdrawn and later replaced before it has been determined by the Minister and the Secretary has complied with subsection (1) in relation to the original application (note: relates to exhibition requirements), then compliance with subsection (1) in relation to the amended, substituted or later application is not required, unless the Secretary determines that the amended, substituted or later application substantially differs from the original application **and** the environmental impact of the development concerned has not been reduced by the changes proposed in the amended, substituted or later application.

In response, the amended application does not substantially differ from the original application. This is because the changes to the scope of the development are not substantial. Further, the environmental impacts of the development will not collectively increase as a result of the changes. On balance, there is no increase/decrease in the adverse environmental impacts. As such, there should be no need to re-exhibit the application.

2.3 Plans and documentation

The Plans and Drawings for the proposed multi storey car park works are listed below. Note the plans and drawings have been updated to include the proposed changes attributed to design development.

Table 2 List of Plans and Drawings for Project

Title/Name	Drawing Number/ reference	Rev./ Issue	Date	Prepared by
Architectural Drawings				
COVERSHEET AND DRAWING LIST	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-00010	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
EXISTING SITE PLAN	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-01010	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
DEMOLITION PLAN	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-03010	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
CAR PARK LOCATION PLAN	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-10000	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
CAR PARK SITE PLAN	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-10010	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
CAR PARK LOWER GROUND	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-12010	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney

Title/Name	Drawing Number/ reference	Rev./ Issue	Date	Prepared by
CAR PARK GROUND FLOOR	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-12020	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
CAR PARK LEVEL 01 PLAN	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-12030	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
CAR PARK LEVEL 02 PLAN	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-12040	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
CAR PARK LEVEL 03 PLAN	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-12050	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
CAR PARK LEVEL 04 PLAN	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-12060	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
CAR PARK LEVEL 05 PLAN	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-12070	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
CAR PARK LEVEL 06 PLAN	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-12080	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
CAR PARK LEVEL ROOF PLAN	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-12090	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
AT GRADE CAR PARK PLAN	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-12100	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
NORTH EAST ELEVATIONS	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-15010	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
SOUTH WEST ELEVATIONS	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-15020	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
SECTION A	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-16010	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
SECTION B	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-16020	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
SECTION C	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-16030	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
SECTION D AND E	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-16040	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
PERSPECTIVE 1	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-19010	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
PERSPECTIVE DIAGRAM	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-19020	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
PERSPECTIVE 3	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-19030	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
LIFT LOBBY PLAN + RCP + TYPICAL	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-23010	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
LIFT LOBBY PLAN + RCP + LEVEL 2	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-23030	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
LOWER GROUND UNDERCROFT	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-23040	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
BRIDGE LINK – PLAN + RCP + SECTION	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-23050	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
LINK BRIDGE SECTIONS	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-23060	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
LINK BRIDGE SECTIONS	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-23061	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
LIFT CAR	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-23110	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
DENTAL LEVEL 2 FIT OUT	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-31010	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
TYPICAL CAR SPACE – PLAN & SECTION	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-31100	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
STAIRS 01, 02, 03 PLAN, SECTION	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-34010	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
STAIR 04 PLAN, SECTION	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-34020	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
CRASH BARRIERS AND HAND RAILS	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-34100	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
FAÇADE BLADE DETAILS	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-46010	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
FAÇADE BLADE DETAILS	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-46020	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
FAÇADE GLAZING DETAILS	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-46110	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
FAÇADE GLAZING DETAILS	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-46110	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
PARTITION DETAILS	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-47010	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
OFF FORM CONCRETE WALL DETAILS	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-47030	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
DOOR AND DOOR FRAME DETAILS	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-55010	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
WAYFINDING	MSC-HDR-AR-RPT-00005	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
FINISHES SCHEDULE	MSC-HDR-AR-SC-60010	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
SPECIFICATION	MSC-HDR-AR-SP-00001	1	14 DEC 2015	HDR Rice Daubney
SHADOW DIAGRAMS SUMMER SOLSTICE 3PM	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-0706	2	20 JAN 2016	HDR Rice Daubney

