

19 August 2020

16205

Jim Betts  
Secretary  
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment  
12 Darcy Street  
Parramatta NSW 2150

Attention: Kathryn Glover, Planning Officer – Social & Infrastructure Assessments

Dear Kathryn,

## **REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION – SSD 7919 MOD 2**

This submission has been prepared by Ethos Urban on behalf of Loreto Kirribilli, in response to the Request for Additional Information (RFI) issued by the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (the Department) on 22 June 2020, relating to SSD 7919 MOD 2. SSD 7919 MOD 2 seeks approval for internal and external design amendments and the installation of a substation.

This letter has been prepared in response to comments raised by the Department, as well as the two public submissions received. It is noted that Council did not raise any comments in relation to the proposed modification. This response should be read in conjunction with the information provided by FJMT at **Attachment A**.

**Table 1** over outlines the submissions and comments received, and the Applicant's response. We trust that these responses and clarifications will assist with your assessment of the proposed modification. Should you have any queries about this matter or require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me on 0411 818 359.





Yours sincerely,



**Kate Tudehope**  
Associate Director  
0411 818 359  
ktudehope@ethosurban.com

**Table 1      Response to Submissions**

Item and Description	Response
<b>DPIE Issues Letter RFI items</b>	
The Department raises strong concerns that the proposed changes to the materiality of the lift overrun (from a transparent glass to concrete) would result in an adverse impact on the sky views enjoyed by the residents on the western side of the site (at 111 Carabella Street).	<p>In response to DPIE's comments, FJMT has prepared a statement to support the proposed change in materiality from glazing to off form concrete (<b>Attachment A</b>).</p> <p>The development, as proposed to be modified, will result in significantly improved views from apartments to the west of the site, notwithstanding the proposed change in lift materiality.</p>
The Department's view impact assessment of the original proposal concluded that the transparent material of the lift overrun would assist in retaining the visual permeability and sky views for the affected neighbours. However, the proposed modification would not result in improving this previously assessed outcome. As a result, the Department considers that the proposed material of the lift overrun should be converted to a transparent material like glass (as previously approved).	<p>The relocation of the kitchen exhaust system and the significant reduction of the mechanical plant on the roof has opened-up this area to provide a greater sense of space and access to northern views towards the water for the neighbours to the west. The height of the lift overrun has also been reduced. As shown in the submitted view analysis (reproduced at <b>Figure 1</b> below), these improvements will greatly enhance the roof top amenity and views across the site from neighbouring apartments when compared to the approved development. This significant reduction in rooftop plant will offset the proposed change in lift materiality.</p> <p>Further, through consultation with the project's façade engineer, it has been advised that completely clear glass would not be achievable due to thermal requirements for the glazing. If the glazing were retained, it would need to have a dark tint or performance film, similar to the sample shown at <b>Figure 2</b>. This, together with the necessary internal structures and equipment would reduce the transparency of the glazing and the visual benefit it offers.</p>
Otherwise further justification should be provided as to why the proposed materiality change would result in a better outcome for the proposal, in terms of the view impacts.	<p>Finally, given the cost of the lift glazing and potential supply chain risks associated with the current circumstances, the revised materiality is considered the most appropriate means of minimising the risk of supply chain delay and potential construction delay and further increase to costs. The concrete finish will be a high quality, off form concrete - FJMT is confident that a high-quality finish can be achieved due to the rectilinear lift form (refer to example at <b>Figure 3</b>).</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the concrete lift overrun will not achieve the same level of transparency as clear glazing, the originally intended transparency is not possible due to the need for the glass to be tinted for thermal performance. Further, the proposed modification will see the extent of rooftop plant significantly reduced, which will improve northern views towards the water from neighbouring apartments, providing benefits beyond what would be achieved by the glass lift overrun.</p>

Item and Description	Response	
	<b>Approved MOD 1 View</b>	<b>Proposed View</b>
	W7 Living Room 	W7 Living Room 
	W10 Kitchen 	W10 Kitchen 
	<b>Figure 1 - Eastern Visual Impact (SSD approved building outlined in red, MOD 1 approved outlined in green, proposed outlined in blue)</b> <i>Source: FJMT</i>	

