

Table 2 – Response to Submissions Received on the Draft PPR

Note: The Responses to Submissions Received on the Draft PPR have ddressed the modified Project Application as they apply to the amended site area.

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
Bushfire Management, Vegetation Management and Revegetation Requirements			
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	The relationship between bushfire and vegetation management requirements including revegetation of the riparian zone needs further consideration and resolution. The Steve Ellis Bushfire Report (Appendix 6) and the James Warren Vegetation Management Plan (Appendix 8) do not provide adequate levels of detail about how bushfire management requirements are to be met in relation to vegetation management and revegetation requirements.	The requirements of the RFS have been resolved. Refer to the updated Bushfire Report (Appendix 6) and Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) (Appendix 8) that provides further details of bushfire and vegetation management requirements.	No
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	You should also review the comments and requirements in the submissions from council, OEH and RFS on the PPR, copies of which are attached. This will require co-ordination between your bushfire and ecological consultants and may require liaison with the agencies to resolve the issues raised, such as OEH requirements for the fire trails and vegetated buffer zones and RFS requirements for access points to the fire trail within the National Park.	Liaison with the RFS and OEH has been undertaken to resolve matters in relation to the maintenance of the fire trails, access points and vegetated buffer zones. Refer to Appendix 15 for the records and outcomes of the consultation process.	No
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	<p>In order to begin to resolve bushfire and vegetation management issues, a clear APZ plan is required showing the actual APZ measurements (Inner Protection Area/Outer Protection Area) measured from the hazard to the building line. I note the advice of the RFS on the PPR that the bushfire attack level (BAL) overlay map, as shown on Drawing 113A, is not recommended at this stage.</p> <p>We need a clear understanding of the extent of the APZs and how they relate to the National Park. Figure 13 of the bushfire report and the statement that 'all APZs are able to be accommodated' needs to be graphically demonstrated. Amendments may be required to the proposed subdivision</p>	<p>An updated APZ plan that shows the proposed Inner and Outer Protection Areas has been provided, refer to Drawing No. 113 in Appendix 4. In-principle agreement was provided by the RFS in relation to the APZ plan (Appendix 15).</p> <p>A 6m wide fire trail has been identified along the southern and western boundaries of the site, within the Bongil Bongil National Park. The Bushfire Report states that this fire trail has been identified in the Council's North Bonville Development Control Plan, as well as the Bongil Bongil</p>	No

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
	<p>layout to provide for APZs wholly within the site.</p> <p>If it is intended to use existing fire trails within the National Park as part of the bushfire management measures then documented agreement of OEH/NPWS is required, and you will also need to address ongoing maintenance of these areas outside the site. There is no guarantee that the department will agree to the inclusion of these area outside the site as part of the bushfire management for the subdivision.</p>	<p>National Park Fire Management Strategy. As this fire trail is subject to formal management regimes it will be used as part of the required APZ for the development site. Written agreement from both the RFS and OEH has been provided in relation to the use and ongoing maintenance of the existing fire trails within the Bongil Bongil National Park. (refer to Appendix 15).</p>	
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	<p>The third paragraph of p. 6 of the bushfire report indicates that the riparian zone/watercourse could be managed in a bushfire hazard free state. This would potentially be contrary to revegetation of the riparian zone, including Office of Waters NOW requirements in the 2012 Riparian Corridor Guideline (it is noted that James Warren still refers to the 2008 guideline and not the latest 2012 version).</p>	<p>The updated VMP (Appendix 8) states that according to the Guidelines for riparian corridors on waterfront land (NOW 2012), the Vegetated Riparian Zone (VRZ) should remain, or become, vegetated with fully structured native vegetation (including groundcovers shrubs and trees). The complete revegetation of the Riparian Corridor in this way however, presents a significant bushfire hazard on the proposed development. In particular, there is only one entry-exit road to the proposed development; therefore revegetation in the immediate vicinity of the road has the potential to create a traffic pinch-point. In order to comply with the Standards for Asset Protection Zones (NSW RFS undated) and eliminate the potential pinch-point, a restricted planting area (20 metres wide) adjacent to each side of the entry-exit road (approximately 0.42 ha) is proposed.</p> <p>The James Warren and & Associates Ecological Assessment and VMP have been updated to reflect the 2012 Riparian Corridor Guideline.</p>	No
Department of	The VMP needs to provide for the APZs either side of the main connecting	Refer to response above in relation to the main connecting	No

