



REV	Description	Initial	Date
В	For SSD Submission	BG	11.08.2021
A	For SSD Submission	BG	05.08.2021



**GEOSCAPES** Landscape Architecture Suite 215, 284 Victoria Av, Chatswood NSW 2067 Ph. (02) 9411 1485 E. admin@geoscapes.com.au

# **VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT**

# Report Ref: 210521\_SSD\_RPT\_VIA01

Prepared for:

Pymble Ladies' Gollege

Prepared by:

Ben Gluszkowski Director Registered Landscape Architect #5868

**GEOSCAPES** Landscape Architecture Suite 215, 284 Victoria Avenue Chatswood NSW 2067

> Geoscapes Pty Ltd ABN 84 620 205 781 ACN 620 205 781

### **Document Status**

# **CONTENTS**

#### 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Project Background
- This Report and Author 1.2

#### 2.0 Methodology of Assessment

#### 2.1 Guidelines

- Computer Generated Visualisations and Photomontages
- 2.2 2.3 Visual Receptor Sensitivity
- 2.4 Significance of the Visual Impact
- 2.5 Site Visit and Analysis of Zone of Visibility
- 2.6 Photographic Recording
- 2.7 Visualisation of the Development

#### 3.0 Justification of Viewpoints Selected

- 3.1 **Receptor Selections and Reasoning**
- 3.2 Viewpoint Map

#### The Site and Environs 4.0

- 4.1 Location
- 4.2 Site Description
- 4.3 Context
- 4.4 Aerial Photography

#### 5.0 **Baseline Description**

- 5.1 Planning Context
- 5.2 Land Zoning
- 5.3 Conservation Area - C11
- Ku-ring-gai DCP Control 19F.1 Development in the Vicinity of Heritage Items or Heritage Conservation Areas (HCAs) 5.4
- 5.5 Landscape Character
- 5.6 Recent Precious Development and Future Development within the Campus

#### **Development Proposals** 6.0

- 6.1 General
- 6.2 Demolition
- 6.3 Height / Scale
- Colour / Materials & Finishes 6.4
- 6.5 Summary

#### Landscape Strategy, Design and Mitigation 7.0

- 7.1 Strategy and Mitigation
- 7.2 Detailed Landscape Proposals

#### **Visual Impact Assessment** 8.0

- Viewpoint 1 No. 59B Pymble Ave, Pymble Looking North 8.1
- Viewpoint 2 No. 57 Pymble Ave, Pymble Looking Northwest 8.2
- Viewpoint 3 No. 57A Pymble Ave, Pymble Looking Northwest Viewpoint 4 No. 53 Pymble Ave, Pymble Looking West 8.3
- 8.4
- 8.5 Viewpoint 5 – Pymble Ávenue, opposite No.57, Pymble - Looking Northwest

#### 9.0 **Conclusions and Recommendations**

10.0 **Glossary of Terms** 

# **List of Figures**

Figure 1 _	Drone Panoramic Photograph Positions
Figure 2 -	Viewnoint Locations
Figure 3 –	Drone at Position 1 - RI 135.2m - Looking North
Figure 4 _	Drone at Position 1 - RI 135 2m - Looking Fast
Figure 5 -	Drone at Position 1 - RI 135 2m - Looking South
Figure 6 -	Drone at Position 1 - RI 135 2m - Looking West
Figure 7 -	Drone at Position 1 - 50m AGL - Looking North
Figure 8 -	Drone at Position 1 - 50m AGL - Looking Florth
Figure 9 -	Drone at Position 1 - 50m AGL - Looking South
Figure 10 -	Drone at Position 1 - 50m AGL - Looking West
Figure 11 -	Site Description
Figure 12 -	Site Context
Figure 13 -	Site Location
Figure 14 -	Land Zoning Map LZN_007C
Figure 15 -	Land Zoning Map LZN_007
Figure 16 -	Land Zoning Map LZN_008
Figure 17 -	Heritage Map HER_007
Figure 18 -	Heritage Map HER_008
Figure 19 -	Demolition Plan
Figure 20 -	Proposed Site Plan
Figure 21 -	3D of Eastern Facade
Figure 22 -	Sections
Figure 23 -	Concept Landscape Plan
Figure 23a -	Eastern Boundary Long Section
Figure 23b -	Sections Cuts 2 & 3
Figure 24 -	Viewpoint 1 : No. 59B Pymble Ave, Pymble - Looking North (F
Figure 25 -	Viewpoint 2 : No. 5/ Pymble Ave, Pymble - Looking Northwest
Figure 26 -	Viewpoint 3 : No. 5/A Pymble Ave, Pymble - Looking Northwe
Figure 27 -	Viewpoint 4 : No. 53 Pymble Ave, Pymble - Looking West (Pho
Figure 28 -	Viewpoint 5 : Pymble Avenue, opposite No.57, Pymble - Looki

