

Ben Eveleigh - FW: GRAYTHWAITE/SHORE SCHOOL

From: Ian Poole <IanP@mprdg.com>
To: "Ben Eveleigh (Ben.Eveleigh@planning.nsw.gov.au)"
 <Ben.Eveleigh@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 5/7/2012 12:13 PM
Subject: FW: GRAYTHWAITE/SHORE SCHOOL

Department of Planning
 22-33 Bridge St
 SYDNEY

ATT: Ms Heather Wharton and Mr Ben Eveleigh

GRAYTHWAITE - SHORE SCHOOL PART 3A - Department of Planning reference MP10_0149; MP10-0150

Ben

Further to the revised Concept Plan application for Staged Development submitted by The Sydney Church of England Grammar School, I wish to reiterate my previous objection, and my new objections to the amended proposal as follows;

1.Process

- i) The submission of the proposed staged works is an abuse of the Part 3A process, insofar as the Concept Plan relies on all three stages to achieve the \$30,000,000 "cut off" to be considered under the provisions of Part 3A, however most of the issues related to the subsequent stages are not dealt with in any detail in the Stage 1 submission and are "subject to later applications"
- ii) The application made on 20 September 2010 relates to Lot 2 DP 539853 and part of Lot 1 DP 120268. The application has now been expanded to include an additional 9 lots, and I submit that this is a different application and not an amended application, and assessment under the original application without re-advertising is unsafe.
- iii) In relation to the Conservation and refurbishment of Graythwaite House, Coach House, and Tom O'Niell Centre and associated garden, and minor demolition works, I have no issues.

2.Substantive traffic issues

- i) The application includes 4 options in relation to bus entries exits and manoeuvring on the lower grassed terrace of Graythwaite adjacent to Union St. There is no attempt at a reasoned assessment of these options, and indeed no option is selected as preferred. The terraces are elsewhere in the report indicated as levelled and to be used as a student play area. Serious concerns exist that the inclusion of these options at this stage, is nothing more than a "stalking horse" for a later application to in fact include and use this area for buses at stages 2 or 3. **I request that a definitive condition excluding the use of the grassed area for use by buses in perpetuity, be included in any approval.**
- ii) Despite a request by the Department in December 2011 that the PPR "be accompanied by a preferred pick up and drop off facility", the revised application includes for a pick up facility only. The provision for drop off is ignored in the current traffic study.
- iii) The preferred Option 2 canvassed in the traffic report accompanying the application is deficient on numerous grounds.
- iv) The principal failure of the proposal is that it fails to internalise impacts. In this regard I can think of no other application in North Sydney such as for example, a commercial building, or supermarket, or retail centre, where a developer would be permitted to export their traffic generation and parking issues onto public roads.
- v) Despite a requirement by the Department that traffic issues be resolved in consultation with North Sydney Council, I understand that no such consultation or agreement with Council has been made or reached. At Meeting no 3600 of the North Sydney Council on 23/4/12 there was discussion regarding buses in Blue St and possible additional bus parking in William St which would remove street parking had been canvassed by the school but not discussed or approved by Council.
- vi) The preferred Option 2 for on-site pick-up refers to "spare capacity" on Union St, however the figures supplied by the applicants own traffic engineers indicates that the weekly average peak on Union St exceeds the 500 vehicle capacity constraint for a collector road. Union St may well be a collector road but it is also a residential street already operating above capacity.
- vii) Option 2 proposes a right hand turn off Union St. into the school followed by an immediate right hand turn into an existing car-park. This right hand turn will occur in the afternoon, against low western sun (ie poor visibility), across oncoming vehicles, and into a dark car-park, with a limited height of 1.8m.
- viii) Vehicles accessing the pick-up then are required to negotiate 2 right angle turns through the carpark before exiting to a pick-up area with provision for FOUR pickup bays.

