<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669</th></tr>
<tr><th>ISSUES IDENTIFIED</th><th>NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED</th><th>COMMENT</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">BUILDING BULK AND SCALE</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ Disappointment the Jeffreys Street Façade is not being upgraded;
▪ Increased height will destroy the view and value of the adjoining properties;
▪ Mass and Density of the development will impact on the adjoining residents and intrude on the skyline;
▪ View impact of the 2.4m acoustic barrier and increase in the parapet height to RL43.49.
▪ Concern over the impact of the new façade element for the entrance raising by 0.67m;
▪ Inadequate setbacks, resultant loss in opportunities to provide meaningful landscaping;
▪ Lack of setback particular acute along 49 Upper Pitt Street and 88 Kirribilli Avenue;
▪ Rectify unsatisfactory and inconsistent material finishes;
▪ There are two Basktetball Courts provided on the Junior Campus;
▪ Increase in building height will impact the existing view corridors;
▪ The new north east wing will see an increase in parapet height;
▪ The proposal would be out of proportion with the Site; 1,100m2 proposed for the Junior Campus;
▪ Failure to comply with the setback provisions, providing a zero metre setback;
▪ PMDL do not consider the amenity of adjoining residents in the Architectural Design Statement;
▪ Overdevelopment of the Site;
▪ Insufficient setbacks proposed from the boundary;
▪ Increase in building height will substantially block views;
▪ Object to the second level extension of the Junior School;
▪ Architectural plans do not provide sufficient details;</td><td>36</td><td>The height, bulk and scale and character of the proposed development is commensurate with the Site and surrounding context.

Primarily submissions were received in relation to the proposed development of the Main Campus.

The built form of the Main Campus has been designed in response to the building height control and consideration of the relevant setback controls. The proposed development across the Main Campus has a maximum RL of 46.17 being the upper most height of the glass lift overrun. The parapet of the redevelopments North-East Wing will retain the existing RL 43.22. Despite the existing non-compliance with building height controls, the proposed development will continue to sit within the existing building envelope and below the existing maximum RL 53.62, of the existing lift overrun.

Pursuant to Clause 4.3 of the North Sydney Local Environmental Plan 2013 (NSLEP 2012), and accompanying height map, a maximum height limit of 12m applies to the Site. The maximum envelope height measured from natural ground level and the relevant areas of departure in metres is summarised in Table 1 below.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Table 1 Building Heights</th></tr>
<tr><th>Building Element</th><th>Proposed</th><th>RL</th><th>Compliance</th></tr>
<tr><td>North-East Wing Parapet</td><td>9.54m (eastern boundary)</td><td>RL43.22</td><td>Yes</td></tr>
<tr><td>New Roof (entrance)</td><td>16.28m</td><td>RL 46.96</td><td>No</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
▪ Significant increase in use of the Junior Campus without discussion in the EIS; ▪ Building Height "creep"; ▪ Unsatisfactory material selection; ▪ Request additional 2m setback along Craiglea adjoining boundary; ▪ Request cement render entire length of wall adjacent to Craiglea and paint to residents satisfaction;		<table><tr><td>Glass Lift Overrun</td><td>29.33m</td><td>RL 46.17m</td><td>No</td></tr><tr><td>Acoustic Barrier (rooftop terrace – eastern boundary)</td><td>13.02m</td><td>RL 41.10</td><td>No</td></tr></table> Notwithstanding the non-compliance with NSLEP 2013, it is important to note that Clause 42 of the Education SEPP was introduced to provide greater flexibility for school development in terms of LEP compliance. Clause 42 states that *'Development consent may be granted for development for the purpose of a school that is State Significant Development even though the development would contravene a development standard imposed by this or any other environmental planning instrument under which the consent is granted'*. Notwithstanding this provision, a Clause 4.6 has been prepared under the original EIS demonstrating that compliance with height of buildings development standard would be unreasonable and unnecessary in these circumstances. Although the proposed development exceeds the prescribed maximum building height, the proposed development is considered to be consistent with the objectives of the LEP height standard. Namely, the proposed development responds to the natural topography of the Site, the heritage significance of the site and surround areas and neighbouring amenity. With respect to compliance with the DCP setback controls, Clause 11 of *State Environmental Planning Policy (State and Regional Development) 2011* expressly states the DCPs do not apply to SSD applications. Notwithstanding, a setback of 3.05m – 4m is provided to the eastern boundary in accordance with **Part 3.3.6** of the *North Sydney Development Control Plan 2013* (NSDCP 2013).

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		Whilst the proposal will seek a variation to the height plane control under NSDCP 2013, this non-compliance does not contribute to the loss of views or solar access from the adjoining apartments to the east. The proposed building setback is consistent with the alignment of the existing building envelopes, and it is not feasible to setback the building further from the eastern boundary due to the need to provide the required teaching and learning space, and the presence of the existing built form in the same location, providing an established building envelope. Whilst the proposed height remains slightly taller than maximum building height, the new development will not be visually prominent and will not impact upon views of the Harbour Bridge and Opera House. This is ensured through proposed setbacks, the siting of the development, and the emphasis on the horizontality of the proposed building. As demonstrated within the Shadow Diagrams in **Appendix N**, adequate solar access will be retained to neighbouring properties. Other aspects of neighbouring amenity, including views and visual and acoustic privacy, will also be maintained and have formed integral design considerations as detailed throughout the supporting documentation. PDML has undertaken further consideration of the proposed materials and finishes. The materiality is considered appropriate in the context of the sit and surrounding built form. The design intent is to use a selection of materials which responds to the surrounding heritage context of Kirribilli, while providing a clear delineation between the existing built form and proposed.

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		The height, bulk and scale of the proposed development is similarly compatibility with the amenity of all neighbouring properties, as described in the accompanying documentation. Whilst the Site is zoned SP2 – Educational Establishment, the development suitably integrates with the residential character of the area for the reasons described above. The proposed building envelope of the Junior Campus is Concept Approval only. Detailed design will be considered as part of a future development application. Notwithstanding, the proposed scale, bulk and location of the addition are considered acceptable in heritage terms as they would not visually dominate the former Milsons Point Public School, the St John the Baptist Anglican Church or the Careening Cove Conversation Area. Overall, the proposed development exhibits a modern appearance, generous setbacks and sympathetic design, which has been informed by detailed view analysis, shadow modelling, and consideration of neighbouring privacy, ensuring the will effectively integrate with the surrounding area. In light of the above, the proposed built form, including associate view impacts, is considered acceptable.
CHARACTER		
▪ St Aloysius College has an adverse impact on the Kirribilli residential precinct and residents; ▪ The school contributes nothing positive to the residential and local amenity; ▪ The development would adversely change the balance of the residential environment of Kirribilli;	5	All three (3) campuses are located within the dense peninsula suburb of Kirribilli. As a long established part of the community, the College aims for its facilities to be integrated within the local context, whilst providing first class educational facilities for its students.

