



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1051826

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH APPLICANT

RE: ST ALOYSIUS' COLLEGE REDEVELOPMENT

PANEL: ANNEWISE TUOR
CHRIS WILSON
SOO-TEE CHEONG

ASSISTING PANEL: ALANA JELFS

APPLICANT: MARK TANNOCK
DAVID WUNDER
MICHAEL MORGAN
ANDREW PENDER
SUE CAI
CHRIS WILSON
ASHLEIGH SMITH
DEAN BRODIE

LOCATION: IPC OFFICES
LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES

DATE: 11.08 AM, WEDNESDAY, 31 JULY 2019

MS A. TUOR: So good afternoon and welcome. Ah, before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders past and present. Welcome to the meeting today on the proposal whereby St Aloysius' College Limited, the applicant, is
5 seeking approval for a concept proposal and detailed stage 1 works to redevelop the site, including concept proposal for the staged redevelopment of the junior, senior and main campuses, including partial demolition, refurbishment and alterations and additions to existing buildings to provide new teaching and learning spaces and new multipurpose sporting facilities; and detailed stage 1 works at the senior and main
10 campuses, comprising alterations and a ground-floor addition to the Wyalla building on the senior campus and internal refurbishment and upgrades to existing teaching and learning facilities; and the demolition and rebuild of the north-east building – wing building on the main campus, construction of a new infill building in the existing quadrangle and associated refurbishment of north wing, south wing, great
15 hall and chapel. My name is Annelise Tuor. I'm the chair of the IPC panel. Joining me are my fellow commissioners Chris Wilson and Soo-Tee Cheong. The other attendees at the meeting are – and I'll just get you to introduce yourselves.

MS S. CAI: Sue Cai from PMDL.
20

MR M. MORGAN: Michael Morgan, St Aloysius' College.

MR D. WUNDER: Ah, David Wunder, St Aloysius' College.

25 MR C. WILSON: Chris Wilson, Willowtree Planning.

MR M. TANNOCK: Mark Tannock, St Aloysius' College.

MS A. SMITH: Ashleigh Smith, Willowtree Planning.
30

MR D. BRODIE: Dean Brodie, Positive Traffic.

MR A. PENDER: Andrew Pender, PMDL.

35 MS TUOR: Thank you. Ah, in the interest of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the commission's website. This meeting is one part of the commission's decision-making process. It is taking place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of
40 information upon which the commission will base its decision.

It is important for the commission to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and you are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any
45 information in writing, which we will then put up on our website. I request that all attendees provide a – all attendees introduce themselves before speaking for the first

time and for attendees to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other, to ensure accuracy of the transcript. So we'll now begin. Um, you were sent a suggested agenda, um, and I think the first part of that was for you to briefly explain the concept proposal and stage 1 works, including the proposed addition to the
5 Wyalla building, the quadrant infill building and the roof terrace. So - - -

MS SMITH: So firstly – Ashleigh Smith from Willowtree Planning – we'd just like to thank you for the opportunity to present today. Ah, as you duly noted in your, um – just previously that it is – we are seeking approval for concept and stage 1 build
10 form approval for the junior, main and senior campus at St Aloysius' College. The project has gone through comprehensive consultation to date, both including with government agencies and also with the general public and local residents both immediately surrounding the school and to the broader locality, and it's the position of the department that they have recommended approval, and we do endorse that
15 approval, but I will hand over to Andrew Pender from PMDL to go through the presentation.

MS TUOR: Thank you.

20 MR PENDER: Okay. Um, Andrew Pender, PMDL. Thank you, Ashleigh. Um, I'll sit and talk to the microphone, I think. So what I'd like to do is just, ah, run through some of the key elements of the design and try to respond in particular to the items that are in your suggested agenda as, ah, some of the key matters of consideration. So, um, as you – the commissioners would be aware, the college, um,
25 occupies three sites in Kirribilli, the northernmost being the junior school, ah, the middle of the three Wyalla senior campus, and across the road, on Upper Pitt Street, the main campus, ah, which is subject to the majority of the work under this application.

30 I'll deal with the, um, concept proposal for the junior school initially. Um, this comprises two parts: firstly, a level 2 addition to provide additional teaching and learning space above the existing two-storey, um – two-storey building, ah, fronting the laneway, and also an almost completely, um, submerged underground, ah, basketball court and support facilities along the Crescent Place laneway, ah,
35 boundary alignment. So that'll be a multipurpose facility which, ah, provides, um, sports and other, ah, general facilities for the boys there, for the students there, and it retains – in fact, improves the available play area at, ah, the ground plane, which is currently quite uneven at the northern half of that part of the site at the minute.

40 So there's, ah, significant improvement to the outdoor amenity as well as the provision of much-needed multipurpose space for this part of the school. Using the fall of the land, as you can see in the sections – particularly at the bottom section, if you can see that – um, we managed to keep the bulk of this facility, um, you know, below ground and therefore having, ah, minimal to negligible impact on the
45 surrounding area. You can see the red dotted line there, being the boundary alignment along the Crescent Lane frontage, so it's only a couple of metres above that, along that fence line. The other side of Crescent Lane is the rear of properties

to, I believe, Carabella Street. So it's laneways, ah, garage doors and rear access and the like that, ah – that that faces onto.

5 Um, you can see they're also – ah, by using the fall of the land and, ah, creating a
sunken area, that we're able to get natural light and air into that, um, semi-
underground space, which is – obviously improves the amenity there, um, with very
minimal impacts on the surrounding neighbourhood. You can see on the left of the
bottom section, the right of the top – ah, top section, we're able to retain, um, a
10 significant amount of the existing vegetation along the Bligh Street, ah, Crescent
Lane corner, um, which was, ah, something that came out in the public consultation
process, so we put some additional emphasis upon that. Um, and, as you're aware,
that's a concept proposal, and, um, as reflected in the proposed conditions, any
further consents would have to go through a further development consent process
somewhere down the track. Um, would you like to – me to continue, or will we take,
15 ah, questions and discussion as we go through on each of the sites?

MS TUOR: I think it may be more efficient if we, um, do – just do it as we go
through. Um, so one question that I had was just in relation to the roof forms, and if
20 you go back to the slide before, um – so the central roof form sort of goes up to a
point, whereas I think, um, when you look at the plan that you showed earlier, which
shows the existing roof, um, it's a roof form that is more similar to the ones to the
left of the slide. So, ah, part of the - - -

MR PENDER: Oh, sorry, I'm – yes, I understand.
25

MS TUOR: Yeah. So part of the discussion we've been having is that, obviously,
by going up to that point, you get an RL of – I think it was forty-four point
something or rather - - -

30 MR PENDER: Mmhmm.

MS TUOR: - - - um, which is a – makes it a higher, ah, more apparent, um, roof
form than what could be achieved with a different form of roof, and, um, just, I
suppose, some commentary on whether that additional height has – competes with
35 the tower and the sort of, um, prominence of the heritage item and also whether that
additional height has any, um, impact or increased overshadowing on the upper
windows of the community centre in, um, the other side of the road. So I suppose
it's, yeah - - -

40 MR PENDER: Okay.

MS TUOR: - - - whether that additional height has impacts and how it relates to the
heritage building.

45 MR PENDER: Okay. There's a couple of parts to that. Obviously, we were
mindful – and this is reflected in the heritage, um, impact statement, um, that was
part of the application. We were mindful that the, um – the tower on the heritage

item there, the original school, needed to retain its prominence. We believe it does. The roof forms are generated by the geometry of the footprint we're seeking, which sits in from the external walls of the existing building so as to, ah, you know, reduce the overall mass and scale of the – of this additional level. Um, we'd be open to
5 looking at revising that roof form to a hip to reduce the height of that ridge, if that was the result without impacting the available floor area, certainly, and that could be something that we could entertain in a condition for further consideration in subsequent development applications. In terms of the shadowing, if you'd like us to investigate that, I'd have to take that on notice.

