



# Eileen O'Connor Catholic School

84 Gavenlock Road, Mardi NSW 2259

## Architectural Design Report

State Significant Development Application for Catholic Schools Broken Bay (CSBB)



July 2025 – Revision B







# Planning Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements Development Details

Application No:	SSD-67173718
Project Name:	New Eileen O'Connor Catholic School
Location:	84 Gavenlock Road, Mardi NSW 2259
	Lot 9 Section 4 DP3368 within Central Coast
Applicant:	Catholic Schools Broken Bay

The following documentation has been prepared to support the State Significant Development Application for the above project and in accordance with the Planning Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARS) dated 19th February 2024 as follows:

	Issue and Assessment Requirements	Relevant Section of this Report
3	Design Quality:	
	<ul> <li>Demonstrate how the development will achieve:</li> <li>design excellence in accordance with any applicable EPI provisions.</li> <li>good design in accordance with the seven objectives for good design in <i>Better Placed</i>.</li> </ul>	Refer to Section 4.0 – Development Proposal
	<ul> <li>Demonstrate that the development:</li> <li>where required by an EPI or concept approval, or where proposed, has been subject to a competitive design process, carried out in accordance with an endorsed brief and Design Excellence Strategy; or</li> <li>in all other instances, has been reviewed by the State Design Review Panel (SDRP) consistent with the NSW SDRP: Guidelines for Project Teams.</li> </ul>	Refer to Section 5.0 – Authority Reviews and Consultation: o Parts 5.1 to 5.5
	Recommendations of the jury and Design Integrity Panel (where a competitive design process has been held) or the SDRP are to be addressed prior to lodgement.	<ul> <li>Refer to the following releveant Sections:</li> <li>Section 4.0 – Development Proposal:</li> <li>Part 4.4 – Design Development</li> <li>Section 5.0 – Authority Reviews and Consultation:</li> <li>Parts 5.1 to 5.5</li> </ul>
4.	Built Form and Urban Design:	
	<ul> <li>Demonstrate how design quality will be achieved in accordance with the Education SEPP Design Quality Principles and the Design Guide for Schools, including: <ul> <li>how the proposed built form (layout, height, bulk, scale, separation, setbacks, interface and articulation) addresses and responds to the context, site characteristics, streetscape and existing and future character of the locality.</li> <li>how the building design will deliver a high-quality development, including consideration of façade design, articulation, roof design, materials, finishes, colours, any signage, integration of services, and the principles of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Refer to Section 4.0 – Development Proposal: o Parts 4.1 to 4.25
	Assess how the development complies with the relevant accessibility requirements.	Refer to Section 4.0 – Development Proposal       •         •       Part 4.22 – Access and Transport
5	Environmental Amenity:	
	Address how good internal and external environmental amenity is achieved, including access to natural daylight and ventilation, pedestrian movement throughout the site, access to landscape and outdoor spaces.	Refer to Section 4.0 – Development Proposal
	Assess amenity impacts on the surrounding locality, including lighting impacts, solar access, visual privacy, visual amenity, view loss and view sharing, overshadowing and wind impacts (including the preparation of a wind assessment where the development has a height above four storeys). A high level of environmental amenity for any surrounding residential or other sensitive land uses must be demonstrated.	Refer to Section 4.0 – Development Proposal and relevant parts as follows:         o       Part 4.11 – Solar Access         o       Part 4.12 – Views         o       Part 4.13 – Visual Privacy         o       Part 4.14 – Acoustic Privacy         o       Part 4.15 – Wind Impacts
	Provide a solar access analysis of the overshadowing impacts of the development within the site, on surrounding properties and public spaces (during summer and winter solstice) at hourly intervals between 9am and 3pm, when compared to the existing situation and a compliant development (if relevant).	Refer to Section 4.0 – Part 4.10 Solar Access.





6	Visual Impact:	
	Provide a visual analysis of the development from key viewpoints, including photomontages or perspectives showing the proposed and likely future development.	Refer to the following relevant S o Section 3.0 – Site Analy Part 3.7 – View o Section 4.0 - Developm Part 4.12 – View
7.	Trees and Landscaping:	
	Assess the number, location, condition and significance of trees to be removed and retained and note any existing canopy coverage to be retained on-site.	Refer to the following relevant S o Section 3.0 – Site Analy Part 3.4 – Exis o Section 4.0 - Developm • Part 4.20 – La
8	Ecologically Sustainable Development (SSD):	
	Identify how ESD principles (as defined in section 193 of the EP&A Regulation) are be incorporated in the design and ongoing operation of the development.	<ul> <li>Refer to Section 4.0 – Developm</li> <li>Part 4.17 - Sustainabilit</li> </ul>
24	Construction, Operation and Staging:	
	Provide details of existing (if relevant) and proposed operations, including staff and student numbers, any before/after school care services and/or community use of school facilities.	Refer to Section 2.0 – Eileen O'( o Part 2.2 – Students o Part 2.3 - Staff
26	Engagement:	
	<ul> <li>Detail engagement undertaken and demonstrate how it was consistent with the Undertaking Engagement Guidelines for State Significant Projects.</li> <li>Detail how issues raised and feedback provided have been considered and responded to in the project. In particular, applicants must consult with: <ul> <li>the relevant Department assessment team.</li> <li>any relevant local councils.</li> <li>any relevant agencies, including: <ul> <li>Transport for NSW</li> <li>for development within the Western Parkland City, the Western</li> <li>Parkland City Authority.</li> </ul> </li> <li>the community.</li> <li>if the development would have required an approval or authorisation under another Act but for the application of s 4.41 of the EP&amp;A Act or requires an approval or authorisation under another Act to be applied consistently by s4.42 of the EP&amp;A Act, the agency relevant to that approval or authorisation.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Refer to Section 5.0 – Authority o Parts 5.1 to 5.5

Sections: lysis: ws ment Proposal: iews

Sections: lysis: isting Vegetation ment Proposal: andscape Design

nent Proposal ity

Connor Catholic School (EOCCS):

Reviews and Consultation:

## Architectural Design Report

Project	Eileen O'Connor Catholic School
Location	84 Gavenlock Road, Mardi NSW 2259
Job Number	2637.20
Date	1 July 2025
Revision	В

## **Table of Contents**

1.0	Intro	duction	5
	1.1	Purpose of this Report	5
	1.2	Project Participants	5
	1.3	Site Description	5
	1.4	The Development Proposal	6
2.0	Eilee	n O'Connor Catholic School (EOCCS)	9
	2.1	Vision & Purpose	9
	2.2	Students	9
	2.3	Staff	9
3.0	Site A	Analysis	10
	3.1	The Development Site	10
	3.2	Surrounding Development	10
	3.3	Topography	10
	3.4	Existing Vegetation	11
	3.5	Bushfire Protection	13
	3.6	Access	13
	3.7	Views	14
	3.8	Solar Access	17
	3.9	Heights and Setbacks	17
	3.10	Constraints and Opportunities	17
	3.11	Soils	17
	3.12	Services	17
4.0	Deve	lopment Proposal	18
	4.1	Project Overview	18
	4.2	Project Objectives	18
	4.3	Design Brief and Parameters:	18
	4.4	Design Development	19
	4.5	Site Planning	60
	4.6	Rise in Storeys	62
	4.7	Massing	62
	4.8	Height & Scale	66
	4.9	Built Form	68

