

**SUBMISSION RE SSD-8996**

**LORETO NORMANHURST SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT (CONCEPT PROPOSAL AND STAGE ONE)**

**91-93 PENNANT HILLS RD, NORMANHURST**

**Objection to Proposal**

**Moira Hutchinson**

**Normanhurst**

I object to the Development Proposal for the following reasons:

1. Traffic and intersection dangers
2. Streetscape and size of buildings
3. Lack of information re usage of some buildings

**1 - TRAFFIC AND INTERSECTION DANGERS**

As raised already in my objection to DA/1227/2018 (Early Learning Centre [ELC] for 80 children), Hornsby Shire Council has been well aware since 1997 of difficulties at the intersection of Mount Pleasant Ave (MPA) and Pennant Hills Rd (PHR) when the ARAP traffic studies rated the right turn at the intersection an "F". Since that time the left turn has deteriorated significantly.

As stated in the Anson Group Report (Table 4) of the current submission, an "F" rating by the RMS Level of Service Summary for Give Way and Stop Sign Intersections is "unsatisfactory and requires other control mode or major treatment". At the State Planning Panel public hearing re the ELC we were informed by the school that the ELC would generate negligible traffic and that a left turn only into and out of MPA should be the agreed traffic management of the intersection with PHR. This, despite saying that a left turn on red at the signalled intersection of Osborn Rd (OR) into PHR should be restricted due to heightened danger with PHR.

With this new SSD application it is stated that the development will generate minimal traffic increase and that the bulk of the traffic increase with MPA will be from the ELC, planning for which has now been passed. This last statement about the ELC generating traffic that will affect MPA seems to be in direct contrast to what was presented to the Planning Committee for that particular application.

At every stage of development we have noted the claim of negligible traffic increase yet, as residents of MPA for 44 years, this is impossible to believe.

Figures quoted in the Proposal seem to be at odds with each other – from other school statistics, it is a well-known fact that the younger the children, the more likely they are to be driven to and picked up from school. First the ELC and now the application to extend the

student numbers in the primary school (sited at MPA) to include years K to 4 will obviously increase traffic movements in MPA.

The proposed boarding house (relocated to the eastern side of the campus) “will provide positive outcomes for a servicing perspective” (sect 1.4) and will have its own street address and front door for ease of relatives “to find the boarding facility and visit their children” (p29). Food delivery, garbage collection (twice or once weekly, depending on what is to be collected), maintenance vehicles and, on top of that, the cars of the visitors to the facility and the students and staff who are residing there. This is seen as a negligible increase to traffic in MPA?

MPA is an unsignalled dead end street entering onto one of the major arterial roads in the Sydney network. It is one of only three roads between the M1 and M2 which cannot access PHR, either directly or indirectly, through connecting streets at a signalled intersection. It is the ONLY one which has two SSD sites to be developed.

The Wahroonga Estate Project Precinct A (Major Project No. 07\_0166) has already been approved at the southern end of the street and is pending construction.

Truly, how can MPA cope with two huge developments, both needing fire evacuation, ambulance access, and access for delivery, garbage and maintenance trucks as well as student and staff vehicles, when the only ingress/egress is via an unsignalled intersection????

This is of major concern to all residents and has been aired at various community meetings. What we are asking for is:

1 - lights at the intersection of MPA and PHR, with a pedestrian crossing for the numerous pedestrians who cross at the intersection to access Loreto College, Normanhurst Public School, Normanhurst Boys' High, bus stops on both sides of PHR (the Loreto bus stop is used by various schools such as Turramurra High School), train commuters and those accessing the Normanhurst shops

Or, if this is rejected:

2 – Loreto College to donate a strip of land along its western boundary for the widening of OR from the intersection with PHR for the length of the road, then an access road (already offered by the Seventh Day Adventist management) to be built to join MPA with OR for the safety of ingress/egress at a signalised intersection. This would not only protect residents and students from a highly dangerous intersection (MPA/PHR) but lessen the traffic congestion in OR and enable the school traffic, especially the buses, to navigate entrance to and egress from the sliproads more effectively.

## 2 - STREETScape AND SIZE OF BUILDINGS

Both MPA and OR are classified as R2 Low Density Residential.

Even the 8.5m allowable height of building in this setting at the perimeters of the school is too high for the surrounding houses. To attempt to raise the height to 22m astounds us and shows no regard for the surrounding neighbourhood.

The architecture of the buildings complements neither the heritage listed school buildings nor the mainly older residential houses in both OR and MPA. It would seem that the building footprints, especially those proposed for MPA, are too big and the buildings themselves far too high. With regard to the boarding house, this is too long, too high and too near the perimeter of the property for this residential neighbourhood.

If the school succeeds in being allowed to construct buildings higher than the recommended 8.5m they should exist only at the centre of the property, not near the perimeters.

We do appreciate the eventual closing of the Barry Wing Carpark to turn it into a greened area. The entrance to this carpark has always had difficulties, being sited at both the crest of the hill and a bend in the road, making it a potential blind spot for oncoming traffic.

### 3- LACK OF INFORMATION RE USAGE OF SOME OF THE BUILDING ENVELOPES

How can one make an informed comment about the project when there is either scant or no information given re usage of some of the proposed buildings?

One such building in question is the Pavilion. At the Community information meetings it would appear that this building was not mentioned and in fact does not appear on the display posters which we photographed at the October 2018 meeting we attended. Is it to be used for school functions? At night? In the day? What extra traffic will be generated? What are the noise issues?

There appears to be little information re any development after stage 1 yet surely the Concept Proposal must be looked at in its entirety not, as with the Early Learning Centre, in isolation from the total impact.