

---

# Graythwaite Consultation Activities

## Graythwaite Consultation Activities subsequent to the commencement of the Revised EA exhibition on 9 November 2011.

1. The School contacted North Sydney Council via its Executive Planner (George Youhanna) offering a briefing from the School or its consultants at the request of the Council officers. The offer was not taken up.
2. The School held a second Open Day on Saturday 12 November 2011 during the exhibition period. Informal comments received are summarised below.
3. The School together representatives from Halcrow and WSP attended the Edward Street Precinct meeting on 7 December 2011 (also during the exhibition period). The discussions that took place are reflected in the Edward Street submission to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure.
4. The School met with the Department of Planning and Infrastructure on 27 January 2012 to discuss their requirements and the process requirements subsequent to the Revised EA exhibition period. The Department of Planning and Infrastructure indicated that they expected the School to submit a Response Report (or Preferred Project Report) after which the Department would prepare its planning report for the Planning Assessment Commission (PAC) who would ultimately determine the application. It was noted that each of the Department and the PAC processes could include further consultation managed by those parties.
5. The Department of Planning and Infrastructure had written to the School seeking that the School in its Response Report identify a preferred option for the pick-up associated with the Stage 2 approval and that this selection be made in conjunction with North Sydney Council. Accordingly, the School met with the Council Traffic Manager and the Acting Planning Manager and discussed the options. At officer level it was agreed that the Union Street option entering through the car park was preferred, but the Council officers made it clear that a formal response from the Council would need consideration by its Traffic Committee and possibly by the Councillors as well. Accordingly, the School agreed to submit a short report on its preferred option to the Council's Traffic Committee in parallel with its submission to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure.

## Feedback from Sat 12 November 2011 Open Day

This document is a record of informal comments received by the consultant team at the Open Day. The attendees' sign-in sheet indicated that 81 people attended between the hours of 10am-12 noon.

The information provided here is summarised from each of the consultants present.

### 1. Sandra Robinson – Planner

- a. **Jason Rudd to attend Edward Precinct meeting** - The chair of the precinct asked if Jason could attend the precinct's next meeting (7 December). The HM agreed that this is a good idea and Jason now has it in his diary. The HM mentioned that someone from the school would also attend.
- b. **Curfew of Union Street** driveways (existing and proposed) - Ian Poole and his wife expressed concerns about existing use of the driveway (collection of skips, reversing beeps, early morning

---

deliveries) and urged the school to consider a curfew to protect their amenity. Mr/Mrs Poole also stressed that buses should not be allowed on the Graythwaite site.

- c. **Positive comments** - several people expressed support for the conservation works
- d. **Amendments made as part of the Revised EAR** - several people commented that the changes were material and improved the project
- e. **Traffic** – Comments received have been covered by Jason Rudd

## 2. **George Phillips – Heritage Architect**

- a. Some attendees complimented the proposal with regard to the heritage conservation and sensitive new development.
- b. One resident raised a concern about the proposed additional traffic crossover to Union Street.

## 3. **Matthew Taylor – Landscape Architect**

- a. General issue was traffic, too much etc
- b. Comfortable with landscape and understood the strategy for the site
- c. Concerns still in relation to West building, materiality etc, noted that this was an application for the building in principle, not the materials and finishes

## 4. **Jason Rudd – Traffic Consultant**

### *Buses*

- a. Again there were questions about why the School was not providing on site buses. Not a lot of solutions were offered.
- b. The Graythwaite lower terrace was not considered to be a desirable option.
- c. One of two people suggested buses should use the new pick up. One person suggested knocking down the Union St car park and rebuilding to accommodate buses (I think this person lived in Lord St.
- d. On balance people saw the benefit of buses in Mount St.

### *Union St Pick Up Facility*

- a. Generally supported but queries why it was only a pick up and not also a drop off.
- b. There was the suggestion that Union St access (all options) be closed and all entry and exits be via Hunter Crescent (i.e. turn around on site).
- c. The options which had an exit to Union Street were favoured by Union Street residents who envisaged delays in Union Street with cars waiting to turn right into the site and queuing back when pick up capacity was exceeded (this was going to happen all the time apparently).

### *Service Vehicles (noise)*

- a. Numerous residents stated that late night and early morning collections and deliveries occurred via the Union St driveway. Reversing beepers wake residents. Apparently the School has been notified about this issue previously.
- b. Also the gates at Union Street make a scraping / squeaking noise. One resident has offered a can of WD40.

---

## 5. Peter Mayoh and Jo Simmons – Architects

- a. **Positive comments** - many positive comments received from Shore related parties in relation to Conservation works and also proposed educational facilities
- b. **Chair of Edward St. Precinct Committee** – requested clarification of the changes since the original EA submission. Once these were explained, he appeared generally satisfied that the changes/ concessions made were significant and he was reasonably positive overall, especially considering recent Heritage Council endorsement
- c. **Concern re height of west building** that doesn't comply with 8.5m height limit. One Bank St. resident had brought along their architect friend (this resident was not directly affected by the development). Their architect suggested that by rearranging the spaces within the building and moving the building back towards the east you could still achieve the same floor space and comply with the 8.5m height limit. It was explained to him that the further east the building is moved, the more underground it would be and also that the Heritage Council had endorsed the current proposed setback of the west building from Graythwaite House
- d. **Bank St. Residents directly affected by development** – the changes since the last community consultation were explained to them, including the further development of traffic options and endorsement of the proposal by the Heritage Council. While still not happy with the proposal, they appreciated being kept informed of progress.

## 6. Dennis Zines – Project Manager

- a. One resident suggested that the traffic options should consider closing the Union Street entrance (I am uncertain of which entrance but assume it is the Graythwaite entrance).
- b. Two residents of William Street were not keen on buses in the street.
- c. The perception is that with so much land, the School should have buses on site. When asked where, they vaguely pointed to entry from Blue/William Streets with a turning circle in the rose garden.
- d. Noise complaints re early morning deliveries and truck beepers from reversing up the drive and suggestions that were lots of School events that generate noise. e.g. Year 9 Formal.
- e. Some residents wanted a complaints line – even citing that they wanted to report some vandals on the School but had no way to do so now.
- f. Other options for pick-up: (a). Pick up on William Street by demolition of School owned terraces to provide off-road space. (b). Use the William Street car park. (c) stagger Prep School leaving times.
- g. Another resident with experience from committees at other schools wanted traffic solutions that were professionally prepared and which worked. He was concerned about queuing issues backing onto the entry streets. He also was annoyed that the School had ignored the West building issues until told about what the latest design included at which point he felt much more content.
- h. A local resident who wasn't protesting about the development was seeking some drainage design to stop current large storm overflows into their property (I am sure their submission is on file from the first exhibition). Matthew Taylor and I agreed that their situation could be improved during the planting that was to occur in the S-E corner of the site (above Kialoa). This would need some minor advice from the drainage designer. The owners were requested to write to the School directly about this issue.
- i. The theory behind the population capacity (for environmental impact assessment purposes) and the School's population policy was explained to Ian Poole (architect) who understood the logic.