

Major Projects Assessment

Department of Planning and Infrastructure

GPO Box 39

Sydney NSW 2001

Attn: Ben Eveleigh

Re: MP 10_0150 Stage 1 Application & MP 10_0149 – Graythwaite Concept Plan

Submission – Objection to Revised EA Application

Dear Sir,

I am the owner-occupier of 29 Bank St, North Sydney. The rear boundary of my property is adjacent to the Graythwaite Estate on the western boundary. I submit that the Graythwaite Concept Plan should be rejected in its current form. The existing Plan will have major negative impacts on the community and on residents in the immediate area of the Graythwaite site. I would also like to object to the processes used in this application.

I support wholeheartedly the MP10_0150 Stage 1 of the Application. This involves the restoration of heritage buildings – Graythwaite House and Tom O’Neill Centre. I have some reservations about Stage 2 of the MP10_1049 Master Plan (the East Building) because of the potential traffic impacts. **However, I object to the Stage 3 proposal (the West Building) and believe the severe negative impacts on the community and residents justify its refusal.**

These impacts include:

- A dominant, oppressive structure representing an overdevelopment of the site
- Consequent exacerbation of traffic hazards and congestion
- Damage to the natural landscape

West Building

The proposed West Building (Stage 3) does not conform to the current North Sydney LEP 2001 general height limit of 8.5 metres. The original proposal was for a building of 14 metres in height. The revised Plan has slightly reduced the height to a little over 12 metres, which is still well above 8.5 metres. This building is cumbersome, dominates the slope and is a massive structure which will have a significant negative impact on the adjoining properties. The applicant has failed to justify the reason for the breaches of the height requirement.

In addition, the proposed building is still too close to the western boundary of Graythwaite and the residents in Bank St. We residents proposed an alternative structure which would have less impact on our properties, however, these were ignored. The proposed West Building continues to have maximum width on the residents’ boundaries and minimum width on the eastern boundaries. The buildings will impact my privacy.

To make matters worse, the applicant does not specify what the building will be used for. The School’s architect claims he does not know what the building will be used for, despite claims it will be used to house more than 400 more people. If the school is unsure about the future use of this massive, dominating structure, it seems premature to approve the application.

Traffic

The traffic in the streets bordering SHORE school is already chaotic in the morning and the afternoon. The traffic study is incomplete. The three options proposed do not adequately disclose the impact of the increased student and staff population on the traffic. Nor do they adequately address the means by which the increased traffic will be managed without causing residents and commuters to North Sydney severe disadvantage.

The impact will be significantly detrimental to all residents, particularly Union St residents. Edward St is already gridlocked at pick up and drop off times. How is it possible for 6 pick up spaces and 6 queuing spaces on site (specified in Option1) to cope with the proposed increase in student numbers? The traffic report states that the "use of Union St as an ENTRY is dependent upon providing sufficient on site queuing between entry and the pick up zone such that vehicles queue on site rather than on the street". This does not seem possible. There is no adequate solution proposed for the drop off and pick up problems and without satisfactory solutions the application should be rejected.

Natural Landscape

The construction of the proposed massive structure will have a detrimental impact on the existing landscape. While I support the removal of weeds and some later plantings, I object to the proposed removal more than 80 trees, some of which have heritage significance. I am also very concerned about the impact the construction of such a massive structure on the western boundary will have on the Port Jackson figs behind the Bank St properties. These figs bordering our properties have extensive root systems. I am very concerned the clearing of the land, the process of construction of the building and the use of the building by more than 400 people will have a severe impact on these figs.

In addition, there are beautiful natural springs on the site which will be detrimentally affected by the proposed construction. This will no doubt impact the existing vegetation on the site and could even impact the plantings in our gardens.

Process

I must also draw to your attention the lack of community consultation. There was no consultation prior to the EA exhibition. There was an Open Day hosted at SHORE school on 30 July. This was not consultation, this was merely an opportunity for SHORE to present its plans. There has been no attempt by SHORE school to engage in meaningful dialogue with residents and the North Sydney community.

I submit that the masterplan application in its current form must be refused. The impact of Stage 3 must be adequately addressed before any approval. There should also be meaningful, two way consultation.

Declaration

I have not made any political donations or gifts of any amount to any political party or person.

Robin Kramar

29 Bank St

North Sydney

4 December 2011