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		A Character Assessment has been carried out by Roberts Day (**Appendix J**). For the purpose of the Response to Submissions, the Character Assessment only addressed the proposed works to the Main Campus. The Character Assessment has been prepared in accordance with the recently released Planning Circular prepared by the Department of Planning & Environment, *"Stepping up planning and designing for better places: respecting and enhancing local character"*. The character and local community values have been distilled into a series of criteria and used to assess the impact of the proposed development from 13 key vantage points. The Character Assessment, as prepared by Roberts Day, concludes the proposal *genuinely respects and responds to the Kirribilli local character and community values, the 4 sub character interfaces and that the interface between the proposed built form and adjoining character is considered appropriate.* The appropriate response of the proposed development to the surrounding character is further reinforced in that the proposal will not change the existing streetscapes and setbacks which are considered to be compatible with the Kirribilli Neighbourhood Local Character. Overall, it is considered, the College remains as an iconic institute of learning in the Kirribilli Neighbourhood local area and does not compromise the scenic values of Kirribilli.
ACCESS		
▪ Consideration of access appears to be an afterthought, as if just ticking a box;	6	A key principle of the proposed development is to provide buildings that are adaptable and flexible, focusing on improving access and circulation.

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		The proposal for the Main Campus provides improved accessibility throughout the campus for users of all levels of mobility. In addition to more extensive lift access, the generosity and configuration of stairways and access links drives the design. The Senior Campus provides challenges in relation to its configuration and heritage status, which have been addressed in the heritage and access assessment submitted with the original EIS. The range of facilities provided has been configured so as to ensure availability of all types of facilities to all users. The Junior Campus concepts are able to be developed as fully accessible solutions, and will be developed as part of the future built form approval.
TRAFFIC & PARKING		
▪ Lack of Parking on the streets surrounding the Main Campus; concern as there is no additional parking proposed under this application; ▪ The lack of drop-off and/or pick-up designated areas; ▪ No additional on-site parking on the Junior Campus; ▪ Lead to increase traffic on small suburban streets; ▪ Limited number of parking spaces (17) within the school grounds limited availability for on-street parking for residents and visitors; ▪ Whilst generally support the improvements to the school facilities, believe the proposal should look to provide more on-site parking facilities; ▪ The development should not progress without the provision of additional on-site parking; ▪ Increased demand on on-site parking; ▪ Fails to provide additional parking with currently only 15 parking spaces available;	61	The Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment submitted with the EIS has determined that the proposed development will not have any adverse impact on the current traffic and parking in the area. The College is committed to ensuring that student drop-off and pick-up continues to be well managed. The College will continue to work with local residents to alleviate their concerns. The existing on-site parking provision for each Campus is clarified in **Table 2** below:

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669</th></tr>
<tr><th>ISSUES IDENTIFIED</th><th>NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED</th><th>COMMENT</th></tr>
<tr><td>

- The redevelopment would provide the ability to provide additional parking on-site;
- Failed to analyse pedestrian and car movements;
- Staff and student utilising restricted on-street parking;
- Jeffrey Street drop-off & pick-up is illegal and poses unacceptable risk;
- Development needs to incorporate on-site drop-off & pick-up zones;
- The school only has 20 internal car spots;
- Using residents to subsidise parking;
- No inclusion of kiss and drop-off/pick-up;
- Congestion will render access roads impassable at certain times of the day;
- No consideration has been given to the current parking situation;
- Lack of staff utilising public transport;
- Lack of traffic management ability considering large amounts of children requiring pick-up and drop-off;
- No additional on-site parking: currently only 19 car spaces for 339 staff and 1244 students;
- Increased traffic between 7:30-9:00am, making it difficult to residents to exit their own properties;
- No provision for on-site student drop off and pick up;
- Failure to comply with on-site parking controls;
- Available car parking in Kirribilli has deteriorated over time due to the growing number of staff and students – the proposal will not rectify loss of parking;
- Car usage will increase with a larger campus;
- Lack of parking provided during demolition and construction;
- Increased traffic along Kirribilli Avenue during demolition and construction;
- Take example from Queenwood School kiss n ride;

</td><td></td><td>

Table 2 | Car Parking Provision

Campus	Parking Provision
Main Campus	▪ The Main Campus does not contain any parking but does include a loading dock facility;
Senior Campus	▪ The Site contains: o Fourteen (14) car parking spaces; o Two (2) Motorbike Parking Spaces; o Ten (10) bicycle parking spaces. ▪ Vehicular access is provided via Robertson Lane; ▪ The parking on-site is available to the staff of the College.
Junior Campus	▪ Ten (10) car parking spaces are located on Site, available to Junior Campus staff.
Star of the Sea Catholic Church	▪ In addition to the on-site parking, an existing arrangement allows the use of the 17 car spaces within the Star of the Sea Catholic Church, on Willoughby Street, Kirribilli by the staff of the College; ▪ Access is provided via Willoughby Street.
TOTAL	▪ 41 Car Parking Spaces ▪ 2 Motorbike Parking Spaces ▪ 10 Bicycle Spaces

Applying the NSDCP 2013 car parking rate of 1 parking space per 6 staff, the College as a whole would require 30 on-site car parking spaces. As per the addendum Traffic Impact Assessment (**Appendix F**) this calculation is based

</td></tr>
</table>

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
▪ Provide parking in accordance with NSDCP 2013.		on the following Equivalent Full Time (EFT) staff population by type, as provided by the College: **Senior School:** ▪ Teaching: 93.6 EFT; ▪ Non-Teaching: 44.3 EFT **Junior School:** ▪ Teaching: 21.2 EFT; ▪ Non-Teaching: 16.1 EFT **TOTAL: 176 EFT Staff** In light of the above, the College currently has a combined total of 43 parking spaces across the three campuses; 41 general vehicle and 2 motorcycle. Therefore, it is considered the College as a whole has an excess of 13 parking spaces. In summary of the above, the proposal provides adequate on-site parking to accommodate the generated demand by the existing education establishment. This demand can be accommodated with little reliance on street parking. Thereby, the proposal will not exacerbate the on-street parking. This is further supported through the implementation of the GTP which aims to encourage non-car modes of travel. As aforementioned, the GTP indicates mode share target for students travelling to school by car of 25% (down from 30% in 2017) and from school by car of 15% (down from 19% in 2017), which is considered achievable two years after completion of redevelopment Phase 2 (Upper Pitt Street).

