

Item no.	Agency	Submission	Consultant Comments
1	Maitland Council	19 Northview Street, Gillieston Heights may not be part of the land that comprises the boundary of an existing or approved school. For this reason, the utilisation of Clause 3.37 of the SEPP (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021 may not apply.	Clause 3.37A was introduced into the T&I SEPP in November 2024 and that applies and allows buildings to be developed on land that has no prior approval for a school for the purpose of a government school, which this development is.
2	Maitland Council	<p>Access Report</p> <p>(a) The access report addresses relevant legislation or identifies elements required to be addressed during detailed design. It is noted that relevant commentary in design detail should be incorporated into the final design to ensure accessibility is achieved.</p> <p>(b) Additionally, notes pertaining to capability of compliance also need to be addressed in final design. Consideration should be given to play spaces and play elements to ensure they have accessible features to allow equal play opportunities (c) as well as to the internal fittings of buildings such as furniture placement, to ensure appropriate circulation around desks etc. (d) The development should also ensure appropriate accessibility from the open play area to the assembly area/main school structure - access ramp appears to provide access from hall building to open play area but not directly from open play area to the assembly area/main school structure, as shown:</p> 	<p>All buildings and paths are designed to meet the requirements of AS1428.1 and AS1428.2. Further detail will be provided as the design progresses to allow for signoff by an Access Consultant.</p> <p>The level change between the multi-use sports field (central open play space) and the hard-play space (assembly area) makes a ramp impractical. The creation of a central lift will provide the opportunity to more easily connect the major play spaces, including the hard-play, COLA/Hall, grassed field, basketball court and passive play areas. The opportunity to use this lift to also connect into the central multi-use field (mid-level from lift) will also be investigated as the design progresses.</p> <p>(i) Access to play spaces and play elements are not a legislative requirement however are positive and inclusive considerations. Detailed designs to incorporate these additional requirements at relevant stage.</p> <p>ii) As above. Fittings and furnishings are not a specific legislative requirement and are not detailed for the purpose of Planning Approval.</p> <p>Detailed designs to incorporate these additional requirements at relevant stage.</p> 
3	Maitland Council	<p>Acoustic Report</p> <p>Construction noise can be managed, but additional mitigation measures are recommended. The report does not adequately address the construction phase.</p> <p>The report is otherwise comprehensive and contains details on the location of mechanical air conditioners, noise from the air conditioning units, children playing anticipated noise, traffic and school bells etc. The report indicates that the expansion should be compliant. The air condition units are to be located nearest Gillieston Road which is a good location. This may become an issue if new houses are built along the road in the future.</p> <p>Traffic to and from the car park may generate acoustic impacts. The report indicates that it will be compliant however property owners on Northview Street may see the location of the car park and noise from drop off as an operational issue. If any of these operational issues arise it will go to the NSW EPA who are the ARA for schools.</p>	<p>The Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment (version E, dated 15 January, 2025) included a preliminary construction noise and vibration impact assessment in Section 6 of the report. This assessment included indicative predictions of construction noise and vibration impacts at the surrounding receivers, as well as indicative construction noise and vibration mitigation measures.</p> <p>The preliminary construction noise assessment conducted indicates that the typical worst-case construction noise impacts are predicted to exceed the noise-affected noise management levels (NMLs) of the EPA's Interim Construction Noise Guideline (ICNG) at the surrounding residential receivers and school receivers within the Site. This is not uncommon considering the low background noise levels expected on site and the proximity of the receivers to the construction works. It is noted that the preliminary assessment did not predict any exceedances of the highly noise-affected NML of the ICNG.</p> <p>Where exceedances of the noise-affected NMLs are expected, the ICNG states that all reasonable and feasible measures should be applied to manage construction noise emissions from the site. The noise and vibration impact assessment (NVIA) has recommended that a detailed Construction Noise and Vibration Management Plan is prepared for the development (typically at construction certificate stage when there is a clearer understanding of the proposed construction methodology) to determine specific noise and vibration management measures. Typical construction noise mitigation measures have been presented in Table 6-6 of the NVIA.</p>
4	Maitland Council	<p>Arborist Report</p> <p>Council ecologists raise no concerns in regard to biodiversity impacts. Only four living native trees will be removed with no habitat features impacted. The proposal also includes a significant amount of revegetation through landscape trees to occur as part of the development.</p>	N/A
5	Maitland Council	<p>Biodiversity Assessment Report</p> <p>Council ecologists raise no concerns in regard to biodiversity impacts. Only four living native trees will be removed with no habitat features impacted. The proposal also includes a significant amount of revegetation through landscape trees to occur as part of the development.</p>	N/A
6	Maitland Council	<p>Bushfire Report</p> <p>It is expected that the school would be referred to the NSW RFS, being a special fire protection purpose, under the Rural Fires Act 1997.</p>	No comment in relation to bushfire until agency comments received.
7	Maitland Council	<p>Contamination / RAP</p> <p>The following comments are provided:</p> <p>a. Remediation is dependent on data gap investigation of inaccessible areas.</p> <p>b. Remediation and validation are required. The extent of which, will be determined once the data gap investigation occurs.</p> <p>c. Remediation is likely to Category 2 work.</p> <p>d. A SAS and SAR must be prepared by a NSW EPA Accredited Site Auditor following completion of remediation.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 7.1 of the RAP outlines data gaps and uncertainties. Inaccessible soils should become available for assessment during the redevelopment through the removal of hardstands, existing demountable buildings and/ or demolition of existing structures/ buildings in the vicinity of the remediation area.</p> <p>It is likely the exact vertical and lateral extent of lead impacted soils would be determined during the remediation and validation.</p> <p>A SAS and SAR will be prepared by a NSW EPA Accredited Site Auditor following completion of remediation. Tom Onus from Ramboll has been engaged and completed Interim Audit Advice to date.</p>

8	Maitland Council	<p>Flood Risk Management Report</p> <p>The following flood comments are provided:</p> <p>a. The critical time of concentration of 45 minutes is considered high for this small catchment. Confirmation of how this time of concentration was established including the tabulation of peak flows and volumes for the 1%AEP Event is required.</p> <p>b. The proposed box culvert solution will result in increasing some hazard categorisations and their extents. Advice is required to confirm how this increase in hazard risk will be minimised, particularly in proximity to the 2.5m high retaining wall. Is fencing proposed to property boundary and top of wall to restrict access to this area from the school site?</p> <p>c. Table 3 – Specifies top water level over the road. This needs a datum to be provided to confirm depth of water over the road. The provided survey plan also fails to address this with no levels shown.</p> <p>d. Conclusion states access is available to the New England Highway to the south. The NEH is to the north and becomes flooded during events. Similarly, access is not available to the south with Cessnock Road also cut off at Testers Hollow as identified by its classification as a high flood island / trapped perimeter area.</p> <p>e. Flood modelling shows that as a result of the proposal, velocities will increase to 2.0 – 3.0m/s in proximity to the proposed 2.5m high retaining walls. Confirmation is required that structural detail can be provided to allow the wall to withstand the changed effects of flooding in the area.</p> <p>f. The proposal nominates for a new culvert and earthworks in the area. It is assumed that owners consent has been provided to allow this to occur. Given owners consent, options should be explored to direct and convey runoff directly from the nominal flow path to the new culvert inlet. I.e. fill the area and regrade to remove the need for the 2.5m retaining wall and improve flow conveyance through the area.</p>	<p>a. The 25 minute storm is the critical duration. The models, maps and report (Rev 05) have been updated. The report presents the peak discharges for the 1% AEP for various storm durations.</p> <p>b. The change in hazard is a re-distribution of hazard due to the proposed earthworks upstream and downstream of Gillieston Rd, the proposed fill and retaining wall, and the proposed box culvert under Gillieston Rd. It is not considered the change in hazard level or extents presented for the 1% AEP event represents an unacceptable risk to people or property. Fencing will be provided to the property boundary to restrict access to top of retaining wall. Culvert inlet and outlet safety screens to prevent access to the proposed box culvert can be provided.</p> <p>c. The depth of flow over Gillieston Road for Scenario 2 is less than 50 mm. Figure 11.1 in the report does not show flood depths less than 50 mm.</p> <p>d. The statement in the conclusion ‘south’ was a typographical error and should have said ‘north’. As stated in section 8.2 of the flood report, ‘flood water does not overtop Cessnock Road in the 2%, 5%, 10%, 20% and 50% AEP events (events more frequent than the 1% AEP)’. Evacuation to the north will need to be undertaken prior to inundation of the evacuation route to the north. This will be facilitated by the NSW Department of Education Emergency Response Team (with duty officer available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week). The Emergency Response Team liaises with the NSW State Emergency Service (NSW SES) Zone Management and Incident Management Teams on a weekly basis to determine potential risks from natural hazards including floods. As natural hazard events develop, the Emergency Response Team (through direct communication with the (NSW SES) supports schools with decision making to close or evacuate prior to the onset of flooding. Consultation with the NSW Department of Education Emergency Response Team will be undertaken and a Flood Risk Response Plan developed for the school and provided to Maitland City Council. The NSW Department of Education Emergency Response Team will liaise with the school administration and Principal in development and implementation of the Flood Risk Response Plan.</p> <p>e. The retaining wall can be designed to cope with velocity 2 – 3 m/s. This will be undertaken in detailed design.</p> <p>f. Discussions with Council around the stormwater strategy of having a large tank under the car park are to be undertaken during the week of 31 March to 4 April 2025.</p>
