

COMMENTS ON –

***PREFERRED PROJECT REPORT AND
STATEMENT OF COMMITMENTS
SUBMITTED TO NSW DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE.***

***EXTENSION OF SHORE SCHOOL ONTO
THE GRAYTHWAITE SITE AT 20 EDWARD
STREET, NORTH SYDNEY.***

Prepared by –



North Sydney

APRIL 2012.

I have not made any political donations in the past 2 years.

I do not want my name to be made available to the Proponent, other interested parties or on the Department's website.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

“ The department requests that any response to submissions report or preferred project report be accompanied by a preferred pick-up and drop-off facility option, in sufficient detail that it can be assessed as part of the concept plan determination. “ DPI letter dated 20.12.11

The DPI also says that this should be done in consultation with North Sydney Council.

This preferred pick up and drop off was supposed to cover

- pick up and drop off
- prep and senior school students
- school buses on site

North Sydney Council supports the need of an onsite pick up and drop off facility for prep and senior school students and school buses.

North Sydney Council advised Shore that any preferred option would have to be approved by the Council Traffic Committee and then possibly Council .pg 3 PPR

No preferred option has been presented to the Council Traffic Committee.

North Sydney Council now states that given the expansion of the proposal (to include a through site drop off facility) a whole of campus traffic management plan is an essential requirement.

The PPR includes,

- a preferred pick up option (**no drop off**)
- for prep school students (**no senior students**)
- a statement that says **NO SCHOOL BUSES ONSITE**

that has not been presented to the Council Traffic Committee.

This is a blatant disregard to the instructions given by DPI.

2.2.4 Assessment of Preferred Concept. Pg 4 PPR

i. Demand for New Pick-up Facility

“Surveys of the existing pickup facility in Edward St indicate that there is a peak pickup demand in the order of 40 vehicles during a 15 minute period between 3.00pm and 3.15pm.” PPR pg40

The Halcrow Report on Traffic and Accessibility Impact Assessment, dated 24 Nov 2010 pg19 Figure 8.

Prep school Pick up vehicle Movements.

3 - 3.15pm – 40 cars outbound

3.15 - 3.30pm – 6 cars outbound

3.30 – 3.45pm – 1 car outbound

3.45 – 5.00pm – 32 cars outbound

From these figures they assume a peak 15 mins of 40 cars and use this figure of 40 as the base of their assessment of preferred concept.

MY CALCULATIONS AND OBSERVATIONS OF EXISTING PICK UP FACILITY.

Let's look at the reality of these figures.

Prep school pick up does not open till 3pm.

Before 3pm all queuing is on the street.

After 3pm, minimal queuing if any is provided onsite (possibly 2 cars?) majority of queuing is still on the street.

All prep school children are ideally to be picked up by 3.15pm.

They estimate the loading time from arrival to the pick up bay till leaving the pick up bay to be 1.05mins for this facility. This pick up facility is in close proximity to classrooms.

There are 4 spaces in the pick up zone.

I have factored in 2 minutes at the start for the first 4 cars to move from the street to the pick up bays and 15 seconds thereafter for the next 4 cars to move from queuing to the bay.

Below, I have outlined the time line for this peak pick up time.

3.00pm – open
3.02pm – 1st 4 cars in pick up bay
3.03pm + 5 secs – 1st 4 cars depart pick up bay
3.03pm + 20 secs – 2nd 4 cars enter pick up bay
3.04pm + 25 secs – 2nd 4 cars depart pick up bay
3.04pm + 40 secs – 3rd set of 4 cars enter pick up bay
3.05pm + 45 secs – 3rd set of 4 cars depart pick up bay
3.06pm – 4th set of 4 cars enter pick up bay
3.07pm + 5 secs – 4th set of 4 cars depart pick up bay
3.07pm + 20 secs – 5th set of 4 cars enter pick up bay
3.08pm + 25 secs – 5th set of 4 cars depart pick up bay
3.08pm + 40 secs – 6th set of 4 cars enter pick up bay
3.09pm + 45 secs – 6th set of 4 cars depart pick up bay
3.10pm – 7th set of 4 cars enter pick up bay
3.11pm + 5 secs – 7th set of 4 cars depart pick up bay
3.11pm + 20 secs – 8th set of 4 cars enter pick up bay
3.12pm + 25 secs – 8th set of 4 cars depart pick up bay
3.12pm + 40 secs – 9th set of 4 cars enter pick up bay
3.13pm + 45 secs – 9th set of cars depart pick up bay
3.14 pm – 10th set of cars enter pick up bay
3.15pm + 5 secs – 10th set of cars depart pick up bay ie 40 cars.

As can be seen above, without any margin for error, the current prep school pick up has a **maximum capacity of 40 cars in 15 mins.**

With all prep parents ideally aiming to pick up by 3.15pm the peak for 3-3.15pm from the prep school figures should be 47 cars at least. This is a total of current car pickups between 3- 3.45pm. (in this total , only 1 car was after 3.30pm).