Title/Name	Drawing Number/ reference	Rev./ Issue	Date	Prepared by
SHADOW DIAGRAMS SUMMER SOLSTICE 12PM	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-0705	2	20 JAN 2016	HDR Rice Daubney
SHADOW DIAGRAMS SUMMER SOLSTICE 9AM	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-0704	2	20 JAN 2016	HDR Rice Daubney
SHADOW DIAGRAMS WINTER SOLSTICE 3PM	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-0703	2	20 JAN 2016	HDR Rice Daubney
SHADOW DIAGRAMS WINTER SOLSTICE 12PM	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-0702	2	20 JAN 2016	HDR Rice Daubney
SHADOW DIAGRAMS WINTER SOLSTICE 9AM	MSC-HDR-AR-DG-0701	2	20 JAN 2016	HDR Rice Daubney
Landscape Drawings				
COVER SHEET AND PLANT SCHEDULE	MSC-OCU-LS-DG-200	5	02 FEB 2016	OCULUS
SURFACE MATERIALS, FINISHES AND LEVELS PLAN	MSC-OCU-LS-DG-201	5	02 FEB 2016	OCULUS
PLANTING PLAN	MSC-OCU-LS-DG-202	5	02 FEB 2016	OCULUS
Civil Drawings				
COVER SHEET	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4001	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
LOCALITY PLAN, DRAWING SCHEDULE & LEGEND	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4002	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
GENERAL NOTES	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4003	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
SOIL AND WATER MANAGEMENT PLAN	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4010	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
SOIL AND WATER MANAGEMENT DETAILS	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4011	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
DEMOLITION PLAN SHEET 1 OF 4	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4100	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
DEMOLITION PLAN SHEET 2 OF 4	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4101	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
DEMOLITION PLAN SHEET 3 OF 4	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4102	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
DEMOLITION PLAN SHEET 4 OF 4	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4103	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
BULK EARTHWORKS CUT AND FILL PLAN	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4150	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
BULK EARTHWORKS CONTOUR PLAN SHEET 1 OF 4	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4151	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
BULK EARTHWORKS CONTOUR PLAN SHEET 2 OF 4	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4152	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
BULK EARTHWORKS CONTOUR PLAN SHEET 3 OF 4	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4153	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
BULK EARTHWORKS CONTOUR PLAN SHEET 4 OF 4	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4154	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
BULK EARTHWORKS LONGITUDINAL SECTIONS SHEET 1 OF 3	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4155	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
BULK EARTHWORKS LONGITUDINAL SECTIONS SHEET 2 OF 3	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4156	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
BULK EARTHWORKS LONGITUDINAL SECTIONS SHEET 3 OF 3	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4157	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
ROADWORKS AND DRAINAGE PLAN SHEET 1 OF 4	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4200	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
ROADWORKS AND DRAINAGE PLAN SHEET 2 OF 4	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4201	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
ROADWORKS AND DRAINAGE PLAN SHEET 3 OF 4	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4202	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP

Title/Name	Drawing Number/ reference	Rev./ Issue	Date	Prepared by
ROADWORKS AND DRAINAGE PLAN SHEET 4 OF 4	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4203	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
ROADWORKS CAR PARK ENTRY/EXIT LONGITUDINAL SECTIONS SHEET 1 OF 2	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4210	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
ROADWORKS CAR PARK ENTRY/EXIT LONGITUDINAL SECTIONS SHEET 2 OF 2	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4211	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
ROADWORKS MORTUARY ROAD LONGITUDINAL SECTIONS	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4212	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
ROADWORKS INSTITUTE ROAD LONGITUDINAL SECTIONS SHEET 1 OF 2	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4213	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
ROADWORKS INSTITUTE ROAD LONGITUDINAL SECTIONS SHEET 2 OF 2	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4214	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
ROADWORKS AT-GRADE CAR PARK LONGITUDINAL SECTIONS	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4215	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
ROADWORKS PEDESTRIAN LINK LONGITUDINAL SECTIONS	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4216	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
ROADWORKS TYPICAL PAVEMENT CROSS SECTION	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4217	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
RETAINING WALL LONGITUDINAL SECTIONS	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4251	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
RETAINING WALL DETAILS	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4255	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP
DRAINAGE LONGITUDINAL SECTION	MSC-ARP-CV-DG-4300	3	20 JAN 2016	ARUP

3 Public exhibition outcomes

The SSDA was exhibited between 19 November 2015 and 18 December 2015. This RTS addresses a total of six (6) submissions received in response to the public exhibition:

- Three submissions from State authorities and agencies, including:
 - NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA);
 - NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH);
 - Roads and Maritime Services (RMS); and
 - Transport for NSW (TfNSW).
- One submission from Parramatta City Council; and
- One submission from a member of the public.

It should be noted these submissions do not constitute objections to the development.

