

WILLOWTREE PLANNING



9 June 2022

REF: WTJ21-087

Department of Planning and Environment
Locked Bag 5022
Parramatta NSW 2124

Attention: Nahid Mahmud

PROPERTY AT 20 AVON ROAD, PYMBLE

PYMBLE LADIES COLLEGE – GREY HOUSE PRECINCT SSD-17424905

Dear Nahid,

We write in response to the **SSD-17424905**, for the Pymble Ladies College (PLC), Grey House Precinct (GHP). Specifically, this letter and attachments provides a response to the additional Request for Information (RFI) dated 19 May 2022. The applicant, PLC, and its specialist consultant team have reviewed and considered all matters raised in this RFI, which relate largely to traffic and biodiversity. **Table 1** below provides a detailed response to the key matters raised and outlines the proposed amendments to comply with these matters.

The following are also provided with this response;

- Appendix 1: Updated Childcare Planning Guideline Assessment
- Appendix 2: Updated Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA)
- Appendix 3: Design Response
- Appendix 4: Revised Drawing
- Appendix 5: SDRP Meeting Response #3
- Appendix 6: Updated Biodiversity Assessment Report

It is concluded that the above response provides clarity on all issues raised, and that this will allow DPE to finalise their assessment. We would appreciate if you could provide Willowtree Planning an updated timeframe to complete assessment and the anticipated date for the Independent Planning Commission meeting.

We look forward to continuing to work with DPE in reaching a favourable outcome for this Site. Should you require anything further, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Kind Regards,

Sally Prowd

Associate
Willowtree Planning

ACN: 146 035 707 ABN: 54 146 035 707

Suite 1, Level 10, 56 Berry Street
North Sydney, NSW 2060

enquiries@willowtp.com.au

willowtreeplanning.com.au

02 9929 6974



DPE Submissions Response

State Significant Development SSD-17424905
 Pymble Ladies College – Grey House Precinct
 20 Avon Road, Pymble (Lot 1 DP 69541)



