

Appendix AA Submission SSD-30759158
Review of Social Impact Assessment - April 2022
Prepared for: Minarah College

Executive Summary:

2.0 Proposed Development

Refers in part to the staged development *“growing in line with growth in the local population”* This statement is in conflict with statements made by Midson’s representatives that staged construction is to correspond with student progression through the school years and has nothing to do with population growth. If it were population driven, no school would be required here before 2040.

There is a series of bullet points talking about what the proposal is and contained within is the following:

- An on-site car park for 138 parking spaces. Given the requirements for 1 parking space for each FTE position and various student requirements, the detailed table of staffing on p42 indicates 96 FTE’s and 12 casuals. If 12 casuals constitute FTE’s then just for staff 108 spaces are required. Add student requirements Years K to 11 inclusive 15 and Year 12 – 22 spaces. This totals to 145 **plus visitor parking** so the parking is well short of statutory requirements or, the detailed table is not correct?

3.0 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE & CHARACTERISTICS

A separate, Catchment Analysis prepared by Lawrence Consulting...

The writer has not found this table in the supporting documents but data has been used in the Social Report to claim certain areas are within a catchment area of 10 klm². This is disputed in the following:

Camden – Ellis Lane. Most of Camden is not within the stated radius and parts of Ellis Lane are also outside the stated radius.
Hoxton Park Is outside the said 10klm catchment radius

The proposed school is an Islamic School and there are at least another 4 other Islamic Schools either in or adjacent to the claimed catchment area. Given that another large Islamic School is already approved for development on Byron and Ingleburn Rd Leppington in the Camden LGA why is this school even necessary? It should be noted that the 2016 Census Data relied upon for most of the demographic analysis and shown in Appendix A has no Islamic persons listed in Catherine Field or the Camden LGA. The writer is not suggesting that there are no Islamic persons in this area but, no data suggests that there is either an error in the compilation of the table or the numbers did not suit the narrative. The total Islamic persons in the identified catchment is claimed to be 10,617 (6.0% of the population) but the writers’ lived experience is that the majority of these persons reside in the North Leppington area and Liverpool LGA which are well served by current and planned Islamic schools. All of these schools are laying claim in part to the same Islamic persons in their catchments. It is unclear to the writer why this proposal even exists? It is certainly based on community need.

4.0 Community Consultation

The report states that: 945 flyers were delivered to residential dwellings and 8 commercial premises surrounding the subject site. There has been significant lack of awareness of the development, therefore I question the distribution of these flyers, as many residents have stated they have not received any communication, flyers or otherwise including adjoining properties. I state categorically that I did not receive any of the flyers claimed to have been sent out at 12 Heatherfield Close, nor have any of my immediate neighbors. I became aware of the project via the local newspaper and joined up to the website from the email address in the article.

The report goes on to say that “35 people registered to participate with an online session with 28 joining the session.” The original link to the session did not work and I am told that there was another link sent out 1 minute prior to the commencement of the online session. I cannot verify this as I had already linked into the session and was waiting online. I waited online for 15 minutes and when it became apparent that this link was not included in the session, I was forced to install Zoom on my computer and sign in consequently I was only able to listen to the last 15 minutes of the session. I contacted Midson’s via email expressing my displeasure and received a follow up phone call from Toby at Midson apologizing for the issue and saying that they wanted to try to establish contact with the near neighbors.

The report states “Detailed letters delivered with the flyer to 17 adjacent neighbours inviting them to a dedicated online information session for immediate neighbours only;” I will state categorically that I did not receive this letter either. In consultation with all other adjacent neighbours, I can confirm that 1 flyer was received at 260 Catherine Field Rd without any detailed letter. This property adjoins the development properties on the southern boundary. In conversations with adjacent property owners I have been unable to establish that any other invitations were received. The report states that there were no attendees to the session. This was due to the fact that no one was aware of the meeting being scheduled. I was

able to organize another meeting involving my family and several other stakeholders either side of my property but that did not resolve any of our concerns.

The report states “Stakeholder correspondence by email to individuals and organisations and groups including provision of an information sheet and community Q&A document;

however it provides little detail relating to the discussion or outcomes.

