

6 February 2018

Ms Iona Cameron  
Senior Planning Officer  
Social and Other Infrastructure Assessments  
Priority Projects  
Department of Planning and Environment

Dear Iona,

## **SSD 8334 -CONSTRUCTION OF A SCHOOL AT 120 -126 HEZLETT ROAD, KELLYVILLE**

I refer to the above development, the December 2017 amended proposal and the Department of Planning email dated 12 January 2018 that provided advice on the December 2017 resubmission as well as the further State Government Agency and The Hills Council responses that have been received to the amended proposal.

This letter has been prepared on behalf of TSA who are the proponents for the project and are acting for the Department of Education.

Five further submissions were received from agencies to the New Kellyville North Public School as follows:

- Department of Primary Industries;
- The Hills Council;
- NSW EPA;
- Roads and Maritime Services; and
- Transport for NSW.

This letter should be read in conjunction with the revised/ supplementary plans and reports that are attached to this letter and are outlined in the table below:

<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>CONTENT</b>	<b>PREPARED BY</b>
<b>Appendix A</b>	Revised Civil Plans	GHD
<b>Appendix B</b>	Updated Remediation Action Plan	Douglas Partners
<b>Appendix C</b>	Updated Acoustic Report	GHD
<b>Appendix D</b>	Subdivision plan	MDL
<b>Appendix E</b>	Updated Waste Management Plan	GHD
<b>Appendix F</b>	Updated Traffic Impact Assessment	GHD

<b>Appendix G</b>	Confidential DRAFT Heads of Agreement between DOE and THSC	DOE/THSC
<b>Appendix H</b>	Updated Civil and Stormwater Management Plan	ADCO
<b>Appendix I</b>	Updated Construction Management Plan	GHD
<b>Appendix J</b>	Tabulated Response Table	GHD

## 1. Planning NSW Key Concerns

This letter now discusses the clarifications sought by the Department of Planning in its email dated 12 January 2018.

Key Issues	DOE Response
<p><i>Details and of the design of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>the proposed 'kiss and drop' on Hezlett Road and Thorogood Boulevard,</i></li> <li>○ <i>the bus zone on Hezlett Road,</i></li> </ul>	<p>Hezlett Road is intended to be utilised as the kiss and drop point for school students. The DOE as part of this application seeks approval to provide a sealed road shoulder within the road reserve in front of the school and adjoining Council reserve to facilitate this. This is illustrated in figure 3-4 on page 46 of the updated Traffic Impact Assessment.</p> <p>Figure 3-4 in the updated TIA also illustrates the location of the bus zones to service the school.</p> <p>It is requested that the DOP condition that a detailed design of this drop off zone and associated bus zone be approved by The Hills Council prior to construction occurring.</p>
<p><i>Details, design and timing of:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>the construction of Hipwell and Prentice Avenue extensions</i></li> <li>○ <i>the construction of the community car parks</i></li> </ul>	<p>Given the concerns expressed, this application now seeks approval for the construction of Hipwell Avenue and associated perpendicular parking spaces. This is illustrated on the subdivision plan as Restriction on use B (Hipwell Avenue Extension) and Restriction of Use C (Proposed parking spaces)</p> <p>It is requested that the DOP condition that a detailed design of this road and associated parking area be approved by The Hills Council prior to construction occurring.</p>
<p><i>The Department is concerned with regard to the proposed use of Thorogood Boulevard as a potential 'kiss and drop' with the potential for 210 vehicles to use the street in the morning</i></p>	<p>It is no longer intended that Thorogood Boulevard be used for the kiss and drop off of students. This will</p>

