

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

AGENCY SUBMISSIONS

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
Dept of Planning & Environment	A1	Design Guidelines and Design Excellence <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide further justification on Clause 4.6 variation to height of buildings standard 	<i>Section 5.2.1</i> <i>Appendix B: Clause 4.6 Variation Revision</i> <i>Appendix C: Bennett and Trimble Urban Design Report Responses to Submissions</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Justify quality and quantity of commercial floorspace and implications for building heights and strategic planning objectives 	<i>Section 5.2.1</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify illustration on floor to floor ceiling height and compliance with ADG 	<i>Section 5.2.1</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider proposed density, building bulk and scale to improve and/or better balance solar access between retail courtyard, Cul-de-Sac plaza and key residential streets with other open spaces 	<i>Section 5.2.1</i> <i>Appendix C: Bennett and Trimble Urban Design Report Responses to Submissions</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Investigate opportunities to provide additional open space and establish better connection to surrounding green corridors/open spaces 	<i>Section 5.2.2</i> <i>Appendix G: Clouston Associates Tallawong Station Precinct South Public Domain and Landscape Strategy - Response to Submissions Supplement</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify how proposed design excellence process will be implemented for future DA stages 	<i>Section 5.2.1</i>
		Traffic and Parking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide additional analysis of non-residential car parking rate, considering site's developing context and evidence of car parking demand at comparable centres 	<i>Section 5.2.3</i> <i>Appendix F: SCT Consulting Technical Memorandum Post</i>

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
DPE (cont'd)			<i>Exhibition Responses to Traffic and Parking Comments</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluate cumulative traffic impact from additional dwellings in wider Area 20 Precinct and proposed dwellings above baseline scenario for Station Precinct and identify mitigation works if required 	<i>Section 5.2.3</i> <i>Appendix F: SCT Consulting Technical Memorandum Post Exhibition Responses to Traffic and Parking Comments</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide wayfinding strategy identifying capacity and safety of pedestrian and cycle links, including links to the east, west and south to The Ponds 	<i>Section 5.2.3</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify calculation of increase of peak hour trips at Schofields Rd/Cudgegong Rd and Schofields Rd/Tallawong Rd intersections 	<i>Section 5.2.3</i> <i>Appendix F: SCT Consulting Technical Memorandum Post Exhibition Responses to Traffic and Parking Comments</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrate 3m lane widths are adequate for larger vehicles e.g. buses, garbage and service vehicles 	<i>Section 5.2.3</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		Other matters <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide evidence of consultation with relevant acquisition authorities and any written undertaking from authority to vary boundaries of land for acquisition. 	<i>Section 5.2.4</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Demonstrate that proposed boundary variation will not adversely affect: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality and quantity of open space Local drainage and/or water management 	<i>Section 5.2.4</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide further analysis of potential noise impacts from road and rail noise to balconies fronting Schofields and Cudgegong Roads and fronting rail corridor 	<i>Section 5.2.4</i> <i>Appendix H: Acoustic Logic Response to Submissions</i>
Blacktown City Council	A2	Planning and Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No residential units should be allowed above 26m apart with exception of lift overruns, parapets and lightweight roof structures associated with roof top open space 	<i>Section 5.3.1</i>

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South

Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
Blacktown Council (cont'd)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential height encroachment above maximum would normally only be considered where one part of development under designated height limit is offset elsewhere on site. Unable to determine whether appropriate offsets have been provided and need to see detailed calculations. 	<i>Section 5.3.1</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building on Site 2C is excessively long and should be broken up. Refer to ADG for principles. 	<i>Section 5.3.1</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Single basement entry to each lot is required 	<i>Section 5.3.1</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ground floor residential interface can be up to 1m above footpath level, not 450mm as noted on urban plan and Section A 	<i>Section 5.3.1</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In principle, site layout and massing is acceptable however detailed planning must achieve full compliance with ADG 	<i>Section 5.3.1</i> <i>Appendix C: Bennett and Trimble Urban Design Report Responses to Submission</i> <i>Appendix E: Design Verification Report Response to Submissions</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conceptually, level changes in town park and plaza acceptable. However, further details of transitioning between areas are required. 	<i>Section 5.3.2</i> <i>Appendix G: Clouston Associates Tallawong Station Precinct South Public Domain and Landscape Strategy - Response to Submissions Supplement</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Waste collection: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> must be contained within respective sites trucks must enter and leave in forward direction basement collection is preferred in all instances ground floor collection of waste for site 1B is not supported. 	<i>Section 5.3.1</i> <i>Appendix J: AECOM Waste Strategy Report</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subterranean apartments are not supported due to poor amenity, safety and security of residents, unsatisfactory interface with public domain and potential impact on drainage and flooding on site. Finished floor levels should be raised up 1m 	<i>No subterranean apartments proposed. See Section 5.3.1</i>

