

Stephen Flood
2/19 Waters Rd
Neutral Bay NSW 2089

13 December 2015

Department of Planning and Environment
22 -33 Bridge St
Sydney

Email: david.gibson@planning.nsw.gov.au

Dear Sir,

Re: SCECGS Redlands School Concept Proposal and Stage 1 Development; SSD 6454.

I am writing to register my ongoing objections regarding this proposal.

I am a resident and property owner of 19 Waters Rd Neutral Bay.

Building Height –

The proposed Humphrey Building has been reduced, though it is still non-compliant with North Sydney Council height restrictions. It is 22.55 metres high, in an area that has a 12 metre height limit – this is approximately 87% too high. I find the requests for the height exemption to be weak. I oppose the school being allowed non-compliance just so it can “develop the facilities required by the School on a single site” (in other words – just to conduct its business). There are higher buildings nearby, but they lack a neighbouring proximity to the school. Further, we can achieve “improvements to the physical appearance of the site through a carefully designed building that is responsive to site context and its intended function” whilst maintaining compliance. I also question that reducing the scale of the development would “undermine the visual quality of the design” - I would expect visual quality of a design can be maintained regardless of scale. Finally, if non-compliance is the only means by which the school’s “accommodation requirements” can be met, then a review of those requirements should be undertaken.

Internal vehicular access link road from Waters Rd to Military Rd –

I am concerned with the frequency and timing of the use of this road.

This road will be used for garbage collection, which can occur as early as 6am (and as late as 10pm). My bedroom window faces the boundary road and so the noise will cause sleep disturbance should this activity occur at this time. In the documentation provided initially for the proposal, the school stated that collection would occur early enough so as to not interfere with school operation. However, in the revised proposal, it is stated that the school has no control over the collection times. I can only conclude that collection will take place early in the morning.

The garbage enclosure has been relocated. However, it is still close to a residential boundary; moving the problem down the road does not resolve the issue.

The road will also be used to collect and drop-off students using school buses. Not only will this occur every school day before and after school, but it will also occur when there

are other school related functions; eg school camps, where students will gather very early in the morning prior to departure.

Noise –

The swimming pool of the Humphrey Building has been moved to the basement of that building. Noise will continue to emanate from the basement when the pool is being used. I have reservations about the enclosure being able to suppress all generated noise associated with pool operation such as sports whistles and spectators. That usage will include training sessions that commence at 6am or earlier, along with carnivals that will occur on weekends.

It is stated that "Buses will take a maximum of 10 to 15 minutes for drop off and pick up during school hours." There is no mention of bus activity before and after school – which is the most common time when students will be dropped off and picked up. Also there is no mention of the number of buses involved in this activity. If there are say 5 buses, does that mean there will be $(10 \text{ to } 15) * 5 = 50 \text{ to } 75$ minutes of continuous noise?

Solar Access –

I object to any reduction of solar access due to this proposal. The northerly aspect of my property was one the of main attractions when purchasing my property, and provides a significant amount of residential enjoyment. The re-supplied solar diagrams show that my solar access will still be reduced. There are diagrams showing shadows cast by walls separating each courtyard. This component of the diagrams appears to be exaggerated. Even if they were accurate, they are not relevant – simply because they are not changing. I object to the proposal using any existing, un-changing shadowing elements as a justification for causing more shadowing. The proposal should report only on the causes of its own changes. I also notice that the proposal has used elevation diagrams to show shadowing caused by a compliant scheme; however, the "proposed" and "existing" diagrams are not elevation diagrams. This makes it impossible for an appropriate assessment to be conducted.

Privacy –

There are still privacy concerns associated with this proposal. In its current form, the school's full size bus will overlook my fence as it travels through the internal link road. There is planting proposed on the northern side of the road; however, this will not alleviate this issue as my property is on the south side of the road.

In conclusion, the proposal still has elements that are non-compliant (with flimsy arguments for exemption), will cause noise that will disturb sleep and quiet enjoyment, and will cast extra shadow on my property.

Thank you for your time.

Regards,
Stephen Flood