**GEOSCAPES** 

GEOSCAPES Landscape Architecture Suite 215, 284 Victoria Av, Chatswood NSW 2067 Ph. (02) 9411 1485 E. admin@geoscapes.com.au

**Pymble Ladies College - Grey House Precinct Redevelopment** SSD-17424905



Photomontage) st (Photomontage) est (CGI) notomontage) ing Northwest (Photomontage)

# VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

# THIS PAGE HAS INTENTIONALLY BEE



GEOSCAPES Landscape Architecture Ph. (02) 9411 1485 E. admin@geoscapes.com.au Pymble Ladies College - Grey House Precinct Redevelopment SSD-17424905



# **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

#### **Project Background** 1.1

This Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) relates to redevelopment of the Grey House Precinct within Pymble Ladies College located at 20 Avon Road, Pymble, Lot 1 DP 69541. The proposal includes several new classrooms, labs and outdoor facilities. This report has been written to assess the visual impact of the new main building upon visual receptors within the immediate context of the development and in particular properties situated along Pymble Avenue.

A request for Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) was submitted by the Willowtree Planning in April 2021 to the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE). The SEARs were received in May 2021. This report aims to satisfy the following requirements of the SEARs:

Built Form and Urban Design –

a visual impact assessment that identifies any potential impacts on the surrounding built environment and landscape including views to and from the site and any adjoining heritage items, including Pymble Avenue Conservation Area (C11) which is located to the south-east of the proposed works.

#### 1.2 This Report and Author

Geoscapes Pty Ltd has been commissioned by Pymble Ladies College to produce a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) for the above mentioned development. This VIA has been written by Ben Gluszkowski (Geoscapes Director and Registered Landscape Architect) who has over 17 years' experience in the field of Landscape Architecture. He has previously been involved in high profile LVIAs on developments within the UK, including the M1 & M62 motorway road widening, several wind farms and energy from waste facilities (EFW).

Within Australia, Ben has completed several LVIAs and VIAs for some of the largest industrial developments in Sydney. These were either submitted as part of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for State Significant Development (SSD) to the DPIE, or to local council. Clients have included Snackbrands Australia, Jaycar, Frasers, Altis, DCI, ESR, Charter Hall and Airtrunk.

# 2.0 METHODOLOGY OF ASSESSMENT

#### Guidelines 2.1

LVIA or VIA does not follow prescribed methods or criteria. This assessment is based on the principles established and broad approaches recommended in the following documents:

- Guidelines for Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (GLVIA) Third Edition (LI/IEMA 2013)
- The Landscape Institute Advice Note O1 (2011) Photography and Photomontage in Landscape and Visual assessment.

In accordance with GLVIA3 the assessment methodology is tailored to the specific requirements of the Proposed Development, its specific landscape context and its likely significant effects. The methodology used for this assessment reflects the principal ways in which the Proposed Development is considered likely to interact with existing landscape and visual conditions as a result of:

The permanent introduction of a new college facilities building into the existing campus/landscape/townscape and visual context.

Landscape assessment is concerned with changes to the physical landscape in terms of features/elements that may give rise to changes in character.

Visual appraisal is concerned with the changes that arise in the composition of available views as a result of changes to the landscape, people's responses to the changes and to the overall effects on visual amenity. Changes may result in adverse (negative) or beneficial (positive) effects.

The nature of landscape and visual assessment requires both objective analysis and subjective professional judgement. Accordingly, the following assessment is based on the best practice guidance listed above, information and data analysis techniques, uses subjective professional judgement and quantifiable factors wherever possible, and is based on clearly defined terms (refer to glossary).

As stated in paragraph 1.20 of the GLVIA:

"The guidance concentrates on principles while also seeking to steer specific approaches where there is a general consensus on methods and techniques. It is not intended to be prescriptive, in that it does not follow a detailed 'recipe' that can be followed in every situation. It is always the primary responsibility of any landscape professional carrying out an assessment to ensure that the approach and methodology adopted are appropriate to the particular circumstances."

This VIA written by Geoscapes is considered to use a methodology and approach that is appropriate to this type of industrial development.

#### **Computer Generated Visualisations and Photomontages** 2.2

It is possible that any receptor with a view towards the development, could potentially receive visual impacts with a resulting high, moderate or low impact. However, it is not feasible or practical to prepare a photomontage for each and every residential dwelling, public open space, footpath or road within the project view-shed. Instead a selection of locations have been chosen that present an understanding of views in the surrounding context of the development.

Photography for the photomontages was undertaken by Geoscapes using a Canon 60D (DSLR) camera. A 50 mm focal length prime lens was attached to the Canon.

Photomontages or CGI's have been prepared to create "simulated" views of the proposed development. Although these do not claim to exactly replicate what would be seen by the human eye, they provide a useful "tool" in analysing potential visual impacts from receptor locations.

