

Hi,

I do not object to the project & am supportive of it on the whole. However I do object to parts of it and the amendments & limited responses do not change my position.

1. The response report did not mention or talk about possible mitigations for outside of school hours access to Second Avenue via Grimes Lane
 - a. "School is not operational between 10pm and 7am. Assessment during this period is not applicable" - Despite objections to monitoring and or forecasting future noise because the school does not operate outside of school hours ... **but traffic doesn't magically stop outside of school hours**. So, if we must have the Grimes Lane extension, it should have restricted or no access outside of school hours to Second avenue via Grimes Lane --- this would ensure that noise in Second Avenue outside of school hours would not change
 - b. Additionally, No response or consideration has been made to the observed with regards to the noted "rat runners" that are already an issue for Second Avenue
2. Where are the details on the other considered traffic routes that are noted but no data is provided with regards to alternatives to extending grimes through second avenue & specifically trees are of concern ?
 - a. Because to facilitate two way traffic on Grimes Lane, using 90 degree Angle Parking for kiss and drop, and NOT have it connect to second avenue - One could remove following trees, none-of which are of high significance (these are of medium significance): T159, T160, T161 - you could also remove the low significance tree T162. This may also permit access to the staff car park but depending up on where buildings are layed out that may not be of help (and would/could conflict with the kiss and drop)
 - b. E.g. the 90 degree angle parking kiss and drop zone proposal
 - c. E.g. using the area in front of the site on Chelmsford Avenue to provide a kiss and ride pick up area
 - d. E.g. the use of an underground car park
3. RWDI seems to not be closely following EPA NSW transport noise policies & the updates to it, as per <https://www.epa.nsw.gov.au/-/media/epa/corporate-site/resources/noise/road-noise-pol-a pp-notes.pdf> "any increase in the total traffic noise level as a result of the development should be limited to 2 dB above that of the noise level without the development" but the report does not mention how a predicted 3 dB increase would be mitigated for one property on Grimes Lane
4. The report seems to suggest that because of informal kiss 'n drop areas that 65% coverage for the "formal" kiss 'n drop will be sufficient this raises the following questions
 - a. What does the traffic modelling look like if we do not modify Grimes Avenue at all?
 - b. What about concerns to do with trees at the second avenue end of grimes lane & their tree roots?
 - c. Perhaps it doesn't need to be modified ... if we are hoping that the green travel plan is followed because a kiss and ride may encourage parents to drive

- d. But at the same time according to the report Strata managers for the Epping Park Development, I'll note that Strata may only represent a small portion of residents due to often low attendance at strata meetings etc., has declined to take on the liability in terms of increased foot traffic - as non-residents to the area may use the path. One should ask 1. Can the state government and or council cover any increase in liability insurance 2. Can we also note that
 - i. there is already a play area that seems to border the school site & 24A Ferntree PI (<https://goo.gl/maps/eRqLYsav3q32b9jW9>) - which could provide access if residents do not wish to modify the path between 30 & 32 Ferntree place
 - ii. Given the locality the possible pedestrian pathway from the south & the size of the Ferntree Place apartment area - it is unlikely that non-local residents would use the path
 - iii. Having students & parents walk 800m instead of ~ 120m from say 32 Ferntree Place to access the school will result in busy parents driving instead of walking & enjoying nature
 - e. So I'll ask the question as to why Strata apparently has the final say with regards to pedestrian access for future students and residents ... when effectively all residents of Second Avenue completely disagree with the extension of Grimes Lane (yes area might be private property but if the school doesn't have a fence adjoining the play area that would seemingly permit access to the school via an existing area via an existing "area" on the private property)
5. If there is to be no good pedestrian south side access, can the plans for this school include a request and or plan explicitly - for the extension of the proposed separated cycle way(<https://www.cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au/sites/council/files/inline-files/1%20Epping%20to%20Carlingford%20Cycleway%20Context%20Plan.pdf>) to go along part of Mobbs Lane, Ferntree Place, Seven Street, and Edenlee Street? (I am not sure to what degree NSW Major Projects can influence cycleway plans)
6. The response document seemingly has ignored a worst case scenario where with 1000 students, assuming excess car usage due to limited south side pedestrian access to the site, & noting the 2019 total fertility rate is 1.66 per female, we could have 500 families accessing the property which could result in 500 cars ... which far exceeds the estimated peak 330 vehicles. Having a green travel plan and projections & estimates does not mean that those estimated and or travel plans end up being followed