10 MS TUOR: All right. Thank you.

MR S. CHEONG: May I - - -

15 MS TUOR: Yes.

MR CHEONG: The entry through the, ah – through the campus, is it coming from the, ah – what is it – the Crescent Place? Right?

20 MR BRODIE: No. It comes from Burton Street on the northern side.

MR CHEONG: Burton Street.

25 MR BRODIE: Yep.

MR CHEONG: All right.

MR PENDER: So that's at the – behind the original schoolhouse on that particular
30 3D view.

MR CHEONG: Right. So - - -

MR PENDER: There is a secondary pedestrian gate on Blich Street.

35 MR CHEONG: Okay.

MR PENDER: But the main entry, security point and reception point for the students and parents arriving is on the northern side of the campus. Crescent Street is a laneway; there's no access off there.

40 COM C. WILSON: So access straight into the existing

MR PENDER: There's actually a part of the earlier new build, there's a cleft between the new build and the original schoolhouse is the main reception area. It's a
45 glazed two-storey connecting piece between the new and the old. That was, I believe, a 1990s piece of work.

MS TUOR: And, at the moment, there's a drop-off space for five cars, is that right? So how does that work in the morning and the afternoon in terms of just people queuing and – do you have an overall understanding of how the, sort of, drop-off and pick-up works with the existing school usage?

5

MR PENDER: I will defer to traffic of the school for that one.

MR BRODIE: Dean Brodie traffic. So in terms of that, Burton Street has about five spaces which generates about five cars every two minutes, so about 300-vehicle capacity in that particular one. Our motor travel surveys that we did of every student and staff across all campuses show that the passenger as a – you know, travelling as a passenger in a vehicle was fairly low. It's more prevalent in the morning, because it coincides with business hours, and it's less prevalent in the afternoon. But there hasn't been any issues around the school to date in terms of that. The other two

10

15

campuses have a similar arrangement in their frontage streets where council have imposed these restrictions that run for an hour and a half in the morning and an hour and a half in the afternoon to respond to that kiss and drop to the campuses.

MS TUOR: But the junior school have the higher percentage of children being understandably dropped off.

20

MR BRODIE: Correct. Yeah, being younger – absolutely correct, yes.

COM C. WILSON: Are they actively managed?

25

MR BRODIE: Yeah, there's staff at the gate.

COM WILSON: Okay.

MR BRODIE: It's similar to the inner-city school we're doing now where you've only got, sort of, the footpath areas to have children alight and pick up, so it's a fairly good system that they've - - -

30

MS TUOR: Thank you. Any other questions? No. Move on.

35

MR PENDER: Thank you. So moving on to the Wyalla campus, this is a building predominantly occupied by the year 11 and 12 students, although there is a pool and basketball court facility in the Dalton Hall part of this site which was built about 2009/10. What we're looking at here is the proposed single-storey addition to the Robertson Lane, the – the rear of the original Wyalla building. You can see in the –

40

in the foreground the corner of a stairwell which was part of a 1990 edition and in the distance, the furthest form is also a 1990 edition.

So the – the rear part of the building that is the original fabric is where we are adding our single storey addition that you can see there in the photo montage. I will also add the proposal does include the removal of the window-rattling air condition, which was still on the 3D. The problem with this building as a teaching and learning

45

building at the moment is that it was originally conceived as a number of smaller rooms, and so it's very difficult to timetable boys – senior or middle school boys into – into the smaller rooms. So the – the purpose of this invention is to create as many larger format – IE normal – classroom-sized spaces as we can, and part of
5 doing that is to create these two large spaces I'm indicating here by this addition, which is the rectangle I'm badly scribing there. The original wall line is along here.

So that provides us, in total, through this building with the completion of the various stages, 12 appropriately sized general learning areas, which suits the streaming and –
10 and structure of the year 11 and 12 at the college. And then we're using the smaller rooms, some of which are currently timetabled, such as these yellow rooms in the original fabric down here – just repurposing those as breakout and seminar-type spaces. So distinguishing the bookable from the timetabled spaces, in an educational sense. So it's really trying to align the building with the needs of the school in terms
15 of its timetabling and class structures. At the moment, there – there are some difficulties in accommodating full class sizes in some of these rooms.

The other occupied level of the Wyalla building is this level 2, and you can see there the roof of the simply addition below, and the size of the rooms that we're dealing
20 with in – in here above are obviously challenging for, you know, 25 to – to 30 young males. But then on the left of the plan, this room here is currently two smaller, undersized classrooms. That's part of the 1990 work, so we're combining those into larger spaces to – to get a smaller number of spaces, but an increased number of
25 appropriately-sized full class spaces.

The further two levels of this, which I haven't included in this pack, are to the left on the roof of the Dalton Hall building – the 2010 building – and that's an internal renovation of existing classrooms. So the impacts on the Wyalla building are this
30 single storey addition to the rear, in a courtyard that is facing the lane and is, uh, not used, uh, as open space, uh, by the school due to its location and supervision issues, and then just minor internal refurbishments. And, ah, if you've read the heritage impact statement, we've gone to some, uh, trouble there to maintain some of the fabric. We're retaining some of the heritage window elements, uh, that are being removed. Uh, they go into storage. We're retaining, um, as much as we can of – of
35 the, uh, fabric and features of the building that the – the minor internal works. So that's – you know, a very simple part of the – the overall picture.

MS TUOR: And the need to accommodate – um, the two extra-large classrooms, that can't be dealt with with your additional to the building – to the – on the left-hand
40 side there?

MR PENDER: Uh, this is not an addition; this is existing space. So - - -

MS TUOR: No, on the lower level.
45

MR PENDER: Oh, okay. I will go back to that one.

MS TUOR: Will you take out the walls and make those two larger?

MR PENDER: So – the two large ones here, yes.

5 MS TUOR: Yes. So that couldn't have been accommodated in other buildings on the site, including the – you know, the added storey? No. No, we haven't got another storey

MR PENDER: No, we haven't added a - - -

10

MS TUOR: That's all right. Sorry, that's on the other one. Yes.

MR PENDER: Yes. So that's the – that's the junior school campus.

15 MS TUOR: Yes.

MR PENDER: This is secondary school boys, and in particular this is the year 11 and – and 12 precinct. And the short answer is no; when we get to the main campus across the road, um, that's – that's already maxed out for – for accommodation for some of the year 12 specialist classes and also for the year 7 and 10 for all their curriculum.

20

MS TUOR: So to meet the needs, specifically for year 11 and 12, you need these additional two rooms to be made larger?

25

MR PENDER: Well, to meet the needs of the secondary school as a whole, yes, um, and – and these rooms are allocated – or this building is allocated predominately to year 11 and 12. So we've considered the master planning across the – the full co to 12 range. Obviously, the junior boys – um, or 3 to 12 range. The junior boys are, um, on a separate site, but we've considered particularly 7 to 12 as one school, um, acknowledging that there are precincts within the two sites that they occupy. But the needs are not standalone; they're being considered together. So keep moving?

30

MS TUOR: Yes.

35

MR PENDER: Thank you. So the main campus is, obviously, where most of the work is going on. And the simple explanation of the project is to infill the existing courtyard which is of dubious amenity. It's a three to four-story cavern with some walkways and it is flanked by a single-storey undersized spaces which are very difficult to program in terms of a contemporary education model. So by infilling that space over three levels from the courtyard to the existing roof of the library block on Kirribilli Avenue here, we get the footprint we need to properly accommodate the teaching and learning needs of the school. We get to do that in a contemporary manner, and we also raise the amenity of the outdoor space by lifting that to this roof level rather than sitting down in the echo chamber concrete courtyard.

45

We're also introducing some canopies within the open courtyard that sits within the elbow of the existing buildings for some partial weather protection and the like, and as you'll see as we go through and you would've seen already, one of the main features of the design is utilisation of this rooftop space as an active area. This complex of buildings is really divided into two halves: top and bottom. There's a half which sits below the quadrangle and really is up to three storeys in height fronting Kirribilli Avenue down here, and most of that comprises the school's great hall, drama facilities and some service facilities. By the time you get around to Upper Pitt Street, up around the north side, the land has climbed up to that third storey level – in fact, to the fourth storey level almost, and so the top half of the site, which is variously four and three storeys along Upper Pitt Street, is, if you like, the top half.

