

1 November 2021

218264

Mr Jim Betts
Secretary
NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
Locked Bag 5022,
Parramatta NSW 2124

Attn: Megan Fu, Principal Planner

Dear Mr Betts,

SSD 9351535 – JOHN HUNTER HEALTH AND INNOVATION PRECINCT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

On behalf of the applicant, Health Infrastructure, this submission has been prepared by Ethos Urban in response to the Department of Planning, Industry and Environments (the Department) Request for Additional Information dated 16 September 2021 regarding the above application.

On 29 September 2021 the project team met with representatives of City of Newcastle Council to discuss the comments provided, with the outcome being that the proposed responses below were satisfactory (meeting minutes are attached at Appendix C).

A meeting was also held with BCD on 28 September 2021, with agreement on the suitability of the proposed responses provided by Umwelt.

This submission also provides a response to the agency submissions received from Transport for NSW and provides further information and clarification as requested.

A response to your queries is provided below.

Request	Comment	Appendix
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment		
Please provide a response to issues raised by Council and the Biodiversity and Conservation division of the Department in the attached letters, particularly further provide further assessment of impacts on the native vegetation in the powerline easement. The Department is also expecting advice from Transport for NSW, which will be forwarded upon receipt.	See below responses	-
City of Newcastle		
<p>Scour protection details downstream of culverts Detailing of scour protection downstream of the two culverts remains inadequately addressed. The extent and nature of proposed scour protection needs to be shown on the civil drawings to mitigate downstream impacts to waterways. This has the added benefit of resolving potential construction stage issues.</p> <p>Inadequate scour protection at concentrated discharge points will mobilise sediment and cause problems in downstream bushland. It may also result in bed erosion undermining upstream civil assets. This is unlikely to be</p>	The project team met and discussed this comment with Council on 29 September. It is acknowledged that detailed design of the proposed scour protection at each culvert outlet must be undertaken at detailed design stage to ensure the stability of the downstream waterways. Northrop have reviewed supplementary information provided by City of Newcastle and confirm the intention for the design of the downstream scour protection aligns with Council's expectations being 'rock pitched' channel lining similar to that adopted by Council for rehabilitation of similar urban creek lines.	Appendix A

Request	Comment	Appendix
<p>mitigated by reliance on discharge velocity limits alone because the receiving waterways are steep – particularly the eastern gully.</p> <p>CN officers are willing to further discuss with the applicant the use of 'rock pitched' channel lining; drawing from a portfolio of over 6km of previous similar rock works to rehabilitate steep urban creeklines.</p>	<p>Further to the above, it is confirmed that the project team has reached out to Council representatives to discuss the opportunity to consult with Council during the detailed design phase of the project to draw on Councils previous experience with similar projects. The project team acknowledge the benefits of ongoing consultation, and Council have indicated they would be willing to continue their involvement once detailed culvert design has been advanced.</p>	
<p>Stormwater Reuse A total of 180m3 of stormwater reuse is required for the site. Northrop Engineers have indicated that a reuse rainwater tank having a capacity of 50m3 will be provided. The remaining volume has been indicated to be off set to the OSD. The reuse from this tank will be for the cooling tower systems.</p> <p>While CN generally does not have any concerns regarding this reuse proposal, it is noted that the development has a lot more potential for stormwater reuse than what has been proposed. The submitted Landscape Plan for the ASB Building Level 00 and Level 01 seems to be creating a great opportunity for a stormwater reuse.</p> <p>Recent large-scale developments in the CN local government area have been reusing stormwater for similar landscape use, some of which have been very successful. At a minimum, it is recommended that an additional rainwater tank/s is provided for reuse of the landscaped areas.</p>	<p>As per Councils advice, the project team have explored the opportunity to increase the rainwater reuse volume as part of the development proposal. Northrop confirm that the Hydraulic consultant WSCE is updating their design documentation to include provisions for landscape irrigation in the vicinity of the new Acute Services Building, as well as increase the minimum storage volume required to service the proposed mechanical plant cooling towers. This modification to the design substantially increases the reuse volume for the development to 125m3 (up from 50m3) in line with Councils recommendation to maximise the onsite reuse volume.</p>	Appendix A
<p>Parking management Concerns raised previously have not been satisfactorily addressed.</p>	<p>It is understood from the meeting with Council on 29 September 2021 that this comments is primarily in relation to the potential impact of construction works on local streets. It was confirmed with Council that the following mitigation measures are proposed that will ensure local traffic impacts are appropriately mitigated:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health Infrastructure will work with the contractor to implement initiatives such as park and ride shuttle bus services and encourage car-pooling. This will help ensure that construction workers will have a dedicated off site parking area and transportation to the works site, ensuring workers do not park in local streets. • The preliminary Construction Traffic Management Plan submitted with the SSD (Section 8 of Appendix G) sets out management measures. It is not anticipated that an on-street Works Zone would be required during the works. If a Works Zone is required, the contractor would be required to obtain approval from the relevant authority (Council, Transport for NSW). • Preparation of a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan by the contractor, which will form a requirement of the development consent. <p>Hospital staff parking supply is proposed to be maintained with no nett loss of existing supply during construction. If required, Health Infrastructure may separately progress an application under Part 5 to offset existing parking to be removed during construction to maintain no-nett loss parking.</p>	-
<p>Local Bushland Impacts</p>	<p>Urbis acknowledge the suggestion for quantitative landscape management targets and in line with</p>	Appendix B

