Blast assessment from LPG storage at Service Centre on proposed New High School for Medowie

For NSW Department of Education

24 January 2025



Doc. No.: J-000782-REP-01

Revision: 0



Arriscar Pty Limited ACN 162 867 763 www.arriscar.com.au Sydney Level 26 44 Market Street Sydney NSW 2000 T: +61 2 9089 8804 Melbourne Level 2 Riverside Quay 1 Southbank Boulevard Southbank VIC 3006 T: +61 3 9982 4535



DISTRIBUTION LIST

| Name | Organisation | From (Issue) | To (Issue) |
|---------------|---|-----------------|---------------|
| Tia Crupti | Colliers International Holdings (Australia) Limited | Rev A | Rev 0 |
| Nathan Martin | Colliers International Holdings (Australia) Limited | Rev A | Rev 0 |
| | | | |

DOCUMENT HISTORY AND AUTHORISATION

| Rev | Date | Ву | Description | Check | Approved |
|-----|-------------|----|--|-------|----------|
| А | 03 Dec 2024 | RR | First draft for client review. | JL | RR |
| В | 14 Jan 2025 | RR | Final Draft with comments incorporated | - | RR |
| 0 | 24 Jan 2025 | RR | Final Issue | - | RR |

This document has been prepared in accordance with the Guidelines for Division 5.1 assessments by the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure (formerly the Department of Planning and Environment), June 2022). This can be accessed here: <u>Development without consent | Planning</u>.

Arriscar Pty Limited, and its respective officers, employees or agents are individually and collectively referred to in this clause as 'Arriscar'. Arriscar assumes no responsibility, and shall not be liable to any person, for any loss, damage or expense caused by reliance on the information or advice in this document or howsoever provided, unless that person has signed a contract with Arriscar for the provision of this information or advice and in that case any responsibility or liability is exclusively on the terms and conditions set out in that contract.



Contents

| Notat | tion | 5 |
|-------|--------|---|
| 1 | Intro | duction |
| | 1.1 | The Proponent |
| | 1.2 | Site Location |
| | 1.3 | LPG Storage at Petrol station |
| | 1.4 | Study Scope |
| 2 | Outlin | ne of Proposed Activity11 |
| 3 | Hazar | d Identification |
| | 3.1 | LPG Inventories at the Petrol Station |
| | 3.2 | Liquid Fuels at the Petrol Station |
| | 3.3 | LPG Release Consequences |
| | 3.3.1 | LPG Releases |
| | 3.3.2 | LPG Fires |
| | 3.3.3 | Boiling Liquid Expanding Vapour Explosion (BLEVE)14 |
| | 3.3.4 | Vapour Cloud Explosion (VCE) |
| | 3.4 | LPG Release Scenarios Modelled14 |
| | 3.5 | Gasoline Pool Fire |
| | 3.6 | Consequence Analysis Results |
| | 3.6.1 | LPG Flash Fires |
| | 3.6.2 | BLEVEs |
| | 3.6.3 | Vapour Cloud Explosions 19 |
| 4 | Concl | usions and Mitigation Measures21 |
| | 4.1 | Conclusions |
| | 4.2 | Mitigation Measures |
| 5 | Refer | ences |

List of Figures

| Figure 1: Medowie HS Location Map | 7 |
|---|----|
| Figure 2: HS Site and Surrounding Land Uses | 8 |
| Figure 3: LPG Storage at Petrol station | 9 |
| Figure 4: Medowie HS Layout | 12 |
| Figure 5: Flash Fire Contours for 8.5 kg Cylinder Rupture | 16 |
| Figure 6: Flash Fire Contours for 210 kg Cylinder Rupture | 16 |
| Figure 7: Lethality Contours for 8.5 kg LPG Cylinder BLEVE | 18 |
| Figure 8: Lethality Contours for 210 kg LPG Tank Cylinder BLEVE | 18 |
| Figure 9: Explosion Overpressure Contours for 210 kg LPG Cylinder Rupture | 19 |

List of Tables

| 13 |
|----|
| 14 |
| 15 |
| 15 |
| |



| Table 5: Consequence Results for LPG Cylinder BLEVE | 17 |
|--|----|
| Table 6: Distances to Lethality Levels from LPG Cylinder BLEVE | 17 |
| Table 7: Distances to Lethality Levels from LPG Cylinder BLEVE | 19 |



Notation

| Abbreviation | Description |
|--------------|--|
| BLEVE | Boiling Liquid Expanding vapour Explosion |
| DoE | NSW Department of Education |
| DP | Deposited Plan |
| EP&A Act | Environmental Planning and Assessment Act |
| ha | hectares |
| HS | High School |
| kg | kilograms |
| km | kilometres |
| kPa | Kilopascals |
| kW/m² | Kilowatts per square metre |
| L | Litres |
| LFL | Lower Flammability Limit |
| LGA | Local Government Area |
| LPG | Liquefied Petroleum Gas |
| m | metres |
| m/s | Metres per second |
| PTS | Permanent Teaching Space |
| REF | Review of Environmental Factors |
| T&I SEPP | Transport and Infrastructure State Environmental Planning Policy |
| VCE | Vapour Cloud Explosion |





1 INTRODUCTION

The NSW Department of Education (DoE) is proposing to construct a new high school (HS) at Medowie, NSW 2318. The proposed school site is located along Abundance Road, Medowie, in the Local Government Area (LGA) of Port Stephens, approximately 34km north of Newcastle.

A petrol station operated by Pearl Energy is located adjacent to the northwestern boundary of the site on 26 Ferodale Road, Medowie. The petrol station stores Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG) in a bulk tank for decanting into smaller cylinders for customers, and Swap 'n' Go LPG cylinders in cages. LPG releases from the petrol station have the potential to impact on the school site.

Arriscar was invited by Colliers International Holdings (Australia) Limited (Colliers) on behalf of DoE to undertake a consequence analysis of the impact on the school infrastructure from potential LPG releases and gasoline releases during a bulk tanker unloading at the petrol station. This hazard assessment has been prepared to support a Review of Environmental Factors (REF) for the proposed New High School for Medowie (the activity). The purpose of the REF is to assess the potential environmental impacts of the activity prescribed by State Environmental Planning Policy (Transport and Infrastructure) 2021 (T&I SEPP) as "development permitted without consent" on land carried out by or on behalf of a public authority under Part 5 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act).

The activity is to be undertaken pursuant to Chapter 3, Part 3.4, Section 3.37A of the T&I SEPP.

The activity will be carried out at 6 Abundance Street, Medowie (the site).

1.1 The Proponent

The Department of Education (DoE) is the proponent and determining authority pursuant to Section 5.1 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (the Act).

1.2 Site Location

The proposed new HS for Medowie site address is 6, Abundance Road, Medowie, NSW 2318. A location map of the site is shown in Figure 1, with the nearby petrol station, also outlined in Figure 1.





Figure 1: Medowie HS Location Map

Source: Google Earth Maps

A map of the site and surrounding areas is shown in Figure 2 (Source NBRS) Ref.[1].

The site is 6.51ha in area, and comprises 1 allotment, legally described as Lot 3 in DP788451.

A large proportion of the site is currently unused and vacant. A small shed structure and caravan are located adjacent to the northern boundary. A cluster of buildings including a single storey dwelling, an outhouse/shed structure and temporary greenhouse are located within the southeastern corner.

The site contains a largely vegetated area to the southwest corner. The site is relatively flat with a gradual fall from west to east toward Abundance Road.

The site has a primary frontage to Abundance Road to the east and Ferodale Road to the north. Abundance Road and Ferodale Road are both classified Local Roads. Medowie Road, approximately 1km east of the site, is a classified Regional Road.

The area surrounding the site mostly consists of industrial, rural residential, educational, and agricultural lands. Adjacent to the northwestern boundary is a Shell petrol station and mechanic garage. Adjacent to the northeastern boundary is a medical health clinic. Across Abundance Road along the eastern boundary are a number of warehouse and light industrial developments. Directly north of the site across Ferodale Road are large lots used for agricultural purposes. Medowie Public School is located on Ferodale Road, to the northwest of the site, opposite the Shell petrol station.



Figure 2: HS Site and Surrounding Land Uses





1.3 LPG Storage at Petrol station

The LPG storage consists of the following:

Two (2) small tank cylinders each 420L (210 kg) capacity. Portable cylinders will decant LPG from these containers. The decanting is done by a trained petrol station operator. The storage containers are filled in situ by LPG tankers, using the pump on the LPG tanker truck.

Two (2) cages of Swap 'n' Go cylinders, each with a capacity of approximately 40 cylinders per cage with a maximum capacity of 4.5 kg of LPG in each cage. The Swap 'n' Go are supplied by the LPG supplier on flat top trucks. These cylinders are not opened, and exchanged by customers by returning used cylinders. The LPG supplier replaces the empty cylinders with full cylinders.

The LPG storage is shown in Figure 3. The LPG tank cylinders and the Swap 'n' Go cylinder cages are highlighted the figure.



Figure 3: LPG Storage at Petrol station

1.4 Study Scope

The scope of the study included undertaking a consequence analysis of potential fires and explosions from the LPG storage at the petrol station, and impact on the new HS for Medowie infrastructure.

