

6 Chuter Street
McMahons Point NSW 2060
Telephone 02 9955 9944



December 7, 2011

Department of Planning
GPO Box 39,
Sydney NSW 2001

Department of Planning
Received
8 DEC 2011
Scanning Room

Dear Sir/Madam,

Re: MP 10 0150 & MP 10 0149 - Graythwaite Concept Plan

As an adversely affected and concerned local resident, I strongly object to the above plan.

The Revised Environmental Assessment for Graythwaite Concept Plan and Stage 1 Project Application must NOT be approved in its current form. Major revisions are still required, and if these are not forthcoming the application should be refused.

The number of additional students has only reduced by 10% from the original proposal. The current scheme has 450 additional students and 45 additional staff.

The School has not solved the traffic and parking problems that would arise from this huge increase in activity on the land.

A whole campus master plan needs to be prepared for the whole of the School before any development is approved on what is only one half of the School land.

1. The conservation of the heritage buildings is supported in principle. However the impact of the new buildings and such a major expansion of the school is still unacceptable. This is an item of State and National heritage significance and must be properly protected for future generations.

2. A publicly accessible through site link for pedestrians and cyclists must be included from Edward St to Union St to improve connectivity between neighbourhoods. This can be achieved without compromising the safety of students.

3. The removal of 99 trees in many cases is still not justified. The impact on the trees of overshadowing by buildings still not addressed. The removal of smaller trees and undergrowth along the slopes, to create a park like setting, will remove habitat for birds and other fauna, reduce screening (and hence privacy) and have enormous visual impact.

4. The Stage 3 West Building envelope is still unacceptable in its current form:

(2)

- It is still excessive and unacceptable in terms of height, bulk, and scale (approx. 30 metres x 35 metres in area and over 4 levels).
- There is a minimal reduction in floor area in the new proposal
- The visual impact has not been substantially reduced
- The bulk is still too big
- Noise impact still unacceptable and does not satisfy the relevant noise standards
- Privacy issues still a problem
- It still does not comply with the 8.5 metre max height limit for the site or the height limit for the adjoining residential area. The proposed plans have height up to 12 metres
- Site poles to be re-erected for revised plans. To the best of our knowledge this has not been done.
- "Community consultation" has resulted in little change. The residents' suggested envelope for the west building has been disregarded by the School.

5. The Stage 3 West Building.

- Needs to be still reduced in size
- Needs to be set back further from the western boundary away from heritage fig trees and residential housing. This can still be achieved with heritage restraints.
- Site poles need to be erected.

6. Traffic issues.

- This application shows no solution to the traffic chaos. Several "options" for on-site drop-off/pick-up are canvassed without queuing analysis, but no workable solution proposed. Pick-up and drop-off and associated car lines must be accommodated on School land.
- Union St is already near capacity traffic wise without the inclusion of extra traffic from the already approved townhouse development on Union St. Union St cannot be considered as an entry and/or exit for student pickup/drop off traffic.
- The School continues to resist coach loading and un-loading on the School land and insists on using the narrow public streets. This impact is unacceptable and all coaches must be on the School land - there is plenty of land available to do this.
- Buried in the depths of this submission is a proposal to have a coach turning area on the lower terrace fronting Union St. This suggestion totally goes against heritage requirements and was not exhibited at the recent open day held 12 November 2011 when this application was on display.

7. Community Consultation.

- Shore states in this revised application that " the wider community will have been provided with substantial opportunity to review and express their views in relation to this development, " report dated Sept 2011.
- The wider community has only had one chance to engage in consultation. This being the Open Day held at Shore 30 July 2011 10am-12pm which was more a presentation rather

(3)

than consultation. This was the same setup on 12 November 10am-12pm when this revised application was on display and already submitted.

- The school has not demonstrated that it has considered the community input and responded appropriately.
- The Director General's requirements for Community Consultation have not been fulfilled.

I am pleased to confirm that I have not made a reportable donation to any political party.

Yours faithfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Thomas W Duff', with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Thomas W Duff
6 Chuter Street,
McMahons Point NSW 2060