

**Ms Aditi Coomar**

Planning Services

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

GPO Box 39

SYDNEY NSW 2001

By email: [aditi.coomar@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:aditi.coomar@planning.nsw.gov.au)

Cc: Alister Henskens SC MP [kuringgai@parliament](mailto:kuringgai@parliament).

Stuart Bruce



08/03/2021

**Attention: Director – Social and Other Infrastructure Assessments**

Dear Ms Coomar,

**LORETO NORMANHURST SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT (CONCEPT PROPOSAL AND STAGE 1), 91-93 PENNANT HILLS ROAD NORMANHURST (SSD-8996) – OBJECTION**

I write to you **to object to the above proposal** in the strongest possible terms.

Nobody denies Loreto a chance to grow and develop. But why is the development so big?

It must be borne in mind that Mount Pleasant Avenue (MPA) is a dead-end street. It has no traffic lights. It is one of only a few on Pennant Hills Road (PHR) that offers motorists no other alternative route out of the street, once in it.

Here are my main concerns:

- Mount Pleasant Avenue is already a traffic nightmare during school operating hours. Ours is a narrow street made worse when Loreto teachers and students park on both sides of the street, effectively turning MPA into a one-lane street. Loreto doubling their numbers will make this much worse.
- Residents already find it hard to exit their homes onto MPA with cars from Loreto parked right up to their driveways. Loreto doubling their numbers will make this much worse.
- An oversized new boarding house on the street, a tripling of the junior school facing our street, a new childcare centre on our street, a new staff carpark with courts built on top on our street, and most concerning, a new link road that results in all drop off and pick up traffic from Loreto exiting onto MPA. This is an enormous cost for one street to bear.
- The intersection between MPA and PHR is problematic. A five foot high brick fence at the corner severely restricts visibility of oncoming traffic. PHR drops down for first 50m looking north from MPA makes visibility worse. The geometry of the intersection means drivers turning left from MPA face a little to the south and have to look back over their right shoulder at an acute angle to see oncoming traffic. The intersection between MPA and PHR will not cope with the increased traffic this development will result in. We fear a serious accident may eventuate.
- Increased traffic will impact access for emergency vehicles on this street – a particular concern given the aged care facility at the end of our street and our close proximity to bush
- Our children's safety is at risk. Students attending Normanhurst Public School, Normanhurst Boys and those walking to the bus stop outside Loreto are already at

risk when they cross from one side of MPA street onto the other. Loreto doubling their numbers will make this much worse.

- My work commute and that of my housemate's involve turning right from Mount Pleasant Avenue, the suggestion of stopping the Right turn is ridiculous, what's green about sending us on an extended detour everyday ...?

As the school plans to almost double their numbers, their traffic management plan and Green Plan are woefully inadequate.

I do have suggestions as a solution to this and prepared to discuss them further.

Here is one of the options:-

I believe traffic lights were suggested for Mount Pleasant Avenue as a remedy and the RMS were refusing to do this, so

So I suggest simply reverse the direction of flow –thus utilising the traffic lights on Osborne. The adults driving from a Western direction have to stop at these lights anyway to turn Right into Osborne so traveling in the opposite direction could improve the journey time. I see the drop-off point is on the Western side of the school – If there is a que in the current direction it will over-flow onto Osborne, where-as in the opposite direction the trail flowing through the school grounds could support this.

The benefits continue and with what appears to be small negatives, is looking better than the current plan.

I would be interested to know if there is meeting I can attend to discuss this further bringing progress and happiness to all

**Declaration – I have not made a political donation in the last two years.**

Yours sincerely

Stuart Bruce

**From:** [Chris Chappell](#)  
**To:** [Aditi Coomar](#)  
**Cc:** [kuringgai@parliament.nsw.gov.au](mailto:kuringgai@parliament.nsw.gov.au)  
**Subject:** Emailing: Loreto redevelopment.SSD-8996.docx  
**Date:** Monday, 15 March 2021 10:46:25 AM  
**Attachments:** [Loreto redevelopment.SSD-8996.docx](#)

---

Dear Ms Coomar

Copy to Alister Hensens SC MP

Please find attached my objection to the Loreto Normanhurst School redevelopment.

Kind regards

Chris Chappell

  
Normanhurst 2076

Your message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:

Loreto redevelopment.SSD-8996.docx

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.