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
Planning & Infrastructure	<p>road, where it crosses the riparian zone, as recommended in the bushfire report. Removal of any existing vegetation for provision of the APZ in this area may also impact the findings and conclusions of the James Warren ecological assessment in regard to the extent of EEC that is to be removed and/or retained, and this should also be reviewed.</p> <p>I note councils' comments on the PPR that further discussion is also required on the provision of an APZ to the main connecting road, particularly if it is intended that council take over long term maintenance. This could require council to maintain a revegetated riparian corridor in a bushfire hazard free state. Council's concerns need to be addressed.</p>	<p>road. The VMP proposes that the areas to either side of the main entry road will be maintained as "restricted planting zone". The restricted planting zone will largely be revegetated in accordance with the composition of the Freshwater wetland EEC. This community is naturally occurring in the Riparian Corridor on the site and typically has a limited number or no woody species (DECC 2008). There will be no removal of vegetation from the restricted planting area. Refer to Appendix 8.</p>	
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	<p>On Drawing No 113A showing BALs there are annotations 'riparian zone control' and 'tree line control' next to a line from the subdivision into the riparian area, but it is unclear what these terms refer to.</p>	<p>Drawing No 113 has been updated to remove BALs in accordance with the advice of the RFS and annotations relating to "riparian zone control" and 'tree line control' have also been removed.</p>	No
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	<p>Figures 8 and 9 of the VMP both show polygons where particular work is to be carried out but with no explanation of why these areas are the shape they are and why it appears that works would be undertaken on the neighbouring property. Council advice in their letter of 22/10/2012 also notes that the VMP mapping covers area that are outside the site, and the need to quantify and cost any works in adjacent council reserve areas.</p>	<p>Figures 9 (Assisted Regeneration Areas) and 10 (Revegetation Areas) of the VMP have been amended to exclude works that are outside of the site of the development (Appendix 8).</p>	No
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	<p>OEH have indicated that planting along the western boundary will need to be free of inappropriate plants that would exacerbate fire conditions. This also needs to be considered as it would include the western edge or perimeter of the riparian revegetation area as indicated in figure 9 of the VMP.</p>	<p>Revegetation planting will be undertaken only in areas cleared of native vegetation within the Riparian Corridor (approximately 2.24 ha). Revegetation will involve Riparian revegetation (1.55 ha) and Freshwater wetland revegetation (0.69 ha) based on site topography, areas of proposed topsoil fill and existing vegetation. Refer to Figure 10 in the VMP (Appendix 8).</p>	No

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
Coffs Harbour City Council	Objective 3 of the plan "To ensure retained vegetation is of low fire risk" is questioned particularly as the Plan proposes to plant 6321 Koala trees, which assumes Eucalypts, and identifies swamp sclerophyll forests as dominant vegetation types.	The VMP has been updated to reflect the amended revegetation requirements and does not propose 6321 Koala trees as was previously identified in Table 6 of the VMP (Appendix 8).	No
Coffs Harbour City Council	The VMP mapping covers areas that are outside of the development area. It is unclear whether costings refer to these areas or not. If the applicant wishes to do work in the adjacent Council Reserve these works will need to be quantified and costed separately.	The VMP and its figures have been amended to remove works that were previously proposed outside of the site (Appendix 8).	No
Coffs Harbour City Council	The VMP does not take account of the Bushfire Report recommendation that a 19m APZ be established either side of the road creek crossing point. Has the Rural Fire Service (RFS) confirmed the requirement for this measure?	The VMP has been updated to include a 20 metre wide restricted planting zone to both sides of the main entry road which is consistent with the proposed 20 m wide Inner Protection Zones as proposed in Drawing No. 113 in Appendix 4 .	No
Coffs Harbour City Council	<p>The VMP planting densities are excessive, particularly for koala trees. Revegetation of 4.2 hectares is proposed to cost \$745000.00 under the Plan. More detail on species and numbers of each species is required. The plan does not differentiate between treatment of CRZ and vegetation buffer in terms of species and densities.</p> <p>The proponent should liaise with Councils Recreation Services Section on the VMP (please contact Ms S Stewart on telephone 6648 4875 or Ms C Brooke on telephone 6648 4871).</p>	Refer to response above in relation to proposed densities of the revegetation areas. The VMP has provided updated costings and provides further details in relation to species (Appendix 8).	No
Coffs Harbour City Council	It is unclear if this Bushfire report considers the proposed 4.2 hectares of planned revegetation identified in the VMP, particularly relating to the northern lots in the subdivision.	The Bushfire Report has been updated to reflect the amended revegetation proposals (Appendix 6).	No
NSW Rural Fire Service	The proposed asset protection zones (APZs) on the south and west elevations are based upon the inclusion of the 6 metre wide fire trail within	The RFS has confirmed its acceptance of the incorporation of the existing Bongil Bongil National Park fire trails in the	No

