

2.0 Schedule of Issues and Responses

Part A - Letters from Local Residents/Property Owners

No	Date	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Response
1	3.10.06	Rotary Club of Liverpool Member	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept Plan does not identify the existing Liverpool Hospital Chapel, despite it's presence since 1985. • Liverpool Hospital Chapel is not nominated for retention. • No provision has been made for a new Chapel. • Liverpool Hospital Chapel is valuable hospital asset and essential resource for patients/families and hospital staff. • Chapel should be relocated to the new development. 	The chapel has been considered and facilities will be provided as an integral part of the redevelopment.
2	15.10.06	Local resident	Object	<p>Supports forward planning for health in south west region.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TAFE site was first hospital in Governor Macquarie's plan for Liverpool and buildings are attributable to Francis Greenaway. • TAFE site has been requested to be State heritage listed by Liverpool City Council and Department of Education and Training. • Area falls within Bigge Park Conservation Area and Areas of Archaeological Significance for Liverpool Town Centre. • Objects to 4 storey car park in north eastern corner of TAFE site and future development to the south of the site until site is assessed by State Heritage Office. Part 3A should be revoked on this site until that time. • Concept plan is inconsistent with Conservation Management Plan for the site which recommends 'No new development may be considered for this site except where replacing intrusive or less significant buildings. Any new structure should respect the overall harmony of the complex with emphasis on buildings being preferably single storey and at most two storeys. The existing layout on the site and spatial relationships are maintained'. 	The Heritage significance of the TAFE complex has been carefully considered. The project Heritage consultant was responsible for the preparation of the CMP for the TAFE site and had regard for all the relevant issues in the final recommendations for limited development within the TAFE site is an integral part of the Concept Plan.

No	Date	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Response
3	30.10.2006 (extension granted)	Collingwood Heritage & Regional Museum Precinct Action Committee	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally supports improvements to hospital. Object to proposed redevelopment of TAFE site as proposed under concept plan. TAFE (former Liverpool Hospital site) is historically significant as oldest Government institution in Liverpool. TAFE site has been requested to be State heritage listed by Liverpool City Council and Department of Education and Training. Whole site should be nominated as State Heritage Item and due consideration should be given to site's significance. 	Refer 3.8 Letter from Cherie Burton MP Parliamentary Secretary for Health to Committee
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement of Heritage Impact submitted with concept plan: Clearly states no consultation with NSW Heritage Office made. Is limited in it's scope of works in regard to the TAFE site and does not assess heritage integrity of entire TAFE site. Does not indicate whether proposed buildings will protrude above significant buildings on the TAFE site. All Historic buildings on the TAFE site should remain visually dominant. Does not comment on height limits on proposed 700m² development south of Zone F or on future expansion For area currently occupied by Zone K. Proposed development is inconsistent with the Liverpool College CMP 1989. Past development of Liverpool Hospital has resulted in demolition of heritage buildings including the Colonial Hall 1857. Local and State Government have responsibility of considering cumulative impacts of proposal on heritage Significance. Cumulative impacts of past and future development, and expansion of hospital site have not been adequately addressed. CHARMPAC recommendations: Entire TAFE site be identified on TAFE's Section 170 and State Heritage Register; Appropriate curtilage also be listed; Nomination for State Heritage Register listing be expedited; Any decision regarding potential TAFE NSW site be deferred until State listing process has been completed; Heritage Act, 1977 be 'switched back on' to ensure heritage and archaeology are considered appropriately during development assessment; Liverpool Hospital's vision for future occupation and use of TAFE site be considered in holistic manner with particular regard given to adaptation of buildings and use of areas between existing buildings; 	

No	Date	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Response
		Collingwood Heritage & Regional Museum Precinct Action Committee cont		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept elevation plans be prepared to show how proposed development sits within historic elements including buildings, landscaping, and significant plantings; • Model be constructed for same reasons; • Plans and panoramas of immediate and distant views to, and from, TAFE complex be prepared; • No new development to exceed lowest RL ridge height of heritage items (including telecommunications mechanical equipment) in vicinity of proposal (Buildings A, B, C, E, F, G, and J); • Updated Conservation Management Plan be prepared for TAFE site; • A section 140 permit (archaeology) be obtained prior to approval being granted for any works within the TAFE site; • Should development proceed in Zone F, or any other area within the TAFE site, prior archaeological assessment should be carried out by a qualified professional under NSW Heritage Office Guidelines. 	

