

## Attachment 1 – External & Internal Referral Response Table

### 1. EXTERNAL REFERRALS

The application, and subsequent revisions, was referred to a number of External Agencies for comment. The following table details the Agency and their final comments in relation to the proposed development.

External Agency	Response
<b>Transport for NSW</b>	The application was referred to Transport for NSW who raised no objections to the and detailed that the regional classified road is under management by Council and the proposed development would not have a significant impact on the state road networks. <b>Conditions received.</b>
<b>Water NSW</b>	The application was referred to Water NSW who raised no objection subject to the imposing of conditions. <b>Conditions received.</b>
<b>ARTC</b>	No comments received. It is considered that if the panel decide that the application can be approved, then comments should be received prior to any determination.

### 2. INTERNAL REFERRALS

The application, and subsequent revisions, was referred to a number of Council departments for comment. The following table details the department and their final comments in relation to the proposed development.

Internal Department	Response
<b>Council Development Engineers</b>	The application was referred to Council's Development Engineers who raised concern in respect of the legal point of discharge for the development which discharges at the property boundary of Lot 2 DP 10006620, Railcorp land without land owner's consent.  They also made the following comments:  <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Post-development conditions have been reviewed against pre-development conditions.</li> <li>2. It has been demonstrated from the latest DRAINS model, provided by Henry &amp; Hymas, that the proposed development has improved the site's hydrologic response in the 1% AEP event, where the peak discharge has been significantly</li> </ol>

	<p>reduced through the provision of on-site stormwater detention (OSD). The peak discharge was reduced from 3.37 m<sup>3</sup>/s to 2.28 m<sup>3</sup>/s.</p> <p>3. I note that there is a marginal increase of peak flow rate in minor storm event, 10% AEP (an increase of 0.004 m<sup>3</sup>/s – i.e. 0.3%), but it can be addressed in the detailed design stage through the refinement of the OSD system – such as modifying the orifice outlet, if condition of consent is granted. The increase is within the modelling tolerances typically accepted in preliminary design.</p> <p>The peak discharges across Hoskins Street are detailed in the table below.</p> <table><tr><td></td><td>Existing Condition</td><td>Proposed Condition</td></tr><tr><td>Minor Storm – 10% AEP</td><td>1.409 m<sup>3</sup>/s</td><td>1.413 m<sup>3</sup>/s</td></tr><tr><td>Major Storm – 1% AEP</td><td>3.37 m<sup>3</sup>/s</td><td>2.82 m<sup>3</sup>/s</td></tr></table> <p>4. The existing channel in question is overgrown and lacks maintenance. This contributes to the flooding within 45 Hoskins Street Moss Vale.</p> <p>5. The existing catchment area of 5Ha that bypasses the development and currently discharges into Hoskins Street, this lies outside the responsibility of the developer.</p> <p>6. While maintenance of the swale will assist with the existing flooding condition, it is noted that the issue is primarily a capacity constraint caused by existing conditions and will not worsen by the proposed development.</p>		Existing Condition	Proposed Condition	Minor Storm – 10% AEP	1.409 m <sup>3</sup> /s	1.413 m <sup>3</sup> /s	Major Storm – 1% AEP	3.37 m <sup>3</sup> /s	2.82 m <sup>3</sup> /s
	Existing Condition	Proposed Condition								
Minor Storm – 10% AEP	1.409 m <sup>3</sup> /s	1.413 m <sup>3</sup> /s								
Major Storm – 1% AEP	3.37 m <sup>3</sup> /s	2.82 m <sup>3</sup> /s								
Traffic and Transport Engineer	<p>Council's traffic section have raised concerns with the ultimate design endorsed by TfNSW for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>Inadequate Traffic Impact Assessment</u>. - The applicant fails to provide sufficient information to address the additional traffic impact on the road network as a result of the development. Particularly, the submitted Traffic Assessment does not address the anticipated increase in traffic volumes turning right from Hoskins Street to Suttor Road, does not address the potential impacts on intersection performance, safety, sight distance and any additional safety measures at this intersection.</li></ul> <p>Based on TfNSW's concurrence, it is noted that vehicles over 12.5m can no longer turn into Valetta Street from Argyle Street. Insufficient information has been provided for the traffic impact on the surrounding road network and businesses for this proposal as a result of this traffic diversion.</p>									

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Inadequate footpath and pram ramp proposal along Argyle Street.</u> - Proposed pedestrian footpath relies on acquiring a portion of 229 Argyle Street Moss Vale and dedicate this portion of land as road reserve. No owner's consent has been provided for the dedication of the land as public road reserve.</li> </ul> <p>Insufficient information has been provided on the proposed realigned footpath on the western side of the main entry to Woolworths, particularly no right of access for public use or equivalent has been proposed over the realigned footpath.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Inadequate Road Upgrade Plan and Documentation</u> - The development will generate additional traffic that will impact Hoskins Street and Hawkins Street. This triggers Hoskins Street and Hawkins Street to be upgraded for the full width, including kerb and gutter on both sides, from the secondary access point up to 8 Hawkins Street Moss Vale to service the development. No Concept Road and Drainage Upgrade Plan has been provided for Hoskins Street and Hawkins Street upgrade to demonstrate how the road upgrades will impact the existing features within the road reserve, including driveway crossings, services, overhead powerlines and street trees.</li> <li>• Inadequate access arrangement on Proposed Lot 2.</li> </ul>
<b>Water &amp; Sewer Engineer</b>	No objections subject to conditions.
<b>Council Environmental Health</b>	<p>The application was referred to Council's Environmental Health Officer who raised issues with the Acoustic Report and contamination submitted.</p> <p>Additional Information was provided by the applicant and re-referred to Council's Environmental Health Officer who raised no objection subject to the imposing of conditions.</p>
<b>Accredited Certifiers</b>	No objections subject to conditions
<b>Heritage</b>	No objections subject to conditions
<b>Tree Officer</b>	No objections subject to conditions