Table 1 RESPONSE TO INFORMATION REQUEST

Matters Raised	Response																
<p>1. The Department previously requested that a clear table assessing the proposal against the principles of Schedule 4 of the State Environmental Planning Policy (Educational Establishment and Child Care Centres) 2017 (Education SEPP), as applicable at the time of lodgement, be submitted. In this regard, the Department notes that the EIS indicates that the Design Report includes this table, however the report does not include such an assessment table for the school component.</p> <p>The submitted RtS also does not include a complete table of assessment against the design principles. The RtS table includes an assessment against the Principles 1, 5 and 7.</p> <p>You are requested to provide a complete table assessing the consistency of the proposal against the various design principles of the Education SEPP. The Department notes that Kuring-Gai Council (Council) maintain their concerns regarding the compatibility of the bulk and scale of the building is with the low-density character of the dwellings that immediately adjoin the precinct to its south (facing Pymble Avenue). Consequently, further detailed clarification regarding the computability of the development with the adjoining precinct and the appropriateness of the context, would be required in the assessment of the development against the design principles.</p>	<p>A complete assessment table is provided on page 60 of the original Architectural Design Report – Appendix 9 of the EIS. Extract is below for reference;</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">OBJECTIVE</th> <th style="text-align: left;">DESIGN RESPONSE</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1. Context, built form and landscape</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GHP proposal responds to school setting; landscape and heritage, including Aboriginal cultural heritage • Replacing temporary buildings at end of life • Spatial organisation informed by and responds to topography and site conditions such as orientation and climate • Landscape holistically integrated into building to provide outdoor amenity wherever possible and to mitigate negative impact on neighbours </td> </tr> <tr> <td>2. Sustainable, efficient and durable</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designed to minimise the consumption of energy through significant PVs, water harvesting and reduce waste and encourage recycling through re-use of onsite materials on the school farm • Designed to maximise flexibility of teaching spaces and be adaptable enabling building to evolve over time to meet future requirements </td> </tr> <tr> <td>3. Accessible and inclusive</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designed with clear main entry to provide distinctive unifying front door as well as clear identity for each of the departments within. • Lift access at central atrium stair for equitable access and access to health services • Designed to enable safe and vibrant space for extended hours community. Dedicated OSHC, ELC and co-curricular dance facilities as well as Health provide varied operation hours to support school community (boarders, families and staff) </td> </tr> <tr> <td>4. Health and safety</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student health and safety has been a strong consideration in the design and approach to engagement with the landscape, materials and tactility, diversity of types of spaces and openness. • Within the campus setting security is less of a concern and a welcoming and accessible building design has been prioritised </td> </tr> <tr> <td>5. Amenity</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible learning spaces and in between spaces have been considered in the design to create pleasant and engaging spaces that are accessible for a wide range of educational, informal and community activities • Siting of the building and stacking of operations considers the amenity of adjacent developments and the local neighbourhood to minimise impact • Campus setting has benefit of minimal acoustic impacts on the building • Diversity of stage and age appropriate indoor and outdoor learning and play spaces incorporated into design • Access to sunlight, natural ventilation, outlook through picture windows, visual and acoustic privacy, storage and service areas. </td> </tr> <tr> <td>6. Whole of life, flexible and adaptive</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masterplan considers the whole site and future school planning • Flexible structural grid and durable natural materials utilised wherever possible to maximize opportunities for re-use and repurpose and to enable change for future use • Maximise multi-use within the building and future flexibility </td> </tr> <tr> <td>7. Aesthetics</td> <td> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good proportions and balanced composition, embedded into the natural topography and landscape setting through terracing of forms and change in podium material • Facade composition includes picture windows to create balance and playfulness, material choice, rhythm and form referencing elegance of formal college setting while acknowledging age appropriate response for child users • Student and staff community commented on positive response to the landscape setting of the college and therefore the building further engages with this positive association • Identity of the school to empower women that will “change the world”, the building speaks to this vision - courageous, unspired, environmental responsibility for the world, flexible to change, connected to Country, our environment and landscape </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Points 1, 5 and 7 were addressed in the RTS directly in response to Councils concerns over bulk and scale. This has been demonstrated thoroughly in all documentation, and as noted in the SDRP’s latest response, the bulk and scale has been significantly reduced through the design amendments.</p>	OBJECTIVE	DESIGN RESPONSE	1. Context, built form and landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GHP proposal responds to school setting; landscape and heritage, including Aboriginal cultural heritage • Replacing temporary buildings at end of life • Spatial organisation informed by and responds to topography and site conditions such as orientation and climate • Landscape holistically integrated into building to provide outdoor amenity wherever possible and to mitigate negative impact on neighbours 	2. Sustainable, efficient and durable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designed to minimise the consumption of energy through significant PVs, water harvesting and reduce waste and encourage recycling through re-use of onsite materials on the school farm • Designed to maximise flexibility of teaching spaces and be adaptable enabling building to evolve over time to meet future requirements 	3. Accessible and inclusive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designed with clear main entry to provide distinctive unifying front door as well as clear identity for each of the departments within. • Lift access at central atrium stair for equitable access and access to health services • Designed to enable safe and vibrant space for extended hours community. Dedicated OSHC, ELC and co-curricular dance facilities as well as Health provide varied operation hours to support school community (boarders, families and staff) 	4. Health and safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student health and safety has been a strong consideration in the design and approach to engagement with the landscape, materials and tactility, diversity of types of spaces and openness. • Within the campus setting security is less of a concern and a welcoming and accessible building design has been prioritised 	5. Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible learning spaces and in between spaces have been considered in the design to create pleasant and engaging spaces that are accessible for a wide range of educational, informal and community activities • Siting of the building and stacking of operations considers the amenity of adjacent developments and the local neighbourhood to minimise impact • Campus setting has benefit of minimal acoustic impacts on the building • Diversity of stage and age appropriate indoor and outdoor learning and play spaces incorporated into design • Access to sunlight, natural ventilation, outlook through picture windows, visual and acoustic privacy, storage and service areas. 	6. Whole of life, flexible and adaptive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masterplan considers the whole site and future school planning • Flexible structural grid and durable natural materials utilised wherever possible to maximize opportunities for re-use and repurpose and to enable change for future use • Maximise multi-use within the building and future flexibility 	7. Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good proportions and balanced composition, embedded into the natural topography and landscape setting through terracing of forms and change in podium material • Facade composition includes picture windows to create balance and playfulness, material choice, rhythm and form referencing elegance of formal college setting while acknowledging age appropriate response for child users • Student and staff community commented on positive response to the landscape setting of the college and therefore the building further engages with this positive association • Identity of the school to empower women that will “change the world”, the building speaks to this vision - courageous, unspired, environmental responsibility for the world, flexible to change, connected to Country, our environment and landscape
OBJECTIVE	DESIGN RESPONSE																
1. Context, built form and landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GHP proposal responds to school setting; landscape and heritage, including Aboriginal cultural heritage • Replacing temporary buildings at end of life • Spatial organisation informed by and responds to topography and site conditions such as orientation and climate • Landscape holistically integrated into building to provide outdoor amenity wherever possible and to mitigate negative impact on neighbours 																
2. Sustainable, efficient and durable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designed to minimise the consumption of energy through significant PVs, water harvesting and reduce waste and encourage recycling through re-use of onsite materials on the school farm • Designed to maximise flexibility of teaching spaces and be adaptable enabling building to evolve over time to meet future requirements 																
3. Accessible and inclusive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Designed with clear main entry to provide distinctive unifying front door as well as clear identity for each of the departments within. • Lift access at central atrium stair for equitable access and access to health services • Designed to enable safe and vibrant space for extended hours community. Dedicated OSHC, ELC and co-curricular dance facilities as well as Health provide varied operation hours to support school community (boarders, families and staff) 																
4. Health and safety	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student health and safety has been a strong consideration in the design and approach to engagement with the landscape, materials and tactility, diversity of types of spaces and openness. • Within the campus setting security is less of a concern and a welcoming and accessible building design has been prioritised 																
5. Amenity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Flexible learning spaces and in between spaces have been considered in the design to create pleasant and engaging spaces that are accessible for a wide range of educational, informal and community activities • Siting of the building and stacking of operations considers the amenity of adjacent developments and the local neighbourhood to minimise impact • Campus setting has benefit of minimal acoustic impacts on the building • Diversity of stage and age appropriate indoor and outdoor learning and play spaces incorporated into design • Access to sunlight, natural ventilation, outlook through picture windows, visual and acoustic privacy, storage and service areas. 																
6. Whole of life, flexible and adaptive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Masterplan considers the whole site and future school planning • Flexible structural grid and durable natural materials utilised wherever possible to maximize opportunities for re-use and repurpose and to enable change for future use • Maximise multi-use within the building and future flexibility 																
7. Aesthetics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good proportions and balanced composition, embedded into the natural topography and landscape setting through terracing of forms and change in podium material • Facade composition includes picture windows to create balance and playfulness, material choice, rhythm and form referencing elegance of formal college setting while acknowledging age appropriate response for child users • Student and staff community commented on positive response to the landscape setting of the college and therefore the building further engages with this positive association • Identity of the school to empower women that will “change the world”, the building speaks to this vision - courageous, unspired, environmental responsibility for the world, flexible to change, connected to Country, our environment and landscape 																
<p>2. The open space area allocation for early learning centre (ELC) students is not clear. The</p>	<p>The Childcare assessment table has been resubmitted with all minor errors resolved (Appendix 1).</p>																



