

SUBMISSION

ST ALOYSIUS COLLEGE REDEVELOPMENT SSD Application Number SSD 17_8669

INTRODUCTION

My comments are in relation to the Junior School site at 29 Burton Street, Kirribilli.

Our property backs on to Crescent Place which forms the eastern boundary of the Junior School Site. Our kitchen, family room and a bedroom are within 11 meters of the school's playground area and the site of the proposed excavation and construction of multi-purpose hall.

OBJECTIONS

Objection 1: 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 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 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.

Objection 2: 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**. This is considered unreasonable.

Issues which need consideration include:

- Excavation (e.g. vibrations, rock stability, need for stability ties into neighbouring properties, excavation noise, dust)
- 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)
- 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)

Objection 3: 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 main EIS document.

'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 may 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.

Objection 4: 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 and cracking to houses. When the test core holes were dug for the geotechnical report in January 2018 there were vibrations in my house and debris from the rear wall fell onto my kitchen benchtop.

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.

Objection 5: 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. Because of the difficulty of reviewing all the material for the 3 sites, I have only been able to prepare comments on the Junior School site.

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.

COMMENT

As a neighbour we feel quite entwined with the operation of the school. We know the rhythms of the days as the noise ebbs and flows, as the boys are dropped off and picked up, as recess and lunch times occur each day, as PE classes and sports practise and Saturday games are conducted on the basket-ball court, as assemblies are held, as bells are rung and music played over the PA system, as flags go up and down, as balls come over the fence with a polite 'could you throw the ball back, please?', as Christmas celebrations are practised and held, as music lessons are conducted. I time my days around the flow of traffic and boys walking in the area. I arrange gatherings in my house according to the time of the day or whether it is school holidays. We cope with the plane tree leaves.

We moved here knowing that we had a school as our neighbour and are quite happy to live with the school's operation and recognise the need for the school to change to meet its future needs. But, with these proposals for change, we would like to be treated as genuine neighbours, not just statutory neighbours.

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.

Judith Cahill
28 May 2018