

Dear Ms Cleary,

I have closely read and endorse entirely the submission prepared by Margaret Shearer objecting to the Weigall Sports Complex proposal by Sydney Grammar School

I would like to further note the following:

I am very concerned by the proposed position. It almost seems that the applicant has gone out of its way to position the proposed development to cause maximum distress to neighbours.

It seems incredible to me that the corner of New South Head Road and Neild Avenue is not the proposed site ie right next to the proposed bus drop off area. Given the fact that the Eastern suburbs railway is safely suspended and supported there and that a pre existing rarely used School building is already sited there, not to mention apartment buildings all along the Western side of Neild Avenue, there can be no engineering reason that the proposed development cannot be sited in that space.

I am also very concerned at the bulk of the development. It is equivalent to a 5 story apartment building (NOT 3 stories as detailed in the applicant's proposal) on a site that has never previously been built out but that is literally the closest point to where the school meets neighbours on three fronts (Neild Avenue, Lawson Street and Vialoux Avenue).

Notwithstanding the bulk issue, there is no functional reason for outdoor (exposed) stairways and external (elevated) balconies that will result in magnified and radiating noise for residents on Neild Avenue.

Also, at a minimum it should be a strict development condition that all increased school foot traffic be entirely within the bounds of the school ground. Neild Avenue is already a busy pedestrian thoroughfare and hundreds of additional school pedestrians with sports and school bags walking 100s of meters on the existing footpath is a recipe for disaster. I can speak personally to this as I have walked past school buses as they disgorge their pupils onto the footpath near the Weigall pavilion. It can be a bruising encounter.

I ask that this proposal be treated as an entirely private proposal. It has no community benefit and manifestly, the school has never shown any inclination to integrate with the local community.

It is telling that the applicant's solution to pupils wishing to play tennis (if the proposal goes ahead and the tennis courts are removed) is to bus the students to

Heffron Park ie the applicant has been unable or unwilling to discuss possible allocation of tennis courts with its literal neighbour, the Maccabi tennis centre.

Finally, and perhaps most dishearteningly, is the applicant's utter disregard for the mature trees that will be destroyed if this proposal in its current form is given the go ahead. At a time when the amenity and benefits of mature trees is now so obvious, it is distressing to see how utterly wilful the applicant's attitude is to the magnificent trees that currently grow in and around the proposed site.

I think the applicant and it's professional advisers and consultants (whose reports have been, almost deliberately one might say, confusing, disorganised, unrigorous and sometimes disingenuous) have not given due weight to the permanent non beneficial impact on neighbours, traffic, pedestrian amenity, and trees, that the proposed site and proposed bulk will impose.

I urge authorities to reject this proposed development in its current form or at the very least impose strict conditions that deal with the issues raised both in this submission and the submission by Margaret Shearer.

Yours faithfully,

Phillip F Thomson de Zylva

[REDACTED]

Darlinghurst, NSW, 2010

[REDACTED]