Part B - Key Stakeholders

No	Date	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Response
1	13.09.06	State Transit Authority of NSW (STA)	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> STA operates the Liverpool – Parramatta T-Way service (route T80). The service does not extend to the Hospital precinct. 	The main entry of the hospital is 300m from the Liverpool terminus of the T-Way.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport, Traffic and Access Report (Appendix E) does not propose changes to the bus network in response to the hospital redevelopment. 	See above.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> STA believes the proposed redevelopment of Liverpool Hospital will not adversely impact on the T-Way service. 	Noted.
2	22.09.06	Ministry of Transport (MoT)	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoT concerned about ensuring provision of efficient public transport networks to serve staff, patients and visitors to the Hospital. 	Noted/See above.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NSW Government has recently launched the Integrated Network Plan for Bus Contract Region 13 and this will be followed by Integrated Network Plans for Regions 2 and 3 (anticipated in August 2007). 	Noted/See above.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Liverpool is served by Strategic Bus Corridors 11 (Parramatta – Liverpool), 31 (Liverpool – Campbelltown) and 33 (Liverpool – Bankstown) and will therefore have a stronger drawing power from the Holroyd and Minto areas. 	Noted.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specific issues which require further considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The prime linkage between the Hospital and bus network is in the vicinity of the site's south-west corner (Elizabeth and Goulburn Streets). There will need to be upgrades to bus stop infrastructure including appropriate lighting, kerbing, passenger manoeuvring areas, signage and shelter. 	<p>The existing bus stop on Elizabeth Street adjacent to the main entry hospital forecourt incorporates upgraded elements including shelter, lighting, kerbs, signage, safety barriers and seating.</p> <p>Commitment to liaise with MOT/STA and Liverpool Council as part of the Project Plan design development process.</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To ensure service delivery times are not impacted as a result of increased traffic, need to ensure appropriate bus access and bus priority measures at intersections, particularly linking the Hospital with the train station and CBD. 	The hospital is well served by buses with an existing bus stop 50m from the main entry foyer. The new northern access road will help ameliorate traffic levels in and adjacent to the hospital.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoT supports enhanced pedestrian and cycle linkages between the Hospital, Liverpool Station and the CBD. 	Noted.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration should be given to the implications on Government endorsed projects, specifically the Southern Sydney Freight Line and Liverpool Turnback. 	The design process leading to the Concept Plan recognised the SSFL and the Liverpool turnback proposals. NSW Health, RailCorp, TIDC, and ARTC are engaged in a process of consultation and meetings as a precursor to proposed VPA which addresses the issues and implications between the projects.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed additional 890 car parking spaces would appear to be contrary to the Metropolitan Parking Policy currently being prepared by DoP. 	The car parking needs of the project are based on detailed studies by the traffic/transport consultant. The studies included supply/demand analyses of staff, patient and visitor parking needs. Issues addressed included staff needs associated with early morning and late night shift starts/safety on public transport after normal hours/travel mode shift for staff/overall reduction in staff car trips by 12%. The proposed parking policy addresses issues raised by Liverpool City Council during the consultation phases.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunities to implement a TravelSmart incentive program at the Hospital should be explored. 	<p>A work place travel plan for the hospital will be developed. Refer Concept Plan Appendix E transport, traffic and access report.</p> <p>Commitment to develop a work place travel plan including a travel smart incentive program.</p>				

No	Date	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Response
3	04.10.06	Heritage Office – Department of Planning	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land to which Concept Plan applies is partly within the Bigge Park Conservation Area. 	Noted.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subject land also comprises several listed or identified heritage items such as the Western Sydney Institute of TAFE Group, Elizabeth Street trees and Hugh Jardine House. 	Noted/Hugh Jardine House not listed/see reference in heritage assessment report Appendix F.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site also adjoins Bigge Park, which is listed in Schedule 2 of Liverpool LEP. 	Noted.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Height and overall envelope of the proposed new structures in the vicinity of identified heritage items should be considered to avoid unacceptable levels of visual impact on the Conservation Area and ensure important views are not obstructed. 	The significance of the conservation zone and heritage elements was carefully considered in the preparation of the Concept Plan. Attached find a series of visual impact assessment studies.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed visual assessment should be undertaken and include realistic photomontages of the proposed buildings. 	See above.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing heritage assessment is not sufficient to justify any new development within the proximity of the TAFE buildings. More detailed heritage assessment should be prepared to assess the impacts of the proposed four storey structure at the north east part of the TAFE site. 	The Heritage significance of the TAFE complex has been carefully considered. The project Heritage consultant was responsible for the preparation of the CMP for the TAFE sight and had regard for all the relevant issues in the final recommendations for limited development within the TAFE site which is an integral part of the Concept Plan. Commitment to undertake additional heritage assessment within the north eastern sector of the TAFE site as part of the Project Plan Application.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst TAFE site is not State Heritage listed, it contains highly significant heritage buildings attributed to Francis Greenaway (convict architect). 	Noted/see Heritage environment report Appendix F.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed multi storey car park and future developments to west and north of Hugh Jardine House should be assessed and alternative design options should be explored for the adaptive re-use of this building. 	The heritage assessment included a careful study of the Hugh Jardine House. It was concluded that the building had limited heritage value and, subject to appropriate archival documentation, the building would be replaced by a new parking structure. Commitment to prepare a photographic archival record prior to demolition.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. The Statement of Heritage Impact recommends demolition of 1 Campbell Street. A photographic archival record of the building should be prepared in accordance with Heritage Office's Guidelines if demolition proceeds. 	Agreed. Commitment to prepare a photographic archival record prior to demolition
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No thorough landscape assessment prepared for the Concept Plan. A detailed landscape survey and strategy should be prepared for future management of the important landscape features of the site. 	Apart from the identified heritage trees in Elizabeth Street the site contains little vegetation. As part of the Project Plan process a detailed survey/condition report by an Arborist will be prepared. Commitment to prepare an arborist report as part of the Project Plan Application.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Statement of Heritage Impact does not include an archaeological assessment but provides an overall summary of the archaeological potential of the site based on existing information in the LEP. It is recommended that a detailed archaeological assessment of the overall site should be carried out prior to the preparation of subsequent detailed proposals for the site. 	Detailed archeological investigations will be prepared as part of the Project Plan Application. Commitment to prepare detailed archeological investigations of the site as part of the Project Plan Application.				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archaeological assessment should be accompanied by a research design and specific methodology. 					
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should also be noted that some design modifications and on-site interpretation should be foreshadowed as an option to allow in-situ conservation of significant archaeological relics if the assessment warrants that the site has State significant archaeology or significant relics are revealed during works. 	Noted.				

