

Shell Cove – Response to Agency Submissions

Table 1 – Issues Raised

	Key Issues Raised	Response
	Department of Planning and Environment (DPE)	
	Views	
1	<p>Submission of a visual impact assessment (VIA) detailing and assessing the impact of the proposed modification on public and private views. The view analysis should be undertaken based on the maximum RLs proposed as part of the development and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> any recommendations to reduce view impacts; and images of the view of the approved concept plan and proposed modification from properties significantly affected. 	<p>A Visual Impact Assessment has been prepared by Richard Lamb and Associates (RLA) (refer Appendix D). The VIA is a comparative analysis of the maximum building envelopes for the Concept Approval and the Modification. The VIA considers photomontages from 8 locations, including public and private vistas. RLA concluded that the proposed increase in heights and the relocation of the hotel does not result in any significant increase in view loss from the public or private view locations.</p>
	Traffic	
2	<p>Submission of a Traffic Impact Study including consideration of generation rates given distance of the site from public transport and assessment of the impact of the proposal on the performance of key surrounding intersections.</p>	<p>Chris Millet (Manager, Land Use at RMS South Region) confirmed in an email dated 19th December 2016, that:</p> <p><i>“RMS has reviewed the information provided in the attached traffic report. RMS is satisfied with the consultant’s reasoning which indicates the modification is only likely to increase traffic generation by 2%. Based on this, RMS agrees with the consultants’ statement that this is only a minor increase and is satisfied it will not significantly impact on the state road network (including the approved arrangements for modified traffic signals at Shellharbour Road, Wattle Street, Addison Street and Harbour Boulevard.</i></p> <p><i>Based on the above, RMS does not require any further traffic analysis for the S75W and has no objections to the modification in principle.”</i></p>
	Building Heights	
3	<p>Nomination of maximum building heights in addition to the maximum storey height proposed.</p>	<p>The Height Plan at Section 4.5 of the Revised Design Report (refer Appendix C) nominates maximum building heights in metres.</p>
4	<p>The areas associated with the dry boat storage and business park must also be captured in the maximum building height map.</p>	<p>The Height Plan at Section 4.5 of the Revised Design Report (refer Appendix C) nominates the maximum building heights in metres for</p>

		the dry boat storage and business park.
	Dry Boat Storage and Business Park	
5	The dry boat storage and business must be included in the maps associated Appendix B Concept Plan Design Report and any impacts from these uses assessed as part of the Modification Report.	<p>The omission of the dry boat storage area and business park in the maps submitted with the Modification was an oversight. They have been incorporated into the revised Design Report (refer Appendix C).</p> <p>The Modification does not propose any fundamental changes to the land uses approved for these areas under the Concept Approval.</p>
	State Environmental Planning Policy No. 65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development	
6	A more detailed assessment of against provisions of SEPP 65 including the Design quality principals.	It is noted that the Concept Approval and Modification contemplate building envelopes in a master planning context, and the application of the SEPP 65 design quality principles is generally applied at the detailed design and development application stage. Notwithstanding, Section 5 of the revised Design Report (Appendix C) contains a preliminary analysis of the indicative residential flat building envelopes against the nine SEPP 65 design quality principles.
	Heritage	
7	Submission of a Heritage Impact Assessment discussing impacts the proposed modification to heritage items within and in vicinity to the site.	<p>A Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) has been prepared by GML Heritage and is included at Appendix F. GML Heritage concluded that <i>“the proposed changes included in the application relate to the increased height of some built forms and relocation of some massing within the commercial precinct. The changes proposed have similar impacts on the nearby heritage items and conservation area to the approved Concept Plan. No significant additional impacts arise from the proposed modification.”</i></p> <p>The Modification is acceptable from a heritage perspective.</p>
	Shellharbour City Council	
	Traffic Circulation, heavy vehicle servicing and on-street parking	
8	It is important that sufficient on - site parking is provided throughout the modification application area to ensure on street parking is not overly relied on. Precinct E1 for instance is a lower density residential area, constrained in on street parking capacity by narrower lot widths (as narrow as 11m) and 7.5m carriageways with box kerb and gutter. These road reserve features compound the importance of sufficient on - site parking. With higher densities and similar road geometry, as proposed in the modification application, the potential for on street parking to be relied on may increase, as will the importance of sufficient on - site parking. The draft Precinct E1 UDGs propose 1 space for a 2 bedroom dwelling which Council considers inadequate. These UDGs are unclear on parking provision for 3 bedroom or other dwelling types.	The structure of the road network and street hierarchy proposed in the Modification is generally in accordance with the Concept Approval. The detailed assessment and resolution of the road network and parking requirements within each Precinct will occur in conjunction with the preparation of the relevant civil works development applications and Precinct Urban Design Guidelines.
9	Minimum parking for dwellings should be as per Council's DCP: i.e. 2 on site.	Residential car parking will be provided in accordance with the Shellharbour DCP or other relevant standard where applicable.

