

# Memo RRM7 Upgrade Assessment and Heritage Act 1977 Approvals Strategy

**To** Tim Smith, OAM, Heritage NSW, Director Assessments  
Rochelle Johnston, Heritage NSW Senior Manager, Major Projects

---

**From** Felicity Barry, TfNSW Senior Environment Officer, Heritage

---

**Date** 17 July 2025

---

## Background

The Richmond Road M7 to Townson Road Upgrade project is a government priority with funding committed by both State and Federal governments. Funding availability is linked to project deliverables and achieving key milestones which necessitates a considered approach to the heritage approvals strategy for the project.

The project is in the process of obtaining a planning approval through a Review of Environmental Factors (REF), under Division 5.1 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment (EP&A) Act, 1979*. The REF was advertised in late 2024 and will be determined based on a 100% concept design. The project will be delivered in a two staged Design and Construct (D&C) approach. These two stages separate the Northern section which extends from Townson Road to Alderton Drive and the Southern Section from Alderton Drive to the M7 interchange. The Southern section of the project includes the Blacktown Native Institution site.

Aligned with the above-mentioned commitments, the northern section of the project will be delivered by December 2026, followed by the southern section, with early works to commence mid-2026 and main works by Q1 2027. The project is currently in the tendering stage, which will be awarded in October 2025.

The alignment of the Richmond Road upgrade impacts part of the land included in the curtilage of the State heritage register listed Blacktown Native Institution (BNI) SHR#01866. Most of the SHR listed site is owned and managed by Dharug Strategic Management Group (DSMG). The DSMG is comprised of representatives of Traditional Custodians of the Place and is a Dharug led not for profit organisation with majority Aboriginal board membership. Transport also owns an allotment within the BNI SHR curtilage, which fronts Richmond Road and extends from the M7 interchange north towards Richmond.

Transport recognises the importance of the DSMG as a key stakeholder for the project and has been engaging and liaising with the DSMG with a view to better understanding their concerns and issues. The DSMG is our neighbour, and we have committed to working with them to progress the best possible outcomes for the BNI and the DSMG from this project.

It is important to recognise that Richmond Road is heavily constrained in its existing alignment, with the proposed Castlereagh Freeway corridor to the north and the M7 interchange to the south. These are important factors that limit how the road can be placed in this area to achieve the project objectives. The following list outlines key constraints:

- Previous decision for the road alignment which widened Richmond Road to four lanes.
- Road and traffic engineering design of the flyover,
- Connection to the proposed future Castlereagh freeway corridor
- Location of the existing bridge over Bell's Creek

### **Impacts to the BNI's listed heritage values**

In response to REF submissions received from Heritage NSW and the DSMG concerning the impacts to the BNI, updates were undertaken to the Statement of Heritage Impact, in particular, the need to consider impacts to the social and cultural values of the BNI. The SOHI outlines mitigation measures proposed by the project and the REF environmental approval, to work through concerns and impacts to social and cultural values of the BNI as the project moves through detailed design.

The SOHI has assessed the project's impact have the potential to result in **adverse impact (major)** to the heritage values of the BNI. These impacts are focused on the social and cultural values of the site to the Aboriginal community. It is important to clarify that this level of impact does not constitute a total loss of significance to the values that underpin the BNI, nor is it considered to reach a threshold that would justify reconsideration of the site's listing on the SHR.

Although the proposed works will result in a reduction in physical landscape integrity and visual legibility, the site's historical, associative, social, and research values remain substantively intact. The affected areas do not represent the primary locations of significance under the listing or the highest concentration of tangible or intangible values. The BNI will continue to retain State-level significance due to its enduring associations with the history of child removal, institutionalisation, and Aboriginal community identity (historical and associative values). These values remain embedded not only in the physical remnants and cultural landscape but also in the collective memory and ongoing cultural practices of the Aboriginal community. The site's importance as a place of reflection, remembrance, and advocacy – particularly for members of the Dharug community and former residents' descendants – remains a cornerstone of its significance.

As a design and construct tendering process, which is currently underway, Transport has identified the sensitivities and importance of the BNI site and the need to involve the DSMG in review and refinement of project's design documentation (development of detailed design).

The establishment of a Working Group with representatives from both the DSMG and Transport, guided by an independent facilitator working through project impacts and guiding the detailed design development is a key measure proposed by the project to mitigate and manage these impacts. The Working Group will be guided by mutually agreed, clear and transparent reporting and accountability, documented in a Terms of Reference.

A copy of the Draft Terms of Reference for the DSMG working Group, with DSMG support, is also attached to demonstrate the intent and approach proposed [**Attachment 1**].<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> In the event the TOR is not finalized, we will include the final in the deferred commencement package to be provided for information to HNSW, refer to *Draft conditions of consent* below.

## Proposed Approvals Strategy

The funding commitments and D&C delivery strategy do not allow for the typical approach of seeking Heritage Council approval on detailed design. The concept design has been developed based on the above listed fixed constraints which solidify key design parameters including location, form and materiality. Transport is seeking HNSW support for a considered approach to heritage approvals on the project that allows the early investigations and detailed design to reduce or at a minimum confirm the impacts assessed in the SOHI.