<p>and afternoon peak periods. Thorogood Boulevard is a local road and has not been designed to accommodate large volumes of traffic. Details are required demonstrating how 210 vehicles (identified in the Section 3.3. of the TIA) will be able to access the site without impacting the residents of Thorogood Boulevard entering and exiting their properties.</p>	<p>occur from Hezlett Road with construction of this occurring as part of the application. The cul-de-sac has been designed to facilitate waste collection vehicles.</p> <p>The subdivision plan for the site indicates that the portion of Mossop Way within the site will be constructed and dedicated to Council as a public road.</p>
<p>The turning head at the end of Thorogood Boulevard is also proposed to provide for school waste collection and student drop-off/pick-up. The RtS includes the swept path of a waste collection vehicle manoeuvring into/out of the school site however, no information or swept paths have been provided indicating that service vehicles for Thorogood Boulevard will be able to utilise the turning head in one movement during the school pick-up/drop-off periods. While it is recognised that service vehicles usually do not operate during school drop-off/pick-up periods, design details are required demonstrating the proposed layout, including the number of vehicles the drop-off/pick-up facilities on Thorogood Boulevard are proposed to cater for. The additional information is to include the swept path of a service vehicle which typically services Kellyville, taking into consideration the part(s) of the cul-de-sac which is proposed to be used for the drop-off/pick-up.</p> <p>The above matters should be included in the Heads of Agreement with Council and submitted to the Department for assessment.</p> <p>Additionally, the Department requires the determination notice of the Early Works DA (800/2018/HA) submitted with Council prior to the determination of the SSD application.</p>	<p>The subdivision plan indicates that a cul-de sac turning head will provided within the current site to facilitate vehicle movements.</p> <p>It is not intended that the Turning Head will be utilised as a kiss and drop zone and in this regard, it is requested that a condition be imposed requiring No Stopping -Service Vehicles Excluded signage to be installed in the cul-de-sac head.</p> <p>The design of the cul-de-sac has been amended to maintain the verge areas of the adjacent properties. The design also allows for the waste collection vehicle to turn around without reversing.</p> <p>The Heads of Agreement between DOE and THSC is currently being finalised and will be forwarded upon finalisation.</p> <p>The Early Works DA was approved by The Hills Council on 30 January 2018. A copy of the determination notice and stamped plans have been provided to the Department.</p>
<p>Further to the above, the Green Travel Plan (GTP) submitted as part of the application should be revised to include, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>objectives and targets (i.e. site-specific, measurable, achievable and timeframes for implementation) to define the direction and purpose of the GTP;</li> <li>actions to help achieve the objectives;</li> <li>measures to promote and support the implementation of the plan, including financial and human resource requirements; and</li> </ul>	<p>The Traffic engineer has revised these comments and advises that: <i>It will not be possible to develop a full travel plan until the school is operational and has a teacher, student and parent population to engage with.</i></p> <p>Given this it is requested that conditions of consent be imposed to ensure the implementation of a GTP once operations commence.</p>

- a process for monitoring and review that allows for the effectiveness of the GTP to be measured.

## 2. Response to Agency Submissions

Part 2 of this letter addresses the key issues raised by both the Department of Planning and Agency Submissions. The following table addresses remaining issues.

### AGENCY RESPONSE TABLE

Issue	Response
<b>1 The Hills Council</b>	
<p><i>As identified in previous correspondence, Council staff remain concerned with the reliance on on-street parking and the appropriateness of the kiss and drop zones given the size and location of the school. Should the Department support the limited on-site parking provided and kiss and drop zone on Hezlett Road, it is recommended that the Department of Education be required to undertake appropriate road works such as a sealed shoulder on Hezlett Road that would facilitate a useable kiss and drop in time for the school to open. Further, 'No Parking' signs will permit set downs and pick ups until all the adjacent roads are built as Hezlett Road on its own will not provide the space required for the demand. The school should also make provision for a signalised crossing on Hezlett Road given its status as a sub-arterial road upon opening.</i></p>	<p>The updated Traffic Impact Assessment indicates that a 90m kiss and drop zone will be provided along Hezlett Road in front of the school and the adjoining Council reserve.</p> <p>The revised proposal also includes the construction of an extension to Hipwell Avenue with cul-de-sac end. The Hipwell Avenue extension will also facilitate the provision of off-street parking spaces. It is considered that both of these zones will provide appropriate drop off parking for the school.</p> <p>It is agreed that a signalised crossing on Hezlett Road is warranted and this forms part of the revised application. The design and staged construction of the pedestrian crossing will be managed in accordance with RMS guidelines by The Hills Shire Council and funded by the Department of Education.</p>
<p><i>These works must be added to the scope of the proposal and an amended engineering plan prepared and submitted showing this. The response to submissions letter still wrongly assumes Hezlett Road fronting the site is planned to be a "town centre road" not a sub-arterial road. The DCP clearly shows which part of Hezlett Road forms part of the sub-arterial road network and which part is a town centre road (namely, that part</i></p>	<p>It is requested that the DOP condition that the detailed design of these works within the road reserve be co-ordinated with and approved by The Hills Council prior to construction occurring within the road reserve.</p>

