



Our reference: ECM 8375601
Contact: Gavin Cherry
Telephone: 4732 8125

12 October 2018

Department of Planning & Environment
Attn: David Gibson
Team Leader
Social Infrastructure Assessments
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Via email: Teresa.Gizzi@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Mr Gibson,

Notice of Exhibition – Nepean Hospital and Integrated Ambulatory Services Redevelopment (Stage 1) (SSD 8766) at 35 – 65 Derby Street, Kingswood

I refer to the notice of exhibition dated 10 September 2018 for the above State Significant Development Proposal.

The proposal seeks approval for Stage 1 works to Nepean Hospital and is understood to enable the provision of expanded medical services and infrastructure to cater for the broader Western Sydney community. This intention is strongly supported by Penrith City Council provided the scale and nature of the development is site responsive, the development suitably responds to the public domain and the redevelopment ameliorates existing parking and traffic management impacts upon the existing local community.

The documentation received has therefore been reviewed and the following comments are provided for consideration and address in the assessment of the development application:-

1. Design Excellence – State Design Panel Review

It is not clear from the documentation submitted if the proposal following lodgement has been considered by the State Design Panel, established through the NSW Office of the Government Architect.

The scale of development and the design of the development will be an important element within the skyline of Penrith noting that surrounding height restrictions are significantly less than that currently proposed.

The Architectural Design Statement notes that the Government Architect of NSW “panel questioned the appropriateness of the terracotta cladding in response to the ‘Blue Mountains’ colour reference. Further consideration should be given to alternative material strategies”. The Blue Mountains theme overall is questioned given the urban setting in which the hospital sits and whilst the terracotta cladding may provide some visual connection with the existing Oral Care building, it doesn’t seem to provide a visual connection with the varied green tones of the new parking building and may exaggerate the experience of the Urban Heat Island effect that occurs local.



As a result, the architectural design of the development, the materials selected and the finishes as viewed from key vantage points necessitates demonstration of design excellence and It is requested that the State Design Panel be re-engaged to review the lodged development proposal (if this has not already occurred).

2. Landscape Design and Landscape Character

The proposed landscape vision for the site is predicated on a Blue Mountains character theme which is inappropriate given the availability of limited landscaped space and the urbanised nature of the development.

The site is not within the Blue Mountains and is located within a health and education precinct which will be surrounded by multi storey residential, commercial and medical developments rather than an expansive bushland setting.

This same concern was raised with the Hospital in the design of the landscape treatment surrounding the Car Park Structure, recently approved through the Sydney Western City Planning Panel.

The landscape theme and planting design should be revised to reflect the urban landscape setting in which the site sits, with suitable spatial separation between large canopy trees and plant species and densities suitable for this space.

3. Car Parking

The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) tables existing parking spaces at page 17 indicating that there is a total of 1509 on-site parking spaces, including staff allocated 370, public 237 and shared public/staff 902. 658 of these spaces are within the multi deck car park on the corner of Derby and Somerset Streets. The multi deck car park when completed will accommodate 627 spaces to cater for the redevelopment of the hospital. Once the subject Stage 1 building is completed, the helipad from the roof of the multi deck car park will be relocated to the subject building, and free up an additional 108 spaces, providing total parking of 735 spaces. The TIA indicates that total on-site parking on completion of Stage 1 will be 2009 spaces, being 500 spaces over current provision. However it is questioned if this figure should be 2244 spaces given the detail above. It is therefore requested that this potential discrepancy be clarified with the applicant.

A study of the parking demand at the hospital is detailed in the TIA (pp 22-23). The total demand was assessed as currently 2,248 spaces, and post development was projected to be 2,585 spaces. The study also included an assessment of the "available" on-street parking spaces via surveys undertaken at a 500m radius of the hospital grounds. The future demand of 2,585 spaces is not reflected within the parking provided on the site which is indicated to be 2,009 spaces which necessitates an understanding of future works which may provide further onsite parking to cater for this shortfall.

