

9 October 2020

Our Ref: P-19177 (DR/CD)

Nathan Stringer

NSW Department of Planning, Industry & Environment

Nathan.Stringer@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Nathan,

RE: ST FRANCIS COLLEGE STAGE 1 - LANDSCAPING (SSD-10365)

City Plan Strategy & Development P/L (City Plan) acts on behalf of the proponent of the abovementioned application. This correspondence responds to the NSW Department of Planning, Industry & Environment's (DPIE) request for additional information in relation to the abovementioned application, dated 11 August 2020. DPIE's request also sought a response to submissions received from the public as well as other government agencies during the application's exhibition period.

The following subheadings outline the key issues in DPIE's request, following which is a response.

1. CLARIFICATION OF DEVELOPMENT FOOTPRINT

The landscape plan has been amended to include a revised legend. The legend includes a red dashed line which represents the proposed development area. A red dashed line is now clearly shown on the plan itself. The amended landscape plan accompanies this correspondence separately.

2. FENCING TO BE SHOWN ON ELEVATION PLANS

An additional plan prepared by JDH Architects (i.e. Drawing Number SSSDA-001, Revision 01, dated 27 August 2020) has been provided demonstrating the new fence in elevation form. This plan also includes detailed images of the proposed boundary fence, including vehicular and pedestrian entry gates. For information, the proposed fence is identical to existing fencing along the subject site's Poziers Rd and Jardine Drive boundaries. It is also consistent with most fences installed at schools in suburban Sydney.

3. PEDESTRIAN ENTRIES

The pedestrian entries were erroneously omitted from the proposed landscape plan. An amended plan accompanies this correspondence which includes three (3) pedestrian entry points, consistent with the original Concept Approval SSD 8832. For information, an extract of the amended landscape plan showing the pedestrian entry points circled blue, is provided on the following page.



Figure 1: Extract of amended landscape plan with 3 pedestrian entries circled blue (Source: Arcadia/City Plan)

4. AGENCY SUBMISSIONS

4.1. Liverpool City Council

Objection is not raised to conditions recommended by Liverpool City Council.

4.2. Environment, Energy & Science Group (EESG)

The EESG stated that the proposed planting schedule included several species which did not reflect, as required by the SEARs, vegetation communities native to the subject locality. The EESG is correct in this regard. However, the vast majority of species within the proposed planting schedule do reflect the subject vegetation community. The number of proposed species which are not is, in fact, quite minor. As a result, it is our view that the proposed planting schedule is consistent with the SEARs.

As DPIE will realise, the original condition of the subject locality is highly modified. Species which may not be derived from the locality's original community were selected as these will adapt to the highly modified environment and assist with the establishment of the entire landscape concept.

4.3. Sydney Water

Objection is not raised to conditions recommended by Sydney Water.

4.4. Transport for NSW (TfNSW)

This application does not propose changes to the onsite parking and/or manoeuvring arrangements. Any changes were in response to conditions in the original Concept Approval and were implemented as part of that approval. Given any changes to the manoeuvring and parking arrangements are not

proposed as part of this application, we do not believe TfNSW's request for a road safety audit (RSA) is warranted.

Regardless of the above, any changes were minor and do not fundamentally alter the parking and manoeuvring arrangements as were found to be satisfactory in the issuing of Concept Approval SSD 8832. Subsequently, we do not believe the changes warrant a RSA. It should be noted that the area referred to by TfNSW is already constructed and in operation, in accordance with previous consents.

TfNSW has recommended a RSA because it believes the minor alterations to the internal manoeuvring arrangements required as part of SSD 8832 will encourage motorists who pick up/drop off students within the site to reverse their vehicles before pick up/drop off occurs. The parking spaces in question are mostly for those students driving to school. Parents picking up/dropping off students are not likely to park their vehicles to pick up/drop off students. Rather, they are likely to wait within or in close proximity of the drop off/pick up zone and wait for children to enter/exit the vehicle. Parents are not likely to park their vehicles which is standard practice for most schools with generous onsite vehicular manoeuvring spaces such as the subject site. As with most schools, administration will implement its own procedures to support this practice. This includes teachers overseeing the pickup zone and calling out a student's name once their vehicle arrives.

5. RESIDENT SUBMISSION

We note that one (1) public submission was received by DPIE during the application's exhibition period. This submission raised concern with dust from the school during its construction phase. Given only one (1) submission was received, we do not believe this represents an ongoing issue, rather, it suggests that the building contractor and the school in general are managing erosion and sedimentation effectively. Regardless, the building contractor/s will be reminded to maintain standard erosion and sedimentation protocols.

6. CONCLUSION

This correspondence responds to DPIE's request for additional information as well as agency and public submissions to SSD-10365. In our view, these matters do not raise any issues which would preclude the issuing of Development Consent for the DA. We also note that the proponent is willing to accept the recommended agency submissions, with the exception of the TfNSW's request for a RSA. In this case, we are of the view that the proposal remains consistent with the original Concept Approval SSD 8832, that the proposal is without any unreasonable environmental impacts, and that Development Consent could be issued under delegated authority.

Should you wish to discuss any of the matters raised above, please contact Carlo Di Giulio on 8270 3500.

Yours Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'David Ryan', written in a cursive style.

David Ryan
Executive Director

Attachments: Amended landscape plan by Arcadia
Additional fencing detail by JDH Architects