*in front of the actual town centre further north). The response to submissions letter calls for either a marked pedestrian crossing or a signalised pedestrian crossing on Hezlett Road without considering the warrants or actual delivery of either as part of this planned development.*

*Significant concern also remains regarding the non-provision of DCP Roads within the site. The site owner has an obligation to provide these roads to facilitate orderly development of the precinct. If these roads are not to be provided and the ILP varied, the Applicant shall demonstrate how adjoining sites or land owned by the Department of Education, surplus to this application (foreshadowed to be sold), could be reasonably development in accordance with the planning controls applying to the land. Given the encumbrance of road construction, concern would be raised in relation to the feasibility of these development sites.*

*The response to submissions letter provides some commentary on this matter, however it links it to future/ planned applications, arrangements and an assumption that someone else will deal with it on the basis that "there is a high demand for land in the precinct". From an orderly development perspective this is not considered sufficient. It should be noted in relation to comments provided in relation to Mossop Way that Council staff have made no agreements to construct the Mossop Way link Road to Hezlett Road and this form part of this application. The completion of this missing link, along with the turning head at the end of Thorogood Boulevard, are needed at an absolute minimum in order to at least complete that part of the pre-planned road network and in response to the changes to the ILP planned as part of the development of the school. Council has received complaints from local residents with respect to these two roads now, before the additional traffic and on-street parking demand generated by the planned school need to be taken into account also. In relation to Thorogood Boulevard, the Applicant makes the comment that the cul-de-sac area could be used as a pick up/drop off area within the school grounds. The cul-de-sac diameter provided is the minimum to allow a waste collection vehicle to turn around without the need to reverse (which is a Council requirement). The cul-de-sac would need to be signposted "no parking" in order to comply with this intent. This would mean the use of this area as the only drop off area until Hezlett Road is upgraded is unreasonable further justifying the need for the works in Hezlett Road noted earlier. The response to submissions letter notes an intent to dedicate this cul-de-sac to the public as public road as part of the planned development.*

The revised application seeks approval for the construction of Hipwell Avenue and the completion of Mossop Way as illustrated on the subdivision plan (Appendix F). The provision of these two roads in conjunction with the turning head for Thorogood Boulevard will facilitate the orderly development of the precinct. The movement network that will result from the construction of the roads will facilitate the intent of the DCP road network which is to provide vehicular access to Curtis Road and then to Hezlett Road.

Given the expanded application that improves the road network as part of this application, and the construction of drop zones in Hezlett Road, it is not considered that the proposed school will unduly impact on surrounding residents.

A plan showing the proposed new site boundary (namely, a subdivision plan) is required. As above, Council already receives complaints about parked vehicles blocking driveways and the existing (temporary) turning facility at the southern end of Thorogood Boulevard now. This issue must be properly addressed as part of the planned school development and in response to the fact the school seeks to remove the planned extension of this road as called for by the ILP. The plans show bins stored along the edge of the roadway, which means waste collection is expected to occur from the cul-de-sac contrary to the intent of providing for this turning area.

A subdivision plan accompanies this re-submission.

The actual planned extent of the cul-de-sac shown on the submitted plan extends into the existing road verge north of the site too. This would impact on the two properties on either side immediately to the north and reduce the verge area (minimum 3.5m). The cul-de-sac and associated verge area must be provided wholly within the subject site as advised previously.

Amended plans have been prepared and the cul-de-sac and associated verge no longer extend into adjoining private properties.

