

May 28 2018

OBJECTION

St Aloysius College Redevelopment

SSD Application Number SSD 17_8669

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

I am the owner of 31 Burton Street Kirribilli which is on the eastern boundary of the Junior School.

I object to the school's proposal on the following grounds:

1. The Concept Plan approval for the Junior School is inappropriate since building will not commence for ten years and the approval will expire after five

At the North Sydney Kirribilli Precinct Committee meeting on May 3, addressed by the School's Principal and others associated with the plans, assurances were given that the School does not intend to proceed with development for ten years.

As development approvals are understood to expire after five years, this means that this approval will not be relevant for the time frame the school is indicating.

2. Excavation will be difficult and will significantly impact neighbouring properties.

The school's application seeks concept approval to a building envelope for the Junior School which provides for an extra level on the main school building and excavation for, and construction of, a below ground multi-purpose hall and basketball court above.

This project will necessitate significant excavation and construction management which is only partially addressed in the School's submission. Given the sandstone shelf on which the school and its neighbouring properties sit, the challenges in this work will be large and several. Past building works in the area, including those undertaken by the Junior School, have damaged the walls of our home; because of the depth of the planned excavations, the plan requires the underpinning of the foundations of neighbouring properties, a requirement which has not been canvassed with me; my home, and the homes of my neighbours, are part of the Conservation Area and as such are old houses which must be 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.

Note: 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. There should be no approval for any such work without detailed planning and consultations with residents.

3. The current plan lacks the necessary detail to make appropriate comment

It is understood that the School needs to plan to meet its future requirements. But the lack of detail is concerning. For example:

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.

However, it appears that the School intends that the multi-purpose hall and basketball court act as a whole school facility, not just for the Junior School.

‘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.

PMDL Architectural Design Statement Page 9

This potentially significantly increases the usage of the multi-purpose hall and above ground basketball court during school hours, after school and for Saturday sports. This change of intensity and impact on residents is not identified in the main EIS document. Because the EIS is largely devoted to the development applications for the Senior and Main Campuses, the description and analysis of the Junior School proposal is only sketchy and insufficient to even assess a Concept Plan.

Equally, other issues such as construction management and the long term impact of the new facilities on the neighbourhood, with attendant parking requirements, noise, overshadowing, landscaping, traffic and pedestrian movements are not dealt with in the School’s Plan.

Given all of the above I respectfully request 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.