No	Date	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Response
4	04.10.06	RailCorp	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RailCorp notes that the grade separated pedestrian and vehicular access bridges proposed in the Environmental Assessment will not be in place in time for the commissioning of the Southern Sydney Freight Line (SSFL). Therefore significant implications for access to the hospital via the Elizabeth Street crossing. 	<p>The closure of the Elizabeth Street level crossing has been the subject of substantial discussion and exchange of correspondence between NSW Health, RailCorp, ARTC and Premiers' Office. It is recognised that the northern link road and grade separated crossing of the rail line are inter-related, integral components of resolving the pattern of critical alternative access to Liverpool Hospital. NSW Health is committed to working with the various agencies to resolve access to the expanded Liverpool Hospital and to provide for both pedestrian and vehicular access between the east and west campuses.</p> <p>Refer Section 3.1 - Additional Information and Section 4 - Statement of Commitments for commitments in relation to VPA with RailCorp.</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased rail operations will lead to minimal opportunity for the use of the level crossing for significant periods of the day. 	<p>Noted. NSW Health, RailCorp, TIDC, and ARTC are engaged in a process of consultation and meetings as a precursor to a proposed VPA which includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for the new north link road and land transfers. Coordination between the projects. Funding of the rail crossings. Achieving construction of the grade separated crossings of the rail line in time for operation of the SSFL to enable closure of the level crossing to all but specified emergency use and other planned use. Criteria for emergency use and other planned use of the level crossing.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closure of existing Elizabeth Street level crossing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RailCorp opposes continued operation of the existing Elizabeth Street level crossing. 	<p>Under the forthcoming VPA, closure will be achieved upon completion of grade separated crossings of the rail line for all but specified emergency use and other planned use.</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The crossing will be closed permanently upon commencement of the SSFL & will not be available for use at all (even in emergency situations as per pages 27 & 49 of the EA). 	<p>Closure contingent upon completion of grade separated crossings of the rail line for all but emergency use and other planned use as specified in the forthcoming VPA.</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grounds for objections include delay to emergency vehicles, 'locking-down' of signal interlocking at Liverpool rail Station (impacting on rail services), significant rail traffic therefore line would be impassable for up to 50mins a day, logistical constraints and coordination issues between Liverpool Hospital, RailCorp and ARTC. 	<p>Noted.</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RailCorp recommends the hospital's emergency use criteria be factored into design and operation of the grade separated pedestrian and vehicle crossings proposed in the EA. Pedestrian and vehicular crossings to be integrated with internal road hierarchies and pedestrian access points. 	<p>Attached plan A1801 (Fig. 11) illustrates the integration of new north link road, rail crossings and internal road circulation. Pedestrian rail crossing will link the new car park with new clinical services building</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grade Separated Crossings <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RailCorp has limited funding towards design/construction of grade separated pedestrian/vehicular access bridges over the rail corridor. 	<p>Noted.</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detail on the design/construction of overhead pedestrian/vehicular crossings is incomplete and it is unclear whether the facility will be used exclusively by hospital staff and/or wider community. 	<p>Matters of design detail. Key clearance criteria and RailCorp proposed infrastructure corridor and land boundaries have been taken into account in the initial concept plan for the crossings. These facilities will be NSW Health facilities and usage will be only for hospital purposes.</p>
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> RailCorp expects information concerning corridor span and interface for overhead pedestrian and vehicle crossings, including height details in relation to overhead wiring and aerial transmission lines. 	<p>Matters of design detail and will be addressed in design development phase.</p>

