

## Ropes Creek Employment Precinct Response to Submissions



Issue Raised		Response
Department of Environment and Climate Change		
	<b>Aboriginal Heritage</b>	
1.	<p>DECCW notes that the community consultation has been conducted using DECCW's current Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010. The Department of Planning has previously indicated to DECCW that the Interim Community Consultation Requirements for Applicants as listed in the Draft Guidelines for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment and Community Consultation are the relevant guidelines to be used for Part 3A projects.</p> <p>The project should have been advertised in a newspaper distributed in the area in which the project is conducted. Rather, the project was advertised in the Koori Mail which is a nationally distributed newspaper and not readily available to some Aboriginal Communities. The DECCW recommends that the project be readvertised in keeping with this requirement to ensure that relevant Aboriginal community groups are made aware of the project.</p>	<p>Jacfin has now consulted with all relevant aboriginal groups and an onsite inspection in which all groups were represented has been held.</p> <p>GML's assessment report was prepared in accordance with the Draft Guidelines for Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Impact Assessment and Community Consultation (2005) for assessments under Part 3A of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. These guidelines require that Aboriginal community consultation be undertaken during an assessment and state that the 'Interim Community Consultation Requirements for Applicants' (December 2004) provide <u>guidance</u> for consultation.</p> <p>Since these draft guidelines were issued in 2005, DECCW has subsequently updated their requirements for consultation in the '<i>Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010</i>'. DECCW itself acknowledges that these 2010 requirements replace the 2004 '<i>Interim Community Consultation Requirements for Applicants</i>' (see page 1 of the 2010 guidelines).</p> <p>To that end, GML conducted Aboriginal community consultation for this project in accordance with the <i>Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010</i>, which are widely considered to be current best practice for Aboriginal community consultation in NSW. We are therefore surprised by DECCW's advice that Aboriginal community consultation for this project should have been conducted in accordance with the <i>Interim Community Consultation Requirements for Applicants</i> from 2004, given that their own document from 2010 ('<i>Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010</i>') explicitly states that it replaces the Interim Requirements.</p>

	<p>Furthermore, as a general rule, the <i>Interim Community Consultation Requirements for Applicants</i> from 2004 are less prescriptive than DECCW's 2010 consultation guidelines. None the less, references to the 2010 guidelines have now been removed from GML's current assessment report on Ropes Creek.</p> <p>We disagree with DECCW's assertion that Aboriginal community groups in Western Sydney may not have access to the Koori Mail and that advertisement in a local paper may have achieved a greater community response.</p> <p>The Koori Mail is acknowledged and referenced by the Aboriginal community in Western Sydney as the key newspaper through which they may become aware of Aboriginal cultural heritage projects in their area. We are also aware, through our extensive professional experience in this region, that the Koori Mail is regularly used and available to Aboriginal communities in Western Sydney. Given the considerable size of the study area borders two LGA's, in this instance, a small local newspaper in one part of Western Sydney (for example the 'Penrith Star') would have a smaller geographical circulation than the Koori Mail; and if this approach had been used, key stakeholders who live outside the circulation of a particular smaller local paper may not have been reached and identified through the advertising process.</p> <p>Six Aboriginal stakeholder groups registered an interest in the project through the advertising process or were contacted outright at the commencement of the project. This range of interest is consistent with similar projects in the Western Sydney region.</p> <p>We contacted DECCW to obtain a list of known Aboriginal stakeholders in the Western Sydney region. All of these groups were invited to participate in the consultation process. GML also asked the Deerubbin Local Aboriginal Council if there were any further Aboriginal groups that should be contacted as part of the consultation process.</p> <p>Our report clearly demonstrates that effective community consultation with Aboriginal community stakeholders has occurred and will be properly considered in determining impacts and future management options for Aboriginal heritage.</p> <p>We now believe that full community consultation is being implemented and therefore we do not believe there is any need or requirement for re-advertisement.</p>
--	---

