

# GOVERNMENT ARCHITECT NEW SOUTH WALES

26 November 2024

Lara Dominish  
Director Placemaking and  
Property  
Sydney Metro-Western Sydney  
Airport  
E:  
LaraMaree.Dominish@transport  
.nsw.gov.au

Dear Lara,

Please find attached the Design Review Panel's response pertaining to Condition of Approval E63 for the Stations Services Trains Operations and Maintenance (SSTOM) package and the letter prepared by Park Life Metro "SMWSA SSTOM—Stage 2 PUDCLP—E63 Compliance Statement."

Do not hesitate to contact GANSW should you require any further information.

Sincerely,



Olivia Hyde LFAIA  
Chair, SM-WSA DRP  
Director, Design Excellence GANSW

Government Architect  
New South Wales

4 Parramatta Square  
L17, 12 Darcy Street  
Parramatta NSW 2150

government.architect  
@planning.nsw.gov.au  
T +61(02)9860 1450

[governmentarchitect.nsw.gov.au](http://governmentarchitect.nsw.gov.au)



Sydney Metro –Western Sydney Airport (CSSI 10051)  
Condition of Approval E63: “Design Requirements and Strategic Context”  
STATIONS SERVICES TRAINS OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

## Introduction

Pursuant to Condition of Approval (CoA) E63 and advice received from Grant Rokobauer, Team Leader, Rail Infrastructure Management, Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (DPHI), this letter confirms that the Sydney Metro-Western Sydney Airport (SM-WSA) Design Review Panel (DRP) has reviewed the draft letter prepared by the Stations Services Trains Operations and Maintenance (SSTOM) contractor Park Life Metro (PLM) titled “SMWSA SSTOM–Stage 2 PUDCLP–E63 Compliance Statement” (undated) and its attachments. This letter seeks “to explain and highlight SSTOM design responses to Condition E63 and to summarise the outcome of the ongoing interactions and review of the design by the DRP.”<sup>1</sup>

E63 requires that the DRP review the design of permanent built works and landscape design associated with SM-WSA according to:

- (a) the design objectives, principles and guidelines identified in documents listed in Condition A1;
- (b) the principles and objectives of the draft Connecting with Country Framework;
- (c) relevant land use changes, masterplans and initiatives, where this information is known and/or available;
- (d) existing and proposed future local context and character; and
- (e) transport and land use integration and system functionality in the context of precincts, to the extent it is known and/or defined.

Further it states that “the outcome of the DRP review must be provided to the Planning Secretary prior to the submission of the Place, Urban Design and Corridor Landscape Plan (PUDCLP).

The DRP is not required under the Approval to review the PUDCLP itself, but rather have been asked to provide an account of the process and outcomes of the design review process in confirmation of the E63 Compliance Statement.

While the DRP is reviewing the SM-WSA project holistically, including designs for Airport Terminal and Airport Business Park, as reflected in the SSTOM Stage 2 PUDCLP, this letter pertains to works carried out under the CSSI 10051 approval only, being St Marys, Orchard Hills, Luddenham, Bradfield and the Services and Maintenance Facility.

This letter incorporates the content of the DRP’s previous E63 letter (dated 24 April 2024) issued in relation to the submission of the SSTOM Stage 1 PUDCLP.

## Background

In 2022, a DRP was established to support the Design Excellence requirements set out in the CSSI approval. The Panel provides independent, expert advice on urban design, architecture, landscape architecture, sustainability, heritage and Connecting with Country issues in accordance with the design objectives and principles outlined in the following project-specific documents:

- Sydney Metro-Western Sydney Airport “Design Guidelines”
- Sydney Metro-Western Sydney Airport “Urban Design Principles”
- Sydney Metro-Western Sydney Airport “Station and precinct specific design principles”

---

<sup>1</sup> Parklife Metro D&C letter to The Planning Secretary, “Re; SMWSA SSTOM—Stage 2 PUDCLP—E63 Compliance Statement” (undated) p. i. Issued to the DRP as a draft by SM on 19 November 2024.

- Connecting with Country Framework (Draft).

The SM-WSA project is being procured via several contracts, with the DRP engaged to review the design development of the following packages of work:

- Surface and Civil Alignment Works (SCAW)
- Stations Services Trains Operations and Maintenance (SSTOM)
- Corridor Restoration Works (CRW)
- Footbridge St Marys (FSM).

