

Miss Shay Bristowe
Unit 311
141-143 McEvoy Street
Alexandria
NSW 2015

23 January 2018

Dear Sir/Madam

Re: Development Application SSD 8373 – Alexandria Park Community School Redevelopment, Park Road, Alexandria 2015

I am writing to voice my concerns over some elements of the proposed redevelopment of Alexandria Park Community School, Park Road, Alexandria.

I understand the State Government needs to deliver infrastructure. However as an immediate local resident I feel that the proposal fails to balance the education requirements to the needs of the local rate paying residents.

As a general note, the apparent lack of consideration of the residents on the southern boundary in the Environmental Impact Statement under 6.2 Environmental Amenity is evidenced by:

6.2.2 – The southern residential units (141-143 McEvoy St) are not even mentioned for privacy

6.2.3 – The southern residents units (141-143 McEvoy St) are not even mentioned with regards to solar access – only the adjacent commercial properties.

6.7 – Impacts: “visual amenity” consultation which is required, has NOT taken place.

As one of 15 owners of properties to the south of the site, I need to express my deep concerns in relation to the following matters that adversely impact the southern properties.

- The position of the development so close to boundaries with residential areas when other options are available for increased boundary set back.
- Positioning of development so close to substantial trees. Where changes to light and hydrology are likely to diminish the life span of the trees, if they survive the construction period.
- The proposed development is in excess of legislated zoning height limits and poses a detrimental impact on:

- Boundary set backs
- Height
- Solar access
- Visual massing
- Noise
- Building height plane/envelopes
- Flooding

These impacts are addressed in more detail below:

Boundary set backs

By creating a green zone along the Buckland Street boundary, the proposed new school buildings are 'arranged along the western & southern boundaries of the site. There are no documented envelope controls. To residents living along the south & west boundaries, this feels like an overdevelopment & saturation of the southern end of the site when there is so much land available to the north, where local residents would not be so severely affected. The excessive site coverage to the southern end of the site would dominate the private spaces and adversely impact our lifestyle. We request the southern boundary setback be increased and the buildings be distributed more equitably over the site.

Positioning of development too close to trees – Tallowoods & White Gum

The proposed positioning of the development so close to trees numbered 87, 88 & 89 would change the solar access & hydrology to such an extent that it is unlikely they would survive.

I note, in the Arborists report, that the trees numbered 87, 88, 89 have been marked "recommended" for retention. We would like assurance that these trees are 'definitely' to be retained as they provide natural shade, aesthetics & some privacy for both residents and students. In addition these trees are home to various fauna including birds, ring tailed possums.

I also note that the proposed buildings appear to be in the drip line of these trees. Our concern is that unless the building is set back sufficiently from these trees that they will die as a result of being too close to the building. Plus provision needs to be made for growth as Tallowood trees can grow up to 40m in height. It is of immense importance to retain as many trees as possible for the good of the wildlife, students, local residents and the environment as a whole.

We seek assurance that the trees will survive and thrive to meet their potential. By moving the development to the north away from the trees & by removing all proposed paving in the drip line of the trees.

Building height plane/envelopes

The proposed buildings are in excess of the L.E.P. zoning height controls. We believe that the residential building 141-143 McEvoy Street (southern end) will be adversely affected as far as shading, light and privacy. We note that diagrams show that the proposed southern

building of the school has 3 storeys but with a 'rooftop playground' which itself has a roof, this actually makes it 4 storeys. We seek the removal of the 'rooftop playground' because it will negatively impact on privacy both for local residents and the school children.

As residents along the southern boundary, we dispute the Environmental Impact Statement conclusion of the applicant that the application if compliant with height would not improve the outcome. Compliance with height regulations would most certainly improve the outcome of the residents of 141-143 McEvoy Street on the southern boundary of the school property.

Solar Access

Loss of solar access/overshadowing

The 15 units in 141-143 McEvoy Street on the southern boundary all have living areas & outdoor areas facing north. The shadow diagrams on DA5002 do not even show this as a residential building.

The document notes that there are **commercial** buildings along the south perimeter of the site but fails to include 141-143 McEvoy Street which is a RESIDENTIAL property. We require further information regarding the solar access and overshadowing of this residential property. We require assurances that this property is given the full consideration that is required by the law, for **residential properties**.

In addition, there are **no shadow elevational diagrams** at all on Drawing No. AR.DA.5002 P1 for 141-143 McEvoy Street which is a residential property & therefore as my understanding is, is required to be taken into consideration.

The shadow plans show that the southern properties will have all sunlight removed at ground level. There are no shadow diagrams showing the impact on the mid & upper balconies & living areas.

Fig 1 & Fig 2 are photographs of the current view from my balcony which is level 3, being the top level of 141-143 McEvoy Street. As you can see having the trees and the current buildings set back most certainly improves the visual aspect and living standard in our urban setting.

Fig 1



Fig 2



We seek evidence of solar access to all 15 units of 4 hours between 9-3 at Winter Solstice. This could be achieved by means of increased boundary set back and/or lowering the height of the proposed development.

Visual massing

The proposed buildings along the southern boundary are visually bulky, excessive in density & in height. In the Environmental Impact Statement part 6.7 it is stated “impact will be minor” We contend that impact is MAJOR to us. We seek the removal of the roofed track & reduction in height of the facade.

Noise

Noise generation poses a significant loss of amenity to the southern and western residents. For that reason, we request the removal of the ground level ‘canopy class room’ on the southern corner and the removal of the rooftop playground on the southern hub.

Please provide details of proposed fencing along the southern boundary – is it to be sound reducing?

Flooding

We ask that council investigate the potential flooding at the southern end of the site due to the increased site cover with the proposed works.

General

I would also like to see evidence that 141-143 McEvoy Street property is correctly recorded & considered in the planning as a residential property.

I acknowledge that the local built environment will increase in density. However our block of residential units is approximately 4 years old and therefore, unlikely to be replaced in the foreseeable future.

As residents and members of the public, we thank the council for considering our legitimate concerns with regards to these planning issues and trust that design amendments will be implemented that support not only State Government infrastructure, the school children & staff but also the amenity of the local rate paying residents.

Yours sincerely,

Shay Bristowe

Email: shaybristowe@hotmail.com