Those viewpoints selected for photomontages have been presented in this report as before and after images on the same sheet for ease of comparison. The computer-generated images include a representation of landscape mitigation both immediately following installation (which have been described as year O) and at a mature age of approximately 10 years. It is important to note that the year 10 images are simulations of how proposed landscaping may appear at a selected viewpoint. The final appearance of landscape mitigation will be based on many factors including growth rates, maintenance and environmental conditions. Additional A1 sized viewpoint sheets (figures 'a') have also been included for selected viewpoints in close proximity to the development, by using a larger paper size a wider angle of view can be displayed.

The assessment undertaken at year 10 assumes that such mitigation has had the opportunity to establish, mature and become effective. For the purposes of most VIA, year 10-15 effects are also taken to be the 'residual effects' of the development. Residual effects are those which are likely to remain on completion of the development including proposed landscaping. These are to be given the greatest weight in planning terms. The significance of visual impacts determined from viewpoint locations (which have been assessed in Section 8.0 of this report), are based on the year 10-15 residual effects. In certain photomontages there may be little or no difference between Year O or Year 10 images, this may be due to the development being partially obscured, that there is no proposed landscaping on a particular side of a development or that landscaping would be behind existing vegetation in the foreground.

The horizontal field of view (FOV) within the photomontages, exceeds the parameters of normal human vision. While the human eye FOV is understood to be approximately 160°, the actual amount of detail in focus is much less and deteriorates towards the outer extents of the FOV. The 'Cone of Visual Attention' of the human eye is thought to be 55° however, in reality the eyes, head and body can all move and, under normal conditions, the human brain would 'see' a broad area of landscape within a panoramic view. Each of the photomontage panoramas within Section 8.0 of this report has a horizontal viewing angle of approximately 67°, viewing angles of extended 'a' figures (separate sheets to this report) vary from approximately

GEOSCAPES Suite 215, 284 Victoria Av, Chatswood NSW 2067

GEOSCAPES Landscape Architecture Ph. (02) 9411 1485 E. admin@geoscapes.com.au

Pymble Ladies College - Grey House Precinct Redevelopment SSD-17424905



### VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

83° - 120°. A single photographic image from a 50mm lens has a horizontal viewing angle of 39.6°. Whilst a photomontage can provide an image that illustrates a photo-realistic representation of a development in relation to its proposed location and scale relative to the surrounding landscape, it must be acknowledged that large scale objects in the landscape can appear smaller in photomontages than in real life. This is partly due to the fact that a flat image does not allow the viewer to perceive any information relating to depth or distance. An extract taken from the Photography and Photomontage in Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, Landscape Institute Advice Note O1/11 states that:

'it is also important to recognise that two-dimensional photographic images and photomontages alone cannot capture or reflect the complexity underlying the visual experience and should therefore be considered an approximate of the three-dimensional visual experiences that an observer would receive in the field'.

### 2.3 Visual Receptor Sensitivity

People's (visual receptors) overall visual sensitivity has been assessed by combining consideration of their visual susceptibility with the value or importance that they are likely to attribute (or not) to their available views.

Factors which influence professional judgement when assessing the degree to which a particular view can accommodate change arising from a particular development, without detrimental effects would typically include:

• Judgements of value attached to views take into account recognition of the value attached to particular views e.g. heritage assets or through planning designations; and

• Judgements of susceptibility of visual receptors to change is mainly a function of the occupation or activity of people experiencing the view at particular locations; and the extent to which their attention or interest may therefore be focused on the views and the visual amenity they experience at particular locations.

Assessment of the sensitivity of visual receptors may be modified (either up or down) by consideration of whether any particular value or importance is likely to be attributed by people to their available views. For example, travelers on a highway may be considered likely to be more sensitive due to its scenic context or residents of a particular property may be considered likely to be less sensitive due to its degraded visual setting.

Typically, sensitivity of visual receptors may be judged to be very high, high, medium, low or very low. Definitions of these indicative categories as appropriate to this assessment are set out in the table opposite.

Table: Visual Receptor Sensitivity

Category	Definition
Very High	Designed view to or from a heritage / protected asset. Key protected viewpoint e.g. interpretive signs. References in liter- ature and art/or guidebooks and tourist maps. Protected view recognised in planning policy designation [LEP, DCP, DoPE]. Views from the main living space of residential properties, state public rights of way e.g. bush trails and state designated landscape feature with public access. Visitors to heritage assets of state importance.
High	View of clear value but may not be formally recognised e.g. framed view of high scenic value from an individual private dwelling or garden. It may also be inferred that the view is likely to have value e.g. to local residents. Views from the secondary living space of residential properties and recreational receptors where there is some appreciation of the landscape e.g. golf and fishing. Local public rights of way and access land. Road and rail routes promoted in tourist guides for their scenic value.
Medium	View is not promoted or recorded in any published sources and may be typical of the views experienced from a given receptor. People engaged in outdoor sport where an appreciation of the landscape has little or no importance e.g. football and soccer. Road users on main routes (Motorway/Freeway/Highway) and passengers on trains.

