APPENDIX A

St MATTHEWS CATHOLIC COLLEGE, MUDGEE (SSD 9872)
CORNER BROADHEAD ROAD AND BRUCE ROAD, SPRING FLAT (MUDGEE)
RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

RESPONSE TO DPIE KEY ISSUES AND AGENCY, COUNCIL & PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

Department of Planning, Industry & Environment Key Issues

The following sets out our response to the Department's key issues as included in its letter dated 7 July 2020.

Issue	Response
Traffic and Transport	
The Department notes that the proposal involves the construction of a new secondary school with a maximum of 680 secondary school students. Section 5 of the submitted Traffic Impact Assessment Report identifies a projected growth in student and staff numbers between 2019 and 2026.	Noted. The Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) assumes that the school with start with the current number of students (i.e. 373 students, see Table 7.1 of TIA), and then will grow to 680 students by 2026.
It is unclear whether the intersection performance results in the SIDRA analysis within the Traffic Impact Assessment Report are for the year of completion / operation of the development or for 2026, when full capacity is expected. In this regard, the SIDRA analysis must clarify the year for which the SIDRA model is predicated.	To clarify, the 2026 SIDRA modelling cases reflect when full capacity of the school population is attained i.e. 680 students. Further, as requested in submissions, a Sensitivity Analysis / revised SIDRA modelling has been undertaken to address and compare potential intersection performance changes arising from the identified changes to traffic distribution. This has now included known information related to a nearby residential subdivision DA, annual growth and the maximum student population up to 2036. As a result, none of the intersections are significantly altered in terms of their Level of Service (LoS) ratings which are still at A and B, and therefore well within the prescribed levels of acceptance. Further discussion is included below in the response to TfNSW's and Council's submissions. See also **Appendix B**.
Clarification must be provided regarding the proposed staging of the number of students / timing specified against the SIDRA analysis or table of results. The details of staging the operational capacity (in terms of student and staff numbers) would also be needed to validate the future rates of car parking spaces on the site.	As above, the 2026 SIDRA modelling cases reflect when full capacity of the school population is attained i.e. 680 students.
If the increase in student numbers and / or construction of the buildings are to be phased during operation, then the associated SIDRA modelling for intersection performances, construction and operational traffic impacts on the surrounding road network must be considered for each phase of increase in student numbers.	As above, noting the construction is in one phase and the population growth is limited to the year 2026 and a capacity of 680 secondary school students.
The construction traffic assessment does not conclude whether works zones are required during construction or whether the surrounding road network can	No work zones are required outside of the site on Council roads as indicated in both the EIS and in

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

accommodate the construction traffic movements. The construction traffic management plan should be amended to include these details and any mitigation measures to minimise impacts on the surrounding traffic network.	the TIA (see Section 9.1). All works are easily accommodated within the site. As reported in Section 9.6 of the TIA, typical construction activities are anticipated to generate up an average of six vehicle trips in an hour which would have a minor impact to the operation of nearby intersections. During the peak construction period (on concrete pour days), there would be up to 20 vehicles per hour. This equates to an average of one construction vehicle every three minutes and could easily be absorbed by the surrounding road network which currently operates at Levels of Service A and B. It is expected that there would be less than 20 major concrete pours on-site during the structural phase which would have minimal impact to the locality. Notwithstanding this, an updated Construction Traffic Management Plan would be prepared along with a Driver Code of Conduct, providing clear guidelines for minimising impacts to surrounds and mitigation measures for any impacts caused by construction works.
The Department notes that Mid-Western Regional Council (Council) and Transport for NSW (TfNSW) have raised a number of concerns regarding the traffic assignments, relevant assumptions, parking and other traffic matters. The Department agrees with these concerns and considers that these be addressed in full in the Response to Submissions Report (RTS).	See further and more detailed commentary below and within other traffic-related documents as appended.
Drainage and Flooding	
The site is located within a natural catchment known as "Sawpit Gully" and is therefore impacted by a flood hazard. In accordance with Council's comment, a detailed Stormwater Drainage and Management Plan is to be submitted for the development.	Triaxial has prepared a revised Stormwater Drainage Management Plan arising from new but limited information recently provided by Council – See **Appendix C**. Triaxial have confirmed that Council has provided its current preliminary flood study. However, this study omits input flow rates which are necessary for modelling and to complete a detailed analysis. Notwithstanding, Triaxial has been able to remodel the flood scenarios at the site and environs through only moderately revised assumptions. It does confirm that the original assumptions and modelling were generally accurate based on the most contemporary and best available information at the time of the preparation of the report. The now revised Stormwater Drainage Management Plan still shows drainage as modelled and anticipated, however with only minor / insignificant levels of sheeting and waterflow over the roadways and which have now been further

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

	addressed in the updated civil plans (stormwater and roadworks). Based on this low velocity sheeting of waterflow over Bruce Road, the project is required to include a graded and subtle landscaped earth berm (nominally 500mm high) to the Bruce Road frontage of the site to divert upstream water around the buildings. This will be integrated into the landscaping / topography to the extent that its existence will not be noticeable and appear as a continuous landscape feature at that frontage. To safeguard the development and assets, Triaxial has recommended the proposed buildings be raised by 150mm to ensure that there is no water ingress in a 1:100+ year storm event. Note, no building height control applies to the site and no new or material overshadowing arises. The revised Civil Engineering Plans and Architectural Plans addressing this change are included at **Appendices G** and **H**.
The stormwater management plan must assess the impacts on the downstream properties and include details of a lawful point of discharge for the development. The Department notes that a drainage easement along the defined water course may be required in the absence of any pre-existing discharge point or changes to the stormwater flow concentration / regime due to the proposed development on the site. The matters in relation to the requirement of a drainage easement is required to be clarified in the RTS.	Triaxial advises that the school site has an existing legal point of discharge for this stormwater catchment by the existence of a 70m wide easement to drain stormwater that exists over the downstream block to the north of the school site - Lot 4 DP1164833. It is anticipated that no changes to the existing flow conditions within this easement will be introduced by the development of the school site. Refer **Appendix H**.
Land Use Conflict Risk Assessment	
The Department notes that the adjoining lands comprise agricultural uses.	Noted. Those adjacent lands are however not intensively used, and in part only used for low-intensity livestock grazing. This is expressed in the submitted land use conflict risk assessment (LUCRA) under this RtS. See **Appendix D**
Having regard to the above, a land use conflict risk assessment is required to be submitted to assess the impacts on the agricultural uses on the future school. The land use risk assessment must be completed in accordance with the guidance documents prepared by Department of Primary Industries and include details: • impacts of agricultural sprays. • odour and dust due to intensive agricultural use. • conflicts between school traffic and slow-moving agricultural vehicles on the surrounding roads.	A land use conflict risk assessment (LUCRA) has been prepared and is included within this RtS package at **Appendix D**. It has addressed the matters raised by both DPIE and the Department of Primary Industries. The findings of the LUCRA are that the low-intensity livestock grazing near the site is unlikely to impact upon the school and vice versa given the distances between each and the nature of this agricultural activity compared to other high intensity impacting uses which do not occur near the site. The DPI's accepted buffer distances of 50m are categorically satisfied given the school will be 125m from its site boundary with land able to be used for livestock grazing to its east and is some 275m from