	4.10	Building Articulation	69
	4.11	Solar Access	71
	4.12	Views	73
	4.13	Visual Privacy	82
	4.14	Acoustic Privacy	82
	4.15	Wind Impacts	82
	4.16	External Materials and Finishes	83
	4.17	Sustainability	84
	4.18	Open Spaces and Edges	85
	4.19	Public Domain	85
	4.20	Landscape Design	86
	4.21	Designing with Country	87
	4.22	Access and Transport	91
	4.23	Service Access	91
	4.24	Waste Management	91
	4.25	Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED)	92
5.0	Auth	ority Reviews and Consultation	93
	5.1	Consultation Overview	93
	5.2	Central Coast Council - Pre-DA Meeting #1 - Advice Register and Responses	93
	5.3	State Design Review Panel – Review #1 – Advice Register and Responses	94
	5.4	State Design Review Panel – Review #2 – Advice Register and Responses	97
	5.5	Central Coast Council - Pre-DA Meeting #2 - Advice Register and Responses	100
	5.5	Rural Fire Services (RFS) – Advice Letter dated 28th August 2024	101
6.0	Appe	ndices	101
	6.1	Central Coast Council – Pre-DA Meeting #1 Minutes	101
	6.2	State Design Review Panel – Review #1 Minutes	101
	6.3	State Design Review Panel – Review #2 Minutes	101
	6.4	Central Coast Council – Pre-DA Meeting #2 Minutes	101
-			

## **Document Control**

Date Issued	Revision	Issued By
19.03.2025	Issue P1 – Draft for Review	Domenic Marra
07.04.2025	Revision A – SSDA Issue	Domenic Marra
01.07.2025	Revision B – SSDA Issue	Domenic Marra



## 1.0 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of this Report

This Architectural Design Report has been prepared for the proposed Eileen O'Connor Catholic School (EOCCS) in support of the project's State Significant Development Application (SSDA) submitted to the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure.

This report provides an outline of architectural content included within the Environmental Impact Statement accompanying the SSDA for the above development proposal, prepared by EPM Projects. The SSDA seeks approval for a new purpose built, K-12 educational facility for students with a disability in the Central Coast Council area of Mardi.

This report serves to address architectural considerations of the "Key Issues and Assessment Requirements" within the Planning Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARS), application number SSD-67173718, listed on pages 2 and 3 of this report, and should be read in conjunction with the drawings and reports accompanying the application.

## 1.2 Project Participants

The project participants are as follows:

Client:	Catholic Schools Broken Bay
Project Management:	RP Infrastructure
Architect:	Stanton Dahl Architects
Town Planner:	EPM Projects
Aboriginal Heritage Consultant:	APEX Consulting
Access Consultant:	Vista Access Architects
Acoustic Engineer:	Acoustic Logic
Arborist:	Bellevue Tree Consulting
ASP Level 3 Engineer	JHA Consulting Engineers
BCA Consultant:	Steve Watson & Partners
Building Services (Mech, Elec, Hyd):	Northrop
Bushfire Consultant:	Bushfire Consulting Services
Connecting with Country:	Artefact
Certifier:	MBC Group
Ecologist/Biodiversity:	NARLA
EPA Auditing:	Ramboll

ESD/Section J: Facade Engineer: Fire Engineer: Geotechnical & Contamination: Landscape Consultant: Lift/Vertical Transport: Quantity Surveyor: Site Surveyor: Social/Community Impact: Structural, Civil & Flood Engineer: Traffic Engineer: Waste Management: Northrop TTW Engineers Lucid Consulting Engineers Raw Earth Environmental Inview Design Intrax MBM Degotardi Smith & Partners Lake Advisory James Taylor & Associates Traffix MRA Consulting

## 1.3 Site Description

The proposed site is within the north-western corner of the existing St Peters Catholic College site at 84 Gavenlock Road, Mardi (Lot 9, Section 4 in Deposited Plan (DP) 3368). The proposed Eileen O'Connor Catholic School site (identified in red) will have an area of 1.284 hectares, with frontage to Keefers Glen.



(Source: Nearmap 28/11/24)



## 1.4 The Development Proposal

Catholic Schools Broken Bay (CSBB) provide excellence in Catholic education for the Northern Sydney Metropolitan Area, Northern Beaches and Central Coast of NSW. Due to their work with students with diverse learning needs in their existing schools they have identified the need for a purpose-built school to provide access to inclusive, quality education for students with disability and highly individualised learning needs. A school where educators and allied health professionals work collaboratively to provide resources that will help students with disability flourish.

After a review of demographic needs and their existing land assets, CSBB have developed this proposal to develop the Eileen O'Connor Catholic School (EOCCS) in Mardi NSW fronting Keefers Glen, on land that was formerly part of St Peter's Catholic College, 84 Gavenlock Road, Mardi.

Catholic Schools Broken Bay (CSBB) are proposing the development of the Eileen O'Connor Catholic School (EOCCS) as a purpose-built Kindergarten to Year 12 school for 200 students.

The proposed development involves:

- Tree removal and infill of existing dam
- Site establishment and benching
- Construction of a part-two, part-three storey school campus comprising:
  - o 20 General Learning Areas (GLA)
  - o Flexible specialist learning areas
  - o Library
  - o Multipurpose hall
  - o Administration
  - o Staff facilities
  - o Storage
  - o Landscaping and playspaces
- Construction of two (2) new vehicle accessways from Keefers Glen and at-grade carpark (including bus parking) and covered drop off/pick up area
- Subdivision of land to create a new allotment for the school
- Widening of a portion of Keefers Glen
- New pedestrian footpath for a portion of Keefers Glen



Eileen O'Connor Catholic School - Aerial View from North-East





Eileen O'Connor Catholic School - Proposed Site Plan (Modified Option 9h)



The proposed design for the development is represented in the following drawings prepared by Stanton Dahl Architects. These drawings shall be read in conjunction with the accompanying consultant drawings and reports.