There were several contacts between Midson representatives and me by email and phone. I have records of all the emails should proof be required.

The document goes on to provide some detail around the issues raised during several conversations including:

- Timing and details around the planning process, construction program and staged opening of the school;
- Concern re vibrations from heavy vehicles during construction;
- Traffic and parking concerns including increased traffic, delays around the school, safety issues (pedestrians), and parking provision on the site;
- Operational characteristics of the proposed school including hours of operation including OOSH care; use of facilities by the wider community for sports etc; noise and light spill; number of staff; student characteristics; curriculum and uniform;
- Building design including proposed fencing to maintain **privacy** for neighbours;
- Environment and the potential cumulative impacts on the environment and animal habitats;
- Strategic context and infrastructure and whether the proposed school would impact on plans for rezoning of surrounding land for residential uses; and whether the school would align with community need in a semi-rural area,

Building design including proposed fencing to maintain privacy for neighbours.

It should be noted that there has been little to no meaningful responses on all/any of these issues other than to attempt to minimize them and in most cases suggest that they are not really problems at all. via the “expert consultants” reports

Flooding was raised on numerous occasions but has been ignored completely in this report

5.0 SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

The subject application has been assessed against the following criteria:

- Way of Life
- Community
- Accessibility
- Culture
- Health and wellbeing
- Surroundings
- Decision-making systems
- Issues raised during consultation
- Public interest benefits

Considered by whom and where?

By way of more detail:

Way of Life.

- Will privacy, peace and quiet enjoyment significantly change for the neighbours and the local area, particularly changes to people’s daily lives and activities during both construction and operation.

This was not addressed with the community and I fail to see how a change from Primary Production – Small Holding ie: farmland over my back fence to the construction of a 1580 student school would not be a dramatic change to my privacy and quiet enjoyment and a change my and my family’s as well as all neighbours lifestyle dramatically. I have a swimming pool approximately 8m from the boundary of the proposed school and I will be overlooked by the 2nd floor classrooms – so much for our privacy. I note that whilst mine and all adjoining residences have all buildings, sheds and other structures showing on the plans, both my, and my neighbours’ pools do not show on any plans. This is misleading and deceptive and a major privacy concern.

- How will people be affected if traffic/parking demands or noise levels change.

The report acknowledges that there will be additional noise through traffic and parking demands but states this is in line with planned future development. There has been no future development plan released for this area of Catherine Field. The plan does not explain how people would be affected so this has not been addressed. It should be noted that the “tolerable” noise level of 46db quoted in the Noise and Vibration Report will be exceeded by up to 40db during construction which is scheduled to take 224 weeks, plus 2 weeks demolition and 4 weeks of earthworks (all going to plan) over the 5 stages of the development.

So the noise levels would be appalling if this project gains consent. Traffic and parking demands have not been addressed and would lead to considerable dislocation for all adjacent properties.

Community: o Will the school result in marked changes to community composition or character? Yes

o How will demand for support services (e.g. child care, social infrastructure) change? Unknown at this time

o Will there be an impact on community cohesion, identity or sense of place? Yes absolutely

None of these matters have been addressed with the community

• Surroundings: o Will there be impacts to public open space, public facilities or streets? Yes

o Will there be changes to environmental values, visual landscape, or aesthetic values? Yes

o How will nearby residents experiences changes in their surroundings during construction? The impacts will be enormous

o Will construction or operations affect public safety for pedestrians, children, drivers or cyclists? Yes There is no drainage, kerb and guttering or footpaths or bicycle lanes or paths in the vicinity of the school or anywhere in the suburb not to mention flooding and dramatically increased traffic as a result of the development consequently there is a significantly increased risk for all of these groups.

Issues raised during consultation

It would be fair to categorise this as being ineffective at best and negligent at worst as none of the issues raised during consultation, (if that is what you call it) have been addressed directly but they have been used to give the consultants a guide as to what to talk down in their various reports.

Public interest benefits

The writer sees no public interest benefits in this application Given that this is a private business posing as a school with numerous commercial interests operating after school hours including weekends well outside of what would be regarded as a normal school operation.

