

Table 1. Request for Additional Information	
Comment	Response
1. Traffic - Pick-up/Drop-off Capacity	
<p>The Department requests additional information be provided to understand the capacity and demand of the pick-up and drop off area. In this regard the Department notes that the analysis provided with the RtS indicates that under both the existing and the proposed arrangements the pickup/drop off would operate below capacity. However, the Department requires more information to substantiate the assessment as from the details provided in the public submissions and having regard to the previous findings of the NSW Land and Environment Court case (<i>Council of Trinity Grammar School v Ashfield Council [2015] NSWLEC 1086</i>), it appears likely that the current arrangements cannot accommodate the current demand, contrary to the information provided in the RtS. Therefore, the Department requires:</p>	<p>An addendum Traffic Impact Assessment has been prepared by Street Level Strategies and accompanies this application as Appendix B.</p>
<p>a) detailed information based on surveys and data collection to demonstrate how the existing and proposed demand has been calculated. The Department notes the number of vehicle trips is very different from data provided in the original traffic assessment, and the increase in demand (82 AM trips and 45 PM trips) is inconsistent with the traffic assessment which provides that the proposal would generate an additional 196 student vehicle trips in both of the peaks, the vast majority of which would be pick-ups / drop offs.</p>	<p>As addressed in Appendix B, the additional 196 student trips and the additional demand for +82 AM trips and +45 PM trips for the pick-up and drop-off, as they are two (2) different metrics.</p> <p>Traffic generation refers to all trips that are generated by the development which has been assessed as 196 additional student trips.</p> <p>Pick-up/drop-off metrics relate to the demand for pick-up and drop-off as a proportion of the car park traffic which is itself a proportion of the traffic generated.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix B for further detail.</p>
<p>b) detailed information to demonstrate demand in the 20 minutes immediately before the AM bell and 20 minutes immediately after the PM bell, noting that peak demand is not spread over an hour but is usually concentrated over a very short timeframe. Where demand results in queuing on Victoria Street, an analysis should be provided of any change in queue lengths and time frame for the on-street queue to clear as a result of the revised design and increased student numbers.</p>	<p>Refer to Appendix B for further detail.</p>

Appendix A - Request for Additional Information Response Matrix

SSD 10424 - Trinity Grammar School

Table 1. Request for Additional Information	
Comment	Response
c) consideration of impacts on queue lengths as a result of other vehicles accessing the site to park.	Refer to Appendix B for details on the consideration of impacts on queue lengths as a result of other vehicles accessing the Site to park.
The Department notes that the school has increased student numbers from 1500 (as per the last consent consent) to 1655. The traffic analysis should compare the situation between current lawful operation of 1500 students and the proposal for 2100 students.	An addendum Traffic Impact Assessment has been prepared by Street Level Strategies and accompanies this application as Appendix B .
2. Traffic - Operation of Intersections	
The traffic assessment indicates that the majority of vehicle trips associated with the school use would travel either via Queen Street / Harland Street or Victoria Street / Liverpool Road, however no assessment has been provided of the impacts of the proposal on these intersections. Therefore, the Department requests that:	
a) further traffic assessment of the impacts to the operation of these intersections be provided,	<p>The intersections previously modelled under the assessment (including those identified as part of the SEARs) are intersections that any traffic to and from the school must travel through.</p> <p>The Department has requested further assessment of the following three (3) intersections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A - Victoria Street/Liverpool Road (Hume Highway); ▪ B - Queen Street/Harland Street; and ▪ C - Harland Street/Service Avenue. <p>The DPIE RFI indicated <i>the traffic assessment indicates that the majority of vehicle trips associated with the school use would travel either via Queen Street / Harland Street or Victoria Street / Liverpool Road.</i></p> <p>The traffic assessment is based on the existing trip distribution captured in the data collected in October 2019. This distribution shows that 40% of the trips are to/from the north along Victoria Street, and 35% of the trips are to/from the west along Harland Street.</p>
b) further assessment of the impacts to the operation of the intersection of Harland Street / Service Avenue.	
Additionally, the analysis should compare the situation between a current lawful operation of the school (1500 students) vs the proposal for 2100 students. Where appropriate, consideration should be given to any mitigation measures to offset the traffic impacts of the proposal.	