Chris Chappell  
Senior Territory Manager

  
The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error, please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

---

This email has been filtered by SMX.  
For more information visit <http://smxemail.com>

---

**Ms Aditi Coomar**

Planning Services

Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

GPO Box 39

SYDNEY NSW 2001

By email: [aditi.coomar@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:aditi.coomar@planning.nsw.gov.au)

Cc: Alister Henskens SC MP [kuringgai@parliament.nsw.gov.au](mailto:kuringgai@parliament.nsw.gov.au)

Chris Chappell



Normanhurst 2076

7<sup>th</sup> April 2021

**Attention: Director – Social and Other Infrastructure Assessments**

Dear Ms Coomar,

**LORETO NORMANHURST SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT (CONCEPT PROPOSAL AND STAGE 1), 91-93 PENNANT HILLS ROAD NORMANHURST (SSD-8996) – OBJECTION**

I write to you **to object to the above proposal** in the strongest possible terms.

Nobody denies Loreto a chance to grow and develop. However, why is the development so big?

It must be borne in mind that Mount Pleasant Avenue (MPA) is a dead-end street. It has no traffic lights. It is one of only a few on Pennant Hills Road (PHR) that offers motorists no other alternative route out of the street, once in it.

Here are my main concerns:

- Mount Pleasant Avenue is already a traffic nightmare during school operating hours. Ours is a narrow street made worse when Loreto teachers and students park on both sides of the street, effectively turning MPA into a one-lane street. Loreto doubling their numbers will make this much worse.
- During school commencement and finish times, the situation worsens, heading north along Pennant Hills Rd (PHR) there is a backlog of cars and buses trying to turn right into Osbourne St, which blocks the centre lane. In addition, at the same times, Normanhurst public School in Normanhurst Rd becomes over congested endangering children.  
If the plan is to stop a right hand turn from MPA, cars will turn left and force their way into the centre lane to turn right into Normanhurst Rd, compounding the situation.
- Residents already find it hard to exit their homes onto MPA with cars from Loreto parked right up to their driveways. Loreto doubling their numbers will make this much worse. I have made several calls to the school asking for cars to be moved so we can exit our driveway safely.
- An oversized new boarding house on the street, a tripling of the junior school facing our street, a new childcare centre on our street, a new staff carpark with courts built on top on our street, and most concerning, a new link road that results in all drop off and pick up traffic from Loreto exiting onto MPA. This is an enormous cost for one street to bear.

- The intersection between MPA and PHR is problematic. A five-foot high brick fence at the corner severely restricts visibility of oncoming traffic. PHR drops down for first 50m looking north from MPA makes visibility worse. The geometry of the intersection means drivers turning left from MPA face a little to the south and have to look back over their right shoulder at an acute angle to see oncoming traffic. The intersection between MPA and PHR will not cope with the increased traffic this development will result in. We fear a serious accident may eventuate, especially for elderly drivers who live at the retirement village at the end of MPA.
- Increased traffic will impact access for emergency vehicles on this street – a particular concern given the aged care facility at the end of our street and our close proximity to bush
- Our children’s safety is at risk. Students attending Normanhurst Public School, Normanhurst Boys and those walking to the bus stop outside Loreto are already at risk when they cross from one side of MPA onto the other. Loreto doubling their numbers will make this much worse.
- There will be at least 4 more entrances and exits to be built on the street with cars and trucks using them in large numbers.
- 105 Trees will be removed on or near MPA to accommodate the new boarding school, thru link road and carparks.
- The proposed buildings are unsightly, too large and out of keeping with the residential zoning of our street.
- During the 20 years we have lived at number 27 MPA, we have had damage to our cars parked on the street, wing mirrors broken and panel damage, just 3 weeks ago, a teacher’s car was badly damaged by a truck that did not stop; I gather this is an offence not to stop and leave drivers details.
- This development lacks any thought and consideration for neighbours on both sides of the school. I believe this development will have a negative effect on our property values, and I will be seeking compensation for any value loss.

As the school, plans to almost double their numbers, their traffic management plan and Green Plan are woefully inadequate.

This development lacks careful evaluation of the local environment, in other words, it is an insane redevelopment and should be modified to suit the local surrounds.

In summary, I object to the Loreto Normanhurst amended proposal. The increased traffic would make an already problematic traffic situation untenable for residents of Mount Pleasant Avenue and Osborne Road and its five feeder streets, all of which are cul-de-sac roads.