How many fee free places are the proponents offering at the school that could qualify it as a public interest benefit.

6.0 ENHANCEMENT, MITIGATION & MONITORING

The proposed school is unlikely to generate any long term or significantly negative social impacts that require mitigation. While it is acknowledged that the proposed development represents a significant change of use and intensification of use of the site, that intensification of use is not unexpected given planned future character of the area for higher density residential development, and the need for infrastructure such as schools to support the future population.

This statement is misleading and deceptive. There are currently no plans for higher density residential development in this area and there is currently no sewer connection to this area and no plans to connect it in the near to medium term so to suggest that it will happen anyway is a nonsense, misleading and deceptive.

Any impacts generated by the intensification of use of the sites are likely to be associated with noise and traffic, which have been separately addressed in reports accompanying the application (including Acoustics and Traffic and Parking).

Another misleading statement. The reports have gone to great lengths to minimise what will be the real impacts of this development proposal. To suggest that the writing of numerous reports will fix it is quite frankly misleading and deceptive. The acoustics will exceed what the reports have determined as tolerable 46db by up to and additional 40db, making 86db a likely common occurrence during 230 weeks of demolition and construction. Traffic will be an absolute disaster and the parking does not meet the statutory requirements.

Negative short-term impacts that may be generated are likely to arise with the construction and fit out of the school buildings over the staged construction of the College, should the application be approved.

To describe 2.4 years of actual construction over a proposed 20 odd year 5 stage plan is anything but short term

Any potentially negative impacts associated with construction can be mitigated through conditions of development consent.

How do you mitigate the noise from a rock breaker? Perhaps put a silencer on the engine but that does nothing for the percussive noise from the actual operation. All of the mitigation strategies in the noise and vibration report just won't happen in a practical situation. This whole section is misleading and deceptive rubbish.

The potential positive social impacts generated by the proposed school will only be realised if consent for the application is granted.

Which positive social impacts are being referred to? Conversely all of the negative impacts will not happen if the application is refused.

7.0 CONCLUSION

With the implementation of the recommendations, impacts associated with noise and disturbance, and traffic and parking can be minimised such that there are not material social impacts generated by the proposed development. There are no reasons from a Social Impact perspective, to refuse the application

How do you trivialise 4.4 years of actual construction, over 800 car trips to and from the school - twice a day, weekend events such as sports up until 09:00pm on weekends including light disturbance by suggesting that there are no material social impacts associated with this development application? False and misleading by any measure. (End of Executive Summary)

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The first 4 pages (Introduction) refer to the rules and guidelines required but contains little by way of content in outcomes.

Near the end of Introduction the following appears

In addition to the above, issues raised during the community consultation process and public interest benefits are also considered.

This was covered in the executive summary but it is not clear where this actually happened or the public interest benefits are actually declared. I consider that there is no clear public benefit given it is a private commercial operation.

The Catherine Field area is an area earmarked for future growth as part of the South West Growth Area Precinct and estimates prepared by Profile id estimate the number of dwellings in Catherine Field Precinct will increase by an average of 123 dwellings per annum to 3,101 in 2041 and the number of dwellings in Catherine Field North Precinct will increase by an average of 189 dwellings per annum to 5,723 in 2041

What appears lost in this report is the timing of this growth. Predictions are for **2041**

2.0 SITE AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

The site has an area of 4.5 hectares and is irregular in shape. The sites currently contain residential dwellings and associated outbuildings

It should be noted that these properties are zoned RU4 Primary production small holdings They do have residential dwellings but they are/were working farms prior to purchase by the proponents.

Development surrounding the site is predominantly residential, with large, semi-rural allotments to the immediate north, west, and east, and smaller residential allotments to the south.

Incorrect descriptions as all the properties to the north, east and west are RU4 and the properties to the south are R5 – large lot residential

There are currently no schools located in the suburb of Catherine Field.

