

SECTION 1.0 – AUTHORITY & ORGANISATION – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS			
ITEM	STAKEHOLDER	SUBMISSION / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
R01	DPIE	Lighting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Further information is required on lighting impacts on nocturnal fauna. These potential impacts have also been raised by SOPA and were not addressed in the RTS. - The Flora and Fauna Assessment report submitted with the original EIS, provided an assessment of lighting impacts on fauna, based on five, 25 m high lighting poles and operating hours till 10 pm. - An addendum to the Flora and Fauna Assessment report shall be submitted, providing an assessment of the lighting impacts of the extended hours of operation and revised lighting design, (which now includes six, 30 m high lighting poles) on fauna. - The difference between the lighting design submitted with the EIS and the proposed lighting design in regard to any additional lighting spill to the nature reserve shall be quantified. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Proponent submits an addendum in Appendix A to the Flora and Fauna Assessment report to capture an assessment of the potential impacts of lighting (& Noise) to the nocturnal fauna and threatened species in the area. - The Proponent notes that the report in Appendix A concluded that a significant impact is not expected to occur to any threatened species in the area as a result of lighting (or noise) resulting from the extension to the park operational hours. Please refer to Appendix A for further details.
R02	DPIE	Noise <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) An addendum to the Flora and Fauna Assessment report submitted with the original EIS shall be submitted, providing an assessment of any noise impacts of the extended hours of operation on fauna. b) The Noise Impact Assessment (NIA) submitted with the original EIS provided an operational noise level of 44 dB(A) at the nearest sensitive receiver. The NIA submitted with the modification application provides an operational noise level of 32 dB(A) at the nearest sensitive receiver. An explanation as to why there is a reduction in the operational noise level shall be provided. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Proponent submits an addendum in Appendix A to the Flora and Fauna Assessment report to capture an assessment of the potential impacts of noise (& lighting) to the nocturnal fauna and threatened species in the area. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The report submitted in Appendix A concluded that a significant impact is not expected to occur to any threatened species in the area as a result of noise (or lighting) resulting from the extension to the park operational hours. Please refer to Appendix A for further details. - The Proponent submits an Acoustic statement in Appendix B providing explanation and justification for the reduction in noise impacts at sensitive receivers based on the new assessment. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) In summary the statement notes the following to justify the reduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Changes to terrains heights and noise barriers from tree planting on the North Western boundary of the site. ▪ Re-arrangement of the location of primary patron noise areas due to the layout changes in the updated design scheme. ▪ Changes in the design of the main building and overall park including the consistent building height and increased focus on amenity to the South East of the park. ▪ Updates to the modelling software resulting in slightly different calculation methods and parameters.
R03	DPIE	Traffic and Parking <p>The proposed modifications result in an increase of GFA of approximately 20%. Please confirm within the Traffic and Parking Assessment (dated 14 April 2021) that the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - estimated surf park traffic generation as detailed in section 5.2.2 of the original traffic impact assessment in the EIS; and - car parking demand of the surf park as detailed in section 5.1.2 of the original traffic impact assessment in the EIS remain valid for the proposed modifications. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Proponent confirms that for the purpose of the assessment the Gross Floor Area (GFA) calculations in the original development application have been re-assessed to provide a like-for like comparison against the modification GFA. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o The Proponent notes that the comparison concluded that there has been an estimated 18% increase in GFA with the updated design scheme. o The Architectural plans have been updated to include a snapshot of the modification GFA with a table comparing the Approved vs Proposed GFA, by level. Please refer to the following plans for relevant updates and comparisons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ DA.14 – Proposed GA Basement Plan. ▪ DA.16 – Proposed GA Ground Plan. ▪ DA.19 – Proposed GA First Floor Plan. o An appendix to the Architectural plan updates has also been provided for information only to show the revised floor area calculations. This is included as Appendix E to this response to submission. o A statement from the Planner has also been included in Appendix C to clarify the GFA calculations. - The Proponent submits a statement from The Transport Planning Partnership in Appendix D to confirm that the increase in GFA in the proposed modification does not have an impact on the original traffic impact assessment presented in the EIS. The parking provisions and traffic generation remain consistent with the original assessment and reporting.

SECTION 1.0 – AUTHORITY & ORGANISATION – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS			
ITEM	STAKEHOLDER	SUBMISSION / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
R04	DPIE	<p>Miscellaneous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Provide details on the proposed use of the fitness retreat and its relation to the surf park, and justification for its addition to the proposed modifications. b) Provide justification for the addition of the maintenance building/shed within Service Area 1. c) Provide GFA calculations on the architectural plans. d) Clarify the proposed building height. A notation on the architectural plans (drawing no. DA.27) indicates the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Max proposed building height: 12.3 m b. Max approved building height: 12.8 m c. However, the statement of support states that building height is being increased by 0.85 m e) Provide a full set of amended architectural plans and landscape plans consistent with the changes made within the RTS. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Proponent confirms the following in response to the items raised: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fitness Retreat <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The Proponent would like to acknowledge the receipt of approval for grant funding under the Greater Cities Sport Facility Fund for the Centre of Surfing Excellence (Formally “Surf Academy”). The fitness retreat is a fundamental component to the Centre of Surfing Excellence for running specific training programs for elite and high-level athletes. The space will also be used for the delivery of functional fitness classes such as yoga, stretch, strength and recovery (Among others). The inclusion of the fitness retreat is based on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To provide a fully equipped and versatile training base for NSW and Australian athletes preparing for Olympic campaigns, international competitions, and tournaments. ▪ To deliver additional fitness offerings and activities at the facility for patrons who are not using the surfing lagoon and may be waiting for a family member or friend. As an example, the fitness retreat will allow parents to attend a fitness class, whilst waiting for a child to complete a surf lesson or session in the lagoon. ▪ To support well rounded training programs for youth and other participants in the facility’s ongoing coaching programs. Maintenance Building <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) The Proponent provides the following justifications for the relocation of the maintenance workshop from the basement to a building/shed within Service Area 1: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To provide an appropriately sized workshop and storage space for ongoing essential on-site maintenance and repairs. The spatial requirements and layout of this maintenance building are driven by feedback from the Melbourne Facilities and Operations teams to improve park management. ▪ To separate the movement of materials and machinery (e.g., forklifts) from the main building, as well as allow safer handling and management of deliveries. ▪ To provide the required space for the Main Switch Room, Communications Room, and essential storage space for the food and beverage services and essential park facilities (i.e., rentals, first aid, lifeguard, security, and administration). GFA Calculations on Architectural Plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> c) Please refer to the following updated Architectural plans for GFA calculations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ DA.14 – Proposed GA Basement Plan. ▪ DA.16 – Proposed GA Ground Plan. ▪ DA.19 – Proposed GA First Floor Plan. Building Height <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) Please refer to Appendix C for a letter providing clarification from SJB Planning on the building height. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Department may refer to the following updated Architectural plans for reference to building height confirmation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DA.25 - Proposed GA Elevations • DA.27 – Proposed Building Sections ▪ Please also note this letter provides further clarification on the updated Gross Floor Area (GFA) calculations. Updated Plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> e) Please refer to Appendix F & Appendix G for updated Architectural and Landscape plans.



Appendices

Appendix A – Biodiversity Impact Statement

Appendix B – AC_RE_001_F_Acoustic Report

Appendix C – SJB Planning Statement

Appendix D – TTPP - Traffic & Parking Statement

Appendix E – DA Appendix 1 - Approved Area analysis

Appendix F – Updated Architectural Plans

Appendix G – Updated Landscape Plans