**Declaration – I have not made a political donation in the last two years.**

Yours sincerely,

Chris and Marie Chappell



Normanhurst 2076

**From:** [Tahlia Alexander](#)  
**To:** ["Jann Deveridge"](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Loreto Normanhusrt  
**Date:** Monday, 24 May 2021 8:15:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [Re Loreto Normanhurst.msg](#)

---

Hi Jahn,

No problem. The Department acknowledges receipt of this submission and your submission received on 21 May 2021.

These issues raised in your submissions will be considered in the assessment.

Kind regards,

Tahlia Alexander  
Senior Planning Officer  
Social and Infrastructure Assessments I Department of Planning, Industry and Environment  
4 Parramatta Square, 12 Darcy Street | Parramatta NSW 2150  
T 02 9995 6022 E [Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au)

The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment acknowledges that it stands on Country which always was and always will be Aboriginal land. We acknowledge the Traditional Custodians of the land and waters, and we show our respect for elders past, present and emerging. We are committed to providing places in which Aboriginal people are included socially, culturally and economically through thoughtful and collaborative approaches to our work.

-----Original Message-----

From: Jann Deveridge [REDACTED]  
Sent: Saturday, 22 May 2021 8:58 AM  
To: Tahlia Alexander <[Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au)>  
Subject: Re: Loreto Normanhusrt

Hi Tahlia,

Sorry to bombard you but there is one other thing. Mount Pleasant Avenue is a no through road which affects two things, firstly for the residents there is no other entry or exit point except Pennant Hills Road and if there is no right turn there it would have a huge impact on our accessibility and travel time. We have a large aged care facility in the street and there is patient transport to Hornsby Hospital and taxis to Hornsby as well as everyone else who wants to travel in that direction. Also if the traffic moves across the school from Osborne Street there is nowhere else for it to go but onto Pennant Hills Road causing major congestion in the street. Thanks for your help.

Regards

JannDeveridge

Sent from my iPad

> On 21 May 2021, at 11:24 am, Tahlia Alexander <[Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au)> wrote:  
>

**From:** [Jann Deveridge](#)  
**To:** [Tahlia Alexander](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Loreto Normanhurst  
**Date:** Friday, 21 May 2021 3:25:43 PM

---

Hi Tahlia,

Thanks for getting back to me. In terms of the traffic management I don't believe that any consideration is being given to the residents of Mount Pleasant Avenue (MPA) and they are only viewing this from the perspective of Loreto. If they were to put a road through the school and traffic were to be one way then it would be much better in the direction from Mount Pleasant Avenue to Osborne Street as there are traffic lights at the intersection with Pennant Hills Road for the traffic to enter left or right. What they propose seriously disadvantages the residents of Mount Pleasant Avenue as we will not be able to access a right hand turn from our street and I assume we won't be able to drive through the school to get to the traffic lights at the Osborne Street/Pennant Hills Road intersection. The proposal would also exponentially increase the amount of traffic in Mount Pleasant Avenue as well. Thank you for your time.

Regards

Jann Deveridge

Sent from my iPad

> On 21 May 2021, at 11:24 am, Tahlia Alexander <[Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au)> wrote:

>

> Hi Jahn,

>

> Thanks for your email.

>

> Yes - you may provide an additional submission the Applicant's Response to Submissions (May 2021) to myself via email [tahlia.alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:tahlia.alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au)

>

> Or alternatively additional submissions can be mailed to:

>

> Planning and Assessment

> Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

> Locked Bag 5022

> Parramatta NSW 2124

>

>

> Kind regards,

>

> Tahlia Alexander

> Senior Planning Officer

> Social and Infrastructure Assessments | Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

> 4 Parramatta Square, 12 Darcy Street | Parramatta NSW 2150

> T 02 9995 6022 E [Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au)

>

>

> The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment acknowledges that it stands on Country which always was and always will be Aboriginal land. We acknowledge the Traditional Custodians of the land and waters, and we show our respect for elders past, present and emerging. We are committed to providing places in which Aboriginal people are included socially, culturally and economically through thoughtful and collaborative approaches to our work.

>

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Jann Deveridge [REDACTED]

> Sent: Friday, 21 May 2021 10:43 AM

> To: Tahlia Alexander <[Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au)>

> Subject: Loreto Normanhurst

>

>



**From:** [Tahlia Alexander](#)  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Loreto Normanhurst SSD 8996  
**Date:** Wednesday, 26 May 2021 10:34:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [image001.jpg](#)

---

Hi James,

The Department acknowledges receipt of your submission below, received on 21 May 2021. The issues raised in your submission will be considered in the Department's assessment.