The stormwater report still refers to managing stormwater with respect to the Upper Parramatta River Catchment Trust OSD Handbook and the need to balance pre-development and post development runoff. As advised previously: The North Kellyville Development Control Plan applies to this site/ development. The Development Control Plan has a very clear set of deemed to comply standards relating to both detention and water quality which are not met. The Development Control Plan does give the option of a site specific stormwater management strategy, however this needs to be accompanied by appropriate calculations and modelling using DRAINS and MUSIC respectively to demonstrate compliance with the overarching targets also set out in the Development Control Plan. In order to progress this matter, Council staff have compared the proposal against the deemed to comply standards from the DCP. Accounting for Hipwell Avenue and the residual land on the eastern side of this road along with Prentice Avenue being excluded the effective site area is approximately 3.228 hectares. Based on this site area and accounting for the roadside swales that will eventually be provided if/ when Hipwell Avenue

GHD's engineers have revised this comment and advise that:

The North Kellyville Development Control Plan applies to this site; however, it states in section 6.1 of the DCP that "All stormwater drainage Designs are to comply with the most up to date revision of the Council's (THSC) Design Guidelines Subdivisions/ Developments". In Section 4.22 of the latest Design Guidelines Subdivisions/Developments, it states that On-Site Stormwater Detention is to be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Upper Parramatta River Catchment Trust (UPRCT) On-Site stormwater Detention Handbook. Therefore, the report refers to the UPRCT handbook in the report.

and Prentice Avenue adjacent are constructed, the stormwater management measures proposed would appear to provide sufficient treatment. The stormwater management measures proposed includes the 900 cubic metre OSD storage tank, the 22.5 cubic metre rainwater reuse tank, 200 metres of grassed swale, 10 enviropods (or an approved equivalent) and the jellyfish chamber (or an approved equivalent). With respect to this however, there are still discrepancies that need to be addressed:

- The stormwater report refers to 900 cubic metres of OSD storage however the stormwater plan shows only 634.5 cubic metres of storage.

As per the UPRCT On-site Stormwater Detention Handbook, above ground storage is to be used for stormwater detention where possible. Therefore, the In-Ground Tank provides 634.5m<sup>3</sup> of stormwater storage, which is enough for the 20 year storm event, with the additional 265.5 m<sup>3</sup> of storage provided in the aboveground basin (grassed area) for the case of a 100 Year storm event.

- The stormwater report refers to a 12.5 cubic metre rainwater tank however the stormwater plan refers to a 22.5 cubic metre rainwater tank.

The Plans are correct, and the Rainwater Tank is to be 22.5m<sup>3</sup>. The report has been updated with the correct figure.

- The stormwater plan still does not show what roof areas are intended to drain to the rainwater reuse tank.

The updated stormwater plan that accompanies this submission indicates the area of the roof that will drain to the rainwater re-use tank.

- The grassed swales are still not shown on the stormwater plan (contrary to the response to submissions letter).

The grassed swales were illustrated in red on the previous stormwater set.

The stormwater plan does not include the detail previously requested for the stormwater connection to Hipwell Avenue, however noting that these works within an existing dedicated public road will require separate approval from Council under the Roads Act 1993 this matter could be dealt with post determination if needed:

As offered, it is requested that this issue be conditioned.

The existing pits and pipes need to be identified via survey and reflected on the plans to show that the pipe sizes and levels included on the design will actually work.

An existing pit was identified along Hipwell Road and the proposed stormwater is to connect to that pit. Refer to the Note on Drawing No. 21-26108-KN-SD-CI-1010. Given this it is considered that the submitted plans demonstrate that the design will appropriately convey stormwater from the site.

### 3. Department of Primary Industry

The department has reviewed the response to submissions and is satisfied that all matters of regulatory interest have been adequately addresses. The department recommends the following conditions be included in the planning consent should the project be approved,

Noted

- The proponent must develop the stormwater management plan in consultation with Lands and Water within 12 months of determination.
- Any works undertaken within watercourses or waterfront lands should be conducted in accordance with Lands and Water Division's Guidelines for Controlled Activities.

The DOE agrees to this suggested condition of consent.

As no works are proposed to be undertaken within watercourse or waterfront land this condition is not warranted.

### 4. EPA

#### EARLY WORKS

Should so-called 'early works' be approved under a separate consent process, the EPA anticipates that the proponent as a public authority would nevertheless take full account of the EPA's EIS submission and recommendations, including those in respect of:

(a) dam de-watering;

The EPA emphasises the importance of ensuring:

- (a) a seamless transition and hand over of environmental control and management measures (e.g. site remediation, erosion and sediment controls, dust minimisation and mitigation measures) provided during the 'early works' phase, particularly if those works are to be undertaken by a contractor other than the contractor undertaking the works the subject of this proposal;

#### EARLY WORKS

(b) hours during which works are undertaken (i.e. 7.00 am to 6.00 pm Monday to Friday and 8.00 am to 1.00 pm Saturdays).

