

Appendix 1

Submission SSD 9483 Chatswood High school redevelopment

Transport Impact Assessment Appendix 21

This report is a clear validation that desktop theory fails miserably to comprehend reality. Further, it is readily apparent that the authors are responding to a particular commission.

The report adopts a 'look see no problem' approach from the outset. In doing so the report fails to recognise the breaches of law, congestion and frustration that take place daily right now, let alone when this road system will need to accommodate substantially more than the current student/parent numbers.

As example, to suggest that the average delay driving from Centennial Ave to Albert Ave. at peak AM and PM times is 28 seconds is an irrelevant nonsense. The traffic at these times backs up into Centennial Ave. as far as Dardanelles Rd. From multiple experiences it can take more than 15 minutes from Dardanelles rd. on the Western boundary of the High School to exit to Pacific Highway and thence to Albert Ave. – a short 400m trip.

Further, the photographs have been selected to create an impression that is far from the norm, so much so that they discredit the entire report. To quote one neighbour, 'I'm incensed that they would insult our intelligence in that way'.

The report's analysis of parking is unbelievable – literally. Figures 2.5 and 2.10 in the Traffic Impact Assessment that purport to show the existing vehicle and pedestrian access to the High School and adjacent parking capacity is wrong.

The document fails to report on, much less provide remedies for, the extreme difficulty ratepaying residents of Centennial Ave. and other adjacent streets have in finding parking adjacent their own homes. Indeed, it appears to propose that several of the existing unrestricted parking places available to residents will be changed to short-term parking.

Nor does it refer to the multiple occasions when residents find cars parked, locked, and empty in their private driveways for long periods of time. This happens because parents are already unable to find parking to drop off and pick up their children. And that is now, before the student numbers increase significantly.

The report fails to recognise the very large number of buses involved in sporting and other interschool events that need to park and navigate these narrow roads. I have previously sent the NSW Education dept. a photograph of one such occasion where 6 buses were parked in Centennial Ave. – three of them illegally double parked. This required children to walk past the first line of kerbside buses to those double parked

on the road. That was not an isolated incident. NSW Dept. Edu advised this would be addressed in the Traffic report – it is not.

I have been advised by the Dept. Edu that their traffic remit is only in respect to parking on the School grounds. That flies in the face of the Transport Assessment report in their submission. Indeed, it is a 'washing of hands' in respect to a serious problem that they themselves have recognised. It reflects badly on Govt. processes.

A proposal to improve the traffic congestion is attached as appendix 2. These would be quick and easy to achieve. Cost in relative terms would be minor. None of these proposals have been considered in the Dept. Edu. submission on transport.

The applicants should be required to submit a realistic traffic impact statement that accurately reflects the current and future situation and provides realistic remedies. That report should be made available to interested parties for comment prior to the project being considered for approval

Building T

The western wall of building T is approx. 50 metres long, two stories high and with the roofline above that - and broadside on. It sits high on elevated land and presents massive bulk to those properties located on Dardanelles Rd. Yes, there are trees to break the visual impact, however from the drawings this wall will be a flat, uninterrupted panel devoid of any architectural features or visual relief. Dept. Edu have advised the building will be brick on Ground floor and concrete panels above.

The applicant should be required to submit details of what architectural features will be used to mitigate the massive bulk of the Western wall of building T. That report should be made available to adjacent neighbours for comment prior to the project being considered for approval.

Security lighting

The report speaks only in generic platitudes about security lighting. It states that there will be an increase in security lighting, but nowhere does it say where this will

be sited or the radius of impact. I was assured by NSW Edu. that the SEARS report would be specific on this subject – it is not.

The applicant should be required to confirm details of security lighting and how this will be designed to ensure that those living adjacent to the school are not flooded with high density light at night. That report should be made available to adjacent neighbours for comment prior to the project being considered for approval.

It should be a requirement of any approval that there be no adverse impact on neighbours from security lighting.

