

Wenona School, Project Archimedes

Attachment A - Response to Submissions

Issues Raised by Agencies	Action
Department of Planning	
<p>The implications of the proposed removal of 11 off-street car parking spaces to facilitate the proposed development is not addressed in the EIS. The existing parking demand and supply at Wenona School should be clearly detailed, and the stated reliance on Council's Ridge Street car park to potentially offset the removal of the car parking spaces requires further clarification and commitment including, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. location and proximity of the Council car park to Wenona School; and ii. confirmation and evidence of any car parking agreement made with Council and/or other land owners for the offset of the removal of 11 spaces, including any existing car parking agreement with Wenona School. 	<p>The proposed development is the relocation of existing school activities and does not increase the demand for parking. Wenona acknowledges that the reduction in parking resulting from the proposed development must be appropriately managed, however it is impractical to enter into an agreement at this stage. As detailed below, the School has a number of existing agreements in place, and is committed to extending these agreements if necessary. The requirement to provide evidence of an agreement being made would be more appropriately addressed by way of condition of consent, with details of the agreement to be provided prior to the issue of the final Occupation Certificate.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the following information is provided in response to the Department's questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Ridge Street car park is located approximately 300m to the north-west of the site. ▪ The relevant car parking agreements with Council and/or any other land owners are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 33 permanent leased spaces from Aqualand (SAP/Rydges building); - 30 permanent leased spaces from North Sydney Council (Ridge Street carpark); and - The School has also previously leased spaces from St Thomas' Church and used other commercial suppliers in West Street, Walker Street and Berry Street. ▪ With respect to parking demand: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The School does not provide any parking for students. - Demand (and hence parking utilisation) varies on a day to day basis, due to the schedule and work locations of staff at the School. - The School aims to provide parking to academic and support staff if they must drive to work, as it is not possible or appropriate for these staff to park in time-restricted residential street parking. - The School is reducing its demand for parking via initiatives (including financial incentives) to discourage private travel and has a Green Travel Plan for submission to North Sydney Council.

Issues Raised by Agencies	Action
Confirmation is to be provided on whether the proposed development generates additional external user groups during, before and after school hours and on weekends.	<p>The proposed development will not generate any additional external user groups during, before or after school or on the weekends.</p> <p>The School's existing pool (on Walker Street) and gymnasium (at 255 Miller Street) are used during school hours, before and after school hours and on the weekends. The facilities are used for a range of activities including netball, volleyball, gymnastics, water polo and squad training.</p> <p>The proposed development will continue to accommodate this range of activities, however does not seek to change or expand the way the School's current pool and gym are used.</p>
The proposal to remove 10 trees on site is considered to be significant in terms of the transformed school campus outlook. Whilst it is acknowledged the removal of the trees is required to facilitate the proposed development, consideration should be given to the planting of trees elsewhere on the school campus, to offset the loss.	<p>The School has a proactive approach to the management of all trees on the campus. The management program identifies 52 significant trees on the campus, with management measures including annual maintenance and replacement of trees where necessary due to age and health.</p> <p>Whilst there is limited scope to relocate any trees within the development site, the location for 5 additional trees has been identified elsewhere on the main campus. This reflects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the imminent addition of 3 semi-mature, large native trees, to balance the necessary removal of a large camphor laurel (noxious weed) due to health and safety; and the introduction of additional trees to 207 and 170 Walker Street. <p>This is in addition to the recent planting of 3 trees on the Walker Street frontage. These plantings are consistent with the School's continued work to improve the green amenity of the whole site for students and the community.</p>
The proposed kiosk substation at the front of the site facing Miller Street is not detailed in the architectural plans. No elevation details have been provided. As such, details of the substation shall be provided including screening options to mitigate any visual amenity impacts on the public domain.	<p>The proposed substation is yet to be approved by Ausgrid. Once approval is received, a Level 3 Designer will be engaged to design the substation to Ausgrid's requirements. Whilst final details of the screening cannot be provided at this stage, it is the School's intention to deliver the best streetscape outcome, within the constraints of Ausgrid's access and design requirements. TZG has prepared indicative sketches of the potential screening options (refer to Attachment B). This includes an option to retain the existing vertical rhythm of the fence, and another which introduces additional vertical elements to further screen the substation.</p> <p>These two options intend to continue the existing fence detail. Two of the existing brick piers will need to be slightly re-adjusted to provide the required clearances, and a new metal screen and door will be installed to retain the visual amenity and rhythm of the existing Miller Street fence. The design intention is for the screen to be consistent with the existing streetscape, whilst being consistent with Ausgrid's requirements.</p>
The existing sandstone pillars and gateposts at 263 Miller Street, North Sydney are proposed to be retained and relocated as part of the proposed works. Details outlining where the pillars and gateposts are proposed to be relocated are to be provided.	Whilst the location for the sandstone pillars and gateposts has not yet been finalised, the School is committed to retaining them on the campus and interpreting them as part of the landscape design. At this stage, it is anticipated that the sandstone pillars will be relocated into the landscaped frontage of the new building. The ultimate location of the pillars will be resolved in consultation with the heritage consultant and landscape architect. The School will provide details of the final location of the pillars prior to the issue of the relevant Construction Certificate.

