

3 June 2021

The Commissioners  
Office of the Independent Planning Commission NSW  
Level 3, 201 Elizabeth Street  
SYDNEY NSW 2000

- By Electronic Submission

Dear Commissioners,

**Roseville College – Sport and Wellbeing Centre (SSD-9912)**

We wish to object to the proposed development at Roseville College and we set out below our grounds for objecting.

We also lend our support for and agreement with the submission made by Mr Wayne Leamon and Mrs Kristine Leamon of 39 Bancroft Avenue, Roseville (the “**Leamon Submission**”), which is the property most directly and adversely impacted by this proposal. We agree with the analysis and points made in their submission and would hope that the Commission gives proper consideration to their points and the impact of the proposal on them and their ability to maintain quite enjoyment of their home – something that is clearly missing from the DPIE’s State Significant Development Assessment (the “**DPIE Assessment**”).

The DPIE make the conclusion in their Assessment that the impacts on 39 Bancroft Avenue, are either acceptable or mitigated. In our view, nothing in their report substantiates that conclusion. We would submit that if the construction is allowed to encroach anywhere onto the property which is 37 Bancroft, then the impacts to 39 Bancroft Avenue are material and largely unmitigable. If we consider the question of the market value of the property at 39 Bancroft pre and post the proposal, it is without doubt lower, given 37 Bancroft currently acts as a “buffer” between the school and that property.

In addition to the points put forward in the Leamon Submission, and as counter to some of the justifications made in the DPIE Assessment, we would add the following:

1. The North Shore is not suffering from a shortage (now or forecast) of places at private girl schools. The community is well served and consequently there is high competition between schools for current and potential students. Consequently, there is something of an “arms race” amongst the schools regarding the provision of facilities. This is evidenced by recent projects at Abbotsleigh, Pymble Ladies College, Ravenswood School for Girls, Monte St Angelo and Wenona. We appreciate that Roseville College is looking to maintain some parity with the facilities on offer at these schools and agree the school should be able to upgrade its facilities. However, the school should not be allowed to continually expand its footprint to do so, particularly if that involves the acquisition and demolition of residential homes. Roseville is at

somewhat of a disadvantage because it is embedded in an established residential neighborhood. However, it should operate within that constraint and seek to differentiate its offering in other ways.

The school bought the property at 37 Bancroft Avenue knowing full well its zoning, but chose to speculate on their ability to ultimately have the property demolished and rezoned. It is the only buyer who could have operated with that intent. The condition of the property is a direct reflection of the school's custodianship and intent. If the school is to be rewarded for its speculation that it could ultimately prevail against existing planning constraints imposed by the HCAs bordering the school boundary, it provides a very poor precedent for the community and creates much uncertainty.

2. It was argued that the proposal provides community benefits through potential shared use. These arguments are spurious. The vast majority of the development is specific to the educational offering of the school and have no "shared use" element. This is established by the positioning of the development as improvement of existing facilities. The sports fields are surplus to the community needs as they are already met via the neighboring Roseville tennis courts and other facilities. It is also doubtful that a sensible access arrangement could be put in place. The existing facilities are not used by the community and there is no good reason why that would change. The swimming pool may offer some learn to swim classes, however, it is questionable that there is the demand or need for this service, outside of the student body, at a level that would make this point a compelling point – and certainly not one that justifies the expansion of the school property beyond its current operating border.
3. We regard the analysis within the school's submission and the DPIE Assessment on the traffic impacts as completely inadequate – it is nothing more than a rather flawed desktop review. The reports does not take into account the fact that the Glencroft – Bancroft – Wandella rout is a major feeder for people commuting from Roseville and suburbs north of Roseville, into the CBD or North Sydney. The route use to be one used by cyclists, however, the traffic increase has seen cyclists divert to different routes. The suggestion that Bancroft Avenue, between Wandella Avenue and Glencroft Avenue and then Hill Street could accommodate 12m trucks during the suggested hours is deeply flawed. This is evidenced every time the school requires busses for some excursion etc and the roads end in gridlock. The DPIE Assessment has not investigated this aspect with sufficient rigor or objectivity. The analysis further fails to take into account the "seasonality" of private vehicle use by students as the school. As the year progresses and more students obtain their Provisional license, there is a notable increase in traffic and competition for on street parking. The suggestion that heavy vehicle movements would the largely confined to school holiday periods is noble, however, anyone who has had any experience with construction projects knows that this is unlikely to be achieved.

As residents, we are deeply concerned by the proposed development will further reduce the Heritage character of the area by introducing large scale buildings which are not in character with the local area and which will dominate the skyline of the streets in the Heritage Conservation Areas (HCA) surrounding the development. Furthermore, we regard the demolition of a residential property that forms part of a HCA, for a project that provides no real community benefit and is hardly really "in the Public Interest" as a poor planning precedent.

We do not accept the school's proposition that it has investigated ALL options to provide the facilities whilst remaining within the current school operating boundary. We would posit that the school's council needs to justify the speculation and investment they made in purchasing 37 Bancroft Avenue.

Yours faithfully,

Sean and Melissa Hogan