On 27 May 2025 Transport discussed the approach to heritage approvals for the RRM7 project with representatives of Heritage NSW. Two options were considered. Details of these options are included in Table 1 below. An options analysis of these approaches outlining pros and cons is included in Table 2.

**Option 1 provides a wholistic approach to assessing the impacts to the Blacktown Native Institution by the RRM7 project, clearly linking project commitments to managing site impacts.** This approach to impact management is linked to the Planning Approval (the REF mitigation measures). To support this approach, we have developed a schedule of commitments [**Attachment 2**] which align with the phases in the construction program and a bespoke flowchart showing how the program will work [**Attachment 3**].

The **Schedule of Commitments** includes the activities related to probable construction program tasks. The Flowchart shows how this program will interact with the DSMG Working group, including a feedback loop between the DSMG Working Group, and an Activity-based impact assessment based on the additional detail. The impact assessment would allow a clear understanding of how the project has responded to the DSMG Working Group inputs. This information would then be lodged for assessment and approval by Heritage NSW against a condition of consent.

This approach is based on the assessment that the project's maximum impact has been assessed by the SOHI submitted with the REF approved concept design. However, this approach enables the project to work through the detail of the road project demonstrating against each stage in the schedule of commitments where impacts have been reduced to the listed values, or if unable to be reduced, remained the same and why this is the case. This approach establishes a mechanism for the Heritage Council to understand how Transport, working together with the inputs of the DSMG, will work through issues to develop the detailed design for the RRM7 project.

**Draft conditions of consent** have also been prepared below to indicate how the schedule of commitments could be aligned to the concept approval and enable the review and outcomes desired of the Heritage Council of NSW, the DSMG and Transport.

## Options analysis for the RRM7 Heritage Act approvals Strategy

Three options for approval have been considered for the *Heritage Act, 1977* approval pathway for this project include the following set out in Table 1:

Table 1: Three options for Heritage Act approval pathways for the project

Option	Preferred/Not Preferred
<b>1. Approval of 100% concept design with deferred commencement for testing of burials and linked conditions of consent developing detailed design</b>	<b>Preferred by Transport</b>
2. A series of individual s60 applications based on project activities at various stages	Not preferred
3. Submitting one s60 application following completion of detailed design.	Not feasible

Table 1 below summaries the pros and cons to the three options.

The benefits of Option 1 are discussed above.

Option 2 is not preferred by Transport as it would require multiple and individual s60 applications to be lodged based on individual works/activity packages. A s60 application must be a stand-alone assessment and cannot refer to future works. It would not be clear how future commitments involved in impact mitigation would be visible in this approach. Understanding of cumulative impact would also be difficult to track along with reporting requirements against each stage. Heritage NSW would receive a detailed package of works and impact assessment at each step.

Option 3 is not viable as Transport would not be able to conduct any activities within the BNI site without a s60 approval and an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) in place to conduct early investigative works needed to guide the development of the detailed design. This includes satisfying Heritage NSW requirements for early burial investigation being used to inform detailed design development. An AHIP cannot be issued without a development consent, in this case a determined REF, in place. Investigative activities necessary to support understanding of the detailed design development (contamination and geotechnical testing) would be unable to be conducted.

The Project delivery strategy, 'design & construct', was unanimously selected by Project leadership following a delivery strategy workshop that presented multiple contract models on the basis that it offered the best chance in meeting the Government Commitment of completing the Southern Section of the road upgrade by 2028. Accordingly, once State & Federal funding approval was obtained (Feb 2025) the project proceeded to the request for tender (RFT) stage under the D&C delivery strategy, with Contract Award scheduled for October 2025. Contractually, TfNSW is required to obtain all statutory approvals on behalf of the successful contractor. A 'Construct Only' delivery strategy would impose an approximate delay of 12-18 months due to the need to complete detailed design prior to transaction processes commencing.

While this is not a heritage issue, heritage approval received after contract award would result in significant project delays resulting in likely costly variations for Transport and the people of NSW. This would in turn have significant reputational impacts as a priority project for western Sydney for the NSW and Federal Governments.