And part of this work was also connecting the top and bottom half of the campus. I'll deal mainly with the top half because that's where the new built form exists. The balance of the application is internal refurbishments. So, in essence, this is – viewed from the south east, this is the infill portion. This is the existing sandstone wall and the boundary and there is a significant height difference between the current courtyard level down here and the neighbouring property ground level and the Craiglea property, and we're proposing to rebuild this wing on Upper Pitt Street in the north east due to significant difficulties with its current structural grid and the like which make it very hard to reuse, and then infilling this component and tying it in to the wing that sits on Kirribilli Avenue.

The three principal floor plans – the current quadrangle level – these drawings here have additional furniture and things on – that weren't in the application set, so you can see there, this is predominantly the proposed new library and student commons area, landscaped courtyard at current quadrangle level and some student support facilities towards the Upper Pitt Street side, and then the open courtyard over outside what we're calling the forum which is a new tiered learning space which enables us to connect down to the great hall below. Currently that's a series rooms beneath the chapel. I'm sorry. The next level up is the first of two general learning levels, and so these are designed as home rooms for the years 7, 8, 9 and 10 boys and again six-stream structure.

So the number of learning space reflects that structure as does the numbers on the Wyalla campus. And then variously around this elbow to the north and west are administrative facilities and various specialist learning spaces as we go up through the tiers of the building. So there's progressive stage redevelopment of those internally as part of the master plan, but the principal new billed work is this infill piece here. The next level up is very similar to level 1. So this level 2 is the second of the general learning areas and then we are at the roof terrace level which has been developed in conjunction with Arcardia Landscape architects.

So I know there's been a lot of discussion and questions around the use of this, so I might dwell on this one for a few minutes if I may. The principal purpose of creating the active space on the roof here was to improve and increase the available outdoor

space for the boys which is currently very limited and very poor in amenity. In doing so, we recognise that obviously it's lifting up to a more prominent location. We believe this is a much more attractive roof scape than the vista that currently exists and it's been designed with specific activities and zones in mind. So it's not a rugby field, by any means. There are spaces for quiet gathering.

There are spaces for outdoor learning. There's a significant low landscape planter along the eastern edge which, apart from softening the overall appearance, has the effect of keeping boys and teachers away from that eastern edge and therefore out of any sight lines into Craiglea, the neighbouring property. So we've been very mindful of respecting the needs of the neighbours in that regard, and during the course of the developing the design the scope and scale of that plant and that separation has increased over time. We note in the proposed conditions that there's a request to reconsider the location, a couple of the elements of this being the barbecue area over here, and also to reconfigure this access to the stairwell in this corner so as to move the activity away in the case of the barbecue, and to close that loop in – that hole in the planting at the edge here and relocate the access to the stair onto the western side. They are perfectly agreeable to those conditions. In fact considerable improvement. We probably should've included it initially.

MR CHEONG: While you're on that location with the stair, is it possible to move this screen on the eastern side back onto the landscape?

MR PENDER: I'm sorry. I'm not sure I understand the question.

MR CHEONG: On the eastern side - - -

MR PENDER: Yeah.

MR CHEONG: - - - between the stair.

MR PENDER: Yeah.

MR CHEONG: Yeah. That is it possible to move back from the edge?

MR PENDER: This piece here?

MR CHEONG: Yep.

MR PENDER: That's the existing building.

MR CHEONG: Yeah.

MR PENDER: The line of the existing building runs across here.

MR CHEONG: But a screen you have is right on the edge at the moment, isn't it?

MR PENDER: The – the – the glass balustrade?

MR CHEONG: The glass – yeah.

5 MR PENDER: I – theoretically I guess it's possible. I'm not sure what benefit would arise and I can see some maintenance issues. One the things we were looking at in terms of keeping the – the glass barrier to the edge was to not have something that you could throw things over. I'm sure boys are very well behaved, but the temptation to drop your mate's lunchbox over the screen might be too tempting.

10 MR CHEONG: You've got 2.4.

MR PENDER: Yes.

15 MR CHEONG: The screen height.

MR PENDER: Yeah, 2.4, which would be 1.5 above the – the planter ledge 2.4. So you're meaning move the balustrade into here.

20 MR CHEONG: At least to the edge of the landscape.

MR PENDER: We can take that on notice and see what impact that has.

MR CHEONG: Yes.

25 MR PENDER: My concerns will be around maintenance of what's outside this room.

MR CHEONG: It would just improve the privacy overlooking my house.

30 MR PENDER: Yes, yes. No, I take your point and we can – we can look at some – some views from this location here near the – near the entry to the stair as well and see what the – the detailed situation is there at the present.

35 MR CHEONG: Can you go back to the lower plan – the floor plan below.

MR TANNOCK: For the ground floor?

MR CHEONG: No, that – at the moment you've got the – just a question on the design quality of the internal amenities of the space. The – you've got an east-west direction, you've got almost like 30 metre wide and north-south is almost 60 metre. Do – do you – are you satisfied that the quality of the space is conducive to good learning?

45 MR PENDER: Yes, absolutely. We've – we've given that a lot of thought in the development of the plan. You'll note that all of the general learning areas are to the perimeter of the building. This western edge of the developed zone is open. It's –

the line of enclosure is back here, so they – they – it is open to natural light and air. The areas here at the heart of the plan which are not – which don't have direct access to the outside wall are the staffrooms, which are only intermittently occupied, and amenities areas. So yes, we're comfortable – very comfortable with that.

5

MR CHEONG: And the floor below?

MR PENDER: The floor below is the same, if we can go back to that one. There were some differences along this edge owing to the configuration to the stairs in – in this external circulation street, but the design principles are the same.

10

MR CHEONG: Is there any opportunity to further set back then the 4.08 setback from the eastern boundary or - - -

MR PENDER: We – we look at that and we're – and we're very challenged for space across that width. The school chapel here, you know – there's a capacity of several hundred – hundred people. We're mindful of needing space for them out – immediately outside the chapel space. We have a staff accommodation requirement. That dimension was stretched.

20

I will say that we have probably added a metre to the setback in the course of design development, and the other measure that we've taken as you can see on the plan here – and I'll show you this section shortly – is to create within that façade I think between 600 and 700 mills of depth to get a laying of – of the privacy screens within that façade – façade depth so that there's, you know, sufficient room to adequately screen any visual intrusion that neighbours might be perceiving. We also note this commentary in – in the – in the proposed conditions that we're quite comfortable to take on in terms of the design process.

25

I will talk a bit more about those plans if May. The – that's the respective view of that eastern façade from – taken from the Craiglea garage roof, and you can see there in the depth of the – of the façade at the upper level with the layering of the screens, and we take on board the note that they should be fixed screens and – and the like and we're happy to pick that up in the detailed design phase. You can see there the – the relative height of the raised screen.

35

The actual height of the – the building themselves matches exactly the – the height of the existing buildings. I'll come to that in a second. You will have seen the Roberts Day visual impact analysis, that's from the – taken from a similar – similar viewpoint. You can see where the existing vegetation, that's their interpretation of the impact of that infill building from – from that point.

40

MS TUOR: So, just on that, we were – um, part of our discussion with the department was trying to understand just the change in level between the RL of the parapet, um on the, ah, new northeast building, which we understand is the same as what was there previously, so that's - - -

45

MR PENDER: Yes.

MS TUOR: No, the one that you went – the one before that, or - - -

5 MR PENDER: Go back?

MS TUOR: Yes, that's probably the best one.

MR PENDER: Yes.

10

MS TUOR: Um, so the RL, if you put your cursor - - -

MR PENDER: This parapet?

15 MS TUOR: - - - along – yeah, along there.

MR PENDER: Yes.

