



**ANGEL PLACE
LEVEL 8, 123 PITT STREET
SYDNEY NSW 2000**

URBIS.COM.AU
Urbis Pty Ltd
ABN 50 105 256 228

29 July 2021

Pascal van de Walle
Coordinator Development Assessment
Bayside Council

Via email: Pascal.vandewalle@bayside.nsw.gov.au

Dear Pascal,

RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR INFORMATION | DA2021/187 | 2 MYRTLE STREET, BOTANY

1. INTRODUCTION

This letter has been prepared on behalf of Bayside Council (the Applicant) in response to Council's letter dated 30 June 2021, pertaining to the Development Application (DA) seeking approval for demolition of the existing children's pool and shelter; removal of seven (7) trees and construction of three (3) water slides, an outdoor aqua play area and associated building for mechanical servicing and change rooms at 2 Myrtle Street, Botany (DA2021/187).

This letter and the accompanying documentation have been prepared in response to the matters raised by Council. The following additional documentation accompanies this letter:

- **Appendix A:** Amended Architectural Plans prepared by Co-Op
- **Appendix B:** Amended Remediation Action Plan (RAP) prepared by Douglas Partners
- **Appendix C:** Amended Landscape Plans prepared by Stuart Noble Associates
- **Appendix D:** Amended Stormwater Management Plans prepared by Crackerjack Consulting
- **Appendix E:** Traffic and Parking Statement prepared by GTA Consultants
- **Appendix F:** Amended Acoustic Report prepared by Resonate

2. BACKGROUND

Further to a meeting held with Council Officer's on Wednesday 2 July 2021 to discuss the RFI, background and operational details have been provided to demonstrate the broader concept plan for redevelopment of the site and funding provided.

On 11 December 2019, a report was presented to Council regarding redevelopment options for the Botany Aquatic Centre. At its final meeting of 2019, Council resolved to approve the development

option put forward for the site which included the redevelopment of the existing pools and associated facilities and amenities.

Despite this earlier resolution, Council at its meeting of 14 October 2020 confirmed:

That funding for the total value of the Botany Aquatic Centre project be realised and available for Council to allocate prior to moving to detailed design and documentation except for the family friendly, adventure water play facilities which will be funded by Sydney Airport;

That Council proceeds to design, documentation and tender for the Sydney Airport funded adventure water play component of the Botany Aquatic Centre project.

This meant detailed design and documentation of the Concept Plan for the entire facility was put on hold. Council resolved to only proceed with the water slides and adventure play component of the project, subject of this DA.

In addition to this, the Sport & Recreation Committee in February 2021 resolved to future proof the facility by including new plant and equipment for the 50 metre and Learn to Swim pool in the construction of the adventure play and water slides project to ensure the filtration systems are separated.

In addition to the new plant and filtration system, the proposal now also contains two heat pumps adjacent to the mechanical plant. These heat pumps are required to be located externally and will be concealed by acoustic louvres. The proposed heat pumps are demonstrated in the amended Architectural Plans at **Appendix A**, and have been assessed by the acoustic consultant.

As discussed at the meeting held on Wednesday 7 July 2021, Council have confirmed that the proposed slides and aqua play are likely to generate 100 patrons per hour and approximately 400 over the entire day. It is noted 100 patrons per hour is a conservatively high estimate. These calculations have informed the amended studies discussed below.

3. RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR INFORMATION

| Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>1. Issues raised by the public</p> <p>The application was placed on public notification for two weeks (14 days) and in that time, three (3) objections were received. It is requested that a response is provided to the issues raised, which have been summarised in points (a) to (c) below (a copy of the submissions will also be provided):</p> <p>(a) Requests for alternative facilities, such as an internal pool and gym to provide year round access and better community participation.</p> | <p>a) The broader concept plan for the site will include improved indoor facilities. Slides are replacing previous outdoor slides that were removed in the south east corner and are the first stage of the redevelopment of the site.</p> <p>b) A Traffic and Parking Statement has been prepared by GTA Consultants and is further discussed below.</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|--|--|
| <p>(b) Traffic and parking impacts from the proposal.</p> <p>(c) Inconsistency with the Master Plan previously prepared for the site.</p> | <p>c) As demonstrated in Section 1 of this letter, this is the first stage of a broader commitment by Council to upgrade the Aquatic Centre. It was resolved that further works would be on hold and the water slides and play area would proceed.</p> |
| <p>2. Contamination</p> <p>It is acknowledged the proposal has been accompanied by a Detailed Site Contamination Investigation, Remediation Action Plan, and Geotechnical Report. Groundwater is identified between depths 1.3m and 2.9m below natural ground level and contamination is found at depths between 0.55m to 1.9m.</p> <p>As part of the assessment of clause 7 of State Environmental Planning Policy 55 (SEPP 55), it is requested that a supplementary contamination assessment and/or an amended Remediation Action Plan (RAP) be completed by a suitably qualified and experienced environmental consultant in accordance with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) NSW EPA (2020) 'Consultants reporting on contaminated land'; e) NSW Environment Protection Authority (NSW EPA) approved guidelines under the f) Contaminated Land Management Act 1997; and g) SEPP 55 <p>The supplementary contamination assessment and/or the amended RAP must further consider risks associated with potential groundwater impacts (eg. from leaching of onsite soil impacts or from offsite sources, if any).</p> <p>If unacceptable risks are identified, the RAP must be amended to clearly outline proposed</p> | <p>2. Contamination</p> <p>The Detailed Site Investigation (DSI) outlined the previous testing conducted for the larger Botany Aquatic Centre Site which included the conversion of four test bores into groundwater monitoring wells which were positioned to capture any on- or off-site migration of contaminants in groundwater. Only minor concentrations of metals exceeded the screening criteria were detected in water sampled from the monitoring wells, and these concentrations were considered likely to be representative of urban groundwater conditions.</p> <p>Based on these assessments, Douglas Partners have included further detail in Sections 5.3 and 9.3 of the Remediation Action Plan (RAP) at Appendix B summarising the previous groundwater results. Based on the results the RAP concludes that further management of groundwater is not currently required. Previously identified contamination was identified to be low or non-leaching, and as indicated in Section 9.4.4 of the RAP, as being suitable for capping. The RAP considers the management required during piling works, including, through capping layers, managing ASS and contaminated soils. Disturbance to groundwater from piling is considered to be negligible and does not require further management. Overall, the DSI and the RAP do not consider that further management (regarding contamination risks) is required for groundwater.</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>clean-up objectives and provide the remediation/management strategies to make the site suitable for the proposed uses. The amended RAP must aim to avoid the use of containment and contaminants should be treated onsite or removed from the site whenever possible. Any remediation that utilises a containment strategy for contaminants must be passive and be accompanied by a Long-term Environmental Management Plan (LTEMP).</p> | <p>In addition, the remediation strategy has been revised with capping of fill as the primary strategy with the following approach discussed and outlined in Section 9 and 10 of the RAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relocation of contaminated fill from areas where capping is unsuitable to other areas; ▪ Preparation and capping of fill in other areas; and ▪ (As a contingency) Removal of fill for off-site disposal. <p>Further detail has been provided for capping designs, piling works and other items in Section 10.4 of the RAP.</p> <p>Douglas Partners confirm that a Long-term Environmental Management Plan (LTEMP) will be required at subsequent stages of construction. Douglas Partners confirm that this can be completed once further comment can be provided from relevant contractors regarding the capping designs in the RAP (and if any adjustments are required) and is otherwise not required at this stage.</p> |
| <p>3. Acid sulfate soils</p> <p>The site is mapped as being affected by class 4 acid sulfate soils, and the geotechnical report identifies that acid sulfate soils would be encountered at approximately 2m below natural ground level. Information provided within the geotechnical report identifies three (3) potential foundation construction methods, two of which extend beyond 2m and could encounter acid sulfate soils.</p> <p>Further information is required in relation to works (e.g. piling) that may extend beyond 2m below the ground surface. Should such works</p> | <p>Item 3</p> <p>As noted previously, Section 13 of the RAP outlines the Acid Sulfate Soils Management Plan (ASSMP).</p> <p>The additional detail for managing piling works in Section 10.4 of the RAP also includes reference to appropriate parts of the ASSMP to manage potential disturbance of ASS during piling.</p> <p>Douglas Partners confirm that works that will entail off-site disposal of water (dewatering) then a disposal permit from Council will be required (e.g. if disposing to stormwater), post</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|---|--|