DPE Submissions Response

State Significant Development SSD-17424905
Pymble Ladies College – Grey House Precinct
20 Avon Road, Pymble (Lot 1 DP 69541)



Table 1 RESPONSE TO INFORMATION REQUEST

<p>child care assessment table submitted with the EIS does not include any numerical data regarding the unencumbered outdoor and indoor play areas to demonstrate their compliance with the relevant standards (the childcare assessment table include incomplete highlighted information rather than a number). The Department has previously requested this; however the information has not been submitted.</p> <p>The Department requires you to clearly demonstrate on the architectural plans and in a table, the delineation of the unencumbered outdoor and indoor play area for the proposed ELC, to comply with the requirements of the Education SEPP.</p>	<p>The internal and external unencumbered areas are 310 sqm and 650 sqm respectively which is above the minimum requirement of 292.5 sqm and 630 sqm for 90 students. The internal and external spaces are clearly demonstrated within the Design Report addendum, page 2 (Appendix 3).</p> <p>The unencumbered space provides more than the minimum area required which includes areas of low density planting functioning as 'bush track' play experiences allowing the children to immerse themselves and interact with the planting. The design has minimised the de-linestation of specific pathways, instead of providing differing paving treatments as part of the discovery and self-led play strategy. The unencumbered area does not include areas for; storage, paths, raised planter beds or screen planting.</p>
<p>3. The architectural drawings and supporting documents in the RtS, demonstrate that the northern portion of the building footprint has been reduced. This implies a change in the overall gross floor area (GFA) of the development. Please provide an amended schedule of the GFA to indicate the extent of its reduction.</p>	<p>A revised floor area schedule has been provided within the Design Report Addendum at page 3 (Appendix 3). The revised total internal area is 5,837m², however it is noted that this is not the gross floor area (GFA), but the total internal area. As there is no GFA restriction across the site, it is considered this is suitable.</p>
<p>4. Please confirm whether the site area for the Grey House Precinct is 0.3ha or 0.06ha.</p>	<p>The total area of the GHP building is 0.3ha, with the overall GHP site area including landscaping elements being 0.6ha, this is referenced within the Design Report Addendum on page 4 (Appendix 3).</p>
<p>5. The Department notes the justification provided with regard to overlooking and visual privacy. However, the Department is concerned that the level 3 classroom windows and level 2 balcony of the proposed building may directly overlook on to the swimming pool</p>	<p>The Design Report addendum, at page 5 (Appendix 3) has shown the distance between the GHP building window line and the adjoining building, being 24m and 30m respectively. There is little opportunity from these windows, through the design of the window elements, distance and angles, into the neighbouring property or their amenity areas.</p>



DPE Submissions Response

State Significant Development SSD-17424905
Pymble Ladies College – Grey House Precinct
20 Avon Road, Pymble (Lot 1 DP 69541)



Table 1 RESPONSE TO INFORMATION REQUEST

<p>and courtyards of the residential properties to the south (facing Pymble Avenue). In this regard, the Department requires you to provide a more detailed view analysis diagram to demonstrate the extent of such overlooking (if any). Should the development result in adverse impacts on the privacy of the neighbouring properties, alternate solutions such as privacy glazing (obscure glass) or highlight windows should be explored and included in the design.</p>	<p>As part of the proposed landscape plan, a row of large Blue Gum trees will be planted along the length of the site boundary, providing a landscaped buffer and adding to the existing garden setting of Pymble Avenue. However, view out towards 57A and 59B from the learning spaces have been tested without the trees and indicate very little overlooking opportunities. The interlayered mesh in the picture window and vertical screening in front of the operable windows further obscure sightline into neighbouring properties and their amenity area.</p> <p>In the L02 outdoor terrace area, landscaping elements have been incorporated to the perimeter which creates a setback to restrict sightline. The 1.8m tall balustrade further limit overlooking opportunities into the neighbouring properties and their amenities area. This is further explored in the Design Report Addendum at page 6 (Appendix 3).</p> <p>Should this not be considered satisfactory, further obscure glazing to these windows can be conditioned accordingly by DPE.</p>
<p>6. The submitted diagrams, showing the views from the site to 57 and 59B Pymble Avenue, do not show the location and/or boundary fence height. The diagrams should be amended to include a reference to the fence to clearly demonstrate the extent of overlooking.</p>	<p>The location of the boundary fence was submitted previously on a drawing that was provided to scale. For clarity, the Design Report Addendum at page 5 (Appendix 3) clearly shows the RLs for the boundary fence.</p>
<p>7. Table 4 of the amended Traffic Impact Assessment Report (TIA), states that the average delay at the intersection between Pacific Highway and Beechworth Avenue during the PM peak hour would be 482.2 seconds per vehicle in the post development scenario, where in the existing scenario the delay is 484.2 seconds per vehicle. The report indicates that this intersection would be slightly improved after the development. Please clarify how the delay would be reduced</p>	<p>The modelling shows that there are more vehicles utilising Beechworth Avenue, that is not experiencing high delays, which therefore alters the average delay.</p> <p>The slight decrease in average delay is due to the increase in traffic onto Beechworth Road and North-West approach of Pacific Highway which is currently experiencing minor delays. The approach that is experiencing the highest delay is the south-eastern approach along Pacific Highway. It has been assumed that there will be little to no additional traffic on this approach as a result of the proposed development. As a result, the overall average delay would increase.</p> <p>The SIDRA results indicate that the average delay for each leg has increased with the post-development scenario.</p>



