

PREVIOUS 2007 OBJECTION TO SHOW HISTORY OF TGS GROWTH

The General Manager
Ashfield Municipal Council
PO Box 1145
ASHFIELD NSW 1800

6 July 2007

Dear General Manager

Re: Development Application No. 10.2006.039
119 Prospect Road Summer Hill

We have reviewed the amended plans and they do not address the concerns we raised in previous submissions to Council.

We object to the proposed Masterplan for a number of reasons:

- 1. There has been an absence of meaningful community consultation.**
- 2. The size of the student body has grown significantly over time and may continue to do so, leading to further traffic and parking issues.**
- 3. The loss of the existing visual barrier and noise barrier between the school and the residential community through the development of a large playground above the pool creates a very important loss of amenity.**
- 4. The destruction of heritage is contrary to the Council's resolution for the draft TGS Conservation Area.**

Trinity Grammar School claims no planned deliberate increase in the number of students attending the site. However, there has been about 30% growth in the number of students, from just over 1,000 up to close to 1,400 currently, as evidenced by:

(a) the dramatic growth in student numbers of almost 26% by 2004, 35% by 2005, and possibly exceeding 40% by 2006;

(b) the incorporation in 2002 of a new and expanding Junior School on the Senior School Campus;

(c) the move of boarders into the 61 Prospect Rd Anglicare Aged Care facility to allow this space and other apartments to be refurbished for Junior School classrooms;

(d) the proposal for the establishment of an Infants School in a residential home at 59 Prospect Road, which was not approved and the subsequent establishment of the school in Lewisham; and

(e) this new proposal to demolish six houses to make way for 20 or more additional classrooms.

We request that the Council ask the school how it intends to fund the \$16 million development, if not through increasing student numbers.

We also request that the Council consider what is sustainable growth on this site. The surrounding residents already experience the intrusion of school created traffic and parking. The potential for the school to grow will inevitably lead to more traffic in the surrounding streets. There is nothing in the plans that would inspire any confidence that the school is making any real attempt to address the parking issues in its proposed further development.

The planned pool area results in the loss of visual and noise barriers. Currently there are houses between the school play areas and the residences. These will be demolished and a large 1,000 square metre playground adjacent to houses and only 20 metres from our property's boundary will be developed. The school argues that there are already students playing in Chapel Drive. That is sometimes true, but the numbers are relatively small. The 1,000 square metre play ground has the potential to house some hundreds of boys for recreational activities and other school activities.

Finally, given that the Council has designated the area a draft heritage conservation area, we have great difficulty accepting that the destruction of houses, as described in the plan, is reasonable. The plans show a lack of sympathetic development in both Prospect Road and Seaview Street. The bulk and scale of the houses currently fit the residential area, but the new buildings do not. The plans show no evidence for any respect for the heritage of the area that formed the basis for the Council's decision to identify it as a conservation area.

We request that you consider our concerns as detailed above and the content of our previous submissions to Council and recommend refusal of the application.

Yours sincerely

Professor Richard P. Mattick and Mrs Susan Mattick

[Redacted signature line]

[Redacted signature line]