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South

Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Scheme provides for excessive use of timber finishes which is not supported. More durable finishes preferred. 	<i>Section 5.3.1</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building specific acoustic reports should be submitted for each building demonstrating that they achieve relevant noise criteria under clause 102 of the Infrastructure SEPP. 	<i>Section 5.3.1</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation with Quakers Hill Local Area Command (NSW Police) should be undertaken to ensure proposal meets CPTED principles 	<i>Section 5.3.8</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal assumes roads and superlots but no subdivision details provided. Subdivision plan must be submitted 	<i>Section 5.3.8</i>
		Recreation Planning and Design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional open space should be provided commensurate with increased population or a monetary contribution provided to address provision of additional open space off site (through a VPA) Open space should be applied at a rate of 2.83ha/1,000 persons. Council strongly objects to SSDA on this basis 	<i>Section 5.3.2</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No justification for reduced footpath widths. Local road footpaths to be minimum of 1.6m and this should include adjacent SP2 and RE1 area which must be a minimum of 3.5m wide 	<i>Section 5.3.2</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further information required as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Details of expected increased population Total allocation of public open space to development Any alternatives to address insufficient open space (public open space excludes private courtyards, rooftop gardens, retail courtyards, cul de sac plaza, precinct entry space, paths, pedestrian and cycleway links) 	<i>Section 5.3.2</i>
		Strategic Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council does not support use of clause 5.3 for land zoned for infrastructure purposes Use of SP2 zoned land for residential purposes should be dealt with through a Planning Proposal. Alternatively, a requirement for a Planning Proposal could be required as a condition of consent for a DA which approved a use under clause 5.3. 	<i>Section 5.3.3</i>
		Proposed changes to Land Reservation Acquisition Map <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Proposal required to adjust Land Reservation Acquisition Map Council will support most expeditious means of amending zoning and acquisition maps via SSDA approval process but would need to be followed by Council agreed Planning Proposal to implement changes 	<i>Section 5.3.3</i>