| <p>be required, then an amended Acid Sulfate Soils Management Plan is to be provided to properly satisfy clause 6.1 of the BBLEP 2013, including management measures for the disturbance of acid sulfate soils beyond 2m below the ground surface.</p> <p>Note: An aquifer interference approval may also be required if the proposal includes works within the water table in accordance with s91 of the Water Management Act 2000. Whilst s4.44(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 excludes Crown authorities from integrated development provisions, information should be provided to confirm whether the works would require concurrence from Water NSW.</p> | <p>approval. Appropriate management measures and recommendations have been provided in Section D5.1 and D5.2 of the RAP.</p> |
| <p>4. Landscaping</p> <p>Council's landscape officer has reviewed the application and has requested for the following additional information.</p> <p>(a) "Further planting in slides area</p> <p>The surface where the proposed slide area is located is mostly concrete. The design shall explore the possibility of including vegetation in areas where concrete for circulation and maintenance is not required. Plating around these structures will provide a more appealing place, will minimise the visual impact of the proposed structures, while providing environmental benefits, (see below this notes pictures of other slides with vegetation around it, and how the visual effect is improved).</p> <p>Vegetation can consist in low shrubs and groundcovers and tree palms, or other trees with narrow canopy which will not affect the functionality or ongoing maintenance of the slides structures.</p> | <p>a) Further landscaping has been provided in the water slide area including vegetation consisting of low shrubs and groundcovers. Please see amended Landscape Plans at Appendix C.</p> <p>b) Upgrades to car parking is not supported as it is not considered to be part of the scope of this DA. Further upgrades will occur as part of the redevelopment of the broader site, and it is premature to require this as a direct outcome of this DA. A Traffic and Parking Assessment has been prepared at Appendix E which demonstrates with the addition of the proposed water slides the current number of parking spaces is sufficient. As a result, not changes to the existing car park are proposed.</p> <p>c) The number of bins on site since the previous slides closed has not been reduced. Sufficient bins are on site including 20 small sulo and 46 large sulo bins. Additional seating and bubblers have been</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|--|---|
| <p>(b) Planting in parking area.</p> <p>Amended plans are required to incorporate landscaping improvement to the parking area to include one canopy tree for every 5 car spaces to achieve 50% canopy coverage to the carpark at maturity (minimum 100 Litre pot size), in accordance with the Botany Bay DCP (Part 3L.6 C1).</p> <p>(c) Further details required on plans:</p> <p>As there is an anticipated increase to visitation of the site, it is expected that additional facilities would be provided on the site such as additional bins, seats, bubblers, shelters or seats will be required”.</p> <p>Amended landscape plan are required to illustrate these details.</p> | <p>provided and are demonstrated in the amended Landscape Plans at Appendix C.</p> |
| <p>5. Waste Management Plan</p> <p>The proposed waterslide and water play area are considered to increase the visitation of the site and incur additional waste generation. An updated waste management plan is requested to address how this waste will be managed, in accordance with 3N of the Botany Bay Development Control Plan 2013 (BBDP 2013). This may require additional bins and bin storage areas to be provided to the site.</p> | <p>The waterslides form part of an existing, larger aquatic centre. As such, the proposed slides will not generate waste to a level where additional capacity is required. Waste management is already entirely managed internally within the site. As noted above, the number of bins has not reduced since the closure of the previous water slides in 2019. Amendments to waste management arrangements would occur as part of the broader concept plan and upgrades for the site.</p> |
| <p>6. Architectural plans - section</p> <p>Additional details on the architectural plans are requested to better understand the relationship of the proposed waterslide and water play area in the context of the proposed earthworks, particularly as this influences the assessment of contamination, water table and acid sulfate soils</p> | <p>The amended Architectural Plans prepared by Co-Op at Appendix A, have been updated to include sections demonstrating the extent of cut and fill and proposed structures. This has informed the updated RAP prepared by Douglas Partners at Appendix B.</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| <p>on the site. A detailed section plan of the exit pool, etc, is required.</p> | |
| <p>7. Stormwater and Drainage</p> <p>(i) "Flooding</p> <p>The site is affected by both 1% AEP mainstream flooding and 1 in 100-year ARI overland flow. In accordance with the Stormwater Technical Guidelines:</p> <p>The finished floor levels of the plant room and change rooms are to be above the flood planning level (In accordance with Council's flood advice letter Ref: FA-2020/2001m dated 5 May 2020); and</p> <p>A flood evacuation management plan is to be provided.</p> <p>(ii) Stormwater</p> <p>Council's preferred stormwater management is to use methods such as an infiltration tunnel, swale, raingarden or bioretention etc, with overflow to stormwater, in accordance with clause 5.1(1) of Part 10 of BBDCP 2013. Such methods utilise the sandy soils on site, incorporate a better longer term maintenance solution of the proposed stormwater infrastructure, and respond to water sensitive urban design (WSUD) principles, in accordance with Part 3G.3 of BBDCP 2013.</p> <p>The proposal includes rehydration cores and GRAF storm plastics rehydration infiltration tunnel. Given the comments above, it is requested that information be provided to explain the rationale behind the proposed stormwater system".</p> | <p>A flood evacuation management plan is not necessary considering the use of the change rooms and mechanical plant and unlikely need for evacuation of this area. The Flood Engineer has confirmed that the proposed floor levels will not result in any flood impacts, due to the fill proposed demonstrated in the amended architectural section at Appendix A.</p> <p>(ii) Stormwater</p> <p>An amended Stormwater Management Plan at Appendix D incorporates stormwater strategy suggested by Council, including swales and deletion of hydration cores.</p> |
| <p>8. Traffic and Parking</p> | <p>A Traffic and Parking Statement has been prepared by GTA Consultants at Appendix E.</p> |

