

Agency	Comment	Response
<p>NSW Government - Transport for NSW</p>	<p>TfNSW has reviewed the documentation presented in support of the planning proposal. It is understood the proposed rezoning is intended to enable increased mixed-use development and add an additional 800-900 dwelling units to the Town Centre, resulting in over 2,500 dwelling units and 37,000 m² retail/commercial within Middleton Grange.</p> <p>TfNSW advises a proposal of this size requires a transport impact assessment. The transport impact statement provided does not provide enough information for TfNSW to be able to assess the impact the proposed development will have on the regional and classified road network.</p> <p>TfNSW will be happy to host a Scoping meeting to discuss and agree upon an appropriate methodology to assess the proposed development densities. A comprehensive discussion of the issues is provided in Attachment A.</p> <p>General Comment</p> <p>The proposed rezoning includes changes to zoning which will increase the density within the Middleton Grange Town Centre. This will constitute a benefit for walking and cycling by bringing people closer to destinations. TfNSW suggests adding language to the LEP/DCP that will encourage end of trip facilities which allows developers to exclude end of trip facilities from their floor space calculation.</p>	<p>A Traffic Impact Assessment for the proposal was undertaken by TRAFFIX in February 2017. The report assesses the traffic generation of the concept development assumed for the site for the purpose of the planning proposal and assesses the potential traffic impacts on the local and surrounding network. Key intersections were analysed using the SIDRA computer program to determine their performance characteristics under existing traffic conditions.</p> <p>The proposed development is expected to generate in the order of 380 and 1,200 vehicles per hour during the weekday morning and evening peak periods, respectively. Under future conditions, subject to the improvements discussed in this report, the road network will operate satisfactorily. These improvements include regional improvements including the widening of Cowpasture Road as well as local improvements that are required to accommodate the development, which relate to the four priority-controlled intersections that provide access to the site.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, TFNSW and RMS have requested further traffic work be undertaken, using AIMSUM modelling (as opposed to SIDRA). The purpose of developing a microsimulation model for this study is to assess future impacts associated with development and testing future options, including background growth and network upgrades. This 'Base Case Development Model' provides the foundation for further detailed analysis. A final draft version of this base model has been submitted to RMS for review (a copy of which is included at Appendix F).</p>

		<p>At a meeting with Council officers, RMS and the proponent on 27 February 2017, RMS advised that it raised no objection to the planning proposal being public exhibited subject to AIMSUM modelling work being undertaken. A copy of this correspondence is also included at Appendix F.</p> <p>In relation to TfNSW general comment in support of the planning proposal, it is agreed that it makes sense from a public transport and road network perspective, to get as much as the population within walkable proximity to the proposed Town Centre and along key thoroughfares (roads and bus / cycle lanes) which have a direct access to these facilities and limit the 'spread'.</p> <p>The proponent raises no issue with the inclusion of provisions within an LEP which encourage end of trip facilities by excluding these facilities from the floor space calculation.</p>
Transport Roads and Maritime Services	Roads and Maritime has reviewed the submitted documentation and notes that the transport study recommends that <i>"the effects of the additional development traffic would be assessed at the development application stage, following traffic counts and analysis"</i> .	
	This approach is not supported by Roads and Maritime and is of the view that due to the nature and scale of the planning proposal, the Local Environmental Plan (LEP) amendment should not be gazetted until such time that the cumulative transport impacts are identified with associated mitigation measures and incorporated into an appropriate funding mechanism (i.e. Section 94 and/or Planning Agreement).	Noted refer to above comments.