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South

Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
Blacktown Council (cont'd)		Drainage Engineering <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant problems with proposal and Council unable to make full assessment 	<i>Section 5.3.4</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Electronic copy of DRAINS and MUSIC models for assessment 	<i>Section 5.3.4</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location of Vortex GPT on AECOM Drainage Plan Sheet 05 is unacceptable. Proposed on a very busy corner which will prevent safe access for maintenance. GPT needs to be relocated to eastern side of Cudgegong Rd. Further details and analysis required with respect to this GPT (refer Council submission for details) Provide a turning area at the end of the access road to enable eductor/maintenance trucks to safely turn around 	<i>Section 5.3.4</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Insufficient and contradictory information provided regarding proposed bioretention basin (refer Council submission for details) 	<i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide detail of Biofiltration Street Tree 	<i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide confirmation from Sydney Water that recycled water is available for the site 	<i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council will provide recommended conditions once amended information is provided 	<i>Noted</i>
		Design Engineering <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In principle agreement to additional bioretention on eastern side of Cudgegong Rd but insufficient information provided to determine if concept will work. Proposed rezoning of SP2 drainage land cannot be supported until proper proof of concept is provided. 	<i>Section 5.3.4</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Long section and hydraulics of stormwater lines and overland flow paths from bioretention to Second Ponds Creek should be submitted to Council for review prior to SSDA determination 	<i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Second bioretention on eastern side of Cudgegong Rd is highly constrained. Lifting it and associated drainage should be investigated. 	<i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SEI calculations are incorrect and need to be reviewed. Details of actual calculations should be provided to Council. 	<i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
Blacktown Council (cont'd)		Access and Traffic Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of RMS and Parramatta car parking rates is not supported. Blacktown Council parking rates should be used. 	Section 5.3.5 <i>Appendix F: SCT Consulting Technical Memorandum Post Exhibition Response to Traffic and Parking Comments</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While SEPP 65 applies to development, the site is not classified as a Regional CBD Centre and thus parking rates for this category of centre cannot be used to determine parking numbers. Sub-regional CBD Centre parking rates should be applied which would mean 1,627 parking spaces, not 1,100, are required 	Section 5.3.5 <i>Appendix F: SCT Consultation Technical Memorandum Post Exhibition Response to Traffic and Parking Comments</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All access driveways, ramps, circulation aisles and parking arrangements are to be designed in accordance with AS 2890.1, AS 2890.2 and AS 2890.6 	Section 5.3.5 <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provision for adequate sight distance needs to be made for pedestrian and vehicle movements at driveways in accordance with Section 3.2.4 and Fig 3.2 of AS 2890.1 	Section 5.3.5 <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		Waste Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide Waste Management Plan for residential and commercial/retail sites (refer Council submission for details) 	Section 5.3.6 <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i> <i>Appendix J: AECOM Waste Strategy Report</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Tables 1 and 2 of Waste Strategy report to include residential waste generation rates of 240L/unit/week for waste and 80L/unit/week for recycling. Melbourne City rates are not acceptable 	Section 5.3.6 <i>Appendix J: AECOM Waste Strategy Report</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> EPA's Better Practice Guide for waste management and recycling in commercial/industrial facilities must be complied with and generation rates based on 'maximum' calculations (amend Tables 3 and 4 of Waste Strategy accordingly) If specific tenancies cannot be provided, the following maximum waste and recycling generation rates should apply: 	Section 5.3.6 <i>Appendix J: AECOM Waste Strategy Report</i>

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South

Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
Blacktown Council (cont'd)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – 500L/100m2 floor area/day for waste – 220L/100m2 floor area/day for recycling 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate that residential bin storage rooms have sufficient space to store all required bins 	<p><i>Section 5.3.6</i></p> <p><i>Appendix J: AECOM Waste Strategy Report</i></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bulky waste storage should be provided at a rate of 4m2/40 units and 1m2/20 units and designed in accordance with Council requirements (refer to Council submission for details) 	<p><i>Section 5.3.6</i></p> <p><i>Appendix J: AECOM Waste Strategy Report</i></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demonstrate that basement design complies with Council requirements for bin collection (refer to Council submission for details) 	<p><i>Section 5.3.6</i></p> <p><i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i></p> <p><i>Appendix J: AECOM Waste Strategy Report</i></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide designated loading bay for collection vehicles designed in accordance with Council requirements (refer to Council submission for details) 	<p><i>Section 5.3.6</i></p> <p><i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i></p> <p><i>Appendix J: AECOM Waste Strategy Report</i></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Truck swept paths for residential sites to provide for an 8.8m long, medium rigid vehicle with a 22m turning circle 	<p><i>Section 5.3.6</i></p> <p><i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i></p> <p><i>Appendix J: AECOM Waste Strategy Report</i></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient detail provided in Waste Strategy Report and concept plans to be able to undertake detailed assessment at this stage 	<p><i>Section 5.3.6</i></p> <p><i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i></p>