The sections below outline the key issues raised in the submissions and key changes made to the proposal as a result of the submissions. A detailed response to the submissions is provided at **Appendix B**.

3.1 Themes raised in submissions and responses

3.1.1 Heritage

A submission from the OEH considers that the Statement of Heritage Impact (SoHI) which supports this EIS inadequately addresses the SEARs:

“This is due to the fact that the archaeological assessment was not prepared in accordance with the guidelines of the NSW Heritage Manual. In addition the SoHI does not include a detailed consideration of likely land disturbance activities relevant to the project area to inform this analysis of archaeological potential. This is necessary to adequately address the above named AMUs and their likely significance and archaeological potential.”

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**.

Response:

RPS Group note that the 2015 SoHI and other reports associated with the proposal (including the geotechnical and contamination studies) provide evidence that there is little potential for archaeological material to be present at the subject site due to extensive disturbances throughout the three Archaeological Management Units (AMUs) identified. Additionally, there has been cut and fill and contamination from asbestos and medical waste disposal in the proposal area in the past, resulting in reduced potential for archaeological material to be present. As such, extensive archaeological investigation would be superfluous as the archaeological significance of the site is low.

Refer to the response prepared by RPS Group at **Appendix I** and the Statement of Heritage Impact at **Appendix Q**.

3.1.2 Site investigation and remediation

A submission from the EPA relates to the proposed site investigation and remediation. Specific concerns relate to the need for the engagement of an accredited site auditor, remedial action, transport and disposal of asbestos waste encountered on site, and management of bulk earthworks impacts, including noise and vibration management, dust control, erosion and sediment control and water quality management. Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**.

Response:

The EPA requirements relating to site management, environmental management, and health and safety management are referenced in Sections 10 and 11 of the Remedial Action Plan (RAP). A Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) is to be prepared by the Principal Contractor to ensure the required measures to control the environmental impacts of the works are implemented.

JBS&G outlined that Health Infrastructure (HI) has engaged Melissa Porter of Ramboll Environ Australia as EPA Accredited Site Auditor 0803. Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, and the response from JBS&G at **Appendix M**.

3.1.3 Asbestos

The EPA submission seeks clarity as to the treatment of asbestos impacted fill materials on site and whether it will affect both lots. The submission recommends the proponent satisfy requirements of the Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulation 2014 (Part 7) and consult SafeWork NSW regarding the handling of any asbestos wastes.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**.

Response:

JBS&G noted that at the current stage of planning it is not proposed to move material from Lot 4 to Lot 100 or vice versa. JBS&G draws the attention of the EPA to Section 10.12 and 12.3 of the Remedial Action Plan (RAP) that references the Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulations 2014.

JBS&G concludes that consultation with both SafeWork NSW and the Head of Asbestos Coordination Authorities (HACA) has been undertaken and will continue throughout the duration of the project. Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, and the response from JBS&G at **Appendix M**.

3.1.4 Waste control and management

The EPA outlines a range of waste control requirements and recommendations including that the proponent should manage waste in accordance with the waste management hierarchy (Waste Avoidance and Resource Recovery Act 2001), commit to assessing and managing all waste generated during the project in accordance with the, "Waste Classification Guidelines Part 1: Classifying Waste" (EPA 2014) and ensure all vehicles/trailers are covered and cleaned of debris before leaving the site. Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**.

Response:

JBS&G refers in their response that waste is to be assessed, classified and managed in accordance with EPA 2014 (as noted in Section 12.4 of the

RAP), and vehicles moving within and off site are to be decontaminated or cleaned in accordance with requirements of the POEO (Waste) Regulations and the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP).

The waste hierarchy is detailed and discussed within the Waste Management Strategy (EIS Appendix W, Part 2 Waste Management Plan).

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, and the response from JBS&G at **Appendix M**.

ARUP note the design for the multi storey car park has attempted to minimise the volume of earthworks material disposal. This has been optimised in the most recent design revision which has raised the car park FSLs, increased the volume of landscape mounds and removed the drainage water quality swales to reduce the volume of spoil material from an initial 12,000m³ to 2,860m³. The reduction of spoil material removes the need to dispose of potentially contaminated materials off site.

3.1.5 Dust control and management

The EPA recommends that the proponent take all such feasible and reasonable measures to minimise dust emissions on site, and prevent dust emissions off site. Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**.

Response:

JBS&G states that dust control measures are discussed within Section 10 and 11 of the RAP and will be address in the CEMP. Further to the EPA's recommendations, JBS&G outlines that airborne asbestos fibre air monitoring and real time dust tracking monitoring requirements are detailed in Section 10.9.1 of the RAP. Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, and the response from JBS&G at **Appendix M**.

