

22 April 2022

Nahid Mahmud

Senior Planning Officer

Planning and Assessment, Department of Planning and Environment
4 Parramatta Square, 12 Darcy Street
PARRAMATTA NSW 2150

Our Reference: 21-0379nmc1

Re: Review of Submissions—Pymble Ladies' College, Grey House Precinct (SSD-17424905)

Dear Nahid Mahmud,

In accordance with your brief and our fee proposal dated 10 November 2021, GML Heritage has undertaken a review of submissions received in response to the public notification of the Pymble Ladies' College (PLC) Grey House Precinct. Attached is a table that sets out our responses to specific submissions or to extracts from more comprehensive submissions that are relevant to the consideration of any potential heritage impacts arising from the proposed development.

In carrying out our review, we have relied on the documentation prepared in support of the development application, in particular the following:

- Heritage Impact Statement (NBRS, dated 11 August 2021);
- Visual Impact Assessment Report (Geoscapes, dated August 2021);
- architectural plans (BVN, dated March 2021); and
- landscape plans (Oculus, dated September 2021).

We also gave primary consideration to the findings of the Heritage Peer Review report (dated February 2022), prepared by GML Heritage for Planning and Assessment, Department of Planning and Environment. The purpose of the peer review was to assess the adequacy of the Heritage Impact Statement in its consideration of the potential heritage impacts of the proposed development.

A total of 130 submissions were received during the consultation period. We assessed the content of these, and extracted a total of 43 submissions that raise concerns about any potential heritage impacts. These are set out in the attached table.

Sydney Office
Level 6
372 Elizabeth Street
SURRY HILLS NSW
Australia 2010
+61 2 9319 4811
heritage@gml.com.au

Canberra Office
2A Mugga Way
RED HILL ACT
Australia 2603
+61 2 6273 7540
heritage@gml.com.au

GML Heritage Pty Ltd
ABN 60 001 179 362

Melbourne Office
17 Drummond Street
CARLTON VIC
Australia 3053
+61 3 9380 6933
heritage@gml.com.au

GML Heritage Victoria Pty Ltd
ABN 31 620 754 761

In summary, the following heritage related issues were raised in the submissions:

- (a) height and bulk of the proposed new building, and its visual impact on the heritage conservation area (HCA);
- (b) loss of trees along the southern boundary of the subject site; and
- (c) design and spatial organisation of any new buildings and the spaces between them within the PLC site.

A significant number of the submissions comprised repetitive form letters copied in whole or in part by multiple respondents. The majority of submissions, including the repetitive form ones, raise either the issues (a) or (b) set out above, or both in many cases. Several submissions (Nos 2, 19, 83 and 84) refer directly or indirectly to current development controls and policies (Ku-ring-gai Development Control Plan & State Environmental Planning Policy [Educational Establishments and Child Care Facilities] [SEPP]), but these are also primarily concerned with issue (a).

However, two of these submissions (Nos 19 and 84), in referring to the above-mentioned SEPP, note the requirement for new educational buildings to be designed to respond to and enhance the positive qualities of their setting, landscape and heritage. Although not specifically referring to the issue, these submissions could be relevant to the consideration of any impacts on the buildings and spaces across the broader PLC site that could be of heritage significance.

As set out in the attached table in response to the submissions that raise concerns in regard to issues (a), the Heritage Impact Statement, the Visual Impact Assessment Report and Heritage Peer Review report all conclude that, as the subject site is physically separated from the HCA by an additional row of dwellings, key views from outside and within the HCA will not be adversely affected by the proposed development. The Visual Impact Assessment Report (VIAR) in particular contains credible photographic and simulated images of key views to demonstrate that, although several properties on Pymble Avenue would be subject to high or moderate view impacts, these properties are not individually listed heritage items and/or within the HCA. These submissions can therefore be discounted.

In regard to issue (b), no evidence has been presented to suggest that the trees to be removed along the southern boundary of the subject site are of heritage significance. Notwithstanding that these existing trees may be of local landscape and amenity value, it is noted that extensive new tree planting is proposed along the southern boundary, and there is no credible evidence for heritage impacts resulting from their removal. These submissions can therefore also be discounted.

