

Attachment A – Hawkesbury Centre of Excellence Response to Request for Further Information

Agency and Issues	Response
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment	
Appendix K (updated BDAR) provided with the RtS is dated 1 October 2021 and would not assess the impacts of this new area. In order to finalise the assessment, an updated BDAR assessing this new area must be provided.	An updated BDAR is contained in Attachment C .
Furthermore, the Department is expecting government agency comments by Friday 3 December 2021 and any issues raised in these comments will be forwarded to you for review and response.	Noted. Subsequent agency comments are summarised and a response to each issue raised is provided below. Reference should also be given to the updated Architectural package contained in Attachment B.
Environment Energy and Science Group	
The Architectural drawings in Appendix D of the EIS previously included a Proposed Site Plan (dated 21 May 2021 which is marked as 'Preliminary') but the Architectural Plans in the RtS (Appendix F) do not appear to include an updated Proposed Site Plan. In its submission on the EIS, EES noted that a comparison of the Proposed Site Plan in Appendix D of the EIS with Figures 11, 14 and 15 in the previous BDAR shows PCT 835 – remnant canopy and hollow bearing trees occur where it is proposed to locate agricultural plots and a dam/OSD and that the remnant canopy is to be impacted. EES sought clarification as to whether the proposed agricultural plots and the dam/OSD could be relocated and/or reconfigured to avoid and/or minimise clearing of the PCT 835 – remnant canopy and the hollow bearing trees. EES advised all efforts should be made to avoid impacting endangered communities and threatened species habitats unless such losses can be adequately justified.	It is noted that due to the soil contamination recorded in the area of PCT 835. The area will need to be remediated regardless of whether the plots are located in this location which will still result in the removal of this area of PCT 835. As the impact cannot be avoided for this reason it is therefore required to be mitigated under the principles of the BAM which will be conducted through the revegetation of Riverflat EEC species and the relocation/replacement of hollows. An updated BDAR is provided as Attachment C .
In response the RtS notes the proposed dam/OSD will remain in the proposed location but the northern-most agricultural plot has been realigned in the top western corner to reduce the impact on remnant canopy and hollow bearing trees. Details are required on the location of this remnant canopy and the number of trees and species that will no longer be impacted by the realignment of the northern-most agricultural plot. Based on the updated BDAR it appears that no PCT 835 with remnant canopy is to remain on the site and that offsets are required for its removal.	Previous and updated proposed site plans reviewed and no changes to design affecting remnant canopies can be found. An updated BDAR is provided as Attachment C .
Comparing Figure 10 and the Proposed Site Plan in the updated BDAR for the RtS, it appears the proposed agricultural plots are still to be located where PCT 835 – remnant canopy and hollow bearing trees occur. The updated BDAR still includes the same Proposed Site Plan as the previous BDAR as they are both dated 24 March 2021. The Proposed Site Plan included in	Refer to Figure 3 within the updated BDAR provided as Attachment C .