- ix) Successful operation of the pick-up is then predicated on each student being collected within a 1.05 minute window. The traffic report makes no attempt at a sensitivity analysis to analyse the effect of parents arriving early and queuing to wait for the 3.00pm pick-up, or the effect of students arriving late for a car already in the queue. Total queuing space on site is limited to 19 cars including cars queuing within the existing car park. Other cars will be required to queue in Union St waiting to turn right into the site and consequently blocking east west movement in Union St
- x) Any effect on the queue with-in the car-park in relation to the movement (backing out) of parked cars is ignored.
- xi) There is no analysis of the effect of the queuing on the residential driveway directly opposite the Shore entrance, which serves numbers 95,97,99 Union St.
- xii) The assessment of Option 2 seems to ignore normal traffic engineering practise in not allowing for a 20% contingency in the calculations. The report refers to a 20% contingency but appears to rely on a 10% figure, and one can only assume that this is indicative that the higher figure would indicate problems with the conclusions drawn.
- xiii) The exit of the proposed pick up into Hunter Crescent and thence into William St is not analysed in terms of the effect of the increase traffic in William St and the flow on effect at the intersection of William St and Blue St or William St and Mount St.
- xiv) I request that the department review the real impact on of school pick-up public roads by attending at Loreto School in Kiribilli to see the extreme disruption to traffic at that location each afternoon.
- xv) The current pick up facilities for Shore School in Edward St are self-evident by a cursory inspection on any given school day, and are covered in the traffic report commissioned by concerned resident. There is a very real chance that any approval of pick-up in Union St will quickly degenerate into a similar situation.
- xvi) As the Edward St situation deteriorates due to the proposed increase in student numbers, it is obvious that more reliance in the future will be made on the Union St pick-up, with serious effects and consequences for traffic on Union St and on the amenity of residents.
- xvii) I submit that until there is a satisfactory resolution of all very serious traffic issues, to the satisfaction of North Sydney Council, the RTA, and local residents there cannot be any approval given.

3. Other substantive issues

- i) The revised proposals still breach the 8.5 meter height limit. There has been little or no attempt by the school to address this issue.
- ii) The bulk and scale and impact on the Bank St residential properties remains substantial, and proper 3D modelling, and photomontages have not been provided.
- iii) No height poles in respect of the amended proposal have been erected.
- iv) The intentions of the school can be clearly read in their objection to the Draft LEP, where the school seeks an increase in the height limit for the entire site to 12.0 meters. One can imagine future applications including along the Conservation Area streetscape of Union St for 4 story structures similar to those built by the school along almost the entire length of William St
- v) Any approval should ensure that there is no construction access along the rear boundaries of the Bank St properties.
- vi) Presumably construction access will be from Union St. This will occur **directly opposite** of the residential properties at numbers 93,95,97 and 99 Union St. Accordingly strict and enforceable curfews conditions must be appended to any approval.
- vii) Conditions imposing curfews in respect of deliveries, and garbage collection to and from the school via the Union St gate should also be imposed. Currently no such curfews exist and deliveries and garbage collections late at night, sometimes at midnight, and early in the morning at 5.00am, and occasionally as early as 3.00 am, are occurring.

The apparently dismissive attitude taken by the school to the concerns of the local residents and community continues. The school has demonstrated by its actions and submissions that they do not take these issues seriously, and indeed states that the proposals have been "generally well accepted by the community" which is patently incorrect.

Having purchased the site for \$35 million the school appears to believe that they should have a right to redevelop to any extent that they deem suitable.

The Department has a clear obligation to the wider community to protect the environment, the heritage and conservation values not only of Graythwaite but the Conservation Area as a whole, and the heritage of the immediately adjoining heritage properties "Kialoa" at 44 Union St and "Yantara" at 93 Union St, and to prevent the applicant from "exporting" its considerable traffic and amenity issues onto public streets, adjoining sites, and the adjoining community.

Your faithfully

Vera Maria Poole

Owner 93 Union St
Mobile 0419 467359
vpooles@pooleassociates.com.au

OR

Ian Poole
0413 751 721
ianp@mprdg.com