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
Blacktown Council (cont'd)			<i>Appendix J: AECOM Waste Strategy Report</i>
		Open Space Infrastructure – Landscaping and Street Trees	<i>Section 5.3.2</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape plans not supported by Council 	<i>Appendix G: Clouston Associates Tallawong Station Precinct South Public Domain and Landscape Strategy - Response to Submissions Supplement</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Streetscape landscape plan should be submitted for review and approval 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Additional landscaped area is required along paths for tree planting (refer sections “E”, “G” & “H” in civil plans. Path width should be reduced from 3.5m to 2.5m or 3m to allow more room for larger canopy trees 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised plan should indicate species for each street as nominated 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised plan should indicate tree and street tree planting details (refer to Council submission for requirements) 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised landscape plan for proposed open space areas adjacent to Themeda Ave to be submitted for review and approval 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All street trees and trees on land to be dedicated to Council to have bonds and fees applied as per Council's Goods and Services Pricing Schedule 	
		Other matters	<i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSDA to comply with Growth Centre Precincts DCP including road design and widths 	<i>Section 5.3.7</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stage 2 Contamination Report required with testing to ANZECC Guidelines and preparation of a RAP 	<i>Section 5.3.7</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure site can be validated to National Environmental Protection Measures 2013 to Residential ‘A’ standards by an EPA accredited Site Auditor 	<i>Section 5.3.7</i>
Government Architect NSW	A3	Density (Bulk and Scale) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of streetscapes, public spaces and habitable spaces of dwellings should not be compromised through overshadowing Excessive overshadowing of retail courtyard, cul-de-sac plaza and key residential streets 	<i>Section 5.4.1</i> <i>Appendix C: Bennett and Trimble Urban Design Report Responses to Submissions</i>

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South

Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
Government Architect (cont'd)		Green infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Landscape and green infrastructure as addressed in Public Domain and Landscape Strategy is supported Broader opportunity to link green infrastructure as a clear holistic concept not fully realised Opportunities to connect green infrastructure with other ecosystems eg WSUD not fully integrated within landscape proposals Concerns raised link to previous comments on overall amenity of the network of public spaces within network 	<i>Section 5.4.2</i> <i>Appendix G: Clouston Associates Tallawong Station Precinct South Public Domain and Landscape Strategy - Response to Submissions Supplement</i> <i>Appendix J: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		Public open space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions regarding function of public spaces adequately addressed Overshadowing of public open spaces will compromise amenity of these spaces 	<i>Section 5.4.1, 5.4.2</i>
		Design excellence strategy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not adequately address design excellence strategy for future 	<i>Section 5.2.1</i>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Establishment of internal Landcom design review panel supported but its effectiveness will relate to its independence and authority of its advice. This should be articulated in Terms of Reference. 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategy should describe how Landcom will ensure a diversity of architectural response through EOI and ITT process 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not clear how design quality will be balanced with other considerations. Further detail required e.g. membership of Tender Evaluation Committee, weighting of design in tender 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Design competition process recommended in accordance with GA Design Excellence Competition Guidelines 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Panel role should continue beyond development approval to final construction quality and this should be described in strategy. 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any modifications to the SSDA should be reviewed by the State Design Review Panel 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategy should describe how design excellence processes are expected to be addressed through Blacktown DA assessment process 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategy should describe how the Design Quality Guidelines are to be used and implemented at each stage 	

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South

Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
		Public/private interface <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intent for the interface between the public and private domain has been adequately addressed 	<i>Noted</i>
		Fine grain <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principles responded to fine grain have been incorporated into Design Quality Guidelines 	<i>Noted</i> <i>Appendix D: Design Quality Guidelines</i>
		Address to Schofields Rd/Cudgegong Rd <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Principles and strategies to ensure a positive address to Schofields Rd/Cudgegong Rd have been incorporated sufficiently 	<i>Noted</i>
Endeavour Energy Endeavour Energy (cont'd)	A4	Rouse Hill Switching Station <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about access arrangements to the switching station Changes to Cudgegong Rd may affect access Access to switching station needs to be maintained at all times Endeavour Energy will need to be given reasonable notice regarding any road works. 	<i>Section 5.10</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		Network capacity/connection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Availability of electricity supply dependent on a range of factors Future applicants will need to submit an application to Endeavour Energy to carry out final load assessment and to determine method of supply Refer to Endeavour Energy submission for further detail re requirements 	<i>Section 5.10</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		Urban residential subdivision <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential subdivision of the site subject to Endeavour Energy Underground Residential Distribution (URD) policy – refer EE submission for further detail 	<i>Section 5.10</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		Location of electricity easements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easements in private lots are problematic and not supported by EE. Easements should be entirely incorporated into public reserves and not burden private lots. 	<i>Section 5.10</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		Substations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future substation locations will require detailed assessment to consider suitability of access, safety clearances, fire ratings, flooding 	<i>Section 5.10</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		Flooding and drainage <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Distribution substation should not be subject to flood inundation. 	<i>Section 5.10</i>