| Comment | Response |
|---|--|
| <p>The site provides 163 car spaces which are shared with the adjacent 'recreation facility (outdoor)' known as Booralee Park.</p> <p>BBDCP 2013 specifies a list of parking rates for four selected types of 'recreation facilities (outdoor)'. This includes swimming pools which are provided with a minimum parking rate of 1 space per 10m² of pool area plus 1 space per 2 employees.</p> <p>At the recent regional panel briefing meeting, it was noted that neither water slides nor sports fields (i.e., Booralee Park) are among the four listed recreation facilities (outdoor). BBDCP 2013 indicates that for other 'recreation facilities (outdoors)', a parking Assessment based on survey of similar developments is required.</p> <p>As water slides may not properly be captured by 'pools', BBDCP 2013 would therefore require a parking assessment, based on a survey of similar developments, or other suitable data estimates. The regional panel have indicated that despite not being required by BBDCP 2013, a complete Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment would be required in order to properly consider the impacts of the proposal.</p> | <p>This has given consideration to the previous water slides that were on the site and removed, including patron and income data for the year between September 2016 and April 2017. In addition, GTA Consultants has completed desktop parking surveys using Nearmap aerial imagery in the nominated study area of both weekdays during summer public holidays and weekends at times when the aquatic centre is fully operational to understand typical and peak parking demand near the site. The Statement outlines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The car park includes 163 parking spaces. On street parking includes 120 spaces within a 200-metre walk of the site along Myrtle Street and Jasmine Street. ▪ Peak demand for parking occurred on Sunday, 27 January 2019. Demand of 75 per cent (120 of 163 spaces) was recorded for the car park and 80 to 90 per cent for on-street parking spaces along Myrtle Street and Jasmine Street. ▪ Peak periods are anticipated to generate use by 100 patrons per hour. As such, the development could generate an additional demand for 17 parking spaces (three staff spaces plus 14 visitor spaces). ▪ With an average peak car park demand of 105 spaces, an additional 20 spaces would result in about 75 per cent demand (or 125 spaces) with about 40 vacant spaces. As such, the anticipated demand of 17 spaces associated with the proposal would still result in 20 vacant spaces during the average peak throughout summer. ▪ In addition, GTA Consultants confirm an additional 30 vehicle trips could be |