This study mainly focuses on the following:

- Identification of LPG release hazards from the petrol station on 26 Ferodale Road, Medowie;
- Development of appropriate and relevant representative gas release scenarios that may impact on the school site;
- Quantification of the consequences of harmful effects for each representative scenario (fires, explosions, exposure to unignited gas), including the potential for impact on the proposed activity;



• Generation of consequence contours superimposed on the site layout to assess the effects on land use safety, suitability and any mitigation measures required to address potential impacts.



2 OUTLINE OF PROPOSED ACTIVITY

The proposed activity involves the construction of school facilities on the site for the purpose of the New High School for Medowie. The site contains a densely vegetated area to the southwest corner which is identified as land with high biodiversity values corresponding to the areas of remnant native vegetation (PCT 3995 – Hunter Coast Paperbark-Swamp Mahogany Forest). The existing dwelling house and other structures on the site will be demolished as part of the works. No other works are proposed within this area.

The proposed new school will accommodate 640 students in 29 permanent teaching spaces including 3 support teaching spaces across 3-storeys of buildings on the site. The proposed activity be delivered across 1 stage, and will consist of the following:

29 permanent teaching spaces including 3 support teaching spaces, to accommodate 640 students and school hall to accommodate 1,000 students. Approximately 10,500 sqm of GFA is proposed.

- Main vehicular ingress and egress to Ferodale Road to the north, with a new pedestrian and vehicle crossing proposed.
- Main pedestrian access to Abundance Road.
- Kiss and ride, and bus drop and pick up areas to Abundance Road (6 x parallel spaces).
- New pedestrian wombat crossing to Abundance Road
- Approximately 55 x car parking spaces and 3 x accessible car parking spaces.
- Approximately 70 x bicycle parking spaces.
- Block A (Admin) consisting of administration and learning spaces.
- Block B (Foodtech/Workshop) consisting of food technology rooms and workshops.
- Block C (Hall) consisting of school hall to accommodate 1,000 students.
- Central quad, 1 playing field, and 1 sports courtyard.

The proposed school development will include general learning spaces, General support learning spaces, administrative services, staff areas, gym and canteen, library areas for science, wood and metal, food and textiles, health PE, performing arts, additional learning spaces, student amenities, storage, movement (stairs and covered walkways).

A preliminary layout is shown in Figure 4.





Figure 4: Medowie HS Layout

Adjacent to the petrol station is the school entry driveway and car park. The nearest school buildings from the LPG storage are:

Wood workshop: 100m

Hall: 110m

The nearest car parking space from the LPG storage is 55m away.



3 HAZARD IDENTIFICATION

3.1 LPG Inventories at the Petrol Station

The maximum quantities of LPG stored at the petrol station are listed in Table 1 below. The actual quantities will vary depending on demand and deliveries.

Table 1: LPG Storage

| No. | Description | Maximum Capacity kg |
|-----|--|------------------------|
| 1 | Tank Cylinders (2x 210 kg cylinders next to each other fronting Ferodale Road) | 420 |
| 2 | Swap 'n' Go cylinders (8.5kg cylinders x approximately 40 per cage) in 2 cages | 680 |
| | Total | 1100 |

3.2 Liquid Fuels at the Petrol Station

Liquid fuels stored for dispensing at the petrol station are gasoline and diesel. These liquids are stored in underground tanks and pose no risk to the school site.

If there is a spill of gasoline during bulk tanker deliveries to the petrol station, and ignition occurs, a pool fire would result with thermal radiation affecting the school site. Unloading is by gravity and a potential release source is a rupture of transfer hose.

3.3 LPG Release Consequences

3.3.1 LPG Releases

An LPG release could occur from the following:

- A release from the cylinder nozzle from valve failure. This release is very small and confined within a few meters of the release.
- A rupture of the cylinder. The cylinders are certified pressure vessels. These are inspected before filling at the distribution centre and unlikely to fail. The 8.5 kg cylinders are also protected in a cage.
- Overfill of in situ 210 kg tank cylinder during refill from road tanker. The filling is carried out by trained and licensed tanker driver who watches a bleed valve and stops filling when required fill level is reached.
- Overfill of smaller cylinders during decanting from tank cylinders. The decanting is done by trained petrol station operator and not by the customer.

3.3.2 LPG Fires

Two types of fires are possible with LP Gas.

1 A jet fire. This could occur if a gas leak or a 2-phase leak from a pipe/vessel/equipment is ignited.



2 A flash fire. A flash fire is the result of ignition of a well mixed air-LPG cloud. An LPG leak would evaporate and disperse into atmosphere forming a flammable air-vapour mixture. If ignited, depending on the degree of congestion and confinement in the flame front, a vapour cloud explosion may result. In its absence, a flash fire would be the result.

3.3.3 Boiling Liquid Expanding Vapour Explosion (BLEVE)

BLEVE is a phenomenon experienced only with liquefied flammable gases such as LPG, stored under pressure above their atmospheric boiling points. A fire impinging on an LPG cylinder can weaken the tank wall, and allow the boiling LPG at high pressure to expand into the atmosphere generating high explosive energy, and resulting in a fireball. Even though the BLEVE is, by definition an explosion, the thermal radiation effect of the fireball would have an impact at longer distances than the flying fragments from the explosion effects.

A BLEVE at stored LPG cylinders is possible if a jet fire impinges on an adjacent cylinder.

3.3.4 Vapour Cloud Explosion (VCE)

If a liquefied flammable gas is released to atmosphere, there is a possibility that the ignition of the flammable cloud may result in an explosion, and it is referred to as a Vapour Cloud Explosion (VCE). For a VCE to occur the cloud must have sufficient mass and confinement.

The partial confinement areas for LPG dispersion are located throughout the facility at the Tanker loading/unloading bay, Swap 'n' Go filling area, and stacked cylinder storage pallets.

3.4 LPG Release Scenarios Modelled

The focus in this study is the impact of LPG release from the cylinders on the proposed school buildings. Therefore, only the worst case releases were modelled, as listed in Table 2

| Event No. | Description | Maximum Release Quantity, kg |
|--------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| 1 | Rupture of 210 kg tank cylinder | 210 |
| 2 | Rupture of 8.5 kg cylinder | 8.5 |
| 3 | BLEVE of 210 kg tank cylinder | 210* |
| 4 | BLEVE of 8.5 kg cylinder | 8.5* |

Table 2: Release Sources based on Isolatable Inventory

*At the time of BLEVE, the inventory would be lower as some gas would have escaped through the relieve valve. Full inventory was modelled as the worst case.

3.5 Gasoline Pool Fire

In the event of a hose failure, gasoline would spill to ground and spread into a pool. If the pool is ignited, the resulting pool fire will radiate heat to the surrounds.

An analysis was undertaken to assess the impact of a gasoline pool fire from tanker unloading at the petrol station on the school site.

The pool fire thermal radiation distances are given in Table 3.



| | Pool | Flame | Distance to specified thermal radiation (m) | | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|---|------------|------------|--|--|
| Scenario | diameter (m) | power (kW/m²) | 4.7 kW/m² | 12.5 kW/m² | 37.5 kW/m² | | |
| Unloading Tanker Hose | 12.0 | 107.0 | 31.0 | 17.9 | 9.7 | | |

| Tuble 51 Gusonne Benvery i oor i ne consequences |
|--|
|--|

3.6 Consequence Analysis Results

Consequence calculations were made using the software Safeti 9.0 (run in consequence mode).

3.6.1 LPG Flash Fires

LPG release dispersion calculations were carried out with the Safeti 9.0 software. LPG was modelled as propane. The lower flammability limit for propane is 2.1% (v/v) in air.

Three wind speed/ weather stability classes were analysed as the weather condition influences the dispersion distance (1.5m/s for stability D and F, and 5m/s for stability D). Distances to Lower Flammability Limit (LFL) were calculated at ground level as the gas is heavier than air and slumps to ground). The F stability occurs only at night time when the school is unoccupied.

The dispersion distances to LFL results are listed in Table 4.

| No. | Event | Distance to LFL, m | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------|--------------------|-------|-----|-------|------|-------|
| | | D1.5 | | D5 | | F1.5 | |
| | | LFL | ½ LFL | LFL | ½ LFL | LFL | ½ LFL |
| 1 | 8.5 kg cylinder rupture | 2.6 | 4.2 | 2.6 | 9.3 | 4 | 3.7 |
| 2 | 210 kg tank cylinder rupture | 12 | 47 | 10 | 58 | 20 | 38 |

Table 4: Flash Fire Results

The distances to LFL and ½ LFL for 8.5 kg LPG cylinder rupture is shown in Figure 5.

The contours in Figure 5 represent the effect of the flashfire in all possible wind directions, known as the "Effects" contour. In reality, the actual contour would only be a fraction of the circle shown, in the downwind direction.

Flash fire would occur in the flammable cloud within the LFL envelope. The contour for ½ LFL is shown because there is a potential for ignition of the cloud within that contour, if an ignition source exists.





Figure 5: Flash Fire Contours for 8.5 kg Cylinder Rupture

The following findings are made:

- The distances to LFL or ½ LFL from rupture of 8.5 kg LPG cylinder do not reach the school boundary.
- A flash fire from an 8.5 kg LPG cylinder rupture would have no impact on the proposed school site.