	<p>In this regard, the Transport Study submitted with the planning proposal is preliminary in nature and has not adequately analysed the cumulative transport and traffic impacts associated with the planning proposal.</p> <p>In this regard, an addendum Transport Study should be undertaken to assess the cumulative impacts of the planning proposal on the local and regional road network (including public transport) and identify feasible infrastructure improvements required to support future developments within this Town Centre precinct. This study should also make reference to funding responsibilities and associated funding mechanisms to be determined in consultation with Liverpool City Council and Department of Planning and Environment.</p>	
	Appropriate public exhibition of the addendum Transport Study should be undertaken prior to adoption of the plan.	Noted. At a meeting with Council officers, RMS and the proponent on 27 February 2017, RMS advised that it raised no objection to the planning proposal being public exhibited subject to AIMSUM modelling work being undertaken. A copy of this correspondence is also included at Appendix F.
	Roads and Maritime would be happy to assist Council in determining the requirements of the addendum Transport Study. Once the maximum yields (based on proposed maximum FSR and Height Controls) for the Town Centre are identified, it is suggested that an evidence based trip generation analysis is undertaken in the first instance. This preliminary assessment would inform the area of influence, key assumptions, and scope of the Transport Study. Roads	Noted refer to above comments.

	and Maritime in collaboration with Transport for NSW would be happy to facilitate a meeting with Council to discuss the requirements of the addendum Transport Study.	
	The above mentioned addendum Transport Study should include a review of the nominated traffic generation rates for the proposed development that take into account that the site does not have a high level of public transport accessibility (i.e. Train Station). In this regard, it is noted that the traffic generation rates adopted for the high density residential development is 0.15 trips per unit in the weekday peak periods. This level of traffic generation is more applicable to high density residential development with a higher level of public transport accessibility (i.e. Walking distance to rail stations with frequent services). As the subject site is not within walking distance of a train station, the applicant should be requested to undertake a traffic generation survey of an existing high density residential development with a similar level of public transport accessibility.	Noted refer to above comments.
	In addition to the above, Roads and Maritime advises that strategic level investigations are currently being undertaken for a future upgrade of Fifteenth Avenue to an arterial road standard. In this regard, the abovementioned addendum Transport Study should include an assessment of the impact of the proposed development on the future upgrade of Fifteenth Avenue and to assist in this process provides specific comment in Attachment A. Roads and Maritime is willing to meet with Council and the applicant to discuss these comments in further detail.	Noted refer to above comments. The proponent will keep working with RMS in relation to the status of strategic level investigations.

	The proponent has not identified the use of Fifteenth Avenue as a strategic bus route for the service of the new western Sydney airport and the overall increase in traffic volumes along this road and the impact that the development may have on the future operation of this road.	Noted. Supplementary transport study identifies Fifteenth Avenue as a strategic bus route.
	Fifteenth Avenue between Cowpasture Road and Second Avenue/Kingsford Smith Road intersections is currently congested and traffic intending to access the town centre may add to this existing congestion.	Noted. Supplementary transport study currently underway.
	Safety concerns are raised with regard to vehicles south of Fifteenth Avenue being able to access the town centre as there is currently only a small mountable roundabout offering traffic management at the Second Ave/Kingsford Ave/Fifteenth Ave intersection. It is therefore recommended that the proponent consult with Liverpool City Council (as the road authority) regarding the upgrade of this intersection from a roundabout to traffic signals.	Noted. To be addressed as part of supplementary transport study currently underway.
	The proponent should also consider the safety of pedestrians and cyclists wishing to access the town centre development from south of Fifteenth Avenue. This may also be addressed in part through consideration of dot point 3 above.	Noted. To be addressed as part of supplementary transport study currently underway.

