

## **ATTACHMENT 1**

In order to finalise the Department's assessment, additional information is required including but not limited to the following:

### **1. Traffic and Transport**

- Given the loss of parking on King Street North to accommodate the proposed flight training centre, where will these car spaces be temporarily located while the new car park is being constructed? In addition, where will flight training centre staff and Qantas employees accessing the flight training centre park temporarily while Stages 2 and 3 of the development (i.e. carpark) are constructed?
- Section 3.17 to 3.21 of the Traffic Report describes in detail the access arrangements to and from the proposed development, particularly the car park. It is difficult to follow this commentary when reviewing the drawings included in the EIS (e.g. NGA-S1822-DWG-DA2.40). Please provide a simple diagram/map that identifies the new and existing internal service roads and is consistent with the commentary provided in Section 3.17 to 3.21 of the Traffic Report.

### **2. Design and Built form**

- Further consideration should be given to the use of green wall/green roof designs for both buildings as per the SEARs and the comments from Council and EES (former OEH). Limited green climbing planting is provided on the car park building and insufficient explanation is given as to the reasons why the flight training centre is not able to include these elements.
- Further information is required for the security fencing proposed along the southern boundary (King Street). The Architectural Plans (Appendix C – DWG DA5.01) and Visual Impact Assessment (Appendix M – Drawing No. DA07) show predominately open palisade fencing. A fencing plan should be prepared indicating the height and type of fencing proposed.
- The visual impact assessment from Viewpoint 7 is taken from a small greenspace outside the AMP/Goodman Corporate Connect Centre. It is requested that an assessment is modelled showing impacts from within the AMP/Goodman Corporate Connect Centre building towards the car park.
- The EIS (pg 42) is overly reliant on the trigeneration plant when justifying the development with regards to the principles of ecologically sustainable development under the design excellence provisions of the Botany Bay Local Environmental Plan 2013. The trigeneration plant is existing and further emphasis should be placed on elements of the proposed development to demonstrate how the principles are achieved.

### **3. Flooding and Stormwater**

- There are differences between the flood levels in the modelling undertaken by Entrust and Council. Please address the agency submissions, including providing a peer review of the flood model.

### **4. Construction Noise**

- Tables 18 and 19 of the EIS show the proposed construction hours as Monday to Sunday 7:00am to 8:00pm. Elsewhere in the document the proposed hours are 6:00am to 8:00pm. Please address this discrepancy.
- Section 7.3.2 of the EIS (pg 89 and 90) describes basic mitigation techniques such as screening and time management will be applied to ensure construction activities comply with the relevant noise limits. Are there any other mitigation measures that will be employed such as respite periods? What level of consultation will be undertaken with nearby receivers particularly Travelodge during the noisiest activities?

## **5. Project Description**

- Further details are required on the proposed staging of the development. Although Section 3.2.10 (pg 31) of the EIS outlines that the project is to be constructed in three stages, there are no details about construction timing.
- The development site contains multiple allotments. Further explanation is required why the allotments are not being consolidated (EIS – pg 10).
- The site is subject to existing development consents. Confirmation is required that these will be surrendered.
- There are inconsistencies in the description of the number of levels of the car park between the EIS (13 levels – pg 1), the Architectural Plans (ground plus 13 levels – DWG.4.01) and the Architectural Design Statement (ground plus 13 levels – pg 14). For ease of understanding, please ensure the ground floor is included when describing the number of levels.
- The number of at-grade car parking spaces should be included in the project description (pg 1) of the EIS and throughout when being described. There are also inconsistencies regarding the number of at grade car parking spaces to be provided, described as 39 spaces (pg 24) and 40 spaces (pg 31).

## **6. Landscaping**

- Please address the comments provided by Council and EES (former OEH) regarding landscaping. Replacement trees should be advanced to minimise any period of reduced canopy cover whilst they reach maturity.
- Further investigation into green roofs and walls to the car park should be undertaken as a measure of compensating the reduction in trees on site.

## **7. Contamination**

- Please clarify the scope and provide additional details of the areas of the site proposed to be remediated. The EIS recommends a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) be prepared to remediate identified heavy metals, hydrocarbons and asbestos hotspots for the site (pg 114). The Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) (pg 55 of the ESA) recommends a RAP only be prepared if the Applicant requires work to be done in the vicinity of the underground storage tanks located in the bus refuel area. Is this area included in the development footprint?

## **8. Development contributions**

- Council has noted the request from Qantas to waive Section 7.11 contributions and outlined their reasons why contributions are payable. Please respond to these comments. Although the EIS states the development will relocate 149 jobs to the LGA, the proposal will also consolidate over 2,000 car spaces in one location resulting in more people travelling to and from the site. Please provide further justification as to why the development should be exempt from paying development contributions.

## **9. Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR)**

- An ACHAR has been provided on 15 July 2019. This has been forwarded to EES and a response to their submission will need to be provided if required.

## **10. Capital Investment Value (CIV)**

- The EIS states that the cost of relocating and installing the simulators has been excluded from the CIV. Justification is required for this in relation to the definition of CIV provided within the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000.