To enable the pursuit of quality design processes and outcomes across all contracts and design packages, SM established and has maintained a consistent and regular process for design review meetings, conducted according to the SM-WSA DRP Terms of Reference. To date, the Panel has met in relation to these packages on 46 occasions to “[e]nsure that the design integrity of approved or awarded schemes [is] maintained as the design develops.”<sup>2</sup>

After each meeting, the DRP’s feedback and recommendations are formalised in the Records of Advice prepared and issued by the Government Architect NSW. These letters provide the fullest account of the design review undertaken by the DRP and constitute the ultimate record of the DRP’s advice and recommendations.

### **Design Review process for SSTOM**

Metro stations, service and ancillary buildings, interchange areas and associated precinct landscape works, as well as the integration of these built works with surrounding development, are being designed and delivered through the SSTOM package.

The DRP’s review of SSTOM commenced in December 2022. DRP review sessions were typically four hours in length and held on a fortnightly to monthly basis. To date, 33 review sessions pertaining to the SSTOM package have been held to provide advice and recommendations to SM related to items (a)-(e) above. A summary of the SSTOM design issues reviewed in each of the relevant DRP sessions is outlined in Appendix A.

In the main, the DRP is satisfied with the robust nature of the design review process SM has established to further the design development of SSTOM precincts, architecture and landscape. The review of design issues is rigorous, regular and on-going over multiple meetings.

### **Design Review outcomes for SSTOM**

Further to the formally issued Record of Advice, SM has maintained the Records of Advice and Recommendations Register which provides a chronologically organised summary of the Panel’s recommendations and records the responses of SM and/or the SSTOM contractor to that advice. The outcome of this process is recorded in the Register as follows:

Closed to the Panel’s satisfaction	The DRP is satisfied that the design issue has been fully resolved through subsequent design development or the provision of additional information.
Closed but not to the Panel’s satisfaction	The DRP has not seen a response to the advice, or the response was considered inadequate.
Superseded	The design issue was subsequently raised again, and SM’s response is grouped with a later item for response.

<sup>2</sup> Terms of Reference (Western Sydney Airport Line and Metro West), 4 March 2022 (rev. 1 January 2024) p. 2.

Closed, to be transferred to relevant SM Working Group	Agreed that the advice pertains to a technical issue subject to SM project requirements or specifications, and as such, the DRP is satisfied that the issue can be transferred to the relevant working group for resolution.
Open	The advice has not yet been actioned or resolved within the timeframe of meetings leading up to the submission of the Stage 2 PUDCLP

The Records of Advice and a version of the Register are included as Enclosures to PLM’s E63 Compliance Statement as evidence of the DRP’s review and its outcomes. The DRP is satisfied that this represents a reasonable account of the general process and outcomes. It is pleasing that all the design advice provided over the extended review period has been considered, with a majority of issues actioned and resolved to the Panel’s satisfaction or transferred to one of SM’s design working groups to pursue to resolution.

At the time of writing, the design review process for SSTOM is ongoing, with resolution still required on several outstanding design issues including:

- Strategic planning and urban design issues at Orchard Hills
- Design implications of descoped sections of streets and plaza at Orchard Hills
- A new design for northern sections of the Luddenham precinct
- The final design of Bradfield Station

**Notable positive outcomes of the Design Review process to date**

**Connecting with Country**

- The co-design process led by the Connecting with Country consultant has resulted in the successful integration of significant precinct design elements, particularly at St Marys.
- The thoughtful and refined approach to planting palettes, materials and colour selection led by the Connecting with Country consultant has made a major contribution to a distinctive presence for each station.
- Collectively, the work of SM’s Connecting with Country Working Group and the SSTOM Connecting with Country consultant has resulted in a wide range of positive outcomes from precinct design, architecture, interpretation, public art to fabric designs for the Metro carriage interiors. This is testament to what can be achieved when Indigenous knowledge and creativity is embedded into a project from its early stages. In sum, Connecting with Country process and outcomes on SM-WSA form a significant legacy of the SM-WSA project.
- The constructive dialogue with SM-WSA Strategic Urban Design team on matters related to strategic planning, urban design and divestment.

**Strategic Planning and Urban Design**

- The constructive dialogue with the SM-WSA Strategic Urban Design team on matters related to strategic planning, urban design and divestment.