9	Maitland Council	<p>Geotech Report DSI</p> <p>The recommendation of the DSI should be implemented.</p>	<p>Agree that the recommendations of the DSI should be implemented.</p>
10	Maitland Council	<p>Geotech Report Desktop</p> <p>The geotechnical report provides advice on the requirements for temporary batter slopes but does not specify what batter is acceptable for permanent works. This may be particularly important where height differences are more prominent across the frontage of the road corridors for Gillieston Road and Ryans Road. This is also important for the requirements that may be associated with any proposal to undertake road widening and physical road construction that may require battering or other embankment treatment which may otherwise potentially impact on the buildings fronting these streets.</p>	<p>For the purpose of preliminary recommendations, based on the conditions encountered in the previous investigation, it is recommended that long-term excavations in the site materials should be either battered at the below batter angles or flatter and protected against erosion or be supported by engineer designed and suitably constructed retaining walls.</p> <p>•Colluvial Soil - 2.5H:1V</p> <p>•Residual Soil, EWM and weathered rock - 2H:1V</p> <p>Excavations may be battered steeper in rock materials, subject to specific geotechnical assessment.</p> <p>Proposed long term batter angles would require confirmation by a geotechnical engineer. proposed long term batter angles to be confirmed in the additional geotechnical investigation proposed.</p>
11	Maitland Council	<p>Heritage Impact Statement</p> <p>10.1 The Heritage Impact Statement (HIS) has been reviewed, and the following comments are provided:</p> <p>Teachers Residence</p> <p>10.2 The Assessment of Significance identifies the former teacher’s residence as having local heritage significance. This is supported and will be included for consideration under a Scheule 5 LEP review. The statement could be further developed to refer to its design by JW Pender.</p> <p>Curtilage</p> <p>10.3 The space retained around the former residence beyond the recommended curtilage is acknowledged as part of the redevelopment. While it is agreed that it does not constitute a part of the immediate curtilage, it does contribute to the setting of the building and could be identified as such.</p> <p>Classroom</p> <p>10.4 The HIS identifies the Building BOOD as having a moderate level of significance with reference to its social and continued educational use at the site. Could provision be made for its relocation to another area on the site? The former classroom is noted to have been moved to the site.</p> <p>Conditions of Consent</p> <p>10.5 The SHI provides recommendations which should be complied with.</p>	<p>10.2 The HIS mentions that the brick cottage was probably designed by the formerly famous local architect JW Pender. There is however, as much information in the report about the Pender link as can be obtained from research. Further available information is likely to be tangential.</p> <p>10.3 Project sees no need for action to identify the curtilage around the brick cottage to any greater extent than at presently reported.</p> <p>10.4 Agree that while the best heritage outcome would be to relocate this timber building to another site, it would be acceptable to destroy B00D because it is not sufficiently intact to be heritage listed.</p> <p>The procedure for adding an item to Schedule 5 of the Maitland LEP 2011 involves formal consultation with asset owners, independent heritage specialist studies and lengthy review procedures by DPHI. The Department expects that this process will be engaged with in full prior to considerations for future LEP-listings of its assets and that Maitland Council would require its own independent specialist evaluation of all potential heritage items prior to proposing new entries on their Schedule 5</p>
12	Maitland Council	<p>Traffic Report (Cell 1)</p> <p>11.1 Numerous supporting studies and the REF states that adjacent greenfield development will provide other road infrastructure improvements and that these improvements will have to consider forecast traffic as a result of the expected changes. It is Councils opinion that where the Department of Education is undertaking development including site intensification and contributing to changes in the area that appropriate improvements should be provided to cater for the forecast traffic associated with this proposal across the frontage of the development site.</p> <p>11.2 This belief is supported by Councils Development Control Plan (DCP) Chapter F.5 for Gillieston Heights Urban Release Area which provides objectives for transport and movement (page 59) that require an interconnected network of streets and paths. The proposal does not provide a simple and safe movement system for private vehicles, public transport, pedestrians and cyclists. The Development Controls for this area are outlined below.</p>	<p>The Department of Education is delivering transport infrastructure specifically tailored to the school’s operational needs at opening, as detailed in the TTIA (Sections 4.2 and 5.1). These include new pedestrian crossings, a Kiss and Drop zone, and a dedicated bus bay.</p> <p>Council’s expectation for wider road upgrades across all frontages overlooks its own prior decisions that allowed subdivision roads (e.g. Northview Street) to be constructed at narrow residential standards immediately adjacent a long-established school site. The TTIA (Sections 2.4 and 7.4) makes clear that background traffic growth is primarily driven by the Gillieston Heights Urban Release Area—not the school. The school is responding to that growth with appropriately scaled upgrades that can be achieved at year-of opening considering the current constructed network and future road linkages and upgrades that are located on property not part of the school site.</p> <p>The school is located at the northern extent of the urban release area and its school catchment, therefore the traffic associated with the school is generally to/from the area south of the Ryans Road and Northview intersection. By 2026, Ryans Road will be generally of an urban road form with widening and upgrades occurring on the western side of the road. An urban road with a kerbside lane with occasional parked vehicles has a capacity of around 600 vehicle per hour per lane and environmental capacity of around 6,000 vehicles per day for a collector street.</p> <p>Increases in school traffic on the northern extent of Ryans Road, Gillieston Road and there roads intersection is therefore limited. Existing and future bus movements will continue to turn left at this intersection out of Gillieston Road onto Ryans Road with minimal impedance and therefore is not the trigger for any pavement widening works.</p> <p>Gillieston Road currently has a pavement which ranges from approximately 5.5m to 7.5m width which allows for two way movement (if on-street parking is restricted). Road cross section upgrades in vicinity of the school site will therefore need to be timed/coordinated to align activity to the north and east of the school. The need for road widening, beyond that for accommodate for a school bus zone, is needed in response future residential development traffic which is expected to generate in the order of 2,180 additional daily trips split across Gillieston Road and Ryans Road.</p> <p>The proposed new bus zone is fit-for-purpose noting the design of the stop will be a 3.2m wide indented bus bay initially and then form part of kerbside shoulder/lane once wider upgrades to Gillieston Road occur in the future. It is also important to factor based on approved subdivision roads on the western side of Ryans Road and height (level) difference between the road and site there is the need for the existing school bus stop to be relocated to Gillieston Road for safety and DDA compliance.</p> <p>The safe movement of school community is provided for by providing new pedestrian crossings in vicinity of the school’s main entry and connecting in which existing and planned shared path infrastructure.</p>

		<p><u>Development controls</u></p> <p>1. Road layout should be consistent with the Precinct Plan. Development applications for subdivisions must ensure that road networks connect to other development areas in a logical hierarchy of street function.</p> <p>2. Each development area is required to have access to a minimum of one of the strategic access intersections as identified on the Precinct Plan. The northern development area fronting Gillieston Road is required to have access to Vintage Drive as well as the upgraded intersection at Gillieston Road.</p> <p>3. No new future lot shall have direct vehicular access to Cessnock Road (MR 195).</p> <p>4. Road widening to 11 metres carriageway width must be provided for lots fronting Gillieston Road, Kiah Road and Cartwright Street in accordance with Council's requirements. Reconstruction of these roads for their full length providing continuous access to the intersection points shall be undertaken in accordance with Council's standards. All other roads including Ryans Road, are to be constructed in accordance with Council's Engineering Standards.</p> <p>5. Cycleways are to be provided for generally in accordance with the Precinct Plan and the Maitland Bike Plan 2005.</p> <p>6. Pedestrian paths and cycleways links with other precincts are to be provided at the strategic access points on Cessnock Road.</p>	<p>and connecting in which existing and planned shared path infrastructure.</p> <p>The KnD zone design with the indented zone allows for two-way vehicle movement to occur on the street which is not currently possible based on the existing narrow street form approved by Council when accommodating for existing school's pick-up times and any on-street parking demand for residents and their visitors.</p> <p>For year of opening, the proposed school expansion will not relay on frontage works along Ryans Road or Gillieston Road and will provide the necessary infrastructure to support the school and connect to the available road and pathway network at that time. DoE is unable to deliver external roadworks that are located on other properties and will rely on delivery by others.</p>
13	Maitland Council	<p>Traffic Report (Cell 2)</p> <p>11.3 The REF also refers to planning activity and/or Council undertaking upgrade road works. Road works are not identified within Councils current four-year Capital Works Program. These upgrades are being undertaken by developers as they subdivide and undertake road widening and road construction works adjacent to their own lands.</p> <p>11.4 Reference is also be made to the Maitland Development Control Plan (DCP) Chapter F.5 where it is noted that road widening of Ryans Road and Gillieston Road incorporating paths is identified and proposed as part of the urban release area requirements.</p> <p>Infrastructure Funding Agreements</p> <p>11.5 There are numerous references to required upgrade works being undertaken by others and the availability of funding arrangements to deliver such improvements.</p> <p>11.6 Whilst Council collects funds for the creation of new allotments under the Gillieston Heights Development Contribution Rates for Roads & Traffic Facilities and Cycleways/Shared Paths these contributions are for works that have already been completed (such as the traffic control signals at key intersections to Cessnock Road). There are no remaining infrastructure works identified through the plan for application in proximity to the school. It should be noted that the school development is not contributing to Developer Contributions that other developments are charged. However, there would be no objection to the Department of Education entering into a Planning Agreement to enable delivery of necessary infrastructure to support the development of the school.</p>	<p>The TTIA acknowledges current gaps in pedestrian and cycle infrastructure but provides a clear plan for how the school integrates with—and supports—the DCP's broader movement goals (Sections 2.3 and 5.2).</p> <p>The school's upgrades are not a standalone fix to area-wide connectivity issues. Rather, they are proportionate improvements that align with Council's staged delivery approach for Gillieston Heights.</p> <p>Council's suggestion that the proposal does not support safe or simple movement disregards the proposed design that separates car and bus movements, improves pedestrian safety by constructing new pedestrian crossing, and anticipates future connections that will align with the school's access strategy and associated (Sections 5.1 and 6.1).</p> <p>Notably, the school is located at the northern end of the Urban Release Catchment and the school's catchment. The areas requiring pedestrian and cycling access are therefore predominately to the south and west of the school site whereby the two proposed crossings integrates into current and future planned pathway infrastructure.</p> <p>The need and subsequent ability to construct pedestrian facilities and crossings to the north of the site is tied to when future development occurs for which in the short-term and for the school upgrade 'opening' there is not the demand to justify the need to construct these facilities.</p> <p>The TTIA notes that DoE should continue to work with Council and TfNSW in opportunities to fund and deliver additional transport infrastructure surrounding the school site to service the Gillieston URA and support sustainable transport options.</p>