Table 1. Request for Additional Information	
Comment	Response
	<p>As part of the traffic assessment, the intersection with Harland St and Victoria St was modelled and found to operate at a Level of Service A in both peaks across existing and future scenarios. Given this is the intersection that all traffic from or between Service Avenue or Queen Street will pass through and is closest to the school, it will bear the greatest impact. In the event the intersection at Victoria Street/Harland Street was operating at a poor level of services, further consideration and modelling of nearby intersections would have been undertaken to assess the broader impact of the traffic distribution. However, as the level of service for the Victoria Street/Harland Street intersection was good, additional assessment was not deemed to be necessary.</p> <p>Additionally, Harland Street is less than 200 metres in length between Queen Street and Victoria Street, therefore if there was significant congestion at either the Queen Street or Service Avenue, this would impact on the operations of Harland Street/Victoria Street.</p> <p>In relation to the Victoria Street/Liverpool Road intersection, the intersection is located approximately 840m to the north of Seaview, and requires vehicles to travel through three (3) other intersections prior to reaching it. Previous modelling of the intersection at Victoria Avenue/Seaview Street, which vehicles travelling to/from Victoria Street/Liverpool Road, would pass through, shows that it operates at a Level of Service A in both the existing and future modelling scenarios.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged 40% of the school's traffic travels to/from the north, there are additional opportunities for traffic to disperse through other intersections, and the total additional vehicles per hour is less than 100. Therefore, it is considered unlikely that traffic associated with the school would have any impact on the operations of the Victoria Street/Liverpool Road (intersection).</p> <p>Refer to Appendix B for further detail.</p>

Table 1. Request for Additional Information	
Comment	Response
3. Maintenance Building on Seaview Street	
<p>a) The Department notes there is a discrepancy between the plans and elevations – the plans show the building forward of the main building line as a two storey element (shown as a two storey ‘store’ on the plans), while the elevations submitted with the RtS show it as a single storey carport type structure. Only a single storey carport structure could be supported in the front setback area. Please confirm the proposed design and provide updated plans including a roof plan.</p>	<p>The Architectural Drawings have been reviewed and amended to remove any inconsistencies.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix C for further detail.</p>
<p>b) A height control of 8.5m under the Ashfield Local Environmental Plan 2013 applies to the allotments fronting Seaview Street. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) states that the height of the building would be 8.0m and that it complies with the control. However, the detailed elevations submitted with the RtS show the building will reach a height of up to 9.8m above natural ground levels. Accordingly:</p>	<p>In response to the DPIE comments, the height of the maintenance building fronting Seaview Street has been resolved to comply with the prescribed 8.5m height controls, pursuant to Clause 4.3 of ALEP 2013. The previous scheme presented a maximum building height of 9m. The proposed maintenance shed now exhibits a maximum building height of 8.5m.</p> <p>In response to the revised changes, further shadow studies have been carried out by PMDL Architects to investigate the impact of the revised design on the adjoining property at 142 Victoria Street. It is demonstrated in the shadow studies a minimum of 3 hours of sunlight on the 21st June to the Northern wing is achieved. In addition, adequate setbacks have been provided to the side and rear property boundaries to ensure residential amenity of neighbouring properties is achieved.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix C for further detail.</p>
<p>i. an assessment, which considers the impacts of the non-compliance must be provided.</p>	<p>The proposed maintenance shed now exhibits a maximum building height of 8.5m, complying with the prescribed maximum building height under Clause 4.3 of ALEP 2013.</p> <p>As the proposed maintenance shed complies with the prescribed maximum building height, no further assessment on the proposed impacts is required.</p>

Table 1. Request for Additional Information	
Comment	Response
<p>ii. a detailed assessment of the visual impacts and overshadowing impacts to living rooms and private open space on the adjoining properties.</p>	<p>As aforementioned, in response to the revised changes, further shadow studies have been carried out by PMDL Architects to investigate the impact of the revised design on the adjoining property at 142 Victoria Street. It is demonstrated in the shadow studies a minimum of 3 hours of sunlight on the 21st June to the Northern wing is achieved.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix C for further detail.</p>
<p>iii. where material adverse impacts are found to arise, consideration should be given to reducing building height.</p>	<p>The proposed maintenance shed now exhibits a maximum building height of 8.5m, complying with the prescribed maximum building height under Clause 4.3 of ALEP 2013.</p>
<p>c) The RtS requested elevations and details of plantings in front of the proposed Maintenance Building to screen its bulk from the street. The stepped boundary fence incorporates hedge plantings to the same height as the fence. While this helps to mitigate the streetscape impacts of the required acoustic wall it does not assist with screening the building. Given the non-compliance with the height control, further consideration should be given to providing plantings in the front setback to assist with screening the building bulk.</p>	<p>A Design Statement has been prepared by Arcadia and accompanies this application as Appendix E.</p> <p>The proposed plant species <i>Acmena Smithii</i> Minor to screen the building and acoustic fence along Seaview Street, will be planted in a hedge format with an unrestricted height of 5m in optimal conditions, with the maintenance of the plant spaces to be captured in the overall maintenance regime. As the species proposed is commonly a screening plant, this allows for greater visual screening on mass assisting in visually separating the built form sight lines from Seaview Street.</p>
4. View Impacts	
<p>The RtS includes a small reduction in height, however no assessment of view impacts has been provided. A public submission (extract attached below) demonstrates adjoining premises enjoy city skyline views over the site. This has not been addressed in the RtS. Consideration should be given to the view impacts of the proposal having regard to the Planning Principle in <i>Tenacity Consulting v Warringah 2004</i> NSWLEC 140.</p>	<p>Richard Lamb and Associates have been engaged to carry out the Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) for the proposed development. The VIA investigated the possible impacts that the proposed building may have on the surrounding and adjacent private and publicly accessible areas. The selection of particular neighbouring properties focused on where the impacts was considered to be high, and where the selected property can be representative of other properties/levels that may not have been included in the original report.</p>