**Precinct Design**

- The inclusion and delivery of the “Eastern Laneway Pedestrian Zone” at Orchard Hills, a thru-site link connecting Precinct Road 2 to a second metro gate line. This is a positive refinement to the precinct plan that provides greater permeability, legibility and pedestrian amenity.

- The successful “designing out” of bollards when HVM was considered early in the design process and as an integral element in the design of the architecture and landscape (e.g. St Marys station building and the exhibited design for Luddenham northern plaza).

#### Sustainability

- The process established by the SM-WSA Sustainability team to reach best-practice sustainability outcomes, navigating complex, multi-stakeholder engagement and varying local government requirements.
- Built form reductions and structural refinements across the project that have resulted in a 31% reduction in emissions related to material use compared to the concept design.
- The thorough approach taken in measuring and accounting for carbon emissions related to materials procurement, delivery, and operation.
- Built form refinements to optimise solar shading and daylight quality to station interiors, and to maximise passive thermal comfort for passengers and staff when considering wind, glare, and radiant heat.
- The thorough and considered approach to selecting paving and hard landscape materials, concurrently responding to Connecting with Country concepts while meeting solar reflectance limits to address the Urban Heat Island Effect (UHIE).

#### Landscape

- The development of the CRW as a separate contract focused on restoration of the Cumberland Plain. Guided by ecological and landscape restoration expertise, the Connecting with Country Working Group, with the inclusion of First Nations bush regeneration specialists, and a planned ARC Grant collaboration with Western Sydney University, Landcom and NSW Department of Climate Change, the CRW is a significant innovation and major advancement for SM projects, with enormous potential as a strategy for other infrastructure projects in the future.
- Significant reduction in the use of strata vaults, tree pit linings and tree grates to better support tree establishment and growth while improving soil connectivity, soil hydration and soil health.
- Planting trials investigating different native species selection, low nutrient soils, irrigation and maintenance regimes to inform a line-wide approach to landscape planting. Although the results of the trial were mixed, the DRP strongly support such research efforts in pursuit of improved landscape outcomes.
- Responses to DRP advice on general layout, circulation and detailed landscape issues at all stations and the SMF.
- Retention and protection of the existing fig tree in the heritage plaza at St Marys.

#### Architecture

- Rationalisation of services and back-of-house components, resulting in a general reduction to the built form area at all stations and the SMF.
- Station architecture, which while nuanced in scale and form to respond to local context, also creates a line-wide identity for the stations through the modular approach to structure, roof, soffit and façade design. This architectural quality is enhanced through attention to the detailing of structure and connections, soffits, façades and louvres. The architecture at St Marys, Orchard Hills and Luddenham stations reflect a confident and high-quality response to the context, climate and culture of Western Sydney.
- The use of a smaller architectural practice to lead the design of the SSTOM services buildings has been a successful strategy for providing additional attention to the architectural possibilities of these secondary buildings. A sophisticated line-wide design

language with a focus on strong form and materiality is the result, with considered responses to context at each location.

- SM’s Public Art Strategy and the ensuing commissioning process for WSA, which promise excellent results for the integration of art into the stations and Active Transport Corridor.
- Adjustments to the location of the gate line and enlargement of the unpaid concourse at Luddenham, enhancing the customer experience and improving station operations.
- Introduction of a second gate line at Orchard Hills.
- Improved passive building performance at the SMF, including introduction of daylight to functional spaces, provision for natural ventilation and airflow, and optimization of roof form for photovoltaics.

### **Missed opportunities.**

#### Legible, future-proofed street networks

- Western Laneway, Orchard Hills

The Western Laneway at Orchard Hills is no longer the proper street (i.e. 10 km shared zone) envisaged in the approved concept design, but rather a shared path, partially closed by bollards, with managed service and maintenance vehicle access only. A legible, gridded network of streets as a framework for future development, comfortably accommodating pedestrians, cyclists, tree canopy but also local vehicular movements, is thus compromised. The 16 m road reserve, while representing a different “laneway” street type, does not allow for flexibility and adjustment should the proposed arrangement prove unworkable.

Traffic engineering issues further compromise the status of the Western Laneway as a clear north-south connector, with its southern intersection with Precinct Road 4/Lansdowne Road deflected, further eroding legibility and creating left over spaces.

