

Terry Mahady, Project Manager
45/107 Macpherson Street
BRONTE NSW 2024

01/02/2021

Dear Mr Mahady,

**Alterations and additions to Kincoppal-Rose Bay School (SSD-10325)
Response to Submissions**

The exhibition of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the above proposal ended on 29 January 2021. Submissions from Woollahra Municipal Council and public authorities received by the Department during the exhibition of the proposal are available on the Department's website at:

<https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/major-projects/project/12191>

The Department requires that you provide a response to the issues raised in those submissions, in accordance with clause 82(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000 (Regulation). Please provide a response to the issues raised in these submissions within two months of the date of this letter.

Please be advised that Ausgrid and the Heritage Division of the Department of Premier and Cabinet are yet to provide comments in relation to the application. Any pending public authority responses will be forwarded to you when received.

The Department has also undertaken a preliminary assessment of the EIS and, in addition to the issues raised in submissions, requires the matters at **Attachment 1** be addressed in full. You are requested to provide the Department with a response to the submissions as soon as possible.

Note that under clause 113(7) of the Regulation, the days occurring between the date of this letter and the date on which your response to submissions is received by the Secretary are not included in the deemed refusal period.

If you have any questions, please contact Andrew Golden, who can be contacted on (02) 9995 6319 or at andrew.golden@dpie.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely



Karen Harragon
Director, Social And Infrastructure Assessments
Social & Infrastructure Assessments

as delegate for the Planning Secretary

ATTACHMENT 1

1. Architectural plan set for concept proposal component

- The Department notes specific architectural plan sets are provided for all components of the detailed design (Detailed Proposal) but plans for the concept component are only found in the architectural design report or within the detailed design plans. The Department considers this to be unclear and inconsistent with the SEARs which requires separate documentation for the Concept Proposal and the detailed works.
- Consequently, the Department requires a separate plan set that shows the entire site and all components of the Concept proposal (similar to figure 16 in the Environmental Impact Statement) including the masterplan, building envelopes with heights etc. The detailed design components of the development should form part of the masterplan / building envelope plan. A separate plan set should then be provided for the detailed works as originally proposed with the EIS. This way the concept proposal includes the entire scope of works.
- The architectural plan set for the concept proposal must be appropriately dimensioned and scaled, include existing and proposed envelopes, and all necessary plans (i.e. north point where relevant, floor plans, roof plans, elevations, sections etc.).

2. Detailed design must form part of the concept proposal

- The detailed design stage does not form part of the concept proposal and must do so to enable the two concept and the detailed stage to form one application as proposed here.

3. Inconsistencies between Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and arborist report

- The Department notes that the EIS and the arborist have inconsistencies regarding proposed tree removal. On pages 36 and 38 (figure 20), the EIS outlines that a total of 16 trees are proposed for removal. However, table 9 (p.39) only lists 15 trees for removal (i.e. tree 16 is not listed). Additionally, tree 24 is listed twice as a tree to be retained on p.37.
- The submitted Arborist Report nominates 16 trees for removal (including tree 16) and 10 trees for retention.
- Consequently, you are required to provide an addendum to the EIS or additional documentation clarifying the total number of trees proposed for removal, and nominating which trees are to be removed and retained.

4. Inconsistencies between documentation

- The Department notes that the civil engineering report requires a bund on the junior school driveway in order to prevent overland flow from entering the school. This does not appear to be incorporated into the civil or architectural plans. The Department requires the bund to be included in the amended plan set for the detailed works as well as civil engineering plans.

- The plan set for the Senior school bus and car parking area shows the new waste management zone on most plans, but AR-B13-B1-01 (“proposed plan – level LG – east”) incorrectly labels the area as parking. The Department requires that all plans accurately show the waste management zone.