No	Date	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Response
		RailCorp cont.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarification should be sought from RailCorp regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minimum height clearance requirements. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Completion of a risk assessment by the proponent carried out in accordance with RIC standard TS 30 000 3 01 SP Structures – Design Standards. Compliance with relevant RailCorp Standards for the design of overhead bridges and pedestrian footbridges over a railway corridor and tracks (ESC 320). Compliance with relevant RailCorp Standards for transit space clearances (ESC 215) compliance with all other relevant standards relating to safety screens, earthing and electrolysis, and Australian Standard AS 1500 with respect to collision protection and loading. Rail Corridor Preservation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Corridor space is required for three electrified tracks to accommodate passengers and one non-electrified track to accommodate the SSFL. Other concerns associated with rail corridor preservation include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RailCorp needs to retain the current Western Boundary between the rail corridor and the western campus of the Liverpool Hospital (Bigge Street) for future passenger needs. Construction of the SSFL and the third commuter rail track in the vicinity of the hospital will require the acquisition of a long, narrow strip of land on the eastern boundary of the rail corridor, which may impact on the location of the proposed multi-deck car park east of the rail corridor. RailCorp requires reservation of land flanking the rail corridor between the TAFE and the rail line. This land will reduce land available to Liverpool Hospital in the area nominated for 'Core Hospital Future Development' adjacent to the multi storey car park. EA denotes location of Hospital Link Road as being well clear of existing tracks. Proponent appears to claim land immediately adjacent to and on the eastern side of the link road, which is actually reserved for future rail operations (land acquisition is to be formalised through the SSFL Developer Agreement). Warwick Farm Substation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RailCorp needs to reserve a 2000m² land parcel for Traction Supply Upgrading works immediately west of the rail corridor. The parcel (owned by RailCorp) is identified in the EA as the location for the north-south access road to the Hospital. RailCorp requires the parcel (as identified in an attachment to RailCorp's submission) be reserved allowing a 2000m² space (20m x 100m) with minimum allowance of 15m x 100m if an access road for Liverpool Hospital can be used by RailCorp for access to the substation. Should be noted that alternative locations for the substation are not possible due to constraints in the rail corridor within the area, and the effect of excessive distances between substation locations. Construction of substation is expected to commence in August 2007. 	<p>Matters of design detail and will be addressed in design development phase.</p> <p>Matters of design detail and will be addressed in design development phase.</p> <p>Matters of design detail and will be addressed in design development phase.</p> <p>Concept plan takes RailCorp proposed infrastructure corridor and proposed land boundaries plan (as provided by RailCorp) into account. The new north link road requires transfer of RailCorp land which is outside the railway proposed infrastructure boundary as shown RailCorp corridor Drawing No. LPTB-RA-SK 200556 A.</p> <p>Concept plan reflects retention of present western boundary.</p> <p>The boundary proposed by RailCorp for the SSFL and Liverpool switchback have been incorporated in the Concept Plan. The proposed east campus car park does not encroach into the RailCorp proposed infrastructure corridor and takes the proposed east campus land boundary into account.</p> <p>The boundary proposed by RailCorp for the SSFL and Liverpool switchback have been incorporated in the Concept Plan. Concept plan has taken RailCorp proposed infrastructure corridor and proposed land boundaries into account.</p> <p>Attached plan A1801 (Fig. 11) illustrates there is no land requirement east of the new north link road nor land required for future rail operations as per RailCorp proposed infrastructure corridor plan and boundaries (as provided by RailCorp).</p> <p>The requirement for the Traction Supply Upgrade sub station can be accommodated alongside the new north link road. NSW Health and RailCorp are cooperating in resolving location and design details to achieve this outcome. RailCorp will require access from the north link road to service the sub-station and NSW Health agrees to this.</p> <p>Refer to note above.</p> <p>Refer to note above.</p> <p>Noted.</p>