Early works' activities would be carried on by such practicable means as may be necessary to prevent, control or minimise pollution, the emission of any noise and the generation of waste. Further, those means would include the environment protection measures outlined in the EPA's advice and

The proponent as a state government agency values the EPA's input into the process and acknowledges the importance of appropriately managing the construction impacts of the development and has carefully considered potential impacts from this stage of the project.

The hours of operation approved in the Early Works application are 7am to 5pm Monday To Saturday. This is one hour less than suggested by the EPA on weekdays and it is unlikely that early work's DA will regularly occur after 1pm on a Saturday. Given this the

(a) *recommendations in respect of this project.*

intent of the EPA's suggested work hours are met.

#### **FARM SEDIMENTS**

*The Report is unclear whether the proponent undertook detailed investigation of –*

*(a) potential contamination of sediments accumulated in disused farm dams on the site, including investigation of any fungicide contamination, and  
(b) potential fungicide contamination of soils along natural drainage lines leading into the disused farm dams.*

#### **Recommendation**

*The EPA reiterates its recommendations concerning farm dam sediments and potential fungicide contamination of those sediments and the natural drainage lines leading to those farm dams.*

The Remediation Action Plan has been updated and an assessment of the dam sediment is proposed as part of the RAP.

The assessment will include fungicides and be expanded to include surface soils in natural drainage lines leading to the disused farm dams. Given this the site will be appropriately remediated and suitable for its future use as a school.

#### **ON SITE "REUSE" OF ASBESTOS IMPACTED SOILS**

*Section 8.1.4 to Appendix D to the Report inappropriately uses the term 're-use' in regard to the excavation, placement and cover of asbestos impacted soils beneath a physical barrier. However, clause 81 to the Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulation 2014 states that "a person must not cause or permit asbestos waste in any form to be re-used or recycled.". Whilst, the EPA does not consider the excavation, placement and cover of asbestos impacted soils beneath a physical barrier constitutes 're-use' (for the avoidance of doubt) that term should not be applied to the proposed remediation method.*

The Remediation Action Plan has been amended to remove the term "re-use". The preferred remediation strategy is off-site disposal to landfill. All contaminated material will be removed from the site.

*Nevertheless, the EPA favours removal of asbestos impacted soils from sites proposed to be used for schools in preference to the proposed on site containment of those soils.*

#### **Recommendation**

*Should the proposed on-site containment of asbestos contaminated soils be approved, the EPA recommends that:*

*(a) a long term environmental management plan is developed and used to identify the location and the requirements for ongoing management of asbestos impacted soil and other contaminated soil to be contained on the site;  
(b) an asbestos works management plan with stringent requirements for dust and water should be prepared and implemented upon confirmation from the auditor that the asbestos works management plan is considered to be appropriate.  
(c) all services lie above the marker layer to minimise any risks to workers undertaking future maintenance work in service trenches;*

#### LAND FARMING

Appendix D to the Report proposes on-site 'land farming' of hydrocarbon impacted soil and re-use of farmed soil.

##### Recommendation

That the proponent be required to ensure that any landfarming is undertaken on site in accordance with the EPA's 'Best Practice Note: Landfarming, 2014' and using appropriate environmental control measures, including control of volatile emissions during the landfarming.

All contaminated material is to be removed from the site.

#### SITE AUDITOR

The Table to Report section 4 suggests that a site auditor is not warranted given "... minor levels of site contamination and noting the extensive earthworks proposed."

Given the sensitivity of the proposed use of the development site as a school and the preferred remediation options of on-site landfarming as well as on-site containment of asbestos impacted soils, the EPA reaffirms its recommendation concerning a site auditor.

##### Recommendation

The proponent be required to engage a site auditor accredited under the Contaminated Land Management Act 1997 to undertake an audit to assess whether the site is suitable for the proposed use.

