

Independent Planning Commission NSW Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street SYDNEY NSW 2000

RE: Submission on SSD 17 8669 for St Aloysius College, Kirribilli

SUBMISSION

We own the terrace house at Street and back on to Crescent Place which forms a boundary with St Aloysius' Junior School.

It is good to see that the Department's assessment report has addressed many of the issues raised in neighbourhood submissions and note that many of these issues can be dealt with at the DA stage.

My issues are only in relation to the Junior School Concept Plan and are as follows:

That part of the Concept Plan for the Junior School relating to the Multipurpose Hall should be deferred to the DA stage as it covers matters which have not been adequately dealt with in the EIS. Approval of the Multipurpose Hall part of the Concept Plan will allow an envelope which has excavation issues, allows unanalysed intensification of the site and too much bulk.

1. Feasibility of Excavation

My main concern and a concern of my neighbours is the impact of the extensive excavation required to achieve the Junior School Concept Plan. It is noted that Condition B13 provides for a geotechnical investigation to take place as part of the DA process.

In ordinary circumstances this condition may be sufficient to cover the geotechnical construction and management issues.

However, a number of incidents over the years have caused unexpectedly large vibrations and damage to our houses and we wonder if the excavation can actually occur without significant damage and the consequent need for rectification and compensation.

Our little group of Victorian terraces and Federation houses are built with the poor foundations of the 1880s to 1920s and are glued together with fragile lime mortar.

You will receive stories from my neighbours about the impact of compacting the school yard and how the work was stopped and not re-started because of the effect on their property,

and about the impact of vibrations from the of construction of the Harbour Tunnel. Even during the minor core drilling that was done to prepare the Geotech component of this EIS, rubble was falling in my kitchen.

It would seem prudent to investigate the technical feasibility of doing the excavation without significant damage to our properties before approving and executing a Concept Plan which is based on an excavation up to 10m deep and underpinning towards our houses.

Failure to properly understand this issue could lead to substantial expenditure and time commitment by the school, only to result in damage to our properties and disruption to our lives, possibly resulting in stop work actions, compensation and/or litigation.

2. Intensification of use not covered in EIS

The Multipurpose Hall is being designed as a second basketball court to meet the needs of the secondary school (as the school is removing the second basketball court from the secondary school). While it was mentioned as a reason behind the Multipurpose Hall, the implications of this were not discussed in the EIS. This represents an intensification of the use of the Junior School site as the court will be needed for additional practise and Saturday games by older students. This will create more activity and substantially more noise than is presently the case with the small boys.

3. Bulk and Scale too large for site

The envelope of the proposed Multipurpose Hall provides for excavation and construction close to the boundary. While the plan says that the substantial plane trees will be retained, it is difficult to see how this will occur in practice. This envelope does not provide for appropriate setbacks and landscaping with substantial vegetation for the future development. The Concept Plan envelope should not allow the DA to be designed so close to the boundary either for the excavation (which would therefore need to be underpinned under the local lane or our houses) or for the adequate future landscaping of the site.

Judith Cahill B Sc Hons (Economic Geography), MTCP, M Teach