2.	<p>DECCW recommends that Commitment 13 of the SoCs for the draft Concept Plan be amended to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That an Aboriginal Heritage Management Plan be prepared for lands to be zoned E2 Environmental Conservation Zone where no impacts from development are expected to occur.</li> <li>• That Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessments be undertaken and submitted with each future project application.</li> </ul>	<p>The E2 zones have already been zoned as such under the SEPP (WSEA) 2009.</p> <p>In terms of the E2 zone, works will not impact on these areas. These zones could be considered in the future by the management authority within the State Government who will be responsible for the Ropes Creek corridor.</p> <p>GML has updated the Heritage Assessment report recommendations (Section 7.1.2) to say for the developable areas outside the E2 conservation zone, Aboriginal Heritage Impact Assessments should be undertaken and submitted with each future project application.</p> <p>Jacfin's Project Application complies with the DECCW recommendation for impact assessment for future applications.</p>
3.	<p>DECCW does not endorse monitoring of earthworks because of the potential OH&amp;S issues that could arise. DECCW recommends that consideration be given to providing the Aboriginal community representatives the opportunity to collect any surface objects prior to earthworks commencing. The SOC should specify the storage location for any Aboriginal objects collected during the course of monitoring.</p>	<p>Jacfin and its contractors will undertake all earthworks in strict compliance with OH&amp;S requirements and as such DECCW's concerns are unwarranted. However, Jacfin will accept a condition of consent that Aboriginal community representatives be permitted to collect surface objects prior to excavation.</p> <p>The storage location of Aboriginal objects can be negotiated with the Registered Aboriginal Parties through a Care Agreement for Aboriginal objects, at the Aboriginal Heritage Management Plan stage of the project and preceding the collection of surface artefacts from these locations. Our report has been updated to reflect this (see Recommendations – Section 7.1.2 of the heritage report).</p>
	<i>Flora and Fauna Assessment</i>	
4.	<p>The proponent should revise the Flora and Fauna Assessment to include an assessment of potential impacts on the Cumberland Land Snail.</p>	<p>Whelans Insites has undertaken an assessment of potential impact on the Cumberland Land Snail (CLS). Whelans notes that there is no suitable habitat for the CLS on the site and that no snails or dead shells were recorded during site investigations.</p>
5.	<p>The assessment should outline the methods undertaken for the flora and fauna survey.</p>	<p>Specific surveys and investigations for flora and fauna on the subject site at Ropes Creek have included inspections of the site on at least three occasions in 2008 and 2010 by the principal author of the Report involving inter alia:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• driven inspections of the whole of the subject land;</li> <li>• walked inspections of the watercourses and drainage lines, farm dams and patches of trees;</li> <li>• the opportunistic recording of fauna species, native plants and features of potential</li> </ul>

		<p>habitat value (e.g. hollow-bearing trees, dams etc); and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• each of those inspections lasted a period of approximately 2-3 hours; and</li> <li>• a detailed survey of the subject site for flora and fauna by two Environmental InSites staff on the 23rd of July 2010 involving walked and driven inspections of much of the land over a period of 4 hours, with the collection of additional records of flora and fauna species, a comprehensive species list and dedicated searches for threatened biota and/or their habitats.</li> </ul> <p>Refer to the statement prepared by Whelans Insites at <b>Attachment C</b>.</p>
6.	<p><b>Section 4.4 of the report states that the vegetation on the site cannot be regarded as an example of the EEC 'River-flat Eucalypt Forest on Coastal Floodplains' as it is not on a coastal floodplain. However, 'Coastal floodplains' includes any floodplains below the escarpment of Great Dividing Range (as stated in the DECCW Identification Guidelines for this EEC). In addition, the list of LGAs in the final determination for this EEC includes the Blacktown LGA. The F&amp;F Assessment should be reviewed against this advice.</b></p>	<p>Whilst the Final Determination of the NSW Scientific Committee to list Cumberland Plain Woodland (CPW) as a "critically endangered ecological community" (CEEC) in the TSC Act does not specifically "include minimal condition requirements", the small patches of Forest Red Gums in pasture on the subject site at Ropes Creek have a groundcover which is predominantly of introduced pasture grasses or oats. Given those circumstances, those small patches (comprising approximately 7 trees) are more accurately described as 'paddock trees in pasture' than an example of the CPW community.</p> <p>It is the opinion of Whelans that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• even were those paddock trees to be considered an example of the CPW community, their loss will not be regarded as of significance with respect to the survival or rehabilitation of the CPW community;</li> <li>• the substantial rehabilitation area adjoining Ropes Creek on Lot 5 (occupying the E2 – zoned land), will include areas of CPW rehabilitation; and</li> <li>• the Hollow-bearing Tree Protocol, which is included in the EIAR, will involve the salvage of tree-hollows from those specimen. In addition, it is recommended that the remainder of the trees be salvaged and either chipped for use in the Offset Area along Ropes Creek or used as brush matting and logs in rehabilitation areas.</li> </ul> <p>It is noted that the small patches of trees on the subject site at Ropes Creek do not conform to the federally listed CEEC known as 'Cumberland Plain Shale Woodlands and Shale-gravel Transition Forest', as the patches (even cumulatively) are not 0.5ha or greater in area and do not support a groundcover that is more than 30% native. The EPBC Act (sensibly) does contain "condition thresholds" with respect inter alia to "ecological communities".</p>

