



Your ref: SSD-79146716  
Our ref: DOC25/541424

Traki Gotsis  
Senior Planning Officer  
Department Planning, Housing and Infrastructure  
4 Parramatta Square, 12 Darcy Street  
PARRAMATTA NSW 2150

By email: [Traki.Gotsis@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Traki.Gotsis@planning.nsw.gov.au)

31 July 2025

**Subject: Request for advice on EIS - Pymble Ladies' College Secondary Innovation Precinct (SSD-79146716) (Ku-ring-gai)**

---

Dear Traki,

Thank you for your email dated 2 July 2025 seeking advice from the Conservation Programs, Heritage and Regulation (CPHR) group of the of the NSW Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) on the State Significant Development Application (SSD- 79146716) located in Pymble.

CPHR has reviewed the Environmental Impact Statement, Urbis, 19 June 2025 and accompanying technical reports and provides its comments and recommendations in **Attachment A**. In summary:

- Three mature *E. saligna* trees, proposed to be removed, should be retained, unless a clear justification is provided for their removal.
- The site is not identified as flood prone land.
- The runoff is less than 20 m<sup>3</sup>/s, so habitable floor should be as per Clause 3 of the Ku- ring- gai Development Control Plan Section 24D.3. Table 3 of the flood assessment should be amended to reflect this clause.

If you have any questions about this advice, please do not hesitate to contact Khatera Tokhi Senior Conservation Planning Officer, via [khatera.tokhi@dcceew.nsw.gov.au](mailto:khatera.tokhi@dcceew.nsw.gov.au).

Yours sincerely

Louisa Clark  
**Director**  
**Regional Delivery – Greater Sydney Branch**  
**Conservation Programs, Heritage, and Regulation Group**

**CPHR response on the EIS for Pymble Ladies' College Secondary Innovation Precinct  
SSD -79146716**

**Biodiversity**

In preparing this advice CPHR has reviewed the following documents:

- SSDA Architectural Design Report, 3XN/GXN, revision 2, 26 May 2025
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Tree Survey, 29 May 2025. [AIA]
- Arboricultural Impact Assessment Drawings, Tree Survey, n.d.
- Tree Protection Plan, Tree Survey, n.d. [TPP]
- Tree Data, Tree Survey, n.d.
- Architectural plan set, 3XN/GXN, various dates
- Request for SEARs, Urbis, 8 January 2025
- Biodiversity Development Assessment Report, Narla, 14 April 2025. [BDAR]
- Vegetation Management Plan, Narla, 16.05.2025. [VMP]
- Environmental Impact Statement, Urbis, 19 June 2025
- Siteworks, roadworks and drainage plan – ground floor, BG&E, revision D, 30 May 2025
- Landscape Architecture Development Application Report, T.C.L, revision 3, 23 May 2025
- Landscape Architecture Drawings, T.C.L, revision 1, 23 May 2025.

**Key Assessment Issues**

|    |                                                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1. | Biodiversity Assessment Method 2020 (BAM)<br>- Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) access           | CPHR did not have access to the BDAR case in Biodiversity Offsets and Agreement Management System (BOAMS) for its review and no digital files were provided.<br><br><b>Recommended action:</b><br><br>The ecological consultant: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• adds 'Greater Sydney – Compliance &amp; Regulation' as a Case Party in BOAMS,</li> <li>• uploads the required digital files (refer to Appendix L of the BAM 2020 for guidance), and</li> <li>• submits the case to 'Greater Sydney – Compliance &amp; Regulation' as the consent authority.</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|    | <i>Extent and Timing</i>                                                                                          | Prior to determination at Response to Submissions                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| 2. | BDAR – avoid impacts to critically endangered ecological community (CEEC)/ serious and irreversible impact (SAIL) | Insufficient effort was made to genuinely avoid impacts to mature trees that form part of the Blue Gum High Forest CEEC, which is also a SAIL entity under the <i>Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016</i> (BC Act).<br><br>There are 3 highly significant trees proposed for removal - Trees 61, 71 and 85 as per the provided arborist report. These trees are located near the edge of the proposed building and present a development constraint.<br><br>There is a requirement to avoid impacts to CEEC/SAIL vegetation and significant trees in the landscape in line with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• sections 6.2 and 6.12 of the BC Act</li> <li>• section 7 of the BAM</li> <li>• Point 7 of the SEARs</li> <li>• clause 6.3 of the Ku-ring-gai LEP 2015</li> </ul> |

