
Sent: 8/02/2020 7:08:23 AM
Subject: submissions for DA2019/1420 John Colet School
Attachments: DA2019-1420 John Colet School.docx;

Attached please find my submission for DA2019/1420 John Colet School
Regards,
Anna-Louise Ainsworth

Anna-Louise Ainsworth
10 Patrick St
Beacon Hill NSW 2100

5 January 2020

The General Manager
Northern Beaches Council
725 Pittwater Rd
Dee Why NSW 2099

Attention: Nick England

DA2019/1420
6 & 8 Wyatt Ave BELROSE
Alterations and Additions to an existing school

I have recently become aware of this proposal by John Colet School and oppose this latest overdevelopment.

I find the proposal very confusing. There is a DA (2019/1420) and a Modification (Mod2019/0627) that have been submitted at the same time. The DA appears to relate to a previous development proposal from 2015 (DA2015/0558) and seeks to implement part of a future stage of that DA – but with changes.

Making changes to the 2015 DA would not comply with the consent conditions for the 2015 approval, so it appears that the applicant has also submitted a Modification relating to DA2015/0558, to change the original plan.

Are we in a Back to the Future movie? After building the first stage of their 2015 proposal, is the applicant now going back in time to get approval for a modification so that today they can submit a development application that reflects the future past (or the past future...?)

This is just ridiculous. How are people expected to understand what's going on and what's really being proposed? The school submitted a "masterplan" in 2015, supposedly to stop all this nonsense. Council should not accept this dual submission. The school should be made to do one thing at a time.

From what I can understand of the plans and documents, the school proposes another huge building along Wyatt Avenue. This will join the other huge buildings they have already imposed on the streetscape, to create one continuous, multi-storey block that has the appearance of cheap apartments or some sort of business park.

CURRENT IMPACTS – PARKING AND TRAFFIC

As a former resident, a user of the Wyatt Ave sports facilities, and a frequent visitor to this location, I am shocked and saddened to see what has happened to this once beautiful, quiet, bushland neighbourhood. The school has become a monstrosity, the lovely bushland setting is gone and the traffic congestion – if one happens to make the mistake of visiting at school rush hour – is appalling.

You'd be lucky to get a parking spot near the oval, what with all the staff cars that take up the spaces for most of the day, though they're a little more cunning these days and have obviously been told to spread out the parking along the street so it doesn't look like they are using all the car park for themselves. I see the same staff cars in mostly the same spots every day.

School staff are supposed to park inside the school – I see that this is a previous consent condition – but the school does not appear able to fit them in. They previously had to remove parking spots because they were damaging bushland inside the school. Then in 2015, they proposed multiple parking spots that were too small or unusable due to their placement and the difficulty of manoeuvring into them, along with the access road being too narrow and unsafe. Judging by how many cars are parked outside the school, they need a lot more spaces than they claim. If they can't fit the staff parking in the grounds, as they are required to do, then it means the site is too small and is being overdeveloped and the application should be refused. **Where is the amended parking plan that was supposed to be submitted for future development proposals?**

This DA does not comply with consent conditions for DA2015/0558.

IMPACT - BUILDING SCALE AND SET-BACKS

The building is big and bulky and whilst it may somewhat fit in with the school's other (non-compliant) big bulky buildings, I don't see why that should be a reason to approve it. Rather, it makes the situation worse as the total appearance will dominate the street.

The proposal doesn't comply with building setbacks at the front and side, or the height, which is way over the limit - this makes the whole thing even more imposing. It's just greedy and selfish to keep trying to break the rules that were put in place to preserve the amenity and character of the neighbourhood. This doesn't reflect what the Desired Future Character is supposed to be, yet they keep getting away with it. Please do not approve this further blight on the neighbourhood.

There is supposed to be dense landscaping to hide the building and compensate for the removal of so much vegetation and tree canopy on the site. I don't see this at all. It's mostly grassed for their new playground and a couple of trees that will

do nothing to hide that western side – the building is 11 metres tall! There is barely any room to plant, only 5m, which does not allow for a dense buffer, and most of the other plants are small shrubs.

This site used to be so beautiful, with native iris and orchids and the sort of stunning native plants that most of us could only wish to have on our premises. It's all so badly eroded and cleared now and there are children running all through what's left. The school should be ashamed at what they have done, yet they keep pushing for more. They should be required to plant local trees, not exotic species in the playground – at least that would provide something for the birds.

STUDENT POPULATION

How many students are there at the school? They have had so many applications for increases and trial periods that my head spins. They wanted 350 for the later stage but only have approval for 285. The application doesn't say how many they have now. How can the impact of student increases be assessed if we don't know how many students are currently attending?

OPEN SPACE MANAGEMENT

Is there a new Open Space Management Plan? They have moved the playground and made the building bigger and because of this, the covered COLA structure must go somewhere else. I don't see a plan to address these changes with this application. They state in their plan that there will be less outdoor space even though there are more students than ever, with more to come.

Will they keep relying on Wyatt Reserve and the children's playground there? Belrose-Terrey Hills Soccer Club have complained about the damage to the oval in the north east corner where the school plays baseball and has either cleared, or worn away, areas of turf back to bare earth for their baseball diamond. Do they have permission for this? Do they have a management strategy to prevent the bushland at the rear of the school from becoming a wasteland due to constant trampling and erosion?

CONCLUSION

The applicant has been pursuing an aggressive business and marketing plan for many years now. The impact on the neighbourhood has been huge. This area is under the WLEP2000 and so developments should comply with the statements in that plan, regardless of whether the applicant has a different agenda. This is a high intensity, high impact development that continues to grow and leverage further approvals based on past non-compliance.

I don't think that just because the school has promoted itself to prospective parents a certain way and promised a future that is clearly beyond site capacity, that this application should be considered worthy. The community have a right to some relief from this relentless site development.

I urge Council to reject this non-compliant development.

Yours sincerely,

(Mrs) Anna-Louise Ainsworth