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
	the adjoining Bongil Bongil National Park. If the fire trails cannot be guaranteed to be maintained then the proposed lot layout will need to be amended to incorporate the required APZs within the site boundaries.	APZ calculations for the development. Refer to Appendix 15 .	
NSW Rural Fire Service	The asset protection zones (APZ) proposed for those lots adjoining the riparian corridor are based upon the re-vegetation being limited to a total of 20 metres wide. Any re-vegetation beyond this will need to comply with the requirements of an APZ as outlined within Appendices 2 & 5 of <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i> and the NSW Rural Fire Service's document <i>Standards for asset protection zones</i> .	Proposed revegetation areas comply with the requirements of <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i> and the NSW Rural Fire Service's document <i>Standards for asset protection zones</i> . Refer to Appendix 6 .	No
NSW Rural Fire Service	All lots within the subdivision are be required to be managed as an asset protection zone as outlined within Appendices 2 & 5 of <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i> and the NSW Rural Fire Service's document <i>Standards for asset protection zones</i> , until further developed.	All proposed lots will be managed in accordance with the APZ Plan, refer Drawing No 114 in Appendix 4 .	No
NSW Rural Fire Service	The bushfire attack level (BAL) overlay map is not recommended at this stage for the use in determining the construction requirements of future dwellings to be erected within the subdivision.	The BAL overlay map has been removed and replaced with the APZ Plan, refer Drawing No 114 in Appendix 4 .	No
NSW Rural Fire Service	Public Road Access shall comply with section 4.1.3 (1) of <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i> .	Public road access complies with the requirements of <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i> .	No
NSW Rural Fire Service	Perimeter roads shall have a minimum carriageway width of 8 metres.	All perimeter roads have a width of 8 metres.	No
NSW Rural Fire Service	Non perimeter roads widths shall comply with Table 4.1 in <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i> .	Non perimeter road widths comply with the requirements of <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i> .	No
NSW Rural Fire Service	The fire trail system is to be connected to the public road system at frequent intervals of 200 metres or less.	Agreement has been reached between the NPWS and RFS in relation to the number and potential location of access points to the fire trail systems. Three locked gates will be provided along the western boundary of the site to	No

