

## Ben Eveleigh - Graythwaite Site - Concept Plan (MP10\_0149) and Stage 1 Project Application (MP10\_0150)

---

**From:** "Jean Williams" <jean\_williams@tpg.com.au>  
**To:** <plan\_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>  
**Date:** 14/02/2011 2:35 PM  
**Subject:** Graythwaite Site - Concept Plan (MP10\_0149) and Stage 1 Project Application (MP10\_0150)  
**CC:** <ben.eveleigh@planning.nsw.gov.au>

---

### Graythwaite Site – Concept Plan (MP10\_0149) and Stage 1 Project Application (MP10\_0150)

Attention: Director, Government Land and Social Projects.

I fully support the objections listed below, which I believe have already been sent to you.

I wonder why I became aware of the proposals through a third party, in spite of the fact that my property adjoins Graythwaite!

It is extremely disappointing to find that Shore School are proving to be not such good neighbours while most of us are willing to work with them and support reasonable requests. These proposals are outrageous and totally against the well being of the surrounding neighbourhood. At this point of time Shore School administration is not even complying with the noxious weed laws!

Jean Williams,

5 Bank Lane,

McMahons Point, 2060.

### GRAYTHWAITE PART 3A APPLICATIONS - Letter to the Minister for Planning – due 28 February 2011

1. Request the Minister, before making any decision, to hold a *public inquiry*, as permitted under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, on the grounds that:
  - The development of this site has been a matter of considerable public interest for many years.
  - The Part 3A application is deficient and does not satisfy the Director-Generals requirements in many respects. Most relevant to the request for an inquiry is the failure to properly and adequately consult with the community. There has been no consultation with adjoining or other local residents. Many of us residents have not received a letter notifying us that the application was on exhibition. An invitation only presentation to 6 people from 3 precincts during the exhibition period is completely inadequate and unacceptable to the vast majority of the community who were excluded from that meeting. When requested at that meeting, Shore School refused to hold a public meeting to explain their proposal.
  - The application fails to satisfy the Director-General's requirements in terms of public benefits and development contributions under Council's s94 plan, or by a Voluntary Planning Agreement.
  - The application fails to include an ADOPTED conservation management plan (also as required by the Director-General's requirements).

2. The Concept Plan application must NOT be approved in its current form. Major revisions are required, and if this is not forthcoming the application should be refused.
3. The conservation of the heritage buildings is supported in principle. However the impact of the new buildings and such a major expansion of the school is unacceptable. This is an item of State and National heritage significance and must be properly protected for future generations. The Design Principles report prepared by the heritage consultants for Shore identifies a further area (in the south-west corner of the site) that they think is suitable for future development. The Minister must protect these areas. If a State heritage listing can't do that, what can?
4. No objection to the demolition of the Ward building east of the Graythwaite House or the Tom O'Neil Centre.
5. A publicly accessible through-site link for pedestrians and cyclists must be included from Edward Street to Union Street to improve connectivity between neighbourhoods. This can be achieved without compromising the safety of pupils.
6. Impact on trees not adequately addressed, nor is the removal the 80+ trees justified in many instances. In particular the application does not address
  - The impact on the trees of the changes to sub-surface drainage caused by the excavation
  - The impact on the trees of overshadowing by buildings
  - Precisely which trees are impacted? (there is no overlay of the buildings and excavated areas with the tree removal plan)
  - The removal of smaller trees and undergrowth along the slopes will remove habitat for birds and other fauna, reduce screening (and hence privacy) and have an enormous visual impact.
7. Traffic and parking impacts
  - The additional 500 students and 50 staff will only make worse the already unacceptable congestion (especially associated with junior school) at Edward, Lord and Mount Streets, and the parking in local residential streets by senior students on a daily basis and by visitors to the school during events, such as parent/teacher nights.
  - The double driveways (next to each other) off Union Street are unsafe and will block traffic in this narrow street, which is a major thoroughfare to Waverton.
  - The proposal ignores these access and congestion problems and transfers these impacts to the public streets.
  - The site needs to be replanned to allow for school coaches to be wholly contained on site and parent drop off to occur either on site or on Edward Street south of Lord Street.
8. The Stage 3 building envelope is unacceptable in its current form:
  - it is excessive and unacceptable in terms of its height, bulk, and scale (approximately 30 metres x by 35 metres in area and over 5 levels).
  - It does not comply with the 8 metre maximum height limit for the adjoining residential area (in places it is over 14 metres).
  - it will have significant visual and shadow impacts on the adjoining houses within the conservation area to the west and south-west.
  - the private open space at the rear of the Bank Street residences will be significantly affected.
  - the use of this building for classrooms will have an unacceptable noise impact and loss of privacy for the adjoining owners.

- The proposal does not satisfy the relevant noise standards.
- 9. The stage 3 building footprint needs to be;
  - substantially reduced in size
  - set back much further from the western boundary heritage fig trees. It should not protrude west of the eastern alignment of the Headmasters house

reduced in height so that at no point does it protrude more than 8 metres above the existing ground level, consistent with Council's height limit for the adjoining lan