ARUP state the erosion and sediment control design has been carried out in accordance with Landcom's *"Soils and Construction Manual Volume 1"*. This includes the implementation of measures to reduce dust generation and to manage the risk on site, such as rehabilitating earthwork areas immediately upon completion, stabilisation of stockpiles, air monitoring, silt fences to reduce silt in runoff and turfing behind kerbs to reduce runoff.

3.1.6 Erosion and sediment control

The EPA submission recommends the installation and frequent monitoring of appropriate erosion and sediment controls due to the proximity of the site to Toongabbie Creek. Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**.

Response:

In response to the EPA recommendation regarding water quality and civil aspects, ARUP advises that the EPA review the civil reports contained within the EIS, including Appendix J, Part 1 & Part 2. Additionally, soil and water management is addressed at Section 10.2 of the RAP prepared by JBS&G.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, and the response from JBS&G at **Appendix M**.

ARUP state the erosion and sediment control design has been carried out in accordance with Landcom's *"Soils and Construction Manual Volume 1"* and a soil and water management plan has been prepared to accompany the design in accordance with the above document.

3.1.7 Water quality and conservation

The EPA submission recommends the implementation of water conservation treatments through stormwater collection to improve water efficiency and improve water quality run off to Toongabbie Creek. Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**.

Response:

As mentioned in Section 2.1.7 above, ARUP advises that the EPA review the civil reports contained within the EIS, including Appendix J, Part 1 & Part 2. Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, and the response from ARUP at **Appendix E**.

The water quality pollution reduction targets identified in the civil design specification have been determined from the Parramatta City Council DCP. ARUP notes it will be the responsibility of the D&C contractor to confirm the final treatment device/s and its ultimate compliance with these targets.

The capture and reuse of storm water was considered during the concept and design phase and was eliminated due to the lack of available landscape areas for disposal, limited to no re-use within the hospital. Water quality swales were also considered and eliminated due to limited space availability.

3.1.8 Noise and vibration

The EPA notes the location of residences in Mons Road, Westmead private hospital and schools including Catherine McAuley Westmead, and the likely change in nature and intensity of noise and vibration impacts on these surrounding sensitive receivers. The EPA notes that the EIS does not appear to provide an assessment of the predicted operational noise impacts on the residences, school, and private hospital, recommending the production of a detailed noise impact assessment that details impacts on, and outlines management of 'sensitive receivers'. Further to these recommendations, adherence to the Interim Construction Noise Guideline (July 2009), consultation with residents and management of other noise sensitive receivers, the adoption of 'quacker' type movement/reversing alarms and undertaking a noise monitoring program following the operation of the parking structure are core EPA issues.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**.

Response:

During the construction phase, noise impacts are to be managed via adherence to standard construction hours outlined in the Interim Construction Noise Guidelines, consultation with adjacent occupants, well maintained equipment, and minimising engine idling.

Modelling conducted by Acoustic Logic has found that based on the worst case scenario of 1,254 cars entering the multi-storey car park over a 2 hour period, noise emissions at all receiver points comply with requirements of the Parramatta City Council DCP and the NSW EPA Road Noise Policy Australian Standard AS2107:2000. In addition, Acoustic Logic has found that predicted noise emissions during the night time period (10pm to 7am) comply with sleep arousal assessment criteria. Furthermore, Acoustic Logic outlines multiple design specifications to ensure noise impacts are controlled.

In response to potential vibration impacts, consultants Acoustic Logic note that it is impossible to accurately predict the vibrations induced by the

proposed activities (demolition, excavation, anchoring, and hydraulic hammering). Thus to ensure potential vibration impacts are minimised and effectively managed, the following guidelines are to be adopted; the German Standard DIN 4150-3 (1999-02): “*Structural Vibration –Effects of Vibration on Structures*”, and EPA Assessing Vibration technical guidelines.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, and the response from Acoustic Logic at **Appendix K**, and updated Acoustic Report at **Appendix L**

3.1.9 Energy efficiency

The EPA recommends the proponent be required to identify, evaluate and implement additional practical measures for energy efficiency and conservation, and in particular address renewable energy. Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**.

Response:

The MSCP incorporates multiple energy efficiency and conservation measures.