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
		be managed by NPWS. Refer to Appendix 15 .	
NSW Rural Fire Service	The provision of water, electricity and gas supplies shall comply with section 4.1.3 of <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i> .	The provision of water, electricity and gas supplies has been designed to comply with the requirements of <i>Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006</i> .	No
Office of Environment & Heritage	Agreement should be reached among relevant parties before approval on the issue of spacing of fire trail related access points that connect the fire trail system with the public road network.	Refer to response above in relation to the fire trail system.	No
Office of Environment & Heritage	The Landscape Master Plan (page 03) should be revised to ensure that it incorporates the planting of Kangaroo Grass (<i>Themeda australis</i>), not Kangaroo Paw.	The Landscape Master Plan has been amended to reflect this requirement.	No
Vegetated Buffer Zones			
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	Appropriate vegetated buffer zones will be required to the site perimeters with the national park, and to the area to be dedicated to NPWS. The response table in the PPR indicates that there will be 4m to 6m buffers. I note advice from OEH on the PPR that vegetative buffering (of minimum 10 metres width) is required along the southern and eastern boundaries to ensure interface/edge and hydrological impacts upon EECs will be appropriately mitigated.	Note that there is no longer the proposal to dedicate a portion of the property to the NPWS as this portion of the site has been removed from the Project Application. The following vegetated buffer zones are proposed, which are contained within public reserves: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Western boundary to road is 7 metres and contains swale drains Southern boundary to road is 15 metres and contains swale drains Eastern boundary to road is 17 metres and will contain various swale drains and drains. 	No
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	The provision of the buffers will need to be considered by your bushfire consultant in relation to bushfire management measures, and cross section details of all buffer zones will be required (the landscape plan provides cross	The vegetated perimeter buffer areas will be planted to the Outer Protection Areas of the APZs. The buffers are proposed to contain swales but have been designed to	No

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
	section details only for the riparian zones, as the VMP only addresses the re-vegetation of the riparian areas). This will provide a clearer understanding of the treatment and management of perimeter buffers; particularly if they are to include APZs and storm water infrastructure/swales (which OEH will likely recommend be provided outside the buffer zones).	connect with the subdivision's internal bio retention basins so as to not discharge runoff to the Bongil Bongil National Park. Refer to Drawing No 107 in Appendix 4 which has cross section details for perimeter roads including stormwater water infrastructure.	
Office of Environment & Heritage	Additional vegetative buffering along the southern and eastern boundaries to a minimum of 10 metres is required in tandem with the proposed revised design measures to ensure that interface/edge hydrological impacts upon Endangered Ecological Communities (EECs), and their habitat and habitat values, will be appropriately mitigated in the longer term.	The width of the vegetative buffers have been increased to reflect OEH minimum requirements and as discussed above the stormwater design measures proposed will reduce potential impacts to the Bongil Bongil National Park including EECs.	No
Stormwater and Flooding			
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	Council does not support the provision of the central swales within the main spine road due to ongoing maintenance, refer to council's letter of advice on the PPR dated 22 October 2012. The stormwater strategy will need to be reviewed to accommodate the removal of these swales.	Advice from the Council confirms that central swales are not supported, however has advised that further design details for replacing the central swales with a suitable bio retention treatment are to be provided at the Construction Certificate stage.	Yes – new (4.13)
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	You also need to consider council requirements (as set out in council's letter of advice dated November 2012) in regard to maintenance arrangements and commitments to the stormwater system including gross pollutant traps. These requirements should be incorporated where relevant within the stormwater strategy and statements of commitments.	The Statement of Commitments has been updated to reflect Councils requirements.	Yes – (4.4)
Coffs Harbour City Council	The central swales are not supported on the grounds of high maintenance costs, even taking into account the measures proposed by the proponent. The bio retention ponds could be resized to take account of the loss of the central swales with the stormwater quality modelling reworked without these swales to determine sizing and treatment.	Refer to response above in relation to the central swales.	Yes – new (4.13)