NSW Office of Water		
7.	Section 6.3.2 of the EA indicates that the Ropes Creek corridor has been separated into a single lot so that the corridor can be managed and maintained by one entity. The NOW supports this approach and recommends the east-west E2 zoned land is also managed and maintained by one entity rather than contained within the development lots and the responsibility of the relevant land owner.	The Project Application seeks approval for the subdivision off of a 7 ha area of land along Ropes Creek for the rehabilitation of that land as part of Jacfin's Biodiversity Offset Strategy recently approved by the Department of Planning. However, the Project Application does not seek approval for the subdivision off of the east-west E2 land. This will be the subject of future applications as and when the land surrounding that land is developed.
8.	NOW recommends the stream banks (northern and southern tributaries) are rehabilitated using a natural solution. The rehabilitation of riparian land along Ropes Creek and the northern and southern tributaries should emulate the local vegetation community.	<p>The regeneration of Jacfin's land along Ropes Creek has recently been approved by the Department of Planning as part of the Biodiversity Offset Strategy relating to MP.</p> <p>The rehabilitation of the northern and southern tributaries will be the subject of further applications beyond this Stage 1 development.</p>
9.	<p>The NOW recommends:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A suitable management edge be provided to clearly distinguish between the landscape areas and E2 zones</li> <li>• The landscape areas complement and be consistent with the plantings in the E2 zone and consist of native species endemic to the local community so as to further improve biodiversity values.</li> </ul>	Jacfin agrees to accept this requirement as a condition of consent.
10.	Road crossings should be consistent with what is currently being proposed on the adjoining Oakdale site and provide for terrestrial and aquatic fauna movement.	Jacfin agrees to accept as a condition of consent that road crossings be designed to provide for terrestrial and aquatic fauna movement in consultation with NOW.
11.	Clarification is required as to whether basement carpark are proposed and if the proposal will require dewatering?	No basement parking is proposed.
12.	<p>The NOW recommends the Statement of commitments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The proposal will rehabilitate the watercourses on site (where required) to mimic naturalised systems)</li> <li>❖ The proposal will rehabilitate a minimum 50m wide riparian corridor (measured from top of bank) along either side of Ropes Creek to emulate the local vegetation community</li> </ul>	<p>Jacfin will rehabilitate its land along Ropes Creek in accordance with its Biodiversity Offset Strategy as approved by the Department of Planning as part of a separate project application for land in Erskine Park.</p> <p>The development of the land adjoining the east-west tributaries and E2 land will be the subject future applications and any required rehabilitation of that land will be appropriately</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ The proposal will rehabilitate a minimum 30m wide riparian corridor (measured from top of bank) along either side of the northern tributary to emulate the local vegetation community</li> <li>❖ The proposal will rehabilitate a minimum 30m wide riparian corridor (measured from top of bank) along either side of the southern tributary to emulate the local vegetation community</li> </ul>	addressed in these applications.
<b>Sydney Water</b>		
13.	Sydney Water raises no objection to the interim servicing strategy proposed and notes that the Sydney Water ultimate servicing strategy for the area will eventually service the Concept Plan area.	Noted.
<b>TransGrid</b>		
14.	TransGrid enclosed a plan indicating the likely area (subject to final survey) that TransGrid believes is required for the Western Sydney Supply Project (WSSP) and anticipated substation augmentation. Jacfin's current development does not take into account the fact that a part of the land will be acquired by TransGrid for the WSSP.	<p>TransGrid has not made an executive decision regarding its "anticipated substation augmentation" and as such its proposals are still in the early planning stages.</p> <p>Should acquisition of the land be required this should be undertaken as a separate process without influence or frustration of the planning process. Nor should Transgrid's early plans, which may or may not proceed, prevent the objectives of SEPP WSEA being achieved, in particular job generation.</p> <p>The Jacfin proposal is consistent with SEPP (WSEA) 2009 and should be assessed as such. Approval of the location of the north/south regional road is sought in Concept only. The final location can be agreed with the DoP in a future Project Application, similar to that which occurred with the Erskine Park Link Road. It is noted that the Stage 1 PA is independent of the north/south regional road and as such this issue raised by Transgrid does not prevent the DoP from approving the Project Application or Concept Plan.</p>
15.	TransGrid suggests the DoP invite Jacfin to submit a revised proposal that avoids any intrusion into land which will be required shortly for critical state infrastructure. Such a revised proposal can then be appropriately considered by all relevant agencies.	During consultation meetings with TransGrid, Jacfin was informed that TransGrid would amend its proposed expansion of the substation to eliminate or limit its impact on Jacfin's Project Application. However, Jacfin has not yet received any such amended plan from TransGrid.