14	Maitland Council	<p>Traffic Report (Cell 3)</p> <p>11.7 Nominated funding arrangements rely heavily on Councils budget allocations, developer contributions and successful grant opportunities. It is recommended that School Infrastructure and Department of Education actively seek funding for delivery of these items rather than rely on others to nominate and/or otherwise fund infrastructure works that are directly attributable to the school.</p> <p>Report Review</p> <p>11.8 The report notes that traffic growth would continue to be generated without the school upgrade but fails to highlight that the school is a key destination hub that generates traffic in the area.</p> <p>11.9 As stated above, the report relies upon others to construct necessary road works. Importantly, the report notes that other transport improvements will be undertaken in response to future residential growth. The report fails to acknowledge the school as a contributor to generation, demand and need.</p> <p>11.10 The following comments relating to specific items are provided:</p> <p>a) 1.2 - Notes a "series of upgrades" and "contributions" towards transport infrastructure to facilitate that all necessary infrastructure fronting the school is to be provided. Please identify where Council has committed to funding and upgrading the road infrastructure requirements associated with Ryans Road and Gillieston Road.</p> <p>b) 2.4 - References Council as undertaking infrastructure upgrades. Road works are not identified within Councils current four-year Capital Works Program.</p> <p>c) 3.2 - Key intersections do not highlight the concerns that will result at Northview Street and Ryans Road and Gillieston Road intersections near the school.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 11.7: The TTIA acknowledges the role of Council, TfNSW, and developers in infrastructure delivery and highlights DoE's planned contributions (bus bay, pedestrian crossings, kiss-n-drop) to be delivered for year-of-opening. The TTIA notes that DoE should continue to work with Council and TfNSW in opportunities to fund and deliver additional transport infrastructure surrounding the school site to service the Gillieston URA and support sustainable transport options.• 11.8-9: The TTIA clearly models school-generated trips and contextualises them against broader URA growth. While traffic is concentrated during peak periods, it is important to note school's generate limited trips outside of peak times and therefore minimal contributors to daily traffic volumes. The school redevelopment would be estimated to generate in the order of 397 to 527 additional daily trips 2026 and 2036, respectively. Considering the schools catchment and location in an emerging urban release area, daily traffic volumes are therefore a matter that is in response to the urban release area as a whole. Residential developments surrounding the school are expected to progressively be developed between now and 2036 and are expected to generate in the order of 2,180 additional daily trips split across Gillieston Road and Ryans Road. This is in addition to an estimated 452 daily trips generated by existing residential properties in this immediate area surrounding the school that would utilising Ryans Road and/or Gillieston Road.Without the upgrade, trips would still be generated by students traveling elsewhere, often with longer vehicle journeys• 11.10a: The TTIA does not state Council has committed funding• 11.10b: Noted. Works in the area are being undertaken by various parties in response to the Gillieston Heights urban release area.• 11.10C. The TTIA identifies which assessment were and were not assessed and why i.e. Northview/Ryans Road was excluded due to its geometric constraints, limited ability to support turn treatments and minimum upgrade potential due to adjacent subdivision roads layouts approved by Council. The constraints at this intersection as a result of the most recent upgrades (by others and approved by Council) were outlined in the consultation phase.
15	Maitland Council	<p>Traffic Report (Cell 4)</p> <p>d) 3.3.1 - If the plan is to rely on active transport but suitable connections don't exist, how is this going to work?</p> <p>e) 3.3.2 - Three buses are outlined, but there are only two (2) spaces in the lay by. The report continues to avoid responsibility with regards to providing appropriate transport options, specifying that buses are the responsibility of TfNSW.</p> <p>f) 3.5 - This section infers that crashes are not attributable to the school. Further comment should be provided to validate this claim. The school directly creates demand for road users in the area.</p> <p>g) 4.1 - The assessment should consider the ultimate demand for the development, not just partial enrolment growth out to 10 years.</p> <p>h) 4.2 - Kiss and Drop - There is strong objection to the provision of any infrastructure within Northview Street because the road is a cul-de-sac which was never intended to serve as a primary entry to the school. The report then explains that this is due to "...activity occur(ing) in the area". Council notes that the school is the activity that is required to upgrade adjacent road infrastructure to serve its (and the wider community) needs for access.</p> <p>i) 5.1 - Notes DDA compliant access is not possible on Ryans Road. Concern is raised as this frontage is the main pedestrian network and access, with enter/exit proposed here. The requirements for ramps does not mean that DDA access cannot be provided, it means that infrastructure is required. Furthermore, the report notes that there is "No space for a bus turn around". It is therefore recommended to construct the road between Northview Street and Gillieston Road.</p> <p>j) 5.2 - Road widths can and should be adjusted to accommodate all development needs.</p> <p>k) Section 6 - Bus stops - The nominal bus stop configuration does not comply with the State Transit Bus Infrastructure Guide requirements. However, it is noted that the overall provided length of the facility is adequate. However, confirmation is required that the nominal width of 3.2m allows for the provision of a suitably wide travel lane (both sides of the road) for the passage of vehicles along Gillieston Road.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Item 11.10d) The TTIA (Sections 3.3.1 and 5.2) acknowledges current limitations in active transport infrastructure; however, the school is addressing this through new pedestrian crossings, footpath connections, and travel planning (Appendix F). While full active transport connectivity will evolve as the surrounding subdivisions develop, there are clear opportunities for future collaboration between DoE, Council, developers, and TfNSW through shared funding models, Section 7.11 contributions, and state grants (e.g. GetActive NSW). The school's works represent a proportionate and catalytic investment toward broader connectivity goals.As highlighted earlier the school is located at the far northern end of the urban release area and its school catchment. Connections for the school community is therefore needed to the south and west of the school. Council planning and subdivisions in the area has designated that shared path infrastructure is to be provided on the western side of Ryans Road which is currently being constructed as part of residential subdivisions. The proposed crossings on Ryans Road and Northview are suitable active transport investments for the generated school community demands and its two peak travel demand times on weekdays. The need for wider active transport infrastructure is infrastructure and amenity is more directly correlated for existing and new local residents in the area.• Item 11.10e) A two-bus bay layout is operationally appropriate given the staggered arrival times of school services. The operator has endorsed the solution, and TfNSW did not raise any objections to the proposed arrangement through the consultation process.• Item 11.10f) Crash data indicates incidents did not align with school peak times and are not attributable to school operations. Additionally, broader safety issues—including at Cessnock Road intersections—are being considered by TfNSW through the MR195 corridor study, and are appropriately outside the scope of the school redevelopment.• Item 11.10g) The TTIA applies standard year of opening and 10-year planning horizon (to 2036) in accordance with TfNSW guidelines.• Item 11.10h) TTIA Section 8.2.1 explains that Northview Street, while suboptimal, is the only feasible frontage for Kiss and Drop due to surrounding grades, land constraints, and lack of alternate access. Council's own subdivision approvals have contributed to these constraints, and the school has responded by implementing a temporary turnaround and upgraded crossings to ensure safety and functionality.• Item 11.10i) DDA access via Ryans Road is not practically feasible without extensive ramping due to the road grade and elevation change relative to the school site.Delivering compliant access in this location would require significant spatial reconfiguration, impacting essential school functions such as play space and outdoor learning areas.These areas are needed to support the student population generated by Council's Urban Release Area approvals. Furthermore

			<p>these areas are needed to support the student population generated by Council's Urban Release Area approvals. Furthermore, Council approved a new subdivision road directly opposite the existing bus zone, which compromises the ability to safely retain the existing bus infrastructure on Ryans Road. DDA-compliant access is instead prioritised via Gillieston Road, where a new bus bay and pedestrian infrastructure are being delivered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Item 11.10j) The school redevelopment does not trigger the need for full road widening. As confirmed in the TTIA (Section 1.3), as these works are not included in Council's capital works plan, the broader upgrades must be delivered in a coordinated manner rather than the current piece meal approach which has resulted in non-compliant intersection spacing on Ryans Road.• Item 11.10k) The proposed 3.2m-wide bus bay meets relevant Austroads guidance and allows for safe operations to service the school. As noted in TTIA Section 6.1, it is designed to transition into Council's future cross-section and will ultimately function as part of the widened road shoulder once Gillieston Road is upgraded in the future.