The distances to LFL and ½ LFL for 210 kg LPG tank cylinder rupture is shown in Figure 6.



Figure 6: Flash Fire Contours for 210 kg Cylinder Rupture

The following findings are made:



- The distance to LFL from rupture of 210 kg LPG tank cylinder rupture reaches the corner of the school entry driveway from Ferodale Road, but would not reach any buildings or open areas/ play space.
- The distance to ½ LFL from rupture of 210 kg LPG tank cylinder rupture covers part of the car park, but would not reach any buildings.
- A flash fire from a 210 kg LPG tank cylinder rupture would have no impact on the proposed school buildings.

3.6.2 BLEVEs

The BLEVE (fire ball) thermal radiation consequences are summarised in Table 5.

| No. | Event | Fireball | Duration, s | Distance to thermal radiation, kW/m ² (m | | | | | |
|-----|---------------------------------|------------|-------------|---|------|----|--|--|--|
| | | Diameter m | | 4.7 | 12.5 | 23 | | | |
| 1 | 8.5 kg cylinder rupture | 11.5 | 1.5 | 30 | 18 | 13 | | | |
| 2 | 210 kg tank cylinder rupture | 33 | 3.3 | 93 | 57 | 41 | | | |

Table 5: Consequence Results for LPG Cylinder BLEVE

BLEVE consequences were expressed as distances to lethality at different levels. These are summarised in Table 6.

| Fable 6: Distances to Lethali | y Levels from LP | G Cylinder BLEVE |
|--------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
|--------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|

| No. | Event | Distance to Lethality (m) | | | | | |
|-----|------------------------------|---------------------------|------|------|--|--|--|
| | | 1% | 10% | 100% | | | |
| 1 | 8.5 kg cylinder rupture | 2 | N.R. | N.R. | | | |
| 2 | 210 kg tank cylinder rupture | 19 | 14 | N.R. | | | |

Lethality contours for 1% and 10% lethality levels for 8.5 kg cylinder BLEVE are shown in Figure 7.





Figure 7: Lethality Contours for 8.5 kg LPG Cylinder BLEVE

- The distance to 10% lethality from an 8.5 kg LPG cylinder BLEVE is not generated.
- The distance to 1% lethality from an 8.5 kg LPG cylinder BLEVE is localised within the petrol station.
- A BLEVE of an 8.5 kg LPG cylinder rupture would have no impact on occupied areas of the proposed school site.

The lethality contours for a 210 kg tank cylinder BLEVE are shown in Figure 8.



Figure 8: Lethality Contours for 210 kg LPG Tank Cylinder BLEVE

- The distance to 1% lethality from a 210 kg LPG tank cylinder BLEVE is at the school site boundary on Ferodale Road.
- The distance to 10% lethality from a 210 kg LPG tank cylinder BLEVE just reaches the car park, but does not reach any occupied areas.



• A BLEVE of a 210 kg LPG tank cylinder rupture would have no impact on occupied areas of the proposed school.

3.6.3 Vapour Cloud Explosions

VCE blast effects are normally assessed at the following overpressure levels [2]:

- (a) 7 kPa Damage to internal partitions and joinery, but can be repaired. Probability of injury is 10%. No fatality.
- (b) 14 kPa Structural damage. House uninhabitable and badly cracked. Injury to exposed people.
- (c) 21 kPa Reinforced structure could distort. 20% chance of fatality indoors.
- (d) 35 kPa Severe damage to structures. 50% chance of fatality indoors and 15% chance of fatality for a person in the open.

No explosion overpressure contours were generated for 8.5 kg cylinder rupture, indicating that there would be no impact on the school.

The explosion results for 210 kg tank cylinder explosion are summarised in Table 7.

Table 7: Distances to Lethality Levels from LPG Cylinder BLEVE

| No. | Event | Distance to Overpressure, kPa (m) | | | | | | |
|-----|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|----|----|--|--|--|--|
| | | 7 | 14 | 21 | | | | |
| 1 | 210 kg cylinder rupture | 69 | 40 | 30 | | | | |

The explosion overpressure contours for 210 kg tank cylinder rupture are shown in Figure 9.

Figure 9: Explosion Overpressure Contours for 210 kg LPG Cylinder Rupture



The following observations can be made:



- The 14 kPa and 21 kPa overpressure contours do not reach the car park (55m away) and a VCE would not cause damage to parked cars.
- No explosion overpressure reaches any of the school buildings.
- A catastrophic failure of a 210 kg tank cylinder would have no blast impact on the school site.



4 CONCLUSIONS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

4.1 Conclusions

The following conclusions were arrived at in the study:

- 1. The operation of the petrol station will have no significant impact and suitability of the site for the proposed school.
- 2. A rupture of a Swap 'n' Go cylinder and fire/ explosion would have localised effects within the petrol station and not impact on proposed school buildings or open areas/ play spaces.
- 3. A tank cylinder rupture and fire/ explosion 7 kPa overpressure would affect the proposed school access drive way on Ferodale Road and proposed school car park, but will not affect any of the school buildings, open areas/ play spaces.
- 4. In the event of a fire at the petrol station, people present in the school car park would need to be evacuated.

4.2 Mitigation Measures

| Mitigation No. | Aspect | Mitigation Measure | Reason for Mitigation Measure |
|-------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|
| 1 | Prior to school operations commencement | Liaise with the petrol station operator to inform the school in the event of an emergency at the petrol station, so that evacuation of people present in the school car park can be initiated if necessary. This procedure can be part of the school site emergency plan. | LPG release from petrol station |

There are no mitigation measures required for the rest of the activity.



5 **REFERENCES**

- [1] NBRS & Partners Pty Ltd, "Medowie HS Masterplan Validation Report," NSW Government/ Colliers, 29 May 2024.
- [2] NSW Department of Planning, "Hazardous Industry Planning Advisory Paper No.6 Hazard Analysis," Sydney, 2011.



REF Review Checklist

Template Reference: DOC24/3137063 Revision 1 December 2024

Project details

Project name:

Medowie High School

Purpose and limitations

This checklist is intended to assist project and consultant teams in checking that Reviews of Environmental Factors (REF) appropriately assess a proposed activity and address legislative requirements. It seeks to address common requirements, does not address every potential environmental matter that may be relevant to a site and includes matters that will not be relevant to all sites/proposals. The project consultant town planner is responsible for identifying potential environmental impacts and assessment requirements to consider and mitigate potential impacts.

Adequacy review

Complete the table below to check that the REF and supporting technical investigations have adequately assessed the proposed activity.

| Requirement | | Y | Ν | N/A | Comments |
|-----------------|---|---|---|-----|----------|
| Ge | neral requirements | | | | |
| Re Do | gulatory requirements es the REF include: | | | | |
| • | an acknowledgement of County? | | [| | |
| • | details of: | | | | |
| | the proposed activity? | _ | [| _ | |
| | • need for the activity? | | | | |
| | alternatives considered, including the do-nothing option? | | | | |
| | relevant planning policies, including relevant indicative layout plans, masterplans, strategic plans or Voluntary Planning Agreements apply to the site? | | | | |
| | how proposal relates to relevant legislation and policies? | | | | |
| | related approvals required? | | | | |
| | relevant determining authority (i.e. the NSW Department of Education) | | | | |
| • | a description of the site (including address and lot/DP) and surrounding environment using text and plans/photos including details the environmental features and planning constraints? | | | | |
| • | a description of land / road reserves associated with any off-site works? | | | | |
| • | a summary of existing approvals and relevant conditions that apply to the site? | | | | |
| • | for existing schools, confirmation that the proposed activity does not contravene a relevant condition of consent? | | | | |
| • | an assessment of potential impacts of the proposal? | | | | |
| • | a summary of consultation undertaken, responses received and how responses were considered? | | | | |
| • | a statement certifying that the contents are true and correct? | | | | |
| • | a conclusion that the proposal is not likely to significantly affect the environment or threatened species, communities or habitats unless a Species Impact Statement (SIS) (for aquatic biodiversity) or (terrestrial) Biodiversity Development Assessment Report (BDAR) | | | | |

