



Attachment A – Response to Submissions

1. Traffic and Parking	
Comments from DoPE dated 2 June 2016	Proponent Response
<p>Required: an updated assessment providing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The expected cumulative peak traffic and parking demand that includes the Sumatran Tiger Adventure project and the proposed Taronga Institute of Science and Learning Additional traffic and parking demand from additional day visitor patronage from the proposal in its entirety Impact on traffic and parking demand when Taronga Zoo host night-time events Clarify that on-site parking would be part of guests' package and detail arrangements for guests arriving via other forms of transport Discuss measures to prevent zoo visitors parking on streets surrounding the zoo. 	<p>Please refer to Attachment F which includes a revised Transport Impact Assessment that assesses the expected cumulative peak traffic and parking demand and measures to prevent zoo visitors from parking on streets surrounding the zoo.</p> <p>On-site parking will be included as part of a guests' booking at the Taronga Zoo Eco-Retreat.</p>
Comments from Mosman Council dated 23 May 2016	
<p>1.1 The 'Transport Impact Assessment' does not provide analysis of how the proposed development will impact on parking rates. This is important as no additional parking is proposed.</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment F which provides an assessment on how the proposed development will impact parking rates on the site.</p>
Comments from public submissions	
<p>1.2 Streets clogged with staff members' cars from as early as 6am. Zoo should be required to provide parking for all staff.</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment F which outlines the impacts the proposed development is anticipated to have on off-site and on-site parking. Please note that all Taronga Zoo staff have access to the car park.</p>
<p>1.3 Heavy traffic congestion and parking issues in surrounding streets- Bradley Head and Whiting Beach Roads.</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment F which outlines the impacts the proposed development will have on traffic generation in the locality.</p>



<p>1.4 Concern that increase in overnight visitors will also impact parking in the local streets- especially during school holidays and on the weekend.</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment F which provides an assessment on how the proposed development will impact parking rates on the site, including at peak hours and during concurrent events. This report highlights that the carpark only meets capacity on a handful of days and the intention is the carpark will primarily be used in the evenings outside of peak times.</p>
---	--

2. Public land: suitability of use, equity issues and social impacts	
Comments from Mosman Council dated 23 May 2016	Proponent Response
<p>2.1 Public land- equitable access must not be compromised. Public access will be compromised to a portion of the site, benefitting only those who can afford to stay in the rooms and suites.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Response to Submission Cover Letter and Attachment B which includes a plan that clearly articulates the extent of site area that will be publically accessible.</p>
<p>2.2 Information of proposed length of stay and cost of accommodation should be provided so equity issues can be better understood.</p>	<p>The price of entry to the Taronga Wildlife Retreat will be market driven, as are all ticketed aspects of Taronga Zoo. Taronga Conservation Society Australia (TCSA) is a non-for-profit organisation and as such all profits from the operation of the Taronga Wildlife Retreat will contribute to the ongoing initiatives of TCSA in accordance with the <i>Zoological Parks Board Act 1973</i>.</p>
Comments from public submissions	
<p>2.3 Concern that the proposal doesn't enhances the Harbour foreshore in any discernible manner at all. Belief that the constant addition of new buildings is a blight on the natural landscape of Sydney Harbour and not eco-friendly.</p>	<p>As illustrated within the photomontages of the proposal which have been taken from key views from Sydney Harbour, the proposal will have minimal visibility from Sydney Harbour. Due to the significant distance of the proposal from the harbour, there is no reasonable opportunity to improve the Harbour foreshore as part of this proposal. Significant landscaping proposed on the site as part of this proposal retains the bushland setting of the site as viewed from the Harbour.</p>
<p>2.4 Rubbish (nappies, food and drink containers) left on nature strips. Concern that this will create pollution in street drains.</p>	<p>This is not a matter of planning consideration as part of this application; however it is noted for future management across the site.</p>