Low	View of clearly lesser value than similar views experienc Road users on minor roads. People at their place of work ing landscape may have some importance.
Very Low	View affected by many landscape detractors and unlikely where the views of the wider landscape have little or no

For the visual receptors identified, the factors above are examined and the findings judged in accordance with the indicative categories below in the table to determine the magnitude of change.

Table: Visual Receptor Magnitude of Change Criteria

Category	Definition
Very High	There would be a substantial change to the baseline, with defining influence on the view. Direct views at close rang
High	The proposed development will be clearly noticeable and or oblique views at close range with changes over a notic
Medium	The proposed development will form a new and recognisa by the receptor. Direct or oblique views at medium range affected.
Low	The proposed development will form a minor constituent small component. Oblique views at medium or long range
Very Low	The proposed development will form a barely noticeable of be similar to the baseline situation. Long range views wit

In some cases, there may be no magnitude of change and the baseline view will be unaffected by the development (e.g development would be fully screened existing bushland). In this case a category of 'no change' will be used.

### 2.4 Significance of the Visual Impact

For each receptor type, the sensitivity of the location is combined with the predicted magnitude of change to determine the level of effect on any particular receptor. Having taken such a wide range of factors into account when assessing sensitivity and magnitude at each receptor, the level of effect can be derived by combining the sensitivity and magnitude in accordance with the matrix table on page 6.



GEOSCAPES Landscape Architecture Suite 215, 284 Victoria Av, Chatswood NSW 2067 Ph. (02) 9411 1485 E. admin@geoscapes.com.au Pymble Ladies College - Grey House Precinct Redevelopment SSD-17424905

# GEOSCAPES

ed from nearby visual receptors that may be more accessible. c or views from commercial buildings where views of the surround-

y to be valued. People at their place of work or other locations importance.

h the proposed development creating a new focus and having a ge with changes over a wide horizontal and vertical extent.

the view would be fundamentally altered by its presence. Direct seable horizontal and or/vertical extent.

able element within the view which is likely to be recognised e with a moderate horizontal and/or vertical extent of the view

of the view being partially visible or at sufficient distance to be a e with a small horizontal/vertical extent of the view affected.

component of the view, and the view whilst slightly altered would th a negligible part of the view affected.

	Magnitude of Change						
vity		Very High	High	Medium	Low	Very Low	
ensitiv	Very High	Substantial	High	High/Moderate	Moderate	Moderate/Minor	
for S	High	High	High/Moderate	Moderate	Moderate/Minor	Minor	
ceptor	Medium	High/Moderate	Moderate	Moderate/Minor	Minor	Minor Negligible	
Rec	Low	Moderate	Moderate/Minor	Minor	Minor Negligible	Negligible	
	Very Low	Moderate/Minor	Minor	Minor Negligible	Negligible	Negligible/None	

In all cases, where overall effects are predicted to be moderate or higher (shaded grey), this will result in a prediction of a significant effect in impact terms. All other effects are considered to be not significant. If a view from a receptor is judged to be 'no change' in the category of Magnitude of Change, then the significance of impact will automatically be none.

In certain cases, where additional factors may arise, a further degree of professional judgement may be applied when determining whether the overall change in the view or effect upon landscape receptor will be significant or not and, where this occurs, it is explained in the assessment.

Visual effects are more subjective as people's perception of development varies through the spectrum of negative, neutral and positive attitudes. In the assessment of visual effects, Geoscapes will exercise objective professional judgement in assessing the significance of effects and will assume, unless otherwise stated, that all effects are adverse, thus representing the worst-case scenario. The significance of visual impacts are assessed against the 'baseline'.

### 2.5 Site Visit and Analysis of Zone of Visibility

A site visit was conducted on the 8th of June 2021 by Geoscapes. The consultant team carried out a site inspection to verify the results of a desktop study and to evaluate the existing visual character of the area. Analysis from inside and outside of the development boundary was undertaken to approximate the Zone of Visibility. Photographs taken at eye level from the site would be limiting and only allow a partial judgement on which properties/locations in the immediate vicinity may see the development from ground level to the top of the extension. This is due to the presence of existing buildings and vegetation and therefore, it is not possible to gain a complete understanding of visibility without the additional use of drone photography.