Issue (c), that is the setting of the new building within the Grey House Precinct at PLC, has not been raised as a specific concern in any submission other than reference to the SEPP. Neither the broader PLC site nor any of the elements within it are heritage listed, although there are a number of buildings and spaces that could be of heritage significance (the closest being Goodlet House). Due to their non-heritage status, the project heritage documentation has not considered in any detail the potential impacts on these elements. However, the proposed development is located in a part of the site that is topographically and visually removed from these earlier and arguably significant buildings, and is unlikely to result in any direct or indirect heritage impacts.

In summary, although the concerns raised by the range of submissions warrant consideration in terms of potential heritage impacts, particularly in regard to the adjacent HCA, our review has found that none of these concerns are sufficiently substantive to warrant reconsideration of the proposed development.

We are happy to provide any additional information or clarification if required.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lynette Gurr', with a horizontal line extending from the end of the signature.

Lynette Gurr

Senior Associate

GML Heritage Pty Ltd

Attachments

- Pymble Ladies College, Grey House Precinct Project—Response to Heritage Related Submissions

Pymble Ladies College, Grey House Precinct Project

Response to Heritage Related Submissions

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
1 N/A Auburn	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>The proposal will visually dominate the heritage items and individual properties located within the Conservation Area in the vicinity. The development of the site is not acceptable from a heritage perspective as there will be significant impact on the character of the Conservation Area which embraces the heritage items in the vicinity.</p> <p>Besides, the conditions of the traffic between Pacific Highway to Livingston Ave will be worse as a result of the increasingly high volume of come-and-go vehicles during peak hours which is surely foreseeable.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>The HIS asserts that the proposed development will <i>'...have no impact on views from Pymble Avenue'</i>, and that the subject site <i>'...is physically separated from the heritage items in the Pymble Avenue Conservation Area by an additional row of dwellings which are located to the southeast of the subject site'</i>.</p> <p>The HIS includes no graphic evidence to support these statements. However, the VIAR report contains credible photographic and simulated images of key views to demonstrate that, although a number of properties would be subject to High or Moderate view impacts, these are not individually listed heritage items and/or within the HCA. The Peer Review concludes that key views from outside and within the HCA will not be adversely affected, so there will be no significant impact on the 'character' of the HCA.</p>
2 Leah Dabron Surry Hills (submitted twice)	<p>Extract from SJB letter:</p> <p>5.0 Impact upon Pymble Avenue Heritage Conservation Area (HCA)</p> <p>The proposed five (5) storey building is inconsistent with Section B, Part 19 Heritage Conservation Areas of the Ku-ring-gai Development Control Plan (KDCP) 2021. Specifically, control 19F.1 Local Character and Streetscape, which requires development in the vicinity of a HCA to have regard to the form of the existing building or buildings, including height, roofline, setbacks and building alignment. Dwellings within the HCA are two (2) storeys in scale and predominantly federation to mid-late twentieth century period. The proposed five (5) storey Grey House Building is of a bulk, scale and design that dwarfs existing dwellings and detracts from the heritage values and significance of the HCA. The proposed</p>

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
	<p>scale and overall height of the building is considered completely out of context which is amplified by the fact it will be seen from Pymble Avenue, including the dwellings located within the Pymble Avenue HCA.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>The proposed development will be a substantial new building that is not, in terms of form, scale and architectural language, compatible with the residential buildings that make up the HCA.</p> <p>However, as noted in the Response to Submission No.1, the HIS, VIAR report and Peer Review all conclude that, due to the physical and visual separation between the proposed development and the properties within the HCA, key views from outside and within the HCA will not be adversely affected, and there will be no impact on the heritage significance of the HCA.</p>
<p>3 N/A Gordon</p>	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>Heritage Impact</p> <p>The heritage conservation area of Pymble Ave will be dominated by this massive and tall building. The look of the building does not fit into the existing surrounding establishments. It is not respectful for the area's culture and history.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p>
<p>6 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)</p>	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>It is unjustifiable to remove 29 trees along the southern boundary of the school for this development. These trees have their value and should be protected.</p> <p>The development is too tall and big for the local context and HCA. </p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>No evidence has been presented to suggest that the trees to be removed along the southern boundary of the subject site are of heritage significance. It is noted that extensive new tree planting is proposed along the southern boundary.</p> <p>Regarding the height and scale of the proposed development, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p>