5. Acid Sulfate Soils

- The Department notes that the EIS indicates the site is Class 5 and that no works are proposed within 500 metres (m) of adjacent Class 1, 2, 3 or 4 land. This statement does not appear to be correct. Class 3 land exists towards the northern end of Dumaresq Road, approximately 250m from the proposed works.
- The Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) indicates that it is unlikely the water table on adjacent land will be lowered below 1m Australian Height Datum (AHD) due to the site’s elevation and anticipated depth of soil disturbance.
- Noting the location of the Class 3 land, the Department recommends additional information be provided verifying the anticipated depth of soil disturbance, distances to Class 1, 2, 3 or 4 land and likelihood of lowering the water table on those lands.

6. Geotechnical matters

- The Department notes that separate geotechnical and hydrogeological investigations were submitted for the proposed Early Learning Centre (ELC), elevated walkway, and bus parking areas. All reports recommend that once architectural drawings have been finalised, additional geotechnical investigations are to be undertaken.
- The Department requires that the additional geotechnical investigations, as recommended in each report, are undertaken and submitted as part of this application to enable appropriate assessment of geotechnical and hydrogeological matters.

7. Contamination

- The Remedial Action Plan (RAP) proposes the excavation and removal of contaminated fill. The waste minimisation and management plan for the construction phases of the development do not include or reference this material. The waste minimisation and management plan is to be amended to accurately detail the amount of contaminated fill to be removed, and how it is to be managed and disposed of.

8. Earthworks and retaining walls

- The Department notes that the development includes earthworks. The EIS outlines consent is sought for earthworks, and the geotechnical and hydrogeological investigation for the ELC outlines a maximum cut of up to 2m. The RAP also proposes the excavation and removal of contaminated fill. Given this, the Department requests that you submit:
 - a separate earthworks plan that accurately shows the extent, depth, volume and balance of any cut and fill proposed.
 - details of any retaining walls (including top-of-wall heights, bottom-of-wall heights, construction materials and finishes).

- details of the earthworks associated with remediation (i.e. removal of contaminated fill and details of whether any fill needs to be imported to offset removal of contamination).

9. Student capacity increase

- The Department notes that an increase in student numbers (from 970 students to 1205 students) is proposed over a 10-year timeframe as part of the application. However, there are no details on how this staging will occur or what services and facilities, if any, will support this increased student population.
- It is also unclear whether this population increase is part of the concept approval or part of the detailed design stage.
- As such, it is required that additional information be provided that breaks down the increase in yearly increments, demonstrating how the overall increase is spread across the 10-year time frame. Alternatively, an addendum is provided that removes the 10-year time frame and simply seeks consent for the proposed student increase.
- Additionally, the EIS includes the student capacity increase as part of the detailed development. The increase includes a 42-student increase in boarders; however, the boarding house extension does not form part of the detailed development stage.
- Additional information and documentation is required as to whether the existing student accommodation arrangements can facilitate the additional 42 boarders as proposed, without reliance on the future extension stage proposed as part of the concept proposal.
- The Department requires clarification on proposed increases to staffing and whether any aspect of the development proposes an increase to, or additional, staff accommodation.

10. Traffic and transport

- Details of construction traffic and service vehicle access have not been submitted with the application. The Department requires that you submit the following information as an addendum to the Transport and Accessibility Impact Assessment (TAIA):
 - proposed truck routes.
 - estimated number of truck movements per day.
 - parking arrangements for construction works to conclude there is sufficient parking available on site.
 - details of any required works zones.
 - high level assessment to conclude whether the local road network could accommodate the movements.
 - any management or mitigation measures required to minimise impacts and ensure safety of road users and pedestrians.