10	Dual occupancy and multi dwelling housing should have parking as per Council's DCP.	Residential car parking will be provided in accordance with the Shellharbour DCP or other relevant standard where applicable.
11	Based on the streets proposed in the modification application, 8.8m vehicles would need to cross over to the wrong side of the road if localised kerb widening (extensions) occurs.	<p>The Modification does not propose fundamental changes to the structure or function of the approved road network. Additional lanes will be added adjoining apartment buildings.</p> <p>The detailed assessment and resolution of the road network and parking requirements within each Precinct will occur in conjunction with the preparation of the relevant civil works development applications and Precinct Urban Design Guidelines.</p>
12	No localised kerb widening (extensions) should be permitted unless it can be demonstrated that 8.8m vehicles can operate without crossing to the wrong side of the road. Parking restrictions should not only apply to intersections, but also to 90 degree bends that are not located at a junction or intersection.	The detailed assessment and resolution of the road network and parking requirements within each Precinct will occur in conjunction with the preparation of the relevant civil works development applications and Precinct Urban Design Guidelines.
13	Any modification application approval should acknowledge that approved street layout/traffic management measures may need amendment to comply with the relevant technical standards for intersections and heavy vehicle access/waste servicing.	See above.
<i>Pedestrian amenity and driveways</i>		
14	Development, especially with double garages (Draft Precinct E1 Urban Design Guidelines) may adversely affect pedestrian amenity by footpaths being punctuated by footpath cross overs every few metres.	The Modification seeks concept approval for built form typologies, a maximum number of dwellings and road structure. The detailed matters raised by Council will be addressed through the preparation of the Urban Design Guidelines, and detailed development applications, for each Precinct in accordance with Part D Condition 1 of the Concept Approval.
15	To benefit pedestrian amenity and on street parking capacity, footpath cross overs should be limited to a maximum 4m width. Multi dwelling corner lot development needing 2 vehicular access points, should have 1 on each frontage. Footpath cross overs should abut one another. This would mean for instance on a street running east – west, a lot's cross over may be located at its eastern edge, with the lot to the east having it's cross over on its western edge (so the 2 cross overs abut one another).	
16	For Precinct E1 for instance, this requirement may necessitate additional dwelling design options to achieve suitable amenity and design.	
<i>Parking for hotel/serviced apartments, restaurant and function centre</i>		
17	Council notes the reduction in on - site parking it advocates in comparison to the previous report by Chris Hallam.	The CBRK Hotel Parking Review (dated 17 November 2017) allows for the shared use of the facilities. The Hallam Report made no allowance for shared use of the facilities.
18	It's recommended that any modification application approval does not lock in any parking provision requirement for the hotel/serviced apartments, restaurant and function centre development.	The parking provision requirements included in the Hotel Parking Review is an indicative demand analysis based on the assumed Hotel operations. Parking provision for the detailed development application will be provided in accordance with the rates and requirements set out under Part 4.3.6 DG1 in the Council endorsed Precinct D Urban Design Guidelines.
19	Parking for the hotel/serviced apartments, restaurant and function centre development must be further assessed at	See above.