Item and Description	Response
	<div data-bbox="696 231 1144 778"></div> <div data-bbox="696 778 1144 831"><p><b>Figure 2 – Indicative glazing tint</b> <i>Source: FJMT</i></p></div> <div data-bbox="696 831 1144 1369"></div> <div data-bbox="696 1369 1144 1433"><p><b>Figure 2 – Proposed high quality concrete finish</b> <i>Source: FJMT</i></p></div>

Item and Description	Response
<b>Public Submissions</b>	
I object to the project in totality for reasons of the ever increasing scale and negative impost that Loreto and St Aloysius have on the local community. Both schools have continued to grow unchecked and now dominate this very small community. Moreover, the schools add nothing to the community rather they simply seek to extract as much value as possible without little or no consideration to the local residents.	<p>The Innovation Centre was approved in October 2018. As part of their approval of the application, the Independent Planning Commission found that the development will <i>'provide benefit for the future users of the site and the community by delivering state of the art contemporary teaching and learning facilities with more adaptable and collaborative learning spaces to improve educational outcomes'</i>.</p> <p>The modification relates to minor internal and external modifications resulting from ongoing design development and includes a reduction in the extent of roof top plant, a change to the materiality of the lift overrun, minor changes to the extent of excavation and the installation of a new kiosk substation on the site's Carabella Street frontage.</p> <p>The changes are minor, and the development, as proposed to be modified, will continue to be in the public benefit.</p>
The further removal of 9 Trees. This is a 'leafy' suburb that Loreto wishes to replace with its ever increasing 'concrete jungle'.	The proposed modification does not involve the removal of any additional trees.
The heritage report suggests that there will be no impact in respect to 44 nor 48 Carabella St and a minor impact on 71 Carabella St. That is a matter of opinion. I have lived in Kirribilli for 20+ years and inclusion of such a substation and removal of local flora can only have a detrimental visual impact.	<p>As noted above, the proposed modification does not involve any additional tree removal.</p> <p>As outlined in the submitted Heritage Impact Statement prepared by GML, the proposed substation and alterations to the school's boundary wall will have no impact to the heritage significance of the school or on elements within the school that are of exceptional significance. The substation will have a minor impact on the setting of J-Block and the Carabella Street boundary wall, which are both assessed as having moderate heritage significance.</p> <p>The substation has been sited to reduce impacts on the site's heritage significance. Various options were considered for the location of the proposed substation, however GML found that the chosen location will have the least impact to the heritage significance of the school, whilst meeting the requirements of Energy Australia.</p>
I live within 2 houses of Loreto School. The noise for this project from December 2019 through to and including March was unacceptably loud. So loud it was not possible to conduct a conversation in the house or make a telephone call without shouting.	<p>Based on the details provided in this submission, Loreto Kirribilli and its project team understand that they have already exchanged correspondence with the Department about noise concerns raised by this resident.</p> <p>As the Department is aware, bulk excavation activities were undertaken on the western side of the campus between December 2019 and April 2020. It is acknowledged that these were noisy activities and that this particular resident found the impacts distressing.</p>
The house would vibrate with certain excavation activities. New cracks have opened up. No dilapidation report was undertaken on the house before the development occurred. Despite this breach nothing has been done. No further works should be undertaken on this project until noise mitigation measures and remediation of the cracking has been undertaken on the house.	<p>These activities included rock breaking, rock hammering, sheet piling, pile driving and similar noisy activities. Regular noise and vibration assessments were undertaken at the site in accordance with the requirements of the Construction Noise and Vibration Assessment (Ref: TJ415-01F05 Acoustic Stage 1 DA Assessment (r7)). The outcomes provided were consistent for projects of this nature and were compliant with the Conditions of Consent. Specific noise mitigation measures were undertaken in accordance with the approved Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan. Additionally, an extra noise monitoring device was installed on the western boundary to provide readily accessible noise data to further understand and manage noise impacts in relation to this specific complaint. To address concerns about cracking, a dilapidation report has now been completed for 113 Carabella Street, to the satisfaction of the Department.</p>
The stress levels from the noise resulted in my face to face complaining to the Principal of the School and the project manager. Remarkably while outside	

Item and Description	Response
<p>the Principal's office I noticed that the noise was significantly less than at the house 2 doors down. Over the period Jan to May I made several complaints to the Department about the noise.</p>	<p>The submission appears focused on temporary impacts from the construction phase. It does not refer to any long-term impacts or concerns in relation to the proposed modification application. As such, the project team will continue to manage any noise or construction impacts in accordance with the Conditions of Consent and previously approved plans.</p>