

SUBMISSION

on

St Aloysius College Redevelopment SSD Application Number SSD 17_8669

My comments are in relation to the Junior School site.

We are the owners of 70 Carabella St, Kirribilli, 2061 and our property (is close to Junior School site – only separated by Crescent Lane – i.e. we back on Crescent Lane. Our names are Paul & Heather Walsh.

I object to approval of the Concept Plan for the Junior School at this time as the site is not going to be developed for 10 years

At a North Sydney Council Kirribilli Precinct Committee meeting held on 3 May 2018, the School indicated that the development at the Junior School would not be taking place for at least 10 years.

It is understood that development approvals expire after 5 years. It therefore seems unreasonable and inconsistent to encumber neighbours' properties with a concept plan approval for development which will significantly affect their properties which will then not be acted on for 10 years.

I object to approval of the Concept Plan for the Junior School as the EIS does not contain sufficient detail to allow appropriate comment

The concept plan for the Junior School appears to be designed as a school masterplan, marketing and financial planning document, rather than an application for a statutory land use/built form approval for the site.

From our perspective, there is little detail in the Concept Plan to understand the scope and nature of the project, how it will affect neighbouring properties and what the school proposes to do to mitigate any effects during construction and operation.

In approving the Junior School Concept Plan the School will be given an automatic future right to build an extra level on the school building, excavate and construct a basement level multi-purpose hall and create a new basket-ball court and stands, without showing and considering the impact on residents. As a resident that backs onto Crescent Lane, that is something that we will not know the final outcome for a number of years.

Issues which need consideration are:

- Excavation (e.g. vibrations, stability, need for stability ties into neighbouring properties, excavation noise, dust). In the process of the bore holing for geotechnical testing, there was considerable vibrations caused – the proposed excavation would be a lot larger and longer than this.
- Construction management (e.g. truck movements, staging of construction, pedestrian management, impact on Crescent Place laneway operation which is the only access to our garages, landscape, retention of significant trees such as the large Lemon Scented Gum - Tree 55). The documents filed by the school are inconsistent – at one point saying they will be retained and at other points saying they are excavating up to the boundary.
- Operation of new facilities and impact on neighbourhood (e.g. noise, special events, parking for school staff and visitors, loss of parking for maintenance workers during school holidays, traffic movements, pedestrian movements, overshadowing, landscaping).

I object to the Concept Plan for the Junior School as there is a significant increase in use of the site without discussion of it in the EIS

The following quote from the PMDL Architectural Design Statement (page 9) indicates that the basketball court will be used by the whole school not just the Junior School. This is not covered in the EIS.

‘The 2016 Masterplan prepared by PMDL identified the need to reinstate the Great Hall at Upper Pitt Street - Main Campus, from a hall cum basketball court as the community and cultural hub for the College, which was its original purpose. The reinstatement thus *created the need for a second sports court in the Kirribilli precinct* to complement Dalton Hall situated on the Wyalla site. *The Masterplan identified that the Burton Street Junior School Campus provides the most suitable location.*’ - italics added.

It would seem that there will now be two basketball courts - one under in the multi-purpose hall and one on top of the multi-purpose hall. The current ground level court used by the 320 Junior School boys (Years 3-6) already generates significant noise. If the two new courts are to be used by the whole school population as the replacement second basketball court for the Senior and Main schools (Years 7-12) the site will be more intensively used for before and after school practise, Saturday morning sport, special school house competitions etc. This will generate significantly more noise from the site and at longer times. It is likely to create much larger movements of school students between the campuses, traffic and parking demand.

I object to the excavation proposed in the Junior School Concept Plan as there is no detail about impact on neighbouring properties and plans for construction.

Long standing residents report that past excavation of sandstone and building work at the Junior School and in the neighbouring area has resulted in significant vibrations (e.g. fridges moving across kitchen floors) and cracking to houses.

The streets surrounding the Junior School (Carabella, Fitzroy Street, Bligh and Burton Streets) have 1880 - 1920s houses with the foundations and structural engineering of those eras. These houses are part of the Careening Cove Heritage Conservation Area and several buildings are items specially listed on Council's North Sydney Local Environmental Plan. Care needs to be taken to ensure that these buildings are protected from vibrations.

The following extracts from the EIS' accompanying Geotechnical Interpretive Report Part 1 indicates some of the issues associated with the proposed excavation:

'It is understood that excavation for the basement may extend to around 10 m deep, although localised deeper excavations may be required for footings and trenches.' Page 17.

'The more competent sandstone (i.e. Class III to Class II rock) will be more difficult to excavate and is likely to present hard or heavy ripping or "very hard rock" excavation conditions'. Page 17. Comment: this sandstone appears to start about 3 m below the surface.

'It will be necessary to obtain permission from neighbouring landowners prior to installing anchors that will extend beyond the perimeter of the site. In addition, care should be taken to avoid damaging buried services, pipes, adjacent basements and other subsurface structures during anchor installation.' Page 17. Comment: The sewer line for several houses backing on to Crescent Place runs down the middle of Crescent Place laneway.

'Maintaining stability of the sides of the deep excavation and of neighbouring properties will be critical for this site.' Page 18.

'Major excavation works will inevitably cause lateral and vertical ground displacements outside of the excavation.' Page 19.

Prior to approval being given to the concept of excavating for a multi-purpose hall, the feasibility of undertaking a successful excavation should be assessed.

At the DA stage any excavation should involve preparation of dilapidation reports for each house prior to any work being approved, establishment of monitoring regimes, creation of and 'unexpected damage hot-line' and agreement by the school to rectify any damage.

I object to the Junior School Concept Plan as consultation has been inadequate

It is difficult for the community to consider within 4 weeks the impact of upgrading school facilities on three separate sites.

Detailed information has not been made available until the EIS. The school's consultation ran for 3 days in November. The restricted period meant that if people were not available at that time, they were not given the opportunity to comment.

It is suggested that the school defer the Junior School Concept Plan from the SSD application at this time and enter into discussions with the neighbours about the proposals and how to best meet the needs of the school and take into account neighbours' issues.

I object to the Junior School Concept Plan as the landscape plans are inconsistent

It is not clear on the plans where the tree along Bligh Street & Crescent Place are staying or being removed. We were assured by the school at the Precinct meeting on May 3, that they were staying, and yet on close inspection of the plans, they are marked for removal, and would be difficult to retain due to the level of excavation and destruction of the roots, with the new building / excavation being so close to the road boundaries.

I object to the School Concept Plan as there is not benefit for the community

The school doesn't pay any taxes to the LGA and it is as it grows adding to the congestion in the local area. The increase in all the facilities will draw more students and parents and competitors into the Kirribilli local area, which doesn't have the capacity to take any more people, and combining that with not adding of the tax base, is incongruent with local objectives.

Paul & Heather Walsh
27th May 2018