

27 May 2020

Eve Salinas  
18 Service Avenue  
Ashfield 2131

**SUBMISSION OBJECTING TO THE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL PUT FORWARD  
BY TRINITY GRAMMAR SCHOOL**

I am the owner/occupier of 18 Service Avenue, on the corner of Harland Street and Service Avenue, where I have lived since 1989. I strongly object to Trinity Grammar School's proposed development application for the following reasons:

1. In the last few years, the traffic in Harland Street has increased enormously. This is because a Trinity Grammar employee (on what authority?) directs cars AND buses exiting their underground parking lot to turn left only, which sends the traffic along Harland Street, a narrow street running along the side of my house. The traffic very often blocks the road and comes to a standstill in Harland Street at school opening (7.30-9am) and closing times (3-4.30pm), and sometimes longer – a minimum of three hours a day. The resulting noise, congestion, and pollution, have significant negative impact on all residents of not only Harland Street, but *all* neighbouring streets.
2. On sports and school fair days, our area becomes completely overrun by parked cars, causing Harland Street to become a one-lane street.
3. My garage opens onto Harland Street, and I am frequently unable to drive my car in or out at these above-mentioned times because of the heavy traffic.
4. This traffic also puts in jeopardy parents and children who walk to Yeo Park Primary School and the elderly who are unable to safely cross the road leading to the park. There are no pedestrian crossings.
5. The Trinity Grammar development proposal will result in the removal of an unacceptable number (at least 26) of fully grown trees which are not only decorative, but play a huge part in the neutralisation of carbon.
6. This development proposal seems to be very extensive, which means that this neighbourhood will become a construction site for a prolonged period – extremely unpleasant for residents surrounding the site, both from the aspect of noise (trucks and other heavy vehicles) and dust.

7. The proposal includes the construction of a 5-storey high rise building, which is completely out of character in this area of residential houses, mostly no higher than 2 storeys.

8. In 2015 the Land and Environment Court determined that it was **not in the public interest** to allow an increase of 200 students, given adverse amenity impacts that this would have on the local residents. **Why then would it be acceptable in 2020 to increase the number of students by 600?** The suggestion is outrageous and in my view this proposal should be rejected out of hand. It clearly places the interests of the school over the welfare of the residents of the neighbourhood, and will adversely impact on their safety, living conditions, and property values.

Eve Salinas