| Comment | Response |
|---|--|
| | <p>generated by the proposal during the Saturday midday road network peak period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given the low traffic volumes generated by the proposal during peak periods, representing one additional vehicle trip every two minutes, the additional traffic could not be expected to compromise the safety or function of the surrounding road network. <p>The Traffic and Parking Statement concludes the existing adjacent car park could wholly accommodate the additional demand and the surrounding intersections will continue to operate well, consistent with existing conditions.</p> |
| <p>9. Acoustic Report</p> <p>The Acoustic Report provided with the application has been reviewed by Council's Environmental Health Officer and the following issues are noted:</p> <p>The acoustic report has not considered the noise impacts or any required noise controlling methods for the mechanical plant room. Details are required, including selected construction materials of the plant room, and location of plant machinery.</p> <p>The Acoustic Report has estimated a patronage of 25 active users, which is considered to be unreasonably low.</p> <p>An amended acoustic report is requested to address these issues to ensure that potential acoustic impacts are acceptable.</p> | <p>An amended Acoustic Report has been provided at Appendix D. The assessment considers the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A peak daily patronage of 400 people adding to the existing peak daily patronage (busiest summer day) of 640 people. Assumed that a quarter of the daily patronage would utilise the entire facility during a typical hour equating to approximately 250 people. 100 people would utilise the aqua play and water slides at any one time. 150 would utilise the existing swimming and recreational facilities. Resonate confirm the predicted operational noise levels at nearby residential receivers achieve compliance with the requirements of the NSW Noise Policy for Industry (NPI). The mechanical plant is not expected to exceed the NPI criteria, provided it is entirely enclosed and have an acoustic performance of Rw 50. A full assessment of |

| Comment | Response |
|---|---|
| | <p>mechanical plant noise emission is required during the detailed design phase.</p> <p>The Acoustic Report concludes that operational noise levels have been assessed to comply with the noise criteria subject to the recommendations.</p> |
| <p>10. Chemical Storage</p> <p>Additional information is required in relation to chemical storage, including:</p> <p>Details of which areas will be serviced by the plant in the mechanical room service.</p> <p>Details of any chemical storage associated with the expanded facility, including storage location and expected volume of chemicals to be stored on site at any one time.</p> | <p>The project team have confirmed that chemicals can be stored within the existing Chemical Store on site, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing Sodium Hypochlorite is to be decommissioned/demolished. Existing Sodium Hypochlorite room is to be converted to Dry Chemical Storage including Calcium Hypochlorite, Sodium Bi-Sulphate, Cyanuric Acid, existing CO2 storage tank to be relocated. |

4. CONCLUSION

In summary, the design has been amended and further information provided to respond to the matters raised by Council. This includes the following:

- Douglas Partners have updated the RAP to further demonstrate the proposed remediation strategy for capping of fill, an assessment and recommendations for piling and further mitigation measures.
- Additional planting, seating and bubblers have been proposed around the proposed slides and aqua play area.
- A Traffic and Parking Statement has been provided. No additional parking is required and no detrimental impacts to the surrounding road network will occur as a result of the proposal.
- The Acoustic Report has been updated to include an assessment of the mechanical plant and expected visitation, which meets the relevant noise criteria.
- An amended Stormwater Management Plan incorporates stormwater strategy suggested by Council, including swale and deletion of hydration cores. In addition, there will be no flooding impacts due to the levels and fill proposed.
- Further details of waste management, chemical storage and operational details have been provided, which demonstrates satisfactory arrangements are proposed.

We trust we have addressed the issues raised in Council's letter dated 30 June 2021, however, should you have any queries please contact me on (02) 8424 5125.



Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "S. Gunasekara", set against a light pink rectangular background.

Simon Gunasekara
Associate Director
+61 2 8233 7698
sgunasekara@urbis.com.au