<p>2.5 Upgrade the quality of the bush path from the Zoo to Sirius Cove- as it is muddy and unusable after heavy rain. Suggested options- boardwalk or concrete path.</p>	<p>This bush path is not part of the subject site and works are not proposed in this locality therefore this suggestion is simply noted for future management.</p>
<p>2.6 Belief that the 'hotel' is not state significant development as it does not benefit the wider community.</p>	<p>As the site is identified as a specified site under Schedule 2 of <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (State and Regional Development) 2011</i> any development on the site that has a Capital Investment Value of more than \$10million is categorised as State Significant Development. As outlined in the QS Statement provided with the development application, the capital investment value of the proposed works exceeds this threshold.</p>
<p>2.7 The proposal separates out a portion of the zoo land to create an exclusive area containing accommodation and dining facilities which will not be open to the general public.</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment B which includes a plan that clearly articulates the extent of site area that will be publically accessible at all times. Further, the proposal will result in additional pathways that are DDA accessible, thereby improving accessibility across the site.</p>

<p>3. Land Use</p>	
<p>Comments from Mosman Council dated 23 May 2016</p>	<p>Proponent Response</p>
<p>3.1 The proposed development is an 'eco-tourist facility', which is a prohibited use in all zones in the MLEP 2012.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Response to Submissions Letter which outlines in detail the permissibility of the proposal on the site.</p>
<p>3.2 The definition of 'eco-tourist facility' in the MLEP does not possess any relationship with the use 'Zoological Garden'. The zoning of the site determines what is ancillary development not reference to overseas examples. Council is not satisfied that the proposed use would be ancillary or ordinarily incidental.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Response to Submissions Letter which outlines in detail the permissibility of the proposal on the site.</p>
<p>Comments from the DoPE dated 2 June 2016</p>	
<p>3.3 Further information and justification of the appropriateness and permissibility of the land use is required. This should include further discussion of how the proposed use is ancillary, or ordinarily incidental, to the use of the site.</p>	<p>Please refer to the Response to Submissions Letter which outlines that the proposal, which is most appropriately categorised as an eco-tourist facility, is a development that is ordinarily incidental to a "Zoological Garden" and is therefore permissible with development</p>



	consent under the MLEP 2012.
3.4 Further information needed regarding details of areas available to the general public and those that are restricted to guests.	Please refer to Attachment B which includes a plan that clearly articulates the extent of site area that will be publically accessible and those areas that will be restricted to guests and staff of the facility.
3.5 Further details of programs and activities available to the general public and restricted to guests (as a written description and on plans).	As outlined within the Response to the Submissions Letter, the majority of new exhibits will be accessible by both retreat guests and day visitors equally. The only exception is the Sanctuary Exhibit, where additional access will be provided to retreat guests. This is typical for other exhibits within the zoo, where viewing platforms are utilised for day guests.
3.6 Further, detailed consideration of the proposal's consistency with <i>Zoo 2000: 'A View to the Future'</i> and associated documents.	Please refer to the Response to Submissions letter which outlines the proposal's consistency with <i>Zoo 2000: 'A View to the Future'</i> and associated documents.
3.7 A detailed explanation of the proposal's consistency with the objectives of the <i>Zoological Parks Board Act 1973</i> .	As outlined within the Response to Submissions letter the proposal is consistent with the formal mandate of the TCSA as it will improve public awareness of species conservation and management and also provide for the improved display of animals and habitat for the educational and cultural purposes. Specifically education is a strong objective of the Act, and one of the most effective methods of educating conservation objectives is through immersive experiences.

4. Landscaping and trees	
Comments from Mosman Council dated 23 May 2016	Proponent Response
4.1 A number of trees have been identified for removal. Council's Tree Officer considers the trees as a worth retention. Further clarification is sought on reasons for removal.	Please refer to the Response to Submissions letter and Attachment I which clarifies the rationale for the required tree removal. Please note that there are a number of trees quoted in Council's submission that are in fact located within the building footprints. The proposal does not seek to remove any additional trees than necessary.