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

	land that is presently used for livestock grazing to its north-east. No mitigation measures or Management Strategy is warranted.
Final version of all associated documents and appendices	
All documentation associated with the EIS must be finalised, with watermarks removed and resubmitted with the RTS. This includes, but is not limited to the following: • Construction Management Plan (Appendix R). • Operations Plan (Appendix T).	Whilst this is counter-intuitive in this phase of the planning and assessment process, these have nonetheless been updated to remove the 'draft' watermarks and included again at **Appendices E** and **F** of this RtS package. Note these will remain preliminary documents. They have also been updated in minor ways to reflect responses arising from submissions and issues contained herein.

Agency, Council and Public Submissions

The following sets out our response to the Agency, Council and public submissions received by the Department.

Transport for NSW	
Issue	**Response**
Traffic Generation Assumptions	
The traffic generation calculations include an assumption that an increased proportion of students will travel to school by bus and active transport compared to existing mode splits and commensurately the proportion of students travelling by private motor vehicle will reduce. Concern is raised as to the likelihood of this occurring due to the location of the school out of town which has the potential to increase access by private motor vehicle instead of travel by bicycle or foot. In this regard, the traffic generation calculations are considered to underestimate the realistic traffic generation and should be revised.	TTPP maintains that the methodology applied to the overall traffic generation for the school is accurate and sound. With respect to the split of traffic generation towards public transport and active transport, the Green Travel Plan (GTP) sets out measures to achieve a mode shift away from car use towards more suitable transport modes. Through the GTP, the school will implement measures to maximise the number of student applications for the School Student Transport Scheme (SSTS) to maximise the awareness and use of the free travel scheme from home to school and back. The school's new location generates the opportunity for a further 6% of students to be eligible for the SSTS, and this has been factored into the TIA's calculations. As per Table 8.1 of the TIA, consideration of the growth in SSTS student eligibility generates a rate of 175 cars driven by parents arriving to pick-up/ drop-off children in either peak period. However, disregarding a 6% growth in SSTS eligibility, there would be 199 cars arriving in each peak period to pick-up / drop-off students (refer to Section 7.1.2 of TIA). This is equivalent to an additional 24 cars (or 48 trips) on the surrounding network, or one additional trip every few minutes. Accordingly, even without the additional a 6% growth in SSTS eligibility, this minor additional traffic would not cause a noticeable impact on the local road network and the Kiss and Drop operation.

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

	It is noted that the TIA assesses a conservative traffic assessment on the basis that future traffic volumes have been calculated using first principles as opposed to RMS school trip generation rates as reported in Section 8.2 of the TIA. Refer **Appendix B**.
Traffic Distribution Assumptions	
The traffic assessment provides the assumption that all development traffic will access the site from the west and that no development related traffic will access the site from the east. This is considered to be an unrealistic assumption. Whilst the bus routes are able to be controlled, private motor vehicle access cannot, and, in this regard, shortest/easiest route is usually selected. Therefore, it likely that the site will be accessed from the east, including, but not limited to the 4% of traffic that has been allocated to the right turnout of Lions Road to head south along the Castlereagh Highway (HW18).	TTPP has carried out a Sensitivity Analysis / revised SIDRA modelling to address and compare potential intersection performance changes arising from the identified changes to traffic distribution. The results continue to demonstrate that all relevant intersections will continue to operate at Levels of Service A and B. Rather than the originally modelled distribution of 100% of traffic arriving from and leaving to the west via Broadhead Road, the distribution has now been split as 88% from the west and 12% from the east via Bruce Road and Spring Flat Road. The updated SIDRA modelling has also included known information related to a nearby residential subdivision DA, annual growth to, and maximum student population up to, 2036. As a result, none of the intersections are dramatically altered in terms of their Level of Service (LoS) ratings which are still at A and B, with only extremely minor additions to delay of 1 or 2 seconds in a handful of cases only. The results of the new modelling therefore remain well within the prescribed levels of acceptance. See the revised modelling at **Appendix B**.
Development Impacts	
(a) Based on the above comments, the SIDRA analysis for the intersections should be revised to reflect the altered traffic generation and split assumptions.	As above, revised sensitivity testing / modelling has been completed – see **Appendix B**.
(b) Concern is raised regarding the proximity of the two proposed driveways (ingress for kiss and ride and ingress/egress driveway for carpark) in terms of confusion for drivers and safety, particularly during peak hours.	Alleanza has refined the access driveway's proximity to each other along Bruce Road, and moved these further to the east away from the Broadhead Road intersection. This is shown in **Appendix G**. The changes have the intent of better segregating the access points off Bruce Road, moving it further from the Broadhead Road intersection, and providing for a separated ingress driveway and egress driveway.
(c) With the increased traffic from the eastern end of Bruce Road, the design of the intersection with the access driveways to the development is to ensure westbound through traffic on Bruce Road is not impacted. A SIDRA analysis should be prepared for the functioning of this intersection.	TTPP advises that under the revised traffic flow distribution as described above, the number of right-turn movements into the site during peak periods would be as follows: • 27 westbound trips in the AM peak hour • 21 westbound trips in the PM peak hour. SIDRA modelling results for the Bruce Road - site access intersection indicates that there would be a