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		Overall, the appropriate measures will be adopted to minimise the impact for traffic and parking on the local street network and it is considered the proposal not contribute to increased parking demand or traffic congestion. The College, as a whole, has been provided by Council two (2) areas of pick-up/drop-off. Due to the existing site constraints, including existing buildings, heritage items, landscape features, topography and the need to retain existing-on-site parking, it is unfeasible to accommodate additional pick-up and drop-off on the Campus sites. Therefore, based on the findings of the Traffic and Parking Impact Assessment submitted with the EIS, the Addendum Traffic Statement and the implementation of a Green Travel Plan to encourage non-car modes of travel, combined with the ongoing assurance that no increase in student/staff population would occur, the proposed development will not result in any adverse traffic or parking impacts.
ACOUSTIC IMPACT		
▪ Noise generated from the rooftop terrace; request restrictions on the use of the terrace; ▪ The new rooftop playground will create additional noise; ▪ The volume of noise from students is likened to that of Pitt Street Mall; ▪ The proposed court will generate unacceptable noise; ▪ Increase of students moving between the campuses. ▪ Accuracy of the acoustic report in terms of surface material and no additional information on the 2.4m acoustic barrier, nor the view impacts of the structures on the rooftop; ▪ Increased noise from outside play and entertainment areas; ▪ Intrusion from elevated sports facility;	18	SLR have prepared an addendum Noise Impact Assessment which accompanies this application as **Appendix I**, in support of the original Noise Impact Assessment submitted with the original EIS Under **Section 5.1.1.2** of the Noise Impact Assessment submitted with the EIS, the noise model took into account hard surfaces and highly reflective materials on the rooftop terraces, as set out in the Landscape Plan submitted with the EIS. The complete surface of the rooftop terrace was modelled as hard ground as a worst-case scenario. Any future proposed soft-landscaping will only have a positive impact by further lowering noise emissions.

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
▪ Possible additional use of rooftop terrace will increase noise levels.		The original acoustic assessment predicted noise levels at the affected residential receivers for the existing operational scenario. It was concluded the relocation of quadrangle functional area, to the rooftop terrace would in fact improve the noise impact on adjoining residents, as any noise produced would be elevated. The reduction in noise generated would also be assisted with the erection of a 2.4m acoustic barrier. With the implementation of an acoustic barrier of 2.4m; noise models taken from 2.1m, around the perimeter of the proposed rooftop terrace of the infill building on the main campus, the proposed changes will in fact reduce the current school noise impacts on the most highly impact receivers. In light of the above, the acoustic amenity will be improved as a result of the proposed development.
STUDENT NUMBERS		
▪ Student numbers may not increase, but the larger teaching areas will most likely result in an increase in teaching staff, and therefore additional parking; ▪ The proposed increase in learning facilities will give raise to an increase in student numbers; ▪ The school has reached the point where the locality cannot accommodate any further growth in student numbers; ▪ Student numbers should be reduced; ▪ Increase in student and staff numbers will result in increased pedestrian, care and bus traffic; ▪ Request cap on student numbers; ▪ How many SAC students reside in the North Sydney LGA?	24	There are no anticipated increases in student and staff numbers as a result of the proposed development. The College is currently used as an educational establishment for boys with an overall population of **1244** students across the three (3) campus. Pursuant to the EIS, the student population and enrolment of **1244** students is currently broken down into the following: ▪ Junior Campus: **321 students**; and ▪ Senior and Main Campus: **923 students**. Student numbers can vary term to term, and year to year, ordinarily attributed to annual fluctuation for Educational Establishments given growing population. Fluctuations in enrolments can be due to changes in population and parental

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		preference. Consequently, staff numbers may also fluctuate at schools depending on student numbers and specialist learning needs of the school. It is noted by the College that Junior Campus numbers have fluctuated between 330 and in 2011 and 328 in 2018, with a minimum of 320 in 2013 and 2017, and a maximum of 330 in 2011. The fluctuation arises from different rates to accommodate available positions from year to year. The fluctuation since 201 is less than 2% about the mean. In terms of the Main and Senior Campus, following completion of the Dalton Hall addition in 2010, and as a result of the additional class room space resulting from the work, senior school numbers increase over 2011 to 2013 from 878 to 924 students. The numbers have stabilised at this level, with very small year-to-year fluctuations since 2013. As aforementioned, the Senior School Numbers are currently at 926. Year-to-year fluctuation has been less than 0.5% about the mean. The College's brief requires a general learning "home room" for each of the six (6) streams, through years 7-12. Years 11 and 12 are accommodated in the Senior Campus, and years 7-10 are accommodated in the Main Campus, within the proposed courtyard infill works. The design for the Main Campus therefore provides for six (6) general learning spaces which serve as home room for each of Years 7-10. As such the proposal provides the adequate learning and teaching facilities to accommodate the relevant student and staff population. Notwithstanding the above, the SSDA currently under consideration by the Department of Planning and Environment, has no intention for a material increase in students. Therefore, it is considered the above information provides further certainty there will be no material increase in student number, only that attributed to annual minor fluctuation.

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		The design for the Main Campus therefore provides for six (6) general learning spaces which serve as home room for each of Years 7-10. These are indicated on drawings **DAU125** and **DAU126**. The six (6) stream structure matches the current enrolment and structure, and is not designed to accommodate additional student enrolments. The spaces provided are appropriate for a typical number of students per call, and are in line with education facility norms. Specialist spaces, including science and art, are in addition to the general learning areas and are provided to meet the curriculum needs of the school in relation to NESA requirements and the academic focus of the College. Therefore, the proposed design addresses the College's brief requirement for contemporary learning environments, and is not based on any future increase in enrolment numbers. Once again there is no intention to increase student numbers under this application.
VIEW IMPACT		
▪ Concern of view impact from the proposed 2.4m glass balustrade and associated increase in height from the Upper Pitt Street Building. ▪ The Main Campus development will result in view loss. ▪ Loss of view cause by the Grandstand; ▪ Visual impact montages are not certified as being true and accurate; ▪ Request evening montages; ▪ Proposed development will obstruct views to the Harbour Bridge;	32	The proposed development has been designed with respect to neighbouring views, including views obtained from 48 Upper Pitt Street, 49 Upper Pitt Street, 50-58 Upper Pitt Street and 88 Kirribilli Avenue. As confirmed through the amended View Impact Assessment (VIA) (**Appendix E**), and **Section 2.1** of the accompanying RTS report, views of the Harbour Bridge, Opera House, and city will be maintained.