The local road network provides limited parking opportunities due to existing on street parking reliance, with existing constraints for Council's waste collection service to navigate the narrow road network. It is also noted that the locality has been zoned for uplift in development scale and density for residential flat building and mixed use developments. Any redevelopment of the hospital must ensure



that all car parking demands generated by the proposed works and existing hospital operations can be contained on the hospital grounds. This includes details on any pay parking scheme to ensure that the costs associated are not a deterrent for on site parking.

The proposed development must accommodate all parking demands generated by the development on the site. In addition, on-street parking should not be included in the hospital demand, as they are public spaces and not for the exclusive use of hospital patrons.

It is therefore requested that the Department ensure that the modelling, the parking projections and the proposed car parking provision demonstrate compliant on site provisions without offsite reliance within the local road network.

4. Water Quality Management

A review of the information provided in the Stormwater Plans includes a commitment to install 2 x 35 cartridge Stormfilter devices, 25 x enviropod pit inserts (on all external pits) and a vegetated swale. A SPEL Puraceptor is also proposed for the helipad area runoff and should be assessed by the Environment Team regarding managing fuel and oil spills. The information however is inadequate for the following reasons:-

- No electronic MUSIC modelling (i.e. *.sqz file) has been provided to enable adequate assessment. This is critical to review the effectiveness of the proposed treatment. The MUSIC model should be provided for assessment.
- In relation to the screen shot of the MUSIC modelling, 2 x 40 cartridge Stormfilter devices are proposed. This is not consistent with what is shown on the Stormwater Plans. All information, plans and models should correspond in their detail.
- The ESD report states that low flow water efficient fixtures and fittings will be used where possible. However, no rainwater tanks are proposed to be installed. Rainwater harvesting should be considered for irrigation and toilet flushing to meet 80% non-potable demand in accordance with Council's WSUD Policy requirements.
- Cross section details for the proposed vegetated swale as well as the Stormfilter chamber and cartridges should be provided on the Stormwater Drainage Plans.
- No draft Operation and Maintenance Plan has been provided for the proposed stormwater treatment measures. This should be provided prior to DA approval and should include details on the cleaning/maintenance requirements of the proposed treatment measures as well as detail on how this will be managed (nominate who will be responsible).

5. Stormwater Management and Flooding Considerations

The hospital site is affected by flooding from local overland flows as identified in Council's adopted College, Orth and Werrington Creeks Overland Flow Flood Study. The development site is clear of the overland flood flows and an existing overland flow path from Barber Avenue will be maintained and accommodated through the site. This has been addressed within the drainage plans provided.



The proposed stormwater drainage system is also satisfactory. The development is not increasing any hardstand area therefore no additional runoff from the site will be generated.

The existing stormwater drainage system that drains the eastern end of Barber Avenue runs in an easterly direction through the site. This system drains a Council road however this infrastructure is not protected by a drainage easement. It is therefore requested that a condition of consent be imposed if the application is approved, that requires the creation and dedication of a drainage easement over the existing drainage system that drains the public road of Barber Avenue through the site to Somerset Street.

6. Traffic Management

Based on the modelling outlined in the TIA, intersection upgrades will be required in the future (2021) at Parker/Derby St and GWH/Somerset St intersections. These intersections are part of the WSIP projects currently with RMS. The TIA does not appear to consider intersections of local roads in the locality which is a critical consideration in the assessment of the application and should be assessed in revised modelling.

Please also note that any proposed new or altered bus routes and/or bus zones/bus stops and bus lay-by areas or pedestrian crossings proposed in local roads as part of the hospital redevelopment requires endorsement of Council's Local Traffic Committee.

7. Acoustic Management

A Noise Impact Assessment prepared by Acoustic Logic (20170106.5/1208A/R7/MF Dated: 23/7/18) was submitted in support of this application. This report provides a quantitative assessment of the main noise generating sources/activities associated with the construction and operational phases of the proposed hospital development.