		<p>Consistent with this commitment, TransGrid should revise its proposed expansion of the substation to limit the impact on Jacfin's application and in particular Jacfin's proposed road pattern. This road pattern is critical to the development of Jacfin's land as proposed in the Concept Plan.</p> <p>In circumstances where TransGrid either cannot or has not obtained approval to exercise its compulsory acquisition powers to acquire Jacfin's land for the proposed expansion of the substation it would be highly inappropriate for the Project Application and Concept Plan to be refused merely based on the assertion by TransGrid's valuer that it may in future require part of Jacfin's land that is zoned for General Industrial (i.e. not Special Activities) purposes. The Project Application, which only applies to part of the land, and Concept Plan must be assessed on their merits irrespective of TransGrid's asserted possible future need for part of the subject land or its desire to redesign the intersection of the north south regional road with Old Wallgrove Road.</p>
<b>Western Sydney Conservation Alliance Inc</b>		
<b>16.</b>	<b>The development encroaches too close to Rope's Creek. The NSW government negotiated with other land owners a far more extensive riparian zone on the opposite side of Ropes Creek when considering the Erskine Park employment lands. We urge the government to require a substantially broader riparian zone than is proposed in the Concept Plan on exhibition.</b>	<p>The Erskine Park Biodiversity Strategy allowed landowners within Erskine Park to clear significant areas of vegetation. Land owned by Jacfin within Erskine Park was cleared grazing land and the development of that land required little clearing of native vegetation. Accordingly, Jacfin is not a party to the Erskine Park Biodiversity Offset Strategy.</p> <p>The Project Application and Concept Plan do not propose clearing of native vegetation along the Ropes Creek corridor.</p> <p>It is noted that the Ropes Creek Corridor is already subject to a separate Biodiversity Offset strategy and will be rehabilitated under that strategy.</p>
<b>Owner of 55 Weaver Street, Erskine Park</b>		
<b>17.</b>	<b>Objects to the development on acoustic grounds. Requests that the developer be required to erect noise suppression walls if the development is approved.</b>	The development meets relevant operation noise guidelines and no acoustic barriers are required.
<b>Blacktown City Council</b>		
<b>18.</b>	<b>Council insists that the following provisions be reinstated as mandatory controls for the development of Ropes Creek Industrial / Employment Estate:</b>	Jacfin will accept these requirements as conditions of consent. However, the minimum lots size should not apply where an application is made for subdivision of land for the purpose of a "neighbourhood shop" or similar uses to service the local workforce and businesses (as