DPE Submissions Response

State Significant Development SSD-17424905
Pymble Ladies College – Grey House Precinct
20 Avon Road, Pymble (Lot 1 DP 69541)



Table 1 RESPONSE TO INFORMATION REQUEST

with additional traffic post operation of the ELC.	
<p>8. The updated TIA says that “there are a number drop-off and pick-up activities occurring along the adjacent streets, including Pymble Avenue (largely due to the presence of Grey House Walk). The students who drive to the College are not allowed to park within the College grounds, and therefore students park along the adjacent streets. This has ultimately led to an increase in traffic and parking demand along Avon Road and Pymble Avenue”.</p> <p>The TIA states that ‘No Parking’ and ‘No Stopping’ zones prevail on Pymble Avenue on school days. It also states that to enable some drop-off/pick-up, the Applicant would consult with Council to ensure that time limited parking can be provided on Pymble Avenue. However, the RtS indicates that this recommendation has been removed in response to Council’s comments.</p> <p>The two above statements are contradictory given that drop-off/pick-up cannot be permitted on Pymble Avenue, if Council does not agree to time limited parking on this road. Consequently, the TIA needs to clarify the drop-off/pick-up area for the students that are proposed to use the Grey House walk, noting the parking restrictions on this street.</p>	<p>The Grey House Walk is used by local students who live along Pymble Avenue, and as such there is no need for a drop-off/pick-up area along Pymble Avenue for students who need to use the Grey House Walk to access the College. This area is not proposed to be utilised for drop off or pick up, as the Grey House Walk is not a formal school entrance and is monitored. No stopping zones already exist around the Grey House Walk.</p> <p>Stantec has removed the comment regarding timed parking along Pymble Avenue in the updated Transport Impact Assessment (TIA) (Appendix 2).</p>
9. Council has reviewed the RtS and raised concerns regarding the impacts of the proposal on Arilla Road, Mayfield Avenue and	It is noted that he estimated 25 and 22 additional vehicles is considered a conservative estimate. As outlined in the TIA (Appendix 2), it is expected that a large number of children enrolled in the ELC will have parents who are staff members of the College or have siblings



DPE Submissions Response

State Significant Development SSD-17424905
Pymble Ladies College – Grey House Precinct
20 Avon Road, Pymble (Lot 1 DP 69541)