The closest primary schools are:

- Barramurra Public School (K-6) at 65 O'Keefe Drive, Oran Park, approximately 3.2km (straight line) and 5.2km driving distance from the subject site

- Gledswood Hills Public School (K-6) at 78 The Hermitage Way, Gledswood Hills, approximately 3.2km (straight line measure) and 4.2km (driving distance) from the subject site

- St Justin's Catholic Parish Primary School (K-6), 3 Hollows Drive, Oran Park, approximately 3.5km (straight line measure) and 5.7km (driving distance) from the subject site.

-

Missing from above list in the claimed school catchment are 11 Primary Schools: St Clares Catholic Primary Narellan Vale, Narellan Vale Public, Mawarra primary school, Narellan Public School, Currans Hill Public School, Denham Court Public School, Leppington Public School, Austral Public School, Rossmore Public School, Harrington Park Public School, St Gregory's Primary School Gregory Hills. Thus makes the claims above misleading at best.

There are no public high schools in the area, and there is only one independent High School – St Benedict's Catholic College (7-12), 1 Hollows Drive, Oran Park, approximately 3.5km (straight line measure) and 5.7km (driving distance) from the subject site.

What is defined as "the area"?

I have used the same criteria as is used in the school catchment referred to in **3.0 DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE & CHARACTERISTICS** on P1 of the Executive Summary. The statement above is also wrong with 14 Schools missing: **public high schools** not accounted for within the claimed Minarah College catchment - Elderslie High, Mt Annan High School,

Elizabeth Macarthur High School Narellan Vale, John Edmondson High School Horningsea Park: **Independent Schools:** Mount Carmel Catholic College Varroville, Magdalene Catholic College Smeaton Grange, St Anthony of Padua Catholic College Austral, Unity Grammar Austral, Arrahman College Austral, Al Faisal College Austral, Macarthur Anglican College Austral, St Gregory's high School Gregory Hills, Approved new Amity College Leppington and Hope Christian School Heath Rd. Leppington. This report nominates a total of 4 schools in "the area" where the writer has counted a total of 25 schools roughly 6 times as many. This report is false and misleading.

2.2 Proposed development

Minarah College Catherine Field will be a co-educational K-12 school accommodating 1,580 students, 840 in primary school and 660 in high school. There will also be an Early Learning Centre (ELC) for 60 students and a School for Specific Purpose (SSP) for 20 students. The new school will be constructed in stages, growing in line with growth in the local population

Parts of the description have been left out in terms of Canteen, Library, Halls, and Sporting Fields. Given that the halls and sporting fields are available for hire out of school hours and on weekends and the canteen may be available also, it is clear that this application does not fit the definition of a school and is clearly a commercial enterprise.

3.0 SOCIAL LOCALITY

A separate Catchment Analysis Report prepared by Lawrence Consulting on behalf of Minarah College Green Valley identifies that the proposed school is likely to have a catchment area within a 10km radius of the subject site. This identified catchment area takes into account existing Islamic schools in the area...

This "Catchment Analysis Report" has been mentioned several times but I am unable to find any such report amongst the documents provided that support this application. If the study took into account the 4 Islamic schools in or adjacent to the stated catchment of 10km radius, how can a 5th Islamic school be justified on religious grounds? Those schools catchment areas should be excluded from this catchment.

There is nothing about the proposed school, that is likely to result in any impacts on levels of relative disadvantage.

Correct statement: This is a private Islamic educational facility and will be fee paying. They could however offer fee free places and have an impact on relative disadvantage.

Principle 1 – Surveillance

The attractiveness of crime targets can be reduced by providing opportunities for effective surveillance, both natural and technical.

Given That this area is in the lowest category for crime currently this is unnecessary and perhaps the application for this educational Facility will actually increase the risk for adjacent neighbours

The proposed school buildings and school grounds will include the installation of electronic surveillance of all building entrances and exits, and entrances and exits to car parking areas in the form of 24 hour CCTV monitoring.

Casual surveillance to surrounding properties and Catherine Fields Road will be improved due to the increased activity on the site, and from upper levels

This means that our privacy will be compromised especially from the CCTV and the 2nd level

4.0 Community Consultation

This has been well covered in the executive summary and requires no further comment.