MS TUOR: And then the RL of the top of the parapet here.

20

MR PENDER: There?

MS TUOR: Yeah. So - - -

25 MR PENDER: Okay, yeah, so the - - -

MS TUOR: Because I thought there was only a one-storey difference, but that looks like it's - - -

30 MR PENDER: No, it's - - -

MS TUOR: - - - much greater than that.

35 MR PENDER: No, it is – it is only one storey difference, so this is a single-storey multipurpose space with the parapet which matches exactly the height of the existing – in the original submission, it was about 200 millimetres, 250 millimetres higher than the existing - - -

40 MS SMITH: it was 270.

MR PENDER: We've undertaken to bring that down to the – to match the existing exactly. This parapet level through here matches the existing parapet level - - -

45 MS TUOR: Okay, so - - -

MR PENDER: - - - on this existing building here.

MS TUOR: - - - the RL of the new building is, um, 43.22 to the top of the parapet; is that correct?

5 MR PENDER: Um, let me have a look for that. Um, I believe it's about that. I don't have the exact RL in front of me at the moment.

MS TUOR: And then the RL, I think, to the top of the parapet of the – on the eastern façade - - -

10 MR PENDER: Down here?

MS TUOR: Yep. So the white – yep, top of that.

MR PENDER: Yeah.

15

MS TUOR: Um, it seemed to be around RL 39.89.

MR PENDER: Okay. Can I just ask my colleague?

20 MS TUOR: Sure.

MR PENDER: Sue, can you verify that from the plan? 39.89 is what's shown on the drawings for it.

25 MS TUOR: So that's a change in level of roughly about 3.3 metres.

MR PENDER: Yes, that – yes.

30 MS CAI: So the existing new – well, the new parapet at the roof terrace level is 39.89.

MS TUOR: Yep.

35 MS CAI: And the parapet level at the northeast corner is 43.22.

MR PENDER: Good.

40 MS TUOR: Yeah, so it's a change in level of about 3.3 metres, and we know that the glass screen is meant to be shown as being 2.4, so that's presumably 2.4 from the bottom of that parapet line, is it, or - - -

MR PENDER: 2.4 from the floor level of the - - -

45 MS TUOR: Yeah, so in that representation, it would be roughly the bottom of that?

MR PENDER: That's - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MR PENDER: - - - about there, yes.

5 MS TUOR: So if we take that as being 2.4, to get to 3.3 would only – would be to where you’ve roughly had your cursor there, wouldn’t it? Like, just visually, I’m looking at it.

MR PENDER: Um, yes.

10

MS TUOR: So I’m just - - -

MR PENDER: I presume.

15 MS TUOR: To me, it looks – the relationship doesn’t look correct - - -

MR PENDER: Oh, I see what you’re saying.

20 MS TUOR: - - - between those two elements, that – this either looks lower, um, or that either looks higher, but the relationship doesn’t look like it’s a relationship of 3.3 metres.

MR PENDER: Okay. Um, that’s from the CAD model. Um, I have no reason to think it’s not accurate - - -

25

MS TUOR: No, no, no.

MR PENDER: - - - but I can see your – I can see your point.

30 MS TUOR: Yeah.

MR PENDER: We’ll take that on notice, and we’ll interrogate the CAD model that generated that, and we’ll come back to you.

35 MS TUOR: Yeah.

MR PENDER: But I’m confident it’s correct.

40 MS TUOR: And – because where it – where it was sort of being highlighted was, um, things in, say, the, um, view analysis, so the view, too, from 49 Upper Pitt Street, which the Department of Planning has kindly given us large versions of it, that’s where we’re all sort of saying, “Well, you know, that didn’t look like 3.3 metres.” It – I know there would be perspective and all the rest of it, but it just looked as if it was just - - -

45

MR PENDER: No, I understand the comment.

MS TUOR: Yeah, yeah.

MR PENDER: But, yeah, we'll interrogate the models and confirm.

5 MR CHEONG: Ah, I support your question. If you look at the, ah, the canopy, the glass canopy, on the section, you'll see that it's actually higher than the parapet, ah, but, on this perspective, it's actually shown lower.

10 MR PENDER: Yes, it's the same – ah, I don't know what to say to you. It's the same CAD model that's generated the sections and the drawings, and it's the view.

MS TUOR: You can't trust computers.

15 MR PENDER: Yes. I'm not sure what response you're seeking.

MS TUOR: No, no, it's just, obviously, we need to have absolute confidence - - -

MR PENDER: Yes.

20 MS TUOR: - - - in the data that is being provided, so it's just a matter of, I suppose, going back and checking it and, yeah, making sure that images like that are sort of - - -

25 MR PENDER: Yes, we're happy to do that - - -

MS TUOR: Yep.

30 MR PENDER: - - - and come back and confirm that, but yes, I'm very confident that's the case.

MS TUOR: Yep.

35 MR PENDER: Okay, so one of the issues you raised was setbacks, so I was going to, um, ah, talk a little bit more about the depth of the façade here and the ability to – to stagger those screens. I think we've probably explained that sufficiently, being mindful of our time, but I'll elaborate further if you wish, and then we – ah, one of the questions on height, ah, that was addressed during the response to submissions was about the parapet height along the Upper Pitt Street façade, ah, so this is the original drawing where we were about 200 millimetres higher than the existing
40 parapet line. We've since undertaken that that will be reduced to match the existing exactly. That's no problem at all. You can see here the improvement of removing the current stair and lift well.

45 Um, you've also noted in the proposed conditions, ah, a request to lower the height of this entry portal element below – to or below the existing height, the blue line, and, again, that presents no difficulties. We pick that up in the detailed design under a condition. Got no problem with that at all. Okay. Um, there were questions – or

your proposed agenda asks us to discuss the overshadowing impacts of developments, so I'll move to that. Um, I've used here some plan views from, um, our shadow studies, PMDL shadow studies, and I've also used some from Roberts Day, and I've just selected them because they're the clearest on screen, but they do align in terms of what they depict.

Um, what we're showing here is 9, 12 and 3 at the winter solstice. The grey is the existing shadow. The red elements are the new shadow introduced by the redevelopment, so what this demonstrates is that the existing, um, existing buildings already, ah, provide the majority of the shadowing impact to the property to the east. You can see down at 3 pm, at the ground plane, there is a very small amount of additional shadowing at Craiglea, and then, using the Roberts Day material for clarity, further studies were done of the, um, impact on the elevations, and, in particular, the windows of the, um, southern Craiglea building, and those impacts are depicted here and are consistent with the shadow diagrams in the PMDL set, and they indicate that there is an impact in the afternoon on three windows, um, in this location here, um, after, ah, starting at 1 pm, but still noting that that's – um, the amount of solar access is still well within the apartment design guidelines for those spaces.

MS TUOR: All right. So, just going back two slides, again, it's about, um, just ensuring that we understand the accuracy of the data. So say the diagram on the right-hand, um, side of the screen, if you look at the shadow cast by the element that's on the corner of the school, the existing element on the corner of the school, that element there, so it casts a shadow onto the rooftop. That's a change in level of roughly one storey, as I understand it.

MR PENDER: From there to there?

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MR PENDER: Yes.

MR TANNOCK: Yes.

MS TUOR: And that casts a shadow that big, that – that length.

MR PENDER: Yes.

MS TUOR: When you look where the infill building is going.

MR PENDER: Yes.

MS TUOR: So, at the moment, the infill building, there would be no shadow – no shadow caused by – cast by that, so in the – the sort of gap where the courtyard is now.

MR PENDER: Mmm.

MS TUOR: Further up, if you want to put your cursor - - -

5 MR PENDER: The actual infill building?

MS TUOR: Yeah. So, at the moment, in that area, there's no buildings, so there will be no shadow cast from that element.

10 MR PENDER: No, the shadow is cast from this element.

MS TUOR: No, but - - -

MR PENDER: The current shadow.

