

Bradley James

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, 4 February 2021 9:29 PM
To: Prity Cleary
Subject: SDD-10371

Dear Ms Cleary

Further to my submission regarding SDD-10371, where my main concerns were loss of views and amenity (predominantly noise), I am writing to advise that I received a letter from Willow Tree Planning (WTP), dated 19/1, with a request to conduct a Visual Impact Assessment. I have agreed to grant access to WTP nominated assessor (Dr Richard Lamb) to my property (159 Victoria Street, Ashfield) tomorrow (Friday 5/2). The WTP letter states that the original VIA was from 157 Victoria Street (a school owned property next door) and describes the city skyline view as "An oblique, cameo view towards the north east... contains a distant horizon, featuring taller buildings of the Sydney CBD". From my perspective, the city scape views from the first floor sitting room of my property are neither oblique nor cameo and I would be prepared to engage an independent consultant if necessary.

I have read the response to submissions and find it difficult to understand how SDD-10371 has addressed resident's noise amenity concerns.

- 1) The western façade of new buildings (Figure 1) appears to be predominantly open stairways and balconies, and likely to generate significant new noise especially when the school bells rings and 2000+ students change classrooms. There also appears to be several open classroom spaces (e.g. roof/agora) and open wet weather play areas which will generate additional noise for the residents of Victoria Street.



Figure 1

- 2) Please require *structural design amendments* to protect residential amenity rather than rely on self-regulation.
 - a. The increase in student body has the potential to exponentially expand use of ovals (including during the evening, Figure 2). Please condition lighting (internal and external) that automatically switches off according to schedule of uses and prohibit floodlighting.

- b. Please include time restrictions on new service depots, as despite DA conditions to the contrary, the school previously had extremely large trucks arriving and departing at all hours of the night (1am, 2am, 3am) which caused significant sleep disturbance for neighbouring residents.
- c. Please require the design amendments (soundproofing/limited open access) to ensure there is no opportunity for excessive noise to emanate from new buildings/play areas, including the pavilion.



Figure 2

- 3) Please ensure the car park exhaust stack remains located away from residences. The diagram regarding the specific location of the carpark exhaust stack is obscure and states “preliminary sketch”.
- 4) An independent traffic survey is required. During the last approved DA, the school was required to promote use of the car park drop/off pick up zone and that students should use this facility and not use surrounding streets to protect the amenities of the area and prevent potential traffic hazards. However, this is not implemented, with daily pick up of 100s of middle/senior school students on surrounding streets (understandable given ~20 min turnaround in the carpark when queued). There currently hazardous pedestrian/car interactions most days.





Thank you for your consideration of the above.



Bradley James

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, 18 November 2020 1:00 PM
To: Prity Cleary
Subject: SSD-10371 Trinity Grammar School Redevelopment

Dear Prity,

Thank you for your time this morning and clarifying the remaining processes/reviews in respect of the above.

You informed me that the Dept of Planning will be undertaking a thorough review of the application and the response to submissions. As discussed I have looked at the responses myself and would make the following brief comments which you might like to take into consideration during the review:

- There were no dates on the current traffic assessment and this has not been rectified in the latest submissions by Trinity. I raise this in particular because I am told that during the assessment for which cameras were erected the school was not at normal capacity. I am told that years 11 & 12 were absent. If this is correct then the analysis presented is misleading.
- Although Trinity documented the traffic situation around the perimeter of the school they did not look at one of the main arterial routes away from the school, namely Victoria Avenue at the junction of Liverpool Street.
- In Trinity's response to the submissions they have reduced the height of the new building from between a mere 40 to 50 cm and they claim that the height is now in alignment with the existing profile and include revised drawings in this respect. The drawings clearly show that the new building is still higher than the existing profile. The proposed increase in student capacity is still tenuous with no evidence that they will be able to attract the student numbers which they are proposing and therefore in the circumstances I think they should not exceed the height of the existing buildings and I would have thought this could easily be accommodated without having to concede on capacity.
- There are really no concessions to the neighbours with such a major development and I would have thought that they would have at least considered erecting a proper "sound-proofing" fence to alleviate the noise, especially on Victoria Road which is currently exposed to almost continuous noise and Seaview Road which will become exposed after the current houses are demolished and a new playground is established.

Thank you for your attention.