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
▪ The increase in height of the Main Campus will impact on views of the Level 3 apartments at 48 Upper Pitt Street; ▪ View impact of the 2.4m acoustic barrier and increase in the parapet height to RL43.49; ▪ Residents of 48 Upper Pitt Street concerned with view impacts and view loss; ▪ The 2.4m acoustic barrier on the southern side of the building will impede existing views; ▪ The rooftop terrace will impede views; ▪ The visual impact montages are not certified and true and accurate; ▪ New buildings will impact on views; ▪ Uncertainty on how the development will be viewed from Craiglea Property.		The analysis of view impacts shows that the proposed development would not cause undue impacts to the existing view corridors. The key vantage points and the respective impacts are as follows: ▪ Views from Level 2 and Level 3, 48 Upper Pitt Street will not be affected by rooftop terrace landscaping and glazed barriers due to the level difference between the rooftop terrace and the north-east wing fronting Upper Pitt Street; ▪ The overall height of the built form when viewed from Craiglea House will capture the Acoustic Barrier, however, the barrier will have no undue impacts as it is constructed of frameless glass and maintain views into the distance through the materials proposed; ▪ The proposal would see no change to the current views afforded to the lower levels of No. 88 Kirribilli Avenue. Overall, the visual impacts assessed from the multiple vantage points surrounding the Site consistently result in impacts considered to be low to moderate, and in some cases, negligible, using the qualitative ratings recommended in *Tenacity.* As outlined above, the VIA was prepared by Roberts Day, a third party consultant. The accuracy of the VIA is based on the following process and information: ▪ Plotting the vantage points using accurate survey details of the site and proposal; ▪ Digitally linking the co-ordinate data into Google Earth; ▪ Creating a 3D Sketchup model of the terrain;

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		▪ Digitally linking the massing model of the proposed built form to the GE for broader context understanding and to match the model view to the photo position and view angle; ▪ Photo-editing the hybrid photo/model views to reflect landscaping, intended built form, and lighting. Therefore, the visual impact photomontages are certified as being true and accurate. Further, due to the sensitivity of the area and valuable views to Sydney Harbour, RobertsDay have used actual existing photos for the VIA (**Appendix E**), which is considered a more accurate and reliable approach. Although the VIA does not cover all the private view points potentially impacts, it carefully selects the most impacts apartments and the ones which are representative to the other apartments in the same building. In light of the above, it is considered that the visual impacts proposed are acceptable and are consistent with the principles established by Senior Commissioner Roseth of the Land and Environment Court of NSW in the judgement in *Tenacity Consulting v Warringah [2004] NSWLEC 140.*
CONSTRUCTION		
▪ Duration of the construction period; ▪ Impacts of the construction on parking and traffic movement; ▪ Concern over the wellbeing of the students during the construction period. ▪ Lack of parking during construction; ▪ Concern over the proposed construction timeframe; ▪ Object to the approval of the concept plan of the Junior Campus, as it will not be developed for 10 years; ▪ Logistics of construction vehicle movement around the Junior Campus;	26	The intent of the Concept Master Plan is to provide the school and the community with certainty around the future built form outcome for the Site. Construction, along with traffic and pedestrian safety will be managed in accordance with a detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP)which will be prepared by the contractor prior to the commencement of works. The necessary controls will be put in place prior to the commencement of construction in line with the approved CTMP.

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
▪ Provide clear indication of construction program; ▪ Disruption of 7 year construction period; ▪ No specific dates have been provided for the construction timeframe for the Junior Campus; ▪ Lack of parking will be heightened by the complexity of traffic movement through construction period; ▪ 7 year construction period will affect the use and enjoyment of adjoining properties; ▪ Concern with truck movements, staging of construction, pedestrian management; ▪ Concern over impact on Crescent Place laneway access; ▪ Confusion over short and long term implications of the approvals – wholesale revision is required; ▪ Construction is due to start in 2018 with no adequate community consultation; ▪ Relocate students to Riverview to expediate construction process; ▪ Local streets not capable of accommodating construction vehicles; ▪ No consideration given to the boundary along Craiglea; ▪ Request work to be completed along Craiglea boundary as quickly as possible to reduce impact on residents; ▪ 7 year construction would be intolerable imposition on the lifestyle and privacy of the residents of Craiglea House;		In addition, mitigation measures will be put in place to minimise amenity impacts on surrounding residents. These measures will be detailed in the approved CTMP. Overall construction will be managed in accordance with the Construction Management Plan as well as additional documentation to be prepared on appointment of the contractor, including a Safety Management Plan, Environmental and Site Management Plan, Traffic Management Plan, Programme, Work Method Statement, Dilapidation Report, Licences and Insurances. The detailed program and methodology to be submitted by the contractor will be required to account for the proximity of neighbouring properties, acoustic treatment, traffic management and hazardous materials. Dilapidation Reports will also be prepared to ensure that no structural damage is incurred by neighbouring properties. Accordingly, demolition and construction will be carried out in a way that minimises disruption to the surrounding context (including neighbours and traffic) and maximises safety (including the safety of all site users). In accordance with **Section 8.11** of the submitted EIS, and reiterated in the Preliminary Construction Traffic & Pedestrian Management Plan, the proposed hours of construction are: ▪ 7:00am to 5.00pm Monday to Friday; ▪ 8:00am to 1:00pm on Saturday. The proposed construction hours are in accordance with Council's standard construction hours.

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		Notwithstanding the above, demolition and excavation works are proposed from 8:00am to 5:00pm Monday to Friday only. No work is to be carried out on Sundays or Public Holidays unless prior approval is granted by North Sydney Council. As previously mentioned, Phase 1 and Phase 2 have a combined construction period of 7 years. It is noted that the external works will not occur for the entire 7 year period. The majority of the construction period will be the completion of internal works. External works are anticipated to occur across a two year period, however, the College will continue to work collaboratively with the local residents to keep them updated on construction timeframes.
EXCAVATION		
▪ Concern over the noise, vibration, dust and potential cracking and destabilisation of properties during excavation for Junior School; ▪ Little understanding of the extent of excavation for the Junior school; ▪ Further consideration is to be given of the excavation of the Junior Campus; ▪ At DA Stage excavation should include a dilapidation report for each house; ▪ Concern over excavation and the associated vibration, stability of neighbouring properties, noise and dust; ▪ Excavation will significantly impact on trees in the vicinity of the Junior Campus; ▪ No detail of the impact of the excavation on adjoining neighbours is provided.	14	There is no bulk excavation planned for either Phase 1 or Phase 2 of the construction programme, including the works at the Main Campus and Senior Campus. Only detailed is excavation required for Phase 1 (Senior Campus) and Phase 2 (Main Campus) including service/infrastructure works. The Junior Campus design would include bulk excavation and would be subject to a future development application. Any future detailed submissions would include full design detail covering all aspects around ground water management, geotechnical stability and civil and structural obligations. It is noted excavation adjacent to the trees located on the Junior Campus will only be carried out under Arborist supervision.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669</th></tr>
<tr><th>ISSUES IDENTIFIED</th><th>NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED</th><th>COMMENT</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">OVERSHADOWING AND SOLAR ACCESS</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ Impact of the proposed infill building on the Main Campus on adjoining residents in terms of solar access, in particular 88 Kirribilli Avenue;
▪ Objection to the second storey addition of the Junior School as it will cause overshadowing;
▪ The proposed will overshadow existing developments;
▪ Overshadowing of adjoining Craiglea Apartments;
▪ Sunshine/shadow projections are inadequately detailed.</td><td>8</td><td>As a result of the proposed development on the Main Campus, adequate solar access will be preserved for surrounding properties, including 88 Kirribilli Avenue.

