

Response to Submissions

Agency	Comments Provided	Project Team Response
DPE	<p><i>DPE notes that the proposed reliance on on-street parking to accommodate the car parking demand generated by the proposed expansion to the hospital is unacceptable and any parking demand generated should be accommodated on-site if possible. If this demand cannot be met on-site, DPE has requested that end-of-trip facilities are provided and a sustainable travel plan be prepared and implemented to encourage alternative travel modes.</i></p>	<p>HI notes that there is actually sufficient parking available on site to cater for the proposal other than potentially a short period of time during nursing staff change over.</p> <p>ARUP undertook a parking survey on 26 June 2015 to verify this statement which is documented in ARUPs response – refer Attachment 2. In summary it states:</p> <p><i>“There are currently 972 parking spaces provided on site (see attached survey data).</i></p> <p><i>Car park occupancy surveys undertaken on this day [of the survey] indicate a 59% occupancy rate with 394 spaces available during the afternoon peak period. This is consistent with site observations over the last 9 months following completion of the new multi-deck car park.</i></p> <p><i>At the completion of the proposed development there will be 982 car parking spaces on-site.</i></p> <p><i>The future peak parking demand for car parking determined by the Arup parking model represents an additional 103 car movements at 2.30pm, which can be accommodated on-site given the available car parking indicated by the recent surveys.</i></p> <p><i>The new multi-deck car park was recently completed and opened in September 2014. This new car park provided a net increase of 296 on-site car parking spaces to cater for both current and future demand. It is considered that there is sufficient parking on site to cater for the use proposed in this application.”</i></p> <p>Nonetheless HI will ensure a sustainable travel plan is prepared and implemented prior to occupation of the proposed works.</p>
DPE	<p><i>Clarification of the proposed full-time equivalent (FTE) and construction and operational jobs required.</i></p>	<p>HI has calculated the FTE construction jobs based on Treasury’s guidelines for estimating jobs supported by actions, programs and</p>

		<p>policies (TPP09-7). This method used the project budget and construction program to calculate jobs.</p> <p>The project is expected to support 630 full time equivalent direct and indirect jobs over the project construction period (based on overall project budget of \$62.9m).</p> <p>The estimate is based on an employment multiplier of 10 jobs for every \$1m of infrastructure spending over the life of the program, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 direct annual jobs in the construction industry, and • 6 indirect jobs (production induced effect i.e. employment associated with the inputs purchased by the industry of the direct spending). <p>In terms of operational jobs, the Sutherland Financial Impact Statement (FIS), projects the staffing increase will equate to an additional 152 FTE jobs upon project completion.</p> <p>The 251 FTE originally noted in the EIS is based on 2021/22 projections and should be disregarded.</p>
SW	<p>Water & Wastewater</p> <p><i>The proposed development can connect to the existing 150mm water main located in Kareena Road.</i></p> <p><i>The proposed development can connect to the existing 225mm wastewater main located in Hinker Avenue.</i></p> <p><i>Detailed water/waste water requirements will be provided at the Section 73 application phase</i></p>	Noted.
OEH	<p><i>"The SEARs requires Aboriginal cultural heritage (values) and impacts to be documented and assessed in accordance with OEH's guiding documents. OEH considers the likely potential for physical evidence of any Aboriginal cultural heritage values has been adequately assessed. However, the assessment, in only involving the La Perouse Land Council, does not comply with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage consultation Requirements for Proponents, 2010.</i></p> <p><i>OEH therefore considers the assessment does not comply with the SEARs as it has not adequately investigated the Aboriginal</i></p>	<p>Artefact Heritage who undertook the Aboriginal cultural assessment has addressed this issue in the SSD application provided a subsequent response to DPE. In summary Artefact Heritage has advised:</p> <p><i>"The consultation guidelines require comprehensive Aboriginal consultation to be undertaken if impacts to Aboriginal objects or places are proposed. The Artefact (2015) report found that there were no Aboriginal sites, places or areas of archaeological potential within the study area therefore comprehensive Aboriginal consultation as outlined</i></p>

	<i>cultural heritage values that the land may retain, irrespective of remaining physical Aboriginal objects with archaeological values."</i>	<p><i>in the consultation guidelines was not required.</i></p> <p><i>The La Perouse Local Aboriginal Land Council (LPLALC) was approached to provide information on cultural significance of the site and was invited to attend the site survey. LPLALC declined to attend the site survey and did not identify any cultural values within the study area."</i></p> <p>On that basis, HI is of the view that the SEARs have been met.</p>
RMS	With reference to the dedicated splay at the intersection of the Kingsway and Kareena Road, RMS notes that all buildings and structures proposed are to be wholly within the freehold property unlimited in height or depth along the Kingsway boundary.	Noted.
RMS	RMS notes that detailed design plans and hydraulic calculations are required to be submitted to RMS for approval prior to the commencement of works.	Noted.
RMS	RMS notes that the layout of the proposed parking areas (including driveways, turn paths, aisle widths etc) are to be in accordance with AS 2891.1-2004, AS 2890.6-2009 and AS 2890.2-2002 (for heavy vehicle usage.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>ARUP confirms in Attachment 2 that all new car parking areas and circulation roads have been designed in accordance with the relevant Australian Standards.</p>
RMS	RMS notes that all demolition and construction vehicles are to be contained wholly within the site and vehicles must enter the site before stopping. A construction zone will not be permitted on The Kingsway.	Noted.
RMS	A Construction Traffic Management Plan detailing construction vehicle routes, number of trucks, hours of operation, access arrangements and traffic control should be submitted to the Principal Certifying Authority prior to works commencing.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>An outline Construction Traffic Management Plan was included in the SSDA.</p>
EPA	Statutory Considerations - the EPA notes that the development will need to comply with the relevant requirements of the POEO Act and its associated regulations.	Noted.
EPA	Air Quality - the EPA notes that a Construction Environmental	Noted.