Table 2: Options Analysis for the proposed RRM7 Heritage Act Approvals Strategy

Option 1: Approval of 100% concept design with deferred commencement for testing of burials and linked conditions of consent developing detailed design		Option 2: A series of individual s60 applications based on project activities at various stages		Option 3: Submitting one s60 application following completion of detailed design.	
Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons	Pros	Cons
A comprehensive assessment of the maximum impacts in the 100% concept design.	The level of detail is significantly less than the following detailed design. Changes to the concept Design are anticipated from this process, however the project limitations noted above remain.	Detailed information would be provided for each stage of work required	S60 applications are not linked. Each s60 must be considered on its own merits. If the s60 applications are deemed to materially affect, each must be advertised.	A comprehensive understanding of the final impacts to the BNI based on 100% detailed design.	Unable to conduct early testing for potential burials (requested by HNSW) and activities under the AHIP within the BNI site to inform the detailed design development.
Deferred commencement enables early testing for burials and then issue of a s60 against conditions under the schedule of commitments. This means greater understanding of the site is available to the DSMG, HNSW and Transport to inform detailed design.	Deferred commencement delays issue of the s60 approval to Transport	Greater certainty for HNSW on how impacts will be managed by the project	This will result in significant delays and costs involved in preparation of the detailed design for each stage and get it approved	One application would be considered by the Heritage Council Approvals Committee due to material affect, which would be advertised under the Heritage Act.	No early works (contamination and Geotech) would be possible to develop the detailed design at critical areas of the site e.g. Bells Creek and the Flyover.
Schedule of Commitments linked to conditions of consent means the detail and revised impact assessment is better understood. This will include DSMG input into its development	Each activity package will be submitted to Heritage NSW for review and approval. The timing for each of these reviews is not clear.		Unclear how the mitigations and outcomes proposed to be developed in later stages would be visible in this approach as each package of activities can not refer to a future s60 application.	Project impacts would have been worked through with the DSMG.	The delay in heritage approval would result in significant project delays and costly variations due to mismatch with contractual requirements.
One application would be considered by the Heritage Council Approvals Committee due	The Heritage Council needs enough certainty in the approach about impact to heritage		Unclear how the environmental approval (REF determination) would		Project delayed post approval due to a lack of geotechnical and contamination testing

to material affect, which would be advertised under the Heritage Act.	values, and the processes for managing this, to consider approval.		be linked to each of the applications.		informing detailed design, which can only occur after approval. This may require amendments after approval to update the plans and approach.
Allows a clearer understanding of the cumulative impacts of the project			Cumulative impacts would not be easily expressed through individual s60 applications.		Strong potential for additional costs due to design changes required in construction phase due to prohibited access to site beforehand.
			Multiple s60 applications may need to be advertised under the Heritage Act. These s60 applications may also need to be referred to the Heritage Council Approvals Committee for consideration.		Resulting project delivery delay will impact existing political commitment and result in significant reputational risks to Government (State and Federal).



## **Relationship of S60 application and activities under an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP)**

The RRM7 project's investigations under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974* identified it was likely that Aboriginal objects would be harmed by the project activities and one site, Richmond Road Bells Creek AFT 1, which is located within the Transport owned BNI curtilage is likely to be partly impacted by the project.

The project's Aboriginal cultural heritage assessment report (ACHAR), which was prepared with the input of Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs), concluded that community (surface) collection together with archaeological salvage is appropriate to mitigate the project's impacts to part of the Richmond Road Bells Creek AFT 1 site affected by the proposal.

The s60 application will include the mitigation measures under the AHIP for part of Richmond Road Bells Creek AFT 1 as part of the Heritage Act approval. Supporting this Approvals Strategy, any activities approved by the AHIP to part of Richmond Road Bells Creek AFT 1 will need to be managed differently to the rest of the AHIP area including:

- Ensuring the burial testing within Richmond Road Bells Creek AFT 1 limits archaeological activities as much as possible, noting the AMRD has a methodology to manage burial testing in this area.
- Surface collection and archaeological salvage will occur to the remaining parts of Richmond Road Bells Creek AFT 1 under an activity package set out below (Package A – Investigation works). This will enable the Activity package to reassess and clarify the level of project impact to Richmond Road Bells Creek AFT 1.

### **Draft conditions of consent:**

If the s60 application is determined as a deferred commencement. The following suggested approach to conditions may be applied to link the task of archaeological testing into the program, delivering the results early on to guide detailed design preparation:

### **Activities shall not commence until the following is submitted to Heritage Council of NSW or its delegate for approval<sup>2</sup>:**

- A) Approval of a final *Archaeological Methodology and Research Design* to conduct test excavation investigating for potential for burials within select parts of the BNI site impacted by the Richmond Road project. The final document must address advice of the DSMG into the development of the archaeological program.
- B) Following written approval by the Heritage Council of NSW or its delegate of Condition A, the program of archaeological testing and investigation can occur.
- C) Following completion of the archaeological program, a final excavation report documenting the findings of the testing program must be prepared and submitted to Heritage NSW for information. This information must be used to inform development of the detailed design and be provided for the information of the DSMG Working Group.
- D) A *Non-Aboriginal Heritage Management Sub-Plan (HMP)* must be provided to Heritage NSW for review and approval. This should include information and procedures to minimise potential damage to the BNI site throughout pre construction and during construction stages including

---

<sup>2</sup> As noted above, if the DSMG Working Group TOR are not finalized by submission of the s60 application, the final version will be included in the deferred commencement package for information as point E. The document has been updated to reflect this approach.

the locations of all non-Aboriginal and Aboriginal heritage features on a map including detailing the heritage protection measures to be undertaken during construction according to Specification G36 of the Contract [Non- Aboriginal and Aboriginal Management Sub-plans].

- E) Copy of the final Terms of Reference for the DSMG Working Group, submitted for information.

