



Department of Primary Industries

OUT15/35159

Mr Patrick Copas
Industry Assessments
NSW Department of Planning and Environment
GPO Box 39
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Patrick.Copas@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Mr Copas,

**Oakdale South Industrial Estate (SSD_6917)
Response to exhibition of Environmental Impact Statement**

I refer to your email dated 11 November 2015 requesting advice from the Department of Primary Industries (DPI) in respect to the above matter. I apologise for the delay in responding to you.

Comment has been sought from DPI Water and Fisheries. Any further referrals to DPI can be sent by email to landuse.enquiries@dpi.nsw.gov.au.

DPI Fisheries have advised no comment. DPI Water has provided comments below.

Comment by DPI Water

DPI Water has reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement and provides the following comments, and detailed comments in Attachment A.

In terms of protecting and enhancing the watercourses and riparian outcomes at the site, DPI Water prefers Concept Proposal Option 1 as presented in the EIS to Option 3.


DPI Water recommends:

- details are provided on why Drainage line 2 is not considered to be a watercourse and whether it exhibits a defined channel with bed and banks,
- the widths of the riparian corridors at the site are to be measured from top of the highest bank on both sides of the watercourses (the Concept Plan for the site may need to be amended accordingly as it would appear the proposal has measured widths from either side of the channel).

- a bridge crossing could be considered to cross Ropes Creek to assist protect riparian connectivity and corridor function along this creek,
- the culvert crossing of Drainage line 1 includes elevated dry cells and recessed wet cells,
- additional details are provided on the proposed source(s) of water and the total annual volume of water that is proposed to be used to irrigate the rehabilitated riparian corridor and E2 zone.

For further information please contact Janne Grose, Water Regulation Officer (Parramatta Office) on 8838 7505 or at janne.grose@dpi.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M Isaacs', with a stylized, cursive script.

Mitchell Isaacs

Director, Planning Policy & Assessment Advice

17/12/2015

Attachment A

Oakdale South Industrial Estate (SSD_6917) Response to exhibition of EIS Detailed comments - DPI Water

The Department of Primary Industries, Water (DPI Water) has reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and provides the following comments:

Watercourses and Riparian Corridors

Concept Proposal Options:

The EIS notes three key concept proposal options for OSE were developed (pages 19-21). Based on Figure 6 (OSE Concept proposal alternatives) Option 1 appears to provide the best riparian outcome for the site. Table 5 indicates that Option 1 provides the maximum buffer to Ropes Creek riparian corridor. Option 1 also retains Drainage Line 2 and the remnant vegetation along this drainage line.

All three options presented in Figure 6 appear to encroach into the proposed riparian zone along Ropes Creek in the south of the site near Precinct 6 – Lot 6B. Any encroachment into the outer 50% of the riparian corridor should be offset by an equal area along the creek on the site. A Vegetation Management Plan will need to clearly show and provide details on any proposed areas of encroachment and the offset areas.

The proponent's preferred option is Option 3 which requires realignment of Drainage Line 1 along 250 m of its length (page 83) and the removal of Drainage Line 2 to create Lots 3C and 3B. Option 3 also appears to encroach the development closer to Ropes Creek in the northern part of the site adjacent to Precinct 1 – Lots 1A and 1C.

Tributaries of Ropes Creek (Drainage line 1 and Drainage Line 2)

According to Section 6.5.1 of the EIS, Drainage Line 2 is not defined as a watercourse (page 129) but no details are provided on why it is not considered to be a watercourse. It is recommended details are provided. Appendix M shows there is an existing 100 yr flood zone along Drainage line 2 (Figure 5). It is recommended further consideration is given in regard to flood related issues and the conveyance of flood flows if drainage line 2 is to be removed.

The EIS is confusing in relation to the proposed treatment of the two tributaries of Ropes Creek. Some sections refer to the rehabilitation of the riparian corridor along one of the tributaries and the realignment of the other, while other sections refer to the realignment and rehabilitation of one and the removal of the other for example:

- Table 12 in the EIS notes the concept proposal observes a 10 m setback to an unnamed tributary and the second tributary is to be realigned (page 59).
- Section 4.2.6 of the EIS refers to the retention, restoration and ongoing maintenance of one of the tributaries but it notes the second tributary would be realigned as part of the development (page 63).
- Section 6.5.2 of the EIS indicates the development would require the partial realignment of Drainage Line 1 and Drainage line 2 would be removed (page 130).

. Rehabilitation of Riparian Corridors

Section 6.5.2 of the EIS notes the implementation of the VMP is scheduled to commence when the development of the OSE reaches 80% completion (page 130). It is unclear why the

rehabilitation of the riparian corridors /E2 zone particularly along Ropes Creek needs to be delayed until the development reaches 80% completion. It is recommended the rehabilitation of Ropes Creek riparian corridor commences once the VMP is approved and the rehabilitation of the riparian corridor/E2 zone along Drainage line 1 commences once the creek realignment stream works are completed.

Table 13 in the EIS notes there will be landscape treatments to provide appropriate transitions between the public and the private domain and between the developable and the non developable land on the site (page 68). It is recommended any landscaped areas which are adjacent to the riparian corridors/E2 zone are consistent with the plantings in the riparian corridors/E2 zone and the landscape areas consist of native species from the relevant local vegetation community, especially landscaped areas which are located on waterfront land.

Licence Requirements

The draft VMP indicates that water may be pumped from Ropes Creek on the provision that a licence is obtained to irrigate and maintain the rehabilitated areas (Section 2.5.5.2, page 33). If it is proposed to pump water from Ropes Creek for irrigation, the proponent will need a Water Access Licence (WAL) to access the water from within the Lower South Creek Management zone.

Table 12 in the EIS indicates the concept proposal incorporates four bioretention basins (A to D) (page 59). Water could be used from the basins for irrigation purposes without the need for a licence from the DPI Water provided the basins will only capture dirty water. If the basins capture clean water as well as dirty water, then a licence may be required if the volume is in excess of the site's harvestable rights.

Groundwater

The Geotechnical and Hydrogeological Investigation Report indicates that based on the site investigation and the proposed earthworks, permanent groundwater is not expected to be encountered during bulk earthworks but there may be minor perched groundwater inflows (Section 5.1, page 7). The EIS indicates permanent groundwater is likely to be present within bedrock at an approximate depth of 20m and shallow, perched groundwater occurs at the soil – bedrock interface and in proximity to Ropes Creek at approximately 6 m depth (Table 8, page 41). It notes earthworks on the site may intersect shallow/perched groundwater in certain locations on the site. This may occur as the EIS notes the maximum cut depth would be approximately 12m (Section 4.3.3, page 78).

If groundwater is likely to be intercepted or extracted, depending on the volumes encountered and the duration of pumping, a licence may be required from DPI Water under Part 5 of the *Water Act 1912* in relation to construction excavation/dewatering activities. It is recommended monitoring piezometers are established in advance.

The project needs to quantify the likely volumes of groundwater to be dewatered. Generally, a groundwater dewatering licence would be required where the total extraction of groundwater during the dewatering period exceeds 3.0 megalitres per annum. .

Table 40 in the EIS indicates a CEMP is to be prepared for the methods and management of any dewatering required during construction (Page 144).

Depending on the volumes of groundwater that are anticipated to be encountered, consideration may need to be given to developing a Dewatering Management Plan for this SSD and provision for this possibility should be included as a Mitigation and Management measure and in the approved conditions.