1. The current road condition and poor infrastructure would not support additional traffic
2. The danger of having an 80k zone used by large trucks and peak hour traffic with no allowance for turning lanes.
3. Current dangerous conditions of traffic travelling along Catherine Fields Road at speed, has eventuated in serious accidents and fatalities.

5.1 Way of Life

The proposed education establishment is unlikely to generate any significant impacts in terms of privacy as the two school buildings have been located centrally within the site, and oriented towards a central forecourt to minimise overlooking to adjoining properties. In addition to the location and orientation of the school buildings away from adjoining residential dwellings and site landscaping, privacy screening is proposed for south facing windows, where required, to mitigate direct overlooking.

This statement is clearly false and misleading for the following reasons: Residents on the southern boundary will be greatly overlooked ensuring no privacy. The claim of centrally located buildings is patently inaccurate, on the southern boundary the building is well away from the boundary at the front but bends and orients on an angle towards the boundary. At the eastern end, the building encroaches on the overland floodway and comes with 8m of the boundary with a building height approaching 9.5 m so the upper classrooms will look directly over the swimming pools and into the rear of homes at 12 and 14 Heatherfield Close. Privacy screening is shown only on the bottom sections of the windows and a person standing would see directly over them. They are also not solid in construction and would still allow vision

However it goes on to say on the next page.

Page 23. States:

"It is likely that noise will be generated through the stated construction of the proposed college and in the operation of the school, particularly when children are playing in outdoor areas and from school bells and the PA system. "

It then goes onto state that these are only temporary impacts, however given staged construction will be present over the duration of the staged development. The noise that they have called out is not associated with development but the daily running of the school.

It then goes onto say that:

"It is reasonable to assume that there will be some noise emissions from the Early Learning Centre and the proposed school, largely limited to hours of operation when there will be children on site. Noise will be generated through school bells and children playing on the outdoor play areas. These emissions represent potential social impacts for residents and tenants of the properties immediately surrounding the subject site."

Noise and disturbance from the site to surrounding properties was raised as an issue during the consultation process.

A Construction Noise & Vibration Management Plan prepared by Day Designs Pty Ltd accompanies the application. That Report considers potential noise and vibration emissions associated with demolition, excavation and construction of the proposed College associated with heavy machinery such as excavators, dump trucks, cranes, cement mixers rock breakers etc.

The Report includes a number of recommendations to minimise noise emissions and disturbance to nearby commercial and residential premises, including periods of respite, work practices; management of heavy vehicles and staff vehicles; dedicated community relations officer; noise complaint procedures; noise and vibration monitoring

The reliance on the Noise & Vibration Report from Day Designs suggests that the person preparing this report did not read it. Noise levels are up to 40db's above the considered "tolerable levels" of 46db. If the writer is happy with up to 86db can I respectfully suggest she buy my house and see how that goes. The N&V report is hotly disputed and contains multiple inaccuracies and false and misleading statements.

Provided the recommendations in Section 6 of this report are implemented, the level of noise and vibration from the construction works at Minarah College, 26/-278 Catherine Fields Road, Catherine Field, NSW will be minimised as far as reasonably practical in accordance with Australian Standard AS2436:2010 "Guide to noise and vibration control on construction, demolition and maintenance sites" and the EPA's Interim Construction Noise Guideline 2009 and Assessing Vibration: a technical guideline 2006, as detailed in Section 4 of this report

The recommendations contained are not practical and will most certainly be ignored if approval is gained. It should be noted that generally the machines are not the main contributor to the noise but the cutting and hammering resulting from the operation of that equipment is generally worse. Add both together and what do you get - 86db etc.

Page 25

The report states: that noise can be controlled through considered positioning of speakers throughout the site, oriented away from residential dwellings and through controlled hours of use of outdoor play area being confined to school hours only.

However, page 41 states the hours of operation for the Multi purpose Hall to be 5pm to 9pm M-F and 9am to 10pm Saturday and Sunday and the playing fields 9am to 9pm – 7 days.