## **PACKAGE OF ACTIVITIES**

Prior to each Activity Package being submitted, Transport will review the package together with the input of the DSMG Working Group to confirm endorsement of the package prior to lodgement. The submission will include sufficient detail of the proposed activity to understand the scope, location, methodology and the assessed impact of the activity. Multiple Activity Packages would be submitted by TfNSW, aligned with the identified Project Stages pertinent to the BNI Site set out below. Prior to undertaking the works authorised under the activity packages A, B and D, Transport must receive written approval from the Heritage Council (or its delegate). For Package C, Heritage NSW will supply written feedback for Transport to inform the movement from Substantial Detailed Design (70%DD) to Final Detailed Design (100%DD), advising how comments have been addressed in the supporting heritage report.

### **Project Stages**

- A.** Investigative works for approval
- B.** Vegetation recovery for approval
- C.** Detailed Design Development (Substantial Detailed Design) equivalent to 70% detailed design, for comment to inform Final Detailed Design (FDD).
- D.** Detailed Design Development (Final Detailed Design) equivalent to 100% detailed design, which will include the site establishment, temporary works and construction packages for approval.

Transport understands that additional conditions relating to e.g Interpretation, Archival Recording, compliance, Aboriginal Objects, unexpected finds are likely to be included and attached to an approval, if issued.



## **List of Attachments**

**Attachment 1:** Terms of Reference for the DSMG working group (Draft)

**Attachment 2:** Schedule of Commitments

**Attachment 3:** Bespoke Process Flowchart

**Attachment 4:** Activity Package Heritage Impact Assessment – Template

**Attachment 1:** Terms of Reference for the DSMG working group (Draft)

# Dharug Strategic Management Group Working Group (DSMGWG)

## Terms of Reference

### 1. Definitions

- **Aboriginal people:** In this document, refers to the First Peoples of New South Wales, including Dharug Traditional Owners and other Aboriginal peoples who have cultural authority, responsibilities, and rights within the Richmond Road RRM7 Project Area.
- **First Nations:** A term recognising the diversity, sovereignty, and distinct cultures of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples across Australia, acknowledging their enduring spiritual, physical, social, and cultural connection to Country.
- **Dharug Strategic Management Group Working Group (DSMGWG):** The appointed Richmond Road RRM7 Working Group established to provide leadership, guidance, and oversight on cultural matters associated with the Richmond Road Upgrade.
- **Transport for NSW (TfNSW):** The New South Wales Government transport agency responsible for planning, managing, and delivering the Richmond Road Upgrade Project.
- **Tika EQ:** The cultural advisory and engagement firm providing strategic guidance, facilitation, secretariat support, and Aboriginal governance expertise to the Richmond Road RRM7 Aboriginal Governance Group.
- **Country:** The land, waters, skies, cultural values, heritage, spirituality, and interconnected living systems that define the physical, cultural, and spiritual landscape of the Dharug peoples with ties to the project area.

### 2. Introduction

The Richmond Road Upgrade is a major infrastructure project led by Transport for NSW, in collaboration with Blacktown City Council. Central to the project's governance is the establishment of the Dharug Strategic Management Group Working Group (DSMGWG), which will provide a forum for representation of cultural authority and ensure meaningful engagement.

Situated on Dharug Country, the project spans from the M7 Motorway to Townson Road in Marsden Park and includes sites of profound cultural importance - most notably, the Blacktown Native Institution (BNI) Site. Recognised as a place of enduring significance for Dharug people, the BNI is integral to truth-telling, healing, and reconciliation. The

DSMGWG will play a critical role in ensuring that Dharug cultural values, heritage, and priorities are respected and embedded across all phases of project design, delivery, and legacy planning.

Through its leadership, the DSMGWG will ensure that Aboriginal knowledge systems, governance practices, and cultural rights are upheld across the Richmond Road RRM7 Project. This approach reflects not only an ethical commitment to Country and community, but also supports broader reconciliation and nation-building outcomes.

### 3. Purpose

The primary purpose of the Aboriginal Governance Group (DSMGWG) is;

- To provide strategic and cultural advice, leadership, and oversight to the Richmond Road RRM7 Project.
- A community interface mechanism, tasked with translating project information to community and bringing community perspectives into decision making.

In addition to providing strategic cultural advice, the DSMGWG will play a vital role in ensuring that Dharug community members are informed, engaged, and meaningfully included in key decisions throughout the Richmond Road RRM7 Project.

### 4. Commitment to Aboriginal Ways of Working

The DSMGWG commits to upholding culturally appropriate ways of working that reflect Aboriginal knowledge systems, relationships, and responsibilities to Country.

4.1 Opening protocols: Each meeting will commence with a Welcome to Country or Acknowledgement of Country, delivered by a designated Aboriginal representative nominated by the members.

4.2 Culturally responsive protocols: The DSMGWG respect gendered knowledge, cultural responsibilities, and restricted information.

4.3 Sensitive content: Members acknowledge that meetings may involve exposure to cultural knowledge, including secret or sacred matters and references to deceased persons.