Kind Regards
[REDACTED]

Bradley James

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Sunday, 21 June 2020 2:24 PM
To: Prity Cleary
Cc: DPE PS Portal Support Mailbox
Subject: Trinity Grammar School Redevelopment SSD 10371

Dear Prity

I am writing this objection to the above to you as concerned resident. My wife [REDACTED] and I own and reside at [REDACTED], which is located 220m from Trinity Grammar. I apologise for the lateness of the submission which was unavoidable due to distracting priorities arising as a consequence of the COVID-19 situation. I hope that it can still be considered.

We object to the proposed development for the following reasons.

1. **Increase in Student and Staff numbers and consequent impacts.** The proposal is to increase student numbers from 1,500 to 2,100 (40% increase) plus an associated increase in staff by 44. The limit of 1,500 was determined in association with past Court cases as what the school considered necessary to cater for reasonable growth. From a resident perspective this was considered excessive.

The school has been increasingly becoming an issue in the 20 years we have lived in Victoria Square because of redevelopment of houses in Seaview Street impacting the heritage significant character of the area, increasing numbers resulting in additional traffic during school weeks and noise and parking issues during school events. Schools such as this, in a residential context that primarily serve students from outside the area, need to be subject to a Masterplan that sets limits to growth. This was the outcome of earlier expansion proposals of Trinity where they ultimately accepted a limit of 1,500 students *Trinity Grammar School v Ashfield Council [2007] NSW LEC 733*.

In 2014 Trinity sought to increase student numbers to 1,700 which was not approved by the Council and refused on appeal to the Court in [Trinity Grammar School v Ashfield Council \[2015\] NSWLEC 1086](#). The Court rejected that proposal and noted a few key points:

- Trinity had not objected to the 1,500 cap in the 2007 hearing.
- An increase to 1,700 would be a material change because of the impacts that would be generated.
- On merit the additional traffic impacts, and to a lesser extent noise, would be unacceptable.

Trinity is clearly seeking an alternate approval pathway in the hope that it will slip through or by proposing an increase substantially above what was rejected by the Court they will get some compromised increase close to what they sought. The detailed assessments considered by the Court can lead to only one conclusion – that no increase in student numbers is acceptable.

2. **Traffic and parking** – As outlined in the Court case the additional traffic impacts are unacceptable. The traffic increase during school terms also occurs in Clissold Street which affects us (being a corner site). Victoria Square is being used for parking by at least school students (that I have witnessed) on occasions. The traffic and parking issues worsen considerably when the school has events. Apart from the direct issues with traffic and road noise, there are serious road safety issues with speed and poor driver behaviour. Past development, including recent major complying development which could not be fully assessed and conditioned should have been accompanied by traffic calming measures, and this should be caught up by a condition if anything is approved on the school site.
3. **Heritage and Visual Impacts** – The impact of the proposed maintenance building and new entrance off Seaview Street is totally unacceptable. While there could also be unacceptable heritage and visual impacts elsewhere, we are only concerned with Seaview Street because of its immediate effect on Victoria Square.

Trinity managed to convince Council to let them remove some large mature Hills Figs street trees in the verge of Seaview Street about 1-2 years ago. This was on the pretence that they were affecting the existing residential buildings. It turns out that these trees were opposite where the Maintenance building is proposed. The TPZs for these trees would have constrained the maintenance buildings and their removal now seems like an obvious contrivance.

Coming from the West along Seaview Street the maintenance building will be prominent, particularly as now the Fig trees are gone. The southern side of Seaview Street is the Victoria Square Heritage conservation area. The proposed maintenance building is a horribly designed building and compound in any residential area and in this case unacceptable replaces residential buildings that are important in the streetscape.

The maintenance building will be located on R2 Low Density Residential zoned land. The southern edge of the Trinity site is mostly zoned R2 and this importantly ensures that the character of the school merges with the heritage significant residential area to the north. It is understood that the school use is permissible but this does not mean that design of the development should not retain a residential character as intended for an R2 zone, which could appropriately involve adapting and using the existing residential buildings for any school use (not necessarily a maintenance depot).

A significant impact upon the heritage significance of Victoria Square will result. It will set the tone for Victoria Square when approached from the west along Seaview Street and diminish its setting.

I trust that the above comments will be considered in the assessment and I thank you in anticipation. Let me know if you have any questions.

Kind regards

[Redacted]

Director



A Level 10, 70 Pitt Street Sydney NSW 2000
P GPO Box 5013 Sydney NSW 2001
M [Redacted]
D (02) 9249 4105
T (02) 9249 4100
F (02) 9249 4111
W glnplanning.com.au