Comments from the DoPE dated 2 June 2016	
4.2 It is requested that the application provide detailed and specific landscape plans that demonstrate that the proposed landscaping will enhance the landscape character of the site, giving consideration to the scenic quality of the Sydney Harbour foreshore and appropriate habitats for the animals housed.	Please refer to Attachment D which confirms the total net gain of significant trees that will maintain and enhance the bushland character of the site and scenic quality of the Sydney Harbour foreshore.
4.3 Information needed on the level of maturity of proposed trees, and the length of time before the landscaping is mature.	Please refer to Attachment D which outlines the total maturity of trees that are proposed to be planted within the site.
4.4 Information needed on the net loss/gain of significant trees	Please refer to Attachment D which confirms the total net gain of significant trees.
4.5 Clarification needed of the numbering of heritage listed trees in the Conservation Management Plan and the arboricultural report accompanying the EIS	Please refer to Attachment E which clarifies the tree numbers of each report.
4.6 Further information needed about how the design of pods has accommodated tree number 93, the required pruning of tree 93 to construct the pods, and the impact that this will have on the tree's viability.	POD C and POD D have been sited to minimise impacts to Tree 93 during and after the construction stage. The proposed walkway is elevated to ensure clearance with the lower canopy. A crown lift has been recently undertaken to ensure the health and size of the tree is maintained. A detailed 3D survey has been completed to ensure the existing levels around the tree are maintained with the landscaping.
4.7 Further investigation of feasible construction methodologies to avoid the removal of significant trees.	POD C will be the last building that to be built during the construction stage, this will provide space for accessing the site without causing any impact to tree 93 during construction stage and ensure space can be maintained around other significant trees to be retained.
Comments from public submissions	
4.8 Removal of the cool, shady, tree lined environment around the paths and animal viewing. Belief that ornamental trees which may replace the native trees, should be of the same size and height.	Please refer to Attachment D which outlines the total maturity of trees that are proposed to be planted within the site.

5. Heritage



Comments from the DoPE dated 2 June 2016	Proponent Response
<p>5.1 Required: submit an updated Heritage Impact Statement to provide further information on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where the Circular Kiosk (item 96B) will be relocated and how the 1917 foundation base will be incorporated into the lodge building • A diagram showing the alignment of the Original and Early Paths • Clarify the impacts on the Rustic Stone Garden Wall • An updated mitigation measure at Section 5.2 of the HIS to include an archaeological survey process of consistent rigour as the excavation permit process under the <i>Heritage Act 1977</i> that could be incorporated into a condition of consent 	<p>Please refer to Attachment E which responds to each of the requests made by the Department of Planning and Environment.</p>

6. Built Form	
Comments from the DoPE dated from 2 June 2016	Proponent Response
<p>6.1 Required: unified plans that show the proposed retreat and a detailed layout of the animal exhibit; plans and supporting documentation providing the maximum height, GFA and building footprint of the facility and existing structures within the project site.</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment B which provides a supplementary plan which clearly illustrates the proposed layout of the Taronga Retreat and the Australia Exhibit.</p>
<p>6.2 The area of the project site in relation to the total area of the zoo is needed.</p>	<p>The total project site area (including all new exhibits) is 12,970sqm. The proposed footprint of the actual Taronga Retreat is only 2,015sqm, 0.7% of the total Taronga Zoo site.</p>
<p>6.3 Required: elevations and photomontages that show all of the accommodation pods, the lodge and restaurant buildings. In particular, photomontages from key view corridors identified in the Conservation Management Plan and the Urban Design Principles and Visual Analysis, and from key vantage points in Sydney Harbour.</p>	<p>Following communication with the DoPE, we understand that revised architectural plans and photomontages are not required. As outlined within the Response to Submissions letter, the proposal has been specifically designed to respond to the visual qualities of the harbour, as illustrated in the photomontages submitted with the EIS. These photomontages have been positioned in the same key locations identified within the UDAS Guidelines at Figures 2.4.2 – 2.4.h.</p>
<p>6.4 Give consideration to reviewing the building and surrounding spaces to address the</p>	<p>Attachment I and Attachment J provide a detailed response to the specific recommendations provided by both Fire and Rescue NSW</p>



specific recommendations provided by Fire and Rescue NSW.	and the NSW Rural Fire Service.
Comments from public submissions	
6.5 Concern regarding undesirable concrete buildings providing for an elite few people.	The Design Report prepared by Cox Architecture confirms the architectural aspiration for the proposed buildings, which have been designed to integrate into the landscape and the site. Please refer to the Response to Submissions letter which outlines how the proposal has been designed to benefit a range of stakeholders, including general Taronga Zoo guests and guests of a new facility.
6.6 Concern that the planned 2-4 storey accommodation pods are too tall and not in keeping with the Zoo's philosophy of harmony with nature and camouflage within the environment of the zoo.	As illustrated on the architectural plans, the 'pods' are proposed at various heights depending on the natural ground level in that location, so that taller buildings were positioned at low points in the development site, with all buildings proposed no higher than the existing Taronga Centre.
6.7 Concern that the proposed development will create flooding along Whiting Beach Road, thus affecting further challenges for the built form.	Taylor Thomson Whiting has prepared a response (Refer Attachment K) to confirm that the proposal is not anticipated to impact flooding along Whiting Beach Road.