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
			<i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		Bushfire <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Electricity network must be designed to meet EE's requirements with respect to bushfire risk. 	<i>Section 5.10</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		Earthing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction of any building or structure connected to or in close proximity to EE's electricity network is required to comply with AS/NZS 3000:2007 'Electrical installations' to ensure there is adequate connection to the earth 	<i>Section 5.10</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submissions</i>
		Prudent avoidance <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When designing new transmission and distribution facilities, consideration should be given to locating them where exposure to more sensitive uses is reduced. New development can impact on electricity infrastructure. EE is not responsible for any amelioration measures should electricity emissions impact on nearby development No mention in EIS of proximity of site to Rouse Hill Switching Station or Feeder 9JA and no discussion about a 'complimentary interface' between Switching Station/Feeder 9JA and buildings to opposite side of Cudgegong Rd. 	<i>Section 5.10</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submission</i>
Sydney Water	A5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sydney Water factoring in Tallawong Station Precinct South in its projections for water related services Any changes to proposal should be notified to Sydney Water as soon as possible. Request further staging information for the development to help SW better understand timescale requirements and potential staging of assets 	<i>Section 5.9</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submission</i>
		Drinking water <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Drinking water to be supplied via Parklea Water Supply Zoned There is sufficient trunk capacity to service initial development however amplification expected over next 5 years to support growth in the wider area Network extensions or amplifications will be determined at s73 application stage 	<i>Section 5.9</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submission</i>
		Wastewater <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is sufficient trunk capacity to service initial development however amplification expected over next 5 years to support growth in the wider area Network extensions or amplifications will be determined at s73 application stage 	<i>Section 5.9</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submission</i>
		Recycled water <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recycled water is being explored as part of Options Planning works and further updates will be available in late 2018 	<i>Section 5.9</i> <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submission</i>

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South

Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is sufficient trunk capacity to service initial development however amplification expected over next 5 years to support growth in the wider area 	
		Stormwater management and flooding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Attention should be given to appropriate use of land based on flooding constraints. Relevant development controls for stormwater discharges and increased storage of roof water should be considered in alignment with proposals for healthy waterways. 	Section 5.9 Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submission
		Development impact on existing assets <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential risk to existing SW assets in the development of new roads, infrastructure and construction developments. Future development of Tallawong may result in impacts to Sydney Water's existing infrastructure. Any works required to existing infrastructure will be considered as part of future DAs and s73 stage. 	Section 5.9 Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submission
Office of Environment and Heritage	A6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no biodiversity, natural hazards or Aboriginal cultural heritage issues that require a formal response 	Section 5.11
Sydney Trains	A7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sydney Trains has no comment 	Section 5.11
WaterNSW	A8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal site is not located in close proximity to any WaterNSW land, assets or infrastructure, and will not involve flood or water supply approvals. 	Section 5.11
NSW Environment Protection Authority	A9	Air Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Air emission exposure from vehicles using Schofields Road has not been adequately addressed. In relation to carbon emissions and sustainability, the Greater Sydney Regional Plan and Western City District Plan targets should be adopted. 	Section 5.5.1 Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submission
		Noise <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A more detailed noise and vibration assessment should be undertaken for Stage 2 of the development to help identify more rigorous strategies for noise control and management, including construction noise mitigation. Noise generating activities and noise sensitive areas should be separated where practicable. 	Section 5.5.2 Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submission
		Water quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Concept Proposal should discuss key sustainability priorities in the Western City District Plan and provide details of expected water quality outcomes. The EIS does not indicate ambient water quality targets for receiving waters Consideration should be given to the OEH and EPA's 'Risk-based Framework for Considering Waterway Health Outcomes in Strategic Land-Use Planning Decisions' as well as a number of other policy and strategic documents aimed at improving or restoring water quality and water flows in NSW catchments. 	Section 5.5.3 Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submission