Also on the same page reference is made to noise reducing strategies and dot point 6 states:

- sound barrier walls made of 6mm FC sheeting

This proposed wall on the southern side of the building is in the centre of the overland flood zone and will likely be washed away in the first downpour after construction

Parking is provided on the site for:

- 86 staff (22 spaces, including one accessible space in the northern carpark and 64 spaces, including 2 accessible spaces, in the southern car park);
- 15 spaces for the Early Learning Centre;
- 37 student parking spaces
- 5 bus parking spaces
-

Given this information, why is there a table on P42 titled **Staff Numbers** that nominates 106 staff and there is requirement of 1 car space per FTE in the regulations. Is the table false and misleading or are the car parking spaces incorrect?

Under the same heading "Way of Life" The report then moves into the traffic issues related to the school. I am not prepared to go through this in detail as I am aware that others are dealing with it in depth however, with 1580 students and potentially 80% -90% travelling using private vehicles. If we take the mean average -85%, that would mean 1343 students would be dropped off

during a one hour window morning and afternoon, with a known peak period of 15 minutes within that hour of drop offs. If we assume 1.5 Kids per car then there is likely 1733 car trips on every school day. Catherine Field Rd cannot cope with this.

In summary, the Proposal is supportable on traffic planning grounds and is not anticipated to result in any adverse impacts on the surrounding road network

Given the current diabolical condition of Catherine Field Rd I believe that above summary statement is false and misleading.

5.2 Community

The reports states that "The proposed school will generate a temporary increase in population of the suburb and the immediate vicinity during school hours". The report stated earlier that we need schools to service our area owing to the limited number of schools. This was shown to be patently false. On CENSUS NIGHT the great majority will be reported in other suburbs and LGA's so should not be even referred to as temporary increases in population.

The proposed College will alter the character and identity of the local area as it represents a departure from the established use of the sites as residential allotments.

It will clearly alter the character and identity of the local area as the ratepayers will need to pick up the tab for the increased local traffic coming from other LGA's. These are not residential allotments. Again false & misleading

There is nothing about this change that is unexpected, given the planned continued growth in the area, and planned change from large allotment/semi-rural residential to an area with increased density, and population While the proposed development represents an intensification of use of the site compared to existing uses, there is nothing about it that is likely to generate any impact in terms of social cohesion and integration within the community.

This statement is very misleading as there is no planned rezoning or growth in the near term in this area . The growth will come around 2040. In the intervening period we are all happy to keep it RU4.

On balance, the proposed development represents a positive social impact in terms of the provision of education and community facilities for the community.

There is no balance here and it does not represent a positive social impact as we like it just the way it is. There are existing community facilities here in Catherine Field and this commercial enterprise adds nothing to our community. How many fee free places are they offering to the community?

5.3 Accessibility

Refer notes from page #27, relating to concentration of traffic within 2 x 15min windows each week day, with 80-90% of students travelling by private car, one student per car with low levels of car pooling.

With only 30 spaces available for kiss and drop it is logical to assume queues travelling to and from the school, there has been no mention of how to manage the traffic with only 1 entrance and 1 exit on Catherine Fields Road, or alternate routes should there be an accident or road closures during heavy rain. The majority of this section contains no information of significance other than the references to the questionnaire given to the Green Valley campus of Mariah College. It should be noted that the student numbers there are less than half of what is proposed here.

Page 36

Heath & Wellbeing

The guidelines pose the questions of potential impacts to health and wellbeing.

- Will community health be improved by public access to school facilities, eq sport facilities?
- Will there be benefits from better active transport and the ability of local children to live near the school.

Neither of these questions have been properly addressed.

The points made include:

- Recreation areas for students – the question in this section relates to the community not the students of the school
- Multi purpose hall and sport fields will be available for hire by the broader community. There are already existing sports fields, and a hall which services the community. I believe that these facilities will not be available to the community and this is only a ruse to get approval. In any case they could easily make the hire rates unacceptable to discourage community use.
- The report calls out temporary health impacts generated associated with noise disturbance, demolition and construction, however does not cover off the impacts of having a school in a rural area and the impacts to health and wellbeing for the residents, once the school has been built.

- The report states “that the proposed development does not generate any negative impacts in terms of health and wellbeing”, however no detail is provided to justify or support this statement. I expect that my and my family’s health will suffer as a direct result if this development gains approval.