Request	Comment	Appendix
<p>It is recommended an appropriate condition is imposed of any consent granted which set quantitative targets for vegetation outcomes in the revegetation areas between the road and remnant bushland. For example, % survival rates; % weeds present; % plant cover after a suitable period – at least 2 years.</p>	<p>professional best practice for project delivery, a landscape establishment period will be set and outlined within a Landscape Management Plan, to be provided for the project.</p> <p>As standard practice it will outline plant survival rates, weeds present, plant cover and so on, that will need to be achieved to close out the landscape establishment period.</p> <p>Accordingly, a condition setting out specific quantitative targets within the planning consent is not considered appropriate.</p>	
<p>Also, the proposed reliance on Soil Seed Bank Translocation alone will not provide cost benefits for this project. Soil Seed bank translocation is a specialised service that requires trialling of seed germination; operational protocols and monitoring from a suitably qualified person. It is unclear whether there is sufficient volume and quality of the desired species type in the topsoil potentially available from site earthworks. The RtS refers to the Glenugie Highway Upgrade as a precedent project. However, this highway upgrade involved restoring 42 hectares adjacent to a highway constructed entirely through a dense state forest in the mid north coast. Other revegetation methods may be simpler, cheaper, and more successful and support local employment by using native provenance tube stock or similar.</p>	<p>At the meeting with Council on 29 September this issue was clarified, that the subject area was minor and that an alternative Soil Seed Bank Translocation was not required.</p>	
<p>Biodiversity and Conservation Division</p>		
<p>BCD recommends that the proponent samples and assesses the native vegetation in the powerline easement within the development footprint accordance with the Biodiversity Assessment Method 2017.</p>	<p>The meeting of 28 September 2021 Umwelt and BCD have agreed on the changes required to address this comment. The amended BDAR is attached.</p>	<p>Appendix E</p>
<p>BCD recommends that the Site Map is redrawn so that the extent of native vegetation assessed for the project is presented at no more than 1: 10,000 scale.</p>		<p>Appendix E</p>
<p>Transport for NSW</p>		
<p>Construction Management – The Construction Traffic Management Plan, coordinated through the NICB / JHH steering committee, should be required prior to the commencement of any works on-site. The development should seek to mitigate traffic related impacts from the development with initiatives such as construction works outside of peak traffic volume periods, park and ride shuttle bus services and car-pooling.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>-</p>
<p>Safety and efficiency – The submitted documentation states that “due to the constrained nature of the site, there will at times be the requirement for construction vehicles to use the Lookout Road / Kookaburra Circuit” signalised intersection. This should be discouraged where possible and the alternatives of Lookout Road / Jacaranda Drive and the future NICB be considered in the first instance. If no alternative is available then risks could be managed through the Construction Traffic Management Plan, which should incorporate additional measures to specifically address the safety of pedestrians and the movement of operational traffic</p>	<p>Noted.</p>	<p>-</p>