On a predominately greenfield site such as Orchard Hills, both of these street layout issues were avoidable.

- Innovation South, Bradfield

Innovation South is the only address to the metro station at Bradfield. WPCA’s vision for Innovation South as an extension of Central Park with pedestrian priority is laudable in intention. However, a proper street with well-designed vehicular access is not necessarily contrary to pedestrian and active transport priority nor the desired visual and physical connection with the park. The current design fails to provide appropriate accessible drop-off and pick-up and convenient kiss-and-ride closer to the station entry. There are also safety/CPTED and activation benefits of well-managed and designed vehicular access to Innovation South during the early stages of Bradfield’s development. With a much-reduced road reservation of 12.5 m, the flexibility to redress any shortcomings and respond to change over time is precluded.

#### Pedestrian priority

- The absence of a Stage 1 Civil Design package entailed no early opportunity to coordinate detailed road and drainage design with precinct urban and landscape designs, nor to confirm the project commitment to prioritise the amenity and safety of pedestrians. Road designs were largely delivered as a *fait accompli*, with neither time nor contractual mechanism to respond to the advice of the Panel, the Chief Engineer NSW (who acted as an advisor to the DRP), nor to changing standards and evolving best practice. Updates to the AustRoads standards on lane widths effective from December 2023, which may have achieved more space for pedestrians and landscape, were not explored, with traffic lanes now being delivered that are often wider than those of the reference design. Similarly, road design performance solutions that could have extracted space for use by pedestrians

and landscape were not explored. Thus, there are several instances where the broader objectives of the Movement and Place framework are not achieved, nor SM-WSA's own urban design objectives and principles relating to pedestrian priority and landscape amenity.<sup>3</sup>

#### — Station Street, St Marys

While acknowledging that Station Street must accommodate a bus interchange and future development to its south, civil and traffic engineering has taken precedence over the delivery of an optimal pedestrian environment, with kerb radii oversized compared to place-based road design, misaligned footpaths, streets and kerbs, wider than needed lane widths, wider pedestrian crossing distances at intersections, as well as a general erosion of space for planting.

The footpath on the northern side of Station Street adjacent the station has also been reduced to less than 3.0 m to accommodate in-road drainage; a dimension considered too tight for this location in the interchange.

#### Better integrated HVM

- An overreliance on bollards, often in long lines, results in physical and visual clutter in the public domain. This is evident at St Marys, but particularly problematic at Bradfield, where interface issues are further manifest through the long line of bollards located on the project boundary, interrupting the continuity of the footpath zone.

#### Earlier integration of blast requirements

- While the stringency of requirements and the complexities of the modelling/testing process are acknowledged, the late integration of blast requirements has been to the significant detriment of design quality, architectural and public art outcomes.

#### Greater attention to soil volume, continuity and hydration to support tree canopy and landscape

- Although the Particular Specification related to soil volumes has undoubtedly been satisfied, those specifications do not align with current best practice and up-to-date research. As tree canopy is a major plank in the efforts to mitigate UHIE, optimal soil conditions to support growth are essential. Although some gains have been made over the course of design development, early collaboration with Penrith City Council and the civil and services engineering teams to advance the issue of extensive and continuous soil volumes and adequate passive irrigation to support soil hydration was required to support the ambitious canopy cover targets, moving towards a more sophisticated understanding of Green Infrastructure.

#### A better developed cycling strategy

- While the difficulties of integrating with local authority infrastructure (or lack thereof) is acknowledged, the opportunity to support the safety, convenience, health and sustainability benefits of cycling as an alternative means of connecting to the metro has only been partially realized.
- There is an overreliance on shared paths, despite dedicated cycleways being acknowledged as better and safer for both cyclists and pedestrians.
- The location of bicycle storage has not been carefully enough considered in relation to convenience, cyclist behavior or customer experience. The storage at Bradfield is too far

---

<sup>3</sup> See SM-WSA Design objective "Transport network" which states: "The Transport for NSW transport modal hierarchy will guide the design of stations, interchanges and associated developments, prioritizing walking and other modes of active transport." Similarly, the project's Urban Design Principles call for "Walkable urban environments...including the provision of safe, permeable and well-connected station precincts" as well as "...centres that provide well-connected and designed streets and spaces..."

from the entry. On the other hand, storage at St Marys and Orchard Hills is too close, ignoring the reality that (despite instructions to dismount) cyclists will ride across these station entries to get as close to the bicycle storage facility as possible, with clashes between pedestrians and cyclists easily predictable.