On top of this actual figure of 47 a minimum 20% variation should be added. This variation would be a start to taking into account those currently picking up from surrounding streets due to the fact that this facility is at maximum capacity. This would make the current 3 - 3.15 pick up number that needs to be accommodated at 57 cars.

Let's also look at the 32 cars between 3.45 – 5.00pm.

I am assuming that most of these cars relate to prep boys being picked up after clubs that operate after main school hours. For many reasons these clubs do not operate every week. Assuming clubs were not being held after school on this day a large proportion of these 32 cars would be picking up in the 3 – 3.15pm time slot.

The demand for the new pick up facility has been based on the school traffic survey conducted Thursday 29th July 2010 – a fine day weather wise. They call this the typical day. In a school situation there are so many variables. It is well known that more children are picked up from school,

- during the first 2 weeks of the year
- on rainy days
- when class sport is cancelled (I think the prep school has class sport on Wednesday after lunch and boys are picked up from Northbridge at 2.55pm instead of Edward St ?)
- when sports training is cancelled (by this I mean after school training)
- when sports training is not on (possibly the 1st and last weeks of term ?)
- Fridays
- Fridays before long weekends
- last day of term

In my calculations,

- during Term 1 of this year 2012, 44 days out of 50 could have been affected by one or more of these events which would have increased the number of boys being picked up during 3-3.15pm
-
- None of the above factors occurred on Thursday 29th July 2010.

The main point to address here is the severe lack of sensitivity testing. There is a big list of factors that could affect the facility – they have not been addressed or even raised. It is unlikely that all these factors would happen together but any combination would have a dramatic effect and they need to be looked at and not ignored.

I am not sure how the PPR can continually refer to the peak 15 minute time 3 – 3.15pm.

3 – 3.15pm is the peak and the time period that parents are aiming to pick up.

All cars picking up at the end of normal school time ie 2.55pm, need to be accommodated in this 15 minute period.

The current demand for prep school pick up is significantly higher than has been calculated which in turn makes the demand for the new pick up facility considerably higher also.

ii. Capacity of Proposed Pick up Facility

The average loading time of 1.05 minutes at the existing Edward St facility is very quick and cannot be assumed for the proposed new facility. Many factors need to be taken into account that have not been, such as -

- proposed facility is located a fair distance from associated classrooms
-
- consideration of traffic in Hunter Cres and William St .
-
- Cars will exit Hunter Cres and join cars picking up senior students in William St.
-
- Cars in William St will be slowed by the pedestrian crossing in William St.
-
- William St is used by local non school traffic as a thoroughfare to Pacific Hwy.
-
- on quick calculations there are over 30 cars in William St relating to senior school pickup all happening at the same time
-
- consideration of traffic in Mount St and Blue St
-
- there has been no analysis as to what happens after the pick up area – cars could be at a stand still trying to exit the pick up area.
-
- Hunter Cres is a 2 way street with not enough space for 2 cars to pass
-
- Movement of cars in the car park
-
- Size of the pick up bay
-
- The current clearance in the car park is 1.8m – most car parks have a minimum clearance of 2m
-
- Drivers will be going from sunlight to dark in the car park and will need time for their eyes to adjust
-
- Pedestrians in Union St
-
- When will the pick up area open and close
-
- What about other traffic on the Union St drive eg. delivery vehicles and vehicles coming and going from car spaces further up the drive.

1.05 minutes is an unrealistic figure to use for this facility.

3-5 minutes would possibly be more realistic.

If

- the loading time was extended to just **2 minutes**
- the facility opened at 3pm (as does the current Edward St) and we allow 3 minutes for the 1st set of 4 cars to travel through the car park to reach the pick up bay
- we allow 30 seconds for each new set of 4 cars to move into the pick up bay

the facility could accommodate 20 cars in 15 minutes.

Less than even the underestimated demand stated in the PPR.

iii. Vehicle Queues

This needs to be looked at more thoroughly.

- 20% needs to be applied for contingencies in the numerical analysis , it appears that only 10% has been applied though it is stated that 20% has been applied.
- “The analysis is based on a theoretical capacity of 220 vehicles per hour with a 20% reduction for contingencies and a vehicle queuing length of 16 vehicles.” Pg 10 PPR Additional Traffic Information.

This should be interpreted as $220 \text{ minus } 20\% \text{ of } 220 = 176$

However in attachment B of Appendix B 198 is used instead of 176.

(198 is 220 less 10%).

iv. Intersection Operation

The PPR states,

“ The analysis indicates that there would be minimum vehicle delays and queuing in Union St during the period of the proposed pick-up facility operation.”