16	Maitland Council	<p>Traffic Report (Cell 5)</p> <p>l) Table 7.1 – Northview/Ryans intersection – The report does not acknowledge the lack of suitable turning space, the cul-de-sac arrangement and the ability to provide a road connection through from Northview Street to Gillieston Road to support the development. This statement is further supported by the notation that the Ryans Road and Gillieston Road intersection is not important because movements will be from the south. Furthermore, the provision of the Kiss and Drop area means traffic demand in this area will be required to return through the intersection. This doubling of the traffic demand should be modelled for impacts on the intersection (Refer also to Section 7.5.2). What mode split does the assessment use (existing or targets? – Council notes that it should be using existing).</p> <p>m) Table 7.2 – The daily rate (7.40 Vs 7.53), AM peak (0.71 Vs 0.83) and PM peak (0.78 Vs 0.84) do not align with the values established by the TfNSW Guide to Traffic Impact Assessment.</p> <p>n) Table 7.3 – Adopts rates as outlined in Figure 7.1 which are referred to as ambitious. Whilst the comment around Figure 7.1 notes these values as based upon the local context and catchments, it fails to consider that a significant portion of the school catchment has limited access to active transport infrastructure of which to facilitate such travel. In the absence of active transport infrastructure (of which the school is not providing) existing rates should be adopted for the purposes of establishing anticipated traffic demand.</p> <p>o) Table 7.4 – Adopts estimated number of students as of 2036. The assessment is to include demand associated with the whole proposal, not just anticipated by the 10-year horizon. The 10-year horizon is nominated to accommodate background growth.</p> <p>p) 7.5.2 – Notes that the Kiss and Drop operates on a continue to work arrangement but fails to acknowledge the duplication due to the cul-de-sac will result in additional traffic being rediverted back thorough the Northview/Ryans intersection.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•11.10 l) – The TTIA (Section 7.6 and Table 7.1) explains that the Northview Street / Ryans Road intersection was not modelled due to its constrained geometry and limited scope for feasible upgrade, as a result of closely spaced intersections approved under previous subdivision consents. The physical limitations of the intersection, combined with minimal options for widening or formal turning treatments, make it unsuitable for further engineering intervention. While the Kiss and Drop facility will increase use of this intersection, the TTIA (Section 8.2.1) addresses this through a temporary turnaround facility and management strategies that limit traffic conflict and queuing. This solution is intended as an interim measure until the adjacent subdivision road is constructed, providing an alternative connection to Gillieston Road and relieving pressure on the cul-de-sac. The adopted approach reflects a pragmatic and site-responsive solution, given the existing local road design and land use constraints shaped by Council's prior approvals.•11.10 m) - all traffic analysis and SIDRA modelling—including trip generation assumptions—were completed prior to the release of the current Guide to Traffic Impact Assessment (GTIA) in November 2024, as evidenced by the SIDRA output dates provided in the appendices. At the time, the methodology used was appropriate and consistent with then-current guidance and practice.•11.10 n) – The TTIA (Section 7.1) includes mode share assumptions that are aspirational but reasonable, reflecting expected improvements in walking, cycling, and public transport access over time. These assumptions are grounded in local catchment analysis, anticipated shared path delivery, and supported by the School Travel Plan (Appendix F). While current car use is high, the mode shares reflect future behaviour, consistent with broader DoE and TfNSW policy goals to promote sustainable transport to schools.•11.10 o) – Presuming the intent of the question, when student demand increases to 1,000 student capacity, a review of surrounding infrastructure should be conducted but the 2036 projects show compliance with the current project design. While there may be student growth contributing to traffic demands, so will background traffic growth which is the main traffic for intersection upgrade considerations rather than the school.•11.10 p) – Noted, this is still part of the peak trips that each drop off/pick-up generates and in/out trip in the peak.
17	Maitland Council	<p>Traffic Report (Cell 6)</p> <p>q) 7.6 – Assumptions to adopt a car travel rate of 40% based on additional development are low. All previous advice points to 60% for private vehicle usage mode share and a rate of 1.75 for carpooling (57%).</p> <p>r) 7.7 – States road formations will be of a Collector standard; however, the report continues to fail to note that the school will not be contributing to this whilst espousing the values and benefits of such upgrades to support the development. Furthermore, the report declares that upgrades are required.</p> <p>s) 7.8 – The report requests others to deliver transport related infrastructure to support the growth surrounding the school. This should be the responsibility of the key provider increasing demand in the area (i.e. the school).</p> <p>t) Section 8.2 – An assessment of the proposed parking and surrounding road network is to be undertaken to confirm that sufficient parking opportunities exist to cater for the estimated demand based upon current mode user shares. (i.e. is there sufficient capacity in the adjoining road network for on-street parking to support the development?)</p> <p>u) 8.2.1 – The report states that Kiss and Drop has capacity for 288 vehicles over 30mins. Verification is required to confirm how a turnover timeframe of 25 seconds per space has been established, particularly when NSW Road Rules allow for a maximum of 2 minutes. Also, demand should be based on current mode shares, not future targets. This relies on the fact that people will not arrive prior to bell time. In Council's experience this rarely happens. The operation of the Kiss and Drop is governed by typical “No Parking” restrictions and enforcement by Council and/or NSW Police. Policies and Procedures as part of the School Travel Plan is irrelevant. The report also identifies that queuing in Ryans Road is likely, but the intersection has not been modelled. This needs to be modelled. Comments continue to note that intersections along Ryan Road are less than 40m (this not true) and therefore do not facilitate upgrades to Northview Street. This further reinforces that Northview is not appropriate for the main site entry, and it is suggested that left in/out to Ryans Road. Everything here suggests that Northview is not appropriate for the purposes of providing a Kiss and Drop and main entry location.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•11.10q) – Referred development won't come online until 2036 thus lower car mode assumed•11.10 r) Council opinion noted but as per TTIA state roads upgrades needed based on wider growth and not school traffic•11.10 s) Report states targeted transport infrastructure to support growth of the URA as it develops which is the key generator of traffic rather than the school.•T) Proposal meets DCP requirement•U) Assuming a 30 second dwell time that facility could turnover 288 cars. Generally well managed KnD achieve an average of 30-60 seconds at pick up time when peak demands generated.
18	Maitland Council	<p>Traffic Report (Cell 7)</p> <p>v) Four spaces plus eight spaces for queuing that will be turned into “No Stopping”. Any Kiss and Drop proposal should be contained internal to the subject site. It is not the requirement of the public road corridor to facilitate private development uses.</p> <p>w) 8.3 – Bicycle facilities should be provided on site.</p> <p>x) Section 9 – References swept paths for RCV and MRV in Appendix H – There is no such appendix or turning templates provided.</p> <p>y) Section 11 Summary – This section relies upon alignment with local and state government goals to reduce car dependence but is not contributing to such actions with required infrastructure. It is agreed that traffic growth will continue to occur, but the school fails to acknowledge that the school contributes to the volume of current (and future) traffic growth in the area. The summary notes that the proposal meets the need at opening of the school but that additional transport improvements are required over time. It is considered that these needs should be provided for as part of the proposed development.</p> <p>z) Repeated reference to Councils Developer Contributions Plans. There are no contributions, nor projects identified within the immediate vicinity of GPS for which contributions can be applied.</p> <p>Other / Generalised Traffic Comments</p> <p>11.11 It appears a current traffic counts assessment has not been undertaken on the surrounding road network. All of the assessment is based on estimated volumes generated.</p> <p>11.12 The existing road network being Gillieston Road (approx. 6m wide) and Ryans Road (approx. 9m wide) are inadequate to support the proposed development. Road widening along these streets shall be delivered in conjunction with the school upgrade.</p> <p>11.13 The proposed Bus bay shall be located outside of the ultimate Gillieston road cross section being an 11m wide carriageway, with minimum 4.5m wide verges. This is to ensure the function of this road is not impeded by the upgrade of the school.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•v) Council opinion noted. On-site options were reviewed but not feasible•w) Noted, proposal is to have bicycle parking on-site•x) Swept paths had been prepared and can be provided. Appear to have been missed in packaging on V005 TTIA. Swept paths show compliance.y) Council opinion noted but the proposed treatments in response to the activity are considered appropriate to meet the needs of the school at year of opening. Beyond this, additional transport improvements (i.e. pathways, crossings, road widening and intersections) are expected to be constructed over time as part of future residential development across the Gillieston Heights URA as they progress. It is therefore recommended that SI continue to work with Council and TfNSW to facilitate targeted transport infrastructure across the precinct through funding initiatives such as GetActive NSW grants, Council's development contributions for the areas and TfNSW's infrastructure planning for the MR195 corridor. <p>•11.1) as per section 7.2 counts were collected for three key intersection assessed as base but given redeveloping area's nature needed to do assessment/estimate of traffic based on land release rather than just applying a uniform generic growth rate across all road approaches</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•11.12) Council opinion noted but not agreed, need for widening is based on background residential development growth and not school traffic for which main traffic demands is to/from south•11.13) The proposed 3.2m-wide bus bay meets relevant Austroads guidance and allows for safe operations. As noted in TTIA Section 6.1, it is designed to transition into Council's future cross-section and will ultimately function as part of the widened road shoulder. DoE cannot build bus based on future road form and other development to occur.