Drawing No.	Drawing Title	Revision	Date
A0001	Cover Sheet	В	01.07.25
A0101	Campus Plan	В	01.07.25
A0102	Site Analysis Plan	В	01.07.25
A0103a	Existing Site Plan 1	В	01.07.25
A0103b	Existing Site Plan 2	В	01.07.25
A0104a	Site Demolition Plan 1	В	01.07.25
A0104b	Site Demolition Plan 2	В	01.07.25
A0105	Cut & Fill Plan	В	01.07.25
A0106a	Proposed Site Plan	В	01.07.25
A0106b	Setbacks and Building Dimension Plan	В	01.07.25
A0107	Extent of Works Plan	В	01.07.25
A0115	Tree Location Plan	В	30.06.25
A0116	Tree Retention Plan	В	30.06.25
A0117	TPZ & SRZ Plan 1	В	30.06.25
A0118	TPZ & SRZ Plan 2	В	30.06.25
A0201	Floor Plan - Lower Ground	В	01.07.25
A0202	Floor Plan - Ground	В	01.07.25
A0203	Floor Plan – Level 1	В	01.07.25
A0204	Roof Plan	В	01.07.25
A0211	Typical GLA Floor Plan	В	01.07.25
A0251	Access Plan – Lower Ground	В	01.07.25
A0252	Access Plan - Ground	В	01.07.25
A0253	Access Plan – Level 1	В	01.07.25
A0301	Elevations 1	В	01.07.25
A0302	Elevations 2	В	01.07.25
A0303	Internal Façade Screen Schedule	В	01.07.25
A0311	Sections 1	В	01.07.25
A0312	Sections 2	В	01.07.25
A0401	Shadow Diagrams	В	01.07.25
A0501	North-West Perspective - Aerial	В	01.07.25
A0502	South-West Perspective - Aerial	В	01.07.25
A0503	North-East Perspective - Aerial	В	01.07.25
A0504	South-East Perspective - Aerial	В	01.07.25
A0505	North-West – Street View	В	01.07.25
A0506	North-West - Driveway	В	01.07.25
A0507	Western Elevation – Keefers Glen	В	01.07.25
A0508	South-West – Street View	В	01.07.25
A0509	North-East – View from Eastern Carpark	В	01.07.25
A0510	South-East – View from St Peters	В	01.07.25
A0511	Playground – View Looking West	В	01.07.25
A0512	Playground – View Looking East	В	01.07.25
A0513	Playground – View Looking North	В	01.07.25
A0514	Playground – View Looking South	В	01.07.25
A0701	Materials and Finishes 1	В	01.07.25
A0702	Materials and Finishes 2	В	01.07.25



#### Eileen O'Connor Catholic School (EOCCS) 2.0

#### Vision & Purpose 2.1

Research conducted by CSBB has identified that 1 in 12 school aged children have a disability, with the demand for disability support increasing at four times the rate of enrolment. Through the new Eileen O'Connor Catholic School, CSBB aims to strengthen support for students with disabilities and their families with a determined focus on providing an inclusive education model, delivering disability-specific support for each student, where students' strengths are highlighted and allowed to flourish.

Primary focus is in providing students with diverse needs the opportunity to access purpose-built, specialist services through an all embracing network encompassing the Schools, parents, carers and health professionals.

#### Students 2.2

The new EOCCS is proposed to have a total enrolment of 200 students, consisting of 140 primary school students and 60 secondary school students.

Students enrolled with EOCCS need to meet the DSM-V (Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders) criteria of Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) Level 2 or 3 and/or an Intellectual Disability (ID) Moderate to Severe. Both Autism and Intellectual Disability are lifelong disabilities, with each person's experience being unique and multi-dimensional.

ASD and ID impact the development of functional skills required for learning and daily living. EOCCS students will require each step of a new skill explicitly taught, with high repetition due to difficulty with recalling how tasks are performed. Each student will be on an individual program to develop the functional skills required for daily living.

Examples of the challenges that may be experienced by each of the 200 students enrolled:

- Delayed speech and language skills •
- Misinterpretation of non-verbal cures such as gestures or body language •
- Limited interest in interactions with peers or educators •
- Poor ability to understand the behaviours and feelings of others •
- Stress when routines change
- Communicating wants, needs and desires ٠
- Processing sensory information •
- Avoiding eye contact •
- Processing cognitive information
- Overstimulation due to visual colour distraction and high light areas •
- Physical ability from extreme agility (including climbing and running) to limited movement but with the overlay of a limited assessment of risk •

Students at EOCCS will transition around the school 7-10 times a day, 5 days a week, 10 weeks a term. Each student will require individualised supports to manage the transitions successfully. Time spent transitioning is time lost from learning in the classroom.

#### 2.3 Staff

A total of 71 full time equivalent staff including skilled teachers, teaching assistants, administrative and maintenance staff teams will assist in facilitating the sharing of teaching methods, staff expertise and curriculum delivery strategies across the new School and the broader CSBB teaching community. The proposed development accommodates smaller class sizes (approximately 10 students per class) to provide safe, responsive learning environments whilst the proposed staffing numbers allows the opportunity for customized adult/student ratios and enabling individualized instruction tailored to each student's specific needs.







(Source: Catholic Schools Broken Bay)



#### 3.0 Site Analysis

#### The Development Site 3.1

The proposed School site is within the north-western corner of the existing St Peters Catholic College site at 84 Gavenlock Road, Mardi (Lot 9, Section 4 in Deposited Plan (DP) 3368). A Plan of Sub-division (extract below right) forms part of this SSDA submission to independently separate the proposed Eileen O'Connor Catholic School site (identified in red below left) and St Peters Catholic College.

The proposed, sub-divided EOCCS site covers an approximate area of 12,840 square metres and includes 3 existing, steel framed and metal clad sheds currently used for maintenance, bus parking and construction study classes by St Peters Catholic College. These 3 structures are proposed to be demolished as part of the EOCCS development.





Beyond the School site, the extended project development area includes the existing residential road, Keefers Glen, with proposed road widening works extending from the northern intersection with Brickendon Avenue to the southern intersection with Deloraine Glen. A new pedestrian footpath is proposed on the eastern side of Keefers Glen extending from the south western corner of the EOCCS site up to the northern intersection of Keefers Glen and Brickendon Avenue.

#### **Surrounding Development** 3.2

The proposed project site is bounded by:

- Keefers Glen to the western street frontage •
- Single and double storey residential dwellings to the north •
- Wetlands to the north-east ٠
- St Peters Catholic College to the eastern and southern boundaries •

#### 3.3 Topography

The project site falls from the southern, sub-division boundary with St Peters Catholic College, to the northern boundary by approximately 4.3 metres along the western frontage with Keefers Glen and approximately 6 metres at the eastern boundary with St Peters Catholic College.

Centred on the site is an existing dam which is proposed to be infilled as part of the EOCCS development.





\_6°12'17" 140.346 (M.G.A. GROUND) {6°12'36" 140.348 (SURVEY)

 $(\mathcal{D})$ 'nσ

Z

ш

ษ

ĽÍ.

Ē

ш

ш Y <sup>84826</sup> FD.

53369

2007

2005

R.M. 🛈 🏻

58047

237

238

239

240

241

S.P.

c

S.P.

:0

0 ÷

 $\alpha$ 

Ω.

-5

M.S.

## Proposed Plan of Sub-Division – refer accompanying documentation

## 3.4 Existing Vegetation

The existing site is predominantly grassland, encircling a central dam. A cluster of existing trees around the southern and north-eastern edges of the dam are proposed to be removed to facilitate the new EOCCS development, with the dam to be infilled to assist with shaping and contouring of site levels for the new School playground.

The majority of an avenue of trees along the western edge, marked with high retention value as per the arboricultural report prepared by Bellevue Tree Consulting, are proposed to be retained. An overall assessment of the retention values of existing trees within the EOCCS site by the arborist has identified a majority of trees concentrated around the dam have a low to moderate value (refer following diagram).

Trees to the northern edge of the netball courts are proposed to be removed to facilitate the stormwater drainage design for the new School.

