

I want to oppose SSD-30759158

I haven't made any political donations to report in the last 2 years.

Appendix A – Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements Table

After reviewing Appendix A, the amount of errors or misleading information astounds me.

Item/ Description

Document Reference

Capital Investment Value and Employment

Section 3.1 and Appendix DD

- the only mention of Capital Investment in Section 3.1 of the EIS is the total Capital Investment Value being \$93,399,314. There is no breakdown of costs as to how this figure was derived. This certainly does not meet the SEARs requirements "Provide a detailed circulation of the capital investment value (CIV) of the development" there is no 'detail' in said report.

- Appendix DD is a Disability Access Report and also makes no mention of Capital Investment Value nor does it discuss "an estimate of the retained and new jobs that would be created" in fact neither the words 'capital', 'investment', 'value' or 'jobs' appear in Appendix DD at all. Therefore, the SEARs requirements regarding Capital Investment Value and Employment have not been met.

Further on Capital Investment Value

The original flyer (page 11, Appendix G) that was supposedly delivered to 945 residential properties and 8 commercial premises lists the school as a "\$70 million dollar investment" to then go on in the EIS to say "CIV of \$93,399,314" without any explanation of breakdown in cost estimate.

Item/ Description

Document Reference

18. Aboriginal Cultural Heritage

Appendix and Section 6.16

Looking at the Documentation attached to the proposal, there seems to be no 'Appendix '. This leads me to believe that the only report to mention the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage is within the EIS in Section 6.16 which is not a thorough report and falls short of SEARs requirements.

Further on the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage. I would like the applicant to explain why on page 34 of Appendix Y the boundary of the study area encompasses not two but three sites? Clearly stating "Lot 231 DP27602 was surveyed as shown in the survey coverage (Figure 12) however this lot was later removed from the proposed development". I suspect the applicant has future plans to grow without disclosing in this application.

Item/ Description

Document Reference

25. Contributions and Public Benefit

Section 4

Firstly, why is there no associated Appendix to this SEARs requirement? Is there a document missing? Section 4 of the EIS does not use the words 'contribution plan', 'dedication', 'works-in-kind'

Further on contributions. Section 6.20.1 of the EIS says "It is understood that the Camden Contribution Plan 2011 is the applicable contributions plan. Under Section 2.8 of the contributions plan 'educational establishments' and non-residential developments outside of the Camden and Narellan town centres are not identified as being required to pay contributions. Therefore, the proposed development is exempt from paying contributions" I disagree as the applicant continuously refers to the proposal comprising on an extension of their existing business including a child care centre, an OOSH centre, the operating of a school canteen and even mention of hiring out the school hall. To me this falls under a commercial operation which in fact falls under Camden Council's Contribution Plan.

Item/ Description**Document Reference****26. Engagement****Appendix D, Appendix G and Section 6.23**

There is no Section 6.23 in the EIS document.

Further on Engagement. Engagement to the community has been minimal. With the delivery (or non-delivery) of said flyers to 945 residential properties and 8 commercial premises, I would like the applicant to respond as to how these were delivered? Were they addressed appropriately and sent through Australia Post? I find it hard to believe that out of 953 flyers that only 35 people registered and only 28 people joined the online session on Thursday 11th November 2021 at 6.45pm.

The same question should be raised as to how the Adjacent Neighbour letter was distributed? I would assume that zero of the 17 Adjacent Neighbours received their flyer would be why zero Adjacent Neighbours signed up for the special zoom meeting.

This leads me to the residents in Catherine Field that either; do not have access to a computer, may not speak English or may still be in transit coming home from work. I would like to ask the applicant why only one zoom session was held and they chose a weekday and not an additional session on a weekend?

To place an advertisement in the local newspaper for only one week is just a 'tick the box' exercise. Catherine Field does not get a newspaper delivery and since Covid, the newspapers have scaled down the quantity that are printed and actually distributed. To read the article online, the user must 'log in' or have a 'subscription'. Perhaps the applicant may have contacted our local radio station targeted to Macarthur area C91.3 and had radio coverage.

Item/ Description**Document Reference****Consultation****Section 5, Section 6.23, Appendix D and Appendix G**

Again, there is no Section 6.23 in the EIS.

I would also like to comment on the Department of Planning's Exhibition Notice.

The notice clearly states "The application for State Significant Development (SSD), Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and accompanying documents will be exhibited from Tuesday 28 June 2022 until Monday 25 July 2022 and are accessible electronically on the Department's website". How then do our local residents access these documents if they do not have a computer or the documents are not on public display at any office?

The notice also states "If you cannot submit online, post or drop your submission to the address below" referring to no physical address but a Locked Bag in Parramatta. I know of a resident who had to look up the physical address in Parramatta, attended reception and the hand delivered submissions that had been collected were refused by staff saying they didn't know what to do with them! I would expect that a government department would have staff trained to accept hand delivered submissions when an application is on Public Exhibition.

Lastly, in speaking with many local residents, they have tried calling the phone numbers on the exhibition notice (02 9995 5228 or 1300 305 695) to ask questions. A number of people tried the first number many times and their call was left unanswered and there was no voice mail in order to leave a message. They then tried the 1300 number and were transferred to many different departments without their questions being answered so gave up and have not been able to ask questions or send submissions.