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
Coffs Harbour City Council	A sewer pumping station (SPS) is proposed to serve 23 lots in the south western corner of the site. A SPS servicing this few properties is not economically viable to Council. A Low Pressure System, conforming to Council's Policy, could be employed in this area. The consent could be conditioned accordingly.	A low pressure sewer system has now been incorporated into the subdivision design for the 23 lots in the south western corner of the site. Refer to Drawing No 111 in Appendix 4 .	No
Department of Primary Industries	The proponent has altered the development layout consistent with the recommendations detailed in the Office of Water's submission dated 14 March 2011 to the Environmental Assessment. In particular the relocation of the stormwater infrastructure out of the riparian zone is acknowledged.	Noted. No response required.	No
Department of Primary Industries	Although the project proposal does not require separate Controlled Activities Approval under the <i>Water Management Act 2000</i> , works within riparian areas should be consistent with State policy, including the Office of Water Guidelines for Controlled Activities. Please note that these guidelines have recently been updated (July 2012). For the revised guidelines, please refer to: http://www.water.nsw.gov.au/Water-Licensing/Approvals/Controlled-activities/default.aspx .	The updated NOW Guidelines for Controlled Activities have been appropriately referenced in the Stormwater Management Strategy.	No
Office of Environment & Heritage	The Stormwater Management Plan (SWMP) should be revised to ensure that it specifically aims to address the impacts of the proposed development upon the hydrological function of the ground water dependent EECs to the east.	The Stormwater Management Strategy (Appendix 5) states that the proposed best practice WSUD strategy will significantly improve the stability, natural function and water quality of the downstream creek systems. It would contribute to the long term improvement in these receiving waters. In addition, a baseline groundwater investigation performed by WorleyParsons under a separate engagement and attached previously to the original Environmental Assessment found that it is unlikely that the development would have a demonstrable effect on groundwater dependent vegetation associated with the	No

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
		adjacent riparian zone or the national park, including the EEC's to the east of the site.	
Office of Environment & Heritage	The SWMP should indicate (and the Statement of Commitments be revised to reflect) an adequate level of commitment by relevant appropriate parties to the ongoing maintenance of retention basins and gross pollutant traps, in order that they will function as designed, in perpetuity.	Refer to response above in relation to the Statement of Commitments.	Yes – new (4.12 and 4.13)
Cultural Heritage			
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	Details are required of the cultural heritage relocation area (for top soil to be removed from ridges) as recommended by the Cultural Heritage Report. OEH recommended in their submission on the EA that details of the relocation area be finalised prior to determination of the project, along with details of long term management.	Refer to Drawing No 121 in Appendix 4 which details the archaeological topsoil cutting and placement. It is proposed that approximately 6,600 cubic metres. The cutting of the topsoil is to be managed in accordance with the Cultural Heritage Assessment report. The topsoil placement areas are to be managed so as to minimise the likelihood of future disturbance to any artefacts. Refer to consultation with Council in Appendix 15 concerning the neighbourhood park.	Yes (9.3)
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	Consideration is required of the extent/volume of top soil to be removed and relocated as it is unclear whether it will impact on proposed cut and fill, and/or storm water measures, including the bio retention areas. If the relocation area is within the south west or south east corners of the site this will potentially impact upon proposed bio retention areas.	The proposed topsoil fill placement areas are shown on Drawing No 121 in Appendix 4 and do not impact on any bio retention areas.	No
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	You should review the comments received from OEH in their letter of 26 October 2012, in regard to Aboriginal cultural heritage issues.	Discussions with OEH have been undertaken in relation to Aboriginal cultural heritage management process and are reflected in the existing Statement of Commitments.	No
Office of Environment &	The proponent must continue to consult with and involve all the registered local Aboriginal representatives cultural heritage values. Evidence of this	A commitment will be made by the proponent for ongoing consultation with local Aboriginal representatives.	No

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
Heritage	consultation must be collated and provided to the consent authority upon request.		
Office of Environment & Heritage	The proponent must prepare a Cultural Heritage Management Plan (CHMP) to detail procedures for managing Aboriginal cultural heritage values associated with the project area. The CHMP is to be implemented in consultation with the registered Aboriginal parties. The plan must also detail the involvement and responsibilities of the Aboriginal stakeholders in the implementation of all cultural heritage management actions, details of all mitigation and management strategies (including monitoring program, further investigations, etc); procedures for the identification and management of previously unrecorded sites (including human remains); details of an appropriate keeping place agreement with local Aboriginal community representatives for any Aboriginal objects salvage through the development process; details of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Education Induction Program for all contractors and personnel associated with construction activities; and compliance procedures in the unlikely event that non-compliance with the CHMP is identified. This process must be undertaken prior to commencing any ground disturbance or development works subject to the development.	A commitment will be made to prepare a Cultural Heritage Management Plan prior to works commencing at the site.	No
Office of Environment & Heritage	The proponent is to provide fair and reasonable opportunities for the registered Aboriginal parties to monitor any initial ground disturbance activities associated with the ridge located within the project area. In the event that additional Aboriginal objects are uncovered during the monitoring program, the objects are to be recorded and managed in accordance with the requirements of sections 85A and 89A of the <i>National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974</i> .	A commitment will be made to provide monitoring opportunities for Aboriginal parties during works at the site.	No
Office of	All Aboriginal sites impacted by the project must have an Aboriginal Site	Noted. The proponent will follow all required processes.	No