The MSCP has been designed to use natural ventilation across all floor plates thus eliminating the need for mechanical ventilation (EIS, Appendix B, ‘Architectural Design statement Part 2’). A holistic approach to water usage will be applied (EIS, Appendix J – Part 1 ‘Civil engineering plans & report’). Furthermore, low energy lighting has been specified (as outlined in the EIS, Appendix R ‘Electrical services statement’). The specification includes a flexible lighting control system with day light dimming to perimeter luminaires. Presence detection is also provided to enable dimming/switch of internal lighting when there are no personnel in the car park.

Arup Electrical Engineers note that no photovoltaic panels will be provided on the building roof top as the building includes a roof top car park and so there will be insufficient space for the installation of photovoltaic panels.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A** and the detailed response at **Appendix B**.

3.1.10 Traffic

Traffic modelling

The submission from the NSW Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) advises that their issues included in the SEARs have been adequately addressed. However, following the receipt of the Raw SIDRA 6 modelling files on 19 January 2016, RMS have provided a preliminary verbal submission on 12 February 2016, comprising of five comments detailed at **Appendix B**. Further to this, a final RMS submission received on 25 February 2016 affirms that the RMS has no objection to the SSD provided ten outlined conditions are included in the Consent. These conditions can be viewed at **Appendix B**.

Response:

Traffic consultant (GTA Consulting) sent the SIDRA files to the RMS on Tuesday 19th January 2016. GTA Consulting provided a response to the verbal RMS submission (informally provided 12 February 2016) on 29th February 2016. An extract of this is provided below.

GTA acknowledges that the RMS response sets out a number of detailed conditions to be met prior to issue of the Section 109R Certificate, and prior

to occupation and operation, as well as several general comments. Noting that the additional commentary relates to specific analysis and treatment details that do not impact consent to the SSDA, the project team will continue to work with RMS and TfNSW to ensure that all comments can be addressed prior to the specified milestone.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, and the response from GTA consultants at **Appendix J**.

Car parking provision

Council notes that the EIS does not provide overall information regarding total increases in car parking provision that is currently under construction or is planned for the near future.

Response:

Whilst the proposed MSCP aims to accommodate a significant proportion of forecast growth in the short to medium term, parking beyond completion of the Darcy Road MSCP is still in planning and does not form part of this application. Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, and the response from GTA at **Appendix J**.

Intersection upgrades

Council states the EIS does not consider impacts to intersections that are not immediately adjacent to the site. Council recommends the following intersections be upgraded to satisfy changed traffic conditions: Redbank Road and Briens Road, Darcy Road and Cumberland Highway, and the widening of Institute Road (westbound approach to Darcy Road).

Response:

In relation to intersection upgrades and road widening, GTA notes the following:

- *Redbank Road and Briens Road:* there is no convenient connection between the proposed Darcy Road MSCP and Redbank Road, thus changed traffic conditions as a direct consequence of the MSCP are considered to be minimal.
- *Darcy Road and Cumberland Highway:* based on journey to work data, it is estimated that limited additional traffic is expected to use this intersection as a result of the MSCP. Further, the cost of intersection modifications is not considered feasible nor suitable to be funded as part of the MSCP project.
- *Institute Road widening:* GTA notes that proposed intersection modifications achieve enhanced pedestrian and cyclist amenity, traffic flow and urban design outcomes in addition to affirming that road widening would result in limited benefits.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, and the response from GTA at **Appendix J**.

Impacts on T-Way Bus Services

TfNSW does not support the proposed modification to the T-Way operation at the intersection of Darcy Road/Mons Road/Institute Road and the proposal to allow construction and staff access onto the northern end of Mons Road T-Way.

Response:

GTA consultants acknowledges that public transport to the precinct is critical and bus priority measures can be complex, the proposed measures aim to minimise the impact on the current and future public transport infrastructure and services, noting that current network constraints make it difficult to limit impacts without improvements.

GTA affirms that the applicant will continue to work with RMS and TfNSW to ensure appropriate intersection arrangements can be achieved to support the MSCP, in addition to reaching agreement on the future access strategy. It is also noted that Health Infrastructure and TfNSW have further discussed the potential for construction vehicles to use the T-Way, with any agreement to be reached separately to this application. Further, GTA consultants are awaiting formal feedback from RMS regarding SIDRA intersection modelling and outline that the modelling does not accurately reflect the operation of the T-Way.

It has been agreed between Health Infrastructure and TfNSW that permanent staff access to the T-Way does not form part of the MSCP SSDA.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, the response from GTA at **Appendix J**.

