



24th October 2017

Dominic Crinnion
Team Leader, Social and
Other Infrastructure
Assessments
320 Pitt St
SYDNEY NSW 2000

Dear Dominic,

Please find our review of the SSD 8344 proposal for North Kellyville Public School.

In general we support the proposal.

We recommend that the following additional information is requested;

- The Green Travel Plan, as requested by the SEARS and mentioned in the Traffic Report, was not found at Appendix F, as the Traffic Report noted. Please provide the Green Travel Plan, including details of bicycle entry and parking.
- A Site plan that describes the entry, parking and drop off zones with notes on how separation of vehicles and pedestrians will be achieved.
- Detailed plans and description of which parts of the school grounds can be made available for after school hours care and community use outside of school hours.
- Detail on sections and elevations which clearly show materials and detailing. Typical details of cladding and windows should be provided at 1:20
- Typical classroom plans showing furniture layouts with alternative arrangements demonstrating the flexibility of the spaces.
- A physical materials sample board where materials are shown in the proportion they are intended to be used in the project.

On the basis of the drawings currently submitted, our design recommendations are as follows;

Government Architect
New South Wales
L24, 320 Pitt Street
Sydney NSW 2000
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

government.architect
@planning.nsw.gov.au
T +61 (02)9373 2800





- Provide a shelter visible to the administration offices and the car pick up zone where students can wait out of the weather.
- Consider developing more articulation in the form as seen from the exterior, for example to provide opportunities to see through the building along the south elevation (over the entry) and to the east, or to demarcate the entry more strongly.
- A revised Landscape Plan is to be submitted showing boundary planting that is more resilient to shade, and ball sports and provides WSUD and wildlife support functions. Provide a detailed planting plan.

Kind regards,

Peter Poulet
NSW Government Architect

Government Architect
New South Wales
L24, 320 Pitt Street
Sydney NSW 2000
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

government.architect
@planning.nsw.gov.au
T +61 (02)9373 2800





COMMENTS IN RESPONSE TO STATE SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION SSD 8310 CURL CURL NORTH PUBLIC SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

BACKGROUND

The Department of Planning has asked the Government Architect NSW to provide independent design review commentary on State Significant Development application SSD 8344, North Kellyville Public School.

The application is for the construction of new school buildings. New landscaping, sports fields, signage and fencing is proposed.

The proposal caters for student numbers of up to 1000 with associated staff and teachers. Consideration should be given for the likely population growth over the next 50 years.

REVIEW

This review is conducted with reference to the GA NSW Design Guide for Schools and Better Placed- An integrated design policy for NSW. It is noted that the submission made no specific references to these documents, but have referenced the SEPP Educational Establishments and Childcare Facilities.

We commend the proposal for its' architectural form, efficiency of planning and siting, access to light and air, approach to sustainability and flexibility and for the delight that is provided by the large internal courtyard.

1. Context, built form and landscape

The proposal provides good aspect for the classrooms and for maximizing light to the playgrounds. The proposal does not replicate or reference the surrounding built form, being single storey dwellings, but rather proposes an institutional building which clearly demonstrates the identity of the building as a school.

The proposal is over the maximum height and significantly higher than the single family dwellings that surround it. However due to the community status of school buildings and the fact that the height is in part produced by the topography and the need to keep level access across the two stories of the school, the height is supported.

It is not clear why demountables have been included in the proposal. Justification should be provided for why there is not a more sustainable and permanent solution for that usage.

Government Architect
New South Wales
L24, 320 Pitt Street
Sydney NSW 2000
GPO Box 39
Sydney NSW 2001

government.architect
@planning.nsw.gov.au
T +61 (02)9373 2800



2. Sustainable, efficient and durable

The proposal maximises the northern aspect of the majority of spaces and controls the solar access carefully through the use of vertical and horizontal blades. Consideration should be given to cross ventilation through the courtyard space so that hot air does not become trapped within that space. Material choices have been made carefully for durability and low maintenance.

The site planning allows for a large amount of the site to be landscaped, however the landscape proposal is inadequate for wear and tear, shade and WSUD principles and should be further developed to incorporate grasses and mid-storey planting around the boundary fencing. Water storage should be equivalent to the capacity required to catch 100 % of the average rainfall in any given month and should be adequate to supply the irrigation of the playing fields. Garden store is not well located for ease of use of the vegetable garden as a teaching and learning space.

Bicycle parking is provided however it appears to be inadequate for 1000 students and teachers.

3. Accessible and inclusive

The proposal includes one lift which is associated with the entry. This is reasonably centrally located, though not associated with a staircase which would provide more equitable access.

A school can play many roles in a community and these opportunities to support other community activities need to be developed. A strategy is required indicating how to secure different parts of the site to enable shared use, for example renting the school hall to another community group in out of school hours or allowing use of the soccer field and netball courts.

4. Amenity

The proposal creates a variety of interesting and useable playground spaces with significant space for playing fields. The proposal in general should contribute positively to the amenity of the area. For example, boundary landscaping should provide amenity, shade and increased public domain where it adjoins public footpaths.

The main entry, as it faces towards the private boundary does not provide for passively supervised arrival and departure. No provision has been made for student pick up zones that provide shelter from rain or sun.

5. Health and Safety



The proposal provides good opportunities for controlled entry/ exit to the building (but not the site). The provision for light, air and physical activity are all well considered. The proposal shows thoughtful strategic site planning in order to achieve practical and useable outdoor spaces and playing fields.

6. Whole of Life, flexible, adaptable

A key factor in the sustainability of a school over time will be in its' ability to be flexible as educational pedagogy evolves. The proposal demonstrates a good level of engagement with the current pedagogy and acknowledgement of flexibility over time. Further information should be provided on the furniture layouts, including a number of alternative furniture arrangements.

7. Aesthetics

The proposal presents as a large institutional building, however the attention to detail in material, colour and planning demonstrates an appropriate playfulness and friendliness despite the scale of the elevations. Further development of the design should see some break up of the form to the south, over the entry and the east towards the street which will give some relief to the long stretches of elevation and roof. The internal courtyard provides amenity to the students and staff through all activities, which creates both a feeling of security and provides the opportunity for lightness to the internal facades.

DESIGN EXCELLENCE PROCESS

The proponent has included documentation of the consultation process, however it is unclear if any design review or independent design advice has been undertaken during the design development. The architect is included in the NSW Government Architect pre-qualification for Strategy and Design Excellence scheme.