Agency and Issues	Response
Appendix D of the EIS was dated 21 May 2021. It is noted Appendix P of the RtS includes a Proposed Site Plan (dated 21 September 2021 which is marked as draft 50% detailed design). Clarification is required as to whether there is a final Proposed Site Plan.	
The proposed changes to the agricultural area shown in Appendix J – updated Landscape Architecture Design reports - Addendum 01 (page 9 of 9) do not appear to show a reduced impact on remnant canopy. Instead comparing the superseded agriculture yard plan with the current plan appears to show that trees are to be removed rather than retained. This needs to be clarified.	The agricultural area will see extensive earthworks relating to soil contaminant remediation works. Where possible remnant vegetation is being retained and in instances where vegetation is being lost seeds can be collected for replanting, replacement plants can be installed after the earthworks (at a ratio of 2:1) and the tree limbs will be salvaged and reused in the landscape areas as habitat.
	Refer to Updated AIA Report contained in Attachment D , AIA Report for Vines Drive contained in Attachment E and the Updated BDAR contained in Attachment C .
EES previously advised that the AIAR differs to the BDAR which states all vegetation in Vegetation Zone 3 will be removed to allow for the proposed development (section 3.3.1) and that "native canopy species consist of Angophora subvelutina and Eucalyptus tereticornis" (Table 3). The AIAR makes no reference to the removal of Angophora subvelutina and Eucalyptus tereticornis.	For assessment purposes, the Updated BDAR assumes all vegetation within Vegetation Zone 3 (with the species of trees identified) will be removed. The Updated BDAR assesses the biodiversity impacts of the removal of this vegetation in accordance with the requirements of the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> and Biodiversity Conservation Regulation 2017.
In response to EES's comments the RtS states "The AIAR makes no reference to the removal of Angophora subvelutina and Eucalyptus tereticornis" which is a reiteration of EES's comment rather than a response. The updated BDAR still states in Section 3.3.1 for Vegetation Zone 3 that this area will require the removal of all vegetation to allow for the proposed development (page 40) and Table 3 in the updated BDAR still indicates for Vegetation Zone 3 that "native canopy species consisted of Angophora subvelutina and Eucalyptus tereticornis" (see page 30) while Appendix 3 of the updated AIAR still does not list Angophora subvelutina and Eucalyptus tereticornis as trees to be removed.	Refer to Updated AIA Report contained in Attachment D , AIA Report for Vines Drive contained in Attachment E and the Updated BDAR contained in Attachment C .
Update BDAR to include Vines Drive Road Work assessment.	An updated BDAR is contained in Attachment C.
EES notes the number of threatened species that have been assumed present because surveys could not be carried out at the appropriate time of year has now been revised from 15 to four species (section 4.3.1 of updated BDAR). Species polygons have been prepared for these species and credits have been calculated. It is noted that further surveys are to be undertaken during the appropriate survey period. If appropriate surveys cannot be conducted, then offsets are to be purchased for these species. EES recommended that if consent is to be granted, it should be conditional on additional surveys being	All surveys have now been completed and an updated BDAR is contained in Attachment C .

Agency and Issues	Response
undertaken and no clearing or ground works can take place until this has occurred.	
It is noted Table 17 in the amended BDAR now includes a mitigation measure that all species that have been assumed present are scheduled to be appropriately surveyed for prior to the commencement of any works within the subject land. For clarity it would be preferable that this mitigation measure also outlined that no clearing is to occur prior to the additional surveys being undertaken. EES repeats that a condition of consent is included to this effect.	As surveys have now been completed this has been removed from the updated BDAR is contained in Attachment C
Previously, EES noted that the review was undertaken without access to the assessment in BOAMS, and without access to spatial data. In regard to the updated BDAR, the assessor has still not submitted the calculator to the consent authority and EES has still not been provided with spatial data.	Following the final update for maintenance lane the reports will be submitted within the BOAMS.
EES notes the updated BDAR now includes an accurate date (1 October) and while the date of the credit reports can't be confirmed without access to the calculator, the date on the credit reports in the BDAR (App G) is also 1 October.	An updated BDAR is contained in Attachment C . Narla Environmental will submit in BOAMS within the statutory period.
 EES previously recommended that prior to the removal of any native vegetation seed from the native plants including trees, shrubs, and groundcover species approved for removal are collected and propagated and used in the SSD plantings a new mitigation measure is included for a native vegetation seed collection program to be developed. 	Noted and no objection to the inclusion of a condition to this effect, subject to review of draft conditions.
EES notes the updated BDAR includes seed collection as a mitigation measure in Table 17 but the RtS notes seed collection will be dependent on the season/ seed availability and that existing species will be recorded and specific in the design. EES acknowledges that seed collection is dependent on the season / seed availability. It is recommended the proponent obtains advice from a qualified bush regenerator and following approval of this SSD the bush regenerator is engaged to undertake seed collection and propagation of native plants in the appropriate season. EES recommends a condition of consent is included to this effect.	
EES previously recommended that any juvenile native plants to be removed by the SSD should be replanted in the landscaped planting areas. In response the RtS notes in general, there is limited success with transplanting native species. With success being dependent on the time of year and weather	Translocation of juvenile native plants is dependant on many factors including: species, growth stage & prevalent weather conditions at the time of removing a installing plants. Translocation is not guaranteed to provide 100% successful