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
<p>7 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)</p>	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>During construction, the GHW will be closed for students. Because of the landscape of Pymble Ave and the distance to Marden Gate; students who live within walking distance to GHW might have to be driven to school via Avon Road. It will add further pressure to Avon Road.</p> <p>GHP can be seen from street of Pymble Ave. It is very unpleasant to see the GHP within the Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA). It is so disrespectful to the history and culture of Pymble.</p> <p>The HCA should be preserved and stay low density like the surrounding residential properties of 2 storey height.</p> <p>Kur ring gai council areas are famous for being leafy suburbs. I strongly against the removal of 29 trees to giveaway for this development. The trees provide amenity to everyone. Even the two large Eucalyptus microcorys (Tallowood) trees with high retention value which located close to property boundary at Pymble Ave side are proposed to be removed. These two trees should be protected instead of being removed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[REDACTED]</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6.</p>
<p>11 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)</p>	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>GHP can be seen from street of Pymble Ave, it is very unpleasant to see the GHP within the Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA). It is so disrespectful to the history and culture of Pymble.</p> <p>The HCA should be preserved and stay low density like the surrounding residential properties of 2 storey height.</p> <p>Kur ring gai council area is famous for being leafy suburbs. I am strongly against proposal of the removal of 29 trees to give way for this development. The trees provide amenity to everyone. Even the two large Eucalyptus microcorys (Tallowood) trees with high retention value located close to school boundary at Pymble Ave side are proposed to be removed. These two trees should be protected instead of being removed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">[REDACTED]</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p>

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
	Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6.
14 N/A Pymble	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) hosts several heritage significance buildings for the culture and history of Pymble. The look of the Grey House Precinct (GHP) from Pymble Ave within the HCA does not fit into the local context and characters. Furthermore, the height and mass of the building is an eye sore to the residents and visitors of the area.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">████████████████████</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p>
18 Emma Rogerson Redfern	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>The area surrounding the development site is not undergoing considerable change. In fact, future development should retain the established character of the highly valued and adjoining Pymble Avenue Heritage Conservation Area, and in doing so, retain visual and acoustic privacy.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Refer to the Response to Submission No.1.</p>
19 Ku-ring-gai Council Gordon	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>Principle 1 (context, built form and landscape) of the design quality principles under State Environmental Planning Policy (Educational Establishments and Child Care Facilities) 2017 states schools should be designed to respond to and enhance the positive qualities of their setting, landscape and heritage, including Aboriginal cultural heritage. The design and spatial organisation of buildings and the spaces between them should be informed by site conditions such as topography, orientation and climate. Principle 5 (amenity) requires schools to provide pleasant and engaging spaces that are accessible for a wide range of educational, informal and community activities, while also considering the amenity of adjacent development and the local neighbourhood; and Principle 7 (aesthetics) indicates school buildings and their landscape setting should be aesthetically pleasing by achieving a built form that has good proportions and a balanced composition of elements. Schools should respond to positive elements from the site and surrounding neighbourhood and have a positive impact on the quality and character of a neighbourhood. The built form should respond to the existing or desired future context, particularly, positive elements from the site and surrounding neighbourhood and have a positive impact on the quality and sense of identity of the neighbourhood.</p>