Table 1 RESPONSE TO INFORMATION REQUEST

<p>Allawah Road due to additional traffic that would be generated by the proposed ELC. Council have suggested that traffic calming measures be introduced or proposed (in concept) on these routes, in consultation with surrounding residents. Council's comments to the RtS are attached to this letter (Attachment A).</p> <p>The Department requires you to address Council's concerns in this regard and proposed additional measures on these surrounding roads.</p>	<p>already attending the College, and as such, will not necessarily generate additional traffic. This is typical of private schools such as PLC which have long waiting lists. As such, in reality, the additional traffic generated by the ELC onto the Arilla Road, Mayfield Avenue and Allawah Road is expected to be lower than 25 and 22 vehicles.</p> <p>It is also noted that the ELC peak pick-up and drop-off periods will be outside the College peak drop-off and pick-up periods. Although there will be a small overlap during the morning peaks, the operational hours of the ELC will be 7am to 6:30pm, which would mean that there will be minor impact during the College peak drop-off and pick-up periods, particularly in the PM peak as the bulk of ELC pick-up activities are expected to occur after 4pm. As such, the peak volumes outlined by Council is considered a misrepresentation of the expected conditions and comparisons/ assessment should be made using the volumes during ELC peak drop-off and pick-up periods.</p> <p>Should it be considered that there is merit to undertaking additional traffic counts to identify the appropriate traffic calming measures required, this can be conditioned accordingly.</p>
<p>10. The Environment and Heritage Group (EHG) have reviewed the RtS and advised that the previous concerns raised by the Government agency have not been adequately addressed. Additionally, the EHG have also requested clarification regarding several areas of the Biodiversity Assessment Report (BDAR) submitted with the RtS. The comments from EHG are attached to this letter (Attachment B).</p> <p>You are requested to review the comments and provide a response to each of the pending issues raised by EHG</p>	<p>The Biodiversity Assessment Report (BDAR) (Appendix 6) has been updated to ensure consistency with advice received from EHG. A separate track change version has been provided to EHG for review.</p>
<p>11. Drawing no AR-DA-D10-AA-03, issue 5, Sections-Sheet 3, does not include any name and the texts on the levels are unclear. Please provided amended drawings to address this issue.</p>	<p>Drawing AR-DA-D10-AA03, Issue 6, has been updated (Appendix 4), to ensure all labels on the drawing are clear and legible.</p>



DPE Submissions Response

State Significant Development SSD-17424905
 Pymble Ladies College – Grey House Precinct
 20 Avon Road, Pymble (Lot 1 DP 69541)



Table 1 RESPONSE TO INFORMATION REQUEST	
12. The N-S section on Page no 23, of the Design report addendum 1 is not consistent with the N-S section in the drawing AR-DA-D10-AA-02, Issue 7. Please provide an amended version of the Design Report to be consistent with the architectural drawings	The N-S section on page no 23 of the Design Report Addendum 1 (submitted with the first RTS) is a diagram for view analysis purpose only. The sections shown in AR-SA-D10-AA-02 are drawings intended to show the building design and therefore different from the diagram shown in the report. No further updates have been made.
Ku-Ring-Gai Council Comments	
1. Height and bulk of the building <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Design changes are minimal, no significant reduction ▪ Landscaping area cannot support large canopy trees and is relied upon to mitigate bulk and scale 	<p>The design has been significantly altered in response to commentary received from Council, the community and the State Design Review Panel (SDRP). The SDRP noted that the revised design significantly reduced the bulk and scale of the proposal (Appendix 5).</p> <p>The design does not rely on the landscaping to minimise impacts of bulk and scale, however the extensive landscaping assists in ensuring the neighbouring residential dwellings have an enhanced outlook. The landscaping enhances the overall built form and ensures important biodiversity values are retained and enhanced on the site.</p>
2. Ecologically Sustainable Development Conditioned to use of Green Star scheme	The proposed design provides for a high level of sustainable design.
3. Traffic and parking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Still concern over Arilla Rd, Mayfield Avenue and Wallawah Road. Proposed traffic calming measures 	As noted above, it is not considered that the proposed development would have a significant impact on these local roads. However, should further modelling be required to determine if traffic calming measures are required, this can be conditioned accordingly.
4. Landscape design <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site wide planting ▪ Landscape plans are conceptual and don't detail species ▪ Landscape buffer not wide enough at Goodlet House 	<p>Site wide planting has been considered for the overall School site; however this application relates specifically to GHP and does not propose to approve or look at a wider masterplan. A schedule of species provided within the Landscaping Plans included within the EIS.</p> <p>The buffer landscape at Goodlet house is 5m wide deep soil planting which is adequate for tree planting which has been offset from the frontage of Grey House Precinct. Schedule of plant species and tree planting plan have been provided as part of the application submission.</p>
EHG Comments	
EES advised the RtS needs to clarify if the regrowth of STIF is from remnant local native vegetation. In response, Attachment K3 notes "a majority of vegetation on site is regrowth or	Within the BDAR (Appendix 6) historical imagery (Figures 1.3a-d) have been added and further justification provided in section 1.2 of the BDAR.