Along the western boundary, a small number of existing trees are located outside of the site boundary and within the existing grassed verge. These trees are proposed to be removed to facilitate the proposed road widening works and new pedestrian footpath on the eastern side of Keefers Glen.

Lastly, a scattering of trees located along the southern and northern boundaries of the site are proposed to be removed as part of the EOCCS development.







Existing Tree Retention Value (prepared by Stanton Dahl Architects) Refer to Arboricultural Report prepared by Bellevue Tree Consulting



#### 3.5 **Bushfire Protection**

To be read in conjunction with the Bush Fire Assessment Report prepared by Bush Fire Consulting Services.

The EOCCS site is defined as "bushfire prone land" in accordance with the Central Coast Local Environmental Plan maps and as defined by Section 10.3 (s10.3) of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act (EP&A) 1979. The northeastern corner of the proposed site is within the area identified as "Vegetation Buffer" zone.



(Source: NSW Planning Portal)

#### 3.6 Access

The proposed, sub-divided site for the new EOCCS is to be accessed via Keefers Glen, with two (2) new vehicle crossovers, providing access to at-grade carparks located on the western, southern and eastern boundaries of the new School and a designated pick-up/drop-off zone beneath the entry Porte Cochere.

A 6m wide perimeter access roadway has been accommodated to provide emergency vehicle access to the full perimeter of the new School building, in addition to direct access to the playground areas in the event of an emergency.

The proposed development includes a proposal for upgrade of Keefers Glen, including road widening works extending from the northern intersection with Brickendon Avenue to the southern intersection with Deloraine Glen.

amenity is to be improved with a new pedestrian footpath proposed on the eastern side of Keefers Glen extending from the southwestern corner of the EOCCS site up to the northern intersection of Keefers Glen and Brickendon Avenue. This footpath will provide access to an entry pathway to the new School gates and pedestrian entry, adjacent a new, public meeting and arrival garden.



## 3.7 Views

Views of the new School site will primarily be along Keefers Glen on the western boundary. On approach to the site from the north, the north-western corner becomes visible as the western boundary extends from behind the residential property at No. 20 Brickendon Ave and follows the natural slope of Keefers Glen uphill to the south (see Image 1)

Moving south along Keefers Glen, views into the site are predominantly clear and unobstructed with only a small number of existing street trees scattered along the western boundary (see Images 2 and 3).

The density of trees increases upon the approach to what is proposed to become the south-western corner of the new EOCCS site, with an avenue of existing trees extending along the western boundary of the St Peters Catholic College site as you move towards the southern end of Keefers Glen. The majority of these existing trees are located within the St Peters Catholic College site and are not impacted by the proposed development. When approaching the new School site from the south, this avenue of trees will afford filtered views of the EOCCS site on the downhill approach (see Images 5 and 6)



Image 1: View from northern intersection at Brickendon Ave



Image 2: View from Residence at No. 6 Keefers Glen



Image 3: View from Residence at No. 10 Keefers Glen



Image 4: View from Residence at No. 16 Keefers Glen



Image 5: View from Residence at No. 20 Keefers Glen



Image 6: View from southern intersection at Deloraine Glen



The proposed EOCCS site provides views across the existing grassland, with sight lines from the southern boundary to the residential properties at the north, views of the existing trees and dam to the north-east and St Peters Catholic College to the east and south (see Images 7 & 8).

Views from the north-western corner of the site extend across the northern boundary to the east, across the dam in a south-easterly direction and uphill with views of St Peters Catholic College to the south (see Images 9, 10 and 11). Views back out towards Keefers Glen and the north from this vantage point provide sight lines back to the intersection of Keefers Glen and Brickendon Ave (see Image 12)



Image 7: View from South-West Corner of Site Looking North



Image 8: View from South-West Corner of Site Looking East





Image 10: View from North-West Corner of Site Looking East



Image 11: View from North-West Corner of Site Looking South



Image 12: View from North-West Corner of Site Looking North (towards Brickendon Ave)



Image 9: View from North-West Corner of Site Looking South-East

View from the northern boundary are dominated by the existing dam and surrounding trees when looking uphill towards the south and back towards the western frontage to Keefers Glen (see Images 13 and 15 below). Views from the northern boundary back to the east towards St Peters Catholic College equally dominated by an avenue of trees running in a north/south direction, along the western edge of the existing St Peters Catholic College netball courts (see Images 14 and 18 below).

From the top of the hill at the southern boundary, views from the south-eastern corner of the site extend back across the grass hill sloping down towards the dam and northern boundary (see Images 16 and 17 below)



Image 13: View from North-East Corner of Site Looking West



Image 14: View of Trees on Western Side of Existing Netball Courts



Image 15: View Looking West from Within EOCCS Site to Keefers Glen



Image 16: View from South-East Corner of the Site Looking West



Image 17: View from South-East Corner of Site Looking North



Image 18: View of Existing Eastern Netball Courts



#### Solar Access 3.8

The location of the project site, positioned on the north-western edge of the existing St Peters Catholic College site results in minimal impact from overshadowing on the subject site from surrounding development with only minor shadowing from the single and double storey residences along the northern boundary fence line.

#### 3.9 **Heights and Setbacks**

There are no nominated height controls for the project site.

Similarly, the Central Coast Council LEP and DCP do not nominate minimum setback conditions in regards to educational establishments in the R2 Low Density Residential zone. For the purposes of this development, the following setbacks have been nominated:

- Northern Boundary (Residences) 8.1 metres •
- Western Boundary (Street Frontage) 19.2 metres •
- Southern Boundary (St Peters Catholic College) 8.5 metres

The western boundary setback has been established with consideration of allowance for public amenity and landscaping buffers to Keefers Glen and is complimentary to the existing setback established by the northern residence at No. 20 Brickendon Ave.

#### **Constraints and Opportunities** 3.10

A feasibility assessment by CSBB and its stakeholders identified a redundant agricultural plot in the north-eastern corner of the existing St Peters Catholic College to be the proposed site for the new EOCCS. During this assessment, the following opportunities and constraints were noted for consideration:

Opportunities:

- The proposed site provides the opportunity for sub-division of land to provide an independent site and location for the new EOCCS, with access from Keefers Glen.
- The proposed sub-divided site affords the EOCCS its own presence and identity within the community. This allows the School to build on community engagement and education, strengthening community support in an allinclusive, diverse environment in accordance with the project's objectives (refer Part 4.2 Project Objectives)
- The proposed site is located within an established natural environment, with views to the north-east bushland area (known as 100 Gavenlock Road)
- Opportunity to engage with local Aboriginal Knowledge Holders to ground the School design and student experience with strong connections to Country

Constraints:

- The existing site is classified as being affected by acid sulfate soils which will require applied design to minimise the extent of cut required and thorough management during the construction phase in accordance with the recommendations identified in the site investigations as noted in Part 3.11 Soils below.
- The site is identified as "bushfire prone land" as noted in Part 3.5 Bushfire Protection. Specifically, the northeastern corner of the proposed EOCCS site is within an area identified as "Vegetation Buffer" zone.
- The proposed site is located out of the Probable Maximum Flood levels (PMF) and therefore deemed to not have any significant impact on flood behaviour or to be inundated by flood waters. However, it is noted that the site could • be isolated for extended periods, with some surrounding roads being affected by flooding during major events. Refer to the Flood Impact Assessment prepared by Tooker & Associates.
- The main natural feature of the site is an existing dam located centrally within the proposed EOCCS site. This will require de-watering and infilling to accommodate the proposed development

