

SECTION 1.0 – AUTHORITY & ORGANISATION – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS			
ITEM	STAKEHOLDER	SUBMISSION / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
R01	DPIE	<p><b>Melbourne Wave Park</b></p> <p>Provide information on the operational details of the Melbourne wave park which are comparable to the proposal, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- site location details and any sensitive receivers within close proximity to the site</li> <li>- noise levels and lighting levels</li> <li>- hours of operation for the different uses on site</li> <li>- ancillary events.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proponent submits a letter in <b>Appendix A</b> from the URBNSURF Group Operations Manager at URBNSURF Melbourne. The letter confirms that since the opening of URBNSURF Melbourne in January 2020 the business has not received any noise or lighting complaints from sensitive receivers within the immediate vicinity of the park during normal operational hours.</li> <li>- The URBNSURF Melbourne operational hours are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Mon-Thurs &amp; Sun: 6am-10pm.</li> <li>o Fri-Sat: 6am-12am (Midnight).</li> </ul> </li> <li>- URBNSURF Melbourne has not required any obtrusive lighting or noise monitoring to be conducted as there are no impacts to sensitive receivers within the immediate area of the site.</li> <li>- For details on the location of the nearest sensitive receivers to the site please refer to <b>Appendix R01 - Figure 1</b>.</li> </ul>
R02	DPIE	<p><b>Lighting</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide details of the lighting and a comparison of the modelled light spill of the: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the approved development operating between the hours of 10 pm to 12 midnight, which excludes any lighting required for the operation of the wave pool; and</li> <li>b) the proposal operating between the hours of 10 pm and 12 midnight, which includes the lighting for the wave pool.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Proponent submits an updated lighting study and compliance statement prepared by Northrop in <b>Appendix R02</b>.</li> <li>- The Proponent would like to acknowledge that the street lighting along Hill Road that is active all night for public safety has been included in the updated modelling by Northrop.</li> <li>- The updated lighting assessment confirms that the modelling previously provided by Gerard Lighting (Gerard, 2017) did not accurately represent the actual light spill present in the wetland throughout the night in the current as built configuration.</li> <li>- The updated Lighting Assessment Report provides a clear indication of the light spill in all scenarios requested by the Department, as well as provides a clear indication of the extent of impacted area. For details on the extent of the light spill refer to <b>Appendix R02 – SY191314-ER-1 - Figure 1</b>.</li> <li>- Conclusive modelling results have shown that the change in light spill in the worst case (All Lighting including street lighting on) is not perceivable to the eye and would require sophisticated measuring equipment to detect any changes. The average light spill increase beyond the road verge buffer zone is 0.14lux which falls into the negligible detection range.</li> </ul>
R03	DPIE/SOPA	<p><b>Biodiversity Impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In consideration of the comments provided by SOPA, provide a revised Biodiversity Impact Statement that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) details the fauna species and fauna habitats that would be impacted by noise and light spill from the proposed extension to the operating hours.</li> <li>b) addresses the strategic context of the site, and relevant sections of the Sydney Olympic Park Authority Act 2001 and the Parklands Plan of Management.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Proponent submits a revised Biodiversity Impact Assessment prepared by Cumberland Ecology in <b>Appendix R03</b>.</li> <li>- The revised biodiversity impact assessment provides a detailed assessment of all relevant regulatory frameworks, guidelines, and plans.</li> <li>- The statement specifically addresses the concerns raised by SOPA in a letter dated 01 September 2021, as well as the requests submitted by the Environment, Energy and Science Group (EES).</li> <li>- The revised assessment in consideration of the additional areas of concern raised by SOPA and the EES highlights that the site is located in a highly Urbanised area and many, if not all species, have adapted to the existing artificial light and noise levels. The assessment concludes that</li> <li>- The Proponent equally notes that the updated lighting impact study submitted in <b>Appendix R02</b> provides a clear indication of the lighting levels expected in the worst case. <b>Figure 1</b> of the External Lighting Assessment (Northrop SY191314-ER-1) provides a visual representation of the extent of the light effects in the wetland habitat.</li> <li>- The acoustic reporting and substantiation provided by Stantec confirmed a significant buffer of 12dB (A) in noise levels at sensitive receivers considering noise limits stipulated by the approved SSD Development consent conditions.</li> </ul>
R04	DPIE	<p><b>Service Area</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provide an amended set of architectural plans that includes a floor plan with RLs, elevations and sections of the proposed buildings/structures within service area 2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The Proponent submits the final architectural documentation pack prepared by CHC Architects in <b>Appendix R04</b>.</li> <li>- The following updates have been included to address the request raised by the Department. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Additional plans included providing further detail on Service Yard 2.</li> <li>b) Additional sections and elevations included to provide context and clear design intent to Service Yard 2.</li> <li>c) Administrative updates to updates to the floor level RLs have been included to ensure consistency with future construction certificate documentation and remove any minor discrepancies. The updates to the RLs have no impact on the overall building height.</li> </ol> </li> <li>- All plans address the requests submitted by the Department.</li> </ul>

SECTION 1.0 – AUTHORITY & ORGANISATION – RESPONSES TO SUBMISSIONS			
ITEM	STAKEHOLDER	SUBMISSION / COMMENTS	RESPONSE
R05	DPIE	<b>Landscape Plans</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Final Landscape pack submitted for simplicity and consistency.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Proponent notes that for clarity, consistency and ease of approval the full Landscape Architecture pack prepared by Oculus has also been included in this final response to submission in <b>Appendix R05</b>.</li> </ul>

### Appendices

- Appendix R01 – URBNSURF Melbourne - Noise Lighting Statement
- Appendix R02 – External Lighting Assessment & External Lighting Statement of Compliance
- Appendix R03 – Updated Biodiversity Assessment
- Appendix R04 – Architectural Plans Final
- Appendix R05 – Landscape Plans Final