Minister of NSW Planning

cc. NSW Parliamentarians

Dear Minister

Re: Shore's proposed development of Graythwaite

I wish to express my strong objections to this proposed development for the following reasons:

. There has been a mark lack of consultation with local residents and the community in this proposal. Before making any decision, a *public inquiry* should be held, 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).

. 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.

. 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?

. No objection to the demolition of the Ward building east of the Graythwaite House or the Tom O'Neil Centre.

. 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.

. 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.

. 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.

. 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.

. 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 land.

On these grounds, I believe you should not approve the proposal as it currently stands and at the very least hold a public inquiry.

Yours faithfully

John Nearhos
53 Bank Street
North Sydney NSW 2060

7 March 2011