The EPA's comment is noted. Preferred remediation strategy is Off-site disposal of all contaminated soils. Given this the proponent remains of the opinion that the engagement of a Site Auditor considered unnecessary. Tip dockets and Clearance Certificates can be provided to interested parties upon completion of remediation.

#### REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN

The EPA notes that the remedial action plan should be amended to reference the current versions of EPA Guidelines, as follows:

- (a) The NSW Site Auditor Scheme, 3rd edition, 2017, and
- (b) Consultants Reporting on Contaminated Sites, re-print, 2000.

The updated RAP references the current version of these guidelines

#### CONSTRUCTION PHASE - NOISE

Section 4.1.1 to the Report Appendix E indicates "construction activities would generally be carried out during recommended standard construction working hours ..." but appears to ignore the EPA's other advice and recommendations in respect of construction phase noise and vibration impacts. The EPA emphasises the importance of properly managing noise and vibration impacts during site preparation, bulk earthworks, construction and construction-related activities, especially in regard to high noise impact activities, such as grinding, jack hammering, pile driving, rock breaking and hammering, saw cutting and vibratory rolling.

The EPA reaffirms its advice and recommendations in respect of construction phase noise and vibration impacts, including impacts during 'early works'.

Section 5.1 of the updated acoustic report addresses this concern and addresses high noise impact construction activities.

#### CONSTRUCTION PHASE - ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

*In section 4 of the Report the 'Agency Response Table' does not address the EPA's advice and recommendation on key construction phase environmental management issues, including:*

- farm dam de-watering (see above),
- dust control and management,
- erosion and sediment control, and
- waste management.

*The EPA emphasises the importance of properly minimising and managing dust, sediment and waste during site preparation, bulk earthworks, construction and construction-related activities.*

The Waste Management Plan and Preliminary Construction Management Plan that accompany this resubmission have both been updated to include consideration of dam dewatering sediments, site clearing, dust control, remediation and disposal of contaminated soils, erosion and sediment control and waste management.

It is noted that this SSD application no longer seeks approval for these works as they have subject to an early works DA approved by the Hills Shire Council. A copy of this consent has been provided to the Department of Planning.

#### CONSTRUCTION PHASE - OPERATIONAL NOISE

*The Table in section 4 of the to Report indicates that the proponent has adopted EPA nominated noise objectives as an alternative to re-measuring the background noise levels in accordance with guidance material in the New South Wales Industrial Noise Policy.*

*(a) community use (general) The 'Agency Response Table' suggests that in light of the government policy encouraging community use of school facilities and noise predictions accompanying the EIS, the EPA's EIS advice and recommendations concerning responsible community use should be ignored.*

*The EPA's EIS submission explicitly acknowledged government policy encouraging community use of school facilities whilst recommending measures that are warranted to ensure that such use does not result in the emission of 'offensive noise'. The EPA regulates all public authorities, including the Department of Education, and has been obliged on numerous occasions to investigate complaints about offensive noise emitted during community use of Departmental school facilities.*

*Accordingly, the EPA recommended initial limits on community use pending noise compliance monitoring to determine whether noise during representative community use of school facilities would exceed the relevant noise criteria and EIS noise impact predictions.*

*The EPA reaffirms its advice and recommendations concerning community use of school facilities on the development site.*

*(b) school hall*

*Section 5.2 to the Report Appendix D recommends that:*

*(a) the school hall not be used after 10.00 pm, and*

The Acoustic Report has been updated to reflect the advice relating to operational noise previously given by the EPA. This is located in section 5.2 of the updated acoustic report

(b) if noisy events are proposed in the school hall that would generate internal noise levels in excess of 90 dBA additional acoustic treatments should be considered.

*Recommendation*

*The proponent be required to ensure that the school hall is not used after 10.00 pm and that all such measures as may be necessary are adopted such that the school hall is not used for activities likely to generate internal noise levels in excess of 90 dBA.*

5. Transport for NSW

*TfNSW concurs with the DP&E view that the construction of Hipwell Avenue and community car parking will be required prior to opening of school and should be made into a condition that must be satisfied prior to occupation.*

The revised application includes the construction of Hipwell Avenue at the rear of the site and the provision of perpendicular car parking spaces.