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South

Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification should be provided regarding wastewater reuse as this is an important sustainability initiative for the Precinct. 	
		Contaminated land <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the proposal is only conceptual at this time, further contamination investigations will be necessary to fully characterise contamination at the site. Information should be provided demonstrating that all stockpiles and topsoils are being managed to ensure they meet regulatory requirements. Extensive basement car park construction is likely to mean that groundwater will be encountered during the construction phase. Further assessment and planning is required to adequately address this issue. The EPA has recommended draft conditions of consent to address issues raised. 	Section 5.5.4 <i>Appendix I: AECOM Engineering Issues Response to Submission</i>
		Domestic waste management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no clear recommendation on the desired approach for waste management to achieve the best outcome for the precinct. No innovative waste solutions have been considered for the development. 	Section 5.5.5 <i>Appendix J: AECOM Waste Management Strategy</i>
Transport for NSW	A10	Broader traffic assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Department of Planning and Environment should consider updating the traffic and transport study for the wider Precinct to evaluate cumulative traffic impact and inform any additional transport mitigation works required. 	Section 5.6.1, 5.3.5 <i>Appendix F: SCT Consulting Technical Memorandum Post Exhibition Responses to Traffic and Parking Comments.</i>
		Transport and access <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification is needed as to which party is responsible for preparing the Travel Plan More details are required regarding the pedestrian and cycle linkages to the east and west and particularly to the south across Schofields Road. Information regarding current bus routes needs to be updated, particularly regarding changes to services operating past the site and which will be directed via Tallawong Station once it is opened. 	Section 5.6.2 <i>Appendix F: SCT Consulting Technical Memorandum Post Exhibition Responses to Traffic and Parking Comments.</i> <i>Appendix G: Clouston Associates Tallawong Station Precinct South Public Domain and Landscape Strategy - Response to Submissions Supplement</i>
Roads and Maritime Services	A11	Land on the corner Schofields Road and Cudgegong Road <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The applicant must seek owner's consent from RMS before consent is granted. 	Section 5.7

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South

Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
NSW Rural Fire Service	A12	Planning for Bushfire Protection <ul style="list-style-type: none">The RFS advised that it has no objection to the proposed development provided that relevant provisions in Planning for Bushfire Fire Protection (PBP) 2006 are adhered to	<i>Section 5.8</i>

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

COMMUNITY SUBMISSIONS

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
Adnan Pal	P1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident of The Ponds Objects to proposal as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> it will increase traffic on Ridgeline Drive and The Ponds Boulevard beyond their capacity and increasing risk of accident it will increase population during construction it will significantly strain capacity of local resources it will increase crime and level of safety currently enjoyed cannot be guaranteed privacy of houses and community will be compromised 	<p><i>Section 6.1.</i></p> <p><i>Section 6.5</i></p> <p><i>Section 6.7</i></p> <p><i>Section 6.3</i></p>
Colleen Abela	P2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to fact that land was originally compulsorily acquired but is now surplus and has not been offered back to original landowner at acquisition price plus CPI. This process should be adopted as Government policy. Inadequate car parking being provided. Not reasonable to assume that future residents would be working along Metro corridor. Very few places in Sydney which are easily accessible by public transport for residents of Sydney's North West 	<i>Section 6.1.2</i>
Gurneet Grewal	P3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to development due to very poor road infrastructure in the area. Proposal will place extra vehicular pressure on Old Windsor Rd which is already operating beyond capacity. Already significant residential and commercial developments underway in the area and these developments will put extra pressure on Old Windsor Rd Old Windsor Rd should be upgraded and all traffic pinch points cleared before any new development is approved. 	<p><i>Section 6.1.1</i></p> <p><i>Section 6.3</i></p>
Matthew McGirr	P4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very poor planning. Amount of open space grossly inadequate for size of proposed population Amount of open space needs to be doubled to ensure area does not become a slum Buildings should be no more than 3-4 storeys high. 8 storey buildings will create an overly shadowed ghetto with limited sunlight for lower levels Scale of development will result in excessive traffic. 	<p><i>Section 6.6</i></p> <p><i>Section 6.2</i></p> <p><i>Section 6.1</i></p>
Name withheld Campsie (271973)	P5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports development Great to see housing being built near transport options such as the Metro There should be increased housing along whole of proposed Metro Being close to transport dramatically reduces traffic near major transport hubs such as Tallawong station 	<i>Noted.</i>
Name withheld Canterbury (271939)	P6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant shortfall in the provision of affordable housing. Development does not meet government's mandate of 10% affordable housing. Development should provide for a minimum of 10% affordable housing into perpetuity Lack of car parking will not make people use bikes 	<p><i>Section 6.10</i></p> <p><i>Section 6.1</i></p>