A drone was used to take panoramic photographs looking north, south, east and west, at one location within the site boundary (refer to Figure 1). A height was flown by the drone to approximately represent the maximum RL of the proposed building (RL 135.2m), refer to figures 3 to 6. Only the proposed lift over-run reaches a height of 135.2m with the majority of the building roof reaching a height of 134.3m. Photographs at RL 135.2m, therefore represent the approximate maximum zone of visibility of the building. The flight was performed on the 8th June 2021 by Pixel Media Productions. These photographs allow a judgement to be made on which receptors in the wider context, will be able to see some if not all of the development. Not all residential properties/public spaces able to see the development are highlighted on figures 3 to 6, as due to the resolution of the imagery, it was sometimes difficult to ascertain an exact property address or locations at greater distances from the drone camera. In other cases some properties are simply obscured by existing vegetation. However, the properties or publicly accessible locations that have been shown, will provide an indication of receptors within the surrounding context, that the development will be most visible to. It is important to note that it is simply unfeasible to photograph every single possible view corridor to and from the site.

As with any VIA, due to the number of receptors that may have views of the development, it is not possible to provide analysis for every single possible visual receiver. It is fairly evident from the drone photography that the most sensitive receivers are to the east/southeast of the proposal and that from all other aspects the development would geberally be well screened by dense vegetation (refer to section 3.0 for details on viewpoint selection).

### 2.6 Photographic Recording

From desktop study, site visits and photography, locations were identified that would potentially be subject to visual impacts from the proposal.

Viewpoints were selected and single photographs were taken by Geoscapes Landscape Architects using a Canon 6OD DSLR Camera and a 50mm lens. Photographs were stitched together using an automated software process to create panoramic images, however, no perspective fixing was used. GPS recordings were taken and locations mapped using topographical survey data. This information was later used to create the photomontages.

In Figures 3 to 10 drone photography has also been stitched together to increase the field of view. As the drone uses a wide-angle lens, in some images there is quite distinct distortion where two images join in the foreground. However, as these images are used only for analysis and identifying potential visual receptors, this does not affect the validity of their use within this report.

#### 2.7 Visualisation of the Development

BVN Architecture provided a 3D model to Morphmedia. Morphmedia then prepared the model for VIA using Autodesk 3Ds Max. The model included all aspects of the proposed development combined with the landscape design and mitigation proposed by Oculus.

Views for VP1, 2, 4 and 5 were generated from the model that matched the camera positions of photographs taken from selected viewpoints. These were then combined with the photographs to create simulated views of the proposal. As no access was possible for VP3, this view is completely computer generated.

Photomontages are intended to be printed at A3 or 'a' figures at A1 and are to be held at a comfortable distance by the viewer, this is generally accepted by current guidelines to be anywhere from 300mm to 500mm away from the eyes and held in a flat projection. CGI imagery is based on different virtual camera lens and therefore, this does not apply.

# **3.0 JUSTIFICATION OF VIEWPOINTS SELECTED**

#### 3.1 Receptor Selections and Reasoning

The visual impacts generated by the proposal development have been assessed based on the criteria described in Section 2.4. The following list of visual receptors have been selected:

- No. 59B, Pymble Ave, Pymble (VP1)
- No. 57, Pymble Ave, Pymble (VP2)
- No. 57A, Pymble Ave, Pymble (VP3)
- No. 53, Pymble Ave, Pymble (VP4)
- Pymble Avenue, opposite No.57 Pymble (VP5)

In total four viewpoint locations have been selected for photomontage and one for fully computer generated imagery, refer to Figure 2 for viewpoint locations.

As identified in the site RL 135.2m drone photography in Figures 3 to 6, it is clear that there are currently a number of other residential properties in the surrounding vicinity that would experience a view of the proposed development. A sample of these would include the following:

- 1180 1166 Pacfic Hwy, Pymble 600m northeast of the development
- Apartments on Cnr Avon Rd & Pymble Av 480m east of the development
- 41 Pymble Av, Pymble 130m east of the development

# GEOSCAPES

GEOSCAPES Landscape Architecture Suite 215, 284 Victoria Av, Chatswood NSW 2067 Ph. (02) 9411 1485 E. admin@geoscapes.com.au

Pymble Ladies College - Grey House Precinct Redevelopment SSD-17424905

# GEOSCAPES

- 47 Pymble Av, Pymble 90m east of the development
- 49 Pymble Av, Pymble 40m east of the development
- 910 Pacific Hwy, Gordon 1.1km east of the development
- 71 Ridge St, Gordon 1 km southeast of the development
- 59 Pymble Av, Pymble 100m south of the development
- 61 Pymble Av, Pymble 110m south of the development

(Note: all of the above distances are taken from the residential dwelling at the address to the closest development boundary)

The five locations selected for visual impact assessment are those which appear to have the most open views towards the proposed development when analysing the site data and photography. Therefore, these are judged to be potentially the most sensitive visual receivers of the Grey House extension. It is evident that there are a number of other residential properties along Pymble Ave that are also in close proximity to the eastern boundary of the college grounds, these will also potentially receive views of the development. However, the actual view seen will vary due to either property elevation and the presence of existing vegetation on the residential property or the college boundary.