As shown within the Shadow Diagrams submitted in support of the original EIS (Appendix 11), and resubmitted as Appendix N with the RTS Report, the required two (2) hours of sunlight will be gained by the property in question. Specifically, the solar access achieved for each individual unit is summarised in Table 3 below.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="4">Table 3 | Solar Access for 88 Kirribilli Avenue</th></tr>
<tr><th>No.</th><th>Existing</th><th>Proposed</th><th>Hours Lost</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>0h</td><td>0h</td><td>n/a</td></tr>
<tr><td>2</td><td>0h</td><td>0h</td><td>n/a</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>0h</td><td>0h</td><td>n/a</td></tr>
<tr><td>4</td><td>1h</td><td>1h</td><td>n/a</td></tr>
<tr><td>5</td><td>4h</td><td>3h</td><td>n/a</td></tr>
<tr><td>6</td><td>3h</td><td>3h</td><td>n/a</td></tr>
<tr><td>7</td><td>5.5h</td><td>3.5h</td><td>2h</td></tr>
<tr><td>8</td><td>5h</td><td>3h</td><td>2h</td></tr>
</table>
</td></tr>
</table>

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		Given that adequate solar access will be maintained, the proposal is not considered to cause any unacceptable loss of natural light.
PRIVACY		
▪ Loss of privacy from the proposed Rooftop Terrace; ▪ Additional height of the Junior Campus will impact on privacy with windows looking directly into adjoining residents.	11	The overall intention of the proposed development is to sensitively respond to maintain the privacy of adjoining residents, as well as the school community. The Main Campus is located adjacent to medium and high density residential development. The location of the North-East wing and infill building has been configured to ensure there are no undue impact on the visual privacy of the neighbouring developments. This has been achieved by the following: ▪ The eastern façade of the building allows natural light and ventilation into the building and filters and external views to the east; ▪ The built form has a varying setback 3.5m to 4.05m from the eastern boundary, separated by landscaped areas and is at a lower level; ensuring adequate separation; ▪ A 3-5 metre landscape setback will be provided on the rooftop terrace to minimise opportunities of overlooking. In light of the above, and as outlined in the supporting documentation, there is unlikely to be any adverse privacy impacts as a result of the use of the rooftop terrace. The proposed extension of the Junior Campus will be orientated in order to alleviate privacy impacts on adjoining residential properties. This will be addressed further under a future development application.

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
PLANNING AND APPROVALS PROCESS		
▪ Proposed height is in breach of the planning restrictions; ▪ The development of the Junior Campus does not provide sufficient information on the detailed design; ▪ Failed to comply with LEP and DCP including on-site parking, setbacks and landscaping – the development should be refused; ▪ This is not Master Plan; ▪ Challenge the validity of the application being a Master Plan; ▪ The proposal is not State Significant; ▪ It is unreasonable to encumber neighbouring properties with a concept plan approval for development that will adversely affect their properties, which will then not be acted on in 10 years; ▪ If the Junior School Concept Plan is approved the School will be given an automatic future right to build an extra level on the school building, excavate and construct a basement level multi-purpose hall and create a new basket-ball court and stands, without showing and considering the significant adverse impact on residents; ▪ It is suggested that the school defer the Junior School Concept Plan from the SSD application at this time and enter into discussions with the neighbours about the proposals and how to best meet the needs of the school and take into account neighbours' issues; ▪ Approving the Concept of the Junior Campus will give the School automatic future right to build an extra level, excavate, and construct a multipurpose hall and new basketball court, with little consideration of the residents; ▪ Insufficient information provided for the three campuses; ▪ Residents will not be entitled to lodge any objectives when the school finally submits detailed plans; ▪ Insufficient detail provided for Junior Campus;	21	The subject SSDA 8669 is undertaken under a defined statutory process to which the College is following. The Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act) is the overarching governing document for all development in NSW. Pursuant to Section 4.36(2), of the EP&A Act provides that: *A State Environmental Planning Policy may declare any development, or any class or description development, to be State Significant Development.* The proposed development is identified as State Significant Development under SRD SEPP. Development for an Educational Establishment with a capital investment of more than $20 million is identified in Schedule 1 of *State Environmental Planning Policy (State and Regional Development) 2011* (SEPP SRD) and is therefore declared to be SSD for the purpose of EP&A Act. Clause 15 and Schedule 1 of SEPP SRD 2011 identifies classes of development which are SSD, which includes the following: *Education Establishments – Development for the purpose of Educational Establishments (including associated facilities) that has a capital investment value of more than $20m.* Pursuant to Section 4.12 (8), *a development application for State Significant Development or Designated Development is to be accompanied by an Environmental Impact Statement prepared by or on behalf of the applicant in the form prescribed by the regulations*. Accordingly, the submitted EIS met the relevant requirements.

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
▪ The proposed development is not a Master Plan; ▪ Object to the approval of the Junior Campus.		As aforementioned under **Section 2.9** of the RTS report, Section 4.22 of the EP&A Act outlines the provisions for concept development applications and staged development. Pursuant to Section 4.22, consent is sought for the stage development, inclusive of a Concept Master Plan and Stage 1 Built Form Approval. The built form approval for the Junior Campus will be subject to a future DA. In addition, as aforementioned, Clause 42 of the Education SEPP was introduced to provide greater flexibility for school development in terms of LEP compliance. Clause 42 states that *'Development consent may be granted for development for the purpose of a school that is State Significant Development even though the development would contravene a development standard imposed by this or any other environmental planning instrument under which the consent is granted'*. Further, Development Control Plans are not a matter of consideration for State Significant Development Applications. Clause 11 of *State Environmental Planning Policy (State and Regional Development) 2011* states that: *11. Exclusion of application of development control plans* *Development control plans (whether made before or after the commencement of this Policy) do not apply to:* *(a) State Significant Developments* *…*

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		Notwithstanding the above, consideration has been given to the relevant planning controls, in particular setback controls, and a Clause 4.6 has been prepared under the original EIS demonstrating that compliance with height of buildings development standard for both the Main Campus and Junior Campus would be unreasonable and unnecessary in these circumstances. In light of the above, SSDA 8669, has satisfied the requirements to be considered a State Significant Development and will continue to be assessed under the current defined statutory process, and will continue to be assessed in this manner.
OPEN SPACE		
▪ Lack of open space across the Site; no intention to improve; ▪ Failure to comply with landscaping controls; ▪ Lack of existing open space at boundaries; ▪ Zero landscaping is proposed; ▪ There is not enough outdoor space across all three sites, and not just artificial enclosed spaces; ▪ Inadequate landscaping along Craiglea boundary;	14	The proposed open space is contextually appropriate for the College being located in a dense inner city suburb. The activation of the rooftop as a recreation area provides a nett increase in open space on the Main Campus, and this open space is foreseen to have significantly greater amenity than the existing courtyard. At present, the existing Main Campus features no landscaped elements, whereas the proposal includes significant and carefully considered landscaped space on the roof terrace level, improving both the amenity for users and those who overlook the Site. The future development of the Junior Campus will contribute further to the provision of functional active recreational space.
TREE RETENTION		
▪ It is imperative that the Junior Campus retain the existing trees along Bligh Street; ▪ Objection to the removal of trees 54, 55 and 57 along Bligh Street;	22	All tree along Bligh Street are proposed to be retained. In particular, trees identified as 54, 55 and 57 will be retained and protected as a result of the

