

I hereby list my objections to the proposed inner Sydney high school as follows.

1. The proposed height of the high-rise building is far higher than currently permitted and far higher than adjacent buildings in the area.
2. The floor size ratio exceeds current limitations.
3. The Concept Plan states that it intends to remove the significant courtyard trees of “high retention value” because they will limit the design of the building and the integrated outdoor area. The trees would surely be suitable for any outdoor area so there should be no reason in that regard to remove them. Other reasons given as to why they should be removed are contestable:
 - to remove them because there are enough of them in inner Sydney is a farcical argument;
 - arborists in every annual report including the 2017 report have found the trees to be perfectly safe and healthy and have not mentioned a short life expectancy;
 - the trees have been there for well over a century so if they are so prone to causing allergic reactions why have they never been removed? Why are they allowed to be so prevalent in inner Sydney if people suffer? The answer is they do not cause people to suffer, certainly not to the point of wishing to remove them. The link between the trees in the courtyard and allergic reactions has not been raised in any Work Health and Safety report, and there has not been an increase in students in sick bay or teachers suffering from the increased pollen in Spring. Thousands of students and thousands of teachers and families have been situated alongside the trees without any resultant difficulties.
4. If the planners are honest, the only credible reason for the removal of the trees is because they get in the way of the new build as they have stated in the Concept Plan. It would be an absolute tragedy to lose such delightfully beautiful markers of our history to make way for concrete and glass. It is also an indicator of how small the courtyard will become in the new plans, requiring even greater dependence upon Prince Alfred Park for outdoor green space.
5. The park and trees will be greatly affected by two or more years of construction. The City of Sydney Council recently completed major works on Prince Alfred Park including the installation of a subterranean well for water conservation. There needs to be an assurance that construction will not damage the great work the council has completed in the park.
6. The designers assert that the overshadowing of Prince Alfred Park caused by the new tower is within required parameters, which it possibly might be, but outside those particular hours of midday to 2pm in the cooler months the overshadowing will be extreme and detrimental to the health or even survival and therefore the aesthetic appearance of the avenue of trees of high retention value parallel to the school as well as the other vegetation in Prince Alfred Park.
7. Student safety will be jeopardised before and after school when congregating in the park, as they no doubt will, in an unsupervised area which is not always savoury in this part of the city. In a school which is forecast to be “open” to the community, with an area which is supposed to flow between the school and the park, I doubt that security can be guaranteed.
8. There is no safe student drop-off zone planned.
9. Available access to a small portion of the school after hours is a token offer to appease the community. A typical high school such as this might quite realistically operate from early morning, say 7.30 to 8am with music practices, meetings, rehearsals, HSC extension classes etc. Similarly it might realistically not finish operating till 5pm or so for the same reasons and other extra-curricular activities commonly held in high schools. Furthermore the school is frequently in use at night for occasions such as Parent-Teacher evenings,

concerts and other functions. Access will probably be unavailable on weekends too as inevitable community users and school activities will prevent it. Therefore the access after hours is extremely limited and as a community member I know that the community was not canvassed on whether it is prepared to accept such limited, tokenistic access to the school in exchange for the school's inevitable use of the park by the students from early before school until late after school finishes. In any case, why would anyone even want to enter a small green patch underneath the school between the hours of 5pm to 7am, especially if it means surrendering a perfectly beautiful park paid for by ratepayers and taxpayers and used heavily by the local community? This is unfeasible and unfair.

10. Transport will be severely impacted upon by an increase of more than 900 students. The Concept Plan stated incorrectly that the current school has approximately 400 students. It does not. The numbers fluctuate from about 150 to 300 and when the numbers go over 300, the school is bursting at the seams. To factor in an incorrect number to calculate the impact is not a good starting point for accuracy. In any case, it doesn't require a mathematical genius to work out that about a thousand more students than now will be descending upon one of the busiest intersections in Sydney. This will have serious implications for the safety of students, staff and the public, for public services available, the comfort of the local public and of the students, traffic and congestion, pollution and noise for nearby residents.
11. View loss - The design is such that when viewed from Chalmers Street, the focus will not be on any glimpse of greenery through the lower open areas of the building but the eye will be drawn automatically to the monolith that will be the new building.
12. The design shows that a two-storey library will be installed inside the current heritage-listed hall. The heritage is very prescriptive about such considerations as attachments on the wall etc. The structure on the ceiling is of beautiful solid vaulted beams which should be clearly visible as an architectural feature. To crowd an acoustically superior open performance space with library shelving and desks and computers with seating will destroy the aesthetic value of the building.
13. If this design is permitted to go ahead, the local community will be driven mad by the noise of the construction for two years followed by a 300% increase of student and school activity noise which is unacceptable. Add to this increased traffic noise and congestion and lowered public transport availability and the community will not be well served.
14. The Concept Plan itself stated that "It is noted that any new development on the site is likely to be non-compliant with planning requirements for floor space ratio, height and sun access protection". The plan then continues on to find ways to rationalise its plans around these requirements. (Part I p.16)
15. I am led to believe there is sacred aboriginal significance on this site but I am unable to find any reference to it on any site pertaining to the new school development. I am worried that this means it has either not been reviewed or it has not been given the consideration it deserves.

The prescribed design brief was to build structures that promote the connection of people to the natural environment. There is nothing in this design that meets the brief. The multi-storey building form obviously does not provide integration with existing buildings and trees into the development, just because the designers say it does. One only has to look at the artist's impression: "The new inner Sydney high school viewed from Chalmers Street" (Credit: FJMT/Narrative) to see what I mean, and this is meant to pose the overbearing structure in a positive light!

On the contrary, the structure is an incongruous lump of glass and metal that might suit the ugly high-rise at Burwood station. Unlike the sandstone structures of the buildings on Cleveland and

Chalmers Streets, the proposed new school bears no likeness in feature, function or material to the natural environment and in fact it laughs at it. It sticks out like the proverbial sore toe and I pity the designers who had to dream up such a plan on such a tiny and unsuitable site. It is a shame they were so blatantly unsuccessful.

It is unacceptable to ignore or bypass current mandated limitations to push a pre-conceptualised design through the channels. Far preferable would be the intelligent formulation of a design which meets the required limitations which are there for good reason, that is, to retain legitimate sensitively aesthetic and functional objectives for all sections of the community which is fully mindful of historic and cultural heritage.

I would support a new high school on the site but only one which is capped at perhaps 800 students and which fits into the current building limitations whilst not impinging on Prince Alfred Park.

Resident of the City of Sydney Council