

From: <Angus.Finney@ubs.com>
To: <Ben.Eveleigh@planning.nsw.gov.au>
CC: <George.Youhanna@northsydney.nsw.gov.au>, <Julie@bermand.com.au>
Date: 4/24/2012 3:30 pm
Subject: RE: Preferred Project Report - Graythwaite Concept Plan (MP10_0149) and Stage 1 Project Application (MP10_0150).
Attachments: disclaim.txt

Ben

I understand from the report that I saw on North Sydney Council website yesterday that they have an extension til today to submit comments on the Preferred Project Report. Hopefully you can accept comments made on behalf of Edward Precinct as well. Precinct generally supports Council's comments, most notably in terms of a whole of site management plan, improved pick up facility and hours of operation, bus use on site, opposing the 41 extra parking spots, and concerns on the profile of the East building. Precinct would also like to see some form of public access either by throughlink or access to park space (as raised in the NSC DCP from memory).

Some of these suggestions may take some time to implement eg Council Traffic Management Plan. Precinct supports the immediate restoration of Graythwaite and if this can be excised from the information and controls that need to apply to Stages 2 and 3 Precinct would support that. Detailed comments are as follows:

1: Whole of site Management Plan- This is a large increase in students over time (450) and related impacts on residents. The proposal is clearly an "all of site" project as the East Building has always been intended to cover the old and new sites. Traffic was always going to impact the whole site as was the increase in bus use and this is finally being acknowledged by the applicant in its Preferred Project Report. As a result, in Precinct's view, the applicant should be providing a whole of site Masterplan.

2: Onsite Parking- Precinct supports Council's DCP and its' related traffic and parking management aims. Allowing the applicant to have an increase of 41 parking spaces further increases their inequitable allocation of parking spaces. With a position so close to public transport they should be under the percentage and not seeking to move to approx 160% of allocation. Staff in particular need to set an appropriate example to students and use public transport. Precinct opposes the extra parking with related vehicle movements in peak hours and supports an equitable distribution of parking availability under the DCP.

3: East Building height- Precinct still has concerns on the northerly aspect of the East Building. The limitation to the height of the Graythwaite eaves may have removed this as a concern but without clear diagrams it is hard to see the consequences.

4: Traffic-

Pick-up Facility- Precinct agrees with Council's comments re the increase in amount and size of spaces ie 8 and "large" sized. Anecdotaly it looks like 90% of vehicles going to the prep school currently are large vehicles. The pick-up facility should also be available to both Prep School and Senior School where possible. And should be for both morning and afternoon pickups. Traffic can be backed up down Edward St both in the am and pm currently despite what Halcro's statistical flow analyses say. When you get out and look as Council did

you can see the real life consequences.

Pedestrian Safety- Precinct supports the applicant being requested to provide pedestrian safety improvements at Mount/Edward. Applicant should install traffic calming measures in Edward as well- though preferably not humps as their early morning truck deliveries already wake people up when they hit the ones further down Edward at speed.

Emergency Services- Lord and Short Sts would be unable to be accessed if a fire or other need arose either from 8am to 9am or 3-3.30pm. Even with the pick-up facility Precinct believes that access will still be an issue. The applicant should be conditioned to have emergency access protocols as well as limiting the amount of vehicles that will be allowed access to the Prep School pick-up.

Traffic Flow Options- Precinct prefers Option One which the applicant was originally strongly pushing. We believe that there will be worse consequences for the Mount/William junctions with related impacts onto the Pacific H'way at Mount/Miller if all the increased traffic is to flow up William St as opposed to some out Union and Lavendar Streets. When combined with the new Council approved and Part 3A developments these junctions will be even further beyond their capacities and the applicants studies don't take these flows into consideration. Council should be requested to provide an updated Traffic Management Plan so that the applicant can take these figures into account. Currently Council's is believed to be from 2003 and somewhat out of date. The applicant should be requested to explain why it has changed its preferred option on flows.

Buses- The applicants bus use is different to other schools. They use buses to shuttle all students to other facilities at Northbridge. Their argument to be able to use the streets like other schools do does then not have the same basis. Along with the increase of 35% in capacity and related increase in bus requirements they should be required to provide all or some bus pooling or loading on site. If you add 35% to the pictures that Council has of buses they will be queued along the Pacific H'way by Greenwood as well. Precinct supports a limited hour or so ie 3-4pm bus parking spot on William St.

5: Public Access- Council's DCP has comment on public access or thoroughfare. A lot of schools and universities provide access to the local communities without there being a DCP requirement supporting it. Precinct acknowledges that there are safety and liability issues but other institutions seem to manage these and provide access/thoroughfare. There is public benefit in Graythwaite being restored but otherwise there are limited public benefits from the proposal as it currently sits and are in fact multiple adverse impacts on residential amenity. Public access or thoroughfare even at limited times would help address this.

Thankyou for your assistance and consideration of the above comments.

Regards

Angus Finney

per Edward Precinct

From: Ben Eveleigh [mailto:Ben.Eveleigh@planning.nsw.gov.au]

Sent: Wednesday, 28 March 2012 4:28 PM

To: Finney, Angus

Subject: RE: Preferred Project Report - Graythwaite Concept Plan (MP10_0149) and Stage 1 Project Application (MP10_0150).