

Ben Eveleigh - Online Submission from Susan Kitchener (object)

From: Susan Kitchener <susan.kitchener@gmail.com>
To: Ben Eveleigh <ben.eveleigh@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 14/03/2011 5:16 PM
Subject: Online Submission from Susan Kitchener (object)
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

I object to the proposed development on the following grounds:

My main objection to the development is on the basis of the environmental damage likely to occur as a result. The ?Flora and Fauna? assessment submitted is manifestly inadequate. The detail and effort put into surveys is poor with insufficient detail ? for instance information on where they looked and for how long. A cursory examination of 10 minutes would hardly be sufficient for instance. Further, it is acknowledged in the report that the timing for the survey could hardly be worse for many species. (i.e. winter and cold ? a bad combination). It is probable that bat activity was very minimal due to the lack of insects to lure them out on really cold nights. Many individuals will stay in torpor and conserve energy for when conditions are better. Likewise frog species are unlikely to call in cold weather. Despite the author?s claims that ?the Red-crowned Toadlet (*Pseudophryne australis*) is a winter breeding amphibian, and these conditions were optimal for detecting this species where present? studies have shown that this is not the case. For instance Lemckert and Mahoney (2008) note that while red-crowned toadlets may call in winter, it is not their preferred time and so their conclusion is erroneous. (Reference: CORE CALLING PERIODS OF THE FROGS OF TEMPERATE NEW SOUTH WALES, AUSTRALIA, FRANCIS LEMCKERT 1, 2 AND MICHAEL MAHONY 1 *Herpetological Conservation and Biology* 3(1):71-76. Submitted: 8 September 2007; Accepted: 18 January 2008). As I live close by and often walk past of an evening, I can assure you the area in question is alive with calls and provides excellent habitat for numerous species. While I appreciate that many of the plant species present may be non-native, and even classified as weeds, they will be providing much needed habitat for many species. A full environmental impact assessment must be demanded of the proponent and a detailed plan of remediation submitted.

SHORE school has constantly and consistently showed a total lack of concern for both the environment and the community in which they operate. The fact that they held no community consultations and did not inform us of their development intentions (indeed misleading us by promising no immediate development when attempting to purchase the property) is extremely disappointing but not surprising. Local residents have had to put up with impacts from the school for a long time. For instance, boys are allowed to drive to school as soon as they receive their P-plates ? despite the fact that the school is extremely conveniently situated with respect to public transport. They speed along our streets, radios blaring, doors slamming, illegally parking and on 2 occasions that I am aware of, causing damage to property with their cars and then attempting to leave or actually leaving the scene without notifying the property owner. An increase in student numbers as a result of the development will just further exacerbate our problems and cannot be tolerated. Instead of removing 80+ trees, destroying habitat and creating a new concrete jungle, SHORE should be encouraged to teach the leaders of tomorrow about respect for the principles of ecologically sustainable development ? environmental and social aspects need to be considered and not just the school?s need to make money. Then they will really be able to say they have succeeded in educating new generations.

Lastly I would also like to express my support for the 9 point statement submitted by members of the ?Stand against development at Graythwaite? group, reproduced below:

1. Minister, before making any decision, to hold a public inquiry, as permitted under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, on the grounds that:

- o The development of this site has been a matter of considerable public interest for many years.
- o 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.

- o 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.
 - o 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
- o The impact on the trees of the changes to sub-surface drainage caused by the excavation
 - o The impact on the trees of overshadowing by buildings
 - o Precisely which trees are impacted? (there is no overlay of the buildings and excavated areas with the tree removal plan)
 - o 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
- o 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.
 - o 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.
 - o The proposal ignores these access and congestion problems and transfers these impacts to the public streets.
 - o 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:
- o 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).
 - o It does not comply with the 8 metre maximum height limit for the adjoining residential area (in places it is over 14 metres).
 - o it will have significant visual and shadow impacts on the adjoining houses within the conservation area to the west and south-west.
 - o the private open space at the rear of the Bank Street residences will be significantly affected.
 - o the use of this building for classrooms will have an unacceptable noise impact and loss of privacy for the adjoining owners.
 - o The proposal does not satisfy the relevant noise standards.
9. The stage 3 building footprint needs to be;
- o substantially reduced in size
 - o set back much further from the western boundary heritage fig trees. It should not protrude west of the eastern alignment of the Headmasters house
 - o 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.

Name: Susan Kitchener

Address:

10 Ancrum St, North Sydney

IP Address: c-59-101-17-129.hay.connect.net.au - 59.101.17.129

Submission for Job: #4274 MP 10_0150 - Graythwaite Project Application
https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=4274

Site: #2350 Graythwaite
https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=2350

Ben Eveleigh

E: ben.eveleigh@planning.nsw.gov.au

[Powered by Internetrix Affinity](#)