

PAN-494710 / DA 25/498 Sewer Main Rehabilitation – Response to Request for Additional Information

This document has been prepared in response to the Request for Additional Information in relation to DA 25/498 issued via email on 7 March 2025.

| RFI Item | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>Clarification as to the location of the repair and/or replacement section of pipeline proposed. Noting, Section 3.4 of the Statement of Environmental Effects (SEE Rev 1 of 18/12/2025) advises that the pipeline includes “Replacement of section between manholes 11 – 10 as per Section 3.2.2”, and while there is no Section 3.2.2 in the SEE, plans and documentation elsewhere in the application identify the subject section as being repaired between SMH 11 and SMH 12 (not SMH 10 & SMH 11). Accordingly, please update the relevant documentation, including clarifying/confirming what is understood to be repair (and reuse of the existing pipe), or where the pipe is to be replaced. Please also update where the superseded documents are referenced in supporting information.</p> | <p>Section 3.4 of the SEE, Rev 2 has been updated to address this comment, see point 1.</p> <p>The following statement has also been included in Section 3.3.1: “The existing pipe in this section will be removed and disposed offsite.”</p> <p>Please supersede SEE, Rev 1.</p> |
| <p>Updated waterfront land assessment in the SEE and associated information in the Site Environmental Management Plan, where waterfront land includes due consideration of both watercourses (such as riparian corridors) as well as waterbodies, noting the pondage between Thredbo River and Friday Flat Creek is a mapped waterbody.</p> | <p>The waterfront land assessment in Section 5.2 of the SEE, Rev 2 has been updated to include the snowmaking pond.</p> <p>Please supersede SEE, Rev 1.</p> <p>No changes to the SEMP are required.</p> |
| <p>Rationale behind the tree removal. Noting, the information supporting the DA advises that the relined section of pipe will seal against root ingress, and so please explain the</p> | <p>Response provided via email on 7 March 2025, see below.</p> |

| RFI Item | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>necessity to remove trees, including where the roots are advised to be affecting manholes that are not being retained (decommissioned).</p> | <p>The removal is in the interest of pipeline longevity and maintaining a 3m corridor. In each instance I have chosen trees that are either sitting directly onto of or immediately adjacent to the pipeline/manholes. Despite their excellent sales pitch, not even rotaloc is immune to a tree if given time. If we leave the trees, they will be cause of future pipe displacement and subsequent breaks, leaks and bellies.</p> |
| <p>Update the report Ecological Assessment – Sewer Trunk Main Rehabilitation- Thredbo Alpine Resort to consider the Alpine She-oak Skink (ASOS) (<i>Cyclodomorphus praealtus</i>). Noting, this species appears in the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Cth) protected matters report provided in Appendix B of the SEE. The EPBC Act listings for the ASOS was effective from 24 December 2009. The isolated BV mapped area that the sewer main traverses through is mapped because it is potential ASOS habitat. While considering that the habitat has limited connectivity with other suitable habitat and the past level of disturbance, it is a species that is difficult to detect and its presence should be assumed where any suitable habitat is present. As such, any environmental impact assessment should consider the species.</p> | <p>The report has been updated as per this request. Refer Ecological Assessment – Sewer Trunk Main Rehabilitation – Thredbo Alpine Resort, dated 11 March 2025.</p> <p>Please supersede version dated 21 November 2024.</p> |