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
▪ Trees to be removed should be clearly identified; ▪ Not against the school being developed but must work within its natural assets; ▪ Retain trees marked 54, 55 and 57; ▪ Nil setback to Bligh Street may impact on existing vegetation; ▪ Retain trees along Bligh Street; ▪ How many trees are to be retained?; ▪ Probable loss of existing vegetation; ▪ Retention of Tree 60. ▪ Independent arborist to be engaged to ensure any canopy proposed to be removed would not destabilise the tree and its root structure; ▪ Landscape plans are inconsistent.		proposed development. The protection of the trees will be carried out in accordance with the recommendations of an Arborist. Further, owing to the high amenity value of Tree 60 to both the College and the adjoining neighbours of 49 Upper Pitt Street, Tree 60 will be retained and protected throughout the development. In order to provide certainty, root investigations were carried out by ArborSafe and an addendum report was prepared and accompanies this application as **Appendix R**. Exploratory trench work was undertaken on 9 October 2018 by means of a third party contractor utilising a Hydro-Vac truck to limit any potential root impact. Three (3) roots were identified within the trench as being large enough, generally over 40mm in diameter to warrant further consideration. Two of the roots were identified as originating from the stump of a previously removed tree, so has no bearing on the assessment, while the remaining root was identified as originating from the subject tree. The root penetrated through a weep hole within the base of the wall, 3.2m to the northwest of the subject tree's trunk alignment. The root was 60mm in diameter, measured 150mm out from the wall, with the diameter being smaller where it penetrated the weep hole. No displacement of any kind was observed within the stones of the wall. AborSafe has concluded at a distance of 3.2m from the truck alignment the root would likely be outside the theoretical Structural Root Zone (SRZ) of the subject tree. Combined with the roots relatively small size and the stability of the wall itself against the remaining root system and associated soil volume, it is considered that serving the root would have minimal to no structural bearing on Tree 60. Overall, it is considered the removal of the garden bed within the courtyard of the St Aloysius College Main Campus, as part of the proposed development,

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		would have minimal effect on the health and structure of the subject tree, Tree 60. As noted, an Arborist will oversee all works within vicinity to the identified root zones of the trees.
LORETO		
▪ Impact of the two development on the local road network; ▪ Failed to consider the Loreto Master Plan and the collective impact; ▪ Two schools are putting their financial interest before that of the local community; ▪ Construction impact of both applications has not been taken into consideration; ▪ Failed to co-ordinate and work with Loreto, with both schools failing to address how they will provide a public benefit; ▪ No explanation of how it will co-ordinate with Loreto over the coming years;	18	The College has met with Loreto Kirribilli on a number of occasions over the course of the last two (2) years and have held fruitful conversations regarding the State Significant Developments being submitted by both schools. Discussions to date have been centred on how the two schools are able to work together to ensure that any approved works are conducted in a manner that is least disruptive to the local community. Both schools are very conscious of the need to ensure close co-ordination of construction schedules and planning in partnership with local groups and authorities. In addition to multiple discussions about the projects, Loreto and the College have met to specifically discuss the co-ordination of high level programming and construction traffic across both projects. The combined project programme review noted the most intensive times of construction across both projects would not overlap. The major construction phase for the College (Phase 2) would occur after Loreto's planned demolition and bulk excavation. In terms of traffic management for construction, vehicles for each school would enter Kirribilli from different points. The only area of concurrent activity would occur at Carabella Street, which would be effectively managed through localised CTMP's for each project. Further, both schools are very keen on a more collaborative approach to sharing resources given our close proximity. This includes the shared use of physical resources and the potential of shared service arrangements.

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669</th></tr>
<tr><th>ISSUES IDENTIFIED</th><th>NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED</th><th>COMMENT</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>The two school's will continue to work collaboratively with one another to ensure appropriate measures are adopted to minimise impact on adjoining residents.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="3">INCONSISTENCY</td></tr>
<tr><td>▪ The plans shown during the public consultation were inaccurate and lacked transparency;
▪ Misleading documentation in EIS, failing to mention the demolition of the four storey building, and implies all work is internal;
▪ EIS is lacking detail on Junior Campus development;
▪ Inconsistency with staff employment numbers;
▪ The EIS documentation contains inconsistencies, inaccuracies and major omissions (for example, There is no lighting plan detailed for the extensive outdoor playground) and contains several unsupported conclusions.
▪ The school should be consistent and honest in its submissions;
▪ EIS does not contain sufficient information on the Junior Camps development to understand the scope and nature of the project;
▪ Provide clarification on the use of the proposed Basketball Court;
▪ Inadequate height dimensions and levels provided in the EIS;
▪ Failure to mention redevelopment of the North-East wing in the EIS;
▪ Quoted staff numbers to TfNSW and RMS are incorrect;
▪ The demolition and rebuild of the North-East wing was not expressed at the community consultation in November 2017;
▪ Omissions and errors in the documentation represents a breach in trust;</td><td>29</td><td>In response to the submissions, all relevant documentation has been updated to rectify any inconsistencies with the proposed information and have been resubmitted as part of this Response to Submissions.

A number of the submissions were concerned with the lack of detail provided for the future development of the Junior Campus. The proposed development has been submitted as a State Significant Development Application for Concept Master Plan and Stage 1 Built Form Approval. The built form approval and detailed design of the Junior Campus will be further considered subject to a future development application submitted to the relevant consent authority.

Further to the above, queries were raised to the accuracy of the proposed staff numbers. Current staff numbers as issued in Section 2.5 of the submitted EIS, are re-issued in the Table 4 below:

Table 4 | Existing Staff Numbers
<table><tr><th>Staff Type</th><th>Current Numbers</th></tr><tr><td>Teaching (Full time and part time)</td><td>122</td></tr><tr><td>Support (Full time and part time)</td><td>63</td></tr><tr><td>Casual</td><td>15</td></tr><tr><td>Co-curricular (coaches)</td><td>102</td></tr><tr><td>Tutors (Instrumental)</td><td>37</td></tr></table></td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669</th></tr>
<tr><th>ISSUES IDENTIFIED</th><th>NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED</th><th>COMMENT</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td><table><tr><td>Total Staff (Full time and Part time)</td><td>339</td></tr></table>
Notwithstanding, there is no intention to increase staff numbers as part of this application.</td></tr>
<tr><th colspan="3">COMMUNITY CONSULTATION</th></tr>
<tr><td>▪ Lack of community consultation;
▪ Failed to adequately communicate with the community with insufficient information provided during consultation;
▪ There was no additional consultation;
▪ Community requests an extension to the exhibition period;
▪ Consultation has been insufficient on the Junior Campus;
▪ Limited time to response to the development;
▪ The EIS failed to address community concerns;
▪ None of the recommendations provided by the Craiglea residents have been adopted;
▪ Restricted consultation period;
▪ Adequate time was not provided to review the documentation;
▪ No further consultation showing how the school had listened to the residents concerns;
▪ Residents requested additional meetings which was refused by the school;
▪ Consultation has been inadequate for the development of the Junior School</td><td>19</td><td>As demonstrated through this submissions matrix, the matters raised by the community have been considered have formed genuine considerations in the planning and design of the development. The development, particularly through the amended design shown in the accompanying appendices to the Response to Submission, is considered to provide an improved educational establishment whilst suitably integrating with the site context and protecting neighbouring amenity.