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
Environment & Heritage	Impact Recording (ASIR) form completed and be submitted to OEH's AHIMS Registrar within 3 months of being impacted.		
Office of Environment & Heritage	If human remains are located in the event that surface disturbance occurs, all works must halt in the immediate area to prevent any further impacts to the remains. The NSW Police are contacted immediately. No action is to be undertaken until the NSW Police provide written notification to the proponent. If the skeletal remains are identified as Aboriginal, the proponent must contact the OEH's Enviroline on 131 555 and representatives of the local Aboriginal community. No works are to continue until the OEH provides written notification to the proponent.	Noted. The proponent will follow all required processes.	No
Office of Environment & Heritage	An Aboriginal Cultural Education Induction Program must be developed for the induction of all personnel and contractors involved in the construction activities on site. Records are to be kept of which staff/contractors were inducted and when for the duration of the project. The program should be developed and implemented in collaboration with the registered Aboriginal parties.	A commitment will be made to preparing an Aboriginal Cultural Education Induction Program prior to works commencing at the site.	No
Maintenance Time Frames and Responsibilities			
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	Time frames and responsibilities need to be clearly identified. In a number of cases there are statements of commitment (taken from recommended conditions in the OEH submission on the EA) which refer to the identification of a 'responsible party' to maintain and/or monitor elements such as APZs and SW infrastructure. This 'responsible party' needs to be identified. In this regard I note council's advice in its letter of 19 November 2012 that it will not accept responsibility of the perimeter fencing to the National Park.	The Statement of Commitments has been reviewed and update where applicable. The NPWS have agreed to accept maintenance responsibility for the boundary fence to the west and south and have requested no fence boundary to the east of the site. Refer to Appendix 13 and 15 .	Yes – various
Department of Planning &	The VMP (p. 10) refers to initial works within 1 year of commencement, followed by a minimum 5 years monitoring and maintenance period by the	The VMP has been updated to state that the future maintenance and ongoing management will be the	Yes - new (4.4)

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
Infrastructure	<p>proponent, whereas the SOC refer to the proponent being responsible for maintenance and ongoing management of public reserves and riparian corridor for 5 years from start of construction.</p> <p>Table 1 of the PPR indicates that all proposed stormwater infrastructure is to be maintained by council. Major elements of this infrastructure are within the public reserve areas, being the bio retention basins, which are to be maintained by the proponent for at least 5 years. Also stormwater management takes into consideration rainwater tanks, which will be on private lots, to be maintained by respective future landowners.</p> <p>Council's advice dated 19 November 2012 indicates that its policy is that maintenance arrangements for the public reserves and riparian areas is five years from the date of commencement of the initial vegetation management plan works.</p>	<p>proponent's responsibility for the first 5 years after which the responsibility will lie with the Council.</p> <p>The Statement of Commitments has been updated to reflect Council's requirement in relation to the maintenance of public reserves including stormwater infrastructure.</p>	
Coffs Harbour City Council	Council's policy on maintenance arrangements of the public reserves and the riparian areas is 5 years from the date of commencement of the initial Vegetation Management Plan works.	Refer to response above in relation to the initial VMP works.	Yes – new (4.4)
Coffs Harbour City Council	Council rejects the assertion that the national park interface should be a Council maintenance responsibility. Council will not accept responsibility for the perimeter fence to the national park.	The NPWS have agreed to accept maintenance responsibility for the boundary fence to the west and south and have requested no fence boundary to the east of the site. Refer to Appendix 15 .	Yes – new (3.7)
Coffs Harbour City Council	In relation to maintenance arrangements and commitments to the stormwater system, including Gross Pollutant Traps Council would apply a 2 year bond (devices involving growth of plants). Handover of these facilities requires such facilities to only be treating natural rainfall events (not development sediment runoff). It may be appropriate to require that either the facilities not be finished as bio-retention ponds until all the development civil works of the stage(s) that might be draining to the device as a sediment pond is (are)	Noted. The Statement of Commitments has been updated to reflect Council's requirements.	Yes – new (4.12)

