

Attachment A – The Department's responses to consultant Michael Rowe's email dated 9 July 2024

Michael Rowe's email in black font; Departments response in blue font.

Will be provided:

1. EIS
2. EDC (QS) Report
3. Architectural Drawings and Report including shadow diagrams, DVS, ADG assessment
4. Survey Plan
5. BCA Report
6. Accessibility Report
7. Landscape and Public Domain Plans
8. Arborist
9. BDAR Waiver
10. BASIX
11. Transport and Accessibility Impact Statement and CTMP
12. Noise and Vibration Assessment
13. Geotech Assessment including groundwater and cover off ASS (class 2)
14. Water Management Plan
15. Flood Impact Risk Assessment
16. Contamination Report
17. Waste Management Plan
18. ACHAR
19. Infrastructure Delivery Management Plan
20. Engagement Report

Would like the Department's clarification on:

1. Aviation Report - The team consulted with Gold Coast airport to find out the OLS and PANS OPS and typically as per the LEP applications are just referred to Gold Coast Airport during the assessment, therefore we're hoping a standalone aviation report isn't required?
– Action unnecessary: SEAR 24 includes the caveat 'if the development proposes a helicopter landing site' and 'if the site contains or is adjacent to a HLS' therefore no action is required to dispense with SEAR 24 if it is not relevant to the subject site and proposal.
-

2. Social Impact Assessment - A full SIA in accordance with the guidelines is a major undertaking. The positive social benefits of the project as social flood recovery housing are relatively self-evident, so Homes NSW were hoping we might not need to prepare an SIA and could just consider the social impacts at a high level in the EIS. – Not agreed: Not enough information has been provided to vary or delete SEAR 21 that requires a Social Impact Assessment.
3. Wind assessment - As the building is approximately 40m, will this be required?
– Agreed: We agree that a Pedestrian Wind Environment Assessment is not required for the subject proposal as part of addressing SEAR 5.
4. Green Travel Plan - I don't feel this is necessary for a residential building of this nature in the Tweed? – Not agreed: Not enough information has been provided to vary or delete SEAR 10 that requires a Green Travel Plan or equivalent.
5. View analysis / VIA - Rather than a standalone report we were hoping to get CKDS to prepare some select views and then assess it in the EIS – Not agreed: Not enough information has been provided to vary or delete SEAR 5 that requires a View Analysis and SEAR 6 that requires a Visual Analysis and a Visual Impact Assessment; However, CKDS may be appropriate for preparing these documents that will simply form attachments to the EIS.
6. CPTED - Rather than a full crime risk assessment report we would like to cover the CPTED measures in design in the EIS – Not agreed: Not enough information has been provided to vary or delete SEAR 7 that requires a CPTED Report; A CPTED Report should be provided that includes a crime risk assessment and CPTED design measures.

Clearly not required:

1. Bushfire - Not in a bushfire prone area – Action unnecessary: SEAR 23 includes the caveat 'if the development is on mapped bush fire prone land', therefore no action is required to dispense with SEAR 16 if it is not relevant to the subject site and proposal.
2. Heritage - Not near any heritage items of HCA – Action unnecessary: SEAR 20 includes the caveat 'where there is potential for direct or indirect impacts', therefore no action is required to dispense with SEAR 20 if it is not relevant.
3. Hazard Analysis – Action unnecessary: SEAR 16 includes caveats 'where there are...', 'where required' and 'if', therefore no action is required to dispense with SEAR 16 if it is not relevant.
4. Hazards Material Survey - Demolition of existing buildings can be done by Homes separately and won't be part of the SSD scope, therefore this isn't required – Action unnecessary: SEAR 18 includes the caveat 'if buildings are proposed to be demolished'.