4.4 Culturally safe environment: The DSMGWG will ensure safe spaces for members to participate openly, recognising the importance of cultural safety, mutual respect, and emotional wellbeing.

## 5. Roles and Responsibilities

5.1 The DSMGWG will operate in accordance with the following expanded engagement principles:

- **Aboriginal-Led Authority:** Cultural visioning, decision-making, and participation will be driven by Traditional Owners and cultural knowledge holders with recognised authority.
- **Deep Cultural Understanding:** All project partners will demonstrate growing cultural competence and commit to respecting Traditional Owners' knowledge systems, histories, and living cultural obligations.
- **Inclusive Representation:** Opportunities will be provided for broader Aboriginal community input, including intergenerational voices, emerging leaders, and Dharug kinship networks.
- **Early and Ongoing Engagement:** Engagement will occur continuously from concept design through delivery, allowing Aboriginal knowledge to shape all stages.
- **Clear Purpose and Communication:** The DSMGWG will operate with transparency, shared expectations, and respectful dialogue that fosters trust and accountability.
- **Relationship Development:** The DSMGWG acknowledges that cultural partnerships require time, patience, and a willingness to engage in honest, challenging, and healing conversations.
- **Transparent Governance:** Regular reporting, accessible communication, and accountable record-keeping will ensure that all parties have confidence in decision-making processes.

5.2 The DSMGWG will:

- Provide comprehensive cultural advice across all phases of the Richmond Road RRM7 Project lifecycle.
- Review and advise on project documents, designs, assessments, and mitigation strategies from a cultural governance perspective within an agreed timeframe.
- Ensure respectful consideration of cultural knowledge shared by Aboriginal stakeholders.
- Facilitate information sharing between community members to ensure transparency.

## 6. Ethical Standards and Duties

6.1 **Code of Conduct:** All members will adhere to ethical standards reflecting respect for culture, responsibility to community, and integrity in decision-making.

6.2 ICIP Protocol: Members will comply with Aboriginal Cultural and Intellectual Property protocols protecting cultural rights, knowledge, stories, and information.

6.3 Conflicts of Interest: Members must avoid circumstances that could compromise impartiality or create real or perceived conflicts of interest. Disclosures must be made immediately to Tika EQ.

6.4 Community Representation: Members must prioritise the collective interests of their community, refraining from advancing personal or external agendas.

## 7. Leave of Absence

7.1 Leave: Leave may be granted for up to two consecutive meetings upon written notice. Members who are absent without explanation will be contacted to confirm ongoing interest.

7.2 Special Leave: Absence for family, cultural or community obligations will be accommodated respectfully.

7.4 Apologies: Members are responsible for submitting apologies and seeking updates on meeting outcomes they miss.

## 8. Quorum

8.1 A quorum shall consist of at least 50% of appointed members, reflecting balanced representation.

8.2 Emerging leaders may attend as observers upon agreement.

8.3 Proxies may be nominated where a member is unavailable.

8.4 Efforts will be made to ensure gender balance is reflected at each meeting.

## 9. Remuneration and Allowances

9.1 Members will be remunerated in recognition of their time, cultural knowledge, ICIP contributions, and leadership.

9.2 Rates may be periodically reviewed to reflect roles, responsibilities, expertise, and evolving project needs.

## 10. Confidentiality

10.1 All members commit to maintaining confidentiality over sensitive cultural, commercial, or project information.

10.2 Public statements will only be made following consultation with TfNSW, Tika EQ and relevant governance bodies.

10.3 Any media requests received by members will be referred to Tika EQ for appropriate coordination.

## 11. Meetings

11.1 The DSMGWG will meet at least every two months, with additional meetings scheduled as required.

11.2 Meetings may occur face-to-face or virtually, depending on agenda complexity, urgency, or member availability.

## 12. Procedures at Meetings

12.1 Members may attend meetings in person or via remote means.

12.2 Decisions will be reached by consensus wherever possible, with dissenting views respectfully recorded in minutes when consensus cannot be achieved.

12.3 Written resolutions outside formal meetings may be passed by unanimous member endorsement.

12.4 Minutes will:

- Accurately record all decisions, discussions, and assigned actions.
- Be reviewed and ratified at the following meeting.
- Serve as a record of cultural advice provided to TfNSW.

## 13. Secretariat Support

Tika EQ will provide secretariat support including:

- Agenda setting (in consultation with TfNSW);
- Circulation of meeting papers;
- Recording and distribution of minutes;
- Management of actions and resolutions.



## 14. Queries

Any queries relating to the DSMGWG, membership, or process should be directed to the Tika EQ Secretariat in the first instance.