15

MS TUOR: But if you go slightly lower there, in the - I wish I had the cursor.

MR PENDER: Would you like the mouse?

20 MS TUOR: Probably make it even worse. I might just go and stand up. So in here, at the moment, there's no building, so that wouldn't be casting any shadow in - from here. But now you're saying - but there is a shadow cast, I understand, by the wall, but it's also - the new building, which is three storeys high - I can't see any shadow cast by it, except for that tiny little bit in the corner, whereas that - where we went
25 before, this was a shadow caused by a one - shadow cast by a one-storey element, so I'm not - I don't understand why they wouldn't - - -

COM WILSON: Should be red.

30 MS TUOR: Why there wouldn't be more red here, given that that's now a three-storey element, where there's no three-storey element at all at the moment.

MR PENDER: Okay. I - I understand the question, but there's the - um, what we'll do is go back and produce the - the model without the infill and - and again, in
35 the same way as Roberts Day have done, I mean, their - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MR PENDER: Their findings are consistent with ours. The height of the infill
40 building above the - the Craiglea, ah, ground level is not three storeys because it's - it's - it's higher than - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah

45 MR PENDER: - - - our quadrangle, but we do have the higher building at the northern end. I - I - I believe that that's where the - the shadow is coming from, from the northern building. Upper Pitt Street building.

MR TANNOCK: The – the current shadow originates from that building.

MR PENDER: Yeah, from the existing building.

5 MS TUOR: Yeah.

MS CAI: If - - -

10 MS TUOR: Although that looks like the shadow is – from the northern building is what's shown here. That. Presumably, that's the shadow that's cast from the northern building. So that bit there.

MS CAI: If I could - - -

15 MR PENDER: Over one storey. I think the best thing is to take that on notice - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah, yeah.

MR PENDER: - - - and come back to you - - -

20

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MR PENDER: - - - with an existing shadow.

25 MS CAI: If I could speak to that - - -

MS TUOR: Yep.

30 MS CAI: And it will be better observed when we do go to site, so – sorry. Sue Cai - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah .

35 MS CAI: - - - from PMDL. The Craiglea natural landscape actually steps deeply down as we go towards the southern end of the site, so by the point we get to about midway point, the courtyard and the outdoor spaces – the ground plane is much lower than where – what Upper Pitt Street is, so the natural shadow caused by the boundary wall itself and - - -

40 COM WILSON: It's already in shadow.

MS CAI: It's actually much deeper. It's almost like a well - - -

45 MS TUOR: So all that shadow that's shown there now - - -

COM WILSON: Is existing.

MR TANNOCK: Is existing.

MS TUOR: - - - is from the existing – from the wall.

5 MS CAI: Correct, yep.

MS TUOR: And this - - -

MS CAI: And the existent building that's - - -

10

MR PENDER: From – from the existing buildings and from the walls.

MS CAI: Yep.

15 MR PENDER: Yes.

MS TUOR: Okay.

MR PENDER: So if I – if I may have the mouse - - -

20

MS TUOR: Yes.

MR PENDER: Sorry. Thank you. I think, Sue, what you're referring to there is the change in level from here - - -

25

MS CAI: Yes.

MR PENDER: - - - to here.

30 MS CAI: That's correct.

MR PENDER: So as that land falls away, the shadow follows it. But we'll take it on notice and we'll come back to you.

35 MS TUOR: Yep, yep. All right. Thanks.

MR PENDER: So that – that was the last of the matters that I was going to raise in design terms, bearing in mind the questions you suggested to us, and before I hand back to Ashleigh, is there anything else on the design front you'd like to discuss?

40

MS TUOR: No. I mean, we've got some questions about, I suppose, the existing lift motor room on the big structure that everyone – you know, that really stands out. This.

45 MR PENDER: Yes.

MS TUOR: Does it need to be as high as it is? We looked at a plan which, sort of, showed that it had a stairwell and a lift and then lift motor room, but – I don't know how many metres high that is, but it's, what, probably about six metres, so whether there was any scope to look at – I mean, I suppose, we're – we're looking at it from
5 the point of view that this is quite a significant change as to the school, and yes, there's the status quo, but what are the opportunities to – without, obviously, impacting on what you're trying to do and the reasonableness of it, whether there are opportunities to also look at improving existing situations, so that if this height wasn't actually doing anything, whether there would be opportunities to look at
10 lowering it because, obviously, that would have a big impact on improving views. So I don't know if you've cast your mind to that at all.

MR PENDER: No. No, we haven't. I mean, it's a – it's a plant area. It's a lift motor room area. Whether it could be demolished and reconstructed to a slightly
15 lower level is not something we've investigated. It's not – you know, it's not within the scope of the – of the proposal. The lift that it serves is certainly required.

MS TUOR: Yep.

20 MR PENDER: So the motor room is required. Yeah.

MS TUOR: But at the moment, it – it's just the motor room on that level, isn't it?

MR PENDER: I believe it's the motor room and some other plant. I – yeah, it - - -
25

MS TUOR: Yes.

MR PENDER: It's not front of mind; I'm sorry I haven't - - -

30 MS TUOR: Yep, yep, yep. But, I suppose - - -

MR PENDER: Yeah, it's not part of the – not part of the proposal so I'm not overly familiar.

35 MR CHEONG: May I just - - -

MS TUOR: Yes.

MR CHEONG: I think that part is not where the lift is. I think you're talking about
40 the – if you look at your roof plan, DAU129 - - -

MS TUOR: No, no, I'm talking about this on - - -

MR CHEONG: Yep, that's right.
45

MS TUOR: - - - DAU130.

MR CHEONG: U130.

MS TUOR: Actually – no, there was another one that had where you were demolishing the

5

MR CHEONG: This one.

MS TUOR: No, no. It's all about the existing one. So many drawings. Here. Sorry. DAU110. That seems to show the lift motor room and the stairs, so I presume that's what this is.

10

MR PENDER: Correct.

MS TUOR: Yep. And so it's just whether that height is needed or not. And then, I suppose, the other question was in terms of the new plant rooms that you're proposing, particularly the one on the north-east building – is that servicing that building or is there opportunity to pull it further away from the – from the façade?

15

MR CHEONG: Or relocate it on the lower roof somewhere.

20

MR PENDER: I – if you – if you want me to come back to you with the areas that those specific plant elements are servicing, I can do so, but they have been located as best we can to keep them within the – the subtended view angles of the existing stepping of the building.

25

MS TUOR: So you consider, in terms of where you would locate them, that this would have the least view, having it there – view impact.

MR PENDER: That was our determination, yes. We – we – we've located them as best we could to sit them into the – if you like, into the cradle of the existing steps of the building and plant and section.

30

MS TUOR: But even if it went – rather than coming out longways that way, it went longways along the length of that building?

35

MR PENDER: Subject to being able to fit the equipment in, I don't think it would concern us what the geometry was if there was a preference, but, frankly, the studies we did – I think we found that the equipment was least obvious in that – that configuration.

40

MS TUOR: Yeah. I just think in terms of views, it seems like you've got the long elevation where the views are, as opposed to if you had it against the wall, the long one against the wall. I mean, we're just looking at small changes that maybe will have benefits in terms of view loss and those sorts of things.

45

MR PENDER: Understand, and, I think, subject to being able to, you know - - -

MS TUOR: Yep.

MR PENDER: - - - fit the equipment in, that wouldn't concern us. Moving –
5 moving the enclosure closer to Upper Pitt Street, as I recall, like, brought it forward
into the view plane, so it also - - -

MS TUOR: No, no, we didn't want it going - - -

MR PENDER: Yeah.
10

MS TUOR: - - - forward to – it was more getting it away from it.

MR TANNOCK: It was bringing it - - -

15 MS TUOR: The more you get it away from it.

MR PENDER: But – but – but if you – if you squeeze it to the west, it comes out to
the sou – to the north and – so it comes – so it - - -

20 MS TUOR: Yeah.

MR PENDER: Yeah, it – this – look, this varies depending on whether you're
looking from the apartments opposite from that le – that floor level or that floor level
because - - -
25

MS TUOR: Sure.