	Management Plan (CEMP) should be prepared prior to works commencing. Further, there are recommended conditions of consent.	
EPA	Noise and Vibration - the EPA recommends that a Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan be prepared prior to works commencing to ensure compliance with all relevant noise and vibration criteria. In addition, the EPA also recommends the inclusion of a condition that requires validation of such compliance by the Certifying Authority prior to the commencement of works.	An amended Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan (CNVMP) has been prepared by Wood & Grieve Engineers (WGE) and is provided at Attachment 6. This plan addresses the issues raised by EPA.
EPA	Water Quality - the EPA recommends that the CEMP clearly documents measures to address the stated requirements in relation to water quality and that it should also include a Soil and Water Management Plan.	Noted.
EPA	Waste - the EPA states that the CEMP should include the methodology for handling, removing and disposing of any potential asbestos from the site. The EPA also includes recommended conditions of consent relevant to waste management.	Noted.
EPA	Contaminated Land Management - the EPA notes that if there is a potential for site contamination, it recommends that DPE consider the involvement of an EPA accredited site auditor during the contamination management process. Further, the EPA includes recommended conditions for additional requirements to be included in the Construction Management Plan for the development.	Noted. SEPP 55 was addressed in the EIS which concluded that based on the Detailed Site Investigation (DSI) undertaken by Douglas Partners, there is unlikely to be significant contamination on site. The recommended conditions by the EPA are equivalent to those recommended in the DSI report and are therefore acceptable.
EPA	General Matters - the EPA notes that some of the references in the Preliminary CMP are outdated. Therefore, the EPA requests that the CEMP includes all contemporary requirements and that the CEMP is endorsed by a "suitably qualified person" prior to construction taking place.	Noted.
SSC	Carparking - SCC notes that there are inconsistencies in the	As noted above, ARUP has prepared a response to the parking queries

	<p>traffic and parking assessment submitted with the EIS. SCC therefore requests that the parking demand generated by the proposal be clarified and that any demand generated for additional parking be accommodated for on-site.</p>	<p>raised – refer Attachment 2. The extract below clarifies this issue:</p> <p><i>"Arup modelled both the existing and future activity profiles to determine the likely change in car parking demand for the future growth predictions for staff, patients and visitors. The model is based on a profile of attendance over a typical day with a vehicle mode share and car occupancy applied to determine the number of car trips and hence car parking spaces required.</i></p> <p><i>The modelled parking demand for existing conditions indicates a peak parking accumulation of 989 vehicles at 2.30pm. A future peak parking demand of 1,092 was determined on a busy day which occurs at 2.30pm coinciding with the nursing shift changeover. This represents an additional 103 car movements at this particular (and limited) time.</i></p> <p><i>The recent car park surveys indicate that existing demand is less than has been modelled, with 394 spaces available during the afternoon peak period. This is more than the additional 103 spaces determined as the future increase in demand.</i></p> <p><i>At the completion of the proposed development there will be 982 car parking spaces on-site. This indicates that only at this peak changeover time (and on a very busy day) that there may be a need for street parking to be used.</i></p> <p><i>From the site survey on 26 June 2015, and observations over the last 12 month period, [it appears that] on street parking is used by staff, visitors, and workers and customers of surrounding businesses. There is however sufficient parking on site to cater for hospital staff patients and visitors.</i></p> <p><i>The new 140 space on-grade car park is a replacement car park for those spaces that will be displaced when the works to the hospital expansion commences.</i></p> <p>On this basis no additional car parking is required.</p>
SSC	<p>Landscaping - SCC requests that indigenous tree planting be continued along the eastern section of the Kingsway between the</p>	<p>Amended landscape plans have been prepared by Arcadia to address this issue – refer Attachment 4.</p>

		<p>In summary the overall ESD objectives of the project have been met (in fact exceeded) and the decision to proceed without a rainwater reuse tank was based on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The water sensitive urban design did not require a rainwater tank to operate efficiently. • All planting selections are native species and drought tolerant, therefore requiring minimal irrigation. • A rainwater reuse system was not considered a cost effective option. Irrigation usage is only 0.04% of the total water usage, therefore the cost to capture and maintain a rainwater reuse system as an ESD initiative is not considered justifiable. • The storage of collected rainwater may contain or breed legionella, dead animals, mosquitoes, chemicals, microbial hazards and escherichia coli which is undesirable particularly in a clinical environment. • The maintenance involved with the general upkeep of rainwater reuse tanks and ensuring the stored collected rainwater is not harbouring infections is generally laborious on the Hospital's maintenance team.
TfNSW	<i>"TfNSW supports the development of a Green Travel Plan containing a package of measures to promote the use of public transport, walking and cycling by visitors and employees for travel to and from the hospital".</i>	HI agrees to the preparation of a Green Travel Plan prior to the occupation of the proposed development
TfNSW	<i>"TfNSW encourages the hospital to increase the number of bicycle parking spaces along with end of trip facilities. This could be focussed on good bicycle parking options at a number of nodes across the campus to make them accessible to staff who choose to ride."</i>	There is existing bicycle parking within the hospital campus however current levels of usage is low. Combined with a low percentage of mode share "trips", the existing bicycle parking is considered to be adequate to cater for the existing and future demand for bicycle parking. More information is provided by ARUP in Attachment 2.