

09/05/2021

Mr David Lewis  
Statutory Planner  
School Infrastructure NSW  
Suite 9 259 George Street  
Sydney NSW 2000

Dear Mr Lewis

**Mosman High School Upgrade (SSD-10465)  
Response to Submissions**

The exhibition of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for Mosman High School Upgrade ended on Wednesday 5 May 2021. Submissions received from the public and all Government agency advice received by the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (the Department) during the exhibition of the project is available on the Department's website at <https://www.planningportal.nsw.gov.au/major-projects/project/34286>.

In accordance with clause 85A of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000, the Planning Secretary requires the Applicant to respond to all issues raised in these submissions and Government agency advice, and where necessary, technical supporting documents must be revised and resubmitted.

Please note that Heritage NSW (Heritage Council of NSW) has yet to provide comments in relation to the application. If received, comments will be forwarded upon receipt.

The Department has also undertaken a review of the EIS and in addition to the issues raised in agency submissions, requires the matters at Attachment 1 be addressed in full.

You are requested to provide the Department with a response to the submissions by **30 August 2021**.

Note that under clause 113(7) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000, the days occurring between the date of this letter and the date on which your response to submissions is received by the Planning Secretary are not included in the deemed refusal period.

If you have any questions, please contact Rebecca Sommer on (02) 9274 6184 or via email at [Rebecca.sommer@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Rebecca.sommer@planning.nsw.gov.au).

Yours sincerely

APPROVERSIGNATUREANDDETAILSWILLBEINSERTEDHERE  
**as delegate for the Planning Secretary**

## Attachment 1

The Department requests the following matters be provided and clarified:

### General

- The Department wishes to emphasise the importance of consistency and accuracy in terminology and naming throughout all documentation. There are several instances where items are incorrectly named (e.g. Belmont, Belmond, Elmont) throughout the report and figures do not add up (e.g. Table 4 (56+34=90, however the total presented is 88) and these generate confusion. The Department recommends a thorough review be undertaken of all documentation prior to formal lodgement.
- A summary of works approved as part of the REF, particularly in relation to the ongoing use of the school for both school and community purposes.
- Clarification on the number of permanent buildings at the site and the number of demountable buildings (current and anticipated during construction). These should be clearly labelled on a diagram.
- Clarification on the CIV and number of construction jobs between documentation provided, application form and forms from lodgement (70 vs. 200).
- Depicted detail and specific numbers of bicycle parks (both existing and proposed) and end-of-trip facilities.
- Confirmation of all operational hours of the school premises, including for school purposes i.e. band and sporting practice and community uses, including on weekends.
- There are trees along Belmont Road that have been identified for removal in architectural drawings (e.g. Demolition Plan) which differs from those presented within the Arboricultural report. Given that no works are occurring in the immediate vicinity of these trees, justification for the removal of the trees is required. Additionally, consistency across all drawings and diagrams must be presented.

### Traffic

- Mitigation of the temporary removal of parking spaces during construction must be addressed.
- The traffic surveys and written surveys were undertaken following the completion of year 12. Given the frequency of senior students driving to school, please provide justification as to how the survey undertaken provides a wholistic view of the existing modal split generated by the existing development and the anticipated changes as a result of increased student numbers.
- Parking surveys should take into consideration year 12 students driving to the school.
- As observed during the traffic survey, multiple buses were observed to arrive simultaneously and queue at the Bus Zone along Gladstone Avenue, which can accommodate two buses only (with five scheduled to arrive simultaneously, which blocks a travel lane). Please provide detail of potential solutions to the queuing and/or justification for the existing operation, particularly given other pick-up/drop-off congestion occurring along Gladstone Avenue.
- Additionally, the capacity of Gladstone Avenue is modelled as LoS A. If the lane is periodically blocked by buses, additional justification of a LoS A is requested.
- Noting that Military Road is often congested, clarification on the level of service outputs provided by modelling should be further justified and the existing congestion in the local area should be acknowledged. This should include detail of the contribution of the existing school operation to the congestion and the anticipated changes to this both during construction and operation or the proposed development.

### Noise

- Provide justification for the location of the loggers and explanation as to why the attended and unattended loggers were not consistently placed at the most affected sensitive receiver.
- The EIS states that normal construction works are expected to exceed the limits for highly noise affected receivers within standard hours, however compliance can be achieved through specific noise mitigation measures. The detail of the measures that would mitigate noise levels has not been provided. The Department requests detail on the measures to be implemented to reduce construction noise impacts and ensure compliance with noise guidelines.
- The technical noise assessment (Appendix AD) needs to include further consideration of recommendations and strategies for the mitigation of construction noise. The impacts are anticipated to be significant and measures must be proposed – consultation with the community is not considered sufficient.

The detail provided on operational noise is lacking, particularly considering the school is an operational site. Please include further detail of the noise impacts upon sensitive receivers anticipated with out of hours use of the site, as well as with public address and school bell systems. This detail should include comparison of the existing operational noise levels to the predicated operational noise levels of the proposed development.