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
	<p>RESPONSE</p> <p>The proposed development will be a substantial new building that is not, in terms of form, scale and architectural language, compatible with the residential buildings that make up the HCA. It is correct to state that it does not respond in a positive sense to and enhance the positive qualities of its setting, landscape and heritage context.</p> <p>However, as noted in the Response to Submission No.1, the HIS, VIAR report and Peer Review all conclude that, due to the physical and visual separation between the proposed development and the properties within the HCA, the new building will not be visible to any substantial degree from within or immediately adjacent to the HCA in Pymble Avenue.</p> <p>Regarding the setting of the new building within the Grey House Precinct at PLC, neither the broader PLC site nor any of the elements within it are heritage listed, although there are a number of buildings and spaces that could be of heritage significance (the closest being Goodlet House). Due to their non-heritage status, the heritage documentation has not considered in any detail the potential impacts on these elements. However, the proposed development is located in a part of the site that is topographically and visually removed from these earlier and arguably significant buildings, and is unlikely to result in any direct or indirect heritage impacts.</p>
<p>24 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)</p>	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>GHP can be seen from street of Pymble Ave, it is very unpleasant to see the GHP within the Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA). It is so disrespectful to the history and culture of Pymble.</p> <p>The HCA should be preserved and stay low density like the surrounding residential properties of 2 storey height.</p> <p>Kur ring gai council area is famous for being leafy suburbs. I am strongly against proposal of the removal of 29 trees to give way for this development. The trees provide amenity to everyone. Even the two large Eucalyptus microcorys (Tallowood) trees with high retention value located close to school boundary at Pymble Ave side are proposed to be removed. These two trees should be protected instead of being removed.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6.</p>

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
26 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>The look of Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) should be preserved, the proposed building is too big and tall for the area. The trees which the college planned to plant could not hide the building.</p> <p>The application proposed to remove 29 trees along the southern boundary of the college. Many of them are native mature trees providing amenity to residents and visitors. These trees should be protected.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6.</p>
34 Han Arrua Northbridge	<p>Extract:</p> <p>This project will have a major detrimental impact on traffic flow in when cars try to turn to Livingstone Ave from Pacific Hwy</p> <p>This project will also affect the aesthetics of the area and is not in keeping with all the structures in the area. Having a very tall building will affect all surrounding houses.</p> <p>Lastly, this project is affect conservation areas nearby.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Regarding the scale of the proposed development and its potential impact on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p>
35 N/A Homebush West	<p>Extract:</p> <p>I oppose this project as its not part of the historical heritage. The new project stands out and does not blend with the community surroundings. The height of the proposal makes it stand out like a sore thumb. There will be increased traffic and pedestrian congestion plus the added issue of noise pollution.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p>
37 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) hosts several heritage significance buildings for the culture and history of Pymble. The look of the Grey House Precinct (GHP) from Pymble Ave within the HCA does not fit into the local context and characters. Furthermore, the height and mass of the building is an eye sore to the residents and visitors of the area.</p>

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
	<p>RESPONSE Refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p>
<p>42 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)</p>	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) hosts several heritage significance buildings for the culture and history of Pymble. The look of the Grey House Precinct (GHP) from Pymble Ave within the HCA does not fit into the local context and characters. Furthermore, the height and mass of the building is an eye sore to the residents and visitors of the area.</p> <p>RESPONSE Refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p>
<p>43 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)</p>	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>The development is too tall and big for the local context and HCA.</p> <p>RESPONSE Refer to the Response to Submission No.2.</p>
<p>44 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)</p>	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>The look of Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) should be preserved, the proposed building is too big and tall for the area. The trees which the college planned to plant could not hide the building.</p> <p>The application proposed to remove 29 trees along the southern boundary of the college. Many of them are native mature trees providing amenity to residents and visitors. These trees should be protected.</p> <p>RESPONSE Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2. Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6.</p>
<p>46 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)</p>	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>The development is too tall and big for the local context and HCA.</p> <p>RESPONSE Refer to the Response to Submission No.2.</p>

