

21 June 2021

Ms Jacquie McCann
Chief Operating Officer
LORETO NORMANHURST LIMITED
91-93 Pennant Hills Road
Normanhurst, New South Wales 2076

Dear Ms McCann

Loreto Normanhurst School Redevelopment (Concept Proposal and Stage 1) (SSD-8996) Request for additional information

I refer to the assessment for the Loreto Normanhurst School Redevelopment (Concept Proposal and Stage 1) (SSD-8996).

After careful consideration, the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (Department) is requesting that you provide additional information to address issues identified in the Supplementary Response to Submissions (SRtS) as detailed below:

(a) Noise Impact Assessment Report

The proposed new though-site road from Osborn Road to Mount Pleasant Avenue may result in additional noise impacts on the surrounding residential properties, particularly due to the new Mount Pleasant Avenue vehicular egress point. Please provide an updated Noise Impact Assessment Report (or an addendum statement as necessary) which provides an assessment of the additional traffic noise generated by the new through-site road and the associated impacts on the surrounding residents.

(b) Traffic SRtS Report

Please update the Traffic SRtS Report, dated 7 May 2021, or provide an addendum to address the following:

- (i) Whether the new drop-off and pick-up (DOPU) facility will be open prior to the afternoon pick-up to address current issues with early queuing. If so, what time?
- (ii) The SIDRA volumes in the RtS Traffic Report appear to differ from SIDRA volumes in SRtS Traffic Report. However, it is not clear whether the future year scenarios considered the rerouted traffic via Normanhurst Road and whether there are any associated impacts.
- (iii) Include SIDRA modelling of the No Right Turn (or any other changes) from Mount Pleasant Avenue (south) into Pennants Hills Road (east) and identify any impacts to Normanhurst Road as a result of rerouted traffic.

(c) Traffic RtS Report

Page 23 of the Traffic RtS Report, dated 15 January 2020, identifies that the existing DOPU facility onsite has a length of 42.6m accommodating four spaces and a queue capacity of three vehicles. Can you please confirm that the queue capacity is accurate. Given the length of 42.6m of the existing DOPU facility, it may have a higher queuing capacity.

(d) Traffic Impact Assessment EIS Report

The SRtS did not provide an updated assessment of construction traffic to reflect the amended proposal (i.e. expansion of scope of stage 1 works to include new car parking areas and the through-site road). Please update the construction traffic section of the Traffic Impact Assessment Report, submitted with the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), to take in to account the amendments made to the application.

(e) Construction Management Plan

The RtS Construction Management Plan (Appendix U, dated 9/12/2020) does not include the 'Site Establishment Plan' referenced as being in Appendix A. The original Site Establishment Plan provided with the EIS (Appendix V) is substantially out of date / superseded. Accordingly, please provide an updated Site Establishment Plan.

(f) Concept Drawings

The Concept drawings (A0027 to A0046) need to be updated to indicate the demolition of the 1960s connecting buildings between Mary Ward and Givendale buildings. The plans incorrectly show these buildings already removed.

(g) Uniform Shop

The SRtS states that the uniform shop demountable building will be temporarily relocated to the future Early Learning Centre (ELS) site until the ELC building is completed. The uniform shop would then be located to another building within the campus. While the indicative relocation of the uniform shop is shown on the aerial image in the SRtS, this needs to be shown in the architectural set of drawings. Accordingly, please include drawings in the architectural set to reflect the proposed temporary relocation of the uniform shop building. Please also include an estimated timeframe for completion of the ELC site / removal of the uniform shop building from the site.

(h) Substation and Switchboard Structure

The proposal includes the provision of a new kiosk substation and a separate switchboard structure located within the Mount Pleasant Avenue site frontage directly adjacent to the Teresa Ball carpark driveway. While Appendix Y of the EIS shows the location of the substation and switchboard, these structures are not shown on the architectural and landscaping drawings.

According to Appendix Y, it appears that the proposed substation and switchboard are located over the pedestrian pathway in front of the Teresa Ball gates. Currently, this pedestrian entry is considered to provide a positive contribution to the streetscape. This location is not considered

appropriate for the substation and switchboard because they would obstruct pedestrian access to the site and would be in a highly visible location, resulting in a poor urban design outcome.

Furthermore, there are two trees in close proximity to the proposed substation and switchboard. The substation and switchboard are not shown on the plans within the Arborist Report and it is presumed that no assessment has been made about the potential impact on these two trees from these structures.

The location of the substation and switchboard should be reconsidered to relocate the structures to a different part of the site taking into consideration visibility from the streetscape, heritage impacts, pedestrian accessibility, and impacts on existing trees. The new substation and switchboard location must be shown on the architectural and landscape drawings and included in the Arborist Report (if there are trees in close proximity).

Additionally, it is noted that the proposed substation and switchboard are located outside the Stage 1 scope of works boundary shown on the architectural drawings (Nos. A0003, S1-003 andS1-004). If consent is sought for these structures as part of the Stage 1 works, they need to be clearly shown on the architectural and landscape drawings as being within the scope of the Stage 1 works.

Alternatively, consideration could be given to removing the proposed substation from the proposal and to seek development consent separately through Council. This would allow for sufficient time to carefully consider an appropriate location for the substation and for consultation with Ausgrid to occur.

You are requested to provide the information to the Department by Tuesday 29 June 2021. If you are unable to provide the requested information within this timeframe, you are requested to provide, and commit to, a timeframe detailing the provision of this information.

If you have any questions, please contact Tahlia Alexander, on (02) 9995 6022 at Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au.

Yours sincerely,

Aditi Coomar Team Leader

Social & Infrastructure Assessments

· Coomar