*An appropriate temporary turnaround facility should also be provided at the end of Hipwell Avenue to assist school student drop-offs. The turnaround facility could be located at the future intersection of Hipwell Avenue and Prentice Avenue and be removed once Prentice Avenue is connected.*

The revised application includes the construction of Hipwell Avenue at the rear of the site and includes a temporary cul-de-sac to facilitate the appropriate turning of vehicles.

*In relation to Thorogood Boulevard, the Applicant makes the comment that the cul-de-sac area could be used as a pick up/drop off area within the school grounds. The cul-de-sac diameter provided is the minimum to allow a waste collection vehicle to turn around without the need to reverse (which is a Council requirement). The cul-de-sac would need to be signposted "no parking" in order to comply with this intent. This would mean the use of this area as the only drop off area until Hezlett Road is upgraded is unreasonable further justifying the need for the works in Hezlett Road noted earlier.*

Approval is no longer sought to use Thorogood Boulevard as pick up/ drop off area. The Parking Impact Assessment has been updated to reflect this. The TIA also recommends No Stopping signage be implemented at the cul-de-sac to discourage pick-up and drop-off activity, other than for service vehicles.

*The need for any interim pick-up/drop-off arrangements and uncertainty regarding adequate school bus provisions could be circumnavigated should Hezlett Road be widened. The RtS Report states that "it is anticipated that Council will construct the continuation of Mossop Way in conjunction with its major upgrade works of Hezlett Road that are planned for completion in early 2019" (pg. 4). As such, at a minimum, localised widening of Hezlett Road could be provided as part of the*

This comment is agreed with and Hezlett Road is proposed to be widened to facilitate the drop off and collection of children.

major upgrade works by commencement of school operations in January 2019. This localised widening should provide for kerbside parking, signage, an appropriate crossing and bus stops and form part of the Heads of Agreement with Council.

## 6. RMS

1. It is noted a pedestrian crossing is proposed on Hezlett Road to be designated as children's crossing for the opening year of 2019. However, the proposed location of the pedestrian crossing is not clear from the provided documents. Concern is raised regarding the location of the future pedestrian crossing and existing crest on Hezlett Road. Sight distance assessment should be provided to determine the location of pedestrian crossing.

A desktop analysis of site lines had been conducted by GHD engineers and it is considered that adequate sightlines are able to be provided.

2. As the number of pedestrians crossing the Hezlett Road is currently unknown, Roads and Maritime has no objections to a children crossing being installed on Hezlett Road (provided Hezlett Road operates with a single lane in each direction). The pedestrian crossing design is to be in accordance with AS1742.10-2009, Sect 7 and Roads and Maritime practices. This facility will need to be approved by the Local Traffic Committee prior to construction.

The updated TIA anticipates this and indicates the proposed pedestrian crossing on Hezlett Road be designated as a children's crossing for the opening year of 2019.

Should the number of unaccompanied children using the pedestrian crossing reach 50 immediately before and after school hours and traffic flows reach 300 vehicles in each direction; the requirement for School Crossing Supervisor can be assessed by Roads and Maritime.

The updated TIA also indicates that the traffic volumes on Hezlett Road will be monitored annually and a signalised mid-block pedestrian crossing be installed when the warrant is met.

The traffic assessment indicates the warrants for installation of mid-block pedestrian crossing signals are not met for year 2020. Therefore, Roads and Maritime requests the traffic and pedestrian volumes at the proposed pedestrian crossing to be monitored annually and when the warrants for installation of signals are met, the proposed traffic signal design and supporting documentation to be submitted to Roads and Maritime for review and assessment.

## Conclusion

I trust the above in conjunction with the specialist reports and amended architectural, landscaped and stormwater plans that accompany this letter satisfactorily responds to the Department's issues and that any remaining concerns with the project can be conditioned to allow a report recommending approval of the application to be finalised.

To keep this application on track to allow the school to commence operating in 2019, the proponent respectfully requests that determination of the application occur by Wednesday 14 February 2018.

Should you require any further information, I can be contacted on 9687 8899 or 0405 530 095.

Brad Delapierre  
Planning Manager  
**Think Planners Pty Ltd**  
PO BOX 121  
WAHROONGA NSW 2076