MR PENDER: - - - the views subtended are different. But the more you bring it
towards the Upper Pitt Street side, as I recall, the – the more it came into the
30 foreground for certain view aspects.

MS TUOR: Yeah, definitely. Whereas the more you move it away – and,
obviously, if it was, sort of, down at this lower level, then it would have less impact.
The other question was just about the height of the parapet, and I don't know what
35 the height is, but it looks quite high, and that roof isn't going to be accessible, so –
and I know it's the height of your existing building, but do you need to have a
parapet as high as that? Because isn't that – that's the springing point for the plane
for the view, isn't it, this – this one here?

40 MR PENDER: That's correct. Um, our design principle has been to, ah, maintain
the existing heights of the buildings.

MS TUOR: But if you – if you don't need to, why would you do it? If you don't
need a parapet of that height, and if it were to actually result in improved views, is
45 that something that has been considered, given that that's, as I understand it – is the
springing point for where you – of that plane about keeping your views? Was there
and here, wasn't it?

MR PENDER: Yeah, that – that’s correct.

MS TUOR: And that establishes a plane.

5 MR PENDER: Mmm.

MS TUOR: So, obviously, if that spring point is brought down as low as possible
- - -

10 MR PENDER: Mmm.

MS TUOR: - - - and I don’t know if you can do it here as well, then that would
potentially open up more views.

15 MR PENDER: Um, look, I think the design principle we adopted was to maintain
the existing levels. I understand what you’re saying - - -

MS TUOR: Yes.

20 MR PENDER: - - - but that’s a design principle we had adopted.

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MR PENDER: Yeah.

25

MS TUOR: Okay.

MR CHEONG: You – you can look at the, um, proposal, view 15 on your drawing
- - -

30

MS TUOR: You don’t have them

COM WILSON: You may not have the same.

35 MR CHEONG: Looking from building 48.

COM WILSON: They - - -

MS TUOR: So – yeah. You don’t have the same - - -

40

MR PENDER: Is that – that looks like it’s from the Roberts Day report.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

45 MS TUOR: No. This is what the – well, it’s from the Roberts Day report. Yeah.

COM WILSON: Yeah.

MR PENDER: Mmm.

MS TUOR: 57.

5 MR PENDER: I don't have that one in front of me, I'm sorry.

MS TUOR: Do you want me to pass you one?

10 MR PENDER: Yes. Thank you.

MR CHEONG: If you look at that one enclosure just at the of the bridge, is that enclosure of the upper roof shown on the D – DAU130?

15 MR PENDER: I believe so. Let me check. No, that's the plant enclosure indicated on DAU129.

MR CHEONG: It's not the upper – upper level.

20 MS TUOR: That's that one there.

MR CHEONG: And then what is the lower one?

MR PENDER: That's the one on DAU128.

25 MR CHEONG: So my question is, is that possible moving – relocate that enclosure to a lower roof to include the - - -

30 MR PENDER: So are you suggesting – you're suggesting relocate some of this plant - - -

MR CHEONG: Yeah.

MR PENDER: - - - to this level.

35 MR CHEONG: To – to further - - -

MS TUOR: Try and get it in there.

40 MR CHEONG: You get it here, DAU129.

MR PENDER: I'd have to take that on notice.

MR CHEONG: Yes. That - - -

45 MR PENDER: There may be some issues with the distance of servicing runs.

MR CHEONG: That would improve the situation.

MR PENDER: But – but I'll just make the observation – yes. I'll just make the observations there are views - - -

MR CHEONG: Yes.

5

MR PENDER: - - - from all direction, so where we move it to there would be likely to have impacts also.

10 MR C. WILSON: If I may, Chris Wilson, Willowtree Planning. Obviously, extensively undertaken an assessment against tenacity principles which I need not remind you of, you know, the process and criteria. We're comfortable having considered and visited the properties and, as best we can, squeezed the development in our view to ensure that the outcome received by those properties is reasonable, and it's well documented in the assessment we've provided amongst the information
15 submitted as part of the application. Where there is opportunity to look at some further squeezing of plants, of course we're more than happy to – to do that, but it has been very well considered.

20 MS TUOR: Yeah, I mean, I suppose the – the principle in tenacity is also looking at whether something is coming from a noncomplying element, and obviously the height control in its terms doesn't apply to this application, but the principle of looking at whether a more skilful design could minimise those impacts, particularly if it doesn't actually affect you in any way – that if there's a way of, you know – such as the parapet height, yes your design principle was that you would maintain
25 that height, but if it's not doing anything why maintain it? If there are incremental improvements that you can achieve which don't affect your proposal, then why not look at them?

30 MR WILSON: Yeah, I mean, we understand. We're happy to look at those things most certainly.

MS CAI: I think with the parapet – if I may speak – that's something we need to look at in balance in conjunction with the because once we lower that then the views to become more obvious, so - - -

35

MS TUOR: Yes, you become more exposed. Yes.

MS CAI: - - - there's a

40 MS TUOR: You could even look at even stepping it down or – I don't know, I was just having a look at it.

MR WILSON: I suppose it's also then striking a balance of having a step and what that presents and – yeah.

45

MS TUOR: Look, we're not saying that that's what the answer is, I'm just saying – I suppose it's looking at your design from the perspective of how you could improve it from – you know, the people that are looking at it.

5 MR TANNOCK: General aesthetic, yeah.

MS TUOR: Yeah. If it doesn't affect your proposal, there may be ways – even, you know, the plant room shifting around the other way may improve it so it's against the wall.

10

MR WILSON: We'll have a look at it.

MR CHEONG: Thank you. Yes.

15 MR PENDER: I – I have nothing else to present

MR PENDER: I have nothing else to present unless you have further questions.

20 MS SMITH: So moving forward, we – Andrew did touch on the heritage – or the building impacts with Wyalla and also around the junior school. Were there any further comments or questions around that aspect?

MR WILSON: Not from me.

25 MS TUOR: No.

MS SMITH: No? So we'll move on. The next point that was on the agenda was the use of the rooftop terrace for the events. Now, under the response to submissions submitted to the Department of Planning, there was a schedule of events that was proposed for both – that was capturing both the existing use of the chapel terrace, the quadrangle and then what was going to be proposed on the new rooftop terrace just in terms of the numbers, the frequency and just in how they would actually be in comparison to what is there currently. As noted in the noise impact assessment, duly noted by Andrew as well, there is a 2.4 acoustic barrier that is being implemented to, I guess, mitigate the noise impacts.

35

The acoustic report did do all their studies on a 2.1-metre barrier and in terms of student activities, it was, in fact, improving the acoustic outcome. And now that we are providing a 2.4 metre, it is implied that it would, in fact, even further improve that outcome from the acoustic point of view. Now, in terms of just – noting we are limited with time, is there anything in particular around the use of the terrace and the frequency and the events itself that you had in particular to note?

40

MS TUOR: So just in terms of the noise, as I understand it, the calculation of the noise likely to be generated was done on the basis of a disco that was held internally, but what sort of numbers do you know were attending that disco so that – in term – just trying to work out again the data, how that compares with what's proposed.

45

MR WILSON: We don't have the actual number.

MS SMITH: No.

5 MR WILSON: We'll have to take that on notice - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah.

10 MR WILSON: - - - and come back to you formally.

MS SMITH: And we can come back with that.

MR WILSON: Yeah.

15 MS TUOR: And again, also, I think the use of it by students was based on the current use of the quadrangle, so again, it's whether that's comparable.

20 MR TANNOCK: Mark Tannock, St Aloysius' College. In terms of the proposed usage of the rooftop terrace, there's no proposal to increase student enrolments, and so our view is that there wouldn't be any change in terms of the numbers of students who might be on the rooftop terrace at any given time compared to the quadrangle. At the moment it would be the same.

