



---

# Lane Cove Bushland & Conservation Society Inc

---

P.O Box 989, Lane Cove NSW 1595

ABN 50 518 833 556

20<sup>th</sup> April 2018

The General Manager,  
Lane Cove Council

## **DA57/2018, 30 Kingslangley Road, Greenwich – Greenwich Primary School.**

The LCB&CS has been in existence for 47 years advocating for and protecting the environment of Lane Cove for the whole of that time. (some members have been involved with Greenwich school longer than that).

We are concerned about the impact of the loss of trees and general amenity that will result from this upgrade.

We commend the intentions to extend the hall, convert existing classrooms into other uses and the new classroom/library building to provide permanent accommodation in lieu of the existing temporary demountables. We agree with the relocation of the tennis court/basketball court.

### **Loss of trees**

Our main concern is the loss of trees from the area of the new building and its outdoor learning spaces. We feel that there has been no effort in attempting to maintain as many trees as possible by modifying the design to accommodate the trees and taking into account the natural features of the site. In particular the bank of existing boulders will be extensively denuded of trees if this plan is implemented in full. The existing trees here are primarily native to this landscape and should be used to complement the natural form of the site.

The landscape plan shows no new trees in this area which is a pity and should be rectified.

We totally disagree with the location of the main ramp and external stairs which require the removal of 7 healthy reasonably young turpentine trees (T14 – T20). Although the site is well provided with this species it is important to maintain continuity over the whole site and not to leave areas without this species.

There is a viable alternative to the location of this ramp. Move it to the north side of the hall where the existing path is located. This would entail the removal of one tree, T33, now recommended to be saved, but would retain the 7 trees now slated to be removed. This change would make no difference to the internal planning of the building and little difference to the layout of the ramp and stair but would retain a significant stand of trees.

The arborist's report whilst strictly adhering to the codes regarding RPZs does not offer any suggestions to reduce the impact on these trees and thus save some trees that he is recommending to be removed. We offer some suggestions about possible modification of design and efforts required to save more trees.

T2, T3, T4, and T5 should all be saved. We cannot see that T4 is any closer to the building than the others, so why is it recommended for removal?. All of these trees are in good health and are long lived trees.

Along the boundary between T5 and T26, besides those trees recommended for retention, there are a number of other trees not listed that should, in the short term, also be saved – including the palms. T12. These trees should remain and care taken with the excavation to ensure minimal disturbance to the RPZ. There may be a need to trim some branches near the roof level of the building.

T14 – T20. These trees must be saved. This can be done by moving the ramp and stair as describe earlier in this submission.

T21, T31 and T32. We are really concerned about the loss of tree T21 which looks as though it is an original tree and is possibly the best example of the species on the site. It could be over 100 years old. We wish the building could be moved to save this tree but accept that this is not possible.

T22 we cannot see how this tree fits the category for removal. If the reason is the disability access ramp this should be moved to descend parallel to the south face of the building. This would also add to the overall area of native grasses shown on the landscape plan.

T23 Once again can this could be saved by reducing the stepped walling here and using a single retaining wall as far as possible from the tree?

T30 This tree should also be saved, if necessary by adjusting the seating and ramp layout.

If the main ramp and stair are moved as suggested above, T33 will have to be removed (it is one to be saved) but this a small price to pay to save trees T14 – T20.

### **Other comments**

The 33% increase in capacity is also commended although we still question if this will be sufficient by 2020 – 21 when the full impact of the present developments in St Leonards will be completed and occupied. By then the St Leonards South area may be on stream and that will add over 2000 new residences with a corresponding increase in school aged children.

We commend the extent of solar panels on the roof and question whether the power generated would be sufficient to provide air conditioning to at least the library level. This would help protect the books and equipment and the cool air would filter down the stair well to help the lower levels.

We do not see any indication of water tanks to collect rainwater from the roof and its reuse. This should be included in this environmentally sensitive area.

We recommend as part of this major works program that the degraded area from Kingslingley road, east of the access road, be included in the landscaping modification and made presentable. It is the first impression that is seen on the approach from this road and it is important to show pride in the institution by a pleasant entry approach.

We urge Council to consider the environment of this site in determining the number of trees that can be saved as well as the amenity of the neighbouring residents to the west who have a new structure close to their previously uninhibited boundary. Consideration for the whole site should be a major concern and not just the provision of the new building and its outdoor areas.

The LCB&CS requests to be informed of the decisions taken on the points raised above regarding the trees and the reasons for those decisions.

Doug Stuart for the Committee,  
Lane Cove Bushland and Conservation Society Inc.