Medowie High School | REF Review Checklist | [Insert date] | 2 / 17

| Requirement | Y | Ν | N/A | Comments |
|---|---|---|-----|----------|
| has been prepared? | - | | | Comments |
| a statement that the proposed activity qualifies as development without consent? | | | | |
| a detailed response to the design quality principles set out in the T&I SEPP? | | | | |
| a detailed response to the Design for Schools Guide? | | | | |
| where relevant, a detailed response to any School Design Review Panel comments? | | | | |
| a schedule of mitigation measures that are specific and deliverable? | | | | |
| Has the REF addressed s171 of the EP&A Reg including the | | | | |
| environmental factors set out in the <u>October 2024 Addendum</u> for Consideration of environmental factors for health services facilities and schools and s171A (if the site is located in a | | | | |
| regulated water catchment)? Has the REF been prepared in accordance with the Part 5 <u>Guidelines</u> , including the <u>October 2024 Addendum for</u> <u>Consideration of environmental factors for health services</u> facilities and schools?? | | | | |
| If early engagement has occurred, has the REF summarised the issues raised been summarised and set out how they have been considered? | | | | |
| Scope | | | | |
| Does the REF incorporate the relevant scope, including associated works such as additional infrastructure (i.e. substation, pumping stations, roadworks, stormwater etc.)? | | | | |
| Landowner's detail and consent If owned by 'education', does the REF note that the land is owned by the Minister for Education and Early Learning rather than the department? | | | | |
| Has landowner's consent been obtained or has the landowner been notified of the REF? Note: It is the preference Landowner's consent is to be obtained prior to lodgement. However, where this is not possible and for any public domain or road works on council land, the council must be notified of the proposed works prior to lodgement of the REF. | | | | |
| Title details Has a copy of the following been obtained to inform the REF: the certificates of title(s) for the site that is/are less than six months old? | | | | |
| the deposited plan? | | | | |
| any instruments or encumbrances registered over the | | | | |
| land? | | | | |
| a detailed survey plan for the site that is less than 12 months old? | | | | |
| Easements and encumbrances Do the survey plan, proposed site plan and civil plans: clearly detail existing easements and encumbrances? | | | | |
| demonstrate that no buildings, works, structures, earthworks, trenches or other activities would contravene or impinge upon any easement or encumbrance over the site unless with written approval of the easement beneficiary? | | | | |
| Plans | | | | |
| Does the REF reasonably depict the proposed activity in figures, plans and/or photomontages including indicative details of: | | | | |
| overall layout? maximum height and footprint of buildings? elevational treatment of buildings? | | | | |
| tree planting and general landscape treatment? Attachments | | | | |
| M Department of Education Jan 25 | | | | |

Medowie High School | REF Review Checklist | [Insert date] | 3 / 17

| Poquiromont | V | N | N/A | Commonte |
|--|---|---|-----|----------|
| Requirement | | | | Comments |
| detect the REF list documents (with revision numbers and | | | | |
| dates) that form part of the REF and are relied upon to | | | | |
| Assess the proposed activity? | | | | |
| Does the REF list include a list of all mitigation measures in | | | | |
| Appendix 1? | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Terminology | | | | |
| Does the REF use appropriate terminology for a REF: | | | | |
| activity instead of development ? | | | | |
| "NSW Department of Education" shortened to "the | | | | |
| department" instead of "School Infrastructure NSW" or | | | | |
| "SINSW"? | | | _ | |
| Proponent Instead of Applicant ? | | | | |
| "Mitigation measures" instead of "conditions"? | | | | |
| Transport and accessibility | | | | |
| Does the REF include a Transport and Accessibility Impact | | | | |
| Assessment (TAIA)? | | | | |
| RTA / early consultation | | | | |
| Does the TAIA summarise the work undertaken as part of, | | | | |
| and the findings of, a Rapid Transport Assessment (RTA)? | | | | |
| Does the REF summarise consultation undertaken through | | | | |
| the Transport Working Group (TWG) process, including | | | | |
| issues raised by transport agencies and proposed | | | | |
| responses? | | | | |
| Existing conditions | | | | |
| Does the TAIA describe the existing road network, including: | | | | |
| the wider state network and local network? | | | | |
| speed and parking restrictions? | | | | |
| public transport? | | | | |
| pedestrian infrastructure? | | | | |
| any known road safety issues? | | | | |
| any significant infrastructure gaps identified? | | | | |
| Construction traffic | | | | |
| Does the TAIA: | | | | |
| set out proposed construction vehicle routes and site | | | | |
| access arrangements and estimated movements per | | | | |
| day? | | | | |
| include a high level assessment of / conclusion that the | | | | |
| local road network could accommodate the movements | | | | |
| subject to appropriate management? | | | | |
| set out parking arrangements for construction workers | | | | |
| and conclude that sufficient parking would be available | | | | |
| on site / proposed arrangements would avoid detrimental | | | | |
| impacts to local roads? | | | | |
| set out whether works zones are required? | | | | |
| Include a preliminary construction management plan that | | | | |
| details management and mitigation measures to | | | | |
| minimise impacts and ensure salety of road users and | | | | |
| Operational traffic | | | | |
| Does the TAIA. | | | | |
| estimate the expected trip generation as a result of the | | | | |
| proposed development having regard to: | | | | |
| proposed number of students and staff? | | | | |
| assumed travel mode share for the school | | | | |
| developed having regard to: | | | | |
| existing mode share | | | | |
| proposed measures to reduce car-based travel | | | | |
| mode shares achieved for schools with similar | | | | |
| use and transport characteristics? | | | | |

Medowie High School | REF Review Checklist | [Insert date] | 4 / 17

| Po | quiromont | V | N | N/A | Commonte |
|------------|---|---|---|------|----------|
| Re | | | | -N/A | Comments |
| | uata from other nearby schools / previous studies and/or census data? | | | | |
| | • expected distribution across the local road network? | | | | |
| • | outline future surrounding roads/road infrastructure | | | | |
| - | shown on a relevant Indicative Layout Plan/Masternlan | | | | |
| | and how the development responds to these? | | | | |
| | include a CIDDA enclusio (or other modelling errord | | | | |
| • | through the TMO of how needby intersections before the | | | | |
| | through the TWG) of key hearby intersections before the | | | | |
| | proposed development (i.e. existing) and after the | | | | |
| | development at completion and 10 years after? | | | | |
| ٠ | include the detailed SIDRA modelling results? | | | | |
| • | include a conclusion that the SIDRA analysis (or | | | | |
| | alternative) demonstrates that the local road network can | | | | |
| | accommodate the additional traffic generated by the | | | | |
| | development? | | | | |
| | if there is a reduction in Level of Service (LoS) from pre | | | | |
| • | to past development, does the TIA justify that this is | | | | |
| | to post development, does the TIA justify that this is | | | | |
| | acceptable or set out measures to mitigate the impact / | | | | |
| | accommodate the additional demand? | | | | |
| • | identify how significant infrastructure gaps will be | | | | |
| | addressed? | | | | |
| • | include an existing conditions road safety assessment if | | | | |
| | existing road safety issues were identified? | | | | |
| • | identify how any known safety issues will be addressed? | | | | |
| Sc | hool Transport Plan | | | | |
| | a School Transport Plan been included in the TAIA | | | | |
| па | | | | | |
| wn | ich: | | | | |
| • | sets out measures to reduce car-based travel? | | | | |
| • | sets achievable targets for mode shift with supporting | | | | |
| | explanation and evidence? | | | | |
| • | include provisions for the monitoring and review of the plan? | | | | |
| Op | erational Parking | | | | |
| Do | es the TAIA clearly set out | | | | |
| | proposed car parking? | | | | |
| • | proposed biovelo car parking? | | | | |
| • | | | | | |
| • | proposed end-of trip facilities? | | | | |
| Do | es the TAIA include an assessment of likely demand for | | | | |
| par | king having regard to the expected/target mode share? | | | | |
| If s | o, does the proposal meet the expected demand? | | | | |
| If it | doesn't match expected demand, does it include | | | | |
| info | ormation to demonstrate why this is acceptable? i.e. | | | | |
| ava | allability of on street parking in surrounding streets based | | | | |
| on | a parking demand survey to demonstrate spare capacity? | | | | |
| | as the TAIA include a similar assessment of bicycle | | | | |
| 00 | king? | | | | |
| pai D=: | wate vehicle dron-off and nick-up - | | | | |
| | vale vehicle drop-on and pick-up | | | | |
| 00 | es une TAIA. | | | | |
| • | describe the proposed private vehicle drop-off and pick- | | | | |
| | up arrangements? | | | | |
| • | identify the expected private vehicle drop-off / pick-up | | | | |
| | demand based on the expected/target mode share, | | | | |
| | number of trips / drop-offs and likely dwell time? | | | | |
| • | assess the capacity of the existing / proposed private | | | | |
| | vehicle drop-off / pick-up areas to accommodate the | | | | |
| | above demand? | | | | |
| Bu | s dron-off and nick-up | | | | |
| | o tho TΔIΔ· | | | | |
| | departing the proposed has drep off / side as | | | | |
| • | arrangements? | | | | |