Office of Environment and Heritage	Background OEH understands that the planning proposal is intended to amend Liverpool Local Environmental Plan (LLEP) 2008 to change the boundaries of the Middleton Grange Town Centre, rezone land, increase development density and height and permit additional uses such as business premises, hotel/motel accommodation, health services and restaurants in the R1 General Residential and BS Local Centre zones.	<p>The site is currently zoned part B2 Local Centre, part R1 General Residential, part RE1 Public Recreation and part SP2 (Drainage) under Liverpool LEP 2008. The proposal changes involve re-aligning zoning boundaries to reduce the number of lots which have dual / split zonings and facilitate rational building and development boundaries.</p> <p>As part of the LEP amendment, it is proposed to amend Schedule 1 – Development for Certain Additional Purposes of Liverpool LEP 2008 –to enable the use of land proposed to be zoned R1 General Residential within the Middleton Grange Town Centre for a restaurant or café and to enable the use of land zoned B2 Local Centre within the Middleton Grange Town Centre for ‘hotel or motel accommodation’.</p>
	OEH notes that the Gateway determination dated 15 August 2016 requires Council to undertake and provide studies to demonstrate consistency with s117 Direction 4.3 Flood Prone Land. Accordingly, OEH's recommends the following in relation to floodplain risk management.	<p>Noted. Additional information was provided to Council on 2 and 3 September 2016. Council on 27 September 2016 confirmed “that the flood study had been reviewed by Council’s flooding officers and accepted. No further reports on flooding are required”.</p> <p>Further flood / stormwater management strategy work was submitted to Council on 21 August 2017. This is currently being reviewed by Council.</p>
	Floodplain Risk Management The primary objective of the NSW Government's Flood Prone Land Policy is to reduce the impact of flooding and flood liability on individual owners and occupiers of flood prone land and reduce private and public losses resulting from floods. The most appropriate method to assess the development of flood prone land is through the floodplain risk management process, which is a risk based assessment detailed in the NSW Floodplain Development Manual (2005).	<p>J. Wyndham Prince (JWP) has prepared a number of previous studies to support the redevelopment of the Middleton Grange Town Centre, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hydrological and Hydraulic Study Southern Hoxton Park Aerodrome Precinct Report (2004) Southern Creek Hydraulic Study – Southern Hoxton Park Aerodrome Precinct (2004)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water Cycle Management Facilities Design Report: Middleton Grange (2005) “Piped Option for Southern Creek Section S7” (May 2017) <p>Copies of the relevant studies are included in Appendix C.</p>
	The purpose of the Section 117 Direction 4.3 'Flood Prone Land' of the EP&A Act is to ensure that development of flood prone land is consistent with the NSW Government's Flood Prone Land Policy and the principles of the Floodplain Development Manual. In order to demonstrate consistency with the direction the Gateway Determination requires Council to undertake relevant flood studies and a Flood Planning Area Map supporting the proposal. To satisfy this requirement an adequate flood study should consider the risks to people and property from mainstream and overland flooding.	Noted.
	<p>Flood Study</p> <p>Section 2.8 of the APP report dated June 2016 indicates that some of the lots within Middleton Grange are flood prone. Furthermore, it is understood that Council has flood information for Southern Creek (dated 2004-05) which runs through the subject site that could inform the decision making process.</p>	JWP has undertaken a review of the Liverpool City Local Flood Plan EMPLAN (2012) and notes that Middleton Grange is not listed as a flood prone area and does not include a specific evacuation plan for this locality. The Cabramatta Creek Flood Study and Basin Strategy Review shows all flood extents within the Cabramatta Creek Catchment but does not include the Southern Creek tributary, presumably since it does not significantly impact flooding in Hinchinbrook Creek.
	To address any floodplain risk management issues, it is important to refer to up-to-date hydrological and hydraulic assessments for the catchment in which the proposal is located including overland flow paths associated with major drainage in addition to mainstream flooding.	Noted.
	Since the proposed development is on flood prone land (i.e. below the probable maximum flood or PMF level), a detailed assessment should be undertaken for both existing and developed conditions and comprise:	JWP has prepared a number of studies to support the redevelopment of the Middleton Grange Town Centre, namely:

- A comprehensive understanding of the flood risk to people and properties for the full range of the floods up to the PMF event for existing and future conditions.
 - An assessment of the impact of the proposal on the existing flood behaviour including any potential reduction of floodway and flood storage areas or redistribution of flow which may result in increasing of flood levels on adjacent, downstream and upstream areas.
 - Identification of appropriate mitigation measures, if necessary, to offset potential flood risk arising from the project. Any proposed mitigation work should be modelled and assessed on an overall catchment basis in order to ensure it fits its purpose and meets the criteria of the Council where it is located. This will also help ensure that the proposal has no adverse impact on surrounding areas.
 - An assessment of the impacts of earthworks and filling within the flood prone land up to the PMF level. The assessment should be based on understanding of cumulative flood impacts of various developments within the catchment. The proposal should ensure that any filling is limited to flood fringe areas identified in accordance with the Floodplain Development Manual (2005).
 - A sensitivity analyses to determine the potential impacts from climate change on flooding behaviour.
- An emergency response plan should be prepared in consultation with the State Emergency Services (SES) Regional Controller in order to manage floods and overland flow above the flood planning level. This plan should include an assessment of the flood evacuation needs to ensure that risk to people is minimised.