As with any potential residential visual receptor, the ability to take photographs from the property depends on a number of factors including the owners permission, access and whether the owner is physically at home. As with any VIA conducted by Geoscapes, no photographs were taken using a drone or by any other means if permission was not granted or if the owner was not at home.

It is clear from the site drone photography, that when the drone was flown at a height to represent the maximum elevation of the proposed building, the zone of visibility is essentially limited to the east and southeast. This is due the extensive vegetation (tree canopy) that is present within and surrounding the college grounds. There are also several other physical barriers in the form of existing buildings and these ridge heights have been noted on the drone photography images within Figures 3 to 10. This will mean that the development is essentially well screened to any visual receivers outside of the college grounds to the north and west.

The drone photography did indicated that some higher elevated properties to the north, northeast and east would experience some medium to longer distance views of the new development. As shown in Figure 4, some properties along Pacific Hwy within Pymble may experience views of the very top of the new building, this is also true for some of the residential apartment blocks at greater distance within Gordon. The Gordon apartments may see more of the development due to gaps in vegetation. However, in both cases any visual impacts generated at these medium to longer distance locations are judged to be negligible.

#### 3.2 Viewpoint Map

The symbols and numbering in Figure 2 on page 9, indicate the viewpoints, photomontages and CGI that have been selected for a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA). A sample of receptors which are closest in proximity to the proposed development and those within the heritage conservation area have been selected. Selection was dependent on the properties that were accessible on the day of the photo shoot. From viewpoint locations 1, 2, 4 and 5 photomontages have been generated to represent as closely as possible views of the proposed development following construction at year 0 and at year 10. Year 10 photomontages are used to simulate proposed landscape mitigation at maturity. Viewpoint 3 has been fully computer generated due to access difficulties at the property, it was felt that a representation of this viewpoint was important as the property is in closest proximity to the new development.

Refer to the visual impact assessment at Section 8.0 of this report and the corresponding viewpoints 1 to 5.



GEOSCAPES Landscape Architecture Suite 215, 284 Victoria Av, Chatswood NSW 2067 Ph. (02) 9411 1485 E. admin@geoscapes.com.au

Pymble Ladies College - Grey House Precinct Redevelopment SSD-17424905



# VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT



### Legend

New Development Footprint

 Drone Position 1 -RL 135.2m
 33°44'53.2"S
 151°08'10.2"E

SCHEDU	E OF VIEWPOINTS	F VIEWPOINTS				
SCHEDU VP Number	E OF VIEWPOINTS Address	F VIEWPOINTS	s Fact		ion AHD	
SCHEDU VP Number	E OF VIEWPOINTS Address No. 598 Pymble Ave. Pymble (GE pool)	F VIEWPOINTS Addre	s East S 151°	tings Elevatio 811"E 1175	ion AHD	
SCHEDU VP Number 1 2	E OF VIEWPOINTS Address No. 59B Pymble Ave, Pymble (GF pool) No. 57 Pymble Ave, Pymble (Ist floor balcony)	F VIEWPOINTS Addre 38 Pymble Ave, Pymble (GF pool) 12 Pymble Ave, Pymble (1st floor by	s Easti S 151°0 S 151°1	tings Elevatio 811"E 117.5 812"E 115.2	ion AHD 53m	
SCHEDU VP Number 1 2 3	E OF VIEWPOINTS Address No. 59B Pymble Ave, Pymble (GF pool) No. 57 Pymble Ave, Pymble (1st floor balcony) No. 57 Pymble Ave, Pymble (upper window)	F VIEWPOINTS Addre 3B Pymble Ave, Pymble (GF pool) 1 Pymble Ave, Pymble (1st floor ba	s East S 151° S 151° S 151°	tings Elevatio 811"E 117.5 812"E 115.2 814"E 115.4	ion AHD 5.3m 5.28m	
SCHEDU VP Number 1 2 3	E OF VIEWPOINTS Address No. 59B Pymble Ave, Pymble (GF pool) No. 57 Pymble Ave, Pymble (1st floor balcony) No. 57A Pymble Ave, Pymble (upper window) No. 57A Pymble Ave, Pymble (Upper window)	F VIEWPOINTS Addre 3B Pymble Ave, Pymble (GF pool) 1 Pymble Ave, Pymble (1st floor ba 14 Pymble Ave, Pymble (upper win	s East S 151° S 151° S 151° S 151°	tings Elevatio 811"E 117.5 812"E 115.2 814"E 115.4 814"E 115.4	ion AHD /53m 528m i45m	





