

447 Maguires Rd
Maraylya NSW 2765
13 March 2011

The Hon Tony Kelly
NSW Department of Planning
GPO Box 39,
Sydney NSW 2001

Dear Minister Kelly

I wish to lodge an objection to the development proposed by Shore School at the historic Graythwaite site at North Sydney. As a descendant of the original owners of the property, the Dibbs family, I strongly object to the plans for the site proposed by the school.

1. I request the Minister, before making any decision, 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 the residents have not received a letter notifying them that the application was on exhibition.
 - 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. 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.

5. Impact on trees is 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.

Please consider the above points before making any decision as to the outcome of the Development proposal.

I can be contacted on 4573 6169, should you wish to discuss my objections further.

Regards

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Ware'.

Katheen Ware

Great, great granddaughter of Sir Thomas Dibbs.