In relation to your specific questions, I have provided answers below:

There is no set time frame for the assessment phase, however I anticipate that this would not be less than approximately 8 weeks. The Department's assessment report will provide an assessment of the issues raised by the community. The assessment report is sent to the Independent Planning Commission (IPC) as well as a copy of all public submissions. In relation to a public meeting, this is determined by the IPC. I have provided the following information from the IPC's [website](#):

## ***1. How does the IPC consider community views in its decisions?***

*First, we need to gather community views which we do in various ways.*

*We have the submissions from the time DPIE put the project on exhibition (and the applicant's Response to Submissions). That's one source of community views.*

*Then after DPIE sends the assessment report to us, we hold a public hearing if instructed to do so by the Minister or make a decision on whether to hold a public meeting or not. And we call for submissions, particularly asking that they address the issues raised in the assessment report from DPIE including comments on any proposed conditions. Out of all this we have the transcript from a public meeting or hearing and the submissions to provide us with more community views.*

*All this material is then studied, analysed, organised by theme and considered against relevant legislation, policy and planning instruments. The Commission Panel then records its deliberations on all of this in the Statement of Reasons.*

*Note we take community views very seriously as we undertake our role as a consent authority for complex and contentious state significant developments. Under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 we, like all consent authorities, are required to set out explicitly how we took into account the community's views – we do this as part of the determination processes in the Panel's Statement of Reasons.*

## ***Determination Process***

*A State significant development (SSD) application is referred in full to the Independent Planning Commission only after it has been publicly exhibited and assessed by the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.*

*The Department provides the Commission a whole-of-government assessment report, which is published on the Department's website and the Commission's website. The Department's*

report is not binding on the Commission's decision.

A public meeting is a meeting to enable the Commission to hear public views on the assessment report.

There is no statutory requirement for the Commission to hold a public meeting before determining an application. The considerations that will guide the Commission in relation to the holding of a public meeting before making a decision on an application are set out in the attached guidelines.

The public meeting does not affect appeal rights under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act (EP&A Act).

**[For further information, please see the Commission's Public Meeting Guidelines.](#)**

The Commission may meet with the applicant, the Department (or other government agencies), the relevant local Council and other interested people before making its decision, if the Commission considers that it is necessary to do so. Records of such meetings will be kept in accordance with the Commission's **[Meeting Record Policy](#)**.

Additionally for your information, an overview of the process for a public meeting can currently be viewed on the IPC website for a different SSD application which is currently before the IPC - <https://www.ipcn.nsw.gov.au/projects/2021/05/roseville-college-sport-and-wellbeing-centre-ssd-9912>

I trust this of assistance.

Kind regards,

**Tahlia Alexander**

Senior Planning Officer

Social and Infrastructure Assessments | Department of Planning, Industry and Environment

4 Parramatta Square, 12 Darcy Street | Parramatta NSW 2150

T 02 9995 6022 E [Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au)



*The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment acknowledges that it stands on Country which always was and always will be Aboriginal land. We acknowledge the Traditional Custodians of the land and waters, and we show our respect for elders past, present and emerging. We are committed to providing places in which Aboriginal people are included socially, culturally and economically through thoughtful and collaborative approaches to our work.*

---

**From:** Jim Phimister [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Friday, 21 May 2021 3:41 PM  
**To:** Tahlia Alexander <[Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:Tahlia.Alexander@planning.nsw.gov.au)>  
**Subject:** Loreto Normanhurst SSD 8996

Hi Tahlia.

I received notification that the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment will now be assessing the submissions and the applicant's response to submissions.

Please advise the time frame for this assessment and how the DPIE review and permitted outcomes will be communicated to all interested parties.

The DPIE will have noted the considerable number of public submissions objecting, and the level of distrust and disbelief in the consultant (Ethos Urban) proposals to mitigate traffic congestion and parking disruption. There is nothing new in their response to submissions that will alleviate resident concerns.

Will there be opportunity for a public meeting to be held for residents to make their concerns known before any final decision?

The applicant's consultant's basis for their response is that:

**“The proposal responds to the strategic planning directions of the Greater Sydney Region Plan and the North District Plan which identify the need to accommodate a 20% increase in school enrolments by 2036 within the North District area of Sydney”.**

The applicant and consultant have proposed an increase of 74% (1150 to 2000 students). This is what forms the basis of resident outrage, and as impacted neighbours we have a right to be listened to in a public forum.

Thankyou

James

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10