

8th December 2019

Department of Planning (Industry & Environment)
320 Pitt St
Sydney NSW 2000

To whom it may concern,

**SUBJECT: PROPOSED ROSEVILLE COLLEGE WELLNESS CENTRE –
STATE SIGNIFICANT DEVELOPMENT
PROJECT APPLICATION NUMBER: SSD-9912**

We refer to the proposed development by Roseville College and The Anglican Schools Corporation involving construction of a Wellness Centre which comprises the elevation and extension of the current tennis courts, demolition of 37 Bancroft Ave Roseville property (currently subject to heritage conservation zone), excavation of site for additional car parking, swimming pool and capturing the existing soft ground between the Auditorium and the tennis courts to facilitate construction of the new indoor Wellness Centre classrooms.

We wish to make the following comments on the proposed development.

TRAFFIC AND RELATED IMPACTS

We have been a resident since 2006 and experienced a number of significant changes by the school over that time. The increase in building footprint within a limited area has allowed the College to boost students, teachers and general staff numbers.

| Category | 2007 | 2015 | 2019 |
|--|------------|------------|--------------|
| Executive, Teaching Staff and Extra Subject | 98 | 126 | 152 |
| Support Staff | 22 | 28 | n.a. |
| Maintenance | 9 | 10 | n.a. |
| Total | 129 | 164 | n.a. |
| Junior School Students | 233 | 237 | 256 |
| Senior School Students | 554 | 620 | 750 |
| - Of which year 11 | | | |
| - Of which year 12 | 74 | 86 | 98 |
| - Of which year 11 & 12 | 82 | 81 | 104 |
| Year 11 & 12 students use cars as a transport option and park in surrounding streets | 156 | 167 | 202 |
| Total School Students | 787 | 857 | 1006* |
| Sources: 2019 – website and Jodie Connor for yr 11 & 12 numbers and 2019 Teaching staff; 2007 and 2015 The Rosevillian n.a. – information not provided. * 976 as advised to residents in email | | | |

Principally, we have witnessed an escalating disturbance to residents caused by increased traffic flow resulting from expanded student, teacher and staff numbers especially senior year 11 and 12 students who drive to school and park in Bancroft and Glencroft Avenues. Unfortunately for residents the situation is becoming intolerable as the problems with traffic, parking, noise and littering are not restricted to school hours due to the number of extra-curricular activities that the school hosts on weeknights and weekends including the provision of a commercial swimming school on the School's premises.

Further, we have had to deal with parents and students parking in and across our driveways and the daily calamity of trying to negotiate exit from and entry to our property. This extends to parents parking to pick up/drop off their children on the corners of Bancroft and Glencroft Avenues, creating a high risk in turning at this intersection as well as risk to children when they alight from the driver's side, parking in no stopping areas and bus zones which results in double parking and subsequent concealment of the pedestrian crossing.

We have repeatedly advised both the school and the Ku-ring-gai Council of the heightened safety risks due to traffic congestion and parking violations and the inconvenience to residents. Unlike other local schools (eg St Thomas High St Willoughby; Pymble Ladies College) there is no traffic management program at Roseville College to organise pick-up and drop-off for students. Consequently, the pick-up and drop-off times (exacerbated in wet weather) are chaotic and raise serious concerns about Roseville College's capacity to manage a large-scale construction and development project, and the future additional volume of traffic/parking, when the current management of day-to-day traffic generated from the school's activities is ineffective/non-existent.

The previous development proposal (since superseded by this proposal) contained a traffic management study, which was simply a car counting exercise and did not reflect the reality of daily traffic and the related impacts within this precinct. This led the community to question the integrity of the study.

The following selection of photos, taken earlier this year highlight our traffic concerns but on any given day, photos of similar transgressions can be evidenced.



3.20pm 24/6/19 – car parked across our driveway



3.27pm 24/6/19 Glencroft Ave – traffic impasse



3.29pm 24/6/19 Bancroft Ave –car parked in No Stopping Zone to collect students; Bus unable to safely park.



10.45am 21/6/19 – Car parked on corner of Bancroft and Glencroft Avenues reducing visibility

With increased student and teacher numbers, both historically and as proposed in the College's business plans, traffic flow has been worsening and with the recent street closure at the top of Bancroft Ave by council (which prohibits right hand turn from Bancroft Ave into Hill St commencing 1st August, 2019) will now divert even more traffic into Glencroft Avenue, a pathway that is already significantly compromised.

In past construction by the school, we had dump and concrete trucks using Bancroft Ave as their pathway. We note that the proposed work zone and egress for construction vehicles will be via Bancroft Avenue and that the plan identifies that workers will be instructed not to drive near the work zone. Our past experiences are that workers park a few streets

away, thereby displacing the everyday park and ride train commuter who then ends up parking near the work zone.

With increased traffic chaos over the years we are concerned that this will create a very risky environment for the school children, parked cars (which we note there have been many cases of cars, including family members, being side-swiped and having their driver side mirrors damaged due to the tightness of Glencroft Ave during the day) and residents/pedestrians.

