

Mark Lintermans
[REDACTED]
Bungendore, NSW 2621
16 October 2021

Director - Social and Infrastructure Assessments
Planning and Assessment
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment
Locked Bag 5022
Parramatta NSW 2124

Dear Sir or Madam

**NEW HIGH SCHOOL IN BUNGENDORE
APPLICATION NO. SSD-14394209**

I refer to the above state-significant development application.

I **object** to the proposal, for the following reason(s):

(1) Operational noise levels

The DA notes the following as key noise sources for the operation of the school:

- use of the hall/gym for presentations or performances,
- the public address (PA) system,
- school bell,
- any out of hours community use of school facilities.

And then states "Regarding outdoor activities, the predicted noise levels exceed the rating background level by up to 16dB(A), which is greater than the standard "background + 5dB(A)" noise emission criteria. The most impacted residential receivers will be those to the north of the site having direct line of sight to parts of the Oval and courts." and then concludes that "The exceedance, however, is considered reasonable in the circumstances of this case....

As the resident to the north that is closest to the hall/gym and the outdoor sports courts, I do not consider it "reasonable" at all. The location of the Hall and sports courts directly opposite residences on Turallo Terrace is a very poor, and unacceptable decision. Both the Hall and sports courts are mooted for community use with the Hall to potentially operate until 10 pm on any day of the week. Both the Hall and sports courts should be located either on the current majara St or Gibraltar St sides of the proposed site which are not residential.

(2) Lighting

The grandly-named (Appendix 24) is a joke; is totally inadequate and so brief as to be embarrassing. The SEARS requirements state that must:

- *"Assess amenity impacts on the surrounding locality, including solar access, visual privacy, visual amenity, overshadowing, wind impacts and acoustic impacts. A high level of environmental amenity for any surrounding residential land uses must be demonstrated.*

Provide:

- *an analysis of proposed lighting that identifies lighting on-site that will impact surrounding sensitive receivers and includes mitigation measures to manage any impacts”*

If you remove all the preamble and bumph about what and where the school is (so that removes 5 of the 6 pages), there are precisely 159 words of content. It does not say what the lighting will be around the Hall (what sort of security lighting, how many units, where placed, what direction do the lights face, are they on a timer (and if so what time does it go off), will it be permanently on, triggered by motion sensors?; what lumens will be emitted?); what is the proposed light spill? How far are the light units from existing residences?

To just say that it will meet an Australian Standard is not enough information for community assessment of the impacts. Similarly the mitigation measures are so bland as to be meaningless. The *Lighting Impact Management Plan* does not address at all following SEARs requirements:

- *amenity impacts on the surrounding locality*
- *visual privacy*
- *visual amenity*
- *A high level of environmental amenity for any surrounding residential land uses **must be demonstrated***
- *an analysis of proposed lighting that **identifies** lighting on-site that will impact surrounding sensitive receivers*

Is there going to be lighting on the outdoor sports courts (proposed and in the future with the DA mentioning possible shared facility use with Council?. I strongly object to any proposal that is going to inflect future floodlighting on immediately adjacent residential properties. The DA needs to specifically rule out floodlighting of the sports courts.

(3) Fencing of the Agriculture Plot

The DA proposes “a 2.1m high chain wire fence surrounding Ag Plot”. The Agriculture Plot is being stolen from the ‘Common’ and a 2.1 m chain wire fence is visually intrusive and aesthetically totally incompatible with the remainder of the ‘Common’ . What is the need for a 2.1 m fence? It is certainly not ‘agricultural’ in nature (I would suggest more custodial than agricultural). Maybe the Department of Education could amend the plan to include guard towers at each corner to make doubly sure that no pesky agricultural nuisances (dogs, rabbits, Bungendore residents?) gain access to the plot! Seriously, what is wrong with an agricultural fence (ie 1.2 m high with standard netting).

I have not, and no associate of mine, has made any political donation to any person in the 2 years preceding this submission.

Yours faithfully,

Mark Lintermans