Travel Demand

The Westmead Precinct is proposed for significant development and growth, demanding a shift away from private vehicles to public and active transport. TfNSW notes the importance of identifying reasons for private car dependence and to consult hospital staff and visitors as to their transport service needs.

Response:

GTA consultants outline that the implementation of a travel plan (with appropriate monitoring strategies) would be completed as part of the broader redevelopment in consultation with TfNSW. Notwithstanding this, feedback received as part of a staff travel mode survey completed in 2014 and specifically relating to public transport utilisation is summarised in Table 5 (refer **Appendix J**).

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, the response from GTA consultants at **Appendix J**.

Regional Transport Impacts

TfNSW notes that the Westmead Redevelopment Project would result in an approximate increase of 40% in the number of staff and beds by the end of 2020. TfNSW expects that this level of growth would have regional transport impact, and as such requests a comprehensive transport assessment be developed in consultation with TfNSW and RMS, for the next stage of the Westmead Redevelopment Project.

Response:

GTA consultants note that the applicant will continue to consult with TfNSW and RMS during the preparation of the future Acute Services Building (ASB) SSD application. A whole-of-government approach to local and regional transport infrastructure is recommended, particularly in the context of the proposed Parramatta Light Rail and associated planning studies.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, the response from GTA at **Appendix J**.

Intersection Modelling

TfNSW requests the verification of base modelling results, particularly for the intersection of Darcy Road/Mons Road/Institute Road and several local intersections known to experience delays and congestion. TfNSW notes inconsistency between operating conditions stated by GTA consultants (Section 4.1 Transport Impact Assessment) and on-site observations.

Response:

GTA consultants outline that Section 4.1 of GTA consultants' Transport Impact Assessment indicates that the modelled intersections operate within an acceptable Level of Service (LOS) during the weekday AM and PM and that no statement indicating significant spare capacity is made as this would be incorrect. GTA consultants affirms that the applicant will continue to work with the RMS and TfNSW to ensure appropriate intersection arrangements can be achieved to support the MSCP.

Further, GTA consultants advise the intention of this SSD is not to address or solve regional issues, but rather assess access to the proposed MSCP and the operation of intersections in the immediate vicinity. It is recognised that there are significant regional transport challenges ahead, necessitating a cumulative regional transport model completed and managed by TfNSW and/or RMS.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, the response from GTA at **Appendix J**.

Car Park Access:

TfNSW seeks clarification and empirical justification for the Number Plate Recognition (APNR) system claimed service rate of 550 vehicles per hour per lane.

Further to this, TfNSW requests appropriate measure be put in place to ensure queuing rates during peak times do not impact the T-Way and adjacent road networks.

Response:

The queuing assessment presented in the GTA Transport Impact Assessment has been updated for the new access control, adopting a conservative service rate of 300 vehicles/hour/lane. Based on the above queuing assessment, the available storage is suitable to accommodate the 95th and 99th percentile queues, albeit with minor queuing back into the lower ground level of the car park during the afternoon peak.

The MSCP access is designed with adequate entry capacity such that queuing would not block through traffic on Darcy Road, Institute Road and T-Way. Appropriate line marking and intersection controls would be implemented to minimise the risk of queuing. Furthermore, an additional entry lane and boom gate off Institute Road is proposed, with the Automotive Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) being replaced with a traditional boom gate card access infrastructure.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, the response from GTA consultants at **Appendix J**.

Pedestrian and Cyclist Access:

TfNSW notes that measures to improve bicycle and pedestrian access and facilities require further assessment in the Traffic Impact Assessment,

principally the reduction measures of potential conflict between car park users and cyclists travelling along the cycleway.

In addition, clarification is sought on the exact numbers of bicycle and motorcycle parking.

Response:

GTA consultants reiterate that the MSCP is the focus of this submission and that there is no requirement for bicycle parking under any planning control or guideline for this type of facility. Whilst bicycle parking, internal wayfinding, pedestrian and cyclist connections and accessible parking spaces have been considered as part of the MSCP design, a campus wide approach will be documented as part of the ASB SSD.

Further, as the access to the MSCP is in excess of the 95th and 99th percentile queues, limiting potential for queuing across the signalised pedestrian/cyclist crossing at the intersection of Darcy Road and Dental Access. No further management measures are considered necessary.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, the response from GTA consultants at **Appendix J**.

Early Works Package:

TfNSW requests that the number of parking spaces proposed in Early Works Package be clarified including the impact in terms of cumulative traffic and transport.