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
	completed and in a state where sediment runoff is being fully controlled upstream OR the bio retention pond be cleaned and proven to be suitable to operate as such at that handover time. The latter would require testing etc to demonstrate that the filters are not blocked etc. Around this the 2 year bonded maintenance period should be applied. This should ensure the bio retention ponds performance at the handover stage (after 2 years). Ongoing maintenance can be scheduled based on the handover condition.		
Office of Environment & Heritage	Agreement should be reached among relevant parties before approval on the issue of responsibility for long term maintenance of the proposed boundary fencing.	Refer to response above in relation to the boundary fencing responsibility.	No
National Park Access			
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	The PPR retains six potential access points into the national park (albeit in altered locations compare to the original proposal with the EA). OEH advice on the PPR requires that the three nominated pedestrian access points along the southern boundary be deleted.	Following consultation with the OEH and RFS, the PPR has been amended to include three access points to the Bongil Bongil National Park along the western boundary only.	No
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	I note that RFS requires that the fire trail system (within the National Park) is to be connected to the public road system at frequent intervals, which is potentially contrary to OEH requirements for restricted access points. It is likely that the fire trail within the National park, adjacent to the southern boundary, cannot be included as part of the bushfire management measures for the proposed subdivision. It is understood, from discussion with NPWS, that this fire trail is in any case less actively maintained, due to the topography and hydrology of this area.	Refer to response above and the relevant responses under the heading 'Bushfire Management, Vegetation Management and Revegetation Requirements'.	No
Office of Environment & Heritage	Nominated access points to the Bongil Bongil National Park along the adjoining southern boundary should be deleted and savings from this alteration be re-directed into upgrading the three proposed pedestrian access	Three access points into the Bongil Bongil National Park have been provided to the western boundary only.	No

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
	points along the western boundary of the site to provide high quality recreation options for National Park visitors.		
Road Verges			
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	The PPR indicates that road verges will be 3.5m wide where possible, to comply with council's minimum acceptable 3.5m width. You should further review this matter to determine whether any requirement that may be imposed for provision of a minimum 3.5m width can be accommodated within the proposed subdivision layout.	All roads have a minimum width of 3.5 metres.	No
Northern Rivers Catchment Action Plan			
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	The targets and intent of the Northern Rivers Catchment Action Plan have not been specifically listed and addressed. NRCMA indicated that consistency should be demonstrated, whereas the PPR response refers to the WSUD measures and rehabilitation of the watercourse/riparian zone and EECs.	The PPR has been updated to provide a detailed response in relation to the targets and intent of the Northern Rivers Catchment Action Plan.	No
Neighbourhood Park/public reserve areas and land to be dedicated as National Park			
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	In the response to council's EA submission it is stated that an alternative location has been made available for a neighbourhood park, but has not been clearly shown on the subdivision plans. Council has reviewed this matter and I note the advice in their letter of 22 October 2012 regarding the preferred location for this neighbourhood park, which would require deletion of three residential lots. This should be discussed with council and an updated landscape plan provided with an agreed location.	It is proposed to provide a neighbourhood park in the north-western corner of the site with a total useable area of approximately 1.19 hectares. The proposed location of the neighbourhood park has been agreed with Council (refer to Appendix 15). Refer to Drawing No. 120 in Appendix 4 for further details of the neighbourhood park.	Yes – new (10.4)
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	Any VPA required for the dedication of land to council will need to be further resolved prior further progress on the PPR. Similarly arrangements for the proposed dedication to NPWS of land zoned 7A on the eastern side of the site will need to be resolved.	The proponent has consulted with Council in relation to the acquisition and dedication processes for land identified for future public reserves purposes (refer Appendix 15). It is proposed that approximately 2.2 hectares will be acquired	Yes – new SOC (14.2) in relation to public

