Submission to the Independent Planning Commission

17th. February 2021

Reference : Blue Gum Community School SSD10444

Ian Cubitt

4 Rosemead Road Hornsby.

Part 1.

Site meeting at Mount Errington 9th February,2021 1pm, where I was an Observer.

As a professional Builder of the last 26 years, I believe my comment in relation to issues, on the agenda, of that meeting,raised the following concerns.

As the architect went through the plans, the detail of how the changes were to take place where extremely vague, both, on the plans, and in the mind of the architect. Having worked on restorations, the details of attachment of the changes, are always, clearly detailed, before the work is accepted as appropriate, for changes to the internal, and or external, of a listed building.

This is not in 4 key elements of the proposed project.

1. The handrail to the front elevation, top floor handrail
2. The attachment to the glass covers to the internal staircase,, that can be done , and show appropriate compliance, and be removed, leaving no heritage damage.
3. The external staircase construction.
4. There is no detail of the enclosing of the rear verandah, to become the admin office

With regard to the external staircase, no structural engineer”s drawings, have been made available. As shown on the plans supplied on the day, the construction, will require two structural columns, one descending through the ground floor verandah [which is enclosed], and one through the enclosed activity room 2.

Clearly these structural Steel columns will need to be grounded on rock, or a concrete footing, which will result in the destruction of the floor in both rooms, and severely compromise the proposed use of both rooms, and the heritage of both rooms.

In it seems to me for such a unique heritage item, Mount Errington, the applicants plans are deficient for any planning approval of a heritage item.

It is expressed by the applicant in the “comments to the IPC on the draft conditions”, that the applicant be not required, to complete this, only after the operation of the premise has started, this request, should be denied, in the strongest possible terms, and should be required to be seen and approved, before any work is commenced.[I will refer to this in Part 2

To close on Part 1, I ask the IPC to ensure the historical value to this property is preserved, in rejecting this application.
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Part 2.

Comments on the IPC Draft Conditions – SSD-10444.

B4 Subclause [e]

This clause should not be amended, as with the nominated colours, they do not meet the heritage requirements.

D2.

Given the issues related to the applicants plans, as noted in part 1, under no circumstances, should this clause be amended. The poor quality of the details of the applicants plans, with regard to heritage detail, clearly justifies this clause remaining.

E15 Subclause [b]

Given the applicant has chosen to create a school and kindergarten, in a quiet residential area, totally unsuitable for the proposed, the use of it on weekends, and nights, must be strictly not permitted, as recommended under planning assessment.

E15 Subclause [e]

This clause should not be amended, this application, is a commercial operation, operating in a residential area, and as such, needs to have waste collection be managed in times as to not to inflict further noise upon the resident, if being done at inappropriate times.

With respect to E15, the residents of this community have already provided, dissenting expert reports as to the validity of the NG Child”s report. This was provided to the planning department, with the applicants’ original submission, and with applicant’s amended submission.

We the residents, request the IPC commissioners, give strength, to the residents Acoustic Reports, as it is clear the planning department did not.

E36 Comments to full clause.

The residents are of the opinion that the NG Child and Associates reports are not unbiased.

With respect to contamination, given the proposal for a kindergarten, and school, it is appropriate to have the soil testing to be completed by an independent authority, selected by the IPC, and or planning department, as it was with the Heritage. As a current active owner of a building company , we continue to find issues with Asbestos, and lead paint[for example] in the Sydney metropolitan area,the fact that this application is for children, gives merit to the strength of an independent report.

F1 Comments.

The residents request that the hours of operation remain as noted in F1.
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F6 Subclause [a]

The residents request that there be no changes to this clause.

F6 Subclause [e]

The residents consider the use of the site on weekends, must not be permitted on any circumstances. The applicant request’s for the use of the site for ancillary activities, on weekends, is inappropriate, the clause should not be changed.

With regard to, Green Travel Plans. The residents regard, the travel situation, to and from the site, to be a substantial problem, with regard to the application. The applicant, states in the application, that 25%of the children attending will walk to the site.

Travel surveys will provide evidence that this assumption, will be proven to be wrong, and the requirement for this type of survey must remain.

Part 3.

IPC meeting with the Applicant 4th of February 2021 at 1pm.

Comments.

MS O’Brian Planning Ingenuity 20-40 P-3

It is stated that the proposal is in the public’s interest.