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
51 Paul Cooper Pymble	<p>Extract:</p> <p>I have lived in Avon Road since 1996 at #21, which sits right opposite PLC gate2. I have, for the most part, appreciated the presence of the school over the road, since it is a very attractive green space indeed. In particular, I enjoy the forest which exists opposite me which, of course, is recognised as Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest ("STIF").</p> <p>For much of the time since arriving in Pymble I fought the high rise development known as 1 Avon Road as President of Pymble Action Group for the Environment ("PAGE" for short). One of the key successes of our campaign over 18 years was the recognition by the Land & Environment Court that there had to be meaningful transition zones between the high rise apartment buildings and adjoining single residences (whether single or two storey). In the particular case of 1 Avon Road, this was achieved to a limited extent by the medium density townhouse zoning of up to three storeys immediately upslope from 11 Avon Road. I believe the correct transition zone height should have been two storeys in this case, particularly since 11 Avon Road is a heritage-listed property known as Macquarie Cottage. I was therefore shocked to view the plans for the new Grey House Precinct at PLC. A five-storey building block with substantial length in its easterly aspect absolutely towers over adjoining residences. The height, bulk and scale impact is increased by the short distance to adjoining properties (twenty metres) and by the fall in the land towards these residences: giving an effective height of six storeys as viewed from them. There is no height transition at all. This is unacceptable. The building should be less bulky and should transition down in scale towards the local residences.</p> <p>The outcome is made the more unacceptable because Pymble Avenue comprises a Heritage Conservation Area. It is not permitted for an HCA to be impacted by inappropriate development within its view lines.</p> <p>I understand that it is proposed that two substantial healthy eucalypts be removed. PLC, as a custodian of STIF on its western boundary, should know better.</p> <p>The building footprint should be adjusted to preserve these trees. Also, doing so will ameliorate the visual bulk impact to the east.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1, 2 and 19.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6.</p>
53 N/A	Extracted from letter:

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>The development is too tall and big for the local context and HCA. [REDACTED]</p> <p>RESPONSE Refer to the Response to Submission No.2.</p>
63 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) hosts several heritage significance buildings for the culture and history of Pymble. The look of the Grey House Precinct (GHP) from Pymble Ave within the HCA does not fit into the local context and characters. Furthermore, the height and mass of the building is an eye sore to the residents and visitors of the area. [REDACTED]</p> <p>RESPONSE Refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p>
67 Alister Henskens SC MP	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>The impact the streetscape also concerns residents who feel that the scale and form of the building is out of keeping with the surrounding homes. The proposed 5 storeys is in significant contrast from the surrounding 1-2 storey buildings. Moreover they find that the contemporary building does not respect the heritage streetscape.</p> <p>RESPONSE Refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p>
72 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>The look of Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) should be preserved, the proposed building is too big and tall for the area. The trees which the college planned to plant could not hide the building.</p> <p>The application proposed to remove 29 trees along the southern boundary of the college. Many of them are native mature trees providing amenity to residents and visitors. These trees should be protected.</p> <p>RESPONSE Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2. Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6.</p>

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
76 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>It is unjustifiable to remove 29 trees along the southern boundary of the school for this development. These trees have their value and should be protected.</p> <p>The development is too tall and big for the local context and HCA. [REDACTED]</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6.</p> <p>Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p>
79 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>GHP can be seen from street of Pymble Ave, it is very unpleasant to see the GHP within the Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA). It is so disrespectful to the history and culture of Pymble.</p> <p>The HCA should be preserved and stay low density like the surrounding residential properties of 2 storey height.</p> <p>Kur ring gai council area is famous for being leafy suburbs. I am strongly against proposal of the removal of 29 trees to give way for this development. The trees provide amenity to everyone. Even the two large Eucalyptus microcorys (Tallowood) trees with high retention value located close to school boundary at Pymble Ave side are proposed to be removed. These two trees should be protected instead of being removed. [REDACTED]</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6.</p>
82 Ian King Pymble	<p>Extract:</p> <p>"The five-storey bulk of the proposed structure is out of keeping with the heritage streetscape of the area. Despite references to it being three storeys on the uphill side, it will be a five storey building when looked at from the east/south-east and will be very visible from Pymble Avenue. Architecturally, it will be out of keeping with the chapel which currently forms the skyline. My suggestion would be reduction of the height to 4 storeys for the easternmost half so that it steps up the hill and will then be less blocky. It would then probably have a benefit of more sunlight for the neighbouring properties. These issues are raised in Table 31</p>

