

OBJECTION To The Renewal Project of TRINITY GRAMMAR SCHOOL

I write in response to reading and viewing the Environmental Impact Statement on Trinity Grammar School, Summer Hill Campus , 119 Prospect Road, Summer Hill - **The Renewal Project**

I begin my objection with some generalised comment on Trinity Grammar School. I am a parent of a Trinitarian (Tim Matchett 2005). It was one of the factors for us to purchase a home in Victoria Square. And I understand that a large independent school such as Trinity does have a right to develop their school site.

However, these developments are not built, nor is their impact felt, in a vacuum.

The school is in a residential area.

My street, Victoria Square, is part of an area of considerable environmental and architectural significance. It was gazetted as a premier residential precinct for Australia's first Centennial in 1888. The first two homes built were for the Premier of New South Wales and the Headmaster of Newington College, Stanmore.

Financial difficulties for Trinity Grammar School during the years preceding the Second World War found the school selling off part of its land for residential blocks along its northern boundaries of Prospect Road, Seaview Street and Victoria Street. This firmly put the school behind a row of houses, and shielded both the school and the community. Trinity has been acquiring these properties over many years. The school demolished a number of these acquired houses to build the Junior School and also gained an ingress point to the school which has not previously been there, on an ordinary residential street.

It has been the building of a Junior school that has changed the impact of the school as a whole, very much to the detriment of the neighbourhood amenity. The major change is that **a very large proportion of its students are privately driven to the school** as opposed to the large majority of students at the senior campus that come by train, or bus.

I am objecting on major areas of

- 1. Traffic volume and parking**
- 2. Increase in student numbers**
- 3. Loss of residential amenity - demolition of 4 houses, removing forever the residential frontage.**
- 4. Permanent placement of an ingress and egress of heavy vehicles and machinery into a residential area, into a small residential street with a steep hill with stop signs – with resultant noise. A loading dock for deliveries at all times of day and night. Light and noise spillage into the neighbourhood.**
- 5. Construction of a substantial maintenance and delivery facility in a residential with movements and permanent housing for large trucks, delivery vehicles, tractors, garbage trucks and service vehicles.**
- 6. Development on a massive scale. The capital value of The Renewal Project is put at \$127,000,000.**
- 7. Community ties. Recurring certainly throughout the Environmental Impact Statement is an observation that seems to have no substantiation. Mention is made of making ties into the local community, and the enjoyment of the site by the local community.**

Further detail to my objections.

Objections numbered 1 and 2 are linked.

My objection to aspects of The Renewal Project is the impact of increased numbers of students to traffic volume and parking out the streets.

I remember the limit of 1500 students that was placed on the school by the Land and Environment Court in a past decision.

It would appear that ruling is no longer being enforced, or is it even enforceable? More numbers of students means more private cars coming to the site morning and afternoon together with a greater number of special buses organised by the school waiting and queueing along our roads, plus the increased parking on our streets by teachers, general staff, parents and older students. From the plans it would seem that parking is to be increased by only 12 spaces, which seems a miniscule increase compared to the impact of the increased student numbers requested.

3. Loss of residential amenity

Our neighbourhood is permanently losing its residential amenity by the demolition of 4 more houses, in a residential row.

No longer families moving in and out of their homes and driveways. Now, an institution built to its very boundaries. An increase in the circulating volume, noise and disruption of cars and buses moving along the boundary of this institution, not passing through a recognisably residential street. It will change the security I feel in the area. No longer a row of occupied houses but an institution that will need increased security monitoring.

4. and 5. Permanent ingress and egress of heavy vehicles and machinery into a residential street and area ,and Construction of a maintenance and delivery dock .

Seaview Street has never had machinery and heavy vehicles coming in and out of its residential street, (aside from the garbage collection allowed at the side of the Junior school.) This size and scale of this development will change the nature of Seaview and Victoria Street intersection. It has a Stop sign, and it is at the crest of a large hill, so trucks will create significant braking and haulage noises.

The plans state the construction of a building 5m high with a delivery dock and maintenance depot, and presumably sufficient road surface width and strength for all this large machinery to be housed and moved in and out of the site.

Also all this noise and disruption with large and heavy machinery can operate at longer hours than the school day.

6. Development on a massive scale

- **The 5 stages appears timewise to be less than 5 years. At least five years of continuous disruption, dust, noise, traffic of heavy vehicles as well as displaced traffic and parking coming to the site.**
- **At least \$25 million dollars a year, presumably more at the beginning, coming in Government grants.**
This will be tax payers' money – given to an institution that pays no tax.
- **Being a State Significant Development will mean much reduced permission and oversight.**

7. Community ties

Page 90 of the Environmental Impact Statement – The Renewal Project states

“the sharing of the school’s facilities will extend benefits to the wider community” and

“the future shared use of school facilities would allow the school to function as a ‘social connector’ for the wider community, fostering social cohesion.

I do not know what these two sentences refer to when it talks of benefits to the wider community, or what the future shared use of the school’s facilities means to the wider community, or how the school’s sharing means being a social connector and fostering social cohesion.

Page 91 of the EIS under Table 11 states,

“Accordingly, the proposed school would support the health of future students and teachers, the wider community and the environment”

I also note with considerable interest the Minister’s (for Planning) foreword on page 5 of the Community Participation Plan, describing what good planning must go beyond, ending with the sentence , “It (planning) must be done strategically and thoughtfully, with the community at the heart of it”

I did not attend the two meetings called for the community to come to in late 2019. I am sorry that I did not attend. I would have had more time and information on which to consider the development.

I have found that dealing with the school over planning matters over at least the last 20 years to be difficult, adversarial, and exhausting. And I consider myself a supporter of Trinity Grammar School.

**Barbara Matchett
20 Victoria Square
Ashfield. NSW 2131**

**Home telephone: 9798.3876
Mobile: 0407 668 249
Email: bmatchett20@gmail.com**