DRAFT

## **Attachment 2:** Schedule of Commitments

RRM7 S60 Strategy - Schedule of Commitments

Stage	Impact	Phase	Activity	Description / Purpose	Requirement/evidence	Impact Assessment
Pre-Contract Award	Low impact	Deferred Commencment (Pre-S60 Approval)	Investigation for potential burials	Investigation for potential burials & overlapping Aboriginal archaeological Salvage as per the AMRD.	Pre-Activity: AMRD Post Activity: Excavation Report	No
			Additional Information supply	Additional deferred commencement requirements (if not supplied with S60 Lodgement)	DSMG Working Group Terms of Reference CEMP (including Aboriginal & Non-Aboriginal sub-plans)	No
		Contract Award			NA	No
Investigation works	Moderate impact	Pre-DCD	Contamination Testing	Testing to inform material usage and waste classification.	Contamination Testing Investigation Plan (within GIPP)	Yes
			Geotech boreholes & testpits	Testing to inform design ground conditions	Geotechnical Investigation Proposal Plan (GIPP)	Yes
			Potholing (utility)	To confirm existing utility location/s.	Utility Investigation Plan	Yes
			Aboriginal archaeological Salvage	Richmond Road Bell's Creek AFT1 (as per Figure 11 of ACHAR)	ACHAR	Yes
			Site walkovers	To familiarise site conditions & constraints.	SWMS	No
			Detail survey	Pick-up of ground topology & features to inform design development.	SWMS	No
Vegetation recovery	Minimal impact	Pre-Construction	Seed collection	As requested by DSMG.	Environmental Management Plan	No
			Tree artefact salvage	As requested by DSMG.	Environmental Management Plan	Yes
Detail Design Development	No impact	DCD / SDD / FDD / IFC	Design Development (Iterative)	Detail Design stages (Developed Concept Design, Substantial Detailed Design, Final Detailed Design, Issued for Construction)	*Available upon request.	No
Site establishment	Low impact	Pre-Construction	Vegetation clearing & grubbing	To faciliate temporary and mainwork construction activities.	Construction Management Plan (including SWMS and relevant subplans)	Yes
			Installation of barriers	To isolate and protect site workers and the public.	Construction Management Plan (including SWMS and relevant subplans)	Yes
			installation of hoarding/fencing	To isolate and protect site workers and the public.	Construction Management Plan (including SWMS and relevant subplans)	Yes
			Temporary works - pedestrian bridge	To enable continued pedestrian movements.	Temporary Works Package	Yes
			Temporary works - lighting	To enable nightwork specific activities.	Temporary Works Package	Yes
			Temporary works - access/temp. paving	To enable essential vehicle & plant movements.	Temporary Works Package	Yes
Temporary works	Low impact	Pre-Construction	Temporary works - erosion & sed. control	To manage onsite run-off / construction waste discharge.	Contractor Erosion Sediment Control Plan & Erosion Sediment Managemer	Yes
			Temporary works - enviro monitoring (noise/dust)	To manage and conform to planning approval requirements.	Environmental Management Plan	Yes
Construction	Major adverse impact	Pre-Construction	Shared path removal (within curtilage)	To faciliate mainwork construction envelope	Construction Management Plan &/or Temporary Works Package	Yes
			Utility relocation/ construction	To faciliate mainwork construction envelope	Utility Design Package	Yes
			Civil works	Earthworks construction to ultimate design levels	Civil Design Package	Yes
			Embankments & retaining walls	Geotech. Engineering Package / Structures (depending on where RW go)	Geotech. &/or Structures Design Package.	Yes
			Lighting installation	To demarcate and provide safe vehicle-user experience.	Lighting Package	Yes
			Pedestrian Bridge removal	To faciliate mainwork construction envelope	Structures Report	Yes
			Bell's Creek Bridge construction	Main work Construction to the ultimate state.	Structures Package	Yes
			Flyover Construction	Main work Construction to the ultimate state.	Structures Package	Yes
			Pavement works	Main work Construction to the ultimate state.	Pavement Package	Yes
			Urban Design/Landscape implementation/CWC	Enhance visual amenity and Connecting with Country initiatives.	Landscaping / Urban Design Package/s.	Yes

\* An Activity Package may be submitted to HNSW for Condition Approval at any design development stage provided both TfNSW and DSMG endorse the Impact Assessment.

\*\* This 'Schedule of Commitments' is subject to change throughout design development, and it will be the responsibility of TfNSW to maintain a current revision that is shared with HNSW.

**Attachment 3:** Bespoke Process Flowchart



**Attachment 4:** Activity Package Heritage Impact Assessment – Template

Transport  
for NSW

# Activity Package Heritage Impact Assessment

[template]

Richmond Road Upgrade  
(M7 Motorway to Townson Road)

June 2025



[transport.nsw.gov.au](https://transport.nsw.gov.au)

OFFICIAL



## Acknowledgement of Country

Transport for NSW acknowledges the traditional custodians of the land on which we work and live.

We pay our respects to Elders past and present and celebrate the diversity of Aboriginal people and their ongoing cultures and connections to the lands and waters of NSW.

The project interfaces with land of State Significant Aboriginal and Non-Aboriginal Cultural Heritage – Blacktown Native Institute and the Colebee and Nurragingy land grant (1819).

We acknowledge the Dharug people as the traditional custodians of the land on which the RRM7 project is proposed

Transport for NSW is committed to honouring Aboriginal peoples' cultural and spiritual connections to the land, waters and seas and their rich contribution to society.