Agency and Issues	Response
conditions and having suitable locations to store plants for re-use. Seed collection or replacement species is preferred. EES suggests advice is obtained from a qualified bush regenerator and following approval of this SSD, the bush regenerator is engaged to undertake the translocation and removal of native juvenile plants. As previously advised the plants should be relocated when plant growth conditions are ideal to give the native plants the best possible opportunity to survive and the plants should be maintained until established. EES recommends a condition of consent is included to this effect.	survival of translocated plants. No objection, subject to review of draft conditions.
EES recommended amendments be made to the mitigation measure for a qualified and experienced ecologist to undertake extensive pre-clearance surveys. EES notes these amendments have been included in Table 17 of the updated BDAR, however there is a typing error in the first sentence which states "prior to removing and vegetation and/or construction" should be replaced by "prior to removing any vegetation and/or construction '	An updated BDAR is contained in Attachment C . No objection, subject to review of draft conditions.
 EES also previously advised the following: The applicant should: provide details on the size, type, number, and location of nest boxes required – this would be based on the results of the pre-clearing survey install replacement nest boxes prior to any vegetation removal (preferably one month prior), to provide alternate habitat for hollow-dependent fauna displaced during clearing salvage and relocate the tree hollows approved for removal to appropriate locations on the same day the tree hollows are removed and prior to the release of any native fauna found using the tree hollows. install other habitat features such as logs (see below) and bee hotels. 	This is a common condition for developments removing hollow bearing trees and will ensure habitat remains within the lease area. This information will be based on the results of the pre-clearance survey which will be conducted prior to vegetation removal. No objection, subject to review of draft conditions.
EES recommends this is included as a condition of consent. he RtS confirms that "Where suitable, tree limbs will be located in the design to provide habitat. Suitable site boulders may also be stockpiled for use in landscape areas to provide habitat" but no details are provided on how many trees could potentially be reused as habitat on the site. The RtS also states "suitable tree limbs could be sourced from elsewhere on the Western Sydney University campus in addition to the local community groups". It is unclear what is meant by this statement. If the removed trees can't be reused on the SSD site for habitat enhancement, then the proponent should consult with	The final quantum of usable limbs are unknown. Only after the removal of the trees can this be carried out. Any material not suitable for reuse as habitat will be mulched and used on site. No objection, subject to review of draft conditions.