Issues Raised by Agencies	Action
To understand the existing built form, the north elevation plans are to be amended to incorporate the existing building outline of 265 Miller Street.	A revised North Elevation, including an outline of 265 Miller Street, is provided at Attachment B .
Details of the proposed fritted glazing treatment to the lightwell to mitigate visual amenity impacts to the adjoining residents is to be provided for assessment.	<p>Wenona appreciates the need to prevent any adverse visual impacts on adjoining residents, as well as the need to maintain privacy for occupants of the proposed building. However, the design intent is for staff, students and visitors to still have a 'sense of the outdoors' and so the material still needs to have an element of opacity to enable light transmission.</p> <p>Whilst the materiality of the light well has not yet been resolved, TZG has provided indicative images of the proposed glazing finish (refer to Attachment B). It is anticipated that the transparency of the glass may be lessened in areas where there is no direct line of site between the neighbouring and proposed buildings. Where there is a direct interface, it is anticipated that frosted or opaque glass, with a decorative frit / pattern will be used to establish a more 'solid' appearance to prevent any visual connection between the two buildings.</p>
Additional perspectives of the Miller Street and Elliott Street frontages incorporating the adjoining built form should be provided to better demonstrate the bulk and scale of the development in context with existing buildings.	Additional perspectives from Miller and Elliott Streets are provided at Attachment B . It is noted that the Elliott Street perspective does not show the future development envisaged on the UnitingCare site, which would significantly alter the scale of development along this streetscape.
North Sydney Council	
Height of the proposed development breaches LEP height control, and in normal circumstances a planning proposal be made to amend the control however, the proposed parapet height to Miller Street matches neighbouring structures and the major offending structure is a lift overrun, therefore it is appropriate that the assessment be based on merit of the proposal.	<p>Noted, and agreed. As detailed in the Clause 4.6 variation submitted with the EIS, the proposed height is considered appropriate for a number of reasons, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposed new building will have a height of 13.4 metres which is less than or consistent with the predominant building height of surrounding buildings in Miller and Elliott Streets. The maximum building height will be the same as the school's chemistry building, which forms part of the Wenona Miller Street Campus. To the north, the adjoining residential flat building is 26 metres in height with a street parapet of 11-12 metres. The new building will step down from west to east to follow the existing ground level. ▪ The development, as proposed, is consistent with the objectives of the height of buildings development standard under LEP 2013. ▪ The development is of a scale that is not out of context with other buildings in the development site or surrounding development. ▪ The proposed development will not overshadow any existing dwellings, public reserves or streets, nor compromise solar access for future development. The adjoining residential flat building is to the north of the site and will not be affected in this regard. ▪ The increase in height will not be perceptible from Miller Street. ▪ The built form will enable the school to meet the modern education needs and provide flexible and adaptable learning spaces, and ensure that equitable access is provided to all levels of the new development.
The non-residential floor space ratio is beyond the maximum set out in the LEP of 1:1, and is at the very least double this. Such a significant increase would not be considered appropriate as a Clause 4.6 variation. The proposal could give rise to development that could undermine the integrity of the LEP control.	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed non-residential floor space ratio exceeds the maximum FSR standard of 1:1 under North Sydney LEP 2013.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the proposed variation, the non-residential FSR is considered appropriate for a number of reasons,</p>

