

Our Ref: PCB180093

2 December 2022

Maitland City Council
285 – 287 High Street
Maitland NSW 2320

Attn: Thomas Howell



ENGINEERING
PLANNING
SURVEYING
CERTIFICATION
PROJECT MANAGEMENT

ABN 26 134 067 842

526 Louth Park Road, Louth Park – Response to Councils Request for Information

I refer to your letter dated 12 October 2022 in relation to the abovementioned application.

In response to the matters raised we enclose for your consideration at Table 1 a detailed summary of documentation and comments provided for Council's assessment.

In addition to the above, a revised set of documents are submitted for assessment, included as,

- Amended Subdivision Plans prepared by Barker Ryan Stewart, **(still to be provided)**;
- Amended Civil Engineering Plans prepared by Barker Ryan Stewart, dated 30/11/22 Revision E;
- Amended Drainage Report prepared by Barker Ryan Stewart, dated November 2022; and
- Revised Ecology Assessment Report prepared by AEP, **(still to be provided)**.

We note your earlier correspondence in relation to the renotification of the application. I note for your assistance the following response to the particular stakeholders raised in your email dated 9th November 2022;

- RFS: Given that the location of the intersection has not changed substantially, the perimeter fire trails are in place and the access provisions previously assessed by RFS also remain unchanged we would suggest that the further amended concurrence of the NSW RFS is not needed. The subject application can comply with the GTA's as issued on the 6 May 2021. Road widths, turning and the perimeter access road previously accepted by the RFS also remain unchanged.

It is our position that the Council can rely on the existing 100B approval as issued by RFS and request your consideration of same, rather than returning the amended application to NSW RFS for further assessment and unnecessary delay of the application period.

- Mine Subsidence Advisory NSW: Noted.
- Public notification: Noting that this is unlikely to delay the assessment we appreciate that you are required to notify the public of the amended proposal. However, where there is no further objection received, can you confirm that this will remove the need for the application to be determined at a Council Meeting. I note that the subject application has previously only received 1 letter of objection.

Apart from those items referenced above as still outstanding, we consider that the application has now been satisfactorily documented to address the concerns Council has previously raised. We would appreciate your timely review of the submitted documentation and will be in touch to discuss your final assessment and the Council Meeting schedule.

Please do not hesitate to contact our office to discuss any of the above further.

SYDNEY

P (02) 9659 0005
E sydney@brs.com.au

CENTRAL COAST

P (02) 4325 5255
E coast@brs.com.au

HUNTER

P (02) 4966 8388
E hunter@brs.com.au

COFFS HARBOUR

P (02) 5642 4222
E coffs@brs.com.au

NORTHERN RIVERS

P (02) 6681 6696
E northernrivers@brs.com.au

SOUTH EAST QUEENSLAND

P (07) 5582 6555
E seqld@brs.com.au

www.brs.com.au

Yours faithfully

Sarah Hartley | Senior Town Planner
Barker Ryan Stewart Pty Ltd

Table 1 - Council Issues and Applicants Response

Council Issue	Action / Response
<p>Vegetation Management:</p> <p>1. The submitted Ecological Assessment Report prepared by AEP dated September 2020 is required to be updated to reflect a recalculated impact area with reference to the most recent subdivision plan (Plan No: 180093-01-121 prepared by Barker Ryan Stewart dated 02/08/2022). If the recalculated tree impacts results in any impact to threatened species, an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIS) is to be submitted and concurrence from the Biodiversity Conservation Division (Department of Planning & Environment "DP&E") issued as prescribed by the Threatened Species Act 1995.</p> <p>An amended subdivision plan is to be submitted nominating specific building envelopes to support the tree retention. Proposed allotments of concern include Lots 5, 8, 9, 10, 14, 22, 20. Building envelope plans will not be required for all proposed allotments within the subdivision.</p> <p>The tree removal plan is also required to be updated to notate the trees identified within the submitted Ecological Assessment Report as being hollow-bearing.</p>	<p>To be submitted.</p>
<p>Formal Notice of Requirements</p> <p>2. Updated NOR from Hunter Water including reference to proposed reticulated sewer.</p>	<p>To be submitted.</p>
<p>Satisfactory Arrangements for designated State public infrastructure</p> <p>3. Please advise if you intend to go back to the Department to amend this certificate.</p>	<p>We have discussed the need for a revised SAC for the subject application with DPE and they have advised that a revised Certificate is not required in these circumstances.</p>
<p>Road design, traffic and transport</p> <p>4. Road 1 is to continue into the adjoining lot (Lot 1 DP221762) and terminate at natural ground level.</p> <p>5. Amended plans are to be provided demonstrating a minimum of 3.5m verge maintained at this intersection to the adjoining property boundary.</p>	<p>Please refer to amended engineering detail that identifies the extent of road works proposed as part of this application.</p> <p>The Applicant is willing to accept a condition of consent that prohibits the construction of a driveway to Road 1 for Lot 14 until the full length of road construction has been undertaken.</p> <p>Please refer to amended engineering detail that now includes a 3.5m wide road verge.</p>

Council Issue	Action / Response
<p>6. The length of the CHR(S) intersection does not comply with Austroads Part 4A Cl 5. Amened plans are to be provided demonstrating that the deceleration lane is designed in accordance with these standards. Any additional environmental impacts of this extended intersection are also to be considered.</p>	<p>Please refer to amended engineering detail. The Louth Park Road footprint has not extended into the eastern side of the road and relies upon the previous environmental impact assessments provided for the road work.</p> <p>(Note: An Ecological Assessment Addendum is still to be provided).</p>
<p>Stormwater management</p>	<p>The report has been amended to address this item.</p>
<p>7. Table 1 of the Drainage Report, prepared by Barker Ryan Stewart, ref: 18/93, dated 02/08/22, does not specify the volume, orifice, or PSD for lot 4. Please include lot 4 in amended calculations.</p>	
<p>8. Further to this, after internal discussion, Council is not willing to support any individual on lot detention for any lot that drains to the road. Detention for these lots must be provided in the public detention basin in accordance with Council policy.</p> <p>Individual on lot detention for lots that drain to a level spreader is supported (lots 5 to 15). Conditions of DA consent will require that underground detention tanks with outlets to the level spreader are constructed at SWC stage and an 88B is provided specifying that any future dwelling must connect into these detention tanks.</p>	<p>A modified engineering solution is proposed that includes an increased detention basin to remove the need for OSD for lots other than Lots 5 – 15.</p> <p>Please refer to amended engineering detail.</p>
<p>9. The revised basin plan demonstrates internal batters at 1:4 and external batters at 1:3. Whilst it is Council's preference for 1:5 batters with a maximum of 1:4 for internal batters, 1:3 batters can be adopted externally if it can be demonstrated that the batter will not require maintenance. A condition can be placed on the DA consent requiring that prior to issue of SWC, landscaping on the external batters is vegetated and designed to require no maintenance.</p>	<p>Section plans have been revised.</p>
<p>10. The section plans of the basin appear to be incorrectly labelled (refer Plan No.: 180093-01-501 prepared by Barker Ryan Stewart dated 02/08/2022). These sections also demonstrate basin embankment batter crossing the boundary onto adjoining land. This is not supported without appropriate owner's consent. The constructability of this basin</p>	<p>Section plans have been revised.</p>

Council Issue	Action / Response
embankment must also be considered given the minimal setback to allotment boundaries.	