Medowie High School | REF Review Checklist | [Insert date] | 5 / 17

| Re | quirement | Y | Ν | N/A | Comments |
|------------|---|---|---|-----|----------|
| • | identify the expected bus drop-off / pick-up demand based on the expected/target mode share and likely dwell time? | | | | |
| • | assess the capacity of the existing / proposed bus drop- off / pick-up to accommodate the above demand? | | | | |
| Sei Do | rvice and emergency vehicle access es the TAIA: | | | | |
| • | set out the proposed access arrangements for service vehicles (i.e. garbage and other deliveries) and emergency vehicles? | | | | |
| • | set out any required mitigation or management measures? | | | | |
| • | assess the above arrangements and conclude that they would not have significant impacts? | | | | |
| Ov Do | erall assessment es the TAIA: | | | | |
| • | include a list of measures to mitigate the impacts of the activity? | | | | |
| • | conclude overall, that the activity would not be likely to have significant environment impacts? | | | | |
| No | ise and vibration | | | | |
| No | ise monitoring | | | | |
| Ass | es the REF include an Noise and Vibration Impact sessment (NVIA)? | | | | |
| Do at l | es the assessment include background hoise monitoring ocations that appropriately represent the existing noise | | | | |
| chu | urches, health facilities, etc.)? | | | | |
| Do | es the background noise monitoring undertaken meet the | | | | |
| req | uirements of Noise Policy for Industry (2017) i.e. at least a | | | | |
| • | average wind speed <5 m/s? | | | | |
| • | no rain or other extraneous noise? | | | | |
| Co | nstruction noise | | | | |
| Do | es the assessment consider impacts from construction se and vibration in accordance with the Interim | | | | |
| Co | nstruction Noise Guideline? | | | | |
| Do | es it: | | | | |
| • | determine noise management levels for the development? | | | | |
| • | predict noise levels of the proposed construction activities (usually of expected standard activities and equipment and associated noise levels given that full construction methodology will not yet be known)? | | | | |
| • | conclude whether the predicted levels would exceed the noise management levels? | | | | |
| • | set out measures to minimise impacts to sensitive receivers, including existing school users, and ensure best practice on site? | | | | |
| • | conclude whether construction noise would be likely to result in significant impacts? | | | | |
| • | adopt standard construction hours set out in the ICNG or include justification where non-standard hours are proposed? | | | | |
| Vib | ration | | | | |
| jmr | es the assessment include an assessment of potential | | | | |
| • | relevant standards and assessment criteria for human | | | | |
| | comfort, sensitive equipment and structural damage? | | | | |
| • | details potential sources of vibration during construction | | | | |
| | naving regard to typical activities and equipment | | | | |

Medowie High School | REF Review Checklist | [Insert date] | 6 / 17

| Po | quiromont | V | N | NI/A | Commonto |
|-----|--|---|---|------|----------|
| Re | expected to undertake proposed construction works? | • | | | Comments |
| • | consider potential impacts having regard to separation | | | | |
| | distances to nearby sensitive receivers? | | [| _ | |
| • | sets out measures to mitigate potential impacts, including existing school users? | | | | |
| • | concludes that the proposed activity would not be likely | | | | |
| | to have significant environmental affects following | | | | |
| - | mitigation? | | | | |
| Op | erational noise | | | | |
| DO | es the assessment: | | | | |
| • | consider hoise impacts from all aspects of proposed | | | | |
| | Industry (2017) or Association of Australasian Acoustical | | | | |
| | Consultants Guideline for Child Care Centre Acoustic | | | | |
| | Assessment in the case of outdoor play? | | | | |
| • | determine noise criteria that would be applicable? | | | | |
| • | consider all proposed activities, including: | | | | |
| | indoor learning activities? | | | | |
| | outdoor play? | | | | |
| | use of public address system? | | | | |
| | plant and equipment (i.e. air conditioning) | | | | |
| | use of the hall | | | | |
| | use of outdoor sports courts | | | | |
| • | conclude that the proposal would meet the project noise | | | | |
| | trigger levels? | | | | |
| • | meet the trigger levels, does the assessment | | | | |
| Int | ernal noise tenability | | | | |
| Do | es the assessment: | | | | |
| • | consider external sources of noise in proximity to the site | | | | |
| | (i.e. main roads or rail corridors)? | | | | |
| • | detail applicable internal noise comfort criteria having regard to the EFSG? | | | | |
| • | predict internal noise levels? | | | | |
| • | conclude that internal noise levels would meet criteria? | | | | |
| • | set out any proposed mitigation measures required to | | | | |
| _ | meet the criteria? | | | | |
| Ov | erall assessment | | | | |
| Do | include a list of measures to mitigate the impacts of the | | | | |
| • | activity? | | | | |
| • | conclude overall, that the activity would not be likely to | | | | |
| Do | result in significant environmental affects? | | | | |
| ass | sessment and incorporate them into the design where | | | | |
| apr | blicable (i.e. does the design include mechanical | | | | |
| ver | ntilation where this is required to achieve internal comfort | | | | |
| lev | els)? | | | | |
| Bio | odiversity | | | | |
| Do | es the REF include either: | | | | |
| • | a statement from a suitably qualified ecologist that the | | | | |
| | proposed activity will not be carried out in a declared | | | | |
| | area of outstanding biodiversity value and is not likely to | | | | |
| | significantly affect infeatened species, populations of | | | | |
| | biodiversity values meaning a Species Impact | | | | |
| | Statement and/or Biodiversity Development Assessment | | | | |
| | Report is not required having regard to s7.8 of the | | | | |
| | Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 (this might include a | | | | |
| | statement that accompanies a Biodiversity Development | | | | |

| Requirement | Y | N | N/A | Comments |
|--|---|---|-----|----------|
| Assessment Report (BDAR) waiver issue ahead of a | | | | |
| previously proposed SSD application); or | | | | |
| • a SIS: and/or | | | | |
| • a BDAR? | | | | |
| A statement that the proposed activity is not likely to have a | | | | |
| significant impact on matters of national environmental | | | | |
| significance, or on the environment of Commonwealth land, | | | | |
| and therefore referral to the Minister under the EPBC Act is | | | | |
| not required? | | | | |
| Note: Contact the Statutory Planning team if impacts are likely. | | | | |
| If the development is on blodiversity certified land, does the | | | | |
| manning) and demonstrate the proposed development is | | | | |
| consistent with the relevant biodiversity measure conferred | | | | |
| by the biodiversity certification? | | | | |
| Does the REF list any mitigation measures identified in the | | | | |
| assessment and incorporate them into the design where | | | | |
| applicable? | | | | |
| Flooding | | | | |
| Flood Hazard | | | | |
| Does the REF include either: | | | | |
| information that demonstrates that the site and key | | | | |
| access routes are free of flood risk; or | | | | |
| a Flood Risk and Impact Assessment (FIRA)? | | | | |
| If a FIRA has been prepared, does it: | | | | |
| • state that it has been prepared in accordance with the | | | | |
| updated Floodplain Management Manual and Toolkit, | | | | |
| Including Planning Circular PD24-001? | | | | |
| detail consultation undertaken with the local council and any relevant agoncies (i.e. State Emergency Service) to | | | | |
| identify existing draft and proposed flood studies | | | | |
| relevant to the site? | | | | |
| describe the flood potential of the site and key access | | | | |
| routes having regard to available flood studies and | | | | |
| information, the conditions of the site, and the types of | | | | |
| flood: | | | | |
| mainstream flooding? | | | | |
| overland flows? | | | | |
| flash flooding? | | | | |
| describe the key flood mechanisms? | | | | |
| include flood modelling showing flood extent, levels, | | | | |
| depths, velocities and hazard classifications for all | | | | |
| relevant events, including: | | | | |
| • 1% AEP / 1 in 100yr? | | | | |
| • 5% AEP / 1 in 20yr? | | | | |
| 10% AEP / 1 in 10yr? | | | | |
| 0.2% AEP / 1 in 500yr? | | | | |
| 0.02% AEP / 1 in 5000yr? | | | | |
| • PMF? | | | | |
| consider the timeframe for flood waters to inundate the | | | | |
| site and timeframe for water to hit peak levels? | | _ | | |
| consider the impacts of climate change on future flood | | | | |
| trequency and levels? | _ | | | |
| KISK / Impact of flood on the activity | | | | |
| II a FIRA has been prepared, does IT: | | | | |
| determine whether the proposal is in a high-fisk catchment? | | | | |
| the location of the proposal in relation to flood behaviour. | | | | |
| and constraints including floodway flood storage area or | | | | |
| flood fringe area? | | | | |

Medowie High School | REF Review Checklist | [Insert date] | 8 / 17

| Re | quirement | Y | Ν | N/A | Comments |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|-----|----------|
| • | the hazard vulnerability classification of the land? | | | | |
| • | frequency of inundation? | | | | |
| • | whether the proposal provides for safe occupation and efficient and effective evacuation in flood events and how it is to be achieved? | | | | |
| • | in high-risk catchments, whether the proposal is likely to result in a significant increase to the risk to life in other parts of the catchment in a PMF flood event? | | | | |
| • | any known evacuation constraints such as the flood emergency response classification for the area and available warning times (including rate of rise and when the evacuation route is cut off by floodwater)? | | | | |
| • | whether the proposal is for a sensitive or hazardous land use, or other higher risk uses and what mitigation strategies (if any) are proposed to reduce any identified risks? | | | | |
| Im If a cor | First of the activity on flood outside of the site FIRA has been prepared, does it address the matters to insider set out in PS-24-001, including has it determined: potential impacts of cut and fill and other building works on flood behaviour? | | | | |
| • | whether there may be adverse flooding impacts on surrounding properties? | | | | |
| • | ability of proposed development to withstand flood impacts? | | | | |
| Bu If a • | ilding and structure design FIRA has been prepared, does it: nominate a flood planning level (minimum floor level plus freeboard) for proposed buildings? | | | | |
| • | recommend any other mitigations such as flood resistant materials or structural requirements? | | | | |
| FE If th doe Re cor | RP ne site or key access routes are impacted by flood waters, es the REF include a preliminary Flood Emergency sponse Plan (FERP) that has been prepared in insultation with NSW SES? | | | | |
| Do | es the plan clearly and simply detail: the flood potential of the site? | | | | |
| • | detail roles and responsibilities across the department and relevant emergency response agencies? | | | | |
| • | flood monitoring and warning systems consistent with advice received to date from NSW SES? | | | | |
| • | flood warning times and notifications? | | | | |
| • | emergency management triggers, including rainfall and water levels? | | | | |
| • | the emergency response to a flood event or events where different flood mechanisms impact a site? | | | | |
| • | messaging and communication protocols? | | | | |
| • | assembly points and flood free routes (where required)? | | | | |
| • | shelter in place locations (where required as last resort) that are able to withstand flood and debris forces of the PMF? | | | | |
| • | mechanisms and requirements for regular review? | | | | |
| • | awareness training for employees, contractors, visitors, students and caregivers and induction of new staff members? | | | | |
| Co Do | nclusion es the FIRA: | | | | |
| • | conclude that the proposal would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects? | | | | |