Issues Raised by Agencies	Action
	<p>including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The development site and the proposed development will be integral parts of the overall Wenona School Campus. There is no scope for residential development and it would not be an appropriate land use within the School campus. Therefore the non-residential FSR standard is unreasonable and unnecessary to apply to the development as the development will meet the B4 zone objective of providing active uses at the street level, however cannot accommodate residential development. ▪ There is no overall FSR control that applies to the site under Clause 4.4 of the LEP, only the non-residential FSR range (0.5:1 to 1:1) under Clause 4.4A. Therefore, a building with the FSR proposed could be accommodated on the site if it was a mixed use development. However, the full FSR potential within the building envelope proposed cannot be achieved under the current standard as Wenona cannot include a residential component of the development. It would be unreasonable therefore to apply the standard to this development. An alternate development scheme on the site that complied with the development standard (i.e. an FSR of 1:1) would constitute under-development of the site and, in the context of the North Sydney CBD, not be an efficient use of the land. ▪ The development as proposed is consistent with the objectives of the non-residential floor space ratio ranges standard under LEP 2013; ▪ The development is of a scale that is not out of context with other buildings in the development site or surrounding development; ▪ The increased density will not be perceptible from the public domain; and ▪ The built form will enable the school to meet the modern education needs and provide flexible and adaptable learning spaces. <p>In addition, a Planning Proposal to remove the maximum non-residential floor space ratio requirement over land subject to Clause 4.4A has been approved at Gateway, and is currently with the Relevant Planning Authority for implementation. The Planning Proposal seeks to improve the flexibility of the existing planning controls, especially in the B4 Mixed Use zone.</p> <p>Under these proposed controls, a minimum non-residential FSR of 0.5:1 would apply to the site. There would continue to be no maximum FSR. The proposed development would be consistent with LEP 2013, as proposed to be modified.</p>
<p>Section 94 Contributions The proposal would result in an increase in floor space of (3804m²) and may increase student numbers. Council's Section 94 Contribution Plan does not necessarily exclude schools and it has been consistent practice that Council does not request schools to provide these contributions. Notwithstanding this, Council would encourage a voluntary contribution from the school for the delivery of infrastructure that it makes use of, such as outdoor space embellishment and library services.</p>	<p>It is agreed that Schools should be excluded from the payment of section 94 contributions. Whilst the School does not consider it is appropriate to enter into a formal agreement with Council for infrastructure upgrades, Wenona will upgrade the site's Elliott and Miller Street frontages as part of the proposed development.</p>
<p>The proposed access to/from Miller Street of the new development is supported, however clause 4.4A (1) (a) seeks to promote continuous active street frontages at a street level, the street frontage activation shown in the proposal could be</p>	<p>Whilst the proposal does not represent a typical mixed use development, the Miller Street frontage will be activated throughout the day by students, staff and visitors moving into and around the campus.</p>