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

	no right-turn queue formed by the vehicles entering the site from Bruce Road east. The revised traffic flows are illustrated in Figure 4 and Figure 5 of the Traffic Statement – see **Appendix B**. It is noted that west-bound traffic on Bruce Road is presently minimal and would remain so under the developed school scenario.
(d) Further details are to be provided to demonstrate how the bus turning bay will function safely, particularly with the right turn out of the site and also considering the additional traffic accessing the site from the east.	Triaxial has confirmed the swept path and turning circle of buses leaving the bus bays to demonstrate a safe turning function. This is shown in drawings at **Appendix H**. Under the revised traffic flow distribution, school peak hourly trips on Bruce Road east would be: • 27 westbound trips and 19 eastbound trips (total 46 two-way trips) in the AM peak hour • 21 westbound trips and 24 eastbound trips (total 45 two-way trips) in the PM peak hour. This equates to one vehicle trip every few minutes which is a low traffic volume and would provide sufficient gaps in traffic flow on Bruce Road to permit buses turning out of the bus bay. The revised traffic flows are illustrated in Figure 4 and Figure 5 of the Traffic Statement – see **Appendix B**.
(e) It is not clear from the information provided that buses turning left out of Broadhead Road into Bruce Road can undertake the turn movement in a lane correct manner. Swept path plans are required to demonstrate that turn movements are achievable in a lane correct manner. If the turn movements cannot be made within the correct lanes, an upgrade to the intersection to accommodate the turning movements is required.	A further swept path analysis has been undertaken by Triaxial of the bus turning movement left out of Broadhead Road into Bruce Road in a lane correct manner. The swept path analysis shows that the left-turn movement can be sufficiently accommodated within the traffic lanes without impacting the westbound traffic lane on Bruce Road. Similarly, the opposite movement has also been provided. The swept path plan showing this (and other) manoeuvres is provided in **Appendix H**.
Parking	
The application is proposing to provide a car park that would accommodate 75 car parking spaces. Mid-Western Regional Council's (MWRC) DCP requires provision of 94 to 103 parking spaces (based on the range of staff and students). Parking calculations based on the demand outlined in the traffic report (excluding the 5% reduction for the reasons outlined above) would require between 84 to 92 parking spaces, excluding provision for canteen workers. Based on these calculations it is considered that insufficient parking has been provided on site for the	The car park has been redesigned and reconfigured to now accommodate 82 cars and 25 kiss and drop spaces to take the overall total capacity to 107 – see **Appendix G**. According to the DCP (noting it is not relevant to SSD DAs), there would need to be 59 staff spaces (1 space per staff member); 20 senior student spaces (1 space per 10 Yr 11/12 pupils); and 1 canteen space (1 space per 30m2). That is, a total of 80 spaces. This is set out in the TIA for this DA.

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

development. The proposed designs for road upgrades fronting the subject site will not facilitate on-street parking. As such concern is raised as to the impact of overflow parking on the local road network.	Although not stipulated in the DCP, visitor parking would be co-used with the 25 pick-up/drop-off spaces during teaching periods. The on-site parking provision has been amended from being based on first principles to now accord with Council's DCP parking rates and would adequately accommodate the parking demand generated by the future school.
The design of the car park does not allow for circulation of traffic. In particular it provides for a dead-end aisle that is 16 parking spaces in length. AS 2890.1 only permits dead end aisles with a maximum length of 6 parking spaces unless provision is made for cars to turn around and drive out in a forward direction. In this regard, the car park is to be redesigned to comply with AS 2890.1.	As noted above, the car park area has been subject to significant review and redesign. See **Appendix G**. The design now further meets the requirements of AS 2890.1.
The location and the design of the car park being surrounded by the 'kiss n drop' facility is not considered to be an efficient design as it: (i) will create congestion within the carpark for vehicles trying to exit the carpark during the peak use of the kiss n drop facility; and (ii) does not provide for any ability to expand the carpark. Consequentially any additional parking provided on site will need to be provided in a new separate location.	Again, as noted above, the car park area has been subject to significant review and redesign. Access to the kiss and drop has been better delineated to allow for intuitive decision-making upon entry to the area and further upon exit to segregate movements. This includes the removal of the blind aisle. See **Appendix G**. Additional parking is now embedded in the revised design (+7 spaces) and the design does not limit a possible further minor expansion, should it be needed or warranted, within this part of the school. As per above, the current capacity meets the school's needs and Council's DCP rates.
Loading Dock	
The use of the loading dock will require vehicles to reverse some 45 metres to position to load/unload or collect waste. The development should be designed to ensure that all vehicles can enter and exit the site in a forward direction. The current design does not allow for this.	The design of the loading and waste collection area has been updated. All service vehicles would enter and exit the site via Bruce Road in a forward direction. Once inside the site, the vehicle would reverse a short distance up to the waste collection or loading/unloading point (approx. 30 m). This manoeuvre is required to facilitate loading / unloading from the rear of the service vehicle. Deliveries and waste collection activities would remain separate to bus movements since they would be scheduled outside of school peak periods. Therefore, there would be no impact as a result of service vehicles undertaking the above-described manoeuvres. The abovementioned changes to the car park and kiss and drop, bus bays, and services access results in a minor change to trees proposed to be removed along the Bruce Road frontage. Based on the revised layout shown at **Appendix G** to this RtS, two additional tres are now included for removal – Trees 8 and 15. Tree 8 is identified as healthy and to be retained by the arborist in his original report, whilst Tree 15 is recommended for removal, given its poor health and low significance.