#### 3.11 Soils

The site is classified as being affected by Acid Sulfate Soils (Classes 3, 4 & 5). Refer to the following Campus site plan prepared by Stanton Dahl Architects

Extensive site investigations have been carried out by Raw Earth Environmental including the following assessments and reports which accompany the SSDA submission:

- Geotechnical Report
- Acid Sulfate Management Plan
- Surface and Groundwater Impact Assessment Report •
- Salinity & Aggressivity Assessment Report
- Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI)
- Sampling & Analysis Quality Plan (SAQP) •
- Detailed Site Investigation (DSI) •
- ENM Statement of Compliance •
- Remediation Action Plan (RAP) •

The assessment areas cover the full new School site area (to be sub-divided) including the northeastern netball courts and existing site sheds proposed to be demolished as part of the EOCCS development.

Data gaps were identified where testing was not possible, such as testing of soils beneath the existing shed concrete slabs. Where data gaps were noted, these have been recorded in the Remediation Action Plan (RAP), with soil sampling plans and methodology prepared in addition to identification of remediation options and strategies to be undertaken during and post demolition.

The RAP is further supplemented by the Interim Audit Advice prepared by EPA Accredited Site Auditors at Ramboll

The Detailed Site Investigation has concluded that the site can be made suitable for the ongoing proposed land use, subject to the recommendations listed in the DSI.

#### Services 3.12

As noted in Part 3.1 The Development Site, a Plan of Sub-division forms part of this SSDA submission to independently separate the proposed Eileen O'Connor Catholic School site and St Peters Catholic College. As such, it is proposed the new development will equally be provided with independent infrastructure including onsite stormwater detention, water, sewer and electrical infrastructure including site specific electrical substation to meet the anticipated demand for the new campus.



#### 4.0 **Development Proposal**

#### **Project Overview** 4.1

The SSDA seeks approval for the construction of the new Eileen O'Connor Catholic School, a purpose-built Kindergarten to Year 12 school for 200 students with a disability and diverse learning needs.

It is proposed that the new School be procured in a single stage including the following scope of works:

- Tree removal and infill of existing dam
- Site establishment and benching •
- Construction of a part-two, part-three storey school campus comprising: •
  - o 20 General Learning Areas (GLA)
  - o Flexible specialist learning areas
  - o Library
  - o Multipurpose hall
  - o Administration
  - o Staff facilities
  - o Storage
  - Landscaping and play spaces
- Construction of two (2) new vehicle accessways from Keefers Glen and at-grade carpark (including bus parking) and covered drop off/pick up area
- Subdivision of land to create a new allotment for the school •
- Widening of a portion of Keefers Glen
- New pedestrian footpath for a portion of Keefers Glen

The proposed building comprises a total gross floor area of 6,786 sqm. The project is expected to generate a significant number of employment opportunities with 71 full time equivalent staff including skilled teachers, teaching assistants, administrative and maintenance staff.

#### 4.2 **Project Objectives**

The design of the new EOCCS has been developed from the foundations of strong design principles which in turn are linked to a single, over-arching objective:

## To design a purpose-built facility to support and promote an inclusive educational experience for students with a diverse range of needs, in a safe, peaceful and positive environment and befitting the wellbeing, honour and dignity of its students and community.

The proposal seeks to deliver on this objective through the following design principles:

- Affording the Eileen O'Connor Catholic School its own presence and identity
- Celebrating diversity in an embracing, inclusive environment
- Prioritising student safety and security in all aspects of the design
- Focus on providing an accessible environment across the development through consideration of appropriate vehicle, pedestrian and traffic movements to support the needs of students, parents and educational providers
- Assist in delivery of specialist services through access to appropriate, purpose-built facilities to support parents, teachers and carers

## 4.3 Design Brief and Parameters:

To facilitate delivery of the noted project scope of works and ensure the functionality requirements of the new EOCCS are achieved, the design development has carefully considered the following briefing requirements and parameters established in unison with CSBB. These requirements and parameters are both measures of a general nature, to meet pedagogy and operational needs, in addition to specific considerations relating to the delivery of services for special needs students and include:

- 20 General Learning Areas with capacity for 200 students, divided across Primary and Secondary school groups as follows:
  - o 14 Primary School GLA's:
    - Two (2) stream Kindergarten to Year 6 classes.
    - 10 students per classroom for a total Primary School capacity of 140 students.
  - o 6 Secondary School GLA's:
    - Single stream Year 7 to Year 12.
    - 10 students per classroom for a total Secondary School capacity of 60 students.
- Provision for a designated, pick-up and drop-off area:
  - o Located at the main entry of the School to facilitate, safe, and controlled transition of students into and from the School building



- o Pick-up and drop-off contained within the School campus to reduce risk of students absconding.
- Grouping of GLA's in pairs with inter-connecting doors: •
  - o To assist with grouping of classes across Year groups in the Primary School.
  - o To provide opportunity for additional staff support from adjacent rooms through inter-connecting doors.
  - o Inter-connecting doors also provide an alternative path of exit for students and staff from the GLA in the event of an emergency.
- Provision for independent access to both Primary and Secondary Schools to reduce risk of interaction between senior and junior school students:
  - From an operational perspective, the interface between Primary and Secondary students is to be supervised and monitored by staff with interactions between larger, senior students and smaller junior students carefully managed for safety purposes.
- Accessibility
  - o Maximising the number of GLA's at ground level with direct access to the main School entry (pick-up and drop-off) and outdoor playground areas to reduce transition times and delays for students with limited or restricted mobility.
- Safety & Security:
  - Ensuring all areas of the site are provided with a double layer of security to reduce risk of students absconding.
  - o Providing glazed windows and doors to all student accessible areas for increased visibility and improved student and staff security.
- Climbability:
  - o Climbable structures and elements are to be minimised with all external columns to be boxed in and or set inward from the edge of overhanging/roof structures.
  - o Any raised platforms, climbable elements or "step ups" are to be located away from fences or elements which may provide leverage/transition from one climbed object to another.

#### **Design Development** 4.4

## 4.4.1 Process

The process of developing the design for the new EOCCS involved the appraisal of the contextual and surrounding site constraints and opportunities (refer Part 3.10 - Constraints and Opportunities) against the functional requirements of the design brief (refer Part 4.3 – Design Brief and Parameters), overlaid with the primary objectives and the specific needs of the students (refer Part 2.2 – Students).

The Design Brief and Parameters along with each of the functional relationship/accommodation requirements and building footprint opportunities over the site gave rise to the planning framework and massing arrangement of the development proposal. Other considerations in the design include:

- Pedestrian and vehicular access
- Bushfire and flooding impacts •
- Acoustic and visual privacy for both the neighbouring properties and students. •
- Designing with Country considerations •
- Sustainability •
- Public domain opportunities

The final design proposal which forms the SSDA submission (referred to as Modified Option 9h) has evolved through a collaboration between Stanton Dahl Architects, Catholic Schools Broken Bay and the broader project team. Along the way, the project team has consulted with various external parties and authorities including Central Coast Council, the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure and the Government Architects Office through the State Design Review Panel. The outcomes of these discussions and consultation are outlined in detail in Section 5.0 of this report.