VP

 $\triangleleft$ 

VP

VIEWPOINT Location & Photomontage

VIEWPOINT Location & CGI



Figure 3: Drone at Position 1 - RL 135.2m - Looking North



Figure 4: Drone at Position 1 - RL 135.2m - Looking East

AUGUST 2021 REV B Job no. 210521 Page 10



Figure 5: Drone at Position 1 - RL 135.2m - Looking South



Figure 6: Drone at Position 1 - RL 135.2m - Looking West



Figure 7: Drone at Position 1 - 50m AGL looking North



Figure 8: Drone at Position 1 - 50m AGL looking East



Figure 9: Drone at Position 1 - 50m AGL looking South



Figure 10: Drone at Position 1 - 50m AGL looking West

# **4.0 THE SITE AND ENVIRONS**

#### Location 4.1

The proposal is known as 'The Redevelopment of the Grey House Precinct' and will be located in the south of the Pymble Ladies Collage grounds. It is situated between the Jeanette Buckhan Gymnasium, Goodlet House and Junior School. The development footprint is approximately 3800m2 and extends to a height of RL135.2m.

#### 4.2 **Site Description**

The site description is summarised in the Figure below.

Figure	11 _	Site	Descri	ntior
FIgure	11 -	SILE	DE2011	μιιυι

Component	Description
Address	Pymble Ladies' College, Avon Road, Pymble NSW 2073
Legal description	Lot 1 in DP69541 & lots 1-26 in DP 7131
Current use	Education Establishment SP2

The site comprises of an education establishment known as Pymble Ladies College and was originally founded in 1916. It has a total campus area of 20 hectares and has several community uses including the Chapel, Sport Fields and Aquatic Centre.

#### 4.3 Context

Located in central Pymble, Pymble Ladies College is close to Pacific Hwy and Pymble Station. Surrounding land use is predominantly low density residential with a high proportion of canopy cover, many streets and gardens contain mature trees. There are multiple open spaces, bushland and riparian corridors throughout the surrounding area.

The site is surrounded by the following specific land uses:

OSCAPES

Immediately the north of the development is the existing Junior School. Further north outside of the campus is the north shore train line, pacific hwy and residential properties, including those along Avon Road.

Immediately to the south, southeast and east is the conservation area C11 which encompasses a number of properties along Pymble Avenue. This forms the boundary of the campus and the new development. It is considered to be the area which will contain the most sensitive visual receivers of the new proposal.

Further east is the suburb of Gordon, here a number of residential towers blocks are potential long distance visual receptors of the development. These are highlighted on the drone Figures 4 and 8.

To the west is Goodlet House and the Aquatic and Fitness Centre. Further west is Sheldon Forest and Avondale Dam, to the southwest is Avondale Golf Course.

#### **Aerial Photography** 4.4

During the drone photography that was carried out within the site boundary, (refer to section 2.6 and figures 7-10) aerial shots were also taken at an AGL of 50m. These prove useful in the following ways:

Demonstrating the site context in which the development sits and highlighting key features of the surrounding landscape;





Figure 13: Site Location (Source: Google Maps)

**GEOSCAPES** Landscape Architecture Suite 215, 284 Victoria Av, Chatswood NSW 2067 Ph. (02) 9411 1485 E. admin@geoscapes.com.au

**Pymble Ladies College - Grey House Precinct Redevelopment** SSD-17424905

# **GEOSCAPES**

# VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

Analysing the existing landscape character and confirming locations of potential individual receptors.

# **5.0 BASELINE DESCRIPTION**

### 5.1 Planning Context

.

The following current local planning controls and policies have been considered in the preparation of this report:

Kur-ring-gai Council Development Control Plan 2020 (DCP) Kur-ring-gai Council Local Environmental Plan 2015 (LEP) Kur-ring-gai Council Local Environmental Plan (Local Centres) 2012

### 5.2 Land Zoning

Figures 14, 15 & 16 show the LEP land zoning for the College Campus and adjacent residential areas along the southeast boundary. The closest residential properties to the development are zoned R2 Low Density Development.



GEOSCAPES Landscape Architecture

Suite 215, 284 Victoria Av, Chatswood NSW 2067

Ph. (02) 9411 1485 E. admin@geoscapes.com.au

Figure 14: Land Zoning Map LZN\_007C (Source: Ku-ring-gai Local Centres LEP 2012)

CAPES

GEOS



Figure 15: Land Zoning Map LZN\_007 - (Source: Ku-ring-gai LEP 2015)



Figure 16: Land Zoning Map LZN\_008 - (Source: Ku-ring-gai LEP 2015)

Pymble Ladies College - Grey House Precinct Redevelopment SSD-17424905



### 5.3 Conservation Area - C11

Figures 17 and 18 opposite show the Conservation Area C11 designation to the residential area immediately to the east / southeast of the proposed development. Conservation Area C11 properties (that can be identified) are also noted on the drone photographs in Figures 4, 5, 8 and 9 with the (CA C11) suffix.