25 COM WILSON: So the noise impact assessment was undertaken by student activities based on quadrangle and its current uses and they've basically just been transposed to the roof; is that right? So the basketball hoop, the ping pong table, the handball courts – they're all matters that were considered in the noise impact assessment?

30 MR WILSON: Yes, they were. Yeah.

MS SMITH: Yes.

35 MR WILSON: And if you go out there, you'll – it's like a – I think the term – Chris Wilson – sorry – Willowtree Planning. There it's – the quadrangle. It's like an echo effect at the moment by raising all this up and with the acoustic measures and the uses proposed in that location, considering the relevant noise criteria, it's a better outcome.

40 COM WILSON: And I presume the noise in the quadrangle, though – it would've just been caught. Most of the noise would've been caught inside the school because
- - -

45 MR WILSON: It actually kind of goes up and out - - -

COM WILSON: Does it?

MR WILSON: - - - and it amplifies out.

COM WILSON: Right. Okay.

5 MR WILSON: It's very much if you – when you do your site inspection you'll see that it's almost like a - - -

MS SMITH: It's a drum effect.

10 MR WILSON: A drum effect. It bounces off the concrete wall that's down the side of the boundary and it just really amplifies out and up - - -

COM WILSON: Okay.

15 MR WILSON: - - - whereas by doing the acoustic attenuation measures that we've suggested in acoustic report, with that barrier it actually bounces off and comes back in, so it doesn't actually spill over

20 MS TUOR: And presumably some students would now have the – still stay down in that lower void area and some would go up to the top, but whereas before you had them all down in that lower void area; is that - - -

25 MR TANNOCK: Yeah, that's accurate. Particularly as the ground floor of the infill building is where amenities are, particularly where the food preparation - - -

MS TUOR: Canteen?

30 MR TANNOCK: The canteen will be down there, and with adolescent boys who suspect that's where they'll be. So you're likely to have a number of boys down in that space at recess and lunch as opposed to the rooftop terrace.

MS TUOR: Do you have staggered recess and lunch, or everyone has it at the same time?

35 MR TANNOCK: No, we don't. They have it at the same time. Keep in mind that the noisy students who undertake it on that site are the boys in year 7 to 10. The boys in year 11 and 12 actually do so across on the Wyalla campus across the world.

40 MR WILSON: Chris Wilson again. It – what it's actually designed to do, it's sort of dispersing the usage – or the patronage, if you like, and providing better control measures in place, ultimately. That's what will do.

45 MR CHEONG: So is there a possibility of, uh, limiting the use – more active use down into the space that was the old quadrangle, such as the hardball court and basketball hoop for – and – and not having that on the rooftop?

MR TANNOCK: Uh, I think we – we would say from the design, no. That ground floor is not designed as an outdoor recreation space with those types of facilities in it. There will be space for boys leading into the library for them to sit and eat, and obviously – but, no, not a transferal of those types of activities down into that space.
5 By design, we've tried to transplant them onto the rooftop, uh, because of the necessity of actually building the indoor facility?

MS SMITH: All right. So we probably have about 15 minutes.

10 MS TUOR: 15 minutes. It's going so quickly. All right. So, um - - -

MS SMITH: Were there any further comments in relation to the use of the terrace, then? Otherwise we will keep moving forward.

15 MS TUOR: Uh, well, just in terms of the – I know we've got to talk about conditions later, but, um, the department in their report proposes a trial period, but they didn't actually put that into the conditions yet, but they're coming back to us with that condition. So did you have any comments on that?

20 MR WILSON: Yes. If I may, Chris Wilson. We've got no issue with implementing a trial period. That's pretty standard, these days, for these sorts of

MS TUOR: And, um, because we haven't seen the wording of the condition, did you envisage that that trial period would include active monitoring, so noise – noise
25 measurements taken and those sorts of things, or would it just be relating to people complaining.

MR WILSON: Look, our – our view is that the modelling that's done in the acoustic report already covers that. It would be more of a complaints register
30 arrangement on the campus, um, and that we can report on back to the department on a monthly basis or something to that effect, for a six month period.

MS TUOR: Yes. And in terms of it being six months as opposed to 12 months, 12 months guarantees that you go through the full cycle, whereas six months, if you're
35 in the middle of winter - - -

MR WILSON: Yes. Mmm.

MS TUOR: Maybe not many people are out there. So I think our preference would
40 be a 12 month trial period. Is that - - -

MR WILSON: Look, we're not adverse to that. And bearing in mind, as you mentioned, Commissioner, that there are conditions about our management plan that also apply, and all those things will be picked up in there again, so that's fine; if it's
45 12 months we're happy to leave it.

MS TUOR: Yes. Parking – pick up and drop off zone.

MS SMITH: So we - - -

MR WILSON: Sorry, just one more thing. It would be our preference that that goes
5 back to the department at the end of the 12 months, rather than to Council, if that's
acceptable.

MS TUOR: I think our understanding is that the department is the - - -

COM WILSON: The department is the consent authority plus the compliance
10 authority. Yes.

MS TUOR: Yes. Yes.

MR WILSON: Yes, the compliance – now – yes. Yes, that's right. That's fine.
15 Great.

COM WILSON: And we will continue to be.

MR WILSON: Okay.
20

MS TUOR: So it would be the department who would – yes.

MR WILSON: Excellent.

MS TUOR: Any questions about the pick – I suppose it was just, um, pickup and
25 drop off were something that has been raised in submissions and – I know you're not
increasing the numbers, but did you actually look at if there was any opportunities to
sort of - - -

MS SMITH: I will hand to Dean Brodie.
30

MR BRODIE: So at the moment the site has a – a small volume of parking across
all the campuses, and also all the kiss and drop is facilitated within the street levels
35 by campus by – through the time restrictions that apply during that time. At the
moment, um, we felt that they were adequate per – per campus. The – the motor
travel surveys show a 70 to 80 per cent use of public transport from year 3 right up to
year 12. Um, and that – um, they – they are functioning quite well. You know,
they're quite convenient. There's no changes to any of the access arrangements or
40 populations in the school.

In terms of bicycle provision, there is additional end-of-trip facilities. The bicycle
mode in the surveys and the original report is very, very low. The topography is
quite a barrier out there. Um, it's the lowest proportion of public transport use out of
45 all, which is kind of expected given the site and the rail and the bus and the ferry
that's available. Um, but there is additional end-of-trip facilities being provided as
part of the proposal now.

MS TUOR: And when it says that you have 10 lockers there now, does that mean you store 10 bikes, or is it each locker – put more bikes in it?

5 MR BRODIE: So in a – there's 14 spaces now on the main campus, uh, let me just confirm that number for you right now. Sorry. And the additional 10 lockers – the idea is to store the bicycles in a – in a safe environment.

COM WILSON: They are additional? That's not clear. Okay.

10 MS TUOR: So they are additional, are they?

MR BRODIE: Yes. These are additional end-of-trip facilities.

15 MS TUOR: And each of that locker – each - - -

MR BRODIE: Is to store a bike securely, yes.

MR WILSON: One bike.

20 MS TUOR: One bike.

MR BRODIE: Yes.

25 MS TUOR: Okay. So you would have a total, then, of 24.

MR BRODIE: That's correct. So at the moment there's about three people that ride their bike from year 7 to – uh, year 3 to 12 and four teachers out the entire school population, so - - -

30 MS TUOR: Right. And you think it's the topography as opposed to concern about traffic or - - -

35 MR BRODIE: Uh, well, as a cyclist, um, there – there's not – there's no off-road facilities. Um, you've got the barrier of the water and the railway line, and the – and the freeway to the north, so it's effectively all people from the east. Um, I know what – what gearing I would prefer if I was riding out there compared to other times, but yes, I think topography is probably a barrier, and it's – um, not – you're either riding within the traffic lane, and that's really your only choice.

40 MS TUOR: Mmm. Yes. So the use of the open space and reliance on Bradfield Park?

45 MR WILSON: I have a clarification, if I may. The recreation management plan – are we able to just understand the panel's view on – on the use of that space and what you would be looking at, or what particular element of it is concerning for the department or otherwise?