This report has been reviewed by Council's Environmental Management Officers and the following additional information is requested:-

- Logger data from long term unattended noise logging and attended noise measurements have not been provided for review. A copy of this data should be made available for review so as to validate the conclusions of the acoustic report.
- It is noted that a child care centre is located to the east of the site. It is stated in contamination documentation that this facility is to be demolished, however, no comment to this effect, or any consideration to this premises has been provided in the acoustic assessment. Should this facility continue to be operational during any stage of works, detailed assessment of potential impacts to this receiver should be undertaken.
- Noise and Vibration impacts on existing buildings within the Nepean Hospital Precinct, which include adjacent general hospital wards, a cancer services centre and Tresillian, have not been duly considered as part of this acoustic assessment. Section 6.5.2 includes the statement "vibration impacts on other buildings within Nepean Hospital will be "addressed through internal hospital management". This is not considered appropriate given the internal noise and vibration criteria



specific to each of these sensitive uses under AS2107: 2016 '*Recommended design sound levels and reverberation times for building interiors*'. To ensure that potential impacts are identified and managed appropriately, it is recommended that further assessment of construction and operational noise be undertaken to demonstrate that the relevant internal criteria can be achieved.

In addition to the above additional modelling and information, the following recommendations should be incorporated as conditions of consent if the proposal is supported:-

- All recommended acoustic treatments outlined in Section 6.4 and Section 7 of the acoustic assessment are to be implemented in full. Any physical acoustic treatments, including the proposed acoustic fencing, should be shown on architectural plans for the proposed development.
- A detailed acoustic review of plant items is to be undertaken following final plant selection, and acoustic design is undertaken in accordance with the recommendations outlined in Section 6.4 of the of the report.
- A condition be imposed prohibiting the level 4 plant room from being open to atmosphere on the eastern façade, in accordance with the recommendations of the acoustic report.
- That the applicant commits to the preparation and implementation of a comprehensive Noise/Vibration Management to manage potential impacts to nearby sensitive receivers (residential and Nepean Private and Nepean Hospital Precinct).
- That the applicant commits to undertaking vibration monitoring, at a minimum during the initial phases of site excavation, to ensure excessive levels of vibration are not achieved. Monitoring at residential properties, Nepean Private Hospital and existing buildings of the Nepean Hospital Precinct should be considered through this assessment.
- That the applicant commits to undertaking the detailed acoustic review of all plant items following equipment selection and duct layout design to ensure that noise emission requirements can be achieved.

8. Site Contamination

As part of detailed site investigations, a total of 24 sampling points were used for contamination characterisation. It is acknowledged that this limited number of sampling points does not meet the recommended sampling points recommended by the NSW EPA in their sampling Design Guidelines, however, given site constraints and the report recommendation that further intrusive investigation be undertaken, this sampling density is considered acceptable. The investigation concludes that the site can be made suitable for the proposed development, "provided this RAP prepared for the proposed development is implemented accordingly." In this regard, site suitability is dependent upon the recommendations stated in Section 9.5 of the DSI and Section 4 of the Remediation Action Plan being satisfactorily completed and implemented prior to any works commencing on this site. It is imperative that a copy of this the results of this assessment and subsequent addendum to the submitted RAP are provided to the consent authority for assessment prior to any site disturbance.



In addition, the following issues are raised for the applicant to address:-

- Section 1.2 of the RAP states that the “the primary aim of the remediation is to remove the source(s) of contamination in order to reduce any risks posed to the identified receptors by the contaminants to an acceptable level.” The RAP does not make explicit the remediation goals for the site, based on NEPC criteria. It is recommended that the RAP be updated to state the remediation goals for the site.
- Section 10.1 of the RAP includes the statement that ‘The project manager and/or planner should assess whether the remediation is considered to be Category 1 or Category 2 under the SSD assessment’. It shall be noted that all remediation works within the Penrith Local Government Area are still currently considered category 1 works and as such, requires approval from the relevant consent authority. The RAP should be updated to reflect this requirement.
- Section 6.2.1 ‘Rationale for Selection of Remedial Strategy’ identifies off-site disposal as the most viable option for remediation of known and potential ACM contaminated fill material. However, the RAP also stated “Alternatively, the ACM contaminated fill material can be capped and contained and an EMP prepared for the long term management of the containment area.” It is recommended that further clarification/confirmation of the final remedial methodology is provided by the applicant. Should the remediation methodology include ‘cap and containment’ works, detail regarding the quantity of material proposed for containment, survey detail/diagrams and justification for the proposed material containment locations should be provided for review.
- It is noted that, based on cut and fill plans, the groundwater RLs indicate that excavation for the proposed development may intercept groundwater. Accordingly, it is recommended that the applicant submit a dewatering plan that details groundwater control methodologies, pollution prevention methods, disposal methodology, and an assessment of potential groundwater impacts through the duration of site works.