In accordance with SEARs issued for SSDA 8669, consultation has been undertaken with the relevant public authorities, the community and North Sydney Council. Table 5 below summarises the meetings, presentation, briefings and information sessions held during the consultation process, including subsequent meetings following the submission of the EIS (as highlighted below):

<table><tr><th colspan="3">Table 5 | Summary of Consultation Sessions</th></tr><tr><th>Date</th><th>Consultation</th><th>Stakeholder</th></tr><tr><td rowspan="3">19 June 2017</td><td rowspan="3">Briefing</td><td>North Sydney Council</td></tr><tr><td>St Aloysius' College Staff</td></tr><tr><td>Design Team</td></tr><tr><td>18 October 2017</td><td>Briefing</td><td>TfNSW</td></tr></table></td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th colspan="3">MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669</th></tr>
<tr><th>ISSUES IDENTIFIED</th><th>NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED</th><th>COMMENT</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>RMS</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Design Team</td></tr>
<tr><td>15 November 2017</td><td>Briefing Session</td><td>Community</td></tr>
<tr><td>16 November 2017</td><td>Briefing Session</td><td>Affiliates of the College</td></tr>
<tr><td>18 November 2017</td><td>Briefing Sessions</td><td>Community</td></tr>
<tr><td>31st January 2018</td><td>Additional Briefing Session</td><td>Residents of Craiglea</td></tr>
<tr><td>27th April – 28th May 2018</td><td>Exhibition Period</td><td>Government Agencies and Local Community</td></tr>
<tr><td>3rd May 2018</td><td>Presentation</td><td>Milson Point Community Precinct</td></tr>
<tr><td>8th May 2018</td><td>Additional Briefing Session.</td><td>Residents of Craiglea</td></tr>
<tr><td>19th June 2018</td><td>Presentation</td><td>North Sydney Council</td></tr>
</table>

During design development, based on the extensive consultation with the relevant stakeholders, the design team sought to address the matters raised through design alterations, focusing primarily on the proposed built form works to the Main Campus, as they were considered a key point of interest.

The following changes occurred out of consideration for community feedback for the original submission of the SSDA:

▪ Refinement of rooftop landscape buffer zones and privacy screening between the Man Campus and the residential properties to the east;</td></tr>
</table>

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		▪ Refinement of rooftop mechanical plant location in order to provide adequate setback from the boundary and appropriate levels of screening; and ▪ Infilling of existing drenched window opening on the existing south-eastern façade of Upper Pitt Street. In response to the public exhibition period, and subject to the accompanying RTS, further amendments were proposed to the building form, as outlined below: ▪ The development envelope of the redeveloped north-east wing has been reduced to be consistent with the height of the current north-east wing building envelope, resulting in a reduction to the proposed parapet height by **270mm**, at and **RL 43.22**; ▪ The proposed acoustic barrier has been designed engineered to minimise visual impact. A 200mm thick structural element will sit below the parapet height to support the proposed glazed parapet. The acoustic barrier has been engineered to ensure the screen above the 1200mm parapet is a clear frameless acoustic glass, with no metal posts or support frames obscuring view corridors. In relation to the Junior Campus, approval is sought for concept plan only. Further opportunity for community consultation will occur during the detailed design as part of a future Development Application. It is important to note that St Aloysius' College are committed to working closely with its neighbours throughout the construction process.

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
CUMULATIVE IMPACTS		
▪ Failed to holistically at the School operation within the Context of the neighbouring developments. ▪ Failed to consider the cumulative impacts; ▪ Impact on Bradfield Park; ▪ The studies have failed to look at the broader community; ▪ No contribution by the school for maintenance and upkeep of local infrastructure; ▪ Does not agree with the statement in the EIS that "the proposal does not have any unacceptable, long term, off-site impacts on adjoining or surrounding properties or the public domain, in terms of traffic, social and environmental impacts"; ▪ No contextual evaluation of the school operations both existing and proposed to confirm what is working and what isn't working; ▪ Supportive of the changes to accommodate the curriculum and educational requirements.	26	The school is part of the Kirribilli Peninsula Community, and the proposed development sits within the boundaries of the three (3) campuses and has been designed in consideration of the adjoining neighbours and developments. The preparation of the original EIS and subsequent Response to Submissions has taken into account the comments raised by the DoPE, North Sydney Council, government agencies, and local community. In particular, the proposed development will include new essential and support services and infrastructure will bring a range of social and public benefits to the local community and broader region. This will reduce any undue impacts on community infrastructure, including Bradfield Park. Overall, as outlined in the ensuing sections of this response matrix the proposed development, across the three (3) campuses, has comprehensively considered the cumulative impacts in terms of traffic, parking, visual impact and privacy, solar access, acoustic impact, landscaping, design and built form, and heritage significance. This is further supported through the extensive consultation which has been carried out to date with the surrounding community, which assisted in the design progression of the proposed development. Therefore, it is considered the proposed development has taken into account the cumulative impacts of the proposed development, and through appropriate design solutions and mitigation measures, the proposal is considered appropriate.

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
HERITAGE		
▪ Implement design changes to maintain the heritage value of Craiglea House; ▪ Kirribilli has special heritage significance as a residential precinct, and the voracious growth proposal will impact on the heritage significance; ▪ Ensure protection of the heritage significance of properties surrounding the Junior Campus; ▪ Acoustic Barrier will impact on the heritage significance of adjoining property.	9	Heritage Impact Statements were prepared by NBRS Architecture and submitted with the original EIS. It is acknowledged that the College both contains and is adjacent to a number of heritage buildings of cultural, aesthetic, historical and social significance. The Staged Development aims to protect the College's heritage significance and maintaining a sympathetic design interface with the adjoining properties of heritage significance. In particular, the Stage 1 Built Form Approval of the Main Campus will have an acceptable impact on the heritage significance of adjoining properties for the following reasons: ▪ The works would not result in the demolition of any identified heritage fabric or landscaping; ▪ The proposed landscaped area at the roof level would provide a secure outdoor area for students, staff and visitors within the boundary of the school; ▪ The landscaped roof area would increase the amenity of the school students and staff. No additional structure associated with the infill building would affect the interior appearance of the Chapel or its ceiling; ▪ The visual impact of the addition would be mitigated by limiting the building height to that established by the Upper Pitt Street building. The balustrade of the roof garden would include glass panels to minimise impacts on views from heritage items in the immediate areas;