Issues Raised by Agencies	Action
improved to fall within the aims of the LEP.	Further, the dynamic form of the proposal seeks to better activate the street and improve the current conditions as the new civic spine, a major public gesture, increases connections from Miller Street. The proposed façade is visually permeable allowing connections with the street over 3 levels showcasing the educational activities within and allowing for better engagement with the public domain.
Council's records show that the land is subject to a proposed road re alignment. The proposed road realignment was made on 3rd December 1943 through a notice published in the NSW Government Gazette Made under the Public Roads Act 1902(now the Roads Act 1993) and s.262 of the Local Government Act 1919 (now the Local Government Act 1993). Council has no records of this road realignment having been removed and as such, this road realignment must be considered in any future proposal at this site.	<p>It is understood that the road widening identified by Council is a historical legacy from when Miller Street was a major arterial route to the Harbour Bridge – prior to the construction of the Warringah Freeway. This issue was not raised by RMS in their submission, and the site is not identified on the Council's LEP Land Acquisition Map for future road widening. Further, Land and Property Information mapping shows the lot boundary extending to the Miller Street frontage, unlike some other properties to the south of McLaren Street where this setback appears to have been enforced.</p> <p>As Council has identified, there are a number of heritage listed buildings in the precinct, including the Stage heritage listed Independent Theatre, which are unlikely to be demolished. Further, there are other buildings in the vicinity of the School which were constructed after 1943 and are aligned with the Miller Street boundary. These include 267 Miller Street (subject to the proposed development) and the Regency Apartments to the north of the site which were built in the early 1990s. Neither of these developments have observed the road realignment.</p> <p>Based on the above, it is considered unnecessary to implement the road widening setback.</p>
This property is burdened with a road widening proposal that runs from Victoria Cross to Falcon Street and has been enforced as the various developments have come on line along Miller Street. The only outstanding properties are 187 Miller Street (Watchmaker's shop), the Rag & Famish Hotel, the school and the Independent theatre. The majority of these remaining properties are complicated by heritage issues, but the overall concept needs to be implemented. Therefore, given that this is permanent development the road widening proposal should be enforced.	Refer to response above.
As there will be deep excavation next to a Council road, there needs to be a freestanding retaining structure built on the school's land that will support the road reserve and should be subject to an easement for support under the Roads Act. No pre or post-tensioned support structures will be permitted into Council's road reserve here.	Noted. Adequate retaining structures will be developed by the project engineers. The School is experienced in constructing similar structures adjacent to Miller Street, having constructed a below ground gym as part of the redevelopment of 255 Miller Street.
The submitted traffic plan discusses the potential for use of Council and/or commercial car parking spaces to make up for the displacement of car parking provision in and around the site this may be adequate in the first instance, considering the area is served by buses and trains in convenient proximity to the site. In the case where vehicular traffic increases due to rise in numbers of students at the school using the facilities or its use by outside user groups, there is potential for there to be traffic impacts to Miller Street and Elliot Street.	<p>There will be no increase in students or staff on the site as a result of the proposed development. Further details around the use of Council and / or commercial car parking spaces are provided above.</p> <p>In addition, it is noted that the proposed development will not generate any additional external user groups during, before or after school or on the weekends compared to what is currently accommodated by the existing pool and gym.</p>

Issues Raised by Agencies	Action
The proposed development would involve works to public infrastructure and services; please condition that the developer liaises with Council's Engineering and Property Services Division as various permits for works, construction hoardings, road and services diversion and connections will be required during construction. They can be contacted on 9936 8100.	Noted. This can be addressed by way of condition of consent.
Transport for NSW	
<i>Green Travel Plan</i> It is suggested that the proponent should clearly detail measures to promote travel choices that support the achievement of State Plan targets in a sustainable travel plan. A sustainable travel plan should be produced prior to the issuing of a Construction Certificate.	Noted. A Green Travel Plan will be prepared prior to the issue of the relevant Construction Certificate.
<i>Construction Traffic Management Plan</i> Prior to the commencement of any works on the site, a detailed site specific Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) should be prepared by a suitably qualified person and submitted to the Principal Certifying Authority (PCA). The plan should be prepared in consultation with and agreed to by TfNSW, Roads and Maritime and North Sydney Council.	Noted. A detailed Construction Traffic Management Plan will be prepared prior to the issue of the relevant Construction Certificate.
Office of Environment & Heritage	
It is understood that the Office of Environment and Heritage provided an email response, and did not raise any further issues.	Noted.
Roads and Maritime Services	
RMS has reviewed the submitted documentation and raises no objection to the application.	Noted.
All buildings and structures, together with any improvements integral to the future use of the site are wholly within the freehold property (unlimited in height or depth) along the Miller Street boundary.	Noted.
The Department of Planning and Environment should ensure that post development of any changes to the stormwater drainage system are to be submitted to Roads and Maritime for approval, prior to the commencement of any works.	Noted.
Sydney Water	
The drinking water main available for connection is the 150 mm main in Miller Street	Noted.

Issues Raised by Agencies	Action
Detailed drinking water requirements will be provided at the Section 73 application phase	Noted.
An extension of the wastewater system will be required from the 225 mm main located on the eastern side of the development. This extension will need to provide a point of connection at least 1m inside all the proposed lot boundaries.	
The proposed wastewater infrastructure for this development will be sized & configured according to the Sewerage Code of Australia WSA 02-2002-2.2 (Sydney Water Edition 1 — Version 3). Evidence of Code compliance should be attached with the design.	Noted.
Detailed requirements will be provided at the Section 73 application phase.	Noted.
NSW EPA	
The proposal does not constitute a Scheduled Activity under Schedule 1 of the <i>Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997</i> (POEO Act). The EPA does not consider that the proposal will require an Environment Protection Licence (EPL) under the POEO Act. Accordingly, the EPA has no comments regarding the proposal and has no further interest in this proposal.	Noted.