19	Maitland Council	<p>Traffic Report (Cell 8)</p> <p>11.14 The report suggests only two buses will be stopped at the bus bay at any one time. There is no further detail to suggest this is appropriate or sufficient. Where will any additional buses wait for pick up?</p> <p>11.15 Any works within the road reserve require approval under Section 138 of the Roads Act, with the application to be submitted to Council for review and approval.</p> <p>11.16 The location of the proposed Wombat Crossing and Children's Crossing shall be consulted with Council's Traffic department.</p> <p>11.17 The proposed Kiss n drop facility with temporary U-turn facility is unsafe, as cars need to cross a pedestrian path twice in order to make a U-turn. This also interacts with the proposed southern carpark driveway entry/exit. During peak times the operation of this will impact traffic flow within Northview Street.</p> <p>11.18 Northview Street is a cul-de-sac and aligns with the concept of a yield street with low value given to both movement and place considerations. The inclusion of Northview Street as part of the school development strategy will require widening of Northview Street in accordance with Councils Manual of Engineering Standards to provide for sufficient travel lanes and parking allowances to supplement the schools traffic demands. Furthermore, the use of Northview Street should not be considered unless sufficient attention is given to issues associated with vehicle circulation.</p> <p>11.19 Any upgrades required to facilitate the expansion of the school at the Cessnock Road/Gillieston Road intersection and/or Cessnock Road/Vintage Drive intersection will be determined by TfNSW.</p>	<p>• 11.14) A two-bus bay layout is operationally appropriate given the staggered arrival times of school services. Key operational considerations include timetabling of buses to avoid concreating arrival of multiple buses at the same time and that local buses drivers/operators typically coordinate arrival and departure sequences and using real time tracking. The operator has endorsed the solution, and TfNSW did not raise any objections to the proposed arrangement through the consultation process.</p> <p>• 11.15) Yes and is noted public realm works is post REF and part of Section 138</p> <p>• 11.16) Yes will be done as part of Section 138 process however as noted earlier the location of this crossing facility is limited by the closely spaces intersection that have been approved by Council as part of recent subdivisions on the western side of Ryans Road.</p> <p>• 11.17) Council was party to the workshop discussions which reviewed several options for the KnD facility and discussed the operational requirements for KnD, parking and pedestrians during pick-up/drop-off periods. This also included detailed investigations of on-site KnD facilities and turn-around facilities which were not deemed viable. In lieu of the proposed KnD facility and interim turn-around facility. The conventional approached would be to retain the current operation of using Council's temporary cul-de-sac at the eastern extent of Northview Street until such time that Northview Street is extended or new road connections to Gillieston Road are provided (by others).</p> <p>• 11.18) Refer to earlier responses and Council not considering the existing school operations when approving subdivision road and Northview Street in its original form. The DoE proposed works are an improvement to the current deficiencies on Northview Street including formalising parking and pathways along the school's frontage. The temporary turn-around facility was workshopped with Council</p> <p>• 11.19) Noted. As per the TTIA traffic generated by the school and impact on state intersections is limited compared to the overall background traffic growth attributed to the greater Gillieston URA.</p>
20	Maitland Council	<p>Waste Management Plan</p> <p>12.1 This report has been reviewed and is generally ok. There are no comments for demolition or construction stage.</p> <p>12.2 The operational phase is high level which is generally appropriate. A single waste storage area adjacent to the school car park; temporary storage locations will be allocated across the site and their content collected daily by cleaners and transported to the waste bins storage area using a 'janitors' trolley'.</p> <p>12.3 It is recommended that at the detailed design stage grades and levels across the site are considered to identify hazards and minimise & mitigate unnecessary WHS risks for employees transporting bins up/down steep slopes, and potentially extended distances. Risk may also arise from repetition of transferring a large number of potentially heavy bins from across the site to the collection point manually. Use of Electric Bin Tugs may be necessary, and if so, a designated place for storage and charging of Bin Tugs should be allocated. If this is the case, any pathways/ramps would need to be wide enough and have sufficient swept paths to allow the electric bin tugs to be manoeuvred effectively.</p> <p>12.4 It is also recommended that the detailed design stage ensures that the waste storage area is fitted with water taps/hose and appropriate drainage to allow ease of ongoing cleaning and maintenance. Consideration should also be given to ensuring shade to minimise odour during summer and hotter months.</p> <p>12.5 The waste management plan indicates the site will be serviced by a private contractor who will access the carpark via Gillieston Road and service bins directly using a rear lift loading waste collection vehicle. The report indicates collection times will be arranged during off-peak times to ensure minimal disturbance to pedestrians and visitors. Consideration should also be given to potential acoustic impacts arising from waste collection.</p>	<p>12.1, 12.2, 12.3 - Can amend report to include the use of bin tugs as an option as well as janitors trolleys.</p> <p>12.4 - "The floor being graded and drained to an approved drainage outlet connected to the sewer and having a smooth, even surface, coved at all intersections with walls; "</p> <p>Can amend this point to clarify that hose taps will be included to drain the WSA.</p> <p>12.5 - Off-peak time consideration have been proposed to assist with both acoustic considerations and impacts to the wider community. On going service agreement discussions to be had by DET.</p>
21	Maitland Council	<p>PSI</p> <p>A DSI and RAP have been prepared. Recommendations to be implemented.</p>	<p>Agree that the recommendations of the DSI and RAP should be implemented.</p>
22	Maitland Council	<p>ACHAR</p> <p>All mitigation measures identified in this report must be adhered to, including the preparation of an AHIP.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
23	Maitland Council	<p>Groundwater</p> <p>15.1 No groundwater was intercepted during investigation. Based on depth of excavations, groundwater is not likely to be encountered.</p> <p>15.2 Query: What is the difference between the iso plans shown in page 173 and 180 of 235 of the document? Noting that these are civil drawings in a geotech report.</p>	<p>15.1: Current data gathered during intrusive investigation indicates that groundwater is unlikely to be intercepted during construction activities. For future construction the construction contractors Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) must include contingencies and controls to manage potential interactions with waters, including potential seepage and surface water flows (if observed).</p> <p>15.2:</p> <p>Page 173 is a cut and fill plan for the proposed bulk earthworks indicating the locations that will be cut (excavated) and those that will be filled (soil emplaced). This plan has been reviewed and included in our report to demonstrate the anticipated topographic changes during the proposed development, and to consider potential environmental interactions. As noted above, the risk of intercepting groundwater as part of bulk earthworks is considered unlikely based on the cut and fill plan, which as outlined in Section 6 and Section 10.4.1 of the report.</p> <p>Page 180 is a Stormwater Management Plan that shows the design contours, which represent the elevation in which stormwater infrastructure will be installed at the site. As outlined in Section 10.1 of the report, this plan indicates that sufficient design measures are included to capture, direct, consolidate and discharge from the site. Therefore, it is considered that there is adequate drainage design features to prevent inundation.</p> <p>Stantec's report and the response to the RFI's apply to the environmental considerations related to surface water and groundwater. Clarification on the technical detail and specifications within each plan should be sought from the specialist consultants who prepared the plans.</p>