# Document control

Document owner	
Consultant	
Approved by	
Branch / division	
Review date	

# Versions

Version	Date	Amendment notes
1.0		
2.0		

# Table of contents

1.	Proposed works.....	5
2.	Authorship.....	5
3.	Overview heritage information .....	5
4.	Key heritage design principles .....	6
4.1	<i>Design Guide for Heritage response</i> .....	7
5.	Options analysis .....	9
6.	Assessment of preferred option .....	10
6.1	Preferred option summary .....	10
6.2	Preferred option assessment.....	10
6.3	Design recommendations.....	10
7.	Conclusion.....	10
8.	Definitions .....	11
	Appendix A: DSMG WG Endorsement .....	12
	Appendix B: Relevant Figures & Plans .....	13
	Appendix C: References.....	14

# 1. Proposed works

Detail	Requirement
Transport for NSW program	Include the relevant Transport for NSW/Sydney Trains program of works. E.g. Transport Access Program, More Trains More Service, Power Supply Upgrade, Major Periodic Maintenance etc.
Summary of works	Brief written summary outlining the proposal, including ancillary sites (i.e. construction compounds).

# 2. Authorship

Include authorship information and company details as required.

This report has been prepared by XX of XX.


# 3. Overview heritage information

Detail	Requirement
Street Address	Insert street address as it appears on heritage listing.
Lot/DP	Insert property Lot and DP as it appears on heritage listing.
Heritage listings	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NSW State Heritage Register (SHR) – XX</li> <li>Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register (S170) – XX</li> <li>Local Environmental Plan (LEP) listing – XX</li> </ul> <p>Note: provide relevant reference numbers.</p>
Statement of Significance	<p>Copy from NSW State Heritage Inventory (SHI) database –SHR/S170. Note any differences if the site is included across multiple listings.</p> <p>Note: If the Statement of Significance is incomplete or outdated provide relevant additional information for consideration as part of the project and future assessment.</p>
Conservation Management Plan/Strategy/Heritage Asset Action Plan	<p>Is there a site CMP/CMS/HAAP?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>If yes, provide details.</p>
Heritage items in the vicinity	Note heritage items in the vicinity if they are adjacent and have the potential to be impacted by the proposal. Only include Statements of Significance if the works have the potential to impact the impact (physical and visual).

## 4. Key heritage design principles

As a series of dot points, outline the key heritage design principles relevant to the scope of work. These should act as the heritage measures of success for the final proposal.

Key heritage design principles may include:

- Reference to aspects of significance or a place that should be avoided or enhanced.
- Key views that should be avoided or understood in massing.
- Materiality preferences for new elements.
- 

4.1 Design Guide for Heritage response

Using the *Better Placed, Design Guide for Heritage*, capture the key Design Considerations under associated with each Objective within the guide. Highlight the key Design Considerations in **bold** in the second column if they are relevant to the proposal. An example is provided below. The third column should include any *Design In Context* criteria which might match, and/or any relevant CMP policies which may also align with the *Design Guide for Heritage* criteria. The fourth column must define the relevancy of the criteria to the place (see example below), and subsequently outline how the design should respond to these criteria with specific design responses (see examples below). This can be in bullet point form.

The following criteria have been drawn from *Better Placed, Design Guide for Heritage* (Heritage Council of NSW and Government Architect New South Wales, 2019). The design responses speak directly to the *Design Guide for Heritage* key design considerations but are site-specific to XX Station.

Table 1: Design Guide for Heritage responses

Design Guide for Heritage objectives	Design Guide for Heritage key design considerations	Design in Context criteria and/or CMP policies (where applicable)	Design response
<b>Better fit</b>  Contextual, local and of its place	<i>Understand the specific character of the place, precinct, or area. Design new work to respond to and, when appropriate, strengthen this character.</i> <b>1. Design new work to positively relate to the style, materiality, scale, massing, and grain of existing buildings and structures.</b> 2. Design new forms to respond to the predominant form of the streetscape. 3. Locate new structures on sites in ways that support existing urban patterns. Careful consideration of height and setback is crucial to designing for a better fit. 4. Where relevant, design new work to respond to and re-establish meaningful urban connections and views. Consider settlement patterns, tree canopy, and connections between places. 5. Retain heritage landscape elements and planting schemes and design new landscape to relate to the existing.	<b>E.g. Character</b>	<b>Define the character of the place:</b> The character of XX Station is defined by XX.  <b>Key design responses which will see positive impacts to the character of the place:</b> The proposal must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Respond to Context<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>XX.</li></ul></li><li>Simple elegant design<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>XX.</li></ul></li><li>Respect key views and vistas<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>XX.</li></ul></li><li>Etc.</li></ul>
<b>Better performance</b>  Sustainable, adaptable and durable	<i>Key design considerations</i> 1. Analyse the opportunities and constraints of existing structures, environmental systems, and site organisation in terms of sustainability, durability, and adaptability. 2. Identify existing effective passive design systems. Rejuvenate them if possible. Consider removing additions that compromise environmental performance. 3. Sensitively integrate new environmental initiatives where appropriate to improve environmental amenity and sustainability performance. 4. Retain and recycle original fabric and materials to preserve embodied energy, where possible. 5. Maximise passive heating and cooling and waste and water management in the design of any new work or additions. 6. Select new building materials and systems to enhance energy efficiencies.	XX	XX
<b>Better for community</b>  Inclusive, connected and diverse	<i>Key design considerations</i> 1. Investigate the cultural significance of the place at the outset of the project. Understand that the place may carry divergent and contested meanings for different groups. 2. Engage local communities early in the process in meaningful ways. 3. Draw on knowledge embedded within the community when identifying significance and developing interpretative strategies. 4. Assess potential impacts on existing communities. Will the project lead to social, economic, and environmental improvements? Is there a risk that it could disenfranchise some existing communities? If so, investigate how this can be ameliorated. 5. Assess the impacts of the method chosen to deliver the project on existing and new communities.	XX	XX