Issues Raised by the Public	Proponent's Response
Aqualand	
Aqualand Projects supports the proposed works by Wenona and commends them for the improved facilities that will be delivered for the School.	Noted, and agreed.
The School is a significant part of the North Sydney community and provides a vital service to the local, as well as wider, area in the provision of education for students.	
The new facilities and proposed upgrades to the school campus will enhance the quality and range of services available to students.	
The replacement of the bridge in Elliott Street and the proposed landscape works will contribute to the amenity of the area.	
The scale, character and design of the proposed building in Miller Street is appropriate to the existing school campus and its context.	
Gregory Wilson	
Building Setbacks	
The setback for the proposed development should be at least 3 metres from the property boundary along the entire recessed area of 267 Miller Street which contains private terraces, with sliding door access and windows from 'ground' / 'bottom' floor (referred to in the DA as Level 1) residential units, and balconies (with sliding door access) and windows to residential units on floors 1 and 2 above.	As detailed in the EIS, the setback has been designed to be consistent with the requirements of North Sydney DCP 2013. Whilst the length of the setback has been extended to the west, beyond the minimum DCP requirements, the setback cannot be extended further to the east as it would result in significant compromises to the key functional areas within the building, and would reduce the amount of teaching space that is able to be accommodated.
At 267 Miller Street the terraces (recorded as such on the strata plan, and not as 'courtyards') are on individual unit titles and are not common property, that living rooms and bedrooms of units 1 and 12 face the property boundary across their private terraces, that main bedrooms of the corner 'ground' / 'bottom' floor units, 2 and 11, look - and open, significantly via a sliding door - on to their respective private terraces adjacent to the narrow strip of common property planter boxes along the building's boundary, and that 'ground' / 'bottom' floor units 1, 2, and 12 do not have access to either a terrace or balcony area elsewhere.	Noted.
The setback extends only part of the way along the property boundary with 267 Miller Street's recessed private residential terrace, balcony, and window area.	Refer to response above.
Beyond the eastern alignment of the balcony zone where the wall of the proposed new building is not set back and is instead at the property boundary with the private terrace of unit 12 and that of unit 11, the separation of the facades will be just over 5 metres and then about 6 metres. Significantly, in the south eastern corner the proposed wall will be just over one metre from the window of the sliding door to the	Refer to response above.

Issues Raised by the Public	Proponent's Response
main bedroom of unit 11 and from the windows to the main bedrooms of the two units above.	
<p>The close proximity of the walls of the proposed building is likely to present ongoing natural light, ventilation, and noise amplification issues for the entire recessed area of private terraces and balconies which is to be closed on all sides for the first time, but particularly in the south eastern corner where the current proposal has the wall of the new building not set back, but at the boundary with the private terrace of unit 11 and continuing part of the way along that of unit 12. Additionally, a wall directly at the boundary of those private terraces in the south eastern corner is likely to result in storm water deflection with significant drainage implications for the terrace of unit 11 in particular.</p>	<p>The building has been designed to minimise impacts on the neighbouring building, with the proposed glass finish enabling more light to penetrate into the space than a masonry wall. The building has been acoustically treated to ensure that there is no noise spill out of the building, and it is not expected to have a significant impact on ventilation of the adjoining outdoor areas.</p> <p>With respect to the concerns raised about stormwater deflection, TTW has confirmed that the neighbouring property's in ground drainage system will not be affected more than the current situation. In fact, the proposed building / wall will block the wind driven storm runoff coming from the south that would otherwise fall into their land which would have been accounted for in their drainage capacity.</p>
<p>It is further submitted that it would be difficult to envision that a building development at or very close to parts of the southern boundary of 267 Miller Street will not result in scaffolding, workers, and equipment encroaching the private terraces of those 'ground' / 'bottom' floor units, during both the construction phase and when maintenance is required.</p>	<p>The building is entirely capable of being construction from within Wenona's site using standard construction techniques.</p>
<p>It is noted that at the other end of the school complex in Miller Street the end school building is set back from the residential premises next door at 243 Miller Street.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<p>Extending the setback zone to the entire length of the private recessed area of 267 Miller Street, ie to the building alignment slightly further to the west, and beyond the eastern alignment of the so called "balcony zone" to the building alignment, will comply with the local government requirement, achieve the minimum visual privacy separation of 8.1m between facades as claimed in the DA (at 5.5.3, page 35), increase the efficacy of the proposed light well, reduce the potential for storm water deflection to private terraces in the south eastern corner, and more satisfactorily (and more equitably as among the neighbouring property owners) mitigate what the DA acknowledges as the "dominance and perceived mass" (5.2, page 32) of the proposed building along its interface with the private recessed area of 267 Miller Street.</p>	<p>Refer to response above.</p>
Inadequate consideration of traffic issues in Elliott Street	
<p>Complete unsuitability of the present DA's projected 650 truckloads within the demolition and excavation stages (Appendix Q, 3.1.6, page 7) and the inevitable numerous other vehicle movements of tradespeople & etc being totally reliant on access to and from Elliott Street. It may be that given the present scale of the proposed project, particularly in the excavation phase, that significant vehicle</p>	<p>The management of construction traffic will be further detailed as part of the Construction Traffic Management Plan, which will be developed prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate. Whilst there will inevitably be some impacts on Elliott Street during the construction phase, it is considered preferable to avoid any impacts to traffic movements on Miller Street which carries far greater volumes of traffic.</p>