Agency and Issues	Response
community groups etc to determine if the tree trunks can be used in habitat enhancement and rehabilitation work off site. As previously advised EES recommends the following condition of consent is included:	
• The Proponent must where it is practicable reuse any of the native trees that are to be removed as part of this project, including tree hollows, tree trunks (greater than 25-30 centimetres in diameter and 2-3 metres in length), and root balls to enhance habitat:	
 Any hollow sections of wood removed should be salvaged and re- located to appropriate locations to provide natural nest boxes prior to the release of any native fauna found using the tree hollows. 	
• If removed native trees are not able to be entirely re-used by the project, the proponent should consult with local community, Restoration/rehabilitation groups, Landcare groups, and relevant public authorities including NSW National Parks & Wildlife Service, local councils, and Greater Sydney Local Land Services prior to removing any native trees to determine if the removed trees can be reused in habitat enhancement and rehabilitation work. This detail including consultation with the community groups and their responses must be documented in the CEMP.	
EES noted the EIS includes the following mitigation measure for tree replacement: "All trees proposed for removal should be replaced at a ratio of 2:1 elsewhere within the site, with mature, locally mature species representative of the River-flat Eucalypt Forest Endangered Ecological	The 120 proposed tree numbers are achieving a 6:1 replacement ratio. This is not including the additional 120 fruit trees being planted by the school in the orchard.
Community" while the previous BDAR required a tree replacement ratio of 1:1. EES notes the updated BDAR now states "All trees proposed for removal should be replaced at a ratio of 2:1 elsewhere within the Subject Property"	A tree replacement of 2:1 is supported as it will result in a net gain of vegetatic representative of the endangered community within the site.
(page 70) whereas the Updated Landscape Architecture Design Report – Addendum 01 states "where possible a 2:1 ratio will be implemented" (page 6 of 9). Greater certainty needs to be provided on this.	No objection, subject to review of draft conditions.
EES recommends a condition of consent is included which requires a tree replacement ratio of 2:1 for trees not covered by a biodiversity offset strategy).	
EES advised the RTS should provide details on:	Refer to Refer to Updated AIA Report contained in Attachment D and AIA
 the total number of trees to be removed by the project, the tree species, and whether the trees to be removed are exotic, invasive, non-local natives or local native species 	Report for Vines Drive contained in Attachment E. Replacement trees are found in Landscape Plan SK012.
• the number of replacement trees, the replacement planting locations, and the replacement plant species.	No objection, subject to review of draft conditions.

Agency and Issues	Response
EES recommends a report is required to be prepared as a condition of consent to address this.	
Both the EIS and previous BDAR included a mitigation measure for landscaping works across the site to use, where possible, native vegetation representative of the River-flat Eucalypt Forest Endangered Ecological Community to provide increased habitat features. EES recommended the landscape planting uses a diversity of local provenance native species from the relevant native vegetation community (or communities) that occur, or once occurred on the site (rather than use exotic species or non-local native species). The RtS notes plant species from the identified plant communities will be used in the design where appropriate (subject to RFS conditions, EFSG guidelines and species availability). EES recommends:	Information regarding planting quantities, species & pot sizes can be found on Landscape Plan sheet SK012. This has been further developed in the detail design package contained in Attachment B .
• the site planting uses local native provenance plants (except where agricultural plantings/ vegetable garden /orchard plantings and vineyard plantings etc are required) and the Planting Schedule /Landscape plan demonstrates that the plant species consist of local provenance	
 the proponent engages a bush regenerator to propagate and/or source local native provenance plant species so that local native plant species are available for planting on the site. 	
EES recommends the following conditions are included in the consent:	A variety of pot sizes have been used due to availability as mentioned. This
 Any planting/ landscaping, rehabilitation associated with the project shall use a diversity of local provenance native trees, shrubs and groundcover species (rather than exotic species or non-local native species) from the relevant native vegetation community (or 	information is covered in the detail design. Tree canopies have been indicated on plans to show the anticipated mature size of the trees. Adequate space has been provided.
communities) that occur or once occurred in the local area except where agricultural plantings/ vegetable gardens /orchard plantings and vineyard plantings are required.	No objection, subject to review of draft conditions.
• Tree planting shall use advanced and established local native trees with a minimum plant container pot size of 100 litres, or greater for local native tree species which are commercially available. Other local native tree species which are not commercially available may be sourced as juvenile sized trees or pre-grown from provenance seed.	
• Enough area/space is provided to allow the trees to grow to maturity.	
 A Landscape Plan is to be prepared and implemented by an appropriately qualified bush regenerator and include details on: 	
 a. seed collection – the location of all native seed sources should be identified 	