	development application stage. This assessment must demonstrate enough on – site parking is provided to not adversely impact on street parking in the town centre and surrounding precincts. Final numerical parking provision may therefore vary to that advocated in the CBRK report of 17-11-16.	
State Environmental Planning Policy 65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development		
20	In the interest of design and amenity, the Department should satisfy itself that apartment development can potentially comply with SEPP 65 and its associated apartment design guide.	COX have provided an analysis of the design quality principles in SEPP 65 in the revised Design Report (Appendix C) which demonstrates that, at a conceptual level, the future residential flat buildings are consistent with the SEPP 65 design quality principles.
Solar Access		
21	The Shellharbour Development Control Plan requires residential development (except SEPP 65 development) to be capable of allowing a minimum of 3 hours mid – winter continuous and direct solar access on its principal private space and to neighbouring main living areas.	The solar access requirements for future residential development will be detailed within the relevant Urban Design Guidelines for each precinct.
22	The Draft Precinct E1 Urban Design Guidelines require only 2 hours of solar access to 50% of private open space in detached housing. And this solar access can be broken up temporally and spatially. Where this standard is derived is unknown.	The preparation of the Precinct E1 Urban Design Guidelines does not form part of the Modification.
23	The Department should be in a good position to determine appropriate solar access provisions given its responsibilities in assessing major projects, its work on the missing middle/Draft Medium Density Design Guide and Housing Code and its work towards genericising development control plans.	Solar access will be considered and incorporated into the Urban Design Guidelines for each stage in accordance with Part D Condition 1 of the Concept Approval.
Public open space and pedestrian links		
24	When compared with the approved concept plan, numerous parks/pedestrian links have been introduced. Some will function as narrow pedestrian links.	The public open space is generally consistent under both the Concept Approval and the Modification. This is illustrated by comparing Figure 3.01 in the Concept Approval Environmental Assessment Report prepared by LFA (dated February 2010), and the Public Domain Framework at Section 4.1 of the Revised Urban Design Report (refer Appendix C).
25	Crime prevention through environmental design principles should be applied to parks/pedestrian links. This includes dwellings addressing the open space/pedestrian link and suitable boundary/paving/ground cover treatments to signify public and private domain and that allows passive surveillance.	Part D Condition 1 of the Concept Approval requires the detailed Urban Design Guidelines for each precinct to establish design controls which achieve compliance with <i>Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design Principles</i> .
Development with a rear and front street frontage		
26	Development with a rear and front street frontage such as in Precinct E should be required to address both street frontages via suitable fencing and site/building design.	This level of detail will form part of all future Urban Design Guidelines that control the types and form of development within each individual precinct.
Public access around harbour perimeter		
27	It appears setback from the harbour of development in Precincts F and G has been reduced. It is unclear whether Precinct G has any setback at all.	The Statement of Commitments includes a commitment that: “the proponent undertakes to protect existing public access to and