24	Maitland Council	<p>Civil Design Report (Cell 1)</p> <p>16.1 The following comments are noted:</p> <p>a) The retaining wall and development of the school will alter the natural flow path of water, which will change the area of impact during storm events, to what extent is unclear.</p> <p>b) It is unclear as to why the proposed basin on the Northern side of Gillieston Road is called 'Temporary'. This should be permanent as it is proposed to provide detention storage that is being removed as part of the school redevelopment. This basin will accept both private and public stormwater flows. The ownership of this basin shall be discussed with Council and appropriate easements shall be created over this to allow legal stormwater discharge and ongoing maintenance of the facility.</p> <p>c) Changes to the existing easement or works within this easement will require further discussions with Council, as Council is benefitted from this easement.</p> <p>d) The proposed sewer pump station is to be located outside of the road reserve.</p> <p>e) The extent of earthworks shall be clearly shown on the plans, as the proposal includes regrading land outside of the school site. Owners consent should be obtained for these works, including consent from Council to undertake works within the easement for drainage.</p> <p>f) Plans attached to the report appear to deal with the proposed development holistically and do not consider staging proposed by other associated plans. This includes for the provision of suitable erosion control details at construction entry/exit points for all stages.</p> <p>g) The drainage proposal nominates to connect directly to the existing 900mm culvert under Gillieston Road. Give the quantum of fill occurring in this area, it is queried how surface flow for the adjacent upstream catchment will continue to access the 900mm diameter culvert for discharge. The nominal sections provided in the plan have no reference to align with on the general arrangement plan.</p> <p>h) Volume for OSD on plans specifies 320m3 but the report nominates 280m3. Confirmation on correct required and provided volumes is required.</p>	<p>a) To the east of the retaining wall on the developers land (Bathla), the design includes re-grading of the land to a new culvert. This has been designed to comply convey the peak 1% peak flows from the upstream catchment. The land owner has approved this design.</p> <p>b) This basin has been labelled as Temporary, as this is a temporary basin until the developer (Bathla) further develops their land and makes the required amendments to the basin and outlet structure to allow for the additional peak flows from their development. This basin has been proposed to control peak stormwater flows from the upstream catchment and replace the existing detention volume created by the Gillieston Road being elevated above the natural ground. Easements comments are noted</p> <p>c) Noted.</p> <p>d) Noted.</p> <p>e) The extent of earthworks is shown on the plans 400001 which shows the cut fill for the school site as well as 1100001 which shows the area of regrade on the eastern property as well as the extent of the proposed basin and associated swale on the northern side. Developer (Bathla) has endorsed the proposed design. Consent from Council is noted.</p> <p>f) Staging of the E+S plans will form part of the CC documentation for each of the CC stages. Access can be managed for the site for each of the stages.</p> <p>g) For the culvert/northern detention basin option, no upstream water will flow through the 900 mm pipe. All upstream water will be directed to the new culvert under Gillieston Road.</p> <p>H) The detention tank volume is 320 m3. The plan is correct.</p>

25	Maitland Council	<p>Civil Design Report (Cell 2)</p> <p>i) Plans show proposed footpath to Northview Street (replacement) and partially along Gillieston Road between bus stop and car park area. There is no new path nominated for Ryans Road despite the nomination of a proposed pedestrian access point, including its use during staged construction when other options are limited, connecting to one of the main pedestrian pathway spines through the school site. It is considered that the provision of footpath across all road frontages to serve the school should be provided as a minimum. This would be a requirement for construction of a childcare centre in accordance with the DCP and it is considered this should also apply for the construction around school sites as well.</p> <p>j) Sampling of surface water from the dam in the eastern portion of the site identified some metals and PFOS contamination that would require consideration during the proposed dewatering and filling of the dam as part of the redevelopment works.</p>	<p>i) New pathway facilities meet the needs of the activity based on the project activity and the surrounding transport network that will be present in 2026.</p> <p>It is likely that other transport improvements (i.e. pathways, crossings) will be undertaken in response to future residential growth as it occurs in the area and coordinated with other activity . At current wider network shared path infrastructure is on the western side of Ryans Road for which pathways and crossing facilities are connecting to this infrastructure. Given there is no pedestrian/front-door access to the school on Ryans Road, until there is any development on the northern side of Gillieston Road there is no trigger/demand for pathway infrastructure along Ryans Road.</p> <p>j) The Detailed Site Investigation (DSI) Report (Stantec, 2025) provides the following conclusion in relation to waters contained within the dam:</p> <p>Exceedances of ecological criteria for total and dissolved copper and zinc, dissolved lead, total nickel and PFOS were reported within surface water samples collected from the dam. It is noted that the water catchment collects surface waters from the broader surrounds to the south (off-site), which is inferred upgradient. As such, waters within the dam may be subject to off-site influences.</p> <p>In the absence of a known on-site source of PFAS and the metals impacted soils on-site found to be non-leachable, the detections of contaminants in surface water are inferred to be from an off-site upgradient location, noting the catchment encompasses up-gradient lands.</p> <p>The current design for the site indicates that the dam will not be filled during construction. Interactions with surface water are envisaged to be limited to managing erosion and sedimentation (ERSED) during earthworks and construction. The protocols for management of ERSED and water quality must be documented in the construction contractors Construction Environmental Management Plan and associated sub-plans to ensure compliance with relevant guidelines and regulatory requirements.</p>
26	Maitland Council	<p>Visual Impact Assessment</p> <p>No additional comments or recommendations. Report appears ok.</p>	N/A
27	Maitland Council	<p>Interim Audit Advice</p> <p>Noted, recommendation to be adopted.</p>	N/A
28	Maitland Council	<p>Electrical & Mechanical Report</p> <p>Works to be in accordance with report.</p>	N/A
29	Maitland Council	<p>Staging Plans</p> <p>20.1 The following comments are noted:</p> <p>a) 4.4 - The PCMP refers to external approvals from NSW Fire and Rescue, but this agency is not identified as a requirement for approval or otherwise referenced within the REF.</p> <p>b) 5.2 – Hoarding on the street/road will require approval from Council.</p> <p>c) 6.1 & 6.2 – Further work is considered necessary to develop a CEMP that aligns with the outcomes of the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report including a cultural heritage induction package, information on unexpected artefact findings, and cultural awareness training. Refer to mitigation measures ACHM 1 through 10 within supporting document A1 for further information.</p> <p>d) 7.3 – Not “where possible”. All vehicles entering and exiting the site are to leave in a forward direction.</p> <p>e) 11 – The mitigation measures identified do not consider all of the requirements specified within the PCMP including but not limited to the need for a Safety Management Plan. Furthermore, the measures discussed in detail within the various sections of the PCMP are not summarised as required mitigation measures within this chapter. Some of these measures are however incorporated into the A1 Mitigation Measures associated with the REF. There are missing pieces of information and inconsistencies within the PCMP and between other supporting documents.</p>	No concerns raised by SHAC. We believe these items can be worked through with the contractor in their detailed management plans.
30	Maitland Council	<p>Mine Subsidence Report</p> <p>To be assessed by Subsidence Advisory NSW.</p>	N/A
31	Maitland Council	<p>Stakeholder Consultation Summary</p> <p>Based on the reasons outlined in this table, there are significant impacts associated with this proposal, primarily relating to traffic implications, aa well as stormwater. The following statement in this report is disputed:</p> <hr/> <p>2.3 Significance of Environmental Impacts</p> <p>Based on the identification of potential impacts and an assessment of the nature and extent of the impacts of the proposed activity, it is determined that all potential impacts can be appropriately mitigated to ensure that there is minimal impact on the locality, community and/or the environment.</p>	Responses provided for concerns raised in other items.