genc	y and Issues	Response
0	b. the type, species, size, quantity, and location of replacement trees	
0	 c. the species, quantity and location of shrubs and groundcover plantings 	
0	d. the plan demonstrates replacement trees plantings will deliver a net increase in trees for trees that are not covered by a biodiversity offset strategy	
0	e. the native vegetation community (or communities) that once occurred in this area are to be planted and the plan demonstrates that the plant species consist of local provenance	
0	f. a list of local provenance species to be used	
0	g. the quantity and location of plantings	
0	h. the pot size of the trees to be planted	
0	 i. the area/space required to allow the planted trees to grow to maturity 	
0	j. plant maintenance regime. The planted vegetation must be regularly maintained and watered for 12 months following planting. Should any plant loss occur during the maintenance period the plants should be replaced by the same plant species.	
ansp	ort for NSW	
all be alified JSTR e civil NSW ertifica orks. I	posed upgrade of the Londonderry Road / Vines Drive intersection e designed to meet TfNSW requirements and endorsed by a suitably d practitioner. The design requirements shall be in accordance with OADS and other Australian Codes of Practice. The certified copies of design plans and signage and line marking plan shall be submitted to for consideration and approval prior to the release of the Construction ate by the Principal Certifying Authority and commencement of road Documents should be to submitted to oment.Sydney@rms.nsw.gov.au	Noted and no objection, subject to review of draft conditions.
e abo orks ir	veloper is required to enter into a Works Authorisation Deed (WAD) for vementioned works. TfNSW fees for administration, plan checking, civil nspections and project management shall be paid by the developer the commencement of works.	Noted and no objection, subject to review of draft conditions
tailin cess	nstruction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) should be updated with g construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, arrangements and traffic control should be updated and submitted to partment for approval prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.	Noted and no objection, subject to review of draft conditions

Agency and Issue	S	Response
and TfNSW. The doc	ument can be submitted to TfNSW via the email: p@transport.nsw.gov.au .	
prepare an updated S	ne first Occupation Certificate, the applicant should School Travel Plan in consultation with and endorsed by ravel Plan (STP) should be submitted to ansport.nsw.gov.au	Noted and no objection, subject to review of draft conditions
	nstruction vehicles are to be contained wholly within the st enter the site before stopping. A construction zone will ondonderry Road.	Noted and no objection, subject to review of draft conditions
	be responsible for all public utility adjustment/relocation by the above work and as required by the various public or their agents.	Noted and no objection, subject to review of draft conditions
	am shows different turn paths stacking up each other, n unreadable. The swept path diagram should be updated urn paths clearly.	Noted and no objection, subject to review of draft conditions
	n plan is to be submitted TfNSW for review as part of the age, prior to the issue of the Construction Certificate.	Noted and no objection, subject to review of draft conditions
Prior to the issue of the first Occupation Certificate, the applicant should prepare an updated School Travel Plan in consultation with and endorsed by TfNSW. The School Travel Plan (STP) should be submitted to development.sco@transport.nsw.gov.au		Noted and no objection, subject to review of draft conditions
The STP should be u	pdated with the following considerations:	
preparing a modes of tra to/from the p the proportio students/vis public transp These object (listed below consideratio	TfNSW notes the objectives of a STP provided. When STP, measures must ensure that non-private vehicular ansport are encouraged as the preferred mode of travel project site. Your STP should include objectives to reduce on of single-occupant car travel by staff and itors to and from the site and increase the mode share of port and active transport for the life of the development. tives need to be met within your Implementation Strategy () and Implementation Plan initiatives, taking into n the TfNSW proposed share table.	
mode share to take susta site. Given a proposes hig	targets: TfNSW appreciates that the TAIA provides a table to identify targets for staff and students and visitors ainable active and public transport travel to and from the access to trains, private buses, university shuttles, TfNSW gher mode shares for these types of journeys to the site tors and students, and another mode share table for	

Agency and Issues

Response

sustainable travel for visitors, students, staff on events on weekends and after hours. Please consult our website Travel Plan Toolkit and Travel Plan template for further information.

