

8<sup>th</sup> May 2012



SJB Planning  
490 Crown Street  
SURRY HILLS 2010

Attn: Scott Barwick

Dear Scott,

Re: SWC letter dated 12 March 2012 – Former Allied Mills site redevelopment

Following extensive discussions with Sydney Water (SWC) regarding the flooding issues on the Former Allied Mills redevelopment site (the site), SWC has responded in the terms in the above letter. Our response to this letter is outlined below.

SWC raises two main issues which are:

1. The need for the development to consider possible broader solutions to the flooding problem in the area; and
2. The potential for floodwaters to overtop their stormwater system and flow across the subject site.

In terms of the first issue, we have considered the flooding behaviour within a wider area than just the site and the potential for the works on the site to have an adverse impact on the flooding behaviour on adjacent sites. This is dealt with in the flooding report and concluded there would be no adverse impact on adjacent areas.

In discussions with SWC and Transport NSW (project manager for the adjacent approved light rail project) after the submission of the Concept Plan application, SWC raised their preference for a flood swale along the southern side of the light rail corridor to accommodate overland flood flows and pipes to convey flood flows from this corridor to their stormwater channel. There were two options for the pipe alignment (see sketches attached to the SWC letter). One was to direct flows to the subject site (upstream of the Longport St culvert) and the other was to direct the pipes under Longport Street to downstream of the culvert. These works would generally be on lands not in our ownership and hence out of our control.

Transport NSW, who have a project approval for the light rail project in the rail corridor, indicated to SWC that they would give consideration to the flooding issue in the corridor in the detailed design of their project but that it was not their responsibility to resolve the regional flooding issues for SWC.

SWC has claimed in their letter that the proposed Building 1A on the subject site would preclude one of the possible regional flood solutions to the broader flooding problems ie their proposed pipes from the railway corridor to the site (see first option mentioned above). This option would not be viable without also upgrading the Longport St culvert as the culvert does not have capacity to accept any more flows. As such, SWC's other pipe alignment option (under Longport St) is likely to be much more cost effective as it would not require upgrade of the Longport Street culvert in order for this pipe option to work.

t: +61 2 9906 8611 f: +61 2 9906 7318

level 4 10-12 clarke street crows nest nsw 2065 australia

po box 1060 crows nest nsw 1585 australia

[www.npc.com.au](http://www.npc.com.au)

national project consultants Pty Ltd abn 40 084 004 160



Notwithstanding these short comings of the SWC pipe option onto the site, the proposed development would not preclude either the pipes or the culvert upgrade in the longer term. If considered necessary, the design of Building 1A could be undertaken to either include the pipes during construction of the building foundations or the foundations designed to allow pipe installation at a later date without adverse impact on the building (use of directional drilling or other methods). Building 1A is located on private land and allows space for future augmentation of the culvert under Longport Street either above or alongside the existing culvert. SWC could fund the extra work required to address this regional flood issue.

The second issue raised by SWC is the potential for the floodwaters to overtop the rail corridor and Smith Street and flow across portions of the site. This potentially could occur at three locations:

1. Location 1 – from overland flows down Smith Street overtopping the site boundary to flow into the SWC channel;
2. Location 2 – from overland flow along the rail corridor overtopping into the site east of the Mungo Scott building into the SWC channel; and
3. Location 3 – from overland flow along the rail corridor overtopping into the site to the west of the Mungo Scott building between the proposed Buildings 2A and 3A.

For Location 1, SWC has agreed with our method of managing these flows.

For Location 2, it was agreed in discussions with SWC, that the proposed coverage of the SWC channel be revised and the pedestrian walkway to the light rail station could be raised over the rail corridor to allow flood flows to pass underneath. Transport NSW has agreed to consider the flood related issues in their design of the pedestrian walkway. We have revised the proposed development on the site to remove channel coverage in the area of flood flow overtopping to allow it to discharge directly into the SWC channel and revised the pedestrian walkway so that it could connect to a raised walkway over the rail corridor.

For Location 3, there is a combination of a wall along the site boundary with the rail corridor or raised land levels on the site which restricts the flood flows from the rail corridor entering the site upstream (west) of proposed Building 2A. Our assessment was that there would be relatively low inflows at this location and these would occur late in the flood so that they would not cause significant additional flood problems.

Notwithstanding our assessment, it is possible to manage the extent of flood inflows in this area with extra height added to the wall along the boundary.

In summary, it is not our responsibility to resolve the regional flooding problems for the SWC but there are simple approaches which could be incorporated into the statement of commitments for our project to address the concerns of SWC. Also, Transport NSW will be considering the flooding aspects which originate from the rail corridor in their detailed design of the light rail project. The recommended commitments to address the SWC concerns are:

1. The detailed design on Building 1A foundation incorporate allowance for inclusion of a 3m wide x 1.5m high box culvert or equivalent to be concrete encased (no maintenance or replacement required) from the southern site boundary to the SWC channel at the eastern end of the building;
2. The wall height on the rail corridor boundary to the west of Building 2A to be adjusted at the detailed design stage to manage the potential inflow of floodwaters from the rail corridor;
3. During the detailed design of the proposed development liaison with Transport NSW be undertaken to ensure that the site design complements the design aspects of the light rail project which deal with the flooding issues.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in blue ink, which appears to read 'Mark Tooker', is written over the typed name. The signature is fluid and cursive.

Mark Tooker