- There would be at least 6 cars queuing on street before the pick up facility opens. Even 2 cars queuing on street , one from the east and one from the west would totally block any through traffic for Union St.
- -“ vehicle access in the proposed pickup facility will be entering from Union St. No exit movement for these vehicles would occur at Union St.”
- no mention of cars using the new car park under the East building
- no mention of delivery vehicles also using the same driveway in and out
- no mention of vehicles using the Graythwaite driveway
- **what about construction vehicles ?**
- **“construction vehicle access to and from Stage 2 and 3 works will be provided via Union St.”**

v. Sight Distances at Union St

- cars travelling east to west along Union St are blinded by the afternoon sun. No mention of this has been made though it has been raised numerous times and it is an extremely important safety issue.

vi. Parking

- no comments

vii. Summary

“ it is concluded that the preferred option is consistent with the key principles identified by Council .. “

The Council does not support this pick up facility and has raised serious concerns that have been ignored, for example, concerns over the right hand turn into the facility.

Pg 3 PPR

“ The Council officers at the meeting noted that any preferred option put forward by the School would need to be approved by the Council Traffic Committee and then possibly the Council.”

This proposal has not been presented by Shore to the Local traffic committee.

The Council states –

“ Importantly, the matters raised by Council for inclusion in the DGR’s were limited in scope to the original application which did not include the proposed student pick up facility

Had this been included in the original application, it is likely that Council would have requested that a master plan be prepared for the development of the entire expanded Shore campus (including Graythwaite site), in order to facilitate orderly and appropriate expansion of Shore, particularly in relation to traffic and parking for the entire school.

While a traffic and parking master plan was not prepared for the original application, given the expansion of the proposal to now include a through site drop off facility traversing the lower part of Shore , it is considered that a whole of campus traffic management plan is an essential requirement. “

Using “baseline data” and inconsistent contingency, with disregard to many possible variables has resulted in a highly biased and very unreliable result.

Properly analysed data will/does not support the current facility or the proposed new facility. A new design is needed rather than just steering data towards a desired result.

2.0 RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

1. Traffic and access

Objection

- (a) Increased traffic (buses and cars)

Shore's Response – not valid on the basis of NSC independent traffic consultant.

MY COMMENTS.

NSC does not support the view of the independent traffic consultant.

“ council holds the view that the streets surrounding Shore School should be regarded as residential streets and prefers the advise from Council's Traffic Engineer over that of the traffic consultant. “ NSC report dated 13 April 2012 pg 15

2. Building envelope and height non compliance

These issues regarding the East and West buildings are valid.

Buildings are still over the height limit and are still too large in scale and mass.

The introduction of an alternate design of the west building in this PPR, moving it closer to the Bank St boundaries has caused great distress and has just inflamed this issue more.

It is a clear example of the School's repeated unwillingness to cooperate or consult meaningfully with their closest neighbours.

This alternate development option needs to be deleted.

Objections still not addressed relating to the West building –

- discrepancies in photo montages
- site poles for the final design were never erected

3. Process and legal issues

Shore has not submitted the preferred prep pick up only to the NSC Traffic Committee.

The DPI directed Shore to include a pick up and drop off facility for prep and senior students and buses on site – only a prep pick up option was supplied.

BUSES.

There has been little discussion in this PPR in regard to school buses except a statement saying that school bus operations should not be on site.

The School currently operates 8 buses Monday to Thursday after school to take students to sport. This will increase to 9 in Stage 2 and 12 in Stage 3.

The School also operates 4 buses every Wednesday at 12.30pm to take prep students to sport. This will probably increase to at least 6 in Stage 2 (with the addition of 100 prep students).

Throughout all the School's Project Reports – never any mention of this or other bus operations for camps/excursions etc.

The school has flagged on idea of an extra bus stop in William St . This has not been submitted to the council traffic committee and council staff have indicated to Shore that this would probably be rejected as Council would not be keen to take more parking spaces off the street.

The Council has indicated that they plan to reduce the bus parking space in Edward St that Shore currently uses but Shore has not indicated how they would deal with this situation.

Shore have stated that it may seek to use bus spaces in Blues St , though no evidence of any approval by the relevant authorities is supplied or referred to.

How can on street bus parking options be raised in a PPR when the approval from the relevant authorities has not been sought or approved?

5.0 CONCLUSION

Please note that this PPR includes a new alternate design for the West building that has not been included in the revised EAR. This needs to be deleted.

All reasonable and relevant issues raised in submissions have not been addressed importantly,

- On site drop off facility for prep and senior students
- On site pick up facility for senior students
- On site facility for pick up and drop off for school buses

- discrepancies in photo montages
- -site poles for the final west building design – never erected

In addition, proposed changes are put forward without even discussion or preliminary approval from relevant Council and State authorities.

The School needs to address their traffic issues and come up with workable solutions with relevant authority approval - which they have not.

I support the NSC view that a master plan for the entire school site needs to be prepared including a whole of campus traffic and parking plan.

**This project, with the exception of Stage 1,
is not worthy of consent.**