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
	<p>of the Government Architect Response to the proposed structure and are not satisfactorily addressed by the proposers.”</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1, 2 and 19.</p>
<p>83 Leah Dabron Surry Hills (submitted twice)</p>	<p>Extract from SJB letter:</p> <p>5.0 Impact upon Pymble Avenue Heritage Conservation Area (HCA)</p> <p>The proposed five (5) storey building is inconsistent with Section B, Part 19 Heritage Conservation Areas of the Ku-ring-gai Development Control Plan (KDCP) 2021. Specifically, control 19F.1 Local Character and Streetscape, which requires development in the vicinity of a HCA to have regard to the form of the existing building or buildings, including height, roofline, setbacks and building alignment. Dwellings within the HCA are two (2) storeys in scale and predominantly federation to mid-late twentieth century period. The proposed five (5) storey Grey House Building is of a bulk, scale and design that dwarfs existing dwellings and detracts from the heritage values and significance of the HCA. The proposed scale and overall height of the building is considered completely out of context which is amplified by the fact it will be seen from Pymble Avenue, including the dwellings located within the Pymble Avenue HCA.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Refer to the Response to Submission No.2.</p>
<p>84 N/A Pymble</p>	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>1) Built Form and Heritage</p> <p>The proposed building possesses too much bulk when assessing characteristics of the area. The bulk and scale of the building is out of character with the existing dwellings in the street. The finishes of the buildings are not consistent with the streetscape and surrounding area. Great concerns the proposal will not respect the heritage and the landscape of the surrounding neighbourhood. The provisions of the Education SEPP require that all development applications for school demonstrate compliance with the Design Quality Principles (Schedule 4). The Design Principle 1 strongly emphasises that schools should be designed to respond to and enhance the positive qualities of their setting, landscape and heritage. The proposed building envelopes do not demonstrate that they fit into the context of the site or the surroundings and are not considered to demonstrate compliance with the Principle. The site is in close vicinity to Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area - C11 (HCA). The building height and scale would dominate the significant heritage elements of the HCA, as well as the surrounding low-density developments and as such the built form of the proposed development is not reasonable and not justified for this site. The GHP proposal must demonstrate</p>

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
	<p>that the proposed building envelopes have a positive impact on the low-density residential environment and the heritage significance of the area, being Principle 1 of Schedule 4 of the Education SEPP. The application does not adequately demonstrate this requirement. The setback of GHP from southern boundary, in addition to the proposed height, would have a detrimental impact on the low-density residences on the adjoining boundary as well as the buildings within the HCA. GHP's envelope would have an unreasonable visual impact on the adjoining residences fronting Pymble Avenue, due to its bulk and height. In according to methodology used to assess the visual impact for this EIS. The visual receptor sensitivity should be very high because GHP can be seen from the street of Pymble Ave within the HCA even 10 years post construction for both locals and visitors. Furthermore, it also can be seen from my main living space.</p> <p>- The expected view from Pymble Ave post development</p>  <p>- This is the current view from my living room.</p>  <p>The visual receptor magnitude of change criteria is also very high because there would be a substantial change to the baseline, with the proposed development creating a new focus and having defining influence on the view. Direct views at close range with changes over a wide horizontal and vertical extend. This location is not suitable for the GHP development.</p>

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
	<p>- View from my backyard, this is the 10 years post construction image provided by the school which has significantly underestimated the visual impact the building will caused.</p>  <p>RESPONSE Refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1, 2 and 19.</p>
<p>85 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)</p>	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>It is unjustifiable to remove 29 trees along the southern boundary of the school for this development. These trees have their value and should be protected.</p> <p>The development is too tall and big for the local context and HCA.</p> <p>RESPONSE Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6. Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p>

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
89 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>GHP can be seen from street of Pymble Ave, it is very unpleasant to see the GHP within the Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA). It is so disrespectful to the history and culture of Pymble.</p> <p>The HCA should be preserved and stay low density like the surrounding residential properties of 2 storey height.</p> <p>Kur ring gai council area is famous for being leafy suburbs. I am strongly against proposal of the removal of 29 trees to give way for this development. The trees provide amenity to everyone. Even the two large Eucalyptus microcorys (Tallowood) trees with high retention value located close to school boundary at Pymble Ave side are proposed to be removed. These two trees should be protected instead of being removed.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6.</p>
91 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>The look of Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) should be preserved, the proposed building is too big and tall for the area. The trees which the college planned to plant could not hide the building.</p> <p>The application proposed to remove 29 trees along the southern boundary of the college. Many of them are native mature trees providing amenity to residents and visitors. These trees should be protected.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6.</p>
99 Han Arrua	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>This project will have a major detrimental impact on traffic flow in when cars try to turn to Livingstone Ave from Pacific Hwy</p> <p>This project will also affect the aesthetics of the area and is not in keeping with all the structures in the area. Having a very tall building will affect all surrounding</p>