- Hydrological and Hydraulic Study Southern Hoxton Park Aerodrome Precinct Report (2004)
- Southern Creek Hydraulic Study – Southern Hoxton Park Aerodrome Precinct (2004)
- Water Cycle Management Facilities Design Report: Middleton Grange (2005)
- “Piped Option for Southern Creek Section S7” (May 2017)

Copies of the relevant studies are included in **Appendix C**.

The key conclusions of these studies is provided below:

The Hydrological and Hydraulic Study for the Southern Hoxton Park Aerodrome Precinct, which includes the site, recommended that detention basins be sized to restrict post development discharges for storms up to the 1% AEP design event to pre-development levels to ensure no impact on surrounding properties and properties further downstream. As documented in the Cabramatta Creek Flood Study and Basin Strategy Review (Bewsher, September 2011), these detention basins have since been constructed. Therefore, development within the study area will not result in significant flood impacts to other properties, as appropriate mitigation measures have already been considered as part of a broader regional strategy. The southern creek has been modified and realigned in the past with little original riparian vegetation currently present. While it was proposed in the Hydrological and Hydraulic Study Southern Hoxton Park Aerodrome Precinct Report that this watercourse be reconstructed as

		<p>a natural channel, the piping of this section will not affect any existing riparian areas</p> <p>Water Cycle Management Facilities Design Report: Middleton Grange (2005) details the procedures used and presents the results of an assessment of a hydrological and hydraulic analysis of the proposed detention basins Central Creek and Southern Creek riparian corridors. It was prepared in support of an application for a Construction Certificate that was made to and subsequently approved by Council. The hydraulic assessment for this report was undertaken in HEC-RAS and the hydrologic assessment was undertaken in XP-RAFS.</p> <p>In 2017, JWP prepared supplementary report (i.e. The 'Piped Option for Southern Creek Section S7') outlining the advantages of piping 'Section S7' of the channel, the portion the divides the town centre. This advice used 1D modelling originally undertaken as part of the Hydrological and Hydraulic Study Southern Hoxton Park Aerodrome Precinct Report (J. Wyndham Prince, 2004) to support the assessment. While this modelling showed that there were no additional adverse impacts in the town centre as a result of the piping of Section S7, Council required an assessment of large stormwater events to be undertaken.</p> <p>The existing stormwater system downstream of Section S7 was designed to accommodate future 1% AEP development flows regardless of whether the channel is "open" or "piped". Therefore, the piping of this section would not result in any adverse impacts on any property in terms of flooding in</p>
--	--	--