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>❖ Minimum allotment size for all industrial / warehouse lots in a Torrents title subdivision shall be 5,000sqm</li> <li>❖ Car parking provisions should be in accordance with Blacktown DCP 2006 and / or SEPP 59 – Eastern Creek Precinct Plan (Stage 3)</li> <li>❖ Private open space in each development shall be 5% of the total GFA of office component or minimum of 50sqm, whichever is greater to a maximum area of 100sqm</li> <li>❖ Stormwater, drainage and WSUD provisions should be in accordance with Council's draft Water Cycle Management DCP.</li> </ul>	defined in the WSEA SEPP).
19.	Objection is raised to the amount of car spaces provided on site as it is not in accordance with the provisions of the Eastern Creek Precinct Plan, dated 14 December 2005, in this regard, 224 overall parking spaces are required for "Building 1" and 178 overall spaces for "Building 2".	Jacfin agrees to accept these requirements as conditions of consent.
20.	Section 3.1.5 of the Stormwater Management & Trunk Drainage Strategy by Brown Consulting states "The results in Table 3 indicate that using the runoff parameters specified by Brown Consulting in Table 1 and used in the XP- RAFTS model generates larger flow estimates (30% for 20 year ARI and 12.5% for 100 year ARI) as using the Probabilistic Rational Method with Blacktown City Council specified parameters. Therefore at this stage, as a conservative approach, it is appropriate to use the XP-RAFTS." Council believes that this approach is not conservative as it leads to lower detention volumes than if the lower existing flow rates such as those derived using the Probabilistic Rational Method were used. Consequently a higher Mannings "n" for pervious areas should be utilised and a review of other factors undertaken to provide lower existing (pre-development) flow rates than currently determined using RAFTS.	<p>Brown Consulting considers that the parameters used in the RAFTS modelling are appropriate for the site and provide a more accurate assessment of runoff peak flows.</p> <p>Brown Consulting has reviewed detention basins sizing with the lowered Permissible Site Discharge calculated with the Probabilistic Rational Method. With the detention basin surface areas proposed in its report, the revised detention volumes and the proposed bio-retention basins can be achieved and as such, are considered adequate at the Project Approval stage. Nonetheless, Jacfin agrees to accept as a condition of consent a requirement to undertake further review and present results at the CC phase for the Stage 1 project and for subsequent applications for the remaining Concept Plan area. This review will include consideration of higher Mannings "n" values for pervious areas in the RAFTS modelling.</p>



21.	<b>Council rejects the proposed methodology of water quality being controlled in regional basins. Each lot must undertake its own water quality treatment to achieve the targets onsite and the water runoff from roads and open space treated in regional basins where provided.</b>	<p>Jacfin's Stage 1 Project Application includes onsite water quality treatment facilities for that lot.</p> <p>Jacfin agrees to accept a condition of consent that requires submission of a revised stormwater concept plan which conforms to Council's guidelines with any further application within the Concept Plan area.</p> <p>Jacfin agrees to accept a condition of consent that it undertake <i>MUSIC</i> modelling at the CC stage for the Stage 1 project to confirm the recommended water quality provisions. The results of this modelling will be presented along with the revised stormwater concept plan.</p>
22.	<b>Council rejects the proposed methodology of water quantity being only controlled through detention in regional basins. As a minimum the detention storage requirements of basin 3 and the eastern half of basin 4 are to be provided on-site with the future industrial and not as a regional basin. The western half of what was basin 4 is then to be directed to basin 5. Council's preference however is that each site provides its own on-site detention and the regional basins only provide storage for runoff from the roads and open space.</b>	<p>See above.</p> <p>Brown Consulting's approach for the applied methodology in the Stormwater Detention Strategy is consistent with the previous projects for the neighbouring industrial developments, located within the Stage 3 Release Area of the Eastern Creek Precinct SEPP 59 Economic and Employment Lands.</p> <p>In all these projects regional detention basins were proposed to attenuate peak flows from the developed catchment, which is in accordance with Blacktown City Council's SEPP 59, Employment Land Precinct Plan (September 2005) and Eastern Creek Precinct Planning Policy.</p> <p>Jacfin agrees to accept a condition of consent that requires submission of a revised stormwater concept plan which conforms to Council's draft Water Cycle Management DCP with any further application within the Concept Plan area. By that stage the draft DCP may have been exhibited, adopted and/or amended.</p>
23.	<b>To account for Climate Change Impacts the rainfall intensity is to be increased by 10% in the post developed case.</b>	<p>Jacfin agrees to accept a condition of consent that requires incorporation of the required 10% increase of rainfall for the 100 year ARI flood due to Climate Change for the post developed case in the CC stage for the Stage 1, project and in any further project applications within the Concept Plan area.</p>
24.	<b>The industrial sites are to be filled to a minimum of 500mm above the 1 in 100 year flood levels with 10% increase in rainfall.</b>	<p>Jacfin agrees to accept a minimum freeboard of 500mm to the 100yr ARI flood level including a 10% increase in rainfall for floor levels. The floor levels for the Stage 1 project</p>