No	Date	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Response
		RailCorp cont.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking Provisions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Recommended that proponent explore options for vehicle access to the Eastern Campus that connect to the Hume Highway and/or Governor Macquarie Drive using Scrivener Drive. 	The access route to the hospital via Scrivener Drive is indirect and circuitous and will only provide limited access to the hospital's east campus. Growth in demand for hospital services will be from the west and south west. The proposed north link road will provide a convenient access route and alternative to access via Liverpool CBD.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proponent should provide car parking ratios for 24/7 and business hours at various locations within the hospital incorporating staff and outpatient/visitor parking. 	Parking requirements are addressed in detail in the Traffic, Transport and Parking Assessment Report of the Concept Plan (Appendix E).
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proponent should provide details of any proposed amplification of Scrivener Street and internal road networks to facilitate vehicle movements that avoid crossing the rail corridor. 	No upgrading to Scrivener Street given the proposed implementation of new north link road.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Entry provision to car parking on eastern campus should be restricted, with regulated entry arrangements (boom gates, access passes or similar, etc). 	Parking on the eastern campus is currently planned to be restricted to staff and access to parking areas will be controlled. However as car parking for the hospital needs to take into account parking on both the western and eastern campuses future operations may need to provide some public parking on the eastern campus.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site Access (from Station) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Detail required outlining what measures are intended to enhance walkability between Warwick Farm Station, Liverpool Station and Bus Interchange and Liverpool Hospital. 	Refer to Concept Plan and attached plan A1801 (Fig. 11) for details of proposed new pedestrian link to Warwick Farm Station as an integral part of new northern link road.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proponent should address the following general issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Full property and title search and physical surveys to define the location of the proposed works/development in relation to RailCorp's facilities. 	RailCorp and NSW Health are co-operating to facilitate resolution of this issue. RailCorp has requirement to acquire hospital land on eastern campus and will also require property title search and physical survey to identify extent of land acquisition requirements and extent of hospital infrastructure affected.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Internal noise criteria adopted by the proponent for the project is too high and is therefore inappropriate. 	Internal noise criteria appropriate for a hospital environment is required to be used.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Request a service search from RailCorp to establish the existence and location of any RailCorp services and structures. Any identified structures to be impacted by the proposal are to be discussed with and agreed to by RailCorp. 	Noted.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Setbacks from the rail corridor will need to be considered, or alternatively suitable crash protection measures must be implemented in all adjoining buildings. 	Information provided by RailCorp to date has been reflected in the Concept Plan. It is understood that hospital facilities outside 10 metres from rail tracks will not require crash protection. The main hospital facilities satisfy this criteria.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With relation to the SSFL Liverpool Hospital is identified as a specific potentially sensitive receiver. Whilst no significant noise impact on the hospital site is expected, the vacation childcare centre may require architectural treatment other than the proposed 4metre wall. 	This issue will be addressed as part of the Project Plan Application and forthcoming VPA. Note that there is in-principle agreement with ARTC that its funding for the noise barrier may be used to fund alternative noise and vibration mitigation works that may better suit the proposed hospital development.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RailCorp notes vibration impacts due to the SSFL will be acceptable at all current buildings and vibration from rail operations is below adopted criteria. Appropriate planning on the part of the proponent should be undertaken to ensure vibration impacts to the hospital's internal facilities are minimised. 	Noise criteria appropriate for a hospital environment should be used for assessment of impacts regardless of the source. Shared responsibility of mitigating noise and vibration impacts is acknowledged. RailCorp, TIDC and ARTC responsibility to mitigate noise and vibration impacts determined in accordance with government policy documented in Interim Guidelines for the Assessment of Noise from Rail Infrastructure Projects Department of Environment and Conservation/Department of Planning September 2006.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proponent will need to enter into a Deed with RailCorp in order to obtain track possessions (stopping of trains running on adjacent tracks) and/or power outages (shutting of power to RailCorp's facilities) to be able to undertake the proposed construction and installation work of the buildings adjoining the rail corridor. 	Noted.

No	Date	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Response
		RailCorp cont.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Physical access to the rail corridor will be required to undertake construction and installation works. Following should be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - No work is permitted within the rail corridor, or its easements, unless prior approval or an Access Deed has been entered into with RailCorp. 	Noted.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Should the proponent require access to the rail corridor prior to entering into a Rail Deed the proponent is required to enter into a Release & Indemnity agreement. 	Noted.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All works are to be carried out in accordance with railway Safe Working rules and regulations. 	Noted.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proponent shall make provision for easy and on-going access by rail vehicles, plant and equipment to support maintenance and emergency activities during and after construction. 	Subject to detail and separate agreement and no disruption to hospital operations.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The proponent will be required to enter into an agreement with RailCorp defining the controls to be implemented in managing the access required and/or the potential impacts of the development on RailCorp, and the involvement of RailCorp staff in ensuring the appropriate safety and technical standards are complied with. 	See above.
5	06.10.06	Transport Infrastructure Development Corporation	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Liverpool Turnback is to be constructed between the existing passenger rail lines and the SSFL. The new line is to be located north of the Shepherd Road overbridge and extend northward past the Hospital precinct. 	NSW Health awaits information from RailCorp and TIDC regarding the impact of the turnback project on the hospital and its environment.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIDC supports EA's acknowledgment of potential noise impacts associated with development adjacent to the existing rail corridor and the recognition of the potential need for mitigation in building design where necessary. 	The design of the building fabric will respond to the increased noise and vibration levels arising from the proposed rail corridor developments following mitigation measures undertaken by the rail agencies in accordance with the forthcoming VPA taking into consideration the Interim Guideline for the Agreement of Noise from Rail Infrastructure Projects.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The EA has adopted noise criteria from a range of sources (including AS 2021 Aircraft Noise Intrusion – Building Siting and Construction) which may not be the most appropriate guide for the assessment of noise impacts from rail operations. 	Noise criteria appropriate for a hospital environment should be used for assessment of impacts regardless of the source. Shared responsibility of mitigating noise and vibration impacts is acknowledged. RailCorp, TIDC and ARTC responsibility to mitigate noise and vibration impacts determined in accordance with government policy documented in Interim Guidelines for the Assessment of Noise from Rail Infrastructure Projects Department of Environment and Conservation/Department of Planning September 2006.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any noise assessment should be undertaken in accordance with Chapter 163 of the Environmental Noise Control Manual for external noise levels and RailCorp's guidelines for internal noise levels (Interim Guidelines for Councils: Consideration of Rail Noise and Vibration in the Planning Process, Nov 2003). 	Noise and ground vibration assessment has been undertaken for this project, refer to Appendix H and appropriate criteria has been adopted. Guidelines and recommendations are included in the assessment and are to be adopted. Shared responsibility of mitigating noise and vibration impacts is acknowledged. RailCorp, TIDC and ARTC responsibility to mitigate noise and vibration impacts determined in accordance with government policy documented in Interim Guidelines for the Assessment of Noise from Rail Infrastructure Projects Department of Environment and Conservation / Department of Planning September 2006. Planning Guidelines for development adjacent Rail Corridors November 2006 is acknowledged including initiatives to reduce and manage rail noise and vibration impacts at the source.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TIDC also supports design based approach to managing noise impacts from rail sources in EA by way of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Acoustic performance of facades facing railway tracks. 	See above.