Medowie High School | REF Review Checklist | [Insert date] | 9 / 17

| Re | quirement | Y | Ν | N/A | Comments |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|-----|----------|
| • | list any mitigation measures identified in the | | | | |
| | assessment? | | | | |
| Do | es the REF list any mitigation measures identified in the | | | | |
| ass | sessment and incorporate them into the design where | | | | |
| app | blicable (i.e. flood resistant structures and materials)? | | | | |
| Bu | shfire | | | | |
| Does the REF include either: | | | | | |
| • | information that demonstrates that the site is not mapped | | | | |
| | as bushfire prone and is not adjacent to a potential | | | | |
| | bushfire hazard; or | | | | |
| • | a Bushfire Assessment (BA)? | | | | |
| lf a | BA has been prepared, does it: | | | | |
| • | assess the immediately adjoining bushfire hazard in | | | | |
| | accordance with Planning for Bush Fire Protection | | | | |
| | (PBP)? | | | | |
| • | consider bushfire in the wider landscape context and | | | | |
| | potential impacts to key access routes or surrounding | | | | |
| | communities that may impact the activity? | | _ | | |
| • | identity bushfire protection measures required under | | | | |
| | PDF (| | | | |
| • | bushfire protection measures including: | | | | |
| | provision of minimum asset protection zones (APZc) | | | | |
| | with all buildings outside of the APZs? | | | | |
| | minimum construction requirements for buildings? | | | | |
| | Note: | | | | |
| | - Table 2, Appendix B of the Addendum November 2022 to PBP | | | | |
| | requires school buildings on bushfire prone land to be built to a minimum of BAI -19 | | | | |
| | - The NSW RFS has advised that BAL-Low does not apply to school | | | | |
| | and similar developments under PBP. If the consultant considers | | | | |
| | that no construction standard applies, the report should state 'no | | | | |
| | NSW RFS. | | | | |
| | access roads? | | | | |
| | • provision of a perimeter road between the buildings | | | | |
| | and the bush fire hazard? | | | | |
| | water provision? | | | | |
| | design of utilities? | | | | |
| | emergency management arrangements? | | | | |
| | o landscaping? | | | | |
| Со | nclusion | | | | |
| Do | es the BA: | | | | |
| • | conclude that the proposal would not be likely to result in | | | | |
| | significant environmental effects? | | | | |
| • | list any mitigation measures identified in the | | | | |
| _ | assessment? | | | | |
| Do | es the REF list any mitigation measures identified in the | | | | |
| ass | Sessment and incorporate them into the design where | | | | |
| app | nicable (i.e. AP2S, BAL-19 construction? | | | | |
| | mammation | | | | |
| RE | F: | | | | |
| • | a Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) and/or Detailed | | | | |
| | Site Investigation (DSI) that conclude that there is a low | | | | |
| | risk of contamination and that the site is suitable for the | | | | |
| | use of the site as a school; or | | | | |
| • | a PSI and/or DSI and a Remediation Action Plan (RAP)? | | | | |
| Do | es the PSI, DSI and RAP address all the potential sources | | | | |
| of c | contamination mentioned in the various report? | _ | _ | _ | |
| If th | ne DSI or RAP identifies that limited further testing is | | | | |
| req | uneu, has this been incorporated as a mitigation measure | | | 1 | |

Medowie High School | REF Review Checklist | [Insert date] | 10 / 17

| Poquiromont | V | N | NI/A | Commonto |
|--|---|---|------|----------|
| in the DEE2 | • | N | | Comments |
| If remediation is required, does the REF determine if the remediation is Category 1 or 2 having regarded to the | | | | |
| Hazards and Resilience SEPP? | | | | |
| Does the REF include an interim statement from a Site Auditor confirming that the RAP is appropriate? | | | | |
| If no interim statement, does the RAP set out actions to remediate all potential sources of contamination? | | | | |
| Does the REF summarise investigations undertaken and | | | | |
| conclude that contamination risk has been appropriately addressed in accordance with the Hazards and Resilience SEPP? | | | | |
| Has the PSI, DSI and/or RAP concluded that the proposal would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects as a result of contamination and/or contamination management? | | | | |
| Does the REF list any mitigation measures identified in the assessment and incorporate them into the design where applicable? | | | | |
| Environmental heritage | | | | |
| Heritage items | | | | |
| In the second se | | | | |
| any portion of the site is a listed heritage item on the department's s170 register, in the Local Environmental Plan (LEP) or on the State Heritage Register (SHR); or there is a place listed on any s170 register, LEP or SHR immediately near the site; or | | | | |
| the school site in a heritage conservation area; or the site has been previously assessed as having heritage significance even if no statutory listing has been provided; | | | | |
| has a heritage impact statement (HIS) been prepared to support the REF? | | | | |
| If a HIS has been prepared, does the HIS: provide a clear assessment of heritage significance against the NSW guidelines for Assessing Heritage Significance? | | | | |
| include an assessment of the degree of impact (physical and visual) to identified heritage items? | | | | |
| assess the impacts of the proposal to be less then minimal? | | | | |
| detail consultation with council if the impacts were assessed as more than minimal? | | | | |
| identify whether additional Heritage Act approvals (s60 permits) are required if the item is on the SHR2 | | | | |
| include adequate project justification and analysis of | | | | |
| design options to show that the heritage impacts were not avoidable (if the impacts were assessed as more than minimal)? | | | | |
| set out appropriate mitigation measures? | | | | |
| Archaeology | | | | |
| Does the REF and/or HIS: | | | | |
| consider the potential for archaeological relics either in a HIS or through existing regional planning documentation or similar? | | | | |
| include an evidence-based archaeological assessment, including a clear grading of the potential for archaeological remains to be identified, and what their archaeological significance is? | | | | |
| If an archaeological assessment was undertaken has: | | | | |
| the assessment been informed by historic archaeological | | | | |

Medowie High School | REF Review Checklist | [Insert date] | 11 / 17

| Re | quirement | Y | N | N/A | Comments |
|------------------------|---|---|---|-----|----------|
| | test excavation (where necessary)? | | | | |
| • | the assessment identified impacts to archaeological relics? | | | | |
| • | archaeological monitoring or test excavation been proposed under a self-approved s139(4) Exception, and if so, has an Exception Record of Use Form been submitted and signed? | | | | |
| • | is a permit under the Heritage Act (s140 / s60), approved by Heritage NSW, required to authorise impacts to relics? | | | | |
| • | set out appropriate mitigation measures required to give effect to any mitigations from the archaeological assessment? | | | | |
| Ab | original cultural heritage | | | | |
| Do | es the REF either include: | | | | |
| • | confirmation that the activity does not include ground disturbing works or removal of mature vegetation; or an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Due Diligence (DD), a Preliminary Indigenous Heritage Assessment Impact (PIHAI) and/or an Archaeological Survey Report (ASR) which identifies no harm to Aboriginal objects or places would occur; or | | | | |
| • Not that AC | an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report (ACHAR)? e: where a DD / PIHAI / ASR has been prepared and it identifies t Aboriginal objects or places are likely to be impacted, an HAR must be prepared. | | | | |
| Wh | ere an ASR has been prepared, has it assessed the | | | | |
| arc | haeological nature and significance of Aboriginal sites | | | | |
| WItt W/b | are an ACHAP has been prepared, has it been | | | | |
| unc | dertaken in accordance with the OEH consultation delines? | | | | |
| Wh ma • • | ere an ACHAR has been prepared, has it completed the ndatory steps, including: agencies contacted to identify relevant parties; an advert placed in local paper to invite registrations of interest; invitations to register issued to potential stakeholder groups; methodology issued to RAPs and invited to comment; and draft ACHAR sent to RAPs and invited to comment? | | | | |
| • | ere an ACHAR has been prepared: have all comments provided by RAPs been addressed and actioned (where possible) in the ACHAR? | | | | |
| • | did the ASR or ACHAR assess the archaeological nature and significance of Aboriginal sites within the study area (through survey / test excavation)? | | | | |
| • | assess impacts of the proposed works? | | | | |
| • | indicate that an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) is required? | | | | |
| Ha: • | s the REF and/or supporting documents: included a list of measures to mitigate the impacts of the activity? | | | | |
| • | concluded that the proposal would not be likely to result in significant environmental effects? | | | | |
| Bu | ilt form and urban design | | | | |
| If that S | ne project has a value over \$50M, has it been presented School Design Review Panel (SDRP)? | | | | |
| lf p | resented to SDRP, have comments from the Panel been: | | | | |

