

22 September 2020

218064

Nicholas Gunn  
Planner  
School Infrastructure Assessments  
NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment  
320 Pitt Street, Sydney NSW 2000

Dear Nicholas,

**RE: REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION  
DARLINGTON PUBLIC SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT (SSD-9914)**

The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Darlington Public School Redevelopment was publicly exhibited for a period of 28 days, concluding on 13 July 2020. During the exhibition period, four submissions were received from members of the public, while 7 submissions were received from government agencies.

The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE) also prepared a letter setting out additional information and clarifications required prior to final assessment of the project. The proponent, School Infrastructure NSW (SINSW) and its specialist consultant team responded to DPIE's letter and all public submissions on 2 September 2020.

On 8 September 2020, DPIE provided a letter to SINSW requesting further information relating to tree removal and landscaping, and comments made by the Government Architect NSW (GANSW). This letter has been prepared in response to the request for further information. The letter should be read in conjunction with the following attached documentation:

- Design Report and Response to GANSW comments prepared by FJMT (**Attachment A**)
- Revised Arboricultural Report Appendix 2 prepared by FJMT Landscape and Moore Trees (**Attachment B**)
- Amended Planting Schedule prepared by FJMT Landscape (**Attachment C**).

A response to each issue raised in the letter is provided in the following sections.

## 1. Tree Removal and Landscaping

### Issue:

*The current version of the Arborist Report does not provide a detailed explanation / justification for the proposed removal of trees site, particularly those located in the future landscaped areas.*

*Please provide an updated Appendix 2 of the Arborist Report which:*

- *details whether each tree listed in the Appendix is proposed to be removed or retained.*
- *includes a detailed justification for the removal of each tree, including the percentage of intrusion into tree protection zones and structural root zones of the proposed works.*

*Tree retention should be maximised, particularly where tree removal is not required for building construction. Landscaping should be designed to enable tree retention wherever possible.*

*The amended Indicative Planting Palette included in the RtS does not include the proposed numbers of each species to be planted. Please provide an updated planting schedule that includes the proposed numbers of each tree species.*

**Response:**

A revised Appendix 2 to the Arboricultural Assessment is provided at **Attachment B**. The appendix includes a list of all trees within the SSDA and Council DA areas, an assessment of the incursion of proposed works into the tree protection zones and structural root zones (where appropriate), whether each tree is to be retained or removed, and a detailed justification for the removal of any tree. Trees proposed to be removed either have significant incursions directly into their trunk (100% incursion) caused by the proposed new building footprint or required regrading works, are in poor health, or are unsuitable for their location.

While the landscape design seeks to retain trees as much as practicable, some trees are required to be removed due to proposed regrading, paving and poor health as described at **Attachment B**. 19 trees will be retained under the SSDA works and another 8 will be retained as part of the Council DA works. It is noted that upon completion, 11 additional canopy trees will be provided in comparison to the existing situation, resulting in an increase in canopy coverage (at maturity).

A revised Indicative Planting Palette is provided at **Attachment C**. The palette indicates the number of each species proposed to be planted. The palette is indicative and will be finalised during design development, prior to construction.

**2. Built Form**

**Issue:**

*The comments made by the Government Architect NSW during the initial exhibition process (attached) have not been addressed. Please provide a response.*

*Preliminary plans for this proposal were reviewed by GANSW on 14.08.19 and 06.11.19 (advise attached for reference). The proposal has changed considerably since it was last reviewed and has not addressed a number of the issues raised through the SDRP process. On the basis of the materials submitted the proposal has not addressed the following issues:*

- *The proposed buildings present large blank facades to both Golden Grove and Abercrombie streets. Articulation of the facades, further definition of openings and detailing of materials to positively address the public domain is requested.*
- *The learning block is contained within a 3 story element which appears overscaled. The rationale for clearstory windows and their environmental amenity is understood and accepted, however the forms need to be detailed and articulated to break down the scale of the block.*
- *The previously included landscaped setback along Golden Grove street has been deleted, and the building no longer engages with the public domain in a positive manner nor does it contribute to public amenity. Articulation of this street edge and the inclusion of public amenity is requested.*
- *The blank wall along Golden Grove street is a poorly considered threshold between the school and public domain and requires further detailing and amenity to be provided.*
- *The proposed materiality notes brickwork can be patterned to achieve texture and transparency. Further detailing of the building facades is requested to demonstrate how this will be implemented.*
- *There is an opportunity for site and context specific artwork to be incorporated into the street facades integral with the materiality of the building to provide identity for the school and public amenity.*

**Response:**

The proponent and their design team have consulted with GANSW to discuss the issues raised in their submission. A detailed response to each issue raised has been provided by FJMT at **Attachment A**.

The proponent and project team have provided a considered and detailed response to all issues raised in the request for further information.

We trust that this information is sufficient to enable a prompt assessment of the proposed development. Should you have any queries about this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me on 9956 6962 or [jdwyer@ethosurban.com](mailto:jdwyer@ethosurban.com).

Yours sincerely,



**Jacob Dwyer**  
Urbanist – Planning



**Chris McGillick**  
Principal – Planning