|    |                                                                         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
|----|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|    |                                                                         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective 27 of the Greater Sydney Region Plan – A Metropolis of Three Cities</li> <li>Planning Priority N16 of the North District Plan</li> <li>Planning Priority K28 and K31 of the Ku-ring-gai Local Strategic Planning Statement</li> <li>Part 13 and 18 of the Ku-ring-gai DCP 2014</li> <li>section 193 of <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2021</i></li> <li><i>Greener Places</i> (Government Architect NSW, 2020).</li> </ul> <p><b>Recommended actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plans are amended in consultation with a suitably experienced AQF level 5 arborist to enable the viable retention of Trees 61, 71 and 85.</li> <li>The BDAR is updated accordingly.</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|    | <i>Extent and Timing</i>                                                | Prior to determination at Response to Submissions                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 3. | Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) – mitigation measures | <p>The BDAR specifies that some structures proposed to be demolished have the potential to be used as a roost resource by threatened microbat species.</p> <p>In addition, a large area of vegetation is proposed to be removed.</p> <p><b>Recommended action:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The BDAR mitigation section is updated to include measures to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mitigate impacts on microbats potentially roosting in structures to be demolished, for example pre-demolition surveys.</li> <li>Mitigate impacts of vegetation clearing to fauna, for example pre-clearing surveys and supervised removal of trees and shrubs (native and exotic) and other habitat to capture, treat and/or relocate any displaced native fauna to an appropriate nearby location.</li> <li>Re-use a subset of trees that are proposed to be removed, including tree hollows, tree trunks greater than 30 cm in diameter and 2-3 m long and root balls, to enhance habitat within the management areas described in the accompanied vegetation management plan.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |
|    | <i>Extent and Timing</i>                                                | Prior to determination at Response to Submissions                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| 4. | BDAR – executive summary                                                | <p>The executive summary in the BDAR states: “The proposed development is expected to impact on areas of exotic vegetation as well as select groundcovers representative of one (1) Plant Community Type (PCT): 3136: Blue Gum High Forest”. This is an inaccurate description of the impact to PCT 3136 as the impact to this PCT includes the removal of trees.</p> <p><b>Recommended action:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The executive summary is updated to accurately describe the extent of impact to PCT 3136.</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
|    | <i>Extent and Timing</i>                                                | Prior to determination at Response to Submissions                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |

|    |                                                                     |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5. | Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) - avoid impacts to CEEC/SAII | <p>In line with avoid and minimise comments above for the BDAR, Trees 61, 71 and 85 should be retained.</p> <p><b>Recommended action:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plans are amended in consultation with a suitably experienced AQF level 5 arborist to enable the viable retention of Trees 61, 71 and 85.</li> <li>The AIA, Tree Protection Specifications, and associated drawings/plans are updated to demonstrate how these trees can be viable retained in line with the Australian Standard 4970—2025 Protection of Trees on Development Sites.</li> </ul>                                            |
|    | <i>Extent and Timing</i>                                            | Prior to determination at Response to Submissions                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| 6. | AIA – demonstrate viable retention of trees                         | <p>The provided AIA states “Further design development will need to be undertaken with the Landscape Architect to ensure grade changes and proposed works will not impact trees...”.</p> <p>The AIA must demonstrate how trees can be viably retained in line with AS 4970-2025.</p> <p><b>Recommended actions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plans are updated in consultation with the project arborist to enable the viable retention of trees.</li> <li>The AIA and Tree Protection Plan be updated to demonstrate how trees can be viably retained in line with section 3 of the AS 4970:2025.</li> </ul> |
|    | <i>Extent and Timing</i>                                            | Prior to determination at Response to Submissions                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |

### **Flood Risk Management**

CPHR has reviewed the Secondary Innovation Precinct (SIP) Pymble Ladies' College (PLC) - Water Management Plan (WMP) - Version E prepared by BG&E dated May 2025, and provides the following comments:

- Appendix C of the WMP includes a Flooding Assessment prepared by ARUP dated 3 March 2025.
- The site is not identified as flood prone land. The development footprint is in the upstream area of Avondale Creek catchment and adjacent to a minor tributary.
- The runoff from the small area upstream of the site is less than 20 m<sup>3</sup>/s as identified in the WMP.
- Therefore, the habitable floor should be identified in accordance with clause 3 of the Ku-ring-gai DCP Section 24D.3. Table 3 of the flood assessment should reflect this clause.
- No further flood risk management input is required.

**End of Submission**