DPE Submissions Response

State Significant Development SSD-17424905
Pymble Ladies College – Grey House Precinct
20 Avon Road, Pymble (Lot 1 DP 69541)



Table 1 RESPONSE TO INFORMATION REQUEST

has been planted by the school. There is little to no remnant vegetation left within the site” (page 3). EHG does not consider this point has been clarified. Regrowth from remnant vegetation has a higher conservation significance than planted vegetation.	
The following are not addressed by the BDAR:	As below:
The requirements for a streamlined assessment - small area BDAR are outlined in Appendix C and Table 27 of BAM (2020).	Minimum information requirements for the BDAR Streamlined assessment module – Small Area has been added to appendix VI of the BDAR (Appendix 6).
The BAM-C calculations were not submitted to the consent authority. As such, EHG has not been able to view the calculations as part of this BDAR review.	The BOAMS will be submitted to DPE as separate files.
The BDAR and BAM-C report say the BOS entry trigger is clearing of vegetation on the Biodiversity Values Map. This is incorrect. The BOS entry threshold does not apply to SSDs.	The Executive summary within the BDAR (Appendix 6) has been amended to include the DPIE and EES requirement for a BDAR to accompany the DA.
The BDAR describes how it has applied Stage 3 of the BAM, but this stage has not been applied to this BDAR. Stage 3 of the BAM is only relevant for applications for biodiversity stewardship sites.	Noted. The Stage 3 heading has been removed from the BDAR.
It is not clear from Figure 2.1 what native vegetation has been included in the count of 25% cover as there’s no legend to the map. RtS needs to clarify if both dark green and aqua vegetation been included and why has a map been provided with the vegetation marked as different colours.	Figure 2.1 within the BDAR (Appendix 6) has been updated to include a legend. Previously mapped native vegetation (Sydney Metro Area_v3_1_2016_E_4489) was approximated at 25% cover within the 1,500m ² site buffer.
No digital shapefiles have been provided to EHG.	Shapefiles have been uploaded to BOAMS. Zipped Shapefiles have been provided directly to DPE for ease of access.
Section 3.1.1 states that “whilst canopy species in the proposed development footprint are	Vegetation in this zone has been re-assigned to the STIF EEC within the BAM-C.



DPE Submissions Response

State Significant Development SSD-17424905
Pymble Ladies College – Grey House Precinct
20 Avon Road, Pymble (Lot 1 DP 69541)



Table 1 RESPONSE TO INFORMATION REQUEST

associated with PCT 1281, the lack of remnant ground species and historical development results in this vegetation not being assessed as a part of the STIF EEC in the BAM-C.” However, the Scientific Committee’s final determination for STIF includes that a stand of remnant STIF trees can meet the definition of STIF.	
The map showing vegetation zones should be provided with other information on the native vegetation present (i.e., in section 3 of the report) rather than in the impact section.	Figure 5.1 has been moved to section 3 (now Figure 3.1) within the BDAR (Appendix 6) and include areas of native vegetation cover within the Development Footprint.
Section 4.2 states that “several candidate species generated species credit species due to the impact on foraging habitat”. However, only one species generated species credit species.	This sentence refers to Candidate species that were generated by the BAM-C prior to Likelihood of Occurrence Assessment in Appendix I of the BDAR (Appendix 6). This has been clarified within the updated report.
The Regent Honeyeater and Swift Parrot have been assessed as being unlikely to occur, however the BDAR should have referred to the Important Habitat Map for these species.	References to each map has been added to the site suitability assessment in Appendix I of the BDAR (Appendix 6). Both species have been retained in the BAM_C for foraging purposes, however are not expected to utilise the site for breeding habitat.
The BDAR states the structures on site are unlikely to be potential habitat for Large Bent-wing Bat because they are in use and well maintained. However, this species does not roost only in uninhabited structures.	It is understood that these species also use inhabited buildings, and the conclusion was from a prior knowledge of these buildings inside and out and doing an assessment of habitat. An Anabat has supplemented this. While it is not the prime time for microbats in the colder months, recordings of a range of species in other studies have been positive by leaving detectors out longer. In this instant there is a very low chance of bats using the building as these small, highly used demountables have fully sealed roof spaces, are low to the ground and if the bats were using the inside they would have been detected/seen, or at least signs such as faecal matter.
EHG previously commented that there was no demonstration in the BDAR of efforts to avoid and minimise impacts on biodiversity values. While some information has now been provided in section 9.1.1., the information is too brief. For example, more justification should have been provided for the statement that the	Efforts to Avoid and Minimise have been added into Section 10 of the BDAR (Appendix 6). Justification has been provided for the design and location of the Grey House Precinct Proposal.