	<b>No filling is permitted within the 1 in 100 year flood extents of Ropes Creek.</b>	will be confirmed at the CC stage. The issue of filling in the floodplain is a merit issue and will be addressed in any future application for development in the Ropes Creek floodplain.
<b>25.</b>	<b>A Flood Management Plan is to be prepared for the subdivision that addresses the impacts of flooding including the PMF, flood hazard, whether flood evacuation is needed and if so safe evacuation routes.</b>	Jacfin agrees to accept this as a pre-commencement condition of consent.
<b>26.</b>	<b>A DRAINS electronic model must be provided and approved to demonstrate that the pipe network can safely carry the 20 year ARI storm flows without surcharge. Blockage factors should be applied to all inlet pits with lintels / grates at 0.5 for sags and 0.2 for pits on grade. For grate only inlets the blockage factor should be 0.5 minimum.</b>	Jacfin agrees to accept this as a condition of consent and undertake the detailed design of the pipe network at the CC stage for the Stage 1 project using <i>DRAINS</i> modelling.
<b>27.</b>	<b>The extent and width of the riparian zone associated with each of the creeks is to be confirmed with DECCW and whether an additional 10m buffer strip is required each side. DECCW requirements for creek crossings and pipe discharge points are also to be included.</b>	See response a point 12 above.
<b>28.</b>	<b>A minimum of 80% of the non-potable water use for the proposed development is to be met through rainwater, unless physically impossible to achieve. Details of realistic non-potable water usage rates are to be provided.</b>	Jacfin agrees to accept this as a condition of consent.
<b>29.</b>	<b>A hydraulic engineer is to prepare a preliminary non-potable water supply, pipe and fixture plan for each development site.</b>	Jacfin agrees to accept this as a pre-commencement condition of consent.
<b>30.</b>	<b>All street tree planting must comply to Blacktown Council's street tree planting guidelines, specifically RTA safety requirements.</b>	Cloustons has prepared the landscape guidelines in accordance with Blacktown Council's street tree planting guidelines and the RTA's safety requirements. It is noted that Blacktown's Guidelines are a generic document which does not provide specific guidance on street tree planting. Cloustons has updated their guidelines to reflect this.
<b>31.</b>	<b>Council no longer accepts the provision of any Eucalyptus species within Council land (or land to be dedicated to Council).</b>	Noted. No Eucalypts are proposed within the public domain.
<b>32.</b>	<b>Proposed street tree locations will need to adhere to current practices with regards to clearance zones and frangible / non-frangible species. Details of clearance zones from the trafficable</b>	Street sections were provided in Appendix O of the EAR which provide details of clearance zones.