The recommendations from each respective consultation have then been considered and informed the design development through each phase, resulting in the final design proposal, Option 9h. Hereafter is a summary of each design phase and how this process has led to the final design proposal including:

- Phase 1: Option 1a
  - Original design proposal presented to SDRP #1
- Phase 2: Post SDRP #1 Review and Considerations
- Phase 3: Modified Option 1a
- o Modified design proposal as presented to SDRP #2 and Pre-DA #2
- Phase 4: Post SDRP #2 Redesign Options 1a to 7
- Phase 5: Option 5 •
- Phase 6: RFS Re-design Options 8a to 10b •
- Phase 7: Option 9h •
- Phase 8: Modified Option 9h •



## 4.4.2 Phase 1 - Option 1a

## Summarv:

The original proposal was developed encapsulating the design brief and parameters as previously noted and included the following:

- Part 2-3 storey western and southern Primary School and Administration wings comprising:
  - o 14 General Learning Areas across two (2) levels
  - Administration and staff facilities 0
  - Kitchen and Canteen facilities 0
  - Multi-purpose Hall 0
  - Library 0
  - o Maintenance and storage areas to lower ground
- 2 storey Secondary School northern wing comprising:
  - o 6 General Learning Areas
  - Staff facilities 0
  - Specialised Learning Areas including Gym/Fitness, Science, CAPA, TAS and Life Skills. 0
- Two (2) new vehicle entry points via Keefers Glen with western ٠ and eastern staff carpark areas (connected via a northern driveway)
- Outdoor playground and landscaping

This proposal was presented to the State Design Review Panel at Review #1 on 24th April 2024.

## Advantages:

- Clearly identifiable entry visible from Keefers Glen
- Clearly defined and independent Primary and Secondary facilities
- 12 GLA's/120 students with direct level access from GLA's to ٠ playground/outdoor spaces for play and/or regulation
- 10 GLA's/100 students with direct level access to main entry •
- Northern Wing provides acoustic and visual barrier to northern . neighbour residences
- View cone from entry predominantly focused in a north easterly • direction to bushlands
- Reduced cut & fill to existing site impacted by acid sulphate soils Staff visibility of playground areas from Staff Room ٠

## Disadvantages:

- Access to Level 2 Secondary School through Primary Circulation ٠ Common area
- Northern Wing not supported by SDRP
- Reduced landscaped buffer zone to Keefers Glen not supported by Central Coast Council
- Northern Wing increases shading to playground

## Conclusion:

Modifications were made to this proposal as noted in Part 4.43 - Phase 2 of the Design Development in response to commentary received following the SDRP #1.













## 4.4.3 Phase 2: Post SDRP #1 Design Review and Considerations

To be read in conjunction with Section 5.0 of this report: Part 5.3 State Design Review Panel - Review #1 - Advice Register and Responses

## General:

Following receipt of the SDRP #1 commentary, the project team reviewed the proposed design with consideration of the concerns raised. The design review thereafter sought to modify the proposed design to address the feedback received, where it was deemed appropriate and supportive with the stated project objectives and principles

It was acknowledged that a primary concern for the SDRP was the positioning of the northern wing due to its proximity to the northern neighbours and impact to the overall playground design. After careful consideration, the design team and CSBB deemed the current building form best addressed the operational requirements for the students, with consideration of the building's siting and its context noting:

- The northern wing building provided a strong acoustic and privacy barrier equally for the northern neighbours and for EOCCS students. 0
- The proposed 2 storey height for the northern wing respectfully complimented the scale of the existing single to two storey residences along the northern boundary. 0
- 0 The northern wing was proposed to be set back a minimum of 9m from the northern boundary. In addition, the existing northern residences are set back between approximately 3.8m to 9m further north from the shared boundary resulting
- in the distance between the proposed building development and residences extending between 12.8m to 18m.
- The 'C' shaped building directed focus and views to the north-east and bushlands which were identified as one of the sites prime opportunities 0

It was therefore decided to proceed with the current building form, with some modifications as noted hereafter.

### Existing Tree Retention:

Acknowledging the SDRP's comments for the design team to "Identify significant trees within the site and strive to retain as many as possible to contribute to placemaking and to create cool, shaded areas for gathering in the playground", the post SDRP #1 review re-evaluated the extent of existing trees proposed to be removed in conjunction with the project arborist, Bellevue Tree Consulting's assessment of tree retention values (refer Part 3.4 Existing Vegetation).

It was noted that the majority of trees assessed with high retention value on the project site are concentrated on the western side of the proposed eastern carpark and were already identified to be retained as part of the EOCCS development. Following further design review, it was noted that there was opportunity to retain additional trees, also marked with high retention value, on the western frontage along Keefers Glen, whereby design of the western carpark and the proposed upgrade works to Keefers Glen could potentially be modified to reduce impact on tree protection zones, therefore allowing these trees to be retained. These trees are marked as Trees 1, 2, 3 and 5 on Figure 3, below.

Tree 4, although marked as having low retention value, was also identified as being possible to retain.

Within the proposed playground area, existing trees concentrated around the existing dam (marked 6 to 12 on Figure 3 below) were identified as being possible to retain (although marked as low/medium retention value in the Arboricultural Report). These trees were selected due to their current positioning and base levels complimenting the proposed playaround design and transition levels





Figure 1: Existing Trees Superimposed over the Proposed Building

Figure 2: Extent of Trees to be Removed/Retained as per Option 1a

Figure 3: Additional Trees Identified to be Retained

5





## Landscaping & Parking:

The Post SDRP #1 Design Review proposed to further enhance the acoustic and visual separation to the northern residences by re-positioning the northern wing a further 1.5m south. This allowed for an increased landscaped buffer zone along the full extent of the northern boundary, varying from 1.9m at the western end to 2.5 metres at the eastern end (refer Figure 4 adjacent)

With a view to reducing the extent of hard, paved surfaces, the design team reviewed the number of parking spaces provisioned. The original concept allowed for a parking space to staff member ratio of 1:1 resulting in a total of 71 car parking spaces as per the Central Coast Council DCP requirements. Following further research and assessment by the traffic engineers at Traffix, the number of spaces were reduced to 61, based on ABS Journey to Work statistics for the Tuggerah region.

The design also sought to reduce the extent of hard, paved surface areas to the western and eastern carparks by introducing additional landscaped garden areas and opportunities to introduce further new trees to offset the extent of trees removed. This particularly focused on new landscaping to the western frontage and public domain along Keefers Glen.



## Figure 4: Re-positioned Northern Wing and Increased Site Landscaping

### Playground Design:

The Post SDRP #1 Design Review considered the complex nature and programming of the Option 1a playground design (refer Figure 5 below) and thereafter sought to simplify the concept (refer Figure 6 below). The playground design encompassed 3 distinct play levels spread across upper, middle and lower playground areas. The revised design looked to smooth the transition between these levels by creating a sweeping, accessible path through the centre of the site, developed to complement the existing site terrain.