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

	No additional healthy or significantly trees are subject to removal arising from the necessary reconfiguration to meet TfNSW and Council's access requirements.
Bus Bays	
Consideration should be given to the provision of weather protection for students waiting for buses.	A zone for bus shelters is now included adjacent to the bus bays, noting the erection of bus shelters is able to also later be provided as Exempt Development under the Education SEPP.
Pedestrian & Cyclist Access	
(a) It is intended to connect the pedestrian and cyclist access from the development to the existing footpath on the western side of Broadhead Road. This footpath is not a shared path. Concern is raised as to the safety of users of the footpath with the funnelling of cyclists onto this existing undersized footpath. Furthermore, children over 16 years of age are not permitted to cycle on a footpath.	The intent is to provide a shared pathway along Broadhead Road to the point of the crossing located at the boundary of the site as shown on the submitted plans. It is not considered appropriate that additional works are undertaken beyond this point as part of the development.
(b) For any proposed pedestrian crossing, including the internal crossing, it needs to be demonstrated that the warrants outlined in the Roads and Maritime Supplement to AS1742.10-2009: Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices – Part 10: Pedestrian control and protection, are met.	Noted. A warrant assessment would be carried out following the construction and initial operation of the school, as is standard. In the interim, the design of the crossing has been revised such that a kerb extension is provided on the north side of the crossing in-line with sight distance requirements on approach to a pedestrian crossing. The site plan showing the amended crossing layout and kiss and drop spaces is provided in **Appendix G**.
(c) If an internal pedestrian connection point is to be maintained, further details shall be provided to demonstrate how pedestrian access will be managed from the car park to ensure that conflicts are not created with the kiss n drop facility through the creation of informal desire lines.	Noted and as set out above.
(d) Pedestrian crossings are to be designed to ensure that: (i) drivers can see pedestrians on or about to use the crossing; and (ii) pedestrians have adequate sight distance at or near the kerbside. The design of the internal pedestrian crossing provides for drop off bays directly adjacent to the crossing and as such does not achieve these requirements. In this regard the pedestrian crossing is to be redesigned to achieve compliance with *AS1742.10-2009 Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices Part 10: Pedestrian Control and Protection* and the associated *Roads and Maritime Supplement to AS1742.10-2009: Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices – Part 10: Pedestrian control and protection.*	Noted and as set out above.
Kiss n Drop Facility	
(a) As a result of 7(d) above, the Kiss n Drop facility is required to be redesigned. The redesign needs to demonstrate that:	Noted and as set out above. See the refined design at **Appendix G**.

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

(i) sufficient drop off spaces will be provided to support the development; and (ii) sufficient queuing area will be provided to ensure the facility does not impede through traffic on Bruce Road.	The capacity of the kiss and drop facility has been expanded from 12 spaces to 25 spaces. The capacity of the facility has more than doubled, and would be able to more adequately accommodate the future traffic demand generated by pick-up/drop-off activities. As reported in the TIA, typically, the bulk of the students would be collected in the initial 15 minutes after the school bell. On this basis, adopting a duration of one-minute per vehicle, each space could accommodate 15 cars in the busiest 15-minute period in the peak hour. Therefore, the 25 bays could accommodate a total of 375 cars in the busiest 15-minute period. Even if all 175 cars driven by parents (or 199 vehicles, as per response to above) were to arrive during this 15-minute period, there would be more than enough pick-up/drop-off spaces to accommodate the demand.
Other	
Where works are to be carried out on Castlereagh Highway, before Council can issue an approval under section 138 of the Roads Act 1993, concurrence is required from TfNSW. Whilst the application is not proposing any works on the Castlereagh Highway as a result of the initial impact assessment, further assessment as outlined above is required in order to determine whether the development will require any upgrade works on the highway including any intersections.	The applicant is not proposing to undertake any upgrade works on Castlereagh Highway. Upgrade works arising from this development are not warranted as demonstrated by the initial TIA and now by the sensitivity testing and refined SIDRA modelling arising from a review of traffic distribution. The Castlereagh Highway intersections at Lions Drive and Spring Flat Road operate at Levels of Service of B and A in both the AM and PM peaks, respectively. These will remain at the same Levels of Service under the 2036 modelling scenario as shown in Table 5 of the Traffic Statement at **Appendix B**. Any upgrade attributed to the school and arising from this development is unjustified and unreasonable in the circumstances. Additionally, an upgrade would also be unwarranted from a safety standpoint as available accident data (as stated in the EIS and TIA) indicates no fatalities or other accidents, other than one hit animal a number of years ago on the highway away from any intersection. Note also that Council is seeking other road upgrades to which the applicant is contributing a proportionate set of works in light of the impact it will have on those intersections. See further below.
NSW Department of Planning, Industry & Environment (Biodiversity & Conservation Division)	
Issue	**Response**
BCD note that a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) waiver was issued for this project on 18 April 2019. BCD have reviewed the exhibited EIS against the documents provided as part of the waiver application. BCD acknowledge that the footprint for the proposed development presented in the EIS is the same as what was assessed for the waiver.	Noted.

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

BCD have examined the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage assessment and Aboriginal consultation undertaken by the proponent. BCD note that the proponent has undertaken consultation in accordance with the *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW)* and acknowledge that the project will not harm Aboriginal objects.	Noted. See also below with respect to the submission made by the Ibbai Waggan-Wiradjuri People.
BCD have no specific comments on the exhibited EIS.	Noted.
NSW Department of Primary Industries	
Issue	**Response**
DPI Agriculture have reviewed the proposal details and raises no objection to this proposal. It is noted that the Mudgee Gulgong Urban Release Strategy 2014 proposes the future of this land as large lot residential development, and that it is identified for future urban purposes in the Mid-Western Council Regional Comprehensive Land Use Strategy (2010).	Noted.
It is recommended that a land use conflict assessment be undertaken in relation to the adjoining lands that are used for agriculture. A Land Use Conflict Risk Assessment guide is available to assist with this and is available at (webpage link)	A Land Use Conflict Risk Assessment (LUCRA) has been prepared addressing both the DPIE's and Department of Primary Industries' comments. See this attached at **Appendix D** to this RtS package.
Ideally mitigation measures should be included to deal with any risk from current or potential agricultural land uses in the area. The soil landscape that this proposal is located on has value for agriculture, as it also supports the viticultural industry to the north east of Mudgee. More information regarding mitigation is available at Primefact – Buffer Zones to Reduce Land Use Conflict with Agriculture – An interim guideline.	As above. The findings of the LUCRA are that the low-intensity livestock grazing near the site is unlikely to impact upon the school and vice versa given the distances between each and the nature of this agricultural activity compared to other high intensity impacting uses which do not occur near the site. The DPI's accepted buffer distances of 50m are categorically satisfied given the school will be 125m from its site boundary with land able to be used for livestock grazing to the east and is some 275m from land that is presently used for livestock grazing to the north-east. No mitigation measures or Management Strategy is warranted.
NSW EPA	
Issue	**Response**
The proposed development is not integrated for the EPA under s.4.47 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 and as such the EPA will not be the appropriate regulatory authority (ARA) for environmental matters during the construction and operation of the school as it will be privately operated (i.e. not a NSW State school). Accordingly, the EPA will not be providing DPIE with any specific advice on the EIS and refers you to Mid-Western Regional Council as the ARA for project SSD-9872 for advice on environmental matters.	Noted. Refer to Council's submission below. No environmental matters (of the EPA's otherwise typical scope of jurisdiction) have been raised by Council.
Essential Energy	
Issue	**Response**
Essential Energy has existing 22kV overhead lines to the west and south of this development along Bruce	Noted.