32	Maitland Council	<p>Social Impact Assessment</p> <p>The Social Impact Assessment is comprehensive and demonstrates appropriate community engagement undertaken to inform development. Appropriate consideration has also been given to the demographics within the school catchment and how the development supports the community given the growth within the catchment area. Noting concerns around traffic being of key concern, I anticipate Council's traffic team will provide relevant feedback on the management of traffic. Additional potential impacts have been considered in Section 5 of the report. It is recommended the mitigation recommendations outlined in the Social Impact Assessment report are implemented to minimise and manage any potential negative impacts associated with this development.</p>	<p>Two edits to the SIA suggested in blue as below so that the issue of delivery is a traffic implementation one:</p> <p>Page 51 of SIA - under OPERATION-TRAFFIC, PARKING AND ACCESS: Residual Impact Significance Assessment- The delivery of the transport and transit infrastructure will be covered in detail in the Traffic Assessment</p> <p>Page 59 of SIA : OPERATIONAL Recommendation O.1: Transport and Accessibility: To ensure equitable and safe access to the school, measures need to be implemented to improve mobility infrastructure that accommodate forecasted traffic increases as is outlined in the Traffic Assessment Report prepared by Bitzios Consulting 2024.</p>
33	Maitland Council	<p>Land Use Conflict Risk Assessment</p> <p>Recommendations to be adopted. Council notes the Traffic issues previously raised in this table conflict with land use conflict assessment.</p>	<p>The LUCRA has found that there could be potential conflicts between the proposed redevelopment and some of the surrounding land users including current or future residential land uses and rural land users, specifically poultry farming. Engineering and administrative controls are proposed to be implemented to reduce instances of conflicts to acceptable risk level (risk ranking < 10), effectiveness of which should be monitored using the suggested performance monitoring criteria (Section 3.4).</p> <p>Suggested risk mitigation measures are provided in Table 4 1 to reduce potential conflict risks associated with odour, visual impacts and traffic related issues. The proposed controls can be implemented during design, construction or operation stages of the project. While these controls are suggested, other design and operational controls may be considered to provide similar reduction in risk ranking, to <10. This may include further specific assessments such as the following (but not limited to), to further inform any design elements of the project to ensure sufficient risk reduction is achieved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Odour impact assessment•Traffic impact assessment•Acoustic assessment•Visual Impact Assessment <p>Also see below image from the LUCRA:</p>

			<div><div>STRATEGIC NOTE: the baseline (B) air points shown are required by the REF approval process and should be cross checked for consistency.</div><div>Table A-7 suggests risk reduction mitigation measures and project implementation stages.</div><table><tr><th>Project Stage <i>(Design or Construction)</i></th><th>Mitigation Measures</th><th>Risk Rating at Project Completion</th></tr><tr><td>B/C</td><td>Where possible, school and landscape design to incorporate elements that reduce noise and other conflicts as well as increase visual amenity.</td><td>3.5</td></tr><tr><td>C/D</td><td>Perventive action to have a leak detector on shut cover so spill oil or fuel from shower to be detected at subsurface collection point.</td><td>3.5</td></tr><tr><td>D</td><td>Sedimentation - Runwater collected from rain run to be used for watering water.</td><td>3.5</td></tr><tr><td>E</td><td>No parking to be kept on the school site.</td><td>3.5</td></tr><tr><td>F/G/H</td><td>Interior ventilation units such as air conditioning.</td><td>3.5</td></tr><tr><td>I</td><td>Vibrationation – limit number jobs during school holidays and close windows doors facing the roadways from daily high wind events.</td><td>3.5</td></tr><tr><td>J/K/L</td><td>School design to include visually attractive elements to increase social amenity of the site To be considered in subsequent assessment.</td><td>3.5</td></tr></table><div>3</div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div><div></div></div>	Project Stage <i>(Design or Construction)</i>	Mitigation Measures	Risk Rating at Project Completion	B/C	Where possible, school and landscape design to incorporate elements that reduce noise and other conflicts as well as increase visual amenity.	3.5	C/D	Perventive action to have a leak detector on shut cover so spill oil or fuel from shower to be detected at subsurface collection point.	3.5	D	Sedimentation - Runwater collected from rain run to be used for watering water.	3.5	E	No parking to be kept on the school site.	3.5	F/G/H	Interior ventilation units such as air conditioning.	3.5	I	Vibrationation – limit number jobs during school holidays and close windows doors facing the roadways from daily high wind events.	3.5	J/K/L	School design to include visually attractive elements to increase social amenity of the site To be considered in subsequent assessment.	3.5
Project Stage <i>(Design or Construction)</i>	Mitigation Measures	Risk Rating at Project Completion																									
B/C	Where possible, school and landscape design to incorporate elements that reduce noise and other conflicts as well as increase visual amenity.	3.5																									
C/D	Perventive action to have a leak detector on shut cover so spill oil or fuel from shower to be detected at subsurface collection point.	3.5																									
D	Sedimentation - Runwater collected from rain run to be used for watering water.	3.5																									
E	No parking to be kept on the school site.	3.5																									
F/G/H	Interior ventilation units such as air conditioning.	3.5																									
I	Vibrationation – limit number jobs during school holidays and close windows doors facing the roadways from daily high wind events.	3.5																									
J/K/L	School design to include visually attractive elements to increase social amenity of the site To be considered in subsequent assessment.	3.5																									

45		<p>Flood Impact Assessment (Cell 1)</p> <p>It is understood that the site falls outside of the Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) extent of mainstream flooding from the Hunter River and Wallis and Swampy- Fishery Creeks flooding.¹ However, we note that the site is impacted by overland flooding, mainly at the northeastern corner of the site. The northeastern corner of the Site is traversed by a 1st order stream via a series of dams before discharging to Swamp Fishery Creek to the northwest of the Site.² Runoff from the local catchment (south of Northview Street) can overtop Northview Street when the capacity of the street drainage system and storage within the road sag is exceeded. Flow from the sag in Northview Street passes across the lots, including the site, in a northerly direction overland towards Gillieston Road.</p> <p>In a 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) event, existing conditions, the peak velocity at the northeastern site corner was estimated at 2.3 m/s with maximum depth of 2.04 m, which is a peak flood hazard level of H5,4 5 which is unsafe for vehicles and people and all buildings vulnerable to structural damage. 6 In the post development conditions (which includes a proposed new 1/2400 x 900 mm stormwater culvert with no blockage factor applied), the peak velocity at the northeastern site corner was estimated at 2.99 m/s with maximum depth of 1.44 m, with a peak flood hazard of H5.7 A 50% blockage factor scenario was also modelled, and while the exact depth and velocity figures were not provided,⁸ we note that the flood depth at the northeastern corner of the site can be in excess of 1.5 metres and velocity up to 3m/s.⁹ Also noting a small increase in the flood extent offsite, north of Gillieston Road and overtopping of a small part of Gillieston Road.)</p> <p>However, the Flood Impact Assessment (FIA), only considered the 1% AEP flood event. We recommend that risk assessment should consider the full range of flooding, including events up to the PMF, and not focus only on the 1% AEP flood, particularly as the site is considered of sensitive use. Climate change considerations should also be included, in line with NSW Government Guidelines</p> <p>We would also like to reiterate that the site and broader area of Gillieston Heights is a High Flood Island, becoming isolated due to road inundation for extended periods of time.¹⁰ This would include isolation from essential services such as hospitals, which are located in Maitland. We recommend that consideration must be given to secondary emergencies to flooding (such as fires and medical emergencies), particularly considering the sensitive nature of the development and the long period of isolation for this area, as outlined below.</p> <p>In the 1% AEP event and greater, the entire suburb of Gillieston Heights is cut off from road access to neighbouring areas, since Cessnock Road at Testers Hollow and Maitland are both cut off.¹¹ “The suburb relies on Cessnock Road (..) for access to Maitland and the New England Highway to the north, and Heddon Greta, Kurri Kurri and the Hunter Expressway to the south. Cessnock Road crosses Swamp-Fishery Creek to the north, and crosses Testers Hollow to the south. When Cessnock Road is cut off at both of these locations, the suburb is isolated (as it was in the 2015 flood event). Cessnock Road at Testers Hollow has flood immunity up to the 20% AEP event (..), while at Swamp-Fishery Creek the road (..) being just overtopped in the 1% AEP event from local flooding (..), but more frequently from Hunter River flooding. The duration of inundation can also be quite long, approximately 9 days at Testers Hollow and 6 days at Swamp-Fishery Creek for a large local catchment event (noting that the draining of the swamp depends on Hunter River levels).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">•Per mitigation G11 Prior to the commencement of each stage of operation, the Flood Emergency Response Plan (FERP) is to be incorporated with the Emergency Management Plan for approval of the DoE and include the following:<ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Prioritise evacuation and avoid shelter-in-place by closing the school before the school day if flood events are forecasted and SES advises.b) School administration must undertake annual evacuation preparations and an evacuation drill prior to the commencement of the wet season (typically November to April);c) School administration to undertake responsibilities as set out in the FERP; andd) Ensure that the Flood Warning Notice is maintained and permanently visible.•The School will be consulted to update the school’s Emergency Management and Evacuation Plan specific to a flood emergency event and secondary emergencies.•The NSW Department of Education Emergency Response Team liaises with the NSW State Emergency Service (NSW SES) Zone Management and Incident Management Teams on a frequent basis to determine potential risks from natural hazards including floods. As natural hazard events develop, the Emergency Response Team (with duty officer available 24 hours a day, 7 days a week) through direct communication with the NSW SES, supports schools with decision making to close or evacuate prior to the onset of flooding. This process is part of development of the Flood Risk Response Plan for the school.•This advice will be taken on notice.
46	NSW SES	<p>Flood Impact Assessment (Cell 2)</p> <p>The 5% AEP Hunter River flood event (as larger) can also cause inundation of these roads and isolate Gillieston Heights.”¹²</p> <p>We would like to emphasise that there is no known safe period of isolation. However, the longer the period of isolation, the more chance there is for mishap requiring external intervention. Even relatively brief periods of isolation, in the order of a few hours, can lead to personal medical or fire emergencies that have to be responded to. During flooding it is likely that there will be a reduced capacity for the relevant emergency service agency to respond in these times.</p> <p>Further, the Flood Impact Assessment (FIA) states that “in the unlikely event that the evacuation route is cut by flooding prior to evacuation, the school would be reliant on emergency services for provision of supplies and evacuation, as is the case under existing operations.”¹³ However, the proposal would result in a significant increase in the number of people at the site, from 339 to 1,012 students (also noting that children are a vulnerable population, largely unable to self-evacuate at this age and particularly considering the introduction of pre-school children at the site), which will result in increased pressure on emergency services, at a time when resources are in abnormally high demand. Development strategies relying on an assumption that mass rescue may be possible where evacuation either fails or is not implemented are not acceptable to the NSW SES. The NSW SES is opposed to development strategies that transfer residual risk, in terms of emergency response activities, to NSW SES and/or increase capability requirements of the NSW SES</p> <p>Based on this review, we provide the following advice:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•Consider the full range of flooding, including events up to the PMF, and not focus only on the 1% AEP flood, particularly as the site is considered of sensitive use. Climate change considerations should also be included, in line with NSW Government Guidelines.•Ensure site users (including staff, students and their cares and workers during the construction phase) are made aware of the flood risk for the lifespan of the development. For example, this can be done through site inductions, by using signage and other flood information tools.•Review and update the school’s Emergency Management and Evacuation Plan specific to a flood emergency event and align with the above considerations / advice provided herein, particularly considering the significant increase in the vulnerable population at the site - from 339 to 1,012 students. Theis should include consideration of secondary emergencies to flooding (such as fires and medical emergencies), particularly considering the sensitive nature of the development and the long period of isolation for this area.•Consider implementing early earning triggers in the Flood Emergency Response Plan (FERP) and consider closing the school down ahead of the start of the school day, if there is any expectation of significant flooding in the area. Please note that NSW SES does not have statutory authority to endorse or approve flood emergency response plans.•Request that notification be provided to the NSW SES if the proposed works are expected to cause disruption to the operation of local roads and there is the likelihood of significant delays in the operation of the roads, as this may impact the ability for emergency vehicles to use these routes.	