	lanes shall be provided.	Jacfin agrees to accept a condition of consent requiring details of street tree planting to be submitted to the relevant approval authority prior to installation of street trees.
33.	The proposal lacks detail on how pedestrians/cyclists will travel to and within the precinct.	Pedestrian and Cycle links are provided in drawing CP012 Circulation Plan at Appendix B of the EAR.
34.	The proposal lacks detail on its recreation and transport relationship with Sydney Parklands.	The proposed cycle and pedestrian paths will connect to regional paths which lead to the Sydney Parklands.
	<b>Sydney Catchment Authority</b>	
35.	The EA states that the Sydney Catchment Authority was consulted on 19 August 2010 and SCA's main concern relates to the pipe crossings. The EA notes Jacfin's response as: Advised that the regional road layout has been designed to be consistent with the WSEA SEPP. SCA has no record of any consultation with Jacfin or the authors of the EA (JBA Planning). This single matter does not represent all the issues of concern to the SCA.	Mark Tooker of APP contacted and spoke to Neil Abraham on 19 <sup>th</sup> August as an initial consultation. He advised SCA of the forthcoming application, how it would relate to the pipeline and that formal consultation would occur in the near future.
36.	<p>As Warragamba – Prospect Pipelines 1 &amp; 2 are critical public infrastructure for Sydney's drinking water supply, it is essential that appropriate measures are implemented to minimise the risk of damage to the pipelines and associated corridor.</p> <p>The SCA requests that the following condition be included in any approval of the development:</p> <p>The proponent shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Ensure that the Works do not damage the SCA's water supply infrastructure or reduce the safety of the operation of the infrastructure; and</li> <li>b) Repair, or pay reasonable costs associated with repairing SCA infrastructure that is damaged by the Project.</li> </ul>	Jacfin Pty Ltd is willing to accept the nominated conditions with the exception of condition c) as it is not considered necessary that the SCA infrastructure will need to be relocated to accommodate the proposed development.

	<p>c) Relocate, or pay reasonable costs associated with relocating any infrastructure that the SCA considers needs to be relocated as a result of the Project.</p>	
37.	<p><b>Security fencing for development adjacent to the Warragamba to Prospect Pipelines :</b></p> <p>a) Chain wire fencing must be erected along all common boundaries between the development and the SCA's pipeline corridor;</p> <p>b) Fencing to be constructed to AS/NZ 1725:2003 – Chain-link Fabric Security Fencing Gates, Appendix A, Type 2 – T-B/B-T; and</p> <p>c) Fences are to be permanent and adequately maintained.</p>	<p>Details of security fencing along the southern boundary will be provided with the relevant Project Applications.</p>
38.	<p><b>The SCA requests that any approval of this development include an appropriate condition requiring post development stormwater flows to match pre-development stormwater flows and for the SCA to be consulted in the preparation of the Stormwater Management Plan.</b></p>	<p>The Stormwater Management Plan submitted with the application proposes to manage stormwater flows in accordance with this requirement.</p>
39.	<p><b>The Concept Plan includes indicative plans for cut and fill earthworks. Areas of excavation are indicated along the boundary of the Pipelines corridor. The SCA requests that any approval of this development include an appropriate condition requiring the SCA to be provided with details and plans of proposed earthworks, retaining walls and other constructions along the SCA boundary before such works commence and that the SCA is advised in advance of any proposed construction activities close to the boundary of the SCA lands.</b></p>	<p>Earthworks details for development along the southern boundary of the site will be provided with future Project Applications. SCA will have the ability to view and comment on those plans at that time.</p>
40.	<p><b>The Concept Plan includes a regional road running through the site, consistent with the SEPP (WSEA) 2009. The SCA has</b></p>	<p>The proposed network is consistent with the regional road network as depicted is generally consistent with the SEPP (Western Sydney Employment Area) 2009. The plan at Attachment</p>