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

Road and Broadhead Road, which could be used to supply this development.	
An application for connection would be required to be submitted via Essential Energy's connections portal to arrange a connection for this development when the load requirements are finalised.	Noted. This will be addressed post-consent.
A preliminary assessment would suggest level 3 & 1 contestable works would be required as part of the connection.	Noted.
Water NSW	
Issue	**Response**
The subject site is not located in close proximity to any WaterNSW land or infrastructure, therefore we have no issues or requirements to provide.	Noted.
Crown Lands	
Issue	**Response**
Crown Lands has no comments for this proposal as no Crown land is affected.	Noted.
Mid-Western Regional Council	
Issue	**Response**
Traffic & Access	
Council has serious concerns regarding the assumptions made in the accompanying traffic study. These include the assumption that 0% of traffic will exit and enter the site off Bruce Road, via Spring Flat Road, off the Castlereagh Highway. Similarly , concern is also raised with the assumed number of traffic movements travelling to and from the site via the intersection of Lions Drive and the Castlereagh Highway. Council believes the number of traffic movements using these intersections will be much higher than that presented.	This matter is now resolved with Council no longer having serious concerns about traffic related matters due to a number of meetings with Council to resolve traffic and access issues. As set out earlier, TTPP has carried out a Sensitivity Analysis / revised SIDRA modelling to address and compare potential intersection performance changes arising from the identified changes to traffic distribution. The results continue to demonstrate that all relevant intersections will continue to operate at Levels of Service A and B. Rather than the originally modelled distribution of 100% of traffic arriving from and leaving to the west via Broadhead Road, the distribution has now been split as 88% from the west and 12% from the east via Bruce Road and Spring Flat Road. The updated SIDRA modelling has also included known information related to a nearby residential subdivision DA, annual growth to, and maximum student population up to, 2036. As a result, none of the intersections are dramatically altered in terms of their Level of Service (LoS) ratings which are still at A and B, with only extremely minor additions to delay of 1 or 2 seconds in a handful of cases only. The results of the new modelling therefore remains well within the prescribed levels of acceptance. See the revised modelling at **Appendix B**. Additionally, the applicant is not proposing to undertake any upgrade works on Castlereagh Highway. Upgrade works arising from this development are not warranted as demonstrated

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

	by the initial TIA and now by the sensitivity testing and refined SIDRA modelling arising from a review of traffic distribution. The Castlereagh Highway intersections at Lions Drive and Spring Flat Road operate at Levels of Service of B and A in both the AM and PM peaks, respectively. These will remain at the same Levels of Service under the 2036 modelling scenario as shown in Table 5 of the Traffic Statement at **Appendix B**. Any upgrade attributed to the school and arising from this development is unjustified and unreasonable in the circumstances. Note also that the applicant will be undertaking other road upgrades as sought by, and discussed with, Council and which are proportionate and reflective of the likely use by the school and of the impact it will have on those intersections. See below.
The EIS outlines the proposed traffic and access arrangements for the development. It also identifies various upgrades to local transport infrastructure which will be required to facilitate the development.	Noted.
Council requests that the specific requirements for the proposed intersection, road and access works in the immediate vicinity of the development site are detailed in construction drawings and submitted to Council for approval. This includes the following works:	See commentary below. Reference is also made to the *Roads Act 1993* noting approval will still be needed via section 4.42 EP&A Act, and that Council cannot refuse the application nor require changes to the plans which are not substantially consistent with the consent.
• Upgrade to the section of Broadhead Road immediately adjacent to the site to provide for pavement widening to form 2 x 3.7 metre wide traffic lanes , kerb and channel and footpath/cycleway along the full frontage of the school boundary;	Based on a meeting held with Council on 23 July 2020 it was expressed that Council had not seen or reviewed plans which detail the scope of Broadhead Road upgrade works. Council however advised that if the requested works are in fact proposed then there would be no issues or concerns. The drawings (based on earlier consultation with Council prior to lodgement of the EIS) do show this scope of works. The original Civil and Stormwater set of plans is included again in this RtS as **Appendix I**. Triaxial confirms that design submitted as part of the SSD already meets these requirements.
• Construct a pedestrian refuge near the school boundary and opposite House No. 44 Broadhead Road to accommodate crossing of Broadhead Road by pedestrians;	A pedestrian refuge is already documented on plans. TfNSW has indicated that approval for a pedestrian crossing in this location cannot be provided until traffic flows are assessed once the school is operational. This is being separately addressed with TfNSW as set out earlier. Based on this response, Council advised (in the meeting of 23 July 2020) that it is satisfied with this outcome, again based on not having seen the proposed plans. Council also appreciates the necessary TfNSW process to secure the relevant warrants for the crossing.