- Site audit: TfNSW asks that an audit of the public and active transport in the vicinity of the site and potential recommendations, including the permeability of the UWS campus and the links between the two sites. For example, from the documentation provided it is currently unclear if there would be a pedestrian crossing on Vine St; Figure 5.1 appears incomplete. This audit requires the STP to advise how nearby bus stops will be upgraded to facilitate public transport use.
- Parking management strategy –TfNSW requests that the STP also considers implementation of a parking management strategy that prioritises use by staff visitors students on a needs basis, actively encouraging these customers to use the sustainable transport options that are available. The car-pooling and Priority Parking examples from the TAIA are good examples to use in this strategy. These strategies can be put in your Implementation Strategy and Implementation Plan (advised below).
- Travel Access Guide TfNSW requests that a separate TAG be placed as an appendices in the STP. The TAG should include separate route maps of all modes of transport; buses (private and public), trains, university shuttles, walking (internal to the campus), as well as times for these public transport options. The TAG should also:
- Include a map and key messages/rules around the Pick Up and Drop Off (PUDO) zone rules for parents and students.
- Provide information advising students and staff that additional information about service routes and timetables for buses and trains is available on the Trip Planner at transportnsw.info/
- Provide details of night time, weekend and week day shuttle services for staff/students and visitors using short term accommodation to get safely to and from the train station.
- Provide information advising students that additional information about walking routes is available on the Trip Planner at transportnsw.info/
- Update number and location of End of Trip facilities (bike racks, showers, lockers, change rooms) and locate on map.
- Monitoring and measuring the GTP TfNSW requests the STP includes an annual travel survey, and these should be undertaken with a focus to establish travel patterns including mode share of trips

Agenc	y and Issues	Response
	to and from the site. These surveys should be undertaken every year and when future transport upgrades take place. To further help monitor and measure the increase in public transport use, TfNSW would recommend:	
0	An additional weekly report of patronage using Opal data to and from the school (as well as data from private bus companies running additional buses).	
0	Traffic volumes can also be assessed on the road network within the school area, before and after school. These could be monitored to assess whether:	
0	Students and staff are re-moding private vehicles to buses.	
0	Traffic volumes during peak hours had reduced.	
0	End of trip (EOT) facilities – TfNSW requests that the development include access and permeability of the site for active transport, including the location and number of "end of trip" facilities; total number of secure bike parking spaces, casual bike parking, provision of e-bike charging points, number of showers and lockers. The locations of the end-of-trip facilities should be promoted in the Travel Access Guide (TAG). This will enable staff and students to store their teaching material/resources and exercise gear in a safe and secure location. Given the hotter temperatures in summer, we recommend the proposed numbers of showers to be 4 showers and 2 change rooms (total). This would mean 2 x showers plus 1 x change room for staff and the same amount for students. These facilities should be promoted within your Implementation Plan listed below. Please also find a resource from our website on this link for end of trip facilities. The location of the bike park enclosure, away from the public domain should prioritise the convenience of staff and students. The fully secured and weather protected bicycle parking facility should be located between an equal distance from Vines Drive and Maintenance Drive site entrance.	The anticipated mode share for both staff and students in the short-term is approximately 0% (based on existing travel habits at Richmond HS, local habits as per Journey to Work, and consideration of the project-specific operations and school catchment). Negligible to nil travel by bicycle would be expected as a baseline. However, the preliminary School Transport Plan submitted with the SSDA suggests a target mode share of 1% for both staff and students, to encourage a shift in this baseline away from other transport modes towards cycling where practical. This would equate to 1 staff member and approximately 3 students. Bike parking for up to 20 bikes is currently proposed, to allow for long-term growth beyond this target, and to accommodate storage of bicycles. In general, showers for students who choose to ride are not provided for within public schools. Understandably there is no provision for the sharing of shower facilities by students and staff. The proposed unisex shower / change area is dedicated for staff only and is considered sufficient for the short-term habits, medium-term targets, and potential long-term growth. No change to Architectural Plans is required.
0	Implementation Strategy: TfNSW requests that you include an Implementation Strategy with an Implementation Plan of tasks and actions for your sustainable transport initiatives and incentives, timing and completion dates, who from the school will be completing the tasks and when they will be completing them. The implementation plan should include your communications tasks, and who will do the tasks. The idea of Travel Plan Coordinator and supporting team is encouraged here to make sure these actions are completed. Tightening up the Implementation Plan with these steps will ensure	Noted and no objection, subject to review of draft conditions