If that is to include the residents, the application to Hornsby council received 89 submissions against the proposal, and 52 submissions, to the planning department, opposed, not including dissenting Acoustic and Traffic reports.

Is says that the application, will create a community. We consider we already have a community.

With 52 submissions from residents who are the community, it seems this statement, to be completely incorrect.

The area around this application, is an area of population, with children of working age. The application, does not take that into account. This confirms that the children attending the school, and kindergarten, will need to travel from outside the area, to the site.

It follows the community created will not represent the current community. Hornsby council area has one of the best kindergarten, and school situations in Sydney. The children travelling to this application, will pass both kindergarten, and primary schools, both state , private, and community run.

Ms O’Brien cont/d at 5P-5

Transcript stated.

“ so I guess we don’t want the neighbours to sort of just pin down to those hours and maybe have concerns when there’s people on site slighty before that”.
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Ms McLachlan speaking 15 P-9 Quote

“I suspect that, given that there is a lot of available parking in the surrounding streets, that some preschool parents would choose to park on the streets surrounding the school land walk in”

That comment is directly against the planning departments request that all children arriving by car are dropped off within the grounds of Mount Errington, and the applicant acknowledges that.

Further the applicant confirms at 30-35 P-9, the reliance of parking outside the school grounds.

Comments of Mr Pilton at 25 P-9 re the problem associated with Ms McLachlan’s Comments, only add ‘s weight to the resident’s concerns.

If restricted parking in Rosemead road is to be implement, outside the school, where will the residents park.

Again on page P-16, through to P-17, the conversation turns to the site meeting on the 9th of February 2021, nominated as one hour.

It confirms that Ms McLachlan, was to prepare an agenda, and provide to all those attending,

Is wish to confirm that I and Bob Sendt, the 2 attending resident observer’s were not offers or given a copy of that agenda.

Part 4.

IPC Public Meeting 10th February 2021 10am

Comments:

Re Ms Harragon

We the residents submitted two traffic reports

One in February 2020

One amended in December2020

The applicant was given 2 months to reply to the questions from the planning department, and they took 6 months to reply, with the amended plans.

The residents were given, only 6 weeks to reply to the amended plane, and produce an amended Acoustic Report, and Traffic reports.

We believe the statement by Ms Harragon at 20 P-5, is incorrect.

The planning department clearly did not consider both our expert traffic reports.
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The traffic issue was the main concern of the residents who made objections.

The residents live there, and live with the traffic issues, yet the issue was disregarded, by planning.

Given the IPC, has been made clearly aware of the residents reports, which clearly indicate the impact of the application will have on the traffic, we expect the IPC, will give merit to our reports.

Comments:

I would like to draw the attention of the IPC commissioners to the follow parts of the submission, and hope merit will be considered to this.

Ms Roberts on behalf of the Hornsby Shire Historical Society.

40 P15/4 P16/10-15 P16/30 P16

Ms Primrose

45 P16-5 P-17/10-15 P-17/20-35 P17/5-15 P 18/5 P-19/30-40 P-19

Mr Ruddock [ Speaking as a local resident]

15 p-20/40-45 P-20- 5-25 P-21/

Mr Nicita

 The whole statement.

Ms Friswell

The whole statement

Ms Friswell live on the corner of Rosemead Road, and William street, this development will have major impact on Ms Friswells properties amenity.

Mr Timms

The whole statement

As with Ms Friswell, being Between Ms Friswells and Mount Errington, the development will have a major impact on Mr and Mrs Timms, and their young family.

Mr Wells

The whole statement

The residents of this area have enjoyed many discussions with Graeme Wells, as being the keeper of knowledge , imparting to us the new ones to the Mount Errington precinct. My family, has lived here for 25 years, and every time I chat with Graeme something new is always learned.
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Mr Foubister

The whole Statement

Mr Sendt

The whole statement

Ms Moffat

The whole statement

Mr Black

The whole statement

I gave up my position to speak, and requested the IPC, give it to Mr Black.

I considered I have

 said enough, and after being an observer at the inspection, on the 9th of February, and walked through Mount Errington, for the first time in 5 years, became overcome with the damage that is now being considered to this home, for what reason?

The concern shown by the residents of this heritage area, for such a little gain in the way of small children’s education, is overpowering.

This property cannot become another tragedy of development, not needed, the impact of Acoustic and Traffic, are significant, but nothing as what is envisaged for the Mount Errington area, and the communities, love of it

Regards, Ian cubitt.