#### Consistent resolution of architectural expression

##### — Bradfield Station

While the decision to engineer Bradfield station to support over-station development is sound (avoiding the need for future partial demolition and reconstruction), the building as a stand-alone element lacks the compositional strength and clarity of the initial design and has not reached the same level of structural and architectural refinement as St Marys, Luddenham and Orchard Hills stations.

To date, options to ameliorate the visual impact of the oversized structural columns, particularly the highly visible corner columns to the northern façade, have not been pursued due to blast requirements.

##### — SMF

The concept/tender design for the SMF showed very considerable architectural promise. While value engineering during design development rationalised the amount of built area, it also resulted in a reduction in architectural quality, diminished architectural character and reduced staff amenity, with a range of elements and details from the concept/tender design lost.

#### Use of higher quality and more sustainable materials

- The use of CFC instead of the GRC that formed part of the tender offer represents a significant reduction in the material quality of the project.
- Original proposals for the SMF explored low carbon cost timber and hybrid structural solutions that were abandoned during the design development phase.

#### A more developed response to urban heat risk

- The opportunity to use water in combination with vegetation and shade to generate coolth in the public domain was a prominent feature of the contractor's initial landscape proposal, lost during the design development phase. While active water features were deleted, other opportunities to leverage the cooling benefits of water in the landscape were not explored.
- A line-wide strategy for shade provision, looking not only at tree canopy but physical devices to provide shade during the tree establishment period, was generally absent. Whilst mostly an omission from the original brief and scope, new evidence and research emphasizes the lack of continuous shade as an emerging heat risk. The absence of a more holistic and staged approach to shade provision has left a residual heat risk for future users and stakeholders

#### **Content of the SSTOM Stage 2 PUDCLP**

As mentioned, CoA E63 relates to the content and outcomes of the DRP's review of the SM-WSA project, and not the PUDCLP document itself. According to CoA E77b, the review of all PUDCLPs pertaining to the SM-WSA are undertaken by an independent reviewer nominated by the DRP.

The DRP met with the independent reviewer on two occasions to respond to specific questions and were provided with drafts of the Stage 1 and 2 PUDCLPs for their information only.

The recommendations, if any, of the independent reviewer have not been supplied to the DRP. The DRP is also unaware of the final content of the SSTOM Stage 2 PUDCLP.



Sydney Metro—Western Sydney Airport Design Review Panel

	Digby Hall
	Laura Harding
	Olivia Hyde (Chair)
	Ingrid Mather
	Matthew Pullinger

Appendix A—SSTOM Design Review Summary.

DRP Meeting Date	Meeting #	Design Issue Reviewed	Record of Advice Issued
1 Dec. 2022	11	Connecting with Country approach; line-wide roof canopy design; service buildings kit-of-parts and materials; Luddenham egress stairs.	8 December 2022
23 Feb 2023	12	Bradfield station and precinct concept design.	1 March 2023
9 March 2023	13	General landscape strategy; St Marys arboricultural issues; Orchard Hills station canopy and facades and precinct, including discussions of WSUD and interfaces with Penrith City Council; Luddenham gate line, bicycle storage and retail locations, canopy, façade and soffit designs; Bradfield station concept design.	15 March 2023
23 March 2023	14	Strategic planning; St Marys precinct and station design including advice to coordinate with civil design works and early design of HVM.	29 March 2023
23 March 2023	15	Bradfield strategic planning and urban design including design of Innovation Place South; line-wide strategy for services buildings and public domain elements; SMF landscape strategy and general roof design.	14 April 2023
20 April 2023	16	Line-wide sustainability strategy and climate change risk; Orchard Hills precinct plan; Bradfield station and services buildings; Luddenham masterplan, station, service building and precinct design; Bradfield masterplan, precinct, station and services building design; Orchard Hills precinct design.	8 May 2023
4 May 2023	17	Public art strategy; Orchard Hills masterplan, station and services buildings	15 May 2023
12 May 2023	Unnumbered	Special meeting with WPCA, Bradfield Masterplan, specifically Innovation Place South.	19 May 2023
24 May 2023	18	Connecting with Country colour palette; line-wide approach to design and detailing of common elements; line-wide approach to materials and detailing of service buildings; Orchard Hills masterplan, precinct and urban design; St Marys station and service buildings.	30 May 2023
1 June 2023	19	SMF landscape and building design, including sustainability issues; Active Transport Corridor including landscape, materials, lighting and bridge design.	14 June 2023
15 June 2023	20	Luddenham services building design; Bradfield masterplan update and design excellence process and design and activation of the Pod 1 service building; general updates on precinct landscapes service buildings and bicycle facilities;	27 June 2023
29 June 2023	21	Orchard Hills station, precinct and service buildings; St Mary Connecting with Country and precinct design; Luddenham precinct and service building design; Bradfield landscape and service building design.	11 July 2024
13 July 2023	22	Soil volumes; Bradfield station design; St Marys station (concourse and platform) design including materials, bicycle storage and service building design.	24 July 2023
27 July 2023	23	St Mary's structure plan; "system-wide landscape and urban elements strategy (paving and paths, furniture, shelters, lighting, water features, planting and extent of application); St Marys urban and precinct design; Orchard Hills urban and precinct design	8 August 2023