		<p>the future development scenario. The existing stormwater system on site has been approved as part of a previous DA.</p> <p>Specific issues raised in the SES and OEH submissions are dealt with in the report as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ The report provides a Hydraulic impact assessment assessing the impact of the proposed update on final Developed Conditions for the full range of design flood events up to the probable maximum flood (PMF). The modelling undertaken demonstrates that that three (3) 3600 x 900 mm RCBC's will be required to manage flows through the trunked drain as previously approved by Liverpool Council.▪ Water quality management strategy using MUSIC model, under full catchment development conditions have been assessed and it is found that there will be no additional pollutant loads generated with the trunk culvert arrangement as would be the case if an open channel drainage solution were adopted.▪ The report finds that the culvert solution as approved is capable of taking all water flows through the site up to the 100 Year Flood Extent, resulting in no overland flows across the site. Given this, a flood evacuation plan is not required in this case.▪ The Planning Proposal only involves proposed amendments to land use zones and development standards. No earthworks or filling is proposed at the stage. If future Development Applications involve filling below the PMF level, an assessment of this will be undertaken in accordance with the Floodplain Development Manual.
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed zoning of the site will not result in any increase in risk to life, health or property of people living on any flood plain.
	As the proposal potentially involves a significant increase of people located in the floodplain Council has a duty of care to ensure occupiers and owners are aware of any potential risks to their lives and to property. Council should be mindful that people may develop a false sense of security. Therefore, an appropriate education and awareness program should be considered in consultation with the SES.	Refer to previous comments.
NSW State Emergency Service	The NSW State Emergency Service (NSW SES) is the agency responsible for dealing with floods, storms and tsunami in NSW. This role includes, planning for, responding to and coordinating the initial recovery from floods. As such, the NSW SES has an interest in the public safety aspects of the development of flood prone land, in particular, the potential for changes to land use to either exacerbate existing flood risk or create new flood risk for communities in NSW. These issues are detailed throughout the State Government's Floodplain Development Manual, 2005 (the Manual).	Noted. SES is the agency responsible for dealing with floods, storms and tsunami in NSW and has an interest in the public safety aspects of the development of flood prone land, in particular, the potential for changes to land use to either exacerbate existing flood risk or create new flood risk for communities in NSW.
	The NSW SES generally does not assess individual planning proposals, due to the limited resources within the NSW SES to do so. However, where the flood risk is significant and can impact on the safety of current or future residents if a planning proposal is approved, the NSW SES makes an exception to this general approach.	Noted. SES roles is not to assess individual planning proposals, unless flood risk is significant and can impact on the safety of current or future residents.
	It appears that the planning proposal may be in an area that is significantly impacted by flooding. However, the NSW SES does not currently have sufficient information to assess the flood risk at the site of the planning proposal. Therefore the NSW SES suggests that to	JWP has undertaken a review of the Liverpool City Local Flood Plan EMPLAN (2012) and notes that Middleton Grange is not listed as a flood prone area and does not include a specific evacuation plan for this locality. The Cabramatta Creek Flood Study and Basin Strategy Review shows all flood extents within the Cabramatta Creek Catchment but does not include the

	<p>fully understand the risk at the site, the proponent should undertake to present an updated assessment of the flood risk at the site.</p>	<p>Southern Creek tributary, presumably since it does not significantly impact flooding in Hinchinbrook Creek.</p> <p>There is not an existing flood evacuation plan for the SES in this area. Nor does one need to be prepared because the site, as demonstrated in the various reports prepared by JWP (i.e. Hydrological and Hydraulic Study Southern Hoxton Park Aerodrome Precinct Report (2004), Southern Creek Hydraulic Study – Southern Hoxton Park Aerodrome Precinct (2004), Water Cycle Management Facilities Design Report: Middleton Grange (2005) and “Piped Option for Southern Creek Section S7” (May 2017)) is well clear of regional flooding. Based on the contours in the area, evacuation could easily occur towards a higher area with a rising grade.</p>
	<p>This will assist Council ensuring that the planning proposal can be fully considered against the relevant Ministerial Section 117 Directions, including 4.3 – Flood Prone Land and determine whether it is consistent with the NSW Flood Prone Land Policy as set out in the NSW Floodplain Development Manual, 2005 (the Manual).</p>	<p>J. Wyndham Prince (JWP) has prepared a number of previous studies to support the redevelopment of the Middleton Grange Town Centre, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hydrological and Hydraulic Study Southern Hoxton Park Aerodrome Precinct Report (2004) Southern Creek Hydraulic Study – Southern Hoxton Park Aerodrome Precinct (2004) Water Cycle Management Facilities Design Report: Middleton Grange (2005) “Piped Option for Southern Creek Section S7” (May 2017) <p>The site and envisaged future development is well clear of Cabramatta Creek and there is no current SES strategy in the area. Nor is it appropriate to prepare a flood evacuation strategy given the site is not located in flood prone land from Cabramatta Creek (Bewsher 2011).</p>