28	Continuous and sufficiently wide public access should be available around the entire harbour perimeter and thence to the beach on either side of the harbour entrance.	<p><i>along the beach and coastal foreshore and provide new opportunities for controlled public access <u>including providing continuous public access to the perimeter of the harbour</u></i>."</p> <p>The Modification does not seek to amend this Commitment.</p>
Business Park inclusion		
29	The modifications report and concept plan design report (Appendix B) do not map the business park. The business park is to remain, as part of the modified instrument of approval and modifications report. Any modification application approval should be clear in its mapping about the business park inclusion.	The business park has been incorporated into the revised Design Report prepared by COX (Appendix C).
Environmental Protection Authority (EPA)		
Water Quality		
30	The modification seeks an increase in the number of dwellings, increased lands for residential development and increased building heights. These changes could increase nutrient and suspended solid loads to receiving water.	<p>The Modification does not seek to change the stormwater treatment related requirements that were noted in previous conditions of approval and which apply to all future Development Applications (refer to Condition 8 in Part D of the 2011 Concept Approval issued by NSW Planning).</p> <p>The previously agreed stormwater treatment requirements are still being met with the proposed Modification.</p> <p>One of the requirements is to ensure that the annual pollutant load export to the proposed Boat Harbour in the developed state does not exceed the export from the existing (pre-development) conditions.</p> <p>Extensive MUSIC modelling (Model for Urban Stormwater Improvement Conceptualisation) has been completed to determine the treatment systems required to ensure that the development does not increase existing nutrient and suspended solids loads into receiving waters. A network of treatment systems is proposed including gross pollutant traps, wetlands, bioretention systems, HydroCon porous concrete pipes (proprietary product supplied by HydroCon) with sand filters and Jellyfish treatment units (proprietary product supplied by Stormwater360). These systems will be distributed throughout the development. In combination these systems will result in the stormwater treatment related requirements noted in the previous conditions of approval being met.</p>
31	The Modification presents an opportunity to ensure that the community's environmental values and uses of waterways in the Shell Cove Harbour Precinct, such as boating and swimming, are recognised and integrated into land-use planning decisions.	The community's environmental values and uses of waterways have been considered in the report titled, <i>Shell Cove Boat Harbour: Section 96 Modification of Consent 95/133 – Support Information</i> , which was prepared in December 2005 by Patterson Britton and Partners. This report was prepared as supporting documentation for the Section 96

		<p>modification application lodged in December 2005, which was approved and subsequently formed part of the Consent Conditions for the Boat Harbour.</p> <p>In this report, the commentary relating to the community's environmental values and uses of the waterway is followed by discussion relating to the adoption of pollutant trigger values at which management action is to be triggered. These trigger values are based on information in the ANZECC/ARMCANZ 2000 guidelines, which are still current.</p> <p>The Modification does not seek to change the stormwater treatment related requirements that were noted in previous conditions of approval.</p>
32	<p>The Modification adopts generic load reductions for total suspended solids, total phosphorus and total nitrogen. These load reduction targets do not reflect contemporary best-practice and may not deliver improvements in the health of receiving waters.</p>	<p>Three water quality objectives are being addressed by the proposed stormwater treatment strategy. These are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Ensure that the annual pollutant load export to the proposed Boat Harbour in the developed state does not exceed the export from the existing (pre-development) conditions. 2) Achieve the following pollutant percentage reductions in load from the developed site by way of the proposed treatment measures, as presented in the Managing Urban Stormwater: Council Handbook by the EPA (1997). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total suspended solids (TSS) – 80% • Total phosphorus (TP) – 45% • Total nitrogen (TN) – 45% 3) Ensure the nutrient concentration within the harbour is below the default trigger values for an estuarine aquatic ecosystem as presented in the ANZECC/ARMCANZ 2000 guidelines. The adopted trigger values are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total phosphorus (TP) – 30 µg/L • Total nitrogen (TN) – 300 µg/L <p>The first objective ensures that the pollutant load from the development is less than (or equal to) that associated with the pre-development conditions and therefore should result in similar health, or an improvement in the health, of receiving waters.</p> <p>The second objective may be considered generic. However, it is a typical objective adopted for such developments.</p>