Medowie High School | REF Review Checklist | [Insert date] | 12 / 17

| Ro | nuirement | Y | N | N/A | Comments |
|--|---|---|---|-----|----------|
| | summarised in the REF / Decian Report? | | | | |
| • | appropriately considered, incorporated into the design (where appropriate) and responded to in the REF / Architectural Design Report? | | | | |
| Do | es the Design Report: | | | | |
| • | explain how the proposed layout, building and facade design appropriately considers and respond to the existing / likely future / preferred character of the streetscape? | | | | |
| • | address the design quality principles in the T&I SEPP and the design principles set out in the Design Guide for Schools? | | | | |
| • | explain how the height of the proposed development is appropriate in consideration of the site context and form of surrounding development? | | | | |
| Env | vironmental amenity | | | | |
| Ov Doe | ershadowing es the REF: | | | | |
| • | include shadow diagrams? | | | | |
| • | discuss impacts from overshadowing impacts? | | | | |
| • | conclude that the proposal would have no significant impacts? | | | | |
| • | if the proposal results in overshadowing of windows or private open space of residential properties, does the REF demonstrate maintenance of at least two hours of daylight as required by the Apartment Design Guide or otherwise in accordance with the applicable Planning principles? | | | | |
| Pri | vacy | | | | |
| Doe pro to r me | es the REF consider potential privacy impacts of the posed works and conclude that these would not be likely esult in significant effects with or without mitigation asures? | | | | |
| Vis Doe pro sigi | ual impacts es the REF assess potential visual impacts of the posed works and conclude that impacts would not be nificant with or without mitigation measures? | | | | |
| Vis If th viev ass Prir • | ual impacts (view sharing) – private views he activity has the potential to obstruct existing significant ws from private property, does the REF include an hessment of the proposal in accordance with the Tenacity inciples including as assessment of the: type of views affected; parts of the property the views are obtained; extent of the impact; and reasonableness of the proposal causing the impact? | | | | |
| Doe wor effe | es the assessment conclude overall, that the proposal uld not be likely to result in significant environmental ects? | | | | |
| Vis If th view in a prir Ros and the • | ual impacts (view sharing) – public views activity has the potential to obstruct existing significant ws from public land, does the REF include an assessment accordance with the established planning principles (i.e. aciples established by the Land and Environment Court in se Bay Marina Pty Limited v Woollahra Municipal Council anor [2013] NSWLEC 1046 (principles of view sharing: impact on the public domain), including: an assessment of: nature and scope of the existing views from public domain; locations in the public domain from which potentially | | | | |

Medowie High School | REF Review Checklist | [Insert date] | 13 / 17

| Poquiromont | V | N | N/A | Commonte |
|--|---|---|-----|----------|
| interrunted view is enjoyed | | | N/A | Comments |
| a over the overlap of the overlap of the overlap over the overlap overla | | | | |
| o intensity of public use of these locations where that | | | | |
| o intensity of public use of those locations where that | | | | |
| the proposed activity: | | | | |
| • whether there is any document that identifies the | | | | |
| importance of the view to be assessed; and | | | | |
| a quantitative and qualitative evaluation of the impacts? | | | | |
| a qualitative and qualitative evaluation of the impacts : | | | | |
| above assessments and incorporate them into the design | | | | |
| where applicable? | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Air quality | | | | |
| If the site is adjacent to a significant potential source of air | | | | |
| pollution (i.e. motorway, airport or hazardous industry), has | | | | |
| the REF been informed by either of the following by a | | | | |
| suitably qualified person: | | | | |
| • a statement that air quality at the site is suitable for the | | | | |
| proposed use based on expert advice and/or existing | | | | |
| data; | | | | |
| an air quality assessment? | | | | |
| Note: Reference may need to be given to <u>Development Near Rail Corridors</u> | | | | |
| If an air quality assessment is prepared, does it: | | | | |
| • conclude that air quality is suitable for the proposed use | | | | |
| with or without migration? | | | | |
| indicate impacts appareted by the proposed activity and | | | | |
| Indicate impacts generated by the proposed activity and suitable mitigation measures? | | | | |
| Suitable miligation measures? | | | | |
| Does the REF summarise the assessment and list any | | | | |
| incorporate them into the design where applicable? | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Trees and landscaping | | | | |
| Has an Aboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) been | | | | |
| prepared to support the REF which assesses existing trees | | | | |
| within the proposed works area, including street trees, and | | | | |
| recommends tree protection measures for trees to be | | | | |
| retained? | | | | |
| Does the REF discuss the number, species, pot sizes and | | | | |
| height of trees to be removed and trees to be planted? | | | | |
| Have any tree protection measures set out in the AIA been | | | | |
| incorporated in: | | | | |
| • the design; | | | | |
| REF mitigation measures; and | | | | |
| the preliminary construction methodology? | | | | |
| Social Impact | | | | |
| Does the REF include an assessment of the social impacts of | | | | |
| the proposed activity comprising either: | | | | |
| Sites identified for a school in a Voluntary Planning | | | | |
| Agreement (VPA), Concept Approval, Precinct Plan, | | | | |
| Indicative Layout Plan, adopted Masterplan, or other | | | | |
| adopted strategic planning document, together with | | | | |
| upgrades to existing schools - Social impact addressed | | | | |
| in REF by the consultant town planner (i.e. no | | | | |
| standalone SIA report). | | | | |
| New schools where land has not been identified as a | | | | |
| school in a strategic planning document or VPA etc - | | | | |
| Social impact addressed in the REF by consultant town | | | | |
| planner (or suitably experienced), or as necessary, in a | | | | |
| stand-alone report. | | | | |
| • Schools subject to closures or mergers, or where there is | | | | |
| loss of, or substantial change to, community | | | | |
| infrastructure: Comprehensive SIA as a separate report | | | | |



Medowie High School | REF Review Checklist | [Insert date] | 14 / 17

| Requirement | Y | N | N/A | Comments |
|---|---|---|-----|----------|
| prepared by suitably experienced consultant | | | | Comments |
| prepared by suitably experienced consultant. | | | | |
| Ecologically sustainable development | | | | |
| Does the ESD Report set sustainability targets for the activity in line with the department's commitments, including: Green Star Buildings certification for projects with >1000m2 new building and >\$10m EDC of 5 Star for | | | | |
| Sydney, Wollongong and Newcastle metro or 4 Star for rest of NSWOperational energy and potable water intensity targets | | | | |
| for the activity? If Green Star Buildings certification is required, does the ESD | | | | |
| Report include: | | | | |
| the Green Star registration number for the project, and | | | | |
| a Green Star Building pathway showing how activity will | | | | |
| achieve the required number of credit points to certify? | | | | |
| If applicable under the Sustainable Buildings SEPP, has an | | | | |
| NABERS embodied emissions material form been included in | | | | |
| the ESD Report? | | | | |
| Does the ESD report include a Climate Change Risk Assessment and Adaptation Plan? | | | | |
| For sites identified as any high or extreme risks in the | | | | |
| Climate Change Risk Assessment and Adaptation Plan, have | | | | |
| design responses been identified to been incorporated into | | | | |
| the project to mitigate the risks? | | | | |
| Does the ESD Report adequately address how the activity | | | | |
| will: | | | | |
| minimise waste from associated demolition and | | | | |
| construction; | | | | |
| minimise peak electricity demand; | | | | |
| minimise overall energy use through passive design: | | | | |
| generate and store renewable energy. | | | | |
| minimise consumption of notable water: and | | | | |
| minimise consumption of potable water, and motor and monitor operative and water consumption and | | | | |
| meter and monitor energy and water consumption and energy generation? | | | | |
| Does the ESD Pepert include a Net Zero Action Plan / Net | | | | |
| Zero in operations plan (exact name TRA) that adequately | | | | |
| addresses how the activity has been designed to eliminate | | | | |
| use of fossil fuels during operations, or how the use of fossil | | | | |
| fuels will be minimised and will be eliminated by 20352 | | | | |
| Steering | | | | |
| Staging | | | | |
| If the project is to be staged, does the REF include | | | | |
| preliminary details on how construction and operations will | | | | |
| be managed during each stage of the development, including | | | | |
| the following for each stage: | | | | |
| operational areas and areas still under construction? | | [| [| |
| student/staff numbers? | | | | |
| operational and construction access and parking | | | | |
| arrangements? | | | | |
| open space provision? | | | | |
| measures to ensure acceptable amenity for students and | | | | |
| staff in areas adjacent to ongoing construction? | | | | |
| measures to ensure the safety and security of students and staff? | | | | |
| Has each relevant technical report (transport and acoustic | | | | |
| reports at a minimum) assessed the proposed staging and | | | | |
| concluded that it would not be likely to result in significant | | | | |
| environmental affects, including cumulative affects? | | | | |
| Does the REF list any mitigation measures identified as a | | | | |
| result of the proposed staging? | | | | |
| Utilities | | | | |



