



PCU012546

Mr Chris Wilson Acting Deputy Director General, Development Assessments Department of Planning and Infrastructure 23-33 Bridge Street SYDNEY NSW 2000

Department of Planning Received 4 DEC 2012 Scanning Room

Dear Mr Wilson

Your Reference:MP11\_0015 Our Reference: DOC12/435377

# RE: MP 11\_0015 Preferred Project for Rozelle Village / Balmain Tigers

Thank you for inviting the Department of Education and Communities (DEC) to make a submission on the preferred project for the Rozelle Village / Balmain Tigers Development.

DEC have reviewed the Preferred Project Report and still has some concerns with the preferred project and the applicant's responses to issues raised by DEC for the original project. DEC request that you investigate the project further for the following reasons:

#### 1. Traffic and Transport

Recent senate inquiries such as the *Joint Standing Committee on Road Safety – Inquiry into School Zone Safety* (March 2012) reinforces the focus of school road safety as a significant issue. DEC therefore requested that the TMAP included a school traffic survey during the AM peak period by a qualified traffic engineer assessing school traffic safety. This was not carried out by the applicant and our concerns with the potential impact on pedestrian safety have not been addressed.

The impact of traffic generation from the proposed development in Terry Street, Merton Street, Darling Street (South) and Victoria Road must also be evaluated together with the Tigers Development. DEC's concern is that together with other planned developments, the traffic network will exceed the budgeted capacity around Rozelle Public School and therefore creating serious traffic issues.

DEC does not agree with proposed clearway measures on Darling Street and Wellington Street to alleviate traffic congestion at peak hour as the school community relies on the current parking arrangement on these streets to access the school.

#### 2. Privacy and Security

٠.

DEC concerns with privacy and security issues raised in our previous response have not been adequately addressed. For example:

• The smoker's balcony whilst screened remains in its previous location, directly facing the school playground. We ask that you ensure that the development is assessed with appropriate conditions to limit the risk of students witnessing smokers through a relocated smoker's lounge facility, to mitigate this socially unacceptable outcome.



 DEC employ qualified staff to ensure child protection and security of children at the school is maintained and for this reason we do not agree with the applicant's argument that greater surveillance will result in better security. DEC's concern is that the height and density of the residential development has the potential to result in visual privacy and security issues from occupants in high rise apartments with direct viewing into the school. This is something that can only be managed through design or reducing the risk factor by reducing the building's height. Our previous submission outlined ways to mitigate this impact of which the applicant has not considered.

## 3. Construction Traffic, Noise and Dust

The Acoustic report notes that construction noise levels have the potential to exceed the stated noise criteria by 7 – 22db to 77db, during construction. The report also notes the assumption that the school does not use natural ventilation, which is incorrect as the school has operable windows on buildings nearest to Victoria Road. Mitigation measures need to be identified to protect the school learning environment and this has not been carried out.

### 4. General consultation on impacts

DEC note that there has been no meaningful consultation carried out by the applicant – e.g. face to face meetings, school visits etc. It appears the applicant is using the Department of Planning and Infrastructure's consultation as a proxy process.

DEC reiterate that the local school community is concerned by the proposed development and requests that the applicant ensure an appropriate and justified level of community consultation is undertaken. This consultation should be driven by the applicant rather than primarily relying on the public exhibition of the proposal's technical documents on the Department of Planning and Infrastructure's web page.

I would also ask that an appropriate *Construction Environment Management Plan* is prepared in consultation with the school so as to avoid loud construction practices, dust emissions and other potential construction impacts during key school periods.

Please contact Devika DeFonseka, Regional Asset Planner, Sydney Region on 9217 3009 or email <u>devika.defonseka@det.nsw.edu.au</u> should you require any further assistance or clarifications in relation to this matter.

Yours Sincerely

۰.

7 Webe Ġ **Tony McCabe** 

Director, Planning and Delivery