No	Date	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Response
		Transport Infrastructure Development Corporation cont.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Careful consideration of glazing, wall construction and openings will need to be given during detailed design phase to ensure an acceptable acoustic environment is achieved. - Locating noise and vibration sensitive equipment and work areas away from eastern and western building facades. - Operating theatres and MRI equipment needs to be located in the centre of the new Clinical Building. • Statement of Commitments should adopt recommendations on pages 33 & 34 of the noise and vibration assessment. • TIDC supports the proposed closure of the Elizabeth Drive level crossing and redirection of pedestrian and vehicular traffic via new separated crossings over the rail corridor. • TIDC concurs with RailCorp's concerns that the new grade separated crossings will not be in place in time for commissioning of SSFL. <p>TIDC does not support emergency access across the rail corridor and recommends the hospital's emergency use criteria be factored into design and operation of the grade separated pedestrian and vehicle crossings proposed in the EA.</p>	<p>See above.</p> <p>This is a functional design matter for NSW Health.</p> <p>This is a functional design matter for NSW Health.</p> <p>NSW Health, RailCorp, TIDC and ARTC will agree by way of the forthcoming VPA to undertake and/or finance noise and vibration mitigation measures as agreed between the parties noting that each party shares the responsibility for mitigating the impacts.</p> <p>Refer to responses made earlier in this section.</p> <p>Refer to responses made earlier in this section.</p> <p>Refer to responses made earlier in this section.</p>
6	06.10.06	Department of Education and Training (DET)	Object	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project will impact three DET sites – Liverpool Girls High School, Liverpool TAFE & Liverpool Boys High School. • Specific issues that affect DET's sites include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Proposed incursion of two metre wide strip along southern boundary and south east corner of Liverpool Girl's High School (LGHS) to facilitate widening of east-west road from Hume Highway (involves land acquisition, replacement of car parking, new fencing, new noise attenuation, relocation of five demountables). - New private north link from Hospital to Hume Highway is proposed to be routed adjacent to and outside LGHS and Liverpool Boy's High School (LBHS) playing field areas, resulting in increased noise and security concerns. • There is a proposal for a health-related development on the present TAFE car park site (planned for 2011-2012), Nomination of a 'core hospital future development zone' will have implications for displaced car parking for staff and students and TAFE facilities planning. This issue requires discussion with DET and TAFE – may be potential for a joint venture Health/Education development. - DET anticipates to enter into a specific Panning Agreement with proponent that will facilitate the planning process and resolve site specific issues. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The Department's intent to enter into a VPA with NSW Health is noted. The detailed impacts on Liverpool Girls High School grounds will be addressed as part of that agreement. Also refer to proponent's specific response to the same issue raised in DoP Attachment B.</p> <p>Commitment to enter into a VPA with the Department of Education.</p>
7	13.10.06	Liverpool City Council	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategically Council supports redevelopment due to social and economic benefits of proposal. • Traffic study should consider impacts of removing traffic signals at Hume Highway/ Mannix Parade/Remembrance Avenue intersection. • Pedestrian activated signals may be required at Hume Highway between Forbes & Goulburn Streets. 	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Issue to be addressed as part of the detail associated with the Project Plan Application.</p> <p>Commitment to enter into a VPA with the Liverpool City Council/RTA.</p> <p>Issue to be addressed as part of the detail associated with the Project Plan Application.</p>