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
Northbridge (submitted twice)	houses. Lastly, this project is affect conservation areas nearby. RESPONSE Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submission No.1.
100 N/A Homebush West (submitted twice)	Extract from message: I oppose this project as its not part of the historical heritage. The new project stands out and does not blend with the community surroundings. The height of the proposal makes it stand out like a sore thumb. There will be increased traffic and pedestrian congestion plus the added issue of noise pollution RESPONSE Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.
101 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	Extracted from letter: GHP can be seen from street of Pymble Ave, it is very unpleasant to see the GHP within the Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA). It is so unrespectful to the history and culture of Pymble. The HCA should be preserved and stay low density like the surrounding residential properties of 2 storey height. Kur ring gai council area is famous for being leafy suburbs. I am strongly against proposal of the removal of 29 trees to give way for this development. The trees provide amenity to everyone. Even the two large Eucalyptus microcorys (Tallowood) trees with high retention value located close to school boundary at Pymble Ave side are proposed to be removed. These two trees should be protected instead of being removed. [REDACTED] RESPONSE Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2. Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6.

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
107 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) hosts several heritage significance buildings for the culture and history of Pymble. The look of the Grey House Precinct (GHP) from Pymble Ave within the HCA does not fit into the local context and characters. Furthermore, the height and mass of the building is an eye sore to the residents and visitors of the [REDACTED] area.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p>
108 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>The development is too tall and big for the local context and HCA [REDACTED]</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Refer to the Response to Submission No.2.</p>
109 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>The look of Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) should be preserved, the proposed building is too big and tall for the area. The trees which the college planned to plant could not hide the building.</p> <p>The application proposed to remove 29 trees along the southern boundary of the college. Many of them are native mature trees providing amenity to residents and visitors. These trees should be protected.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6.</p>
111 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>The development is too tall and big for the local context and HCA.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Refer to the Response to Submission No.2.</p>

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
116 N/A Blackwall	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>Built Form</p> <p>The scale and mass and height of the proposed building is way too dominate the surrounding residential properties especially within heritage conservation area in Pymble Ave. The look of the street view in the area should be protected. The proposed building should be redesigned and ensure it has the same scale, height, and setback to the surrounding residential properties.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p>
119 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>The development is too tall and big for the local context and HCA. </p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Refer to the Response to Submission No.2.</p>
121 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>The look of Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA) should be preserved, the proposed building is too big and tall for the area. The trees which the college planned to plant could not hide the building.</p> <p>The application proposed to remove 29 trees along the southern boundary of the college. Many of them are native mature trees providing amenity to residents and visitors. These trees should be protected.</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6.</p>
125 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>It is unjustifiable to remove 29 trees along the southern boundary of the school for this development. These trees have their value and should be protected.</p> <p>The development is too tall and big for the local context and HCA. </p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6.</p>

Number/ Objector/ Location	Submission Extract/Response
	Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.
128 N/A Pymble (submitted multiple times)	<p>Extracted from letter:</p> <p>GHP can be seen from street of Pymble Ave, it is very unpleasant to see the GHP within the Pymble Ave Heritage Conservation Area (HCA). It is so unrespectful to the history and culture of Pymble.</p> <p>The HCA should be preserved and stay low density like the surrounding residential properties of 2 storey height.</p> <p>Kur ring gai council area is famous for being leafy suburbs. I am strongly against proposal of the removal of 29 trees to give way for this development. The trees provide amenity to everyone. Even the two large Eucalyptus microcorys (Tallowood) trees with high retention value located close to school boundary at Pymble Ave side are proposed to be removed. These two trees should be protected instead of being removed.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">██████████</p> <p>RESPONSE</p> <p>Regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on the heritage significance of the HCA, refer to the Response to Submissions Nos.1 and 2.</p> <p>Regarding the proposed removal of trees along the southern boundary, refer to the Response to Submission No.6.</p>