5.4 Culture

Moreover, the facade needed to create a distinct entry point to the school, as this would be the predominant pedestrian entry. Through the design process emerged two distinct architectural motifs for the front facade. These were perforated brickwork and perforated aluminium screening. The patterned textural quality of each medium could be utilised to express some of the culturally significant themes that are significant to Minarah College. The patterned brickwork is a nod towards the intricate geometries prevalent in Islamic architecture.

There is currently no Islamic architecture in the Camden LGA much less the Hamlet of Catherine Field. This design is ugly and brings no association to the existing architecture or culture in the area.

There are no existing or proposed bicycle pathways in the area and no ability for safe cycling to and from the school, however council has requested parking for 48 bicycles.

It is safe to assume that over time if approval is granted there will be some upgrades to assist safe cycling but this is a longer term issue. If approval is not granted then this is irrelevant.

It is anticipated that school facilities, specifically the multi-purpose hall and sports fields will be made available for hire by the broader community on weekends

I note the term anticipated, not guaranteed so I won’t hold my breath waiting.

The proposed development does not generate any negative impacts in terms of the health and wellbeing of the community

Stated as an absolute: Privacy, quiet enjoyment are negatives we cannot avoid. This a false and misleading statement.

5.6 Surroundings

Due to the lack of existing or proposed bicycle pathways in the area, there is no apparent ability for safe cycling to and from the proposed school. However, as requested by Council, bicycle parking is included in the masterplan for 48 bicycles in the form of 24 double racks

The first part of this statement is a negative in terms of safety but its Camden Council’s fault? No mention of: no footpaths, kerb a gutter or drainage?

The Guidelines suggest consideration of the potential impacts of a school development on its surroundings, in particular:

- Will there be impacts to public open space, public facilities, or streets? Yes
- Will there be changes to environmental values, visual landscape, or aesthetic values? Yes
- How will nearby residents experience changes in their surroundings during construction? Noise. Disruption
dislocation and parking
- Will construction or operations affect public safety for pedestrians, children, drivers, or cyclists? Yes

Nearby residents and tenants may experience disturbance associated with the proposed fit out and additions to the existing buildings. As detailed in Chapter 5.1, these impacts are temporary, and are able to be controlled through conditions of development consent.

Change the “may” to “will”. What are the proposed changes to existing buildings? Earlier in the report it stated that they would be demolished. I am glad that 4.4 years of actual demolition and construction are “temporary”. If you also believe that Development Consent will control all of that disturbance, then I have a bridge I can sell you.

The proposed works will be contained wholly within the existing buildings and within the sites, it is not envisaged that the construction process will result in any impacts in respect of public safety for drivers, or cyclists

This statement is false and misleading as there is a considerable amount of civil works to be completed on and around Catherine Field Rd and all of this will cause inconvenience as traffic control will be required and public safety will be at risk for cyclists, motorists and pedestrians. It must be remembered that there are no footpaths, cycleways, or made road edges around here and all the road verges flood during moderate rain.

5.7 Decision making systems

Guidelines highlight the importance of the local community to be informed about decisions.

Can affected people make informed decisions and feel they have power to influence project decisions, including elements of project design

This point will be sorely tested by this process. We have the ability to make informed decisions but whether that opportunity is afforded to us in terms of power and influence cannot be answered at this time.

.1 Issues raised during consultation

As detailed in Chapter 4.0, the following issues were raised during the consultation process:

- • Timing and details around the planning process, construction program and staged opening of the school;
- • Concern re vibrations from heavy vehicles during construction;
- • Traffic and parking concerns including increased traffic, delays around the school, safety issues (pedestrians), and parking provision on the site;
- • Operational characteristics of the proposed school including hours of operation including OOSH care; use of facilities by the wider community for sports etc; noise and light spill; number of staff; student characteristics; curriculum and uniform;
- • Building design including proposed fencing, and window screening to maintain privacy for neighbours;
- • Environment and the potential cumulative impacts on the environment and animal habitats;
- • Strategic context and infrastructure and whether the proposed school would impact on plans for rezoning of surrounding land for residential uses; and whether the school would align with community need in a semi-rural area,

Not all issues have been included in this report that have been raised. Issues around the lack of engagement with the community, poor communication, making misleading statements around the amount of engagement, Road conditions and safety concerns, potentially an increase to traffic accidents and potential loss of life owing to increase in traffic, with speeding vehicles in a 80km speed zone, drainage, storm water management and waste management and more. Flooding also seems to have been missed here.