Medowie High School | REF Review Checklist | [Insert date] | 15 / 17

| Po | quiromont | v | N | N/A | Commonte |
|--|--|---|---|-----|----------|
| | quinement | | | | Comments |
| 00 | vised by persent envised and utilities? | | | | |
| Sei | as the REE assess any works required to provide | | | | |
| pocossany convices and utilities and conclude that these | | | | | |
| necessary services and unimities and conclude that these | | | | | |
| WO | n aita watar traatmant ia required deep the DEE include | | | | |
| 011 | an side water meter management plan / land conshility | | | | |
| an | on-side waste water management plan / land capability | | | | |
| 255 | sessment that concludes that the site would be capable of | | | | |
| acc | vironment? | | | | |
| | amporary arrangements are required (i.e. generator) does | | | | |
| the | REF assess any potential temporary environmental | | | | |
| effe | ects as a result of the arrangements and conclude that | | | | |
| sia | nificant effects would not be likely? | | | | |
| Sto | ormwater drainage | | | | |
| | a starmustar management plan been prepared that | | | | |
| па | s a stormwater management plan been prepared that: | | | | |
| • | considers and complies with council's applicable | | | | |
| | engineering specifications, including requirement for on- | | | | |
| | she determion and water quality treatment? | | | | |
| • | demonstrates that the proposed stormwater | | | | |
| | management system would not increase runoil from the | | | | |
| | site (i.e. that post-development flows do not exceed pre- | | | | |
| - | development nows)? | | | | |
| • | would discharge to a logal point of discharge? | | | | |
| _ | would discharge to a legal point of discharge? | | | | |
| • | conclude that stormwater would be managed so that the | | | | |
| | proposal would not be likely to have significant | | | | |
| Do | environmental affects : | | | | |
| | es the REF summarise the proposed stormwater | | | | |
| not | be likely to have significant environmental impacts as a | | | | |
| res | ult of stormwater management with or without mitigation | | | | |
| me | asures? | | | | |
| 90 | il and water | | | | |
| 14 44 | | | | | |
| II U | ie site is mapped as, or has otherwise been identified, as | | | | |
| nav | and samily potential, does the geotechnical report | | | | |
| mit | igate impacts (i.e. Salinity Management Plan) so that they | | | | |
| wo | uld not be significant? | | | | |
| If th | be site is mapped as, or has otherwise been identified as | | | | |
| hav | ving acid sulfate soils (ASS) potential does the | | | | |
| dec | technical report consider impacts from ASS and set out | | | | |
| me | asures to mitigate impacts (i.e. ASS Management Plan) | | | | |
| SO | that they would not be significant? | | | | |
| lf th | he site is mapped as being in an area of groundwater | | | | |
| vul | nerability, does the REF include an Integrated Water | | | | |
| Ма | nagement Plan that assess the potential of the activity to | | | | |
| imp | pact groundwater and does it conclude that the activity | | | | |
| wo | uld not be likely to have significant environmental impacts | | | | |
| with | n or without mitigation measures? | | | | |
| lf th | ne site is mapped as being in an area of landslide risk, | | | | |
| doe | es the REF assess the potential of the activity and does it | | | | |
| cor | clude that the activity would not be likely to have | | | | |
| sig | nificant environmental impacts with or without mitigation | | | | |
| me | asures? | | _ | _ | |
| Ha | s an Erosion and Sediment Control plan been prepared to | | | | |
| Info | orm the REF that includes: | | | | |
| • | a plan(s) detailing: | | | | |
| | property boundaries, existing levels of the land in relation to the building, reads and where starmwater | | | | |
| | surface flows enter and loave the site? | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Medowie High School | REF Review Checklist | [Insert date] | 16 / 17

| Poquiromont | v | N | N/A | Commonto |
|--|---|---|-----|----------|
| Requirement | | | | Comments |
| o the location of stabilised constituction access points? | | | | |
| the location of perimeter sediment/erosion controls? | | | | |
| • any 'no-go' areas that are not to be disturbed? | | | | |
| location of stockpile areas? | | | | |
| location of proposed temporary and permanent site drainage? | | | | |
| • specific measures to be implemented to prevent pollution of stormwater off the site? | | | | |
| Does the REF summarise the proposed controls and | | | | |
| incorporate any mitigation measures identified in the above | | | | |
| documents? | | | | |
| Waste management | | | | |
| Has a preliminary Construction Waste Management Plan | | | | |
| been prepared that informs the REF that considers: | | | | |
| the likely type and volume of waste generated by the activity? | | | | |
| opportunities to reuse and recycle waste in order to reduce waste sent to landfill? | | | | |
| • set out measures to handle and dispose of the waste? | | | | |
| conclude that appropriate arrangements can be put in | | | | |
| place such that there would not be likely to have significant environmental affects? | | | | |
| Has a preliminary Operational Waste Management Plan | | | | |
| been prepared to inform the REF that considers: | | | | |
| the likely type and volume of waste generated by the | | | | |
| activity? | | | | |
| opportunities to reuse and recycle waste in order to | | | | |
| reduce waste sent to landfill? | [| [| | |
| set out measures to handle and dispose of the waste | | | | |
| including the number of bins, siting and size of the waste | | | | |
| storage area, and truck access arrangements (including | | | | |
| swept path diagrams to demonstrate access can be | | | | |
| achieved in a forward direction)? | [| | | |
| Council's waste management policies, it applicable? | | | | |
| conclude that appropriate arrangements can be put in | | | | |
| place such that there would not be likely to have | | | | |
| Significant environmental affects? | | | | |
| Does the REF summarise outcomes of the above and | | | | |
| documente? | | | | |
| Aviation | | | | |
| Aviation | | | | |
| If the proposal is located within the Obstacle Limitation | | | | |
| Surface (OLS) of is in close proximity to an aviation facility, | | | | |
| suitably qualified person accessing the proposed activity | | | | |
| been prepared to inform the REE? | | | | |
| Does the statement: | | | | |
| describe the nearby aviation facility? | | | | |
| any relevant policies, procedures or controls that apply | | | | |
| to development works on the site? | | | | |
| assess any potential impacts from the activity including | | | | |
| proposed buildings, on aviation operations? | | | | |
| assess any potential impacts of the proposed | | | | |
| construction activities, including use of cranes on | | | | |
| aviation operations? | | | | |
| describe any consultant with the relevant airport_CASA | | | | |
| or other relevant aviation authority? | | | | |
| advise if any approvals are required under aviation | | | | |
| legislation? | | | | |
| conclude that the proposal is appropriate and would not | | | | |

Medowie High School | REF Review Checklist | [Insert date] | 17 / 17

| Requirement | Y | Ν | N/A | Comments |
|--|---|---|-----|----------|
| have detrimental impacts on aviation safety or | | | | |
| operations? | | | | |
| Does the REF summarise outcomes of the above and | | | | |
| incorporate any mitigation measures identified in the above | | | | |
| documents? | | | | |
| Signs | | | | |
| Does the REF include: | | | | |
| an assessment of the proposed signs against the | | | | |
| Chapter 3 Advertising and Signage, under SEPP | | | | |
| (Industry and Employment) 2021a site plan and | | | | |
| elevations of any proposed signs that clearly depict the | | | | |
| location, type, content and appearance of any proposed | | | | |
| signs that form part of the REF activity? | | | | |
| Other | | _ | | |
| If the site is located in a coastal management or sensitivity | | | | |
| area, does the REF include a Coastal Management | | | | |
| Assessment that assesses the likely impacts of the activity | | | | |
| likely to be significant with ar without mitigation? | | | | |
| If the site is in provimity to a gas or oil pipeline, petrol station | | | | |
| I PG storage landfill or other bazardous use does the REF | | | | |
| include a Preliminary Hazard Assessment that assesses the | | | | |
| risk to the proposed activity and concludes that the risk is | | | | |
| acceptable according to any relevant assessment | | | | |
| framework? | | | | |
| If the site is in a Mine Subsidence District or Mine | | | | |
| Subsidence Risk Area, does it include a Mine Subsidence | | | | |
| Statement and Advisory Board Approval or Mine Subsidence | | | | |
| Risk Report (as appropriate? | | | | |
| If the site is in close proximity to high volage power lines or | | | | |
| telecommunication towers, does the REF include an | | | | |
| Electromagnetic Field Report that assesses the risk to the | | | | |
| according to any relevant assessment framework? | | | | |
| If the site is located in an area of risk of unevoloded | | | | |
| ordinance does the REE include an Unexploded Ordinance | | | | |
| Risk Assessment that assesses the risk to the proposed | | | | |
| activity and concludes that the risk is acceptable according to | | | | |
| any relevant assessment framework? | | | | |
| If the proposed activity includes a proposed government | | | | |
| preschool, does the REF include a report that details how the | | | | |
| proposed activity complies with Part 4 of the Child Care | | | | |
| Planning Guideline September 2021? | | | | |

Completion

| | Name and position | Signature | Date |
|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Prepared: | [Name] | | [Insert date] |
| | Project Town Planning | | |
| | Consultant | | |
| Reviewed: | [Name] | | |
| | Project Manager | | |