Table 1. Request for Additional Information	
Comment	Response
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;">   </div> <p style="font-size: small; margin-top: 5px;"> <small>V1515</small> <small>View from first floor bedroom standing at window of 157 Victoria Road (50 mm lens used for emphasis)</small> </p> <p style="font-size: small; margin-top: 5px;"> <small>https://www.realestate.com.au/solidproperty-house-nsw-ashfield-106878786</small> </p>	<p>As part of the original VIA documentation, a Visual Impact Assessment was documented from 157 Victoria Street. This is an inter-war two-storey cottage and is similar in age and condition to several other properties in the street. Views were taken from the ground level of the residence which contains the formal living areas and the first floor bedroom window. It was acknowledged that although the view from the first floor has a higher viewing level, it did not have a direct view to features beyond the School Site to the east, as this was blocked by existing buildings. An oblique cameo view toward the north-east over the shade structure at the north of the northern playing field on the site and over existing lower buildings facing Seaview Street contains a distant horizon, featuring the profile of taller buildings of the Sydney CBD. This part of the site is not proposed to increase significantly in height and this limited view to the distant feature of the CBD is likely to remain unaffected by the proposed development. The original assessment concluded that as adjoining properties were of a similar size and scale, the view of which a photomontage has been prepared (V15) was a reasonable representation of views from residences in the general vicinity.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, it is understood, a formal submission was previously issued by the resident/land owner of 159 Victoria Street, Summer Hill stating the proposed development, in particular the 5-storey element will result in a view loss of an iconic view, being the city skyline.</p> <p>A formal request for access to 159 Victoria Street was hand delivered on 19 January 2021 (refer to Appendix F). The resident/land owner has been advised they have 14 days to respond from the 19 January 2021.</p>

Appendix A - Request for Additional Information Response Matrix

SSD 10424 - Trinity Grammar School

Table 1. Request for Additional Information	
Comment	Response
5. Noise	
<p>The updated acoustic assessment provided with the RtS shows that increased student numbers will increase noise impacts of the outdoor playing areas which already exceed the noise criteria. While the increase is small, it is based on an increase from current student numbers, rather than lawful student numbers so is not representative of the actual impacts of the application which would effectively increase permitted students from 1500 to 2100.</p> <p>Therefore, overall cumulative impacts are considered material given existing use of the site already significantly exceeds the amenity criteria.</p> <p>According, the Department requests that consideration should be given to measures to reduce the additional noise impacts of the proposal. The Department is not supportive of a further solid construction boundary fence to Seaview Street as it would result in associated streetscape and natural surveillance impacts, noting that a solid fence is already required for part of the frontage due to noise from the loading dock.</p>	<p>An addendum Noise Impact Assessment has been prepared by SLR and accompanies this application as Appendix G.</p>
6. Architectural Plans	
<p>The RtS appears to be missing a revised set of architectural floor plans. The Department requests, a revised set which includes corrected RLs is to be provided.</p>	<p>The complete Architectural Drawing set has been reviewed and amended to show all current RLs.</p> <p>Refer to Appendix C.</p>
7. Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Report (ACHR)	
<p>The Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Report (Appendix 16) of the EIS recommends that "a copy of the final ACHR must be provided to all Project Registered Aboriginal Parties (RAPs). As previously requested by the Department, an evidence that the final ACHR has been provided to all project RAPs is to be submitted.</p>	<p>Refer to Appendix H.</p>