Response:

The existing and proposed parking supply (post completion of the MSCP) is shown in Table 7 at **Appendix J**.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, the response from GTA consultants at **Appendix J**.

Parramatta Light Rail:

TfNSW recommends that the applicant communicate with TfNSW's Parramatta Light Rail project team to ensure the impacts of the current project (and future stages) on the light rail project are considered.

Response:

The Westmead Redevelopment project team has and will continue to consult TfNSW's Parramatta Light Rail team. Following the route announcement, the applicant has provided a significant amount of project related information to assist in the planning of the Parramatta Light Rail.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, the response from GTA at **Appendix J**.

Construction Traffic Management Plan:

TfNSW requests that prior to the commencement of any works on the site, a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) should be prepared by a suitably qualified person. It should be submitted to the Principal Certifying Authority (PCA). The Plan must be prepared in consultation with Parramatta City Council, RMS and TfNSW.

Response:

GTA consultants affirm that a CTMP will be prepared prior to construction of the MSCP incorporating TfNSW's comments and in consultation with Parramatta City Council, RMS and TfNSW.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, the response from GTA at **Appendix J**.

Minor Issues and Transport Impact Assessment:

TfNSW seeks clarification on the extent of works illustrated in Figure 2.9, Section 2.3 and footpath design in Section 7.9 of the Traffic Impact Assessment.

Response:

The reference made to Figure 2.9 as part of Section 2.3 of the GTA consultants' Transport Impact Assessment is correct. The purpose of Figure 2.9 (included again in Figure 2 of this letter) is to indicatively show the proposed location of the MSCP, the extent of works as depicted by the red line, as well as the extent of the Stage 1 Early Works (in green).

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, the response from GTA at **Appendix J**.

3.1.11 Accessibility

One submission was received from a member of the public which relates to disability parking, disability access and walking distances in the hospital campus.

The submission notes that distances between the proposed MSCP and the University Clinic for appointments at Diabetes and Obesity is not manageable for people with limited mobility. It also questions whether concession holders/pensioners will have access to discounted car parking fees.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**.

Response:

Westmead Hospital responded to this submission regarding accessibility for patients and parking concessions. The Hospital noted internal transport around the Hospital is currently provided by buggy vehicles operated by volunteers. The service will be able to transport the patient from the proposed MSCP to the University Clinics/Outpatient unit (around 400m away). This service is likely to be expanded by acquisition of an additional vehicle.

With regard to discounted car parking fees, the Western Sydney Local Health District (WSLHD) advised that all new Westmead campus car parks will comply with the NSW Health Policy Directive which outlines 10 groups/categories of Hospital Campus visitors and patients that are eligible to obtain concession rates. In relation to the public submission, holders of an RTA issued Disabled Parking Permit and/or holders of a Blue Pension Card (2/10 categories) are eligible for; free parking under 3 hours, \$5.00 dollars per day (1 exit), \$10.00 dollars for 3 days (multiple entries/exits) and \$20.00 for 7 days (multiple entries/exits). Refer to the Hospital car parking fee policy at **Appendix O**.

Additionally, additional visitor parking is proposed as part of the future new Acute Services Building (ASB) which will be built near to the University Clinic (Diabetes and Obesity). The ASB building will therefore provide additional parking in a location which will provide improved accessibility opportunities for some patients.

Refer to the submission at **Appendix A**, a detailed response at **Appendix B**, the response from GTA at **Appendix J** and the Hospital car parking fee policy at **Appendix O**.

4 Mitigation measures

The submissions received in response to public exhibition of the EIS recommend a number of measures be implemented to mitigate environmental impacts during construction and operation of the MSCP.

It is noted mitigation measures are also managed through the conditions of consent as prescribed by Section 89E of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* and specified in the Standard/Model Conditions of Consent (Urban Development) for State Significant Development. Issues not addressed by standard conditions are detailed in the table below.