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

• Upgrade to Bruce Road between Broadhead Road and Spring Flat Road, with sealing to 7.2 metre wide on a 9 metre pavement width. This section of road will be used primarily for construction traffic, and is also considered to be an additional access and egress route when the school becomes operational. The upgrade to Bruce Road should be undertaken prior to the issue of any Construction Certificate;	We confirm that our intent will be to use Lions Drive and Broadhead Road for construction-related access to the site. We note that the EIS and the TTPP TIA erroneously included Bruce Road as a proposed construction traffic route. The submitted Integrated Management Plan noted that Bruce Road will not be for construction traffic and can be appropriately managed. Accordingly, upon clarifying this in our recent meeting, it has been agreed with Council that the type and nature of the Bruce Road upgrade will be: • 9m wide pavement for the full length of the school site only; • Kerb and gutter on the school side; • A spray seal (two-coat flush) over the majority of the roadway; • Otherwise, asphalt hot mix in the area of the bus bays and loading / servicing bay within Bruce Road (and within the respective bays); and • Transition to match existing east-bound on Bruce Road. Asphalt hot mix would also be used within the Bruce Road and Broadhead Road intersection. Council accepted that bus traffic would likely require a lesser / lighter road finish than that related to construction traffic, noting again Bruce Road is not nominated for construction traffic. The request for Bruce Road to be upgraded prior to issue of a Construction Certificate is accordingly redundant and onerous in the context. The relevant timing would be prior to the Occupation Certificate in light of the above, given no construction traffic.
• The transition from 9 metre pavement width to 6 metre pavement width on Bruce Road after the bus bay should be increased to 7.2 metres, so that that the width is consistent with the rest of Bruce Road to Spring Flat road upgrade;	As above.
• Upgrade to 4 x intersections (Broadhead Road and Lions Drive intersection, Broadhead Road and Bruce Road intersection, Lions Drive and Robertson Road intersection, Bruce Road and Robertson Road intersection) to provide for acceptable bus turning swept paths and pavement treatment, which may include AC surfacing and splitter islands for pedestrian refuges; and	In our recent meeting with Council it was confirmed that the wording of this particular matter suggests a range of uniformly comprehensive intersection upgrades, but this however was not the intent. Council advised that a better approach would have been a review of each intersection for an upgrade need (and scope if required) on a case by case basis. As noted, the applicant is already committed to the Broadhead Road-related intersection upgrades (at Bruce and Lions, respectively) to cater for bus movements, but do not agree that those works related to Robertson Road (at Bruce and Lions, respectively) warrant bus-scaled improvements, particularly as Robertson Road

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

	intersections can already cater for bus movements – see swept analysis at **Appendix H**. Council agreed that the road intersection upgrade works would be related to whether bus traffic would be using those intersections and whether the existing intersections warranted any form of upgrade to meet increased traffic volume levels. Based on this, the **bus-related intersections** of Broadhead Road & Lions Drive and Broadhead Road & Bruce Road are agreed to be upgraded as follows: **Broadhead Road and Lions Drive intersection** • New centre line at the intersection within Broadhead Road; • New hold line for northbound traffic within Broadhead Road at Lions Drive; and • New kerb and gutter from Lions Drive south-bound into Broadhead Road. **Broadhead Road and Bruce Road intersection** (in addition to the proposed roadworks) • New centre lines on Bruce Road west bound and east bound at the intersection; • New hold lines for west bound and east bound traffic on Bruce Road at the intersection. The **lighter vehicle intersections** of Lions Drive & Robertson Road and Bruce Road & Robertson Road are proposed to be upgraded as follows: **Lions Drive and Robertson Road intersection** • New centre line on Lions Drive west bound at the intersection; and • New hold line for west bound traffic on Lions Drive at the intersection. **Bruce Road and Robertson Road intersection** • New centre lines on Bruce Road west bound and east bound at the intersection; and • New hold lines for west bound and east bound traffic on Bruce Road at the intersection. It is noted that whilst the Robertson Road intersections can presently cater for bus movements, Ogden's bus routes (the school's transport provider) do not utilise these routes or intersections to service the area and will not likely uses these to service the school in this location. Triaxial intersection analysis plans and swept paths are found at **Appendix H**.

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

• Kerb and gutter is to be extended along the full frontage of Bruce Road to alleviate any gaps in drainage infrastructure.	This has been agreed and is documented in the Triaxial plans at **Appendix H**. Note this is only in respect of the full frontage of the school site.
Parking	
The EIS states that there are 75 car parking spaces proposed for use by staff, senior students and visitors. It also indicates 3 bus bays and 12 marked student drop-off/pick-up spaces (kiss and ride zone) will be provided and there is sufficient capacity on site to accommodate overflow parking for events and the like.	Council supports the changes made to the car park and kiss and drop design to enhance capacity, particularly its consistency with the DCP. The reconfiguration has also enabled the car park capacity to grow from 75 to 82 cars, and from 12 kiss and drop spaces to 25. Overall, the capacity in the car park area has grown from 87 cars to 107. This is shown in **Appendix G**.
The proposed car parking for the development has been calculated based on a maximum of 59 staff members. The EIS states that in addition to the 59 teaching staff, there will be 22 support staff (ie a total of 81 FTE staff members). Council is concerned that if there is a shortage of car parking on-site, this will encourage parking on the street. Council requests that the required car parking is recalculated based on staff numbers of 81 so that adequate on-site parking is available.	For clarification, there was an inconsistency within the EIS with respect to quoting staff numbers, where both 59 staff and 59+22 staff are identified. The TTPP TIA numbers and assumptions as well as the architectural plans however align with each other. The correct number is a maximum of 59 staff FTE in total by 2026. This is also further affirmed in the appended Transport Statement.
Council is also concerned, that if the traffic splits assumed in the traffic report are not accurate, the number of students travelling to and from school in cars, rather than on buses could be much higher. If so, there will be insufficient on-site car parking available to cater for student parking.	In recognition of the above error and the increase in parking, Council has advised that this issue is effectively redundant. Further, to support this, through the GTP, the school will implement measures to maximise the number of student applications for the School Student Transport Scheme (SSTS) to maximise the awareness and use of the free travel scheme from home to school and back. The school's new location generates the opportunity for a further 6% of students to be eligible for the SSTS, and this has been factored into the TIA's calculations. Ogden's have also confirmed up to 16 different bus routes will be amended to service the new school site.
All car parking areas must be constructed with an all-weather sealed surface and dimensioned to comply with the requirements of AS 2890.1 Parking facilities: Off-street car parking. Council requests that the development be conditioned to prohibit on-street car parking.	Compliance with the requirements of AS 2890.1 Parking facilities: Off-street car parking is accepted, however prohibition of on-street parking is not accepted. A condition of this type would be onerous. Whilst on-street parking is unlikely to be an issue, it is principally a signposting and management issue of Council through required street parking zone requirements. Council advised that if no overflow occurs then there is no need to condition prohibition of on-street parking. The addition to the capacity of parking and kiss and drop area to meet Council's DCP rates effectively renders this matter as redundant in the context.