Issues Raised by the Public	Proponent's Response
movement may have to take place via Miller Street, in the same way that other significant local developments have had to be accessed via an important main thoroughfare such as the Pacific Highway.	
Given these concerns and little consideration in the DA of local residents' vehicle access (vehicle access to 267 Miller Street's off-street parking is entirely via two driveways off Elliott Street, almost immediately to the north of the project site and the excavation vehicle parking zone), at the very least an independent traffic report on the DA should be commissioned.	Construction traffic management arrangements will be addressed further in the detailed Construction Management Plan and Construction Traffic Management Plan, which will be prepared prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate. These Plans will ensure that impacts on resident access are managed and minimised.
The apparent lack of official consideration of the longer term sustainability of development on Elliott Street where another SSD is in prospect suggests that state and local government planning authorities should be giving urgent consideration to a longer term plan for residents and other stakeholders, including Wenona School and Rydges Hotel.	<p>We are not aware of any other SSD projects which are currently under assessment in the vicinity of the site. Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that a Stage 1 DA has been approved for the UnitingCare site to the south-east of the site.</p> <p>As detailed in the EIS, the proposed development will not result in any additional students or staff on the campus, and there will be no increase in traffic generation as a result of the proposal. The closure of the childcare centre on the site will reduce traffic using Elliott Street by 10-15 vehicles per hour during the peak periods, with further reductions in traffic resulting from the removal of 11 on-site parking spaces.</p>
Inadequacy of protection for identified Tree No. 1	
The tree on the footpath of Elliott Street identified as Tree No. 1 in Appendix C to Appendix U is a very high priority for protection by residents of 267 Miller Street, particularly those with units at the south eastern corner of the building looking onto Elliott Street where the tree provides a leafy outlook and privacy to and from the Wenona school buildings across the street.	Noted.
Of particular concern is that the tree, a mature specimen in good health and good foliage condition, is immediately adjacent to the proposed construction site and the excavation truck parking zone shown in Appendix E to Appendix Q where it is proposed trucks will be loaded parallel to the street, ie directly facing the tree. In view of its very close proximity and the anticipated high number of truck movements in the excavation phase, it is submitted that a greater buffer be provided between the tree and the excavation parking zone and that greater physical protection be given to the tree trunk and canopy.	Tree protection measures will be incorporated in accordance with AS4970-2009, prior to commencement of any works on the site. These measures have been developed to ensure that trees are protected during the construction phase, and have been used successfully in similar circumstances.
Less than satisfactory likelihood of effective noise mitigation	
The mitigation measures submitted with the DA are too tentative and loose and as such fall well short of an undertaking that effective noise mitigation will be in place that potentially affected residents might reasonably expect having regard to the very close proximity of the project and its potentially deleterious effects on their health and wellbeing. Indeed, the Preliminary Construction Management Plan (Appendix Q, at 3.1.2, page 6) effectively concedes the real potential for	As detailed below, the Construction Noise and Vibration Report details measures to mitigate against construction noise impacts. These measures will be further resolved as part of the detailed Construction Management Plan, which will be prepared prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.