This revised pathway was further developed with consideration of Designing with Country principles and the journey through the site from the public domain on Keefers Glen, through the new School main entry and onwards through the playground and outdoor areas. This is highlighted in Figure 6 below, with the design seeking to create hold points (highlighted with pink dots in Figure 7 below) along the way for gathering, reflection and engagement through a multi-sensory journey and experience of Country.

This journey was proposed to commence with a public meeting garden area on Keefers Glen, Acknowledgement of Country at the main entry and through to a main, central gathering space on the upper playground with views to the north-eastern bushlands before transitioning to the lower playground area through the new, sweeping pathway which further promotes opportunities for a slow paced, fully immersive experience through the site.





## Natural Light and Ventilation:

Noting the SDRP #1 comments regarding natural light, the Post SDRP #1 Design Review re-evaluated the roof design for the proposed building and sought opportunities to increase the extent of glazing and sunlight ingress into the GLA's. The proposal was therefore modified to split the current single roof planes to each wing, to allow for high level, clerestory windows, increasing the natural light to the GLA's, as per the below sketches in Figures 8 and 9





Figure 8: Proposed Revised "Split" Roof Design Plan

Figure 9: Proposed Revised "Split" Roof Design - Site Section



## 4.4.4 Phase 3: Modified Option 1a

## Summary:

Modified Option 1a was developed as noted in Phase 2 of the Design Development.

The built form and planning remained similar and sympathetic to the original design proposal as outlined in Phase 1, with the following modifications and additions:

- Increased landscaping buffer along northern boundary
- Increased retention of existing trees. ٠
  - Reduction of hard surfaced, paved landscaping through: o Reducing onsite staff parking spaces from 71 to 61 parking spaces and 2 onsite School bus overnight parking bays.
    - Increased landscaped garden areas to western and 0 eastern carparks
- Improved engagement with public domain with the introduction of a public arrival/meeting garden at the Keefers Glen pedestrian entry ٠ and increased landscaping to the western frontage
- Simplified playground design, sympathetic and complementing the ٠ site terrain.
- Revised roof concept with split roof design incorporated into each wing to allow for additional natural light to GLA's

The design proposal at this stage had also progressed with initial consultation with Aboriginal Knowledge Holders as part of the Connecting with Country framework. As a result, Designing with Country principles were further incorporated into the modified Option 1a design including the "grasslands" façade concept (refer to Part 4.2.1 of this report).

This proposal was presented to the State Design Review Panel at Review #2 on 26th June 2024.

## Advantages:

- Clearly identifiable entry visible from Keefers Glen
- Clearly defined and independent Primary and Secondary facilities
- 12 GLA's/120 students with direct level access from GLA's to ٠ playground/outdoor spaces for play and/or regulation
- 10 GLA's/100 students with direct level access to main entry
- Northern Wing provides acoustic and visual barrier to northern ٠ neighbour residences
- View cone from entry predominantly focused in a north easterly • direction to bushlands
- Reduced cut & fill to existing site impacted by acid sulphate soils Staff visibility of playground areas from Staff Room

## Disadvantages:

- Access to Level 2 Secondary School through Primary Circulation ٠ Common area
- Northern Wing not supported by SDRP ٠
- Northern Wing increases shading to playground

## Conclusion:

Following the meeting, SDRP #2 comments reiterated ongoing concerns with the design (refer to Section 5.0 – Part 5.4 of this report), with particular focus on the retention of the northern wing in the current design proposal.

As a result, the project team shifted into additional site planning and Phase 4 of the Design Development.





massing tests to address these concerns, as summarised hereafter in



#### Phase 4: Post SDRP #2 and Pre-DA #2 Re-design – Options 1a to 7 4.4.5

Following the commentary received from SDRP #2 and the second Pre-DA meeting with Central Coast Council held on 10th July 2024, the design team undertook a comprehensive review of the concepts developed to date, with consideration of the feedback received across all authority consultation sessions (refer Section 5.0 of this report for detail).

The review afforded the design team and client the opportunity to self-assess the current design proposal (Option 1a) against the items raised in the consultations and explore opportunities that could provide a successful balance between addressing the commentary received whilst maintaining focus on the project objectives and principles in the best interests of the students.

Noting the primary concern raised in regard to the positioning of the northern wing, the following studies focused on the testing of options with a view to de-construction of, and/or re-distribution of areas from, the northern wing across the project site and within the contextual limitations and opportunities previously noted.

The following is a detailed summary of Options 1a to 7 (9 Options in total)





Option 1a:		Concept
Summary	As detailed in Design Development – Phases 1 to 3.	11 bit Lie beste between the set the s
Advantages	<ul> <li>Clearly identifiable entry visible from Keefers Glen</li> <li>Clearly defined and independent Primary and Secondary facilities</li> <li>12 GLA's/120 students with direct level access from GLA's to playground/outdoor spaces for play and/or regulation</li> <li>10 GLA's/100 students with direct level access to main entry</li> <li>Northern Wing provides acoustic and visual barrier to northern neighbour residences</li> <li>View cone from entry predominantly focused in a north easterly direction to bushlands</li> <li>Reduced cut &amp; fill to existing site impacted by acid sulphate soils</li> <li>Staff visibility of playground areas from Staff Room</li> </ul>	3 Option 1a - Level 2
Disadvantages	<ul> <li>Access to Level 2 Secondary School through Primary Circulation Common area</li> <li>Northern Wing not supported by SDRP</li> <li>Reduced landscaped buffer zone to Keefers Glen not supported by Central Coast Council</li> <li>Northern Wing increases shading to playground</li> </ul>	
Conclusion	As per Design Development Phases 1 to 3, and following review and discussion between the project team, consultants and CSBB, this concept was deemed unsuitable and therefore excluded due to the retention of the northern wing, which conflicted with the SDRP and Central Coast Council comments received.	1 Option 1a - Level 3







Option 1b:		Concept
Summary	Option 1b design concept retained the built form and planning of Concept 1a. In response to SDRP and Central Coast Council comments received, this concept proposed to shift the entire building to the east to increase and maximise the landscaped buffer zone to the western frontage along Keefers Glen.	11 bit Ute Ute base base base
Advantages	<ul> <li>Clearly identifiable entry visible from Keefers Glen</li> <li>Clearly defined and independent Primary and Secondary facilities</li> <li>12 GLA's/120 students with direct level access from GLA's to playground/outdoor spaces for play and/or regulation</li> <li>10 GLA's/100 students with direct level access to main entry</li> <li>Northern Wing provides acoustic and visual barrier to northern neighbour residences</li> <li>View cone from entry predominantly focused in a north easterly direction to bushlands</li> <li>Reduced cut &amp; fill to existing site impacted by acid sulphate soils</li> <li>Staff visibility of playground areas from Staff Room</li> <li>Increased landscaped buffer zone to Keefers Glen in response to Central Coast Council commentary</li> </ul>	2 Option 1b - Level 2
Disadvantages	<ul> <li>Access to Level 2 Secondary School through Primary Circulation Common area</li> <li>Northern Wing not supported by SDRP</li> <li>Northern Wing increases shading to playground</li> <li>Reduced internal playground area</li> </ul>	
Conclusion	Following review and discussion between the project team, consultants and CSBB, this concept was deemed unsuitable and therefore excluded due to the retention of the northern wing, which conflicted with the SDRP and Central Coast Council comments received.	3 Option 1b - Level 3