10 August 2023	24	Connecting with Country line-wide colour and material strategy; Bradfield Masterplan and station and service building architecture, and bicycle storage; St Marys service buildings and bicycle access and storage	21 August 2023
24 August 2023	25	Luddenham urban design and precinct; Bradfield urban design and precinct; Orchard Hills service building; bicycle infrastructure	4 September 2023
31 August 2023	26	Public art; Orchard Hills planning and urban design; corridor and ecological restoration.	18 September 2023
7 September 2023	27	System wide station canopies, façade engineering and detailing; public furniture; Orchard Hills stormwater strategy, bicycle storage and retail pod designs; integration of additional SCAW-related stockpile at SMF.	18 September 2023
21 September 2023	28	Corridor Landscape Masterplan; Active Transport Corridor, including bridge design; Luddenham egress stair and services building; SMF landscape design and architecture, including detailing; Public Art integration.	5 October 2023
5 October 2023	29	Stage 1 Landscape package; St Marys precinct design; Luddenham precinct and station design' Bradfield precinct, station and service building design,	18 October 2023
19 October 2023	31	Corridor Landscape Works; planting trial; Orchard Hills urban and precinct design.	26 October 2023
2 November 2023	32	St Marys station and bicycle storage design; Orchard Hills urban, precinct and entry plaza design; first evidence of civil design and its impact on footpath width at St Marys.	14 November 2023
16 November 2023	33	Public art update.	23 November 2023
30 November 2023	34	Luddenham station and precinct design including activation, HVM, bicycle storage; St Marys precinct design including heritage; Bradfield service building Pod 1 and bicycle storage design; general discussion on a shade across the project.	14 December 2023
14 December 2023	35	Line-wide sustainability and heritage interpretation, civil design (including use of dish drains, lane widths), HVM, bicycle facilities; Bradfield Pod 1 service building; SMF photovoltaic installation and stockpile design.	20 December 2023
1 February 2024	36	Line wide bicycle storage and lighting principles; general traffic engineering and coordination of civil and precinct design; St Marys precinct design and station lighting; Orchard Hills HVM.	12 February 2024
29 February 2024	38	St Marys, Orchard Hills, Bradfield road and drainage design/ traffic engineering.	15 March 2024
28 March 2024	39	Prototyping, materials, finishes and colour; St Marys, Luddenham and Bradfield precinct design.	12 April 2024
2 May 2024	41	Public art/ artist selection; St Marys, Orchard Hills and Luddenham strategic planning and divestment strategies; soils and tree pit design; Orchard Hills precinct.	13 May 2024
30 May 2024	42	Connecting with Country work on materiality and colours; Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal heritage interpretation and their coordination; Bradfield station design.	13 June 2024

14 June 2024	43	Luddenham precincts materials coordination; line-wide street and plaza tree plantings; Corridor Landscape Works and Active Transport Corridor; shade issues at SMF.	24 June 2024
25 July 2024	44	Planting strategy and landscape maintenance; scope reductions/cost cutting impacts to design of Orchard Hills and Luddenham precincts; Bradfield station blast requirements	13 August 2024
31 October 2024	46	Design and place implications of scope changes at Orchard Hills; design changes subsequently to PCC review.	8 November 2024