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		▪ The proposed internal changes to the Great Hall would increase flexibility of the space. The replacement of the existing wall panels would enhance the acoustic performance within the hall; ▪ The works would generally improve the internal circulation within the Main Campus building and enable the school to address statutory access to premises requirements. The proposed Concept Master Plan of the Junior Campus is considered to be appropriate in relation to heritage for the following reasons: ▪ The proposed addition would enable essential educational facilities to be upgraded within the boundary of the Junior Campus; ▪ The proposed works have been located to minimise adverse impacts on significant views to and from heritage items in the immediate area and the Careening Cove Conservation Area; ▪ The scale, bulk and location of the proposed minor addition are acceptable in heritage terms as they would not visually dominate the former Milsons Point Public School, the St John the Baptist Anglican Church (7-9 Broughton Street), or other heritage items in the immediate area; ▪ The proposed development will have an acceptable visual impact on the existing sightlines between the Junior School and the Careening Cove Conservation Area; ▪ The location of the proposed works would maintain existing view corridors along street within the immediate Kirribilli area; ▪ The proposed works have been assessed by Casey & Lowe, Consulting Archaeologists as having an acceptable archaeological impact; ▪ The works would maintain a large section of the site as open playground to facilitate safe areas for activities within the boundary of the school.

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		Overall, the proposed building envelopes for the Junior Campus are considered acceptable from a heritage perspective.
LIGHTING PLAN		
▪ Request for preparation of lighting plan.	18	A Lighting Concept has been prepared by Umow Lai and accompanies this application as **Appendix J**. Due to the context of the Site, the future lighting of the rooftop terrace would need to give consideration to light spill to neighbouring properties, light pollution (glow sky), discomfort glare, and the visibility of lighting from harbour view. A desktop review of the neighbouring properties in relation to the proposed development has been undertaken to identify potential light sensitivity receptors. Consideration has been taken to avoid unnecessary light spill and to serve main purpose of lighting design for Roof Terrace. The design aims to consider the light spill to private residential and public areas from proposed types of light fittings, their orientation and location. Lighting would be designed and installed in accordance with the requirements of AS4282 Control of the Obtrusive Effects of Outdoor Lighting. The following mitigation measures are recommended to ensure a desirable design outcome will be achieved: ▪ Use low level lighting; ▪ Avoid using floodlight; ▪ Use low-glare luminaire with glare shield;

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		▪ Introduce dimming control system to reduce intensity of light. A suitable condition of consent may be imposed to facilitate the implementation of the details and recommendations of the light spill assessment.
PUBLIC BENEFIT		
▪ No public benefit provided; ▪ No benefit to ratepaying residents; ▪ The school does not pay rates.	12	It is generally accepted that it is not appropriate for school developments to pay Section 94 Contributions. This is because schools generally provide their own sport or open space facilities within their campuses, or have alternative arrangements with other schools to share facilities, and the developments further enhance the provision of available sporting facilities. In this instance, the proposal will not put additional demand on Council's infrastructure, and so it is considered reasonable that a exemption be given. The proposed development is in the public's best interest as its key impacts have been minimised through detailed design of the built form, and amendments to the proposed development. The residual impacts will be localised and managed. Importantly, the benefits will be significant and widespread for the entire community. The benefits include: ▪ The proposed development is of a high quality in terms of built form, bulk and architectural treatment and responds positively to proportions of adjoining development. The proposal will make a positive contribution to the built form of the school and create an attractive streetscape interface with the surrounding development; ▪ New essential and support services and infrastructure will bring a range of social and public benefits to the local community and broader region. The proposal will provide enhanced sport and recreational facilities on the Junior Campus. At present, the College relies on off-site facilities for certain sporting programmes. The introduction of a

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		purpose built facility will help to relieve demand on external facilities generated by the school; ▪ The proposed development will result in an improved educational environment for the College through: o Enabling an excellent academic space; o Providing appropriate and function open space for students; o Will modernise outdated educational facilities for future generations; o Create an inclusive, supportive and secure environment.
LAND HOLDINGS		
▪ Failed to consider development of other school landholdings; ▪ Has the school explored the option of purchasing another campus; ▪ Not looking at landholdings in a holistic way; ▪ Advised the School was unable to consider the Willoughby Site as it is in a different LGA – this is considered wrong; ▪ Currently contain three constrained sites.	17	The College is part of the Kirribilli Peninsula Community, and the proposed development sits within the boundaries of the individual campuses and has been designed in consideration of the adjoining neighbours and developments. The proposed development is in relation to the future development of the existing educational establishment. As outlined above, the Proposal is considered to be in the public's interest as its key impacts have been minimised through the amendments to the built form. Importantly, its benefits will be significant and widespread for the entire community, including: ▪ The implementation of the Green Travel Plan will encourage sustainable transportation; ▪ The proposed development is of a high quality in terms of built form, bulk and architectural treatment and responds positively to proportions of the adjoining development; ▪ New essential and supportive services and infrastructure will bring a range of social and public benefits to the local community and broader

MATRIX OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS – SSDA 8669		
ISSUES IDENTIFIED	**NUMBER OF TIMES RAISED**	**COMMENT**
		region. The proposal will provide enhanced sport and recreational facilities on the Junior Campus. At present, the College relies on off-site facilities for its sporting programmes. The introduction of the future purpose built sports facility will help relieve demand on these facilities generated by the College.
MISCELLANEOUS		
▪ Financial impact on residents; ▪ Request an Open Site Visit to express concerns to the Minister; ▪ School is a private enterprise subsidised by those that bear the burden of the proposed development; ▪ Failed to improve footpath treatments; ▪ Request structural details of the acoustic barrier be provided; ▪ No digital model provided; ▪ Request for Site Poles to be erected on the Main Campus.	37	The project is in the public's best interest as its key impacts have been minimised through amendments to the design throughout the design process. The residual impacts will be localised and managed. Importantly, its benefits will be significant and widespread for the entire community. Height frames and open site visit may be considered if requested by the determining authority. The detailed design of the Balustrade has been prepared by Wood & Grieve Engineering and accompanies this application as **Appendix K**. A 200mm thick structural element will sit below the parapet height to support the proposed glazed parapet. The acoustic barrier has been engineered to ensure the screen above the 1200mm parapet is a clear frameless acoustic glass, with no metal posts or support frames obscuring view corridors. In relation to the failed improvement of the footpath, this is beyond the scope of the application. The College appreciate the notation regarding the surrounding infrastructure, however, at present they are not required to carry out upgrade works. It is noted, as part of the future approved CTMP, any damage on public land, resulting from the construction period will be rectified.