



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 NORTH SYDNEY COUNCIL

RE: ST ALOYSIUS' COLLEGE REDEVELOPMENT

PANEL: ANNEWISE TUOR
CHRIS WILSON
SOO-TEE CHEONG

ASSISTING PANEL: ALANA JELFS

COUNCIL: DAVID HOY
KIM ROTHE

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

DATE: 2.39 PM, WEDNESDAY, 31 JULY 2019

MS A. TUOR: So good afternoon and welcome. 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 of the proposal whereby St Aloysius' College Limited, the applicant, is seeking
5 approval for a concept proposal and detailed stage 1 works to redevelop the school, 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 sports facilities; and detailed stage 1 works of 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 of existing teaching and learning facilities; and demolition and rebuild of the north-east building wing on the main campus, construction of a new infill building in the existing quadrangle and associated refurbishment of north wing, south wing, great hall and chapel. My name
15 is Annelise Tuor. I'm the chair of the IPC panel. Joining me are my fellow commissioners Chris Wilson and Soo-Tee Cheong. Um, the other attendees of the meeting are – and if you want to just say your names.

MR K. ROTHE: Kim Rothe, senior assessment officer, North Sydney Council.
20

MR D. HOY: And David Hoy, team leader of assessments, North Sydney Council.

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
25 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 information upon which the commission will base its decision. It is important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we
30 consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website. I request that 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.
35 So we'll now begin. So we sent out a draft agenda, but, as I understand it, you, um, wish to speak more, ah, just to the council's report and on conditions.

MR HOY: Put simply, we weren't quite sure what the commission was asking us to respond to. We've seen the department's assessment report, and, um, we weren't
40 sure if we were here to clarify what the department was putting forward as the reasons history to support the application in front of the panel – or the commission. Um, really, we felt it was our role simply to clarify the submission that was put on by the council itself. So we're here for the commission's clarity.

45 MS TUOR: Yeah. I mean, I suppose - - -

MR HOY: - - - we'll assist where we can.

MS TUOR: And it was just giving you the opportunity to express your concerns
and comment on whether the department's report had adequately addressed them, in
5 your opinion. That sort of thing.

MR HOY: Yes.

MS TUOR: So - - -
10

MR HOY: Okay.

MS TUOR: But if you want to – maybe to start, um, the quickest way is just for you
to explain what your – the council's concerns were, um, noting that you've put in
15 two submissions. So if you can just briefly summarise what the concerns were and
what's still outstanding.

MR ROTHE: Sure. Um, look, we'll go to the, ah – I'm Kim Rothe. Um, we'll go
to the, ah, 11th of June, ah, letter that we, ah, submitted. Um, look, we'll just go in
20 sequence of the issues as raised, which – ah, the principal one was the, ah, traffic,
um, concerns, and, um, this was also raised in the recent matter of the Loreto
alteration additions, which are in very near vicinity of the site. Um, so very well-
regarded schools in the area, and we appreciate that they've, ah, got an obligation to
upgrade and do their facilities and stuff like that.

25
But the current proposals from both sites, um – both sites – sorry – already have
existing traffic – temporal traffic issues, in that, um, when you have your morning
drop-off and the evening pick-up, there's always, um, a number of parents and
people, like, coming in and around, trying to, ah, collect their kids or drop them off.
30 Um, the principal concern really just revolves around that, um, both schools are
proposing fairly significant – well, very significant additions, um, in what they say is
to bring them up to modernisation and current educational standards.

35
Now, certainly, council doesn't have a problem with them doing that, but what –
what our ongoing concern is, in both situations that have been addressed by the
statements that we're being advised that the school doesn't intend to increase the
student and or teacher populations, but specifically to St Aloysius we're looking at
around about nearly 5000 square meters of additional floor area being introduced in
the proposal across all three campuses.

40
And we just find it very hard to accept that over a long enough timeframe that at
some point in time they're not going to come back with a proposal to increase their
student numbers and then – like, when we've already got concerns relating to the
traffic that occurs around the area at the time, what safeguards do we have in place,
45 particularly for the community and our constituents as council that we have to be
mindful of, how is that in the long-term going to be conserved, I suppose, for what of
a better word.

We have a concern that it will be a case of build it and they will come situation, where the school goes “okay, well, now we want a lot more demand for utilisation of the school, but we can’t meet that demand because we have limitations.” So what preventative measures beyond the condition of consent is going to be put in – put
5 into play to revisit these issues down the track if they – if they seek the expansion of the school numbers down the track when – when looking at 5000 square meters, that’s a fairly significant - - -

10 MS TUOR: But, specifically, your concerns about the existing traffic situation is in relation to the parents, which is largely the junior school parents dropping their children off and picking them up.

MR ROTHE: The traffic report - - -

15 MS TUOR: And the – and the traffic then going through the residential areas; is that - - -

MR ROTHE: Their traffic indicates – yeah, the significant demand generator is the junior school, and we appreciate that. Obviously, people would want to, you know –
20 their kids to be – ensure that they’re at school and picked up, that’s fine. But the school – comparing apples with apples in this particular one, Loreto had much – much more onsite parking provided, and while we’re still – council were still not necessarily satisfied in that particular regard, it was better because there was a bigger provision of parking on site and also a situation to get more parking via the parking
25 available at the sailing club at the end of the point.

But Aloysius only has what, in the order of about 16 to 20 parking spaces in total, and they’ve made absolutely no progression in this to - - -

30 MS TUOR: But they’re two separate issues; one is in terms of pick-up and drop-off is that that’s a traffic-generating issue - - -

MR ROTHE: Sure.