		<p>The third objective ensures that the health of the receiving waters is not negatively impacted.</p> <p>The consideration of these three treatment objectives as part of the treatment train design is in accordance with current best practice.</p>
33	<p>Water quality targets to support the NSW Water Quality Objectives (WQOs) should be developed instead of adopting load reduction targets. The Risk-Based Framework for Considering Waterway Health Outcomes in Strategic Land-use Planning Decisions (OEH & EPA, 2017) is a protocol that can be used to ensure the community's environmental values and uses for waterways are recognised and integrated into land-use planning decisions. The Modification should identify opportunities to adopt this framework, including the development of water quality targets and management responses to support the WQOs. A copy of this framework can be obtained at: http://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/Water_pollution/policy.htm.</p>	<p>As noted above, the load reduction targets are one of three objectives that have been adopted for the stormwater treatment strategy.</p> <p>An approach similar to that outlined in <i>Risk-Based Framework for Considering Waterway Health Outcomes in Strategic Land-use Planning Decisions</i> (OEH & EPA, 2017) was followed during preparation of the report titled, <i>Shell Cove Boat Harbour: Section 96 Modification of Consent 95/133 – Support Information</i>, prepared in December 2005 by Patterson Britton and Partners.</p> <p>This included a mass balance modelling approach to predict nutrient concentrations according to MUSIC model results and expected tidal flushing rates.</p> <p>We have reviewed the risk-based framework (OEH & EPA, 2017) and make the following comments:</p> <p><u>Step 1: Establish Context</u> The majority of the tasks required for this step have been completed as part of the abovementioned report prepared in December 2005 by Patterson Britton and Partners. The report identified water quality objectives for the Boat Harbour in the form of nutrient concentration trigger values (refer to Objective 3 listed above).</p> <p><u>Step 2: Effects-based assessment</u> This is undertaken to quantify how the land-use activity will potentially change the health of the waterway.</p> <p>Shellharbour Swamp, a relatively degraded water body, was originally on the site of the proposed Boat Harbour. The Boat Harbour will be a new and very different environment to what was there originally. Quantifying any change in the condition of the harbour is not possible.</p> <p>MUSIC has been used to model the development. Stormwater treatment measures have been adopted throughout the development.</p> <p>To assess Objective 3 relating to the nutrient concentration trigger values, the methodology outlined in the report prepared in December 2005 by Patterson Britton and Partners was again followed and applied</p>

		<p>to the latest MUSIC model results.</p> <p>Based on the latest stormwater treatment strategy and using data exported from the MUSIC model the predicted 80th percentile nutrient concentrations in the harbour are expected to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Total phosphorus (TP) – 20 µg/L • Total nitrogen (TN) – 244 µg/L <p><u>Step 3: Compare against waterway objectives (analysing risk of impact)</u></p> <p>The predicted concentrations determined in Step 2 are below the adopted trigger values for Objective 3 noted above.</p> <p><u>Step 4: Strategic impact assessment (evaluating risks based on feasibility)</u></p> <p>This involves evaluating the risks of impacts of the land-use activity on the waterway based on the feasibility of achieving the intended outcomes of each management response.</p> <p>It is feasible to install the proposed stormwater treatment measures.</p> <p><u>Step 5: Design and implementation</u></p> <p>This involves detailed planning of specific controls or treatment measures to achieve the intended outcomes of the chosen management response.</p> <p>The various development precincts are at different stages of development so the status of this step varies throughout the development.</p> <p>*** Note the above breakdown of the framework steps has focused on water quality Objective 3 to align with the comments from NSW EPA. However, it is also appropriate to include Objectives 1 and 2 as part of these steps. The proposed stormwater treatment strategy results in all three objectives being met.</p>
34	A change to housing density and diversity could cause increases in flow event peaks while also increasing the loads of nutrients and sediment delivered to waterways, if not managed appropriately.	As shown above, the proposed treatment measures will manage stormwater run-off appropriately. There will be no increase in nutrient or sediment loads to waterways.
35	The Modification seeks to remove bio-retention swales in favour of gross pollutant traps and tertiary treatment devices. The Modification should ensure that specific controls or treatment measures will deliver improvements in the health of receiving waters. Justification for the removal or inclusion of specific controls or treatment measures should be provided. This should include details of any arrangements to ensure that specific controls or treatment measures are monitored and maintained to meet the desired levels of performance.	Primarily for maintenance reasons Council has requested that bio-retention swales be removed from the stormwater treatment strategy. Other changes have been made to ensure the strategy aligns with current best practice. The main change that has occurred compared to the original strategy is that treatment systems have been configured in off-line arrangements where possible, and have been sized to treat