7. Construction Impacts	
Comments from the NSW EPA dated 23 May 2016	Proponent Response
7.1 Implement an Unexpected Finds Protocol for the managing, transport and disposal of any asbestos encountered during the project.	The concern has been noted and could be conditioned.
7.2 Proponent required to satisfy the requirements of the Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulation 2014 with particular reference to Part 7 'asbestos wastes'.	The concern has been noted and could be conditioned.
7.3 Proponent required to consult with SafeWork NSW concerning the handling of asbestos waste.	The concern has been noted and could be conditioned.
Comments from Mosman Council dated 23 May 2016	



<p>7.4 Council's standard construction hours are 7am to 6pm, Monday to Friday and 8am to 1pm on Saturdays. Construction vehicles should not be generating noise that could affect the amenity of surrounding residential properties outside of standard construction hours.</p>	<p>The Taronga Wildlife Retreat is being designed to utilise off site construction through the use of pre-fabrication which will reduce the construction period and reduce the number of trades required onsite. The proposal will be constructed within the hours set out in the development consent.</p>
<p>Comments from public submissions</p>	
<p>7.5 Previous construction in the zoo has resulted in noise from heavy transport deliveries- disrupting sleep before 7am.</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment F which addresses concerns relating to construction traffic. Further, please refer to Attachment G which provides an additional assessment on vehicular noise impacts to surrounding properties.</p>
<p>7.6 Belief that constructions vehicles should not be allowed to access the site before 7am on weekdays and before 8am on weekend, and that early arrivals would need daily monitoring by local rangers.</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment F and Attachment G which responds to these comments. The proposal will be constructed within the hours set out in the development consent.</p>

<p>8. Noise Impacts</p>	
<p>Comments from the NSW EPA dated 23 May 2016</p>	<p>Proponent Response</p>
<p>8.1 Concerned about risks of unacceptable noise impact which may arise from inadequate noise impact assessment, management and mitigation measures.</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment G which provides an Addendum to the Noise and Vibration Assessment to the comments raised in the submissions, including management and mitigation measures.</p>
<p>8.2 Proponent should provide predicted worst case noise impacts on surrounding residences as required by the SEARs.</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment G which provides an Addendum to the Noise and Vibration Assessment to the comments raised in the submissions including predicted worst case noise impacts.</p>
<p>8.3 The EPA notes that EIS Appendix L does not establish the background noise level at noise sensitive receivers (i.e. residences), especially those located to the north and northeast of the project site.</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment G which establishes background noise levels at surrounding sensitive receivers.</p>
<p>8.4 The EPA is aware that certain outdoor entertainment activities at the Zoo have been the subject of noise complaints. However, Appendix L does not provide an assessment of typical noise impacts (including sleep disturbance impacts) arising from amplified</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment G which provides an Addendum to the Noise and Vibration Assessment including cumulative noise impact</p>



music and predictable behaviour of function centre and terrace, bar and restaurant patrons.	with events occurring at the site.
8.5 Recommendation- the proponent should identify background noise level for the locality measured at the most affected noise sensitive receivers in accordance with guidance material in Chapter 3 of the NSW Industrial Noise Policy.	Noted. Please refer to Attachment G .
8.6 Recommendation- proposal should undertake a comprehensive quantitative assessment of noise impacts associated with operations of the new facilities together with design for feasible and reasonable noise impact avoidance and mitigation, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential sleep disturbance impacts on surrounding residents; and • Whether or not there is a need to apply 'modifying factors' to noise monitoring data and associated noise impact assessment. 	Noted. Please refer to Attachment G .
8.7 Prepare a detailed operational noise impact statement that incorporate feasible and reasonable measures to avoid, minimise and manage noise and incorporating those noise avoidance and minimisation measures at the design stage of the project.	Mitigation measures to address operational noise are addressed within Attachment G .
8.8 Necessity of establishing and fostering a good relationship with surrounding residents.	This is noted and developing good relationships with surrounding neighbours will be ongoing.
8.9 Undertake a noise mentoring program to 'ground truth' noise impact predictions at set periods following commencement of operation of the new facilities.	The concern has been noted and could be conditioned.
8.10 Restrict loading dock and waste collection activities to 'day-time' as defined in the NSW Industrial Noise Policy, January 2000.	The concern has been noted and could be conditioned.
8.11 Undertake a noise monitoring program at various periods after commencement of operation of the each project element to verify that measured noise levels do not exceed levels predicted in the required noise impact statement and acceptable noise levels identified in the NSW Industrial Noise Policy, January 2000.	The concern has been noted and could be conditioned.
Comments from the DoPE dated 2 June 2016	