This designation covers the following properties along Pymble Ave:

No's. 37, 39, 41, 45, 51, 55, 57, 59, 61, 65, 69, 71, 73, 75, 77B and 77.

It is noted that the conservation area designation along Pymble Avenue does not apply to properties in closest proximity to the campus. These would be:

No's 35, 43, 47, 49, 53, 57A, 59B, 59A and 67.

Of the properties assessed for visual impact assessment one falls into the C11 area, this is property No.57. Properties on the southern side of Pymble Ave and Pymble Ave itself (within the conservation area) would have limited or no view of the development due to either other existing properties or vegetation screening views.

Following the removal of trees on the campus close to the residential area boundary (refer to Section 6.0), the development is likely to become more visible to No's. 59, 59A and 59B. However, mitigation for the loss of mature trees is proposed in the landscape plans.

#### 5.4 Ku-ring-gai DCP Control 19F.1 - Development in the Vicinity of Heritage Items or Heritage Conservation Areas (HCAs)

As per DCP Control 19F.1-1, a Heritage Impact Statement has been prepared as part of the development by NBRS Architecture. The conclusion of this report notes the following:

'The proposed removal of the existing demountable buildings and the addition of a new multi-level "Grey House Precinct" school building and associated landscaping on the site will have no adverse impacts on the setting of the Heritage Conservation Area nor heritage items in the vicinity. The legibility, visibility and amenity of the neighbouring Conservation Area and heritage items in the vicinity will be retained.'

'Views to and from individual properties located within the Conservation Area in the vicinity, and views to and from heritage items in the vicinity, will also be retained'.

The significance of any visual impacts are discussed in Section 8.0 of this report. It is noted that as per control 1 (iii) within 19F.3-1 'Gardens, Settings and Curtilage', the proposed development will include screening planting along the boundary. Refer to Section 6.0 for further details.

### 5.5 Landscape Character

OSCAPES

The landscape character of Pymble Ladies College is a mixture of federation, inter-war architecture and modern development. The landscape elements are highly contrived with landscape being heavily formalised and extensively maintained. Vegetation is a mixture of planted exotic trees and open turf lawn areas with remnant canopy trees (BGHF) and forest areas. This zone is highly urbanised/modified with no evidence of the original landscape or its components. The value in this landscape character is in the distinctive architectural types, buildings/landscape. The surrounding landscape around the campus is predominately low density residential surrounded by extensive tree canopies. Avondale Golf Club is located to the southwest.

GEOSCAPES Landscape Architecture

Suite 215, 284 Victoria Av, Chatswood NSW 2067

Ph. (02) 9411 1485 E. admin@geoscapes.com.au



Figure 17: Heritage Map HER\_007 - (Source: Ku-ring-gai LEP 2015)



Figure 18: Heritage Map HER\_008 - (Source: Ku-ring-gai LEP 2015)

Pymble Ladies College - Grey House Precinct Redevelopment SSD-17424905

# GEOSCAPES

# VISUAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT REPORT

### 5.6 Recent Previous Development and Future Development within the Campus

In 2015 the Fitness & Aquatic Centre was constructed under approval SSD-5314, SSD-5314 did not include the Grey House Precinct. Further projects are planned but these are not part of the College masterplan. The masterplan itself has not gone through an approval process and is for the College use only.

# **6.0 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

### 6.1 General

The following description is based on the architectural plans, visualisations and sections shown in Figures 19, 20, 21 and 22. The proposal includes the redevelopment of the Grey House Precinct which will incorporate the following:

- Junior School classrooms (Years 5 and 6);
- Science, Technology Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) labs;
- Health and wellbeing facilities (consulting rooms and wards);





Figure 20: Proposed Site Plan (Source: BVN)

- Dance academy;
- Out of School Hours Care (OSHC) facilities;
- Early Learning Centre (ELC); and
- Outdoor learning spaces.

### 6.2 Demolition

As part of the development a number of existing buildings and trees will need to be removed. This includes temporary (demountable) teaching spaces. Two mature Eucalyptus trees close to the campus boundary will be removed, this will have the potential to create more open views towards the development from residential properties including No. 59B & 59A Pymble Avenue. However, landscape planting along the boundary is proposed to help mitigate the loss of screening. Refer to Section 7.0 for further details.

### 6.3 Height / Scale

Shown in Figure 22 on page 18 are sections through the proposed new facility. These show a four-storey building with a roof height of RL 134.3m, The lift overrun extends up slightly higher to RL135.2m. From ground level OO, the total height of the building is 20.2m and is approximately one

Figure 19: Demolition Plan (Source: BVN)



GEOSCAPES Landscape Architecture Suite 215, 284 Victoria Av, Chatswood NSW 2067 Ph. (02) 9411 1485 E. admin@geoscapes.com.au Pymble Ladies College - Grey House Precinct Redevelopment SSD-17424905

#