		The proposal does not affect flood storage nor require compensatory works. Consequently, an emergency response is not required due to proximity of the site, absence of an SES plan in the area and rising grade from the site. No mitigation works are required to support this development since there is no impact in terms of flooding on surrounding areas. Practice Direction 4.3 – Flood Prone Land is satisfied.
	In particular, the NSW SES draws Council to the following principals outlined in the Manual which are considered to be of particular importance to the NSW SES role. Council in assessing the planning proposal should consider the following:	
	Zoning should not enable development that will result in an intolerable increase in risk to life, health or property of people living on the floodplain.	<p>The site is currently zoned part B2 Local Centre, part R1 General Residential, part RE1 Public Recreation and part SP2 (Drainage) under Liverpool LEP 2008. The proposal changes involve re-aligning zoning boundaries to reduce the number of lots which have dual / split zonings and facilitate rational building and development boundaries. The proposed changes do not result in an increase in risk to life, health or property of people.</p> <p>The site is not listed as a flood prone area under the Liverpool City Local Flood Plan EMPLAN (2012) and does not include a specific evacuation plan for this locality. The Cabramatta Creek Flood Study and Basin Strategy Review shows all flood extents within the Cabramatta Creek Catchment but does not include the Southern Creek tributary, presumably since it does not significantly impact flooding in Hinchinbrook Creek.</p>
	Risk assessment should consider the full range of flooding, including events up to the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) and not focus only on the 1% AEP flood.	Noted. Not applicable to the site.

		An assessment of the impact of the proposal on final Developed Conditions for the full range of design flood events up to the probable maximum flood (PMF) has been undertaken by JWP. The modelling undertaken demonstrates that that three (3) 3600 x 900 mm RCBC's will be required to manage flows through the trunked drain as previously approved by Council.
	Risk assessment should have particular regard to flood warning and evacuation demand on existing and future access/egress routes. Consideration should also be given to the impacts of localised flooding on evacuation routes.	<p>Noted. Not applicable to the site.</p> <p>JWP has undertaken a review of the Liverpool City Local Flood Plan EMPLAN (2012) and notes that Middleton Grange is not listed as a flood prone area and does not include a specific evacuation plan for this locality. The Cabramatta Creek Flood Study and Basin Strategy Review shows all flood extents within the Cabramatta Creek Catchment but does not include the Southern Creek tributary, presumably since it does not significantly impact flooding in Hinchinbrook Creek.</p> <p>There is not an existing flood evacuation plan for the SES in this area and nor does one need to be prepared because the site, as demonstrated in the various reports prepared by JWP, is well clear of regional flooding. Based on the contours in the area, evacuation could easily occur towards a higher area with a rising grade. On this basis, many of the comments made by the SES in their letter dated 10 February 2017 are not applicable to the site and are therefore satisfied. Refer to Maps 1 and 2 in Appendix E of the report prepared by JWP (Appendix D), which show 1% AEP extents across the site.</p>
	In the context of future development, self-evacuation of the community should be achievable in a manner which is consistent with the NSW SES's principles for evacuation.	Noted. Not applicable to the site.

	Future development must not conflict with the NSW SES's flood response and evacuation strategy for the existing community.	Noted. The proposal does not conflict with any NSW SES's flood response and evacuation strategy for the existing community.
	Evacuation must not require people to drive or walk through flood water.	Noted. Not applicable to the site
	Development strategies relying on deliberate isolation or sheltering in buildings surrounded by flood water are not equivalent, in risk management terms, to evacuation.	Noted. Not applicable to the site
	Development strategies relying on an assumption that mass rescue may be possible where evacuation either fails or is not implemented are not acceptable to the NSW SES.	Noted. Not applicable to the site
	The NSW SES is opposed to the imposition of development consent conditions requiring private flood evacuation plans rather than the application of sound land use planning and flood risk management.	Noted. Not applicable to the site
NSW Government - Department of Education	<p>With regard to the potential for impact on the adjoining Middleton Grange Public School, we have reviewed the existing zoning and land use controls and then compared them with those requested in the Planning Proposal.</p> <p>The school adjoins an existing B2- Local Centre zone for a length of approximately 110 metres. The Planning Proposal seeks to extend this zone by about 40 metres to the Hall Circuit frontage. The existing maximum building height permitted in the B2 zone immediately adjacent to the school is 18 metres. The Planning Proposal does not include any change to the maximum building height in this location.</p>	<p>For the majority of the site's frontage to Bravo Avenue and the Middleton Grange Public School, the site has an 8 m height limit, with a 20 m high building within the site's north-east corner (slightly taller than the existing 18 m height limit).</p> <p>Revised overshadowing diagrams are included at Appendix D. The existing school to the east of the site is not overshadowed by the proposal between 9.00 and 12 noon on the 21 June, with any overshadowing restricted to within the site. By 3.00 pm, the proposal casts shadow over Bravo Avenue and parts of the school grounds, with only a small area of the existing school building in the southern portion of the school site being affected by overshadowing.</p>