Option 2:		Concept P
Summary	Option 2 began to test the viability and opportunities to "break down" the bulk and scale of the northern wing by gradually shifting spaces from the northern wing to form a new, eastern wing. Option 2 achieved this by removing 2 GLA modules from the Lower Ground and Ground levels of the northern Secondary School wing and relocating them to form a two (2) storey, two (2) GLA module eastern wing for the Primary School. This produced complexity for the School's working requirements as the upper level is a mix of Primary and Secondary spaces, which is not preferred. After an in-depth review of the programming and functionality of the School, the value of segregating the Primary from the Secondary School areas, was deemed to be essential. As a result, the unfavorable mix of junior and senior spaces conflicted with the operational and functional needs of the School.	1.1 bit das bat unit unit das
Advantages	<ul> <li>Clearly identifiable entry visible from Keefers Glen</li> <li>10 GLA's/100 students with direct level access from GLA's to playground/outdoor spaces for play and/or regulation</li> <li>10 GLA's/100 students with direct level access to main entry</li> <li>Reduced Northern Wing footprint in response to SDRP commentary</li> <li>Reduced cut &amp; fill to existing site impacted by acid sulphate soils</li> <li>Staff visibility of playground areas from Staff Room</li> <li>Reduction in Northern Wing footprint increases opportunity to soften transition/levels through playground from south to north</li> <li>Independent access to Secondary School (ie. not through Primary Circulation/Common area)</li> <li>Increased solar access to playground with reduction of Northern Wing</li> </ul>	A constrained of the second of
Disadvantages	<ul> <li>Mixed Primary and Secondary facilities with Secondary School classrooms split across three (3) levels</li> <li>Northern Wing not supported by SDRP</li> <li>Reduced landscaped buffer zone to Keefers Glen not supported by Central Coast Council</li> <li>Northern Wing increases shading to playground</li> <li>Reduction in Northern Wing footprint results in:         <ul> <li>increased viewing cone to northern neighbour residences</li> <li>reduced acoustic attenuation and privacy to northern neighbour residences</li> <li>reduced viewing cone to north-eastern bushland</li> </ul> </li> <li>Complexity in shape and terrain for playground/outdoor areas</li> </ul>	(2) <u>Option 2 - Level 2</u>
Conclusion	<ul> <li>Following review and discussion between the project team, consultants and CSBB, this concept was deemed unsuitable and therefore excluded due to:</li> <li>o the retention of a portion of the northern wing, in conflict with the SDRP and Central Coast Council comments received.</li> <li>o The resultant mixed Primary and Secondary School facilities</li> </ul>	A de de la constante A de de la constante A de la







Option 3:		Concept F
Summary	Option 3 continued to test the viability and opportunities to "break down" the bulk and scale of the northern wing by gradually shifting spaces from the northern wing to form a new, eastern wing. Option 3 achieved this by removing an additional GLA and specialist learning area module from the Lower Ground and Ground levels of the northern Secondary School wing and relocating these to form a two (2) storey, three (3) module eastern wing for the Primary School. As the value of segregating the Primary from the Secondary School spaces, and the co-relationship of inter- year classes, particularly within the two stream Primary School areas, was deemed to be essential, the arrangement of spaces within each of the Primary and Secondary areas conflicted with the operational and functional needs of the School.	1.1 but the late has have the late the late has a second s
Advantages	<ul> <li>Clearly identifiable entry visible from Keefers Glen</li> <li>Clearly defined and independent Primary and Secondary facilities</li> <li>Independent access to Secondary School (ie. not through Primary Circulation/Common area)</li> <li>Reduced Northern Wing footprint in response to SDRP commentary</li> <li>Reduced cut &amp; fill to existing site impacted by acid sulphate soils</li> <li>Staff visibility of playground areas from Staff Room</li> <li>Reduction in Northern Wing footprint increases opportunity to soften transition/levels through playground from south to north</li> <li>Increased solar access to playground with reduction of Northern Wing</li> </ul>	2 Option 3 - Level 2
Disadvantages	<ul> <li>Secondary School classrooms split across three (3) levels</li> <li>Split stream for one Primary School year group across two (2) levels</li> <li>Northern Wing not supported by SDRP</li> <li>Northern Wing increases shading to playground</li> <li>Complexity in shape and terrain for playground/outdoor areas</li> </ul>	1:500 1:
Conclusion	<ul> <li>Following review and discussion between the project team, consultants and CSBB, this concept was deemed unsuitable and therefore excluded due to:         <ul> <li>the retention of a portion of the northern wing, in conflict with the SDRP and Central Coast Council comments received.</li> <li>The resultant arrangement within Primary and Secondary School facilities</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	







Option 4:		Concept F
Summary	Option 4 continued to test the viability and opportunities to "break down" the bulk and scale of the northern wing by shifting spaces from the northern wing to form a new, eastern wing. Option 4 achieved this by relocating the entirety of the northern wing to form a new two (2) storey, four (4) module eastern wing. In this concept, it was proposed the eastern wing would then form the new Secondary School facilities. In doing so, this required an in-depth review of the programming and functionality of the School including the separation of Primary and Secondary School spaces. As a result of this testing, the re-positioning of the entirety of the Secondary School wing from the north to the east better suited the functional and operational requirements of the School, although access to the Secondary School building would be through areas designated for the Primary School.	12 tui tui tui tui tui tui me tuuse
Advantages	<ul> <li>Clearly identifiable entry visible from Keefers Glen</li> <li>Clearly defined and independent Primary and Secondary facilities</li> <li>Deletion of Northern Wing footprint in response to SDRP commentary</li> <li>Reduced cut &amp; fill to existing site impacted by acid sulphate soils</li> <li>Staff visibility of playground areas from Staff Room</li> <li>Removal of Northern Wing footprint increases opportunity to soften transition/levels through playground from south to north</li> <li>Opportunity for additional staff/building facilities and/or COLA at Lower Ground level below northern end of Eastern Wing</li> <li>Increased solar access to playground with removal of Northern Wing</li> </ul>	
Disadvantages	<ul> <li>Access to Level 2 Secondary School through Primary Circulation Common area</li> <li>8 GLA's/80 students with direct level access from GLA's to playground/outdoor spaces for play and/or regulation</li> <li>8 GLA's/80 students with direct level access to main entry</li> <li>Reduced landscaped buffer zone to Keefers Glen not supported by Central Coast Council</li> <li>Removal of Northern Wing footprint results in: <ul> <li>increased viewing cone to northern neighbour residences</li> <li>reduced acoustic attenuation and privacy to northern neighbour residences</li> <li>reduced viewing cone to north-eastern bushland</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Conclusion	Following review and discussion between the project team, consultants and CSBB, this concept was deemed unsuitable and therefore excluded due to: o the Secondary School facilities being accessed via the Primary School	An and the first of the second sec



## Plans