COM WILSON: Well, we've asked the question of the department what's – what – what the objective of the plan is.

MR WILSON: Yes.

5

COM WILSON: And they've answered briefly, in the previous meeting. I guess we're just trying to understand how you, as the applicant, would engage that plan. If you're required – if eventually you're required to prepare that plan and implement that plan, what – what do you envisage would be in it?

10

MR WILSON: Yes, sure. And, Mike, you might give a bit of overview as to the use of it currently?

MR TANNOCK: Yes, certainly. Um, the school, uh, for as long as we can remember, has utilised Bradfield Park at lunchtime, uh, for senior schoolboys only, uh, and indeed, largely the only boys that go down there are in the age group of middle school. So, um, 12 to 15 year olds. Um, during the summer months we might have up to about 70 or 80 boys who go down there; in the winter months much less. It's actively supervised by staff, both their movement down to the park and, indeed, whilst they're there.

20

Um, at the moment, actually, for the last two years, a significant amount of Bradfield Park has been roped off underneath the bridge, so that has really limited the boy's access to it, which is fun. Um, we anticipate that the proposed redevelopment on the Upper Pitt Street campus will be an incentive for a number of boys to remain on that campus, given an increasing of the footprint for – on the rooftop.

25

Um, however, having said that, we certainly have a – a great desire to continue the access to Bradfield Park, given the longstanding capacity for the school to – to access it. We would be very keen to ensure that the management plan addresses any concerns that either department, the council or, indeed, residents have about that use, without actually prohibiting it.

30

COM WILSON: Okay.

35

MR CHEONG: What sort of activities are the student engaging in?

MR TANNOCK: Uh, some of it very passive. Um, and other times they kick a soccer ball around between the pylons underneath the bridge – that's what it looks like.

40

MS TUOR: So, presumably, that plan would attempt to formalise that arrangement.

MR TANNOCK: Uh, absolutely, yes. Well, certainly formalise the way in which we're – we can use it, and, um, the responsibilities that the school has to ensure proper stewardship of it. Um, so, yes, absolutely.

45

MR CHEONG: Okay.

MS TUOR: And then the cumulative impact of construction with Loreto.

5 MR TANNOCK: I – I can speak to that.

MS TUOR: Anyone – yes.

10 MR TANNOCK: Um, so Aloysius and Loreto Kirribilli have worked very closely since we began this process, uh, a few years ago. We were conscious of the fact that Loreto was also undertaking both a master planning exercise and, indeed, a state-significant development application. That, um – uh, that level of interaction has continued. Uh, we meet on a regular basis, uh, myself as principal and Anna Dickinson as the principal there meet regularly to discuss our – our, uh, dual plans.

15 Uh, we would anticipate that that, um – that level of interaction is only going to increase, uh, in the months and years ahead, and – uh, both schools are very conscious of their responsibility as good neighbours to the residents of Kirribilli, so we know it's really important that we do that. Um, so it has been, uh, a very
20 important part of what we've done up until this point, and we anticipate it being even more important in the years ahead.

MR WILSON: Just to add to that – Chris Wilson speaking. The construction traffic management plans have been considered cumulatively. So we've actually been –
25 um, the overall preparation and the traffic – construction traffic management plan has considered Loreto Kirribilli's construction timeframes and staging, um, against ours, and – and we've procured that accordingly.

30 COM WILSON: We raised the issue with the department. It might be useful, also, to consider your green travel times and then integrate those a well.

MR TANNOCK: Yes. Understood. There's also a commitment from the two schools to look at – as we enter construction phases to sharing resources to mitigate disruption to the operation of the school, and we think that's, um – given our close
35 proximity, a smart idea.

MS TUOR: So you might have the girls and boys mixing.

40 MR TANNOCK: Long overdue, Commissioner.

MS TUOR: That could solve your expansion plans.

MR TANNOCK: Indeed, it could. Hostile takeover by the Loreto Sisters.

45 MR WILSON: Future-proofing your student population.

MR TANNOCK: Yes, that's right.

MS TUOR: Um, so, comments on the department's assessment report? Is there anything that you would like to - - -

5 MS SMITH: Not anything further from what we had already – and I think a lot of it has been, um, covered off in particular around the trial period, and that has been discussed in the 12-month – or the recommendation of the 12-month period.

10 MS TUOR: And then the condition on the cap – just moving on to comments on the proposed conditions. So, um, the cap on student and staff numbers – the Commission is going into the proposed concept approval. Any comments?

15 MR TANNOCK: I might speak to that, with your permission. Um, we recognise that this is, uh, uh, a fairly standard, contemporary protocol in these approvals in terms of a cap on student and staff numbers. As the panel knows, we are not seeking to increase student enrolments in this, um, proposal. Um, it's all about improving the current facilities. What we would like some consideration is, um, some of the variability of student enrolments, uh, that occurs on an annual or biannual basis, uh, in school. An example of that is, um, when we put in our application, we've submitted a student enrolment number 1244, I think.

20

MS SMITH: Forty-four.

25 MR TANNOCK: That's now in the 1260s, so it has risen by about 20 or so over that period of time. Um, it's possible that will decline. Um, so – uh, we were wondering if there could be some consideration for some of the – some of the variants you have in student enrolments, whilst keeping in mind that we're not seeking to add another year group or another stream, um, in the – in the student population. Staff – staff numbers are, um, acceptable to the school.

30 MS TUOR: All right. So you're looking at it that you have a cap but that there be – you know, plus - - -

COM WILSON: An average.

35 MR TANNOCK: Yes. Some acknowledgment that that – there can be some shifts and roundabouts on an annual basis without it being in any way extreme, and we would understand that the department and residence would take a very dim view if all of a sudden we have 100 extra students which we would have no intention of doing.

40

MS TUOR: Mmm. So the variants would be, what, plus 10 students or - - -

45 MR TANNOCK: I think – I think around plus 20 would be – would be a reasonable consideration.

COM WILSON: And that would – would they be mainly at the main – uh, sorry, at the main campus, or would they be across the three campuses?

MR TANNOCK: Yes. For us it's largely in the senior school where you would see an increase in that, between the Upper Pitt Street campus and the, um – and the, uh, senior campus, as opposed to the junior school.

5 MS TUOR: And, um, just having the overall cap and not having it divided into the three campuses if that – that - - -

MR TANNOCK: Mmm. That would be our preference, yes.

10 MS TUOR: It's – because then you can mix it between the two.

MR TANNOCK: We're happy – happy with that. Yes, yes. 1

MS TUOR: All right. So any other comments on conditions?
15

MS SMITH: No. No, no further comments on the conditions.

MR TANNOCK: No.

20 MS TUOR: Yes. I mean, one thing that we brought up with the department as well was just the structure of the consent at the moment. At the moment it's – sort of has them, um, concept approval pretty much only relating to the plans for the junior school, whereas I think our feeling was that the concept approval should be the umbrella and there should be some plans in there that relate to the overall three
25 campuses, and then the stage 1 comes off that. So I think they're having a look at that.

MR WILSON: We don't have a problem with that, Commissioner. Um, we've had our PCA look at it in terms of, you know, how things are reasonably applied and the
30 wording of the conditions, and we've largely come to – we can understand why that change had to be made.

MS TUOR: Yes. And we didn't have – we ran out of time with the department to actually go through any of our comments on the conditions, so that's something that
35 we will have to do at another time if appropriate. All right. Any other questions?

MR CHEONG: No.

MS TUOR: Alana?
40

MS A. JELFS: No.

MS TUOR: Chris?

45 COM WILSON: No, it's fine, thanks.

MS TUOR: Okay. I think that's all. Thank you very much for coming in.

MS SMITH: No, thank you.

MR WILSON: Thank you very much.

5 MR TANNOCK: Thank you so much. We will see you next Thursday.

MS TUOR: Yes.

10 **RECORDING CONCLUDED**

[2.30 pm]