



Our ref: DOC20/840738-17

Your ref: SSD-10159

Ms Louise Starkey

Senior Planning Officer
Regional Assessments
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
louise.starkey@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Ms Starkey

Response to Submissions Report – Northside Private Hospital, West Gosford (SSD-10159)

I refer to your email dated 13 October 2020 in which Regional Assessments invited Biodiversity and Conservation Division (BCD) of the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (the Department) for comment on the Response to Submissions Report for the proposed Northside Private Hospital project (SSI-10159), located in West Gosford; within the Central Council area.

BCD has reviewed the '*Response to comments for Northside Private Hospital, Gosford submissions*' letter included as an Appendix of the revised Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (prepared by Ecological Australia, and dated 28 July 2020), including relevant appendices, annexures and attachments in relation to impacts on biodiversity and flooding.

BCD's recommendations are provided in **Attachment A** and detailed comments are provided in **Attachment B**. If you require any further information regarding this matter, please contact Steve Lewer, Senior Regional Biodiversity Conservation Officer, on 4927 3158 or via email at rog.hcc@environment.nsw.gov.au

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B Mee'.

BRENDAN MEE
Acting Senior Team Leader Planning
Hunter Central Coast Branch
Biodiversity and Conservation Division

Enclosure: Attachments A and B

BCD's recommendations

Northside Private Hospital, West Gosford (SSD-10159)

Biodiversity

1. BCD is satisfied that the Response to Submissions letter has satisfactorily addressed our previous biodiversity comments (dated 24 March 2020).
2. BCD recommends the BAM accredited assessor certifies that the BDAR was finalised within 14 days of the exhibition of the EIS.

Water Floodplains and Coasts

3. Site flooding issues should be adequately assessed. This may result in the need for additional drainage controls to divert water within or around the sites.
4. Emergency management issues relating to potential flooding of the basement carpark should be adequately addressed.
5. The stormwater management and construction environmental management plans should be reviewed to determine if runoff within sediment traps needs to be filtered or flocculated before the water is released to the environment.

BCD's detailed comments

Northside Private Hospital, West Gosford (SSD-10159)

Biodiversity

1. BCD is satisfied with the biodiversity assessment

BCD's prior review of the Environmental Impact Statement for the project contained the following recommendations (as per correspondence dated 24 March 2020 (DOC20/130830-8)):

- BCD recommends the BAM accredited assessor provides adequate justification as to why the floristic plot is representative of the vegetation on site, given the absence of key diagnostic canopy species used to justify the PCT, or resample the vegetation so that the floristic plot includes the diagnostic canopy species.
- BCD recommends the BAM accredited assessor to submit the credit calculator via the NSW Biodiversity Accredited Assessor System.

Ecological Australia (ELA) acknowledge that the *Eucalyptus pilularis* was not located within the floristic integrity plot, but it was captured within the transect (Figure 2) (Photo 1) of the revised Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR). ELA indicate had the plot been orientated slightly west it would have included the *Eucalyptus pilularis*, but the plot would also have included a large portion of the carpark and less representative species of PCT 684. Hence, the plot was orientated to include a patch of vegetation in the east which although lacking the diagnostic canopy species was more representative of PCT 684. BCD accepts this justification.

The BAM credit calculator was submitted.

Recommendation 1

BCD is satisfied that the Response to Submissions letter has satisfactorily addressed our previous biodiversity comment (dated 24 March 2020) and no further biodiversity assessment is required.

2. Accredited assessor needs to certify BDAR was finalised within 14 days of the exhibition of the EIS

Section 6.15 (Currency of a biodiversity assessment report) of the BC Act indicates that a biodiversity assessment report cannot be submitted in connection with a relevant application unless the accredited person certifies in the report that the report has been prepared on the basis of the requirements of (and information provided under) the biodiversity assessment method as at a specified date and that date is within 14 days of the date the report is so submitted.

The BAM accredited assessor has not certified that the BDAR was finalised within 14 days of exhibition of the EIS.

Recommendation 2

BCD recommends the BAM accredited assessor certifies that the BDAR was finalised within 14 days of the exhibition of the EIS.

Water Floodplains and Coasts

3. Flood impacts have not been adequately addressed

The proponent has provided additional information to address Item 5 from BCD's review of the environmental impact assessment (EIS) (DOC20/130830-8, 24 March 2020). This information was prepared by GRC Hydro who state that the overland flow path identified in the Gosford CBD Local Overland Flow Flood Study, Cardno, 2013 only results in minor ponding on the site, in areas away from work areas.

GRC Hydro have not explained how an overland flow path running through the site would only result in minor ponding. Further, Central Coast Council's flood mapping, and the Section 10.7 Planning Certificate state that the site is flood affected.

Recommendation 3

Site flooding issues should be adequately assessed. This may result in the need for additional drainage controls to divert water within or around the sites.

4. Emergency management of flooding

The Emergency Management issues raised through Item 6 of BCD's review of the EIS have not been addressed.

These concerns relate to the safe functioning of the on-site detention (OSD) system. The proposed hospital has two underground carparks that are lower than the OSD tank. Overflow from the OSD could flow down the access driveway and flood the basement carpark when its capacity is exceeded. This could occur in the event of a pump failure, blockage, or if Council's receiving stormwater pipe is overloaded.

The OSD does not appear to have a failsafe overflow mechanism to ensure that flows in excess of the OSD's storage capacity do not flood the basement carpark. Under predevelopment conditions, any rainfall runoff in excess of the Council's piped stormwater capacity would have previously left the site by overland flow in a distributed manner. The proposed stormwater configuration directs all site runoff to the OSD. In case the OSD fails, requirements for alarming and evacuating the basement should be considered as part of the emergency management.

Recommendation 4

Emergency management issues relating to potential flooding of the basement carpark should be adequately addressed.

5. Construction management plans are inadequate

BCD is satisfied with the proponent's calculations to support sizing of the construction sedimentation basin, provided in response to Item 12 of BCD's review of the EIS. However, erosion and sediment control for dispersible soils have not been considered. Additional flocculation treatment may be required as the geotechnical investigation (Appendix 19 of the EIS) identified that clay soils of depths up to 3m will be excavated. The report did not test for dispersibility of subsoils within the development site.

Recommendation 5

The stormwater management and construction environmental management plans should be reviewed to determine if runoff within sediment traps needs to be filtered or flocculated before the water is released to the environment.