		<p>frequent flows associated with minor storm events only.</p> <p>The Modification aside, the objectives of the stormwater treatment strategy have always been as noted above and therefore, specific controls and treatment measures will be in place to ensure that the health of receiving waters is not compromised.</p> <p>A monitoring and maintenance program will be developed for all stormwater treatment measures that form part of the development. This program will ensure that the measures are monitored and maintained to ensure that the treatment objectives are met. Significant investigation has been undertaken and information provided to Council regarding maintenance regimes and costs.</p>
36	A change to housing density and diversity could cause increases in sewage loads. The Modification should ensure that there is adequate capacity in the existing sewage system to cater for any additional load and the system's environmental performance will not be compromised. This includes sewage overflows from any sewage pumping station and discharges from any associated wastewater treatment plant. The EPA's policy is that for new systems, there should be no pollution of waters as a result of sewage overflows from the reticulation systems during dry weather and overflows during wet weather should be avoided.	Noted. This will be undertaken as a discussion with Sydney Water to ensure that there is sufficient capacity within the sewage system. See responses to Sydney Water below.
Heritage Council of NSW		
37	The proposed development is located in the vicinity of the State Heritage Register listed item Bass Point Reserve, Boolwaroo Parade, Shell Cove (SHR No 01896). Bass Point Reserve is of state heritage significance for its: Aboriginal and European values; pre- and post-contact history; and natural and maritime heritage.	Noted.
38	The documentation submitted with the application includes a report dated August 2017 prepared by Ethos Urban which states there are no identified European heritage elements, however, an indigenous midden site with 'relatively high' archaeological value is located south of the mouth of the Boat Harbour, and is to be retained and protected on the site. The report further states that the proposed modifications do not alter DPE's original assessment and recommendations.	Noted.
39	It should be noted that the 2011 approval of the original concept plan preceded the 2013 listing of the Bass Point Reserve on the SHR. The original assessment, therefore, did not take into consideration the impacts of the proposal on the SHR listed values of Bass Point Reserve.	Noted.
40	The modified proposal could potentially impact on significant views from and to the Bass Point Reserve. It is, therefore, recommended that a Heritage Impact Assessment (HIS) should be prepared in accordance with the guidelines in the NSW Heritage Manual that provides an assessment of the impact on the significance of heritage items in the vicinity. The HIS must include a visual impact assessment that identifies significant views to and from the SHR item, assesses impact of the proposal on these views and provides recommendations to mitigate these impacts. These recommendations should be included as consent conditions.	<p>GML Heritage has prepared a Heritage Impact Assessment to accompany this RtS (Appendix F). The HIS has been prepared in accordance with the methodology for assessing and reporting heritage impacts set out in Statement of Heritage Impact published in the New South Wales Heritage Manual by the Heritage Office.</p> <p>GML Heritage determined that:</p> <p><i>"The proposed built form, and proposed plantings, will be visible from Bass Point Reserve but lies outside direct views from Bass Point to Shellharbour. In comparison to the approved plan, the modified Concept Plan provides a taller element but its apparent bulk has been</i></p>