Table 3 Key Issues and Mitigation Measures

Issue	Recommended mitigation measures
Hazardous Materials There is an anecdotal history of asbestos being present within the soils and buildings at the site.	All works will be undertaken in accordance with the POEO Act and POEO (Waste) Regulations 2014 and the Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulation 2014 – Part 7 ‘Asbestos Waste’. All works must be undertaken in accordance with the Remedial Action Plan and Site Auditor’s Interim Advice Letter. Refer to Appendix P .
Waste Management Management of construction waste.	Waste is to be assessed, classified and managed in accordance with EPA 2014 as noted in Section 12.4 of the RAP. The Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) to be prepared by the Principal Contractor will address specific requirements regarding decontamination or cleaning of plant moving within and leaving the site.
Dust Control and Management Management of dust and airborne substances during construction.	Dust control measures are discussed within Section 10 and 11 of the RAP. The Principal Contractor is required to detail dust control measures in the CEMP. Airborne asbestos fibre air monitoring and real time dust tracking monitoring requirements are detailed in Section 10.9.1 of the RAP.
Noise and Vibration Noise from reversing movement alarms, potential noise factors, and signage to reduce noise.	Mitigation measure: • A safety risk assessment of construction activities to be undertaken to determine whether use of less annoying/noise intrusive movement/reversing alarms can be installed on construction vehicles to reduce noise impacts on surrounding receivers. • The floor surface of the MSCP is to have a broom finish to mitigate against potential tonal noise factors from car tyres squealing on the floor surface. • The MSCP is to display signs reminding users of the car park to keep noise to a minimum within the car park.

5 Conclusion and recommendation

In conclusion, the six submissions addressed in this RTS have either been generally supportive of the proposed MSCP development or are clarifying aspects of the development. The submissions provided recommendations to ensure environmental impacts are minimised during construction and operation of the MSCP. These recommendations have been addressed through this RTS.

Key changes to proposed development

The proposed changes to the exhibited SSDA do not represent substantial changes to the scope of the development, and will result on balance in no change in the environmental impacts. The building is proposed to be moved 1.83 metres northwards, which will improve solar access to the existing hospital buildings and reduce the required excavation and disturbance of potentially contaminated soil. The floor to floor heights of the building will be reduced, resulting in a reduced overall building height and improved bulk and scale. The proposed substation will be relocated from the interior to the exterior of the MSCP building which will require the removal of one mature tree and possibly some small trees.

Submissions and responses

Key themes raised in the submissions related to concerns about heritage impacts, traffic impacts, pedestrian accessibility, and environmental impacts including contamination, waste management, dust control, erosion and sediment control, and noise and vibrations.

Refer to the submissions at **Appendix A** and responses to individual submissions table at **Appendix B**.

Conclusion

In summary, it is considered that no changes to the development are required as a result of the six submissions examined in this report.

Furthermore, it is considered that there are no grounds for re-exhibition of the application given the content and response to submissions and changes to the development and associated impacts as a result of design development.

Recommendation

The proposed development is generally consistent with the applicable legislation, planning instruments, controls and guidelines.

It is recommended that this State Significant Development application be approved subject to the mitigation measures provided in Chapter 3 of this report.

Appendix A Submissions

The following submissions are attached to this report:

- **Office of Environment & Heritage submission**
Received January 2016
- **NSW Environment Protection Authority submission**
Received January 2016
- **NSW Road and Maritime Services submission**
Received January & February 2016
- **Transport for New South Wales submission**
Received January 2016
- **Parramatta City Council Traffic & Transport submission**
Received January 2016
- **Public submission**
Received January 2016

Appendix B Response to individual submissions

The following responses to submissions are attached to this report:

- Response to Office of Environment & Heritage submission
- Response to NSW Environment Protection Authority submission
- Response to NSW Roads and Maritime Services submission
- Response to Transport for New South Wales submission
- Response to Parramatta Council Traffic & Transport submission
- Response to Public submission

Appendix C Architectural drawings

Prepared by HDR Rice Daubney Architects

January 2016

Appendix D Civil drawings

Prepared by ARUP

January 2016

Appendix E Civil statement

Prepared by ARUP

January 2016

Appendix F Landscape plans

Prepared by Oculus

February 2016

Appendix G BCA statement

Prepared by ARUP

February 2016

Appendix H Services infrastructure

Prepared by Warren Smith & Partners

January 2016

Appendix I Heritage statement

Prepared by RPS Group

December 2015

Appendix J Traffic statement

Prepared by GTA Traffic Consultants

January 2016

Appendix K Acoustic statement

Prepared by Acoustic Logic

January 2016

Appendix L Acoustic report

Prepared by Acoustic Logic

January 2016

Appendix M Contamination and waste statement

Prepared by JBS&G

January 2016

Appendix N Arborist statement

Prepared by Allied Trees

January 2016

Appendix O Hospital car parking fee policy

Prepared by NSW Health

September 2013

Appendix P Site Auditor's Letter

Prepared by Ramboll Environ Australia

January 2016

Appendix Q Statement of Heritage Impact

Prepared by Ramboll Environ Australia

January 2016