- proposed access arrangements for service vehicles and emergency vehicles, including swept paths.
- The Department notes swept paths for a medium rigid vehicle (MRV) are provided. Clarification is required as to whether the proposed waste service vehicles are intended to be MRV.
- Within the TAIA, there is no reference made to the 10-year timeframe associated with the student capacity increase. If the student capacity is increased over a 10-year timeframe, the traffic modelling must account for the likely increases in traffic in the vicinity of the site of the specific year across the period (i.e. the amount of traffic in the road network likely to exist in 2031). It should then model the design traffic volume based on the forecast background traffic growth after 10-years. Alternatively, if the 10-year timeframe for student capacity increase is removed, this additional modelling would not be required, and the existing forecast can be relied upon.
- The development includes additional parking in Precinct A; however, there are inconsistencies between documentation. For example, on the proposed site plan (AR-ABC-A1-01 revision 4) there are three parking spaces proposed behind the ELC's outdoor play area; however, these spaces are not shown in detail in the plan set for Precinct A (i.e. A-A0-00 – A-Y1-03). Additional information is required that clearly shows the location, dimensions and relevant details of all parking spaces proposed within Precinct A.

11. Stormwater concept

- The Department notes a civil engineering report and civil drawings set have been provided. However, the Department does not consider that the information adequately addresses the SEARs.
- The SEARs required details of drainage associated with the proposal, including stormwater and drainage infrastructure.
- A stormwater concept for the entire site has not been provided. For example, there are no details on where the increased stormwater as a result of the new ELC building flows, and whether it is connected to the proposed on-site detention system (OSD). If it does not flow to the OSD, clarification is required as to how this stormwater is treated for water quality.
- As such, the Department requires revised civil drawings, and an addendum to the report, that adequately details how stormwater within the entire site is managed.

12. Child Care Planning Guideline

- The Department notes that the EIS includes an assessment against State Environmental Planning Policy (Educational Establishments and Child Care Facilities) 2017 and the Child Care Planning Guideline 2017. In this assessment, it is outlined that compliance is achieved with regards to unencumbered indoor and outdoor play space. However, there are no figures, diagrams or plans verifying the unencumbered play areas. Consequently, the Department requires you to provide an addendum to the EIS that shows all floor plans for the ELC buildings, with the unencumbered spaces

hatched/outlined with dimensions and notations to demonstrate compliance in relation to both indoor and outdoor areas.

- The Child Care Planning Guideline requires laundry facilities and nappy change areas, which are not included. The Department does not consider the laundry facilities in the Senior school boarding house, and the absence of nappy change areas, to be sufficient, given that a new facility is proposed. Consequently, the Department requires laundry and nappy change facilities be included within the proposed ELC building.
- The submitted plans do not adequately demonstrate that appropriate shading is provided for the outdoor play areas of the ELC to comply with the Child Care Planning Guideline requirement for a minimum 30% of the area. The Department requires additional information demonstrating that this requirement is complied with.

13. Ecologically sustainable design (ESD)

- The Department notes that a Sustainable Development Report has been submitted in support of the application. However, the report is 'draft', and the document is not a final version (nor does it have a document reference number). A final version of the report should be submitted with the Response to Submissions, to comply with the requirements of the SEARs.
- The report confirms at section 5.2 that photovoltaic (PV) panels will be installed as part of a site wide strategy; however, only indicates potential locations for PV panels, being the junior and ELC roofs. The report also recommends that rainwater tanks be added to the ELC and junior school.
- However, the architectural plans do not include rainwater tanks or PV panels. Clarification is required as to whether or not PV panels and rainwater tanks are included in the design. If so, they are to be clearly detailed on architectural plans to allow proper assessment.
- Additionally, the table included under section 5.3 of the report is not complete. Throughout the table, a number of columns include question marks and highlighted text. As such, the table does not accurately indicate what initiatives are included in the development, and an assessment cannot be undertaken. The Department requires you to submit an amended Table in the final report.

14. Architectural plan set matters

- The architectural plan sets for the detailed design must include details of all proposed signage, including dimensions, elevations, content, illumination and location.
- The view impact analysis photomontages contained within the architectural design report are to be included in the relevant architectural plan sets.

15. Landscaping

- The landscape information submitted with the application is not satisfactory detailed for the scale of the proposed development. Revised detailed landscape plans that are appropriately dimensioned and scaled are required and must include a landscape

concept for the entire site, and for each individual component of the detailed development.

- The landscape plans should also be submitted in two separate sets for the Concept Proposal and the Stage 1 proposal.