	recently advised the DoP that this road alignment will create a number of problems for the SCA. Consequently the SCA has separately requested that the DoP further investigate the option of crossing the Pipeland corridor further to the west.	<p>D shows how the road will cross over the pipeline and connect to development located south of the pipeline.</p> <p>The route proposed by SCA would be inconsistent with the SEPP and would mean that the regional road proposed would not connect with existing public roads. It would also be inconsistent with the Goodman development approved to the south.</p>
	<b>Department of Planning</b>	
41.	<b>The Department requests that Jacfin provide clarification concerning the road alignment of Regional Road 1 (RR1) and the Erskine Park Link Road as illustrated in Figure 20 of the EA for the Concept Plan.</b>	<p>Regional Road 1 is based on the SEPP alignment at the points where it enters and exists the site. Internal to the site the road has been slightly realigned so as to avoid constraints within the site.</p> <p>The Erskine Park Link Road is based on the approved RTA alignment (MP06_0166) as opposed to the original proposed alignment – both of which are shown on Figure 4 of the EAR with the black line representing the original SEPP alignment and the blue line showing the actual approved alignment.</p>
	<b>Roads and Traffic Authority</b>	
42.	<b>The RTA has no objection in principle to the proposed Concept Plan layout, developable areas, regional road connections, and indicative staging of the development, however further consultation with the RTA will be required at each stage as subdivision and development progresses through Stages 2, 3, 4 and 5. It is the RTA's preferred option to signalise intersections along regional roads, however this will be subject to further consultation and assessment when Stages 2, 3, 4 and 5 are submitted to the Department and referred to the RTA for comment.</b>	It is understood that each future Project Application will be referred to the RTA.
43.	<b>The DoP shall acquire /purchase the triangle of land located between the proposed temporary road and the proposed Link</b>	We believe that this is an inappropriate condition as it is not within the powers of the Proponent to comply with the condition.

	Road from Lot 166 DP803478 (located to the north of the Transgrid land and easement, and adjacent to chainages CH600.00 and CH800.00 for Road No.1 on Civil Plan, Drawing No 001, Revision B, General Site Layout), following full consultation between the Department and the RTA.	
44.	<p>The RTA gives in principle support for the construction of the temporary road between Old Wallgrove Road and Stage 1 of the Jacfin Ropes Creek development, subject to full consultation with the RTA regarding the timing of its construction and its final location and design being approved by the RTA.</p> <p>The shared path, temporary access and temporary connections to Old Wallgrove Road and the Erskine Park Link Road are to be removed at no cost to the RTA, once the construction of the Erskine Park Link Road has been completed and is operational.</p>	Noted. The proposed design allows for the construction of a shared path.
45.	Stage 1 – No objection raised	Noted
46.	Stage 2 – No objection to the temporary access road arrangements for Stage 2 development on the eastern side of the proposed arterial road and any extension of roads and services from Stage 1 to the eastern portion of Stage 2. Further assessment of the traffic capacity of the temporary road will need to be carried out to determine if it can support the proposed Stage 2 development on the Western side of the proposed arterial road should the Erskine Park Link Road not be constructed at the time of the development of Stage 2.	Noted, further traffic assessments will be submitted with each Project Application.
47.	Stages 3 & 4 - Further assessment of the traffic capacity of the	Noted, further traffic assessments will be submitted with each Project Application.

	temporary road connection to Old Wallgrove Road will need to be carried out for these stages should the Erskine Park Link Road not be constructed when these stages are developed.	
48.	All allotments fronting proposed Arterial Road No. 1 shall have an access denied boundary along the road reserve. All access denied boundaries are to be included in the subdivision plan and on the title of individual allotments. The RTA does not support intermediate left in/left out road connections to proposed Arterial Road No.1 and all access points must be located on side roads.	Noted. The proposed design currently proposes access from local roads consistent with this requirement.
49.	The locations of the indicative bus stops located along Road No. 1 within the development site shall be finalised with the Department of Planning and then design and constructed in accordance with the Concept Plan for Stage 1.	We believe that this issue can be resolved by way of a condition of consent requiring resolution prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate for Stage 1 of the development.
50.	A shared path shall be constructed along the verge of Road No. 1, in accordance with 'Figure 1 – Typical Local Road Section, Site Development Guidelines' and Figure 22 – Local Road Section, page 24, EAR, with the development site to be extended outside the development site to connect to Old Wallgrove Road and is to run parallel to the temporary access road.	Noted, the current design provides for this.