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South

Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car parking required because of inadequate public transport system Car parking needs to be provided for each unit If adequate car parking is not provided, the precinct will become dangerously overcrowded potentially leading to social problems 	
Name withheld Castle Hill (275835)	P7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to 8 storey building along Schofield Rd opposite Amarco Circuit. Building will result in loss of privacy, increase in noise and air pollution as well as overshadowing Development will impact on property values in Amarco Circuit 	Section 6.2 Section 6.4 Section 6.9
Name withheld Eastwood (272741)	P8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> First home buyer inquiring about when dwellings will be available for purchase. 	Noted
Name withheld Kellyville (274636)	P9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resident of The Ponds Concerned that there is insufficient car parking Final designs need to provide for ample car parking. Need to provide for a minimum of 1 car space per dwelling and 3 bedroom dwellings should have 2 car spaces In insufficient car parking is provided, people will park in commuter car park and this will cause significant problems for people catching trains. 	Section 6.1 Section 6.1.2
Name withheld Marrickville (272324)	P10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Metro should not be used as an excuse to building excessively high rise buildings across Sydney. Metro lines should be built to complement heavy rail lines, not replace them and be built where there is no other rail alternative. Suburbs should not have high rise forced upon them which shadow surrounding homes, parks and schools High rise brings excessive traffic and places significant burden on local infrastructure including roads Unrealistic to assume that people living close to public transport will not own a car unless legislative and physical restrictions are put in place No essential services including public transport should be privatised. Population and infrastructure need to be planned before high density introduced 	Section 6.1 Section 6.3 <i>Response: NSW State Government is committed to providing an integrated transport network. The rationale and justification for the Sydney Metro North West was addressed in the Northwest RailLink State Significant Infrastructure Application.</i>
Name withheld NSW (272072)	P11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extent of site unclear. No schematic drawing of the site provided. Schofields Rd is located south of the station. There is no room for development here. 	Section 6 Appendix C: Urban Design Report Appendix D: Design Quality Guidelines Report Response to Submissions