Design Guide for Heritage objectives	Design Guide for Heritage key design considerations	Design in Context criteria and/or CMP policies (where applicable)	Design response
<p><b>Better for people</b></p> <p>Safe, comfortable and liveable</p>	<p>Key design considerations</p> <p>1. Design any new work to be of a quality and approach that is commensurate with the quality and style of the heritage place.</p> <p>2. Analyse existing circulation and urban relationships to help determine patterns of use important to the site.</p> <p>3. Engage highly skilled consultants to deliver collaborative solutions that balance function, comfort, and compliance with heritage significance.</p> <p>4. Consider how the project can help promote equitable access and walkable communities.</p>	XX	XX
<p><b>Better working</b></p> <p>Functional, efficient and fit for purpose</p>	<p>Key design considerations</p> <p>1. Retain the existing use where it is both integral to the heritage significance and feasible in terms of current needs, economic viability, and standards.</p> <p>2. Establish a common understanding of appropriate re-uses early and in consultation with professionals, the local council and/or the Heritage Council of NSW.</p> <p>3. Explore the history and significance of a heritage place as a possible generator for ideas for future use.</p> <p>4. Consider temporary uses as a means to maintain heritage places.</p> <p>5. Design new work to accommodate possibilities for future changes of use.</p>	XX	XX
<p><b>Better value</b></p> <p>Creating and adding value</p>	<p>Key design considerations</p> <p>1. Explore how the project can add value for the community as well as the client and owner of the heritage place.</p> <p>2. Ensure that careful project planning, upfront investment in design quality, and consideration of long-term maintenance are all embedded in the process.</p> <p>3. Undertake cost assessment early in the planning stages and identify applicable financial incentives or concessions.</p> <p>4. Engage specialist trades where appropriate.</p> <p>5. Consider ongoing maintenance costs during the design process and embed these in management plans.</p>	XX	XX
<p><b>Better look and feel</b></p> <p>Engaging, inviting and attractive</p>	<p>Key design considerations</p> <p>1. Design new work to complement the heritage place, not compete with it.</p> <p>2. New work should exemplify design excellence in its own right.</p> <p>3. Respond sympathetically to existing planning and spatial structures.</p> <p>4. Take an informed and strategic approach to colour, materials, and details. Consider their character and history, and identify opportunities for new and existing work to communicate through the design and selection of materials and details.</p>	XX	XX



## 5. Options analysis

**Drafting guidance**

- Options analysis is a critical component of the heritage design process. The below table must outline all of the options that have been considered in arriving at the preferred solution.
- Discuss in the table below the alternative options that have been considered for all aspects of the design, outlining why the preferred option was chosen, and why others were discounted.
- Option numbering should be aligned with the project for ease of identification and cross referencing.
- Refine fields as needed to capture all aspects of the design. Example below.

Table 2: Options analysis

Illustration	Description	Heritage comment
Location		
Option 1		
	•	•
Option 2		
	•	•
Option 3		
	•	•
Materiality		
Option 1		
	•	•
Option 2		
	•	•
Option 3		
	•	•
Form		
Option 1		
	•	•
Option 2		
	•	•
Option 3		
	•	•

## 6. Assessment of preferred option

### 6.1 Preferred option summary

This section should include a dot point summary of the proposed works and overarching preliminary review on the heritage suitability of the preferred solution.

### 6.2 Preferred option assessment

### 6.3 Design recommendations

The heritage design recommendations to guide development of XX are as follows:

- XX.
- XX.

## 7. Conclusion

## 8. Definitions

Term	Definition
CMP	Conservation Management Plan
HDR	Heritage Design Report
LEP	Local Environmental Plan
REF	Review of Environmental Factors
SHI	NSW State Heritage Inventory
SHR	NSW State Heritage Register
SOHI	Statement of Heritage Impact
TAM S170	Transport Asset Manager of New South Wales Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register
Transport	Transport for NSW

# Appendix A: DSMG WG Endorsement

(Provided through Working Group Mechanism)

# Appendix B: Relevant Figures & Plans

# Appendix C: References