Request	Comment	Appendix
<p>including staff, visitors and emergency vehicles through this intersection.</p>		
<p>Completion of works – TfNSW recommended a condition be drafted requiring connection to the NICB (Newcastle Inner City Bypass) as a priority to accommodate the additional traffic before the occupation of the site for any part of the development that generates additional traffic. DPIE has suggested the following condition: <i>“Should the Newcastle Inner City Bypass Rankin Park to Jesmond road works approved as part of State significant Infrastructure approval SSI 6888 not be completed by the commencement of operations of the Acute Services Building, the proponent shall identify appropriate management measures (such as ensuring there is no uplift in clinical activity, staggered staff start and finish times, modified visiting hours) to minimise traffic growth on the John Hunter Hospital Campus during peak periods to the satisfaction of the Secretary. These measures shall be implemented until the completion of the Newcastle Inner City Bypass Rankin Park to Jesmond road works.</i> This condition could be supported provided advice and direction about access is coordinated through the NICB / JHH steering committee and the outcomes are incorporated into the Construction Traffic Management Plan. The hospital should work with all relevant parties (staff, visitors, etc) to ensure identified measures are achieved.</p>	<p>Health Infrastructure requests the following minor change to the condition wording:</p> <p>Should the Newcastle Inner City Bypass Rankin Park to Jesmond road works approved as part of State significant Infrastructure approval SSI 6888 not be completed by the commencement of operations of the Acute Services Building, the proponent shall identify appropriate management measures (such as ensuring there is no controlled uplift in clinical activity, staggered staff start and finish times, modified visiting hours) to minimise traffic growth on the John Hunter Hospital Campus during peak periods to the satisfaction of the Secretary. These measures shall be implemented until the completion of the Newcastle Inner City Bypass Rankin Park to Jesmond road works.</p> <p>The requested change from ‘no’ uplift to ‘controlled’ uplift is a more reasonable method which will ensure the Hospital’s clinical functions can appropriately be managed while ensuring the intent of the condition can be achieved.</p>	-
<p>Stormwater Management – The submitted concept stormwater management plans and addendum fails to detail the relationship between the proposed stormwater management system and receiving (downstream) NICB system. The development should be conditioned to ensure that discharged stormwater from the development does not exceed the capacity of the stormwater drainage system for the NICB.</p>	<p>The stormwater drainage system design for the proposed JHHIP development includes the provision of onsite detention basins so not to increase flows to the downstream system as a result of the development. This approach is in line with standard industry practice and the City of Newcastle DCP. It is the responsibility of the NICB design team to ensure that their downstream drainage system is designed to cater for the existing discharge from the John Hunter Hospital site for all storm events up to and including the 1% AEP in line with standard industry practice.</p> <p>The recommended consent condition proposed by TfNSW is unreasonable. The current wording suggests that if the NICB designers have not adequately fulfilled their design obligation of catering for existing upstream catchments additional controls will need to be designed and implemented by the JHHIP project.</p> <p>See response provided by Northrop at Appendix A.</p>	Appendix A
<p>Green Travel Plan – TfNSW has a number of recommendations to improve the GTP and the proposed initiatives to encourage sustainable transport to the site.</p> <p>Should DPIE support the proposed development it is recommended that the following comprehensive condition (to replace the previously recommended generic one) be imposed:</p> <p>(see below)</p>	<p>Health Infrastructure does not accept the recommended TfNSW Green Travel Plan condition. Notwithstanding, we provide the following comments to select conditions below.</p> <p>Further detailed comments will be provided to the draft conditions provided by the Department at the appropriate time.</p>	-

Request	Comment	Appendix
Comments on TfNSW draft Green Travel Plan condition		
Prior to occupancy, the proponent is to provide a revised Green Travel Plan (GTP) for the whole of the John Hunter Hospital Health Campus for TfNSW's consideration that	The project will prepare the GTP for the John Hunter Hospital only and will be happy to provide a copy to Newcastle Private and other ancillary services for their consideration to implement - however the implimentation of the GTP to these facilities are not the responsibility of Health Infrastructure.	-
-audit of the campus and its surrounding areas for attractive cycling and walking routes, beyond the cycleway map including lighting, shelter, width of footpaths or other issues around hospital access points and routes from points of interest (noting the road user space allocation policy).	request removal - the location of the hospital is in bushland and unlikely to be an increase in active transport due to shift work and the issue with passive surveillance. Responsibility for any improvements required outside of the hospital campus is the responsibility of others.	-
Includes aspirational, achievable, sensible and specific mode targets with <i>aim to increase non-car modes and car occupancy rates potential increases in cycling, walking and bus use beyond 1, 0.5, and 2% respectively. Note that the closest train station is over 3km walk away so people traveling by train would normally be using a bus, bike or other transport to complete their journey;</i>	request removal for specific targets particularly for walking and cycling. Request a change to state 'aim to increase non-car modes and car occupancy rates'. Reason - given the sites location surrounded by bushland and the nature of hospital arrivals and shift work hours it will be difficult to achieve specific targets for walking and cycling.	-
Considers opportunities to improve the pedestrian and cycling link to Blackbutt nature reserve and New Lambton, noting the barrier effect of Lookout Rd, and whether there are opportunities to work with parties such as Council to make Blackbutt to more accessible for cycling;	request removal - the location of the hospital is in bushland and unlikely to be an increase in active transport due to shift work and the issue with passive surveillance. Responsibility for any improvements required outside of the hospital campus is the responsibility of others. Further, passive surveillance likely to be an issue.	-
Considers how the site is making provisions for further public transport improvements, such as potential incorporation to the future light rail network or BRT network;	Request to be removed - outside of the scope of this project.	-

1.0 Subsidence Advisory

It is noted that with respect of requirements related to mine subsidence risk, Health Infrastructure has obtained approval from Subsidence Advisory for the development under section 22 of the *Coal Mine Subsidence Compensation Act 2017*. A copy of the approval is provided at Appendix D for the Department's information.

2.0 Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report

The ACHAR submitted with the original EIS has been updated to reflect the amendments to the design outlined and as discussed in the Response to Submissions Report previously. There were no new of different matters raised because of the additional notification. Refer to **Appendix F**, which outlines the outcomes of the 28-day notification process.

3.0 Conclusion

We trust that the responses will enable the Department to finalise their assessment of the SSDA. Given the environmental planning merits (and the ability to suitably manage and mitigate any potential impacts) and significant public benefits proposed, it is requested that the application be approved.

Yours sincerely,



Chris McGillick
Associate Director
+61 4 1104 7748
cmcgillick@ethosurban.com