Issues Raised by the Public	Proponent's Response
less than satisfactory noise mitigation by acknowledging "It may be necessary to pause the excavation and demolition works to provide the surrounding building occupants some respite".	
The proposal should be allowed to proceed only on the basis that effective noise mitigation is in place.	Noted.
Potentially deleterious effects on local residents of proposed site hours	
<p>While non-standard/ extended hours may result in the project's completion in a shorter time (which would be highly desirable for all concerned), the effect on local residents of a six day-a-week 'long day' exposure to excess noise in particular (if not successfully mitigated, excess decibels of up to 25 dBA on weekdays and 30 on Saturdays, according to the DA at 5.8.2, page 40) would appear unreasonable and potentially hazardous to health and wellbeing, especially for retired and very young residents of 267 Miller Street who may not be in a position to take refuge elsewhere. There are also resident school children (and their parents) who should have a reasonable expectation of a sufficiently undisturbed home environment for school homework after say, 1600 hours Monday to Friday.</p>	<p>Due to the site's CBD context, and the proximity of the site to surrounding development, there will inevitably be some construction noise impacts during the construction period.</p> <p>As detailed in the Construction Noise and Vibration Report submitted with the EIS, whilst there will be some exceedances of the construction noise criteria prescribed by the <i>Interim Construction Noise Guidelines 2009</i> during both the standard and extended construction hours, the extent of the exceedance is consistent with similar sites where residences overlook the development in such close proximity.</p> <p>In order to mitigate these impacts, reasonable and feasible noise management measures will need to be adopted. These measures include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Selection of the quietest feasible construction equipment; ▪ Localised treatment such as barriers, shrouds and the like around fixed plant such as pumps, generators and concrete pumps; ▪ Provision of respite periods; and ▪ Carrying out trial testing of vibration levels where equipment identified as having the potential to exceed the human comfort criteria is used. <p>These measures will be resolved in detailed as part of the Construction Management Plan, when a contractor has been engaged on the project, and construction techniques have been better defined. With appropriate planning, it is feasible that the levels predicted could be reduced by 15dBA, meaning that no receiver would exceed the 'highly affected' management level.</p>
Alexander Koch	
The proposed building will significantly impact the amenity and value of my property. Existing outlook of the North Sydney skyline, trees and sunsets will disappear	Noted. The Visual Impact Assessment that was submitted with the EIS found that the views lost are more appropriately defined as an outlook rather than a view. What is lost is not scenic, iconic or culturally significant. Similarly, no water, land-water interface, whole or iconic items are lost. Further, considering that the views affected are across the side boundary, and are from lower levels where it is not reasonable to expect view sharing.
I am concerned that the 'treated glass facade' has sufficient privacy (for both parties). I am concerned that the 'frit' design may still allow some vision in both directions. I would request that a solution be proposed that ensures no effective vision in either direction. One option may be frosting that allows natural light to	Refer to response above.

Issues Raised by the Public	Proponent's Response
pass through but without any effective vision. Another option may be to provide louvres of some kind, although I am concerned that these do not encroach on the proposed set-back outlined in the property. I believe this is an aspect that will be beneficial to both parties.	
I am concerned for the noise impact this building may have upon completion. Can you confirm what measures there will be to minimise noise (e.g. double glazing?)	As detailed in the Construction and Operational Noise Report submitted with the EIS, the glass light well (which represents the closest point to the Regency Park Apartments) will be constructed using a minimum of 6.38mm laminated glass, and will either be acoustically sealed or will provide acoustically treated ventilation openings. Based on indicative calculations, all noise from the operation of the pool area, science hub, amphitheatre and senior ecosystem will be no greater than 50dBA. This will meet the required daytime criterion of 59dBA.
I am concerned that the proposed set-back (minimum 10 metres) be maintained. I would like to be notified if at any stage there are proposed amendments to this aspect of the design.	Noted.
I appreciate the attempt to provide landscaping/greenery that will be a pleasant outlook for properties in our building. Can I request that this be maintained if there are any suggestions to withdraw it from the design proposal. At the very least, may I please be notified if any change to this aspect of the design becomes a possibility?	The School is committed to implementing design measures to improve the outlook from neighbouring apartments. There is no intent to remove the proposed landscaping from the scheme.