

I say the following,

I will begin my reply to this DA, by saying that this is a Da, to change the character of a property, that is the Jewel in the crown of the heritage of Hornsby shire Council.

It will change for ever, the character of the area I and my family have called home for the past 22 years.

The magnificent part of this area, we have been fortunate to live in, and the tragedy, of having the prospect of this Da being approved, directly opposite my home, just as I was about to retire, and enjoy it, leaves me devastated.

I have included the response received by Joe Nicita, to his questions to the Education Director of Blue Community School on the 15.1.2020.

I will now work through my reasons by working through the documents.

Acoustic Report: -

Above you will find the Assessment completed by "Noise and Sound Services" report No. nss 23149 final

That report clearly sets out the inaccuracies of the one nominated in the DA.

It clearly sets out the noise from the DA, will clearly breach all requirements set down in NSW law with respect to this type of development in a residential area.

It clearly sets out the noise from the movement of vehicles, during the hours of the operation of the proposed Da, to be outside acceptable level [it was completely left out of the DA report].

Addendum to Arboriculture Impact Assessment Report – Recommended Remedial Works: -

This garden is a statement of the buildings Heritage. It is a historical reference to the culture of this area, and the life of the people who were part of it.

There are trees in the property, that were brought, as seeds from previous periods, including ww1, and ww2.

Will these be preserved or removed among the 9 trees to be removed, or the 20 trees impacted the provision of access, and carparking, and the 10 trees to be impacted by the extension of the driveway, and or the 2 trees to be impacted by the brick paved area proposed, and or the 1 tree to be impacted by the new fire stairwell.

The word impacted, is improperly noted, it should be the word "Removed".

Arboriculture Impact Assessment Report for DA:-

Reading through this report, it considers all the trees to be removed for the parking area to be of "low", I presume they mean impact.

What about the impact, to the two adjoining neighbours on the eastern side, who will have lost all the protection and privacy, by removal of these trees? The acoustic report already shows the fence will not provide adequate sound reduction, what about privacy and western sun protection.

I have found this report very misleading, as I have gone through the intentions of the result for each tree, if this report is adopted.

It appears to me; the decision is in the hand of the developer as to whether it is retained or removed.

In appendix 4 tree 40 is noted as retained, but under likely impact, the work will likely have an adverse impact, their others like this, so clearly the report leaves it clearly open to have other trees removed.

I consider this report to be clearly a contradiction in favour of the Developer.

Bush Fire Assessment Report: -

As my home is rated at Bal 40, I would expect this site to be the same.

Only to say the current fires we have experienced I expect will see an increase in the local fire rating, given the ember distance travelled in the current fires.

Neighbour Notification Plans: -

Given the significance of this Da to the community that lives surrounding Mount Errington, it was disappointing to find out only 5 surrounding owners were notified.

Schedule of External Finishes: -

This one-page exercise in colours, does not provide any research on behalf of the Developers, to ascertain the original colours of the building.

It continues the lack of proper evaluation of the significance of "Mount Errington to the people of Hornsby.

Statement of Environmental Effects: -

Clearly who ever created this report, does not know how to read an acoustic report. Given we have supplied a report that clearly states that the writer of the Developers report does not have the academic qualifications to make that report.

The writer of the Statement of Environmental Effect, basis his conclusions, with respect to the developer's acoustic report which are incorrect.

I will be sending a copy of our acoustic report to the provider of the statement of environmental effects and ask for their comments.

The statement in his conclusion, do not reflect the situation on site regarding the traffic and parking assessment.

I cannot find anywhere in this report where the writer confirms that he attended site, but solely relied on the associated reports and plans.

The writer's comments on the "kiss and drop" location, takes no consideration of the traffic movement, and the fact that the Dural street/Rosemead road corner is a blind corner, and a kiss and drop at the location noted, would be dangerous to say the least.

He notes that deliveries will be made out of hours, so his conclusions with regard to the impact on the neighbours, clearly considers early morning or late after deliveries, to a constantly operating long day centre will not have any impact on the local residents.

Statement of Heritage Impact:-

Again, this report is very complimentary to the efforts of the developer.

It regards Mount Errington, as being able to be changed and then changed back if later required, by storing the items for latter reinstallation, where will it be stored, what guarantee is there to these claims.

Traffic and Parking Assessment Report for DA:-

With reference to the sections of this report.

The unit that counted the movement of traffic was placed outside my home at 4 Rosemead Road.

By placing the unit there, it effectively discounted all the traffic in William Street.

Anyone that knows William Street, effective know it is a two-way street, which is a rat run in and out of parked cars.

During the morning and afternoon hours, the operating times of the proposal, it is at its worst.

By ignoring the problems of William Street, it appears the developer intends access from Dural Road, to the corner of Rosemead Road, entering the site, and leaving the site at a new driveway opening

onto Rosemead road outside 4 Rosemead Road, and turning right, and back down Dural road, and right into Lisgar and left into William, and straight into the rat run section of William street.

Coming from north in Peets Ferry Road you cannot turn right into Dural street, from 6 to 9am and 3 to 6 pm, this will mean, most vehicles from the north will need to go along to William street.

Anyone that knows this area, knows in these times it is chaos at these times, and the line waiting to get across the railway bridge to go south, extends back to the rms sometimes.

None of this has been considered.

The natural way will be to turn left out of the propose development, and turn left into William street, in which case they will encounter all the traffic coming up from the lower end of Rosemead Road, and the housing development at the base of Rosemead road. There is no mention of this in the traffic report.

Let's look at the new traffic numbers, leaving aside these issues.

Given 80 pupils say 75% by car = 60 Cars movements per day on normal operation, in and out morning and afternoon. That means 240 addition car movement per day in peak times for Dural street and William street.

At full operation 52 weeks a year less 10 weeks holiday, we have 42 weeks x 240 daily car movements x 5 days = 50400 additional car movements.

At holiday times 10 weeks by 50% occupation with 160 daily car movements x 5 days = 8000 additional car movements.

In a single year 58400 times the two streets William and Dural will be used by the pupils alone, if a car is used for delivery and pick up by parents greater than 75%, these numbers will grow dramatically.

Staffing not included.

In no part of this report are these number mentioned.

The kiss and drop concept, if the large volume of cars come up William street, and go back the same way, common sense will tell you, parking outside 2 and 4,6, 8 Rosemead road will be affected, and both residents of these 2 addresses park cars outside their homes, which with cars parked at the kiss and drop, make Rosemead Road a one way.

In conclusion I have included the response that Joe Nicita received from the Education Director of the proposed developer, it shows that they, do not, truly understand the consequences of the situation, that this development will have on the residents of Dural and William street, and Rosemead road from top to bottom, and the residents of the areas at the lower end of Rosemead Road.

As have said before, both the traffic and the acoustic report, are a clear sign, of the poor quality of this application, this development, is totally not required, I have enclosed a list of the alternative schools in the Hornsby council area.

This list is not a complete list, but clearly show a development of the type of application, is not required.

Please below the link

<https://www.goodschools.com.au/compare-schools/in-hornsby-2077?page=1>

regards, Ian Cubitt