47	Ausgrid	<p>Method of Electricity Connection</p> <p>The method of connection will be in line with Ausgrid’s Electrical Standard (ES)1 – ‘Premise Connection Requirements.</p>	<p>Noted. Connection to be compliant to Ausgrid documentations including ES-1</p>

48	Ausgrid	Supply of Electricity It is recommended for the nominated electrical consultant/contractor to provide a preliminary enquiry to Ausgrid to obtain advice for the connection of the proposed development to the adjacent electricity network infrastructure. An assessment will be carried out based on the enquiry which may include whether or not: -The existing network can support the expected electrical load of the development -A substation may be required on-site, either a pad mount kiosk or chamber style and; -site conditions or other issues that may impact on the method of supply. Please direct the developer to Ausgrid's website, www.ausgrid.com.au about how to connect to Ausgrid's network.	A preliminary enquiry (700009340) and Design Application was submitted. Design Related Services Offer was received from Ausgrid. (Webform Ref : 1946179, MC Reference: 1900130751, AP Reference: 800673743)
49	Ausgrid	Conduit Installation The need for additional electricity conduits in the footway adjacent to the development will be assessed and documented in Ausgrid's Design Information, used to prepare the connection project design.	A proposed design scope (PDS) drawing was prepared for the REF submission noting the need for additional conduits.
50	Ausgrid	Vegetation All proposed vegetation underneath overhead power lines and above underground cables must comply with the requirements of ISSC 3 Guideline For Managing Vegetation Near Power Lines.	There are a number of electrical and communications (NBN) lines in or near the boundary of the site. All new vegetation, both within and outside the site boundary, will be reviewed to ensure compliance with the requirements of the ISSC 3 Guidelines for Managing Vegetation Near Power Lines. Please note that there are a number of existing, mature, trees in the road reserve which are in the proximity of powerlines, but are outside the scope of this project.
51	Ausgrid	Streetlighting The developer is to consider the impact that existing streetlighting and any future replacement streetlighting and maintenance may have on the development. Should the developer determine that any existing streetlighting may impact the development, the developer should either review the development design, particular the placement of windows, or discuss with Ausgrid the options for relocating the streetlighting. The relocating of any streetlighting will generally be at the developers cost. In many cases is not possible to relocate streetlighting due to its strategic positioning.	It is not anticipated that any existing streetlighting will be impacted by development works.
52	Ausgrid	Service Mains It is recommended that the developer engage a Level 2 Accredited Service Provider (ASP) Electrician to ensure that the installation will comply with the Service Rules.	Noted. ASP2 to be engaged.
53	Ausgrid	Proximity to Existing Network Assets Overhead Powerlines There are existing overhead electricity network assets in Gillieston Rd. Safe work NSW Document – Work Near Overhead Powerlines: Code of Practice, outlines the minimum safety separation requirements between these mains/poles to structures within the development throughout the construction process. It is a statutory requirement that these distances be maintained throughout construction. Special consideration should be given to the positioning and operating of cranes and the location of any scaffolding. The “as constructed” minimum clearances to the mains should also be considered. These distances are outlined in the Ausgrid Network Standard, NS220 Overhead Design Manual. This document can be sourced from Ausgrid's website, www.ausgrid.com.au Should the existing overhead mains require relocating due to the minimum safety clearances being compromised in either of the above scenarios, this relocation work is generally at the developers cost. It is also the responsibility of the developer to ensure that the existing overhead mains have sufficient clearance from all types of vehicles that are expected be entering and leaving the site.	Existing overhead assets are not located along the development's property but on the opposite side of the road. The Proposed Design Scope drawing denotes the proposal to have conduits cross the road to connect to the new padmount.
54	Ausgrid	Underground Cables There are existing underground electricity network assets in Gillieston Rd, Ryans Rd, & Northview St. Special care should also be taken to ensure that driveways and any other construction activities within the footpath area do not interfere with the existing cables in the footpath. Ausgrid cannot guarantee the depth of cables due to possible changes in ground levels from previous activities after the cables were installed. Hence it is recommended that the developer locate and record the depth of all known underground services prior to any excavation in the area. Safe work Australia – Excavation Code of Practice, and Ausgrid's Network Standard NS156 outlines the minimum requirements for working around Ausgrid's underground cables.	Existing underground network assets were identified in a survey undertaken during the planning stage of the development.
55	Jemena	Jemena has reviewed the location of the 'Notice of Exhibition' and undertaken a review of the documentation provided. Jemena has no objection to this development. Ensure appropriate Before You Dig Australia (BYDA) processes are followed as part of the construction process.	N/A
56	Subsidence Advisory	The proposed development is not within a declared mine subsidence district. Subsidence Advisory does not have legislative powers under the act to make determinations regarding development or subdivision on land that is not within a district. We note however that the site is undermined by historic abandoned workings in the Homeville Top seam. The workings under the site are not considered to pose a risk of subsidence to the proposed school redevelopment and new pre-school. Design measures to account for future coal mine subsidence are not required.	N/A

57	Public Submission	<p>I am unsure where and how to list my concerns, so I am hoping here is the appropriate forum.</p> <p>I am a resident of Northview Street, Gillieston Heights.</p> <p>The street is currently in chaos every morning and afternoon as a result of the school traffic for drop off and pick up. The road is too narrow and becomes impassable parents and residents. Trying to get out of my driveway is almost impossible and it literally takes a ridiculous amount of time to actually get out of the street every morning and then to return home each afternoon.</p> <p>I have frequently been abused by parents parking across my driveway and those who are dropping their children off in the mornings or collecting them in the afternoon, despite the large area of land opposite that is available for parking currently.</p> <p>The road is way too narrow for residents' cars, cars parked on the school side of the street and those trying to drive in or out now! I shudder to think about the chaos that will ensure once the school is expanded.</p> <p>I agree that the school needs to be upgraded due to the huge number of additional homes being built in the area; however, my concern is that the traffic will further congest Northview Street! It is a small street, that was never designed to withstand such a huge traffic flow! Parents trying to get their children to school refuse to give way and allow cars to leave Northview Street, which means they are banked up till almost the length of the street at times with no passing available. This realistically means that the traffic comes to a complete standstill with no one able to enter or exit Northview.</p> <p>I am very concerned that there doesn't appear to be additional planning to get the traffic out of Northview Street! Gillieston Road is too narrow for much traffic there and the same with Ryans Road! The traffic HAS to go somewhere, and the roads are NOT coping as it is! Perhaps if the end of Northview Street was opened and became a one way street with a roundabout or traffic lights onto Cessnock Road, and Gillieston Road became a one way street in, then there may be some relief?</p> <p>I would appreciate your feedback and advice on what will be happening to support the current residents of Northview Street, who simply want to be able to get in and out of their street to get to work and go about their business.</p>	<p>1. Historical Context of the School and Street Planning</p> <p>Gillieston Public School has long existed at this location—well before the development of Northview Street. Unfortunately, when Northview Street was later approved and constructed as part of residential subdivision, Council allowed for it to designed to narrow residential standards without adequately recognising or planning for the presence and future growth of the school. This includes a lack of foresight in terms of road width, traffic flow, and integration with broader access networks.</p> <p>2. Impacts of Urban Growth and Council Approvals</p> <p>The current and future traffic pressures in Gillieston Heights are largely a result of rapid residential expansion within the Urban Release Area, which has been approved and facilitated by Council over recent years. This has significantly increased student numbers and traffic demand—especially on constrained local roads like Northview Street—without the supporting road infrastructure being delivered in parallel.</p> <p>3. Limitations and Proposed Improvements</p> <p>The school upgrade project recognises the current limitations and is seeking to directly address school-related impacts through targeted improvements. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A dedicated Kiss and Drop zone on Northview Street with targeted widening to accommodate queuing and these vehicles, this will be supported by targeted education and guidance on more orderly pick-up and drop-off activities• A temporary turnaround facility to manage traffic flow within the cul-de-sac to reduce u-turns and other manoeuvres. <p>However, it is important to note that the Department's responsibility extends only to mitigating impacts generated by the school and within the school's immediate frontage. Broader road upgrades—such as new connections to Cessnock Road, widening of Ryans or Gillieston Roads, or one-way systems—fall within Council's control as the roads authority and the planning body responsible for subdivision approvals and infrastructure coordination.</p> <p>The Department is open to collaborating with Council and other stakeholders on future road upgrades and planning solutions that improve safety and accessibility for both the school community and local residents.</p>
----	-------------------	---	--