No	Date	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Response
		Liverpool City Council cont.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal reduces number of existing car parking spaces on Hart Street as a result of Hart Street works. Lost spaces should be relocated preferably to the northern end of Hart Street. 	Improved parking and separation from through traffic for Hart street residents are included in the north link road, refer plan A1801 (Fig. 11).
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic study did not cover all areas in Liverpool CBD where hospital visitors are likely to park in absence of nearby parking. Considered appropriate that all proposed on street parking (for hospital staff & visitors) be provided on-site within hospital premises. 	Traffic and parking study Appendix E addressed all relevant issues including the MoT assessment.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal should provide for significant upgrade works to public domain between Hospital and Liverpool Rail Station to improve connectivity and encourage patronage. 	Noted. There is a commitment for the project to contribute to public domain upgrade in conjunction with other stakeholders such as LCC. Issue to be addressed as part of the detail associated with the Project Plan Application and as part of a VPA with Liverpool City Council.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redevelopment should recognise urban design guidelines in DCP 30. 	The Concept Plan reflects the urban design guidelines set out in DCP 30.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Redevelopment should be sensitive to the Bigge Park heritage conservation zone. 	Refer to additional illustrative material prepared to reflect relationship between Bigge Park conservation zone and proposed development.
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommended that a condition be placed on the approval requiring a detailed staging plan. A local focus group (including Council representative) should be established to identify key construction concerns. 	The Project Plan Application will address the staging of development. A communications plan will be addressed as part of the detail associated with the Project Plan Application. NSW Health, RailCorp, TIDC, and ARTC have agreed to a coordinated community communication process.

Part C -Summary of Department of Planning Issues

Issue	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early Works & Future Approvals Section 1.6 of the Concept Plan (page 9) seeks approval for 'early site preparatory works and detailed excavation and structural works up to ground level for the new eight storey core hospital development'. Clarification is sought as to whether these works are intended to form part of a Part 3A project application or is approval being sought through Section 75P(1)(c) of the Environmental planning and Assessment Act, 1979 (the Act). 	<p>Approval of early works is sought through Section 75P(1) of the EPA 79. The scope of the Early Works comprises the works as shown by plans A1904, A1905 and A1906 (refer 3.2 Figs. 04-06). The works include services diversions and relocations, heritage and archaeological assessment and management, demolition and excavation in development zone A and structural works to ground level in development zone A. Refer to Section 3.2 for additional detail.</p>
<p>In either case, confirmation is sought regarding the proposed timing of such works. It should be noted that further plans/details and approvals from other agencies may be required prior to the commencement of works.</p>	<p>Proposed timing: demolition, excavation, structural works to ground level. Early works program in summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part 3A Approval January 2007 Works commence April 2007 Works complete December 2007
<p>Clarification is also required regarding the future development and determination roles of Liverpool City Council and the Minister for Planning. It should be noted that in approving the Concept Plan, the Minister may wish to identify future development that would be subject to Part 4 of the Act (with Council as the consent authority), or as exempt and complying development.</p>	<p>Preference for Minister to retain approval role. It is understood that the Minister may delegate to Liverpool Council or identify development components that would be subject to Part 5A of the Act.</p> <p>However for components of the project with a construction value of up to \$10m it is proposed that development applications be submitted to Liverpool City Council under Part 5A of the Act.</p>
<p>The Department notes that the construction of the proposed northern link road may require a reclassification of land prior to commencement of works. The proponent is advised that any approval of the Concept Plan will not address the issue.</p>	<p>Advice from Liverpool Council indicated that reclassification of land use not required for construction of new northern road.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Detailed Visual Analysis - Additional Plans Required The Department requests a plan be produced to show existing reduced levels (RL's) (AHD) for topography and ground levels, future ground level RL's and maximum future RL's of proposed development envelopes and number of storeys (including floor to ceiling heights). 	<p>Additional plans showing RLs for ground levels (existing and proposed) together with RLs of development envelopes and site context have been prepared and form part of this response.</p>
<p>All additional plans should be produced at an appropriate scale (A1 size or similar) and encompass both the Liverpool Hospital site and the surrounding area in order to show the context of the site in the immediate locality. The plans will ensure that the Department can carry out an accurate assessment of the Concept Plan proposal.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>It is requested that a detailed visual analysis be produced from a range of public vantage points so as to clearly show the bulk, scale and interface between existing and propose built development particularly proposed heights and setbacks. As a minimum photomontages should be submitted to show panoramic views from Bigge Park, the TAFE site and Campbell Street.</p>	<p>A series of visual analysis drawings have also been prepared showing views from TAFE , Campbell Street, Elizabeth Street and Bigge Park (see Fig. 04, 05, 06 and 07). Also refer to Section 3.5 for further detail.</p>