DPE Submissions Response

State Significant Development SSD-17424905
Pymble Ladies College – Grey House Precinct
20 Avon Road, Pymble (Lot 1 DP 69541)



Table 1 RESPONSE TO INFORMATION REQUEST

existing access path 'is presently too narrow for the current requirements of safety and access and requires upgrades regardless of the new proposed building'.	
The discussion in Chapter 9 titled 'Avoid and minimise impacts' discusses potential impacts on 'features that threatened species depend on', and then lists the prescribed impacts under the BAM. This suggests the assessor does not understand what prescribed impacts are, and why they need to be assessed separately.	Section 9 in the BDAR (Appendix 6) has been amended to assess prescribed impacts. Section 10 has been amended to address the 'Avoid and Minimise' requirements within the BDAR.
Four trees will be removed for the accessway. The impacts have been calculated at a loss of 5% canopy cover. No justification is provided for the figure of 5%. EES considers this impact value is likely insufficient given the loss of four trees and the trimming that is required.	Justification has been provided in section 6.1.1. of the BDAR (Appendix 6) and summarised below. Total canopy cover within the impacted vegetation zone was determined to consist of approximately 29% of the vegetation plot. The canopy was predominantly located along the eastern (right hand side) of the plot. Patches of open canopy were also observed and contributed to the low total cover value. The removal of trees T839 and T841 will have negligible impact on the future percentage cover, as larger adjacent trees were already shading this area of the zone. T829 and T882 were both located on the boundary of the vegetation plot (see final arborist report for tree locations). This was due to the BAM required 10mx100m plot dimensions. Subsequently, the canopy of these two trees was only partially within the plot. Therefore, canopy trimming has been calculated as a loss of 5% cover in the future integrity calculations in the BAM-C.
There is no discussion of the frequency or responsibility of mitigation measures. There is no table of mitigation measures.	A mitigation measures table (Table 11.) has added to section 11 of the BDAR (Appendix 6). The table includes responsibility, frequency and at which stage of construction the measures are proposed.
The BDAR has not addressed the matters in section 9.1.1 of the BAM in relation to serious and irreversible impacts (SAII). The BDAR states that it has applied the Guidance to assist a decision-maker to determine a serious and irreversible impact. However, Appendix B of the Guidance lists information that is required	This has been addressed within Appendix B of the BDAR (Appendix 6).



DPE Submissions Response

State Significant Development SSD-17424905
Pymble Ladies College – Grey House Precinct
20 Avon Road, Pymble (Lot 1 DP 69541)



Table 1 RESPONSE TO INFORMATION REQUEST	
to be provided in the BDAR, and this has not been provided.	
There is no map of SAll threatened ecological communities and species, impacts requiring offset, impacts not requiring offset, not requiring assessment.	A map of BGHF and STIF has been included in of the BDAR (Appendix 6).



WILLOWTREE PLANNING



ACN: 146 035 707 ABN: 54 146 035 707

Suite 1, Level 10, 56 Berry Street
North Sydney, NSW 2060

enquiries@willowtp.com.au

willowtreeplanning.com.au

02 9929 6974



SYDNEY | NEWCASTLE | GOLD COAST | BRISBANE