Agenc	y ar	nd Issues	Response
	be ser sho you eng	e overall effectiveness of the STP. This implementation plan should updated both on an annual basis, and when future transport vices and pathways eventuate. Your STP Implementation Plan ould include your stakeholder engagement strategy (including all of ur stakeholders, key messages and the channels you will use to gage your stakeholders) – please find our link for Potential gagement techniques that may be useful to you.	
0	Im	entives –TfNSW requests that you consider in your plementation Strategy further possible incentives for staff to use ive and public transport such as:	
	\succ	Pre-loaded opal cards during orientation.	
	\triangleright	School subsidised panniers or backpacks for staff committed to active travel.	
	۶	Time in staff meetings to share tips and support for staff wanting to start walking to and from school.	
	۶	Wayfinding at the school for End of Trip facilities locating where showers, lockers and change rooms are.	
0	Ad	ditional initiatives to promote additional use of active travel, such	
	as		
	\triangleright	Holding competitions and offering prizes for staff and students that walk to school eg Steptember.	
		Promoting active travel as a means to support staff and students health and wellbeing.	
	۶	Promoting to parents the potential of active travel to school as an opportunity to stay active themselves.	
	>	Cycling education initiatives within the school in the Implementation Plan for the STP, potentially integrated with the physical education curriculum.	
0		nsiders additional incentives for students to use active and public nsport such as:	
	>	Promotes combining train and bicycle travel to the site, with information on how to carry your bicycle on the train, including the recommended route from the station.	
		Establishing a bicycle user group in collaboration with WSU and potentially organising bicycle maintenance sessions and other activities, such as excursions by bicycles to places of interest such as other nearby	

Agency	y and Issues	Response
	Considers whether an additional stop for the WSU shuttle bus (or use of existing stop of Vines Drive) would be an option for use by staff, students and visitors of CoE, demonstrating how this arrangement will work.	
	Provide details of safe shuttle services during weekends for students/staff staying in short term accommodation.	
0	Application of travel demand management initiatives: In our advice for your proposed STP we would recommend to reduce car usage and increase public and active transport mode share for the staff and students and visitors using the development. There is, however some flexibility as to how many or which of these you apply to your STP, just as long as you have initiatives in your STP, that you can demonstrate are likely to reduce your car usage target mode share, and increase your public and active transport mode share for staff and residents. These initiatives would then be updated in your Implementation Plan specifying how they will be completed and completion date, and an implementation checklist to achieve the proposed initiatives.	
0	Governance: TfNSW recommends you appoint a Travel Plan Coordinator for the life of the development, who will manage the STP. The STP will need to have a steering group or committee created with relevant internal and external stakeholders to inform future targets and the ongoing monitoring and revision of the STP for five years post-occupancy.	
0	Travel Survey – TfNSW would request that as part of this STP you	

include an actual Travel Survey as a separate appendices (in your STP) of the actual questions you will ask students and staff and visitors just after occupation of the site (as this will provide a baseline survey to promoting the sustainable transport options within the STP) and can also be used to compare whether your sustainable mode share targets are being met. We would suggest you identify residential postcodes of students and staff and visitors, and would

encouraging some of your STP initiatives and incentives. Please find our online travel survey here. The survey should mention that it will be updated both annually, and when future upgrades take place. Car-

encourage you to do this for your survey post-occupation

pooling can also be promoted for staff in this TAG.