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South

Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
Name withheld Rouse Hill (272074)	P12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Positive development Responsible that affordable housing included 	Noted
Name withheld Rouse Hill (272139)	P13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs of local residents not being considered High rise development will bring too many people to the area, most of who will have cars Reality is people will still drive cars Infrastructure already over-stretched Increasing building height from 8 to 16 storeys will double influx of people in an area that is already struggling. Schools, roads and shopping centres already overflowing Not clear how buildings will enhance the area Keep buildings at 4 storeys not 8 or 16 storeys 	<i>Section 6.1</i> <i>Section 6.2</i> <i>Section 6.3</i> <i>Section 6.4</i>
Name withheld The Ponds (271928)	P14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to proposal Current infrastructure and roads insufficient to accommodate new proposal Project will have a detrimental environmental and social impact on current community 	<i>Section 6.3</i> <i>Section 6.5</i>
Name withheld The Ponds (272052)	P15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Number of units and height of buildings excessive and not in keeping with current community and environment Traffic already terrible and highly unlikely that future residents won't have cars. Site is 50km from the city and everyone uses cars. Area will be ruined as a result of this large development 	<i>Section 6.2</i> <i>Section 6.1.1</i>
Name withheld The Ponds (273082)	P16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly objects to the proposal This many units on such as small site and so close to The Ponds will have adverse impacts on social living of residents 8 storey buildings will block view of Tallawong Station from The Ponds Initially the site was earmarked for commuter car parking. Requests NSW Government to reserve the site for parking to meet needs of future residents of Box Hill, Riverstone, Schofields and Marsden Park 	<i>Section 6.4</i> <i>Section 6.2</i> <i>Section 6.8</i>
Name withheld The Ponds (274765)	P17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to high rise slum Driveways and footpaths are not public spaces Proposal is for high density residential without any real open space for residents to come together and form any sort of community. The development will become a breeding ground for crime and terrorism Already enough development in the pipeline to exceed capacity of the Metro and old line and Windsor Road highly congested Government should be building communities not just houses 	<i>Section 6.2</i> <i>Section 6.6</i> <i>Section 6.5</i> <i>Section 6.1</i>
Name withheld The Ponds (275245)	P18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objects to proposal on the following grounds: 	<i>Section 6.4</i> <i>Section 6.3</i>

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South

Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overdevelopment and overcrowding of site. Open spaces, low density housing and friendly community are major attractions of the area. High rise development out of place in this context. Development will be over bearing, out of scale and out of character for the area. Overcrowding of state facilities. Schools are already at full capacity and neighbouring suburbs already developing and growing. Overcrowding at schools will lead to failures in education Negative effects causing shading and loss of light on the surrounding areas. State roads do not have sufficient capacity to accommodate additional population. New train system may help existing problems but increase in population will be greater than system can handle. Most residents prefer their own cars. Planners and developers failing to understand this pressure. Ongoing and continuing noise and dust pollution. Have been dealing with this for years and problem will continue with development. 	
Richard Ure	P19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Best way to encourage public transport use for commuting is to limit parking at commuters' destination. Should be greater focus on zoning land for office accommodation within walking distance of the stations. Instead, planners are removing existing commercial zoning under the justification that residents will use public transport. This is despite census figures that show only 25% of those who live near stations use public transport to commute. 30-minute city a fallacy under these circumstances. 	<i>Section 6.8</i>
Urbis on behalf of CDG Developments	A13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CDG Developments owners of 34-42 Tallawong Rd. Project supported overall 	<i>Noted.</i>
		Building height <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed building heights represent a missed opportunity. Additional height could contribute toward a more visually interesting and varied outcome and deliver a more vibrant town centre. Consider delivering a number of feature/gateway buildings with additional ground level community domain 	<i>It is considered that the proposed building heights represent an appropriate balance between achieving adequate development density given the site's proximity to the new metro station and the need to provide good residential amenity.</i>
		Traffic impact assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SSDA has not taken into account a number of significant applications and development consents for nearby parcels (refer submission for details of recent applications/approvals) Approved residential densities/yields and expected timing of delivery need to be taken into account 	<i>Further analysis of cumulative impact provided in Appendix F: SCT Consulting Technical Memorandum Post Exhibition Responses to Traffic and Parking Comments.</i>

APPENDIX A

SSDA 9063 Tallawong Station Precinct South

Summary of community and government agency issues raised in submissions

SUBMISSION FROM	NO	ISSUES RAISED	ISSUE ADDRESSED IN THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS
		Design of road/path networks and other infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In an area of fragmented ownership, it will be critical that infrastructure design is effectively integrated and coordinated prior to detailed design and construction to address issues such as finished levels, horizontal alignments and capacities 	<i>Noted</i>
		Overall lead coordination <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated approach to development of land to the south as well as the north of the station is required A more logical precinct boundary for the DCP should include 34-42 Tallawong Road and 59 Cudgegong Rd Clear responsibilities need to be established for relevant parties through a reference group or similar to ensure coordinated approach to detailed design and delivery of infrastructure in the area. 	<i>Noted</i>