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
		<p>by Council in accordance with the North Bonville Developer Contribution Plan for Neighbourhood Park and Stormwater Management and approximately 6.6 hectares to be dedicated unencumbered and free of cost. Refer to Drawing No. 119 in Appendix 4.</p> <p>Note that there is no longer the proposal to dedicate a portion of the property to the NPWS as this portion of the site has been removed from the Project Application.</p>	<p>reserves and the SOC on the NPWS dedication matter has been removed</p>
Coffs Harbour City Council	<p>No neighbourhood park has been identified in the PPR. Council's current policy for local parks is a minimum 1 hectare in area. This area must include adequate functional space for play equipment and kick around area. Having reviewed the site and details provided by Department of Planning and Infrastructure the Council preferred solution is relocation of bio retention basin 1 and deletion of the annexure of the area of the 3 adjacent lots to public reserve. This area would then provide sufficient space for the local Park. This Park is of particular importance as it will be the only play park south of Lyons Road, and is essential for the overall well-being of the residents of the subdivision. An essential requirement for the space is to allow for natural surveillance of the play area i.e. not set down from road level, and not located at the back of housing lots. The play area needs to be functional after wet weather and also permit mowing to access freely without the need to alter mowing schedules (therefore not located in poorly drained areas). The play area must also be set back from roadways for safety and not require fencing.</p> <p>It is important that the proponent resolve this matter with Council's Recreation Services Section. Please liaise with Ms C Brooke on telephone</p>	Refer to response above in relation to the neighbourhood park.	<p>Yes – new (10.4)</p>

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
	6648 4871.		
Office of Environment & Heritage	The proponent should commit to the establishment of a voluntary planning agreement in respect of the proposed dedication of 12.7 Ha of 7a zoned land. The drafting of such an agreement should be undertaken with regard to material developed by OEH specifically designed to assist in delivering agreements that meet OEH requirements.	Note that there is no longer the proposal to dedicate a portion of the property to the NPWS as this portion of the site has been removed from the Project Application.	Yes – SOC on this matter has been removed
General Matters			
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	Table 1 of the PPR refers to responses to 'public' submissions', where this is a response to 10 agency submissions and 3 public submissions.	The PPR has been updated to reflect this amendment.	No
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	References to the department and other agencies, within the SOC are to be current, where relevant, such as the Department of Planning and Infrastructure and OEH, instead of Department of Planning and DECCW.	The PPR has been updated to reflect this amendment.	No
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	The SOC's need to be numbered and these numbers referred to in Table 1 of the PPR.	The PPR has been updated to reflect this amendment.	Yes – numbering system introduced for SOC's
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	An overall development or subdivision plan should be provided which includes areas and dimensions, including areas of the proposed public reserve and proposed to be dedicated to NPWS (refer to sheet 102A – Geoff Slattery and Partners, appendix 4 of the PPR, compared to Drawing 11 in EA).	Refer to Drawing No. 119 in Appendix 4.	Yes
Department of Planning &	In section 3.4.2 of the PPR there is a reference to the TMP as appendix 8 instead of appendix 12.	The PPR has been updated to reflect this amendment.	No

Agency	Issue Raised	Response	Change to SOC?
Infrastructure			
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	The bushfire report, page 7, refers to the road layout being amended to create a cul-de-sac (dead end road), the PPR (table 1) and report could clarify that this relates only to the short road at the eastern side near the subdivision entry, otherwise it seems inconsistent with the argument in the report that 'through roads' are proposed not dead ends/cul-de-sac.	The PPR has been updated to reflect this amendment.	No
Department of Planning & Infrastructure	Section 3.3.10 of the SW Management strategy (Appendix 5) refers to medium density dwellings which no longer form part of the proposal.	The Stormwater Management Strategy has been updated to reflect this amendment.	No
Department of Primary Industries	The Office of Water supports the Statement of Commitments for the proposal.	Noted. No response required.	No