Issue	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vehicular and Pedestrian Accessibility Significant concern has been raised from a number of agencies, and particularly RailCorp, regarding the proposed access across the rail corridor between the eastern and western campuses. The Department requests details be submitted outlining alternative access arrangements and funding, or alternatively documentation that an agreement has now been reached between NSW health and all affected parties. 	<p>Detailed negotiations have taken place with RailCorp to resolve the alternative access arrangements given the proposed closure of the Elizabeth Street level crossing.</p> <p>NSW Health, RailCorp, TIDC, and ARTC are engaged in a process of consultation and meetings as a precursor to proposed VPA which includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the new north link road and land transfers. • Coordination between the projects. • Funding of the rail crossings. • Achieving construction of the grade separated crossings of the rail line in time for operation of the SSFL to enable closure of the level crossing to all but specified emergency use and other planned use. • Criteria for emergency use and other planned use of the level crossing. <p>Commitment to prepare a VPA between NSW Health and the relevant agencies responsible for the rail line that clearly identifies the agreed solution, funding, timing clearance requirements, land transfers and construction responsibility as part of the Project Plan Application.</p>
<p>Schematic plan and relevant supporting information should be provided demonstrating how the primary public access hospital road and the northern link road to the Hume Highway will function. Further information should be provided to show what impact, if any, the proposed roads may have on Liverpool Girls High School (including any required land acquisition, relocation of demountables and car parking area, etc) as well as any required road realignment. The agreement of any relevant parties (Council, RTA) should also be documented.</p>	<p>The impact of augmenting the existing northern service road within the hospital and its impact on the Liverpool Girls High School grounds is clearly set out in the attached plans including demountables/car parking etc. Refer to letter from DET indicating intent to reach agreement. Refer to Liverpool Council's letter of support.</p> <p>Commitment to enter into a VPA with the Department of Education.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Southern Sydney Freight Line (SSFL) It is unclear how and where the Concept Plan addresses issues relating to the tenure of the existing grade crossing, and any land acquisition requirements, and to a lesser degree, implications for existing rail service capacity and operation performance of the existing railway level crossing. 	<p>Detailed negotiations have taken place with RailCorp (see above) to resolve the issues associated with access between the east and west campus and support will be addressed in the forthcoming VPA.</p> <p>Commitment to prepare a VPA between NSW Health and the relevant agencies responsible for the rail line that clearly identifies the agreed solution, funding, timing clearance requirements, land transfers and construction responsibility as part of the Project Plan Application.</p>
<p>It is understood the Hospital may still rely on the level crossing at the time the SSFL is commissioned, which may have significant implications for access between the two campuses. Furthermore, whilst the Department acknowledges that land acquisition issues associated with the SSFL are to be resolved through a planning agreement between NSW Health and the Australian Rail Track Corporation, the Concept Plan should document that the appropriate arrangements are in place (or accounted for) to ensure access to/from the hospital will not be impeded by any such acquisition.</p>	<p>Detailed negotiations have taken place with RailCorp (see above) to resolve the issues associated with access between the east and west campus and will be addressed in the forthcoming VPA.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mental Health/Open Space Interface Figures 3.05 (page 24) and 3.08 (page 28) of the Concept Plan provide for a mental health centre directly adjacent to the proposed east-west plaza mall. The Department understands the plaza mall is envisaged to be a major pedestrian zone linking major zones within the hospital. In the absence of having details of the form and function of the mental health centre, concern is raised regarding the interface and relationship between the proposed mental health unit and public open space, particularly having regard to the risks associated with patients quality of care and treatment in highly accessible and permeable areas. 	<p>The Mental Health Centre was recently completed and commissioned. The Centre has been designed to provide a secure environment for mental health patients.</p> <p>The mental health centre has its own and separate and secure courtyards and it is fully separated and there is no link between the centre and the hospital pedestrian mall. The concept plan design has taken the potential impact on the mental health patients and the patients will not be able to be viewed.</p>

Issue	Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Medi-Hotel Facility It is noted the Concept Plan proposes a 'Medi-Hotel' facility on Goulburn Street. Further details are required regarding the broad development parameters envisaged for this facility including bedroom numbers, traffic generation and the like. Likely future ownership and management should also be addressed. 	<p>The proposed Medi-Hotel facility fully complies with Liverpool City Council's LEP and DCP for the city centre and is regarded as an important support health facility given the wider role that the expanded Liverpool Hospital will have in the region. At this stage of concept design issues such as bedroom numbers, traffic generation, ownership and management have not been subject to detailed assessment but will form part of the subsequent Project Plan Application.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Agreements/Section 94 Contributions It is noted that NSW Health intends to enter into several VPAs with Council and other agencies where appropriate. Clarification is sought as to when NSW Health envisages the preparation and execution of the proposed VPAs as any such agreement will need to be publicly exhibited on a similar basis to the Concept Plan proposal. The Department would prefer any VPA(s) to be resolved prior to the issuing of any Concept Plan approval. Payment of any financial contribution or provision of works in kind would be tied to issuance of the construction or occupation certificates or commencement of works. 	<p>VPAs are being negotiated by NSW Health with TAFE, NSW Department of Education, RailCorp, Liverpool City Council and other agencies. It is anticipated that the various negotiations will be resolved and the VPAs will form part of the subsequent Project Plan Application.</p> <p>Commitment to prepare a VPA between NSW Health and the relevant agencies responsible for the rail line that clearly identifies the agreed solution, funding, timing clearance requirements, land transfers and construction responsibility as part of the Project Plan Application.</p>