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

Drainage and Flooding	
Council requests that a detailed Stormwater Drainage Design and Management Plan be prepared for the development. This should include appropriate detention devices and measures to limit runoff from all developed surfaces to existing undeveloped levels. Alternatively, it may be appropriate and necessary for the creation of a drainage easement along the defined water course.	As set out earlier, Triaxial has prepared a revised Stormwater Drainage Management Plan arising from new but limited information recently provided by Council – See **Appendix C**. Triaxial have confirmed that Council has provided its current preliminary flood study. However, this study omits input flow rates which are necessary for modelling and to complete a detailed analysis. Notwithstanding, Triaxial has been able to remodel the flood scenarios at the site and environs through only moderately revised assumptions. It does confirm that the original assumptions and modelling were generally accurate based on the most contemporary and best available information at the time of the preparation of the report. The now revised Stormwater Drainage Management Plan still shows drainage as modelled and anticipated, however with only minor / insignificant levels of sheeting and waterflow over the roadways and which have now been further addressed in the updated civil plans (stormwater and roadworks). Based on this low velocity sheeting of waterflow over Bruce Road, the project is required to include a graded and subtle landscaped earth berm (nominally 500mm high) to the Bruce Road frontage of the site to divert upstream water around the buildings. This will be integrated into the landscaping / topography to the extent that its existence will not be noticeable and appear as a continuous landscape feature at that frontage. To safeguard the development and assets, Triaxial has recommended the proposed buildings be raised by 150mm to ensure that there is no water ingress in a 1:100+ year storm event. Note, no building height control applies to the site and no new or material overshadowing arises. The revised Civil Engineering Plans and Architectural Plans addressing this change are included at **Appendices G** and **H**.
Water and Sewer Services	
The water main servicing the development site will require upgrading to 200mm ID, with the size of the service to be determined based upon modelling for development specific pressure and flow requirements.	This comment has been largely replaced by agreement between Council and the applicant to enter into a works in kind arrangement for water servicing of the site, including mains upgrades. See further below.
It is requested that a ring main be constructed to facilitate suitable water pressure and volume to service the development. This will require installation of a new 200mm ID water main along the frontage of the development on Broadhead Road, to connect with the existing 200mm ID main along Lions Drive to the north	Based on a recent meeting with Council's Engineers, and subsequent agreement, the following is now proposed to address water servicing of the site: • That a new water main to be constructed at the developer's expense in lieu of the

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

and to the existing 250mm ID main on Bruce Road to the South.	water-related section 64 levy. To that end, a works in kind agreement will be entered into to facilitate / complete the works as set out in the drawing 'Water Plan' by Triaxial as included at **Appendix H**. The applicant has agreed to the above in lieu of water headworks charges. It is estimated that the cost of these works is in the order of $350,000 - $450,000 dependent upon the nature of any remedial or make-good works at or in front of residential properties at Lions Drive. This far exceeds the levy Council was seeking to have imposed. This effectively replaces the commentary / issue raised in Council's submission and consequently also deals with the water-related section 64 levy set out below.
Council also requests that backflow prevention be required on the master meter, as well as sub- meters for protection between water supply zones .	This is noted and accepted. An appropriately drafted condition would be accepted.
Sewer servicing will require connection to the existing 225mm ID sewer main running through the development site. This sewer main has sufficient size and capacity to service the proposed development. Council requires that the connection to the sewer network be made at the furthest access chamber downstream within the envelope of the development.	This is noted and accepted. An appropriately drafted condition would be accepted.
A Liquid Trade Waste application will be required for the development given proposed on-site activities, including teaching laboratories, cooking and commercial kitchen uses.	This is noted and accepted. An appropriately drafted condition would be accepted.
Contributions	
Section 64 Contributions Pursuant to Council's 2008 Development Servicing Plans for Water and Sewer, the applicable contributions are calculated at 0.040 ET per student (Day School). Based on 680 students, the developer contributions applicable to the proposed development are: Water Headworks ($8,548 x 0.04) x 680 = $232,505.60 Sewer Headworks ($3,903 x 0.04) x 680 = $101,161.60 **Total Headworks = $338,667.20**	As above, and as agreed with Council, the applicant will undertake the water mains headworks in lieu of the water-related levy. See Water Plan by Triaxial in drawings included at **Appendix H**. The applicant accepts the sewer headworks levy as set out by Council in its submission.
The headworks costs associated with delivering water and sewer infrastructure are material, and if Council does not collect the relevant contributions, the costs are then borne by Council and other developers. It is Council's position that this places an unreasonable and unequitable burden on the Mid-Western Regional rate payers, to bear the costs on the developer's behalf especially given the large increase in demand generated by the proposed development. To that end, Council is unable to grant a waiver and requires the applicant to pay the relevant Section 64 Contributions.	As above.