The well traversed “rat-run” from Glencroft Ave into Lord Street (northward bound) or Glencroft Ave to Bancroft Ave (city bound) is essentially a single lane thoroughfare due to the traffic-calming chicane and parking on either side of the street. It has become hazardous for residents trying to exit and enter their properties by car and on foot.

Potentially compounding all the above is the use for the proposed Wellness Centre. At the community meetings with the School, none of the delegated representatives could provide any assurance that the tennis courts, pool and facilities such as gymnasium would not be used for expanded commercial purposes. Additional facility usage would have further traffic implications for residents both inside and outside school operating hours. As mentioned, the school holds many extracurricular activities outside of school hours, which prolongs the disturbance for residents. Currently an outsourced commercial swim school operates on Saturday mornings, which introduces a new population, additional traffic, parking and noise. Generally, there is some relief from the noise and traffic on weekends (from Saturday afternoon) and school holidays, however, if the school are proposing to extend hours and open the facility to a wider community then this would have serious lifestyle implications for residents.

NOISE

Currently, the tennis courts are low lying and we experience considerable daily noise when students and teachers are undertaking outside activities including Saturday morning sport and grading for term sports (conducted outside school hours). The openness of those courts projects constant noise directly into the homes neighbouring Bancroft Ave/Glencroft Ave and Victoria Ave.

The proposed development will bring forward from the existing Auditorium, to the edge of the current tennis courts, a solid wall that will also be extended along the length of #37 Bancroft Avenue (which is being demolished). The proposed raised pavilion will create an L-shaped noise catchment area open to Bancroft Ave.

The structure will now be elevated by at least 1 metre from the existing tennis court ground level. By the time the new structure reaches the boundary between #37 and #39 Bancroft Avenue, the elevation (inclusive of pavilion and tennis courts chain wire fencing) will be at least 1 metre higher than the existing roofline of #37 Bancroft Ave. Students will be around 6 metres above ground level at the point of the existing residence at 37 Bancroft Ave.

Overall, the new structure will undoubtedly cause more noise to be amplified into Bancroft/Glencroft Avenues and with the additional height of the structure vis-à-vis the superseded proposal, we are greatly concerned about amplified noise and the impact on

residents. This will be compounded by any proposal to extend operating hours for the Wellness Centre and the addition of an extra court.

We have expressed to both the School's Architect and Project Manager that the proposed (conceptual) hedging is inadequate. To help minimise the extra noise that will undoubtedly be generated by the new development, we would request more mature trees, additional hedging and green screening along the full length of the new structure in order to create a barrier to absorb noise created by the new structure, especially the tennis court and pavilion.

We note that an acoustic study has not been done and the concept drawings depict minimal forethought as to the projection of noise from the proposed structure. Neither, the Architect or Project Manager could provide any feedback regarding their plans for potential noise mitigation at both community meetings.

LANDSCAPING AND AESTHETICS

There are several Heritage-listed homes directly opposite and surrounding the proposed development that will be impacted by the project. The Architect and Project Manager were unable to provide residents with any information about how the buildings would be finished or the materials to be used and whether the development will be sympathetic towards the existing heritage-listed buildings surrounding the project. The concept drawings propose a structure that appears incongruent to the environment.

The perspective from our residence will be quite harsh with an elevated view of solid buildings (we currently have a clear view into the next street) and a much higher than existing chain mail fence bordering the new and extended tennis courts. Our request for more significant green screening, hedging and trees is imperative and will not only serve to mitigate at least some noise (as discussed above) but will also help to soften and minimise the impact of this substantial building from the streetscape.

The College has evolved and expanded significantly over the years and has consumed almost all of the green space leaving very little "soft" ground. Residents find this especially difficult to accept as we must all comply with soft/hard ground ratios. We note that 17 trees and the last of the remaining small lawns will be removed for this project however the concept drawings depict very little green replacement. The proposed run-off created by the College's very "hard" footprint will apparently be channelled into the existing residential storm-water drainage system. Thus additional greening where possible will have further environmental benefits and would be consistent with the College's and Ku-Ring-Gai Council's philosophy concerning the environment and sustainability.

HEIGHT

The proposed height of the new buildings has also been questioned and at our meeting the Principal Architect was unable to confirm new height levels yet when we raised the observation that conceptual drawings suggested an overall height that was at least one

metre above the roofline of the existing #37 Bancroft Ave, he did not disagree with that proposition.

We find it objectionable that all residents' developments have to comply with Ku-ring-gai Council height restriction, that is, no development can exceed the existing roofline, owing to the conservation order in place. The college has purchased an existing residence to gain additional land for this project yet #37 Bancroft Ave has always been a residential home compliant with council roofline restrictions. It is not an existing educational building within school grounds.

We own a heritage listed home and undertook renovations in 2007-2008 and the Ku-Ring-Gai Council Heritage Officer made it a condition of our DA that the existing roofline could not be exceeded. We question why the School is permitted to effectively overturn a longstanding height condition imposed on all other residents.

Yours faithfully

Tracey & John Davenport
28 Bancroft Avenue Roseville
0407285517 (Tracey)
0411603322 (John)