Acoustic report

Hall 'T' is immediately adjacent a large number of residential properties

The use of hall 'T' should be restricted to 8.00 am to 9.00pm weekdays and 8.00am to noon Saturdays. There should be no use on Sundays. Musical events should be held only in the existing hall 'J' as is done now. This should be a mandatory requirement of any approval

Quote from the Acoustic Assessment report:

'A typical use of the Hall outside of School hours is assumed to be as follows: •Disco; 1 to 2 a year from 3pm to 7pm •Band 1 to 2 times a week 8am-9am in hall •Year 6 / Year 12 farewell – 1 x per year •presentation nights – 2x per year •OOSH; Monday –Friday; 30-50 kids – 3pm to 6:30pm.'

This bears little relationship to the current use of the existing facility building 'J', let alone once the new hall T is operational. Amongst other outside uses there is regular band practice after hours and on weekends (note: the report states the band will be 8am – 9am which is a nonsense), and religious services. There are also music festivals and other community events that are not identified in the report. There is no reference to the hall T being used for sporting events (albeit it is designed to do so) and no reference to noise from cheering supporters. This will occur both during and after hours and on weekends.

The applicant must be required to deliver a new report that accurately reflects the reality of noise impact arising from building T. That report should be made available to neighbours for comment prior to the project being considered for approval.

Further to this:

The plans for building T include a 'plant room' but there is no definition of what will go into that room, nor of how it is acoustically shielded. Nor does this feature in the Acoustic report. Dept. Edu have said it will be hot water only at opening, but that other machinery may be installed later.

The applicant should be required to submit details of what machinery will go into the plant room and how that will be acoustically shielded

There are two sets of doors shown on the lower ground floor of the West elevation of building T immediately adjacent neighbouring residences. Either side of the doors are louvres for ventilation. Further, there are louvres along the entire length of the upper walls of building 'T.'

The applicant should be required to submit details of the acoustic impact of these doors and louvres, both open and closed.

The report speaks of a lift in Building T, yet none is shown in the plans. Dept. Edu. have since confirmed there will be a lift

The applicant should be required confirm how the acoustic impact of the lift will be mitigated and that the noise impact on neighbours will be within tolerance

Quote: 'R8 –7 Dardanelles Road, Chatswood 4240 No (+ 2 dB) The majority of the air conditioning condenser units are able to meet the acceptable noise level, with the exception of Residential Receptor R8. The slight exceedance based on typical condenser units would be able to be designed to reduce the level of noise emission at this location.' This is R8 is adjacent local residences.

This should be made a mandatory requirement of approval.

Quote: 'Once the mechanical plant selection has been finalised, a final assessment should be made of the mechanical plant noise emission, prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate.'

This should be made a mandatory requirement of approval.

Rainwater drainage

The proposed drainage plan calls for gutter/downpipe runoff from buildings Q,S,J and T to be decanted into a pit near the Northwest corner of the site (near the North end of Building T). The report uses theoretical desktop calculations in respect to the capacity of the system. As advised previously to NSW Dept. Edu, even in moderate rain this pit is inadequate. Water bubbles up either side of the pedestrian footpath, from under the drive at 60 Centennial ave. and between drive and roadside kerb.

The applicant should be required to submit a realistic plan to demonstrate adequate rainwater containment and drainage exists and how existing overflow problems will be remedied. That report should be made available to adjacent residents for comment prior to the project being considered for approval

Sewerage

As advised previously to NSW Dept. Edu, there are problems with the school's sewer line running adjacent the Western boundary of the school. Dept. Edu has advised that the Principal has confirmed this problem. By way of theoretical calculation, the report states categorically that the existing system is satisfactory for the proposed future use. And yet their own Site survey High School Part 1 page 8 states that they were unable to access the sewer pit on the NW corner and that further down the line they were unable to use the 'flexi rod' due to obstruction. Clearly there is a problem.

The applicant should be required to submit a realistic plan to demonstrate that adequate sewerage containment exists. That report should be made available to adjacent residents for comment prior to the project being considered for approval.