Operational Characteristics:

Hours of operation:

The different parts of the College will likely have the following hours of operation: **Use**

	Hours of Operation		Days	
ELC	7am - 6pm		Mon - Fri	
OOSH	7am - 6:30am		Mon - Fri	
School Hours	8:20am - 3:20pm	Mon - Fri	Staggered lunch and recess	
Multi purpose Hall	School hours and 5pm - 9pm		Mon - Fri	
Multi purpose Hall (weekend)	9am - 10pm	Sat and Sun	Training and competition and community use	
Primary Hall	8:20am - 3:20pm		Mon - Fri	
Sports field (during the week)	School hours and 5pm - 9pm		Mon - Fri	
Sports field (weekend)	9am - 9pm	Sat and Sun	Training and competition	

These hours are not the normal hours of a school and reflect the commercial nature of this enterprise

Light Spill:

It is not anticipated that a significant volume of activities will be held on the site at night such that lighting will be required outside of the core hours of the college

False and misleading. The playing fields will be used 9.00 to 21.00 Sat & Sun which will cause significant light spill for the neighbours. The security section also referenced lights burning all night.

Staff Numbers

This table conflicts with earlier representations in the document and whilst it seems to be a comprehensive list it also conflicts with all the other reports so which is correct?

5.9 Public interest benefits

- The proposed school provides a number of public interest benefits, including provision of a modern education facility for the existing and future school population;

Public interest benefits don't exist unless the College is offering public school places ie: fee free places. If they are - how many and which documents show this information?

- In the census data attached there are no Islamic persons listed in the suburb of Catherine Field or the Camden LGA and the 10,000 claimed in the catchment area are also covered by four other Islamic colleges

The Report refers to a modern education facility, however it states in the report that most of the children will be travelling from outside the local Catherine Field area, considering low density in the area and an ageing population. How is there a public benefit in this

It also adds that there will be an increased casual surveillance of surrounding streets, but no explanation of what that means or how they plan to provide the surveillance.

Improvements to the existing site are justified and a matter of opinion. Those improvements are not in line with the surrounding community, or a rural residential lifestyle.

6.0 Enhancement, Mitigation and Monitoring

The proposed school campus is unlikely to generate any long term or significantly negative social impacts that require mitigation as it involves the staged construction of a Early Learning Centre and College providing education across all stages. While it is acknowledged that the proposed development represents an intensification of use of the site, that intensification of use is not out of character with the planned and anticipated future character of the area and schools are essential services for an area earmarked for future residential growth.

This area is slated for residential development in approximately 20 years and there are currently no sewerage services in the area and I understand that Sydney Water has no plans to do anything for the foreseeable future. This statement has no relevance here.

7.0 Conclusion

The proposed Minarah College Catherine Field development at 368-378 Catherine Fields Road, Catherine Field has been assessed in social impact terms in this report.

False and misleading. The address is incorrect

The proposed development is unlikely to generate any long term negative social impacts.

This was disputed when stated earlier in the report.

Temporary negative impacts are likely to be associated with internal construction and fit out of the school. Temporary impacts associated with construction and fit out can be controlled through conditions of development consent.

This statement shows no consideration of the issues associated with operating a building site and how useless rules in the DC really are. Trying to operate only one machine at a time will double the construction time and the cost.

The Traffic and Parking and Acoustic reports accompanying the application outline design and operational recommendations to ensure the proposed campus can operate with minimal disturbance to surrounding residential properties

The traffic I have left to others. The parking does not comply with the regulations. The acoustic data is rubbish and report only support how bad it will actually get. 86db is not acceptable in anyone's language.

On the basis of this report I oppose any granting of approval for this or any other learning establishment development on this site.