Upon resolution of the above issues, the following recommendations are provided for consideration in the preparation of conditions of consent:-

- It is recommended that further assessment of all identified ‘data gaps’, including beneath existing building footprints, asphalted car parking areas and concrete paths is undertaken in accordance with the recommendations outlined in Section 9.5 of the Stage 2 Environmental Assessment and Section 4 of the Remediation Action Plan.
- It is recommended that a further detailed assessment for Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) is undertaken to delineate the vertical and lateral extent of asbestos impacted fill material, prior to any work commencing on the site. The results of this assessment and subsequent addendum to the submitted RAP shall be provided to the consent authority for review and comment prior to any site disturbance.

- It is noted that the proposed development area has been significantly increased to the south and south-east. Further intrusive investigation of development areas not previously assessed by EIS as part of the Preliminary Stage ESA investigation shall be undertaken. It shall be ensured that all assessment is undertaken following demolition of existing site buildings and prior to excavation works.
- It is recommended that an Asbestos Management Plan is prepared detailed management measures and controls to be implemented throughout site excavation and associated works.
- It is requested that a copy of all reports, including any addendum to the existing DSI and RAP, are provided to Penrith City Council. Furthermore, a copy of the site validation report and Environmental management plan shall be provided to Penrith City Council for notation on the relevant properties s149 certificate.

9. Social Planning and CPTED Considerations

The EIS outlines that “The recommendations of the CPTED Strategy by Southern Cross Protection are to be implemented in the detailed design and ongoing operation of the hospital”. Implementation of the full list of strategy recommendations is supported to minimise safety concerns and this should be included as conditions of consent if the proposal is supported.

Whilst an Environmentally Sustainable Design Report is provided to address how the building’s design incorporates sustainability features, it does not consider the proposal’s contribution to environmental conditions. Given the Urban Heat Island effect experienced locally, consideration of Council’s Cooling the City Strategy is encouraged, including solar reflectance, water permeability of hard surfaces and green infrastructure. Incorporation of the Cooling the City Strategy principles would ensure the proposal contributes positively to local environmental conditions.

10. Accessibility Considerations

The development application is accompanied by an Access Report dated 27 July 2018, prepared by Blackett Maguire + Goldsmith which forms Appendix 224b of the Environmental Impact Statement. The following is noted from a review of the report:

- The report outlines requirements concerning accessibility that the proposal is required to satisfy, however the report is limited in detail on whether the proposal does in fact comply with all listed requirements based on what is proposed on the accompanying drawings.
- The report does outline that the multi storey car parking structure currently being constructed will provide for a number of accessible parking spaces with an emergency drop off area providing an accessible car parking space. Specifics on that number of accessible parking spaces however is not outlined within the report and this structure is approximately 180m away from the proposed development. Suitable accessible parking must be provided in close proximity to this development.

- The report also indicates that the 'schematic architectural design' of the development is capable of achieving compliance with accessible sanitary facility requirements.
- Blackett Maguire + Goldsmith has concluded that the project design will be able to satisfy the requirements of BCA2016 and the Access to Premises Standard 2010 if the works are designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements of the BCA and AS1428.01 – 2009 and AS2890.6 – 2006 and subsequent Access Reports and Performance Solutions.

It is therefore recommended that a more specific accessibility assessment be undertaken of the development as proposed, to ascertain its current level of compliance with the above requirements.

11. Heritage Considerations

While no objection is raised to the demolition works proposed, it is requested that an archival photographic recording be made of the heritage items to be demolished / altered and that a copy of that archival recording is provided to Penrith City Council prior to works commencing.

Should you require any further information or would like to discuss this matter further, please do not hesitate to contact me on (02) 4732 8125.

Yours faithfully



Gavin Cherry
Development Assessment Coordinator