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

Section 7.12 Contributions Pursuant to Council's Developer Contributions Plan 2019, Section 2.6 Educational Establishments are subject to 7.12 Contributions, calculated as 1% of the total capital investment value. This requires a contribution of $362,740 from the applicant. There is no mechanism in the Plan to waive 7.12 Contributions. Council may consider the dedication of land, or undertaking of works in kind to offset a monetary contribution in part or full. As the applicant has not put forward a proposal for the dedication of land or provisioning of works in kind, the Section 7.12 contribution is applicable. The payment of contributions is required prior to the issue of any Construction Certificate.	The applicant and Council have subsequently agreed that this contribution will provide for the roadworks to seal Bruce Road from the school's eastern boundary through to the intersection with Spring Flat Road. The roadworks will be undertaken by Council and involve a 9m sealed pavement, kerb and gutter on the school side and a 1m unsealed shoulder and table drain on the other side of the roadway. To that end, however, and in recognition of the lack of a nexus to specific works under Section 7.12 contributions and the Minister's power under section 7.13(2)(a) of the EP&A Act to determine whether or not to waiver a contribution or impose a different contribution, the applicant seeks a condition that ensures that the contribution is applied directly to these roadworks, as agreed with Council.
Construction	
The EIS has provided limited details in relation to the management of the construction workforce for the proposed development.	The details would be further resolved upon completion of the construction methodology and Construction Management Plan.
Prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate, Council requests that the applicant submit a Workforce Construction Statement detailing how the construction workforce will be managed to minimise local impacts during the 17 month construction period. These impacts include management of on-site parking, vehicle movements and accommodation arrangements. This statement should address both locally and externally sourced contractors at peak workforce numbers.	An appropriately drafted condition would be accepted.
To avoid construction traffic congestion and parking issues in the public roadway, Council requests that all construction traffic park on-site. The Construction Management Plan should provide a detailed plan or map showing proposed construction access routes and on-site parking areas.	The Construction Management Plan already identifies the objective of all construction traffic parking on-site during works. An appropriately drafted condition would be accepted in relation to a revised and finalised Construction Management Plan prior to CC.
Signage	
The EIS proposes installation of two digital signs to keep the school community updated. Council requests that the proposed digital signage is not turned on outside the hours of 6am and 9pm - 7 days per week, and the output lumen limited so that it complies with *Australian Standard AS 4282:1997 - Control of the Obtrusive Effects of Outdoor Lighting*.	An appropriately drafted condition would be accepted.
After Hours and Weekend Use	
The EIS indicates that the multipurpose hall may be utilised after hours and on weekends for a range of activities including dance lessons and competitions, dinner functions, musical performances, sports activities, small conferences and events. The EIS notes that outdoor spaces would only be used during core school operating hours.	Noted.
It is important that any after hours and weekend uses do not cause amenity impacts for neighbouring residents. It is recommended that relevant conditions	An appropriately drafted condition would be accepted.

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

be included to appropriately manage these impacts, in particular noise, traffic and use of outdoor spaces. It is also requested that the applicant provide suitable lighting to the car parking areas, in order to cater for after-hours use of the site.	
Ibbai Waggan-Wiradjuri People	
Issue	**Response**
Ibbai Waggan People, as observers & upholders of our Culture & Lore within our Ngurangbang are deeply concerned with the Dictatorship by the State & Federal governments to First Nations of this Continent. Ibbai Waggan People are distressed in the way the State & Federal governments use their techniques to continually mislead our Senior Elders. 1. The Ibbai Waggan People will object to the St Matthews Catholic Collage for the unlawful application & approval process conducted by the Planning Minister of NSW & Planning, Industry & Environment. The Planning Minister of NSW & Planning, Industry & Environment NSW have & never had the power to endorse any projects within the Ibbai Waggan Ngurangbang. 2. The Ibbai Waggan People will object to the St Matthews Catholic Collage unlawful process, which has been conducted without discussion or consent of the Ibbai Waggan Senior Elders. 3. The untold damage to Ibbai Waggan People spiritual & culturally sensitive sites & to the environment over the past 250 years is overwhelming to our people. It certainly appears the economy comes before the Ibbai Waggan environment. The Ibbai Waggan Elders have the authority within Ibbai Waggan Lore "the Lore of this land" & has always been that way, to instruct the Planning Minister of NSW, to cease all current approvals & not to approve any future applications within our Ngurangbang.	The objection is noted. The matters raised are broadly of a type for the Department's general consideration. Notwithstanding, as previously advised to the Department, consultation for the project was undertaken in accordance with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW) (the consultation requirements) in accordance with the SEARs requirements for the project. In accordance with section 4.1.2 of these requirements, potential interested parties (Aboriginal stakeholders) were identified through contacting several government agencies. In accordance with section 4.1.3 of the requirements an advertisement inviting Aboriginal people and groups to register their interest in the project was also placed in the local newspaper. Agencies contacted for the project included: • National Native Title Tribunal • NTS Corp • Office of Environment and Heritage • Office of the Registrar • Central Tablelands Local Land Services • Mid-Western Regional Council • Mudgee Local Aboriginal Land Council PO Box 1098 • Office of Environment and Heritage - North West Information was provided from three agencies - the Office and Environment and Heritage (now Department of Planning, Industry and Environment), the National Native Title Tribunal and Mid-Western Council. Attempts to contact all groups that were identified in this correspondence were made and is recorded in the ACHAR consultation log. The Ibbai Wagan Wiradjuri People do not appear on the information provided from the agency responses and were subsequently not contacted from these lists. Advertisements were placed in the Mudgee Guardian on the 11 January 2019 and the Koori Mail on 30 January 2020 to identify potentially interested parties who were otherwise not identified by the agency contact.

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com

	From our records the Ibbai Wagan Wiradjuri People did not register their interest from the advertisements. It is further noted that NSW Department of Planning, Industry & Environment (Biodiversity & Conservation Division) acknowledges that consultation was undertaken in accordance with *Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Consultation Requirements for Proponents 2010 (DECCW).*
Matthew Nipperess	
Issue	**Response**
I just wanted to offer my support for this project. I think this project will be an asset to the Mudgee township and its impact on the local environment will be positive. I like the location and look of the buildings and think that the local students who use the school will enjoy the improved amenities that are on offer. This much needed expansion of the current education facilities for Mudgee should be approved at the earliest possible time.	The support for the project is noted.

_planning Pty Ltd
Oliver Klein BA MURP MPIA CPP (Registered Planner)
ABN 25 620 516 583
ACN 620 516 583
Phone: 0437 259 581
Email: oliverklein1968@gmail.com