

Date: 07 November 2022

Attention: Independent Planning Commissioners

RE: Pymble Ladies College - Grey House Precinct (SSD-17424905)

We refer to the abovementioned proposed development.

As previously advised, we are the residents and owners of an adjoining property immediately to the south-west and downslope of the Pymble Ladies College (PLC) property.

We have raised significant objections against the proposed development and we continue to be deeply concerned about the impacts on our property (and other adjoining residential low density properties).

Given one of our primary concerns relates to the height, bulk and scale of the proposed building and its associated impacts in terms of the excessive visual impact, overlooking and overshadowing, we appointed an eminent expert, John Denton in CAD Draft P/L, to prepare a comprehensive set of Shadow Diagrams and photomontages. With deep regret that PLC has not provided a proper set of Shadow Diagrams, particularly as there was no Survey Plans undertaken of our property (and other adjoining properties). Furthermore, there has been no proper Photomontage provided by PLC as to the Visual Impact of the proposed building when viewed from our property (and other adjoining properties). Accordingly, we had to go to the considerable expense of appointing John Denton to prepare proper Shadow Diagrams and photomontages. This is not a criticism of John Denton whose work is clearly of the highest standard and we have been advised by various sources that he is a most eminent expert in the field. We are merely of concern and angst that we had to go to the considerable expense of appointing John Denton to prepare these Shadow Diagrams and photomontages, when we understand that it is the Applicant's responsibility to produce accurate and correct Shadow Diagrams and Photomontages.

We consider that the attached Shadow Diagrams and Photomontage clearly reinforce our very significant concerns about this proposed development in terms of overshadowing and visual bulk. How can such structure be considered which immediately adjoins low density residential housing and sits higher than our properties, thus worsening these impacts.

We fully respect that the PLC is entitled to redevelop its school facilities for the benefit of the school community and the general community. We, however, cannot understand why this excessively tall and bulky new building is placed in a corner of the PLC property, immediately adjacent to low density housing. The height, bulk and scale of the proposed development is totally contrary to the low density housing immediately to the south. The height, bulk and scale is exacerbated by the fact that our property (and other low density residential properties), sits lower than the school property and the proposed 5 storey building. As a result, the visual impact of the proposed building will be exacerbated by all adjoining residents (including ourselves) looking up at this very tall and bulky building. Furthermore, we will suffer a range of adverse impacts including Visual Impact, Privacy Loss, Overshadowing and Acoustic and Overlooking Impact. Whilst, we have been advised that the issues of Privacy and Acoustics can be resolved by Conditions of Consent, the issues of Visual Impact and Overshadowing can't be resolved unless modifications can be made to the setback, mass and bulk of the building. We note that Ku-Ring-Gai Council has raised significant concerns about the bulk and mass of the proposed building and we are very concerned.

It appears to us that our amenity is going to be seriously compromised.

We respectfully ask you to review the attached Photomontage and Shadow Diagrams. Can you imagine living next door to a building bulk and mass of the size currently proposed?

The above concerns will be the subject of a further submission on our behalf which will summarise all our points of objection. A further exhibition of additional material and public submission is required because recent submissions by PLC in response to a significant level of concerns raised by Ku-Ring-Gai Council and other parties raised concerns in our mind regarding the responses by PLC. Simply put, we consider that the responses by PLC are not adequate and do not properly respond to our significant concerns.

Many thanks for considering this submission and our future submission. We will be forwarding our further submission when additional material responding to the IPC request on 16 September 2022 is available.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.