	<p>An urban design report has been submitted to accompany the PP (Urbis, 26 November 2015) which, based on concept building forms shown in the report, examines potential overshadowing during the Winter Solstice. At 3.00 pm there is a shadow cast on the School hall and canteen building but not on any classrooms. The urban design report also refers to certain building design elements to be incorporated to minimise the impact of the height of buildings, e.g. the upper levels to be modulated/set back from side boundaries, and external building materials to be non-reflective. The Department considers that adoption of these building design provisions is necessary to avoid impacts on the Middleton Grange Public School, such as loss of sunlight, loss of privacy and glare from reflective building materials. The Department therefore requests Council include these requirements in the relevant Development Control Plan for the site.</p>	<p>Details in relation to modulated/set back from side boundaries and external building materials to be non-reflective as well as other architectural treatments to be provided at the relevant stage.</p>
	<p>It is also noted that rearrangement of the existing RE1 Zone is also proposed. This change, although minor, is supported by the Department because it extends the RE1 zone closer to the school boundary.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Sydney Water	Water <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is currently serviced by Cecil Park Water Supply Zone for drinking water. • Based on our latest system-based Growth Servicing Strategy, there is sufficient trunk capacity for the initial proposed zoning changes. • The site is currently fronted by 100-200 mm water mains. • Extensions would be required from the existing mains in the area. Note that these mains will need to be upsized to meet minimum pipe size requirements and to ensure there is sufficient capacity to service the ultimate development. • The rezoning proposal significantly changes building heights and the current servicing scheme only catered for building up to five storeys. • Detailed requirements, including water main extensions or relocations/diversions, will be provided at the Section 73 application phase. 	<p>Noted. Detailed requirements, including water main extensions or relocations/diversions, will be provided at the Section 73 application phase.</p>
	Recycled Water <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is also serviced with Recycled Water from the Hoxton Park scheme. • Sizing of Recycled water reticulation should be as per the WSA Code requirements for the new proposed zoning and building heights. 	<p>Noted.</p>
	Wastewater <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is located within the Malabar Wastewater System and is currently serviced by the Hoxton Park Carrier. 	<p>Noted. Detailed requirements, including wastewater main extensions or relocations/diversions, will be provided at the Section 73 application phase.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Based on our latest system-based Growth Servicing Strategy, there is sufficient trunk and treatment capacity for initial development. For wastewater, the development can be connected to the 225 mm wastewater mains within the development size. Detailed requirements, including wastewater main extensions or relocations/diversions, will be provided at the Section 73 application phase. 	
	<p>Sydney Water Servicing A Section 73 Compliance Certificate under the Sydney Water Act 1994 must be obtained from Sydney Water.</p> <p>The proponent is advised to make an early application for the certificate, as there may be water and wastewater pipes to be built that can take some time. This can also impact on other services and buildings, driveways or landscape designs.</p> <p>Applications must be made through an authorised Water Servicing Coordinator. For help either visit www.sydneywater.com.au > Plumbing, building and developing > Developing > Land development or telephone 13 20 92.</p>	Noted. A Section 73 Certificate will be obtained from Sydney Water at the relevant stage.
	<p>Building Plan Approval The developer must have the building plans stamped and approved before any construction is commenced. Approval is needed because construction/building works may affect Sydney Water's assets (e.g. Water, sewer and stormwater mains).</p>	Noted. Details to be provided at the relevant stage.

	For further assistance please telephone 13 20 92 or refer to the Building over or next to assets page on the Sydney Water website (see Plumbing, building and developing then Building over or next to assets).	
	Attachment 2 - Requirements for Business Customers for Commercial and Industrial Property Developments If this property is to be developed for Industrial or Commercial operations, it may need to meet the following requirements:	Noted. Details to be provided at the relevant stage.