		<p>reduced by narrowing it from this perspective. The potential impact of the Concept Plan is not substantially different from the approved scheme, which is minor".</p> <p>Therefore, GML Heritage conclude:</p> <p><i>"The changes proposed have similar impacts on the nearby heritage items and conservation area to the approved Concept Plan. No significant additional impacts arise from the proposed modification".</i></p>
41	<p>The proposed development is unlikely to have a direct impact on any known shipwrecks or maritime heritage sites. However, it is unclear from the provided documentation if any statement of heritage impact was prepared for the foreshore development along the eastern side of the study area. There is potential for at least one historic shipwreck (<i>Screw Steamer Kiltobanks wrecked Shellharbour 1924</i>) to be located within the vicinity of the study area. Accordingly, any further development along the foreshore and beach areas must take into consideration potential impact to shipwrecks and other maritime related infrastructure sites including wharfs, jetties, piers, etc.</p>	<p>The Modifications do not involve any works along the foreshore, beyond the existing site boundaries established under the Concept Approval. Therefore, consideration of potential impacts to shipwrecks and other maritime related infrastructure is not relevant, and has not been addressed as part of the heritage assessment.</p>
42	<p>If any further excavation with potential to impact on terrestrial or maritime archaeology is proposed as a result of these modifications an archaeological assessment should be prepared to investigate both the colonial and the maritime history of the area. The assessment should document any significant historic and maritime archaeological sites (above and below water, under the sea bed, and potentially under land fill where there has been any foreshore reclamation). The seawalls along the boundary of the site are to be included in this assessment. A suitably qualified and experienced historic / maritime archaeologist should be employed to undertake this assessment, which must be completed prior to the commencement of any works. Any archaeological sites identified should be fully documented and recorded to archival standards, including engineering quality standard recordings and photographs. A permit will likely be required to disturb any archaeological sites.</p>	<p>No excavation beyond that anticipated by the Concept Approval is proposed as part of these Modifications. Therefore, further archaeological assessment has not been undertaken as part of the heritage assessment.</p> <p>The Office of Environment and Heritage reviewed the proposed modifications and raised no issues - refer to OEH submission on the Department's major project website.</p>
Roads & Maritime Services		
43	<p>A traffic impact study (TIS) is required. As a guide Table 2.1 of the RTA Guide to Traffic Generating Developments outlines the key issues that may be considered in preparing a TIS.</p>	<p>Chris Millet (Manager, Land Use at RMS South Region) confirmed in an email dated 19th December 2016, that:</p> <p><i>"RMS has reviewed the information provided in the attached traffic report. RMS is satisfied with the consultant's reasoning which indicates the modification is only likely to increase traffic generation by 2%. Based on this, RMS agrees with the consultants' statement that this is only a minor increase and is satisfied it will not significantly impact on the state road network (including the approved arrangements for modified traffic signals at Shellharbour Road, Wattle Street, Addison Street and Harbour Boulevard).</i></p> <p><i>Based on the above, RMS does not require any further traffic analysis for the S75W and has no objections to the modification in principle."</i></p>
44	<p>The concept plans provided are not detailed enough for design to make a proper assessment on the impacts to the state classified road network. Impacts will be assessed against current standards and traffic efficiency requirements when further details are provided.</p>	<p>See above.</p>
Sydney Water		

45	Sydney Water has a servicing strategy in place and is in the process of delivering more trunk infrastructure in the Precinct. The developer is required to deliver lead-in mains as development occurs in the proposed site.	Frasers will continue to deliver lead-in mains as development occurs across the precinct.
46	The proposed development has increased the indicated dwelling yield from the original 1058 to 1566, which exceeds the maximum capacity of the water and wastewater servicing in the precinct. It was determined that the existing infrastructure and works being delivered could service up to a maximum of about 1420 dwellings within the precinct. Therefore, Sydney Water is unable to commit to servicing the proposed 1566 dwellings as the essential water and wastewater assets delivered to date have only been designed to accommodate 1420 dwellings.	Noted. We understand that the existing wastewater infrastructure has been designed to deliver up to 1,420 dwellings. Frasers will continue to engage with Sydney Water's strategic planners to ensure appropriate additional servicing strategies are introduced to ensure capacity to achieve the proposed yield.
47	Sydney Water suggests the Department include a condition of consent for this application that the proponent must discuss with Sydney Water, and lodge a Section 73 Compliance certificate prior to development commencement in each stage, in order to determine service demand, infrastructure requirements for the specific development stages.	This is accepted.