<p>8.12 Update the <i>Australia Habitat and Taronga Wildlife Retreat Noise and Vibration Assessment</i>, prepared by Renzo Tonin and Associates and dated 14 March 2016 to include quantified assessment of likely construction and operational noise and whether that demonstrates compliance with relevant noise criteria, as sought by the Environmental Protection Authority.</p>	<p>Noted. Please refer to Attachment G.</p>
<p>Comments from public submissions</p>	
<p>8.13 Noise from leaf blowers in the morning for at least two hours is unacceptable.</p>	<p>This is not a matter of planning consideration as part of this application; however it is noted for future management across the site.</p>

<p>9. Threatened Species</p>	
<p>Comments from the DoPE dated 2 June 2016</p>	<p>Proponent Response</p>
<p>9.1 Provide additional information addressing the potential impacts on the Red-crowned Toadlet within the project area.</p>	<p>Please refer to Attachment H which includes a formal response by the Threatened amphibian biologist working at Taronga Zoo.</p>

<p>10. Conservation</p>	
<p>Comments from public submissions</p>	<p>Proponent Response</p>
<p>10.1 The staging of business events and social functions is fundamentally and essentially a commercial activity which has no relationship to any conservation purposes of a Zoo.</p>	<p>Taronga Conservation Society Australia (TCSA) is a non-for-profit organisation and as such all profits from the operation of the Taronga Wildlife Retreat will contribute to the ongoing initiatives of TCSA in accordance with the <i>Zoological Parks Board Act 1973</i>.</p>
<p>10.2 Belief that the proposal prioritises tourism over conservation- funds should be put towards wildlife and conservation, especially for animals in captivity.</p>	<p>As outlined within the Response to Submissions letter the proposal is consistent with the formal mandate of the TCSA which includes improving public awareness of species conservation and management. The use and priority of funds is not a planning consideration.</p>



11. Bushfire Safety	
Comments from public submissions	Proponent Response
11.1 Taronga Zoo is on Enclosed Lands and therefore poses serious potential risks and the fire brigades getting access to the area, thereby seriously jeopardising all neighbouring owners properties to potential fire hazards.	The concern has been noted and has been addressed by the Bushfire Safety consultant as part of the EIS.

12. Water and Wastewater	
Comments from Sydney Water dated 15 April 2016	Proponent Response
12.1 The following comments have been provided in relation to water: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The drinking water main available for connection is the 150mm main in Bradleys Head Road Detailed drinking water requirements will be provided at the Section 73 application phase 	The concern has been noted and could be conditioned.
12.2 The following comments have been provided in relation to wastewater: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The wastewater main available for connection is the 300mm main constructed within the property boundaries Detailed wastewater requirements will be provided at Section 73 of the application phase 	The concern has been noted and could be conditioned.
12.3 The following comments have been provided in relation to Sydney Water Servicing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A Section 73 Compliance Certificate under the Sydney Water Act 1994 must be obtained from Sydney Water Stamped and approved building plans are required before any construction is commenced 	The concern has been noted and could be conditioned.
12.4 The following comments have been provided in relation to trade wastewater requirements:	The concern has been noted and could be conditioned.



<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The property owner must submit an application requesting permission to discharge trade wastewater to Sydney's water sewerage system• It is illegal to discharge trade wastewater into the Sydney Water sewerage system without permission• A Boundary Trap is required for all developments that discharge trade wastewater where arrestors and special units are installed for trade wastewater pre-treatment.	
<p>12.5 The following comments have been provided in relation to backflow prevention requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• All properties connected to Sydney's Water supply must install a testable Backflow Prevention Containment Device appropriate to the property's hazard ranking. Properties with a high or medium hazard ranking must have the backflow prevention containment device tested annually. Properties identified as having a low hazard rating must install a non-testable device, as a minimum.	<p>The concern has been noted and could be conditioned.</p>