35 MS TUOR: - - - that you’ve got people driving their children to school and, you know, is there queueing that’s occurring because there’s only five spaces for the drop-off etcetera, etcetera. Providing more parking spaces in some ways would actually encourage more traffic to occur. If you had parking there, then potentially more teachers would drive – you know, the year 12 students might want to drive and
40 that sort of thing, so to me they’re two separate issues, whether you provide more parking.

So, in terms of dealing with the first one, which is about drop-off and pick-up, do you – is there at the moment with the current numbers at the junior school queueing
45 or, you know, issues that are occurring - - -

MR C. WILSON: Safety issues.

MS TUOR: Safety issues or those sorts of things that are occurring with the current arrangement with the pick-up and drop-off, where they've got five spaces allocated on Burton Street.

5 MR HOY: Do you mean in a specific location? Um - - -

MS TUOR: Well, as I understand it, they've got five spaces allocated on Burton Street for pick-up and drop off, so presumably that's where - - -

10 MR ROTHE: We provided advice.

MS TUOR: - - - the children jump out of the car and, um, run into school, and the parents whizz off.

15 MR HOY: Look, it's something that our traffic division has, um, over a long period of time, worked to mitigate through ranger patrols, um, but also, ah, analysing, um, how particular intersections work. I don't have the response for the particular points where there are pressure points for the existing operation. Um, our issue is, at the moment, that Kirribilli – well, we call it a peninsula, basically because it is an
20 isolated area and you've the restricted road entries, um, and the circulation routes around – under the bridge and back up through to the bridge approaches.

So we – we see that, and I saw this this morning, when I was out there at drop off time, there was traffic issues. You couldn't say that they were particularly targeted
25 just to St Aloysius School, but it's certainly a, um, it's a locality issue for Kirribilli in itself, so we are quite sensitive to development down on the peninsula that would see traffic generating, um, uses, which is really what you would – you would see as a result of, um, ah, large expanses of educational establishments.

30 Now, we raised this with the Loretto School, and we – we said, over a 50 – 50-year period, it's – it's not likely you could expect the schools not – the school populations not to increase, both on a staffing level but with students as well, um, and what we're not seeing as part of these concept applications is any attempt to address this as a known issue.

35 Now, I – we see with the conditions there's, um, pushes towards green travel plans and all the rest of them, but what we're saying is that you really need to be dealing with that upfront, and I don't know that the evidence is – is sufficiently there to – with some certainty, to say that the existing situation is going to either stay the same
40 or get better, so, for that reason, we maintain that as a big issue, and taking the two sites in isolation, I think, is also a problem.

Um, very difficult to say they must work together to develop a strategic traffic management plan, but they do. They are in a couple hundred metres of each other,
45 and they are major – major, um, traffic-generating uses within that peninsula so, um, in terms of specific areas where our traffic division has had problems, we would look to put you in the frame of the areas where we see there's some problems, but I will

get – we’ll do that through, um, some subsequent correspondence to the Commission, so at least you’ll know what our, um, traffic division is doing about that. At the moment, I think it’s mostly focused on compliance with rangers.

5 MR WILSON: Is this congestion, or is it parking, or both?

MR HOY: It’s congestion, but it’s also illegal, um, parking infringements.

MR WILSON: Okay.

10

MR HOY: So stopping in no stopping zones, unsafe drop offs, those sorts of things.

MR ROTHE: I mean, our traffic department, on review of the upfront application, concluded it was okay on the proviso that there was no increase in students, um, so that’s a very important thing, but as soon as you factor in a potential increase over a period of time, which may or may not occur, we don’t know, but, um, then there’s a problem.

15

MR WILSON: Well, you’ve read the department’s recommendations, haven’t you?

20

MR ROTHE: Correct.

MR WILSON: Yeah.

MR ROTHE: Yes. Yeah. No, no, we’re fully aware that there’s a condition there that locks in the numbers. That’s – that’s fine, we understand that, but, ah, I just can’t look at these things in pure isolation impacts. The area is scheduled for higher density over – you know, at a corresponding period of time, so it’s not just the schools that are also going to be generating these things, but over time it would – you know, we would anticipate there will be, ah, steadily increasing densities in the residential areas, so the cumulative impact of all these things going on, you know, really has the potential to, um, yeah, in terms of parking and everyone getting in and out of there, um, we’re not getting a metro or anything in this place. So, ah - - -

30

MS TUOR: But at the current operation of the school, in terms of, um, transport and, um, number of children on the pavement, pedestrians, that sort of thing, that’s working okay, or is that an issue as well?

35

MR ROTHE: It’s – like I said, the – ah, the initial advice letter we provided states, as long as the numbers don’t change now - - -

40

MS TUOR: Mmhmm.

MR ROTHE: - - - um, it is sufficient. I’ll leave it at that, but I’d probably qualify it by, “It’s barely sufficient, but you’re only talking about the temporal problems like morning and evening.” Any other time, there isn’t a general problem, um, but – yeah. And you - - -

45

MR WILSON: So what we've heard is drop off is probably – probably worse than pick-up, because people are on their way into the city and so forth, and business hours. Is that – is that your understanding?

5 MR HOY: Um, I think it's actually pick-up is the greater period.

MR WILSON: Okay.

10 MR HOY: It – my understanding of these traffic analysis - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.

15 MR HOY: You get greater – greater compression of the timeframes for collection because you – you spend – you're more – more people on the roads at that time.

MR WILSON: Because you can't leave them alone.

20 MR HOY: That's right. You can drop them off whatever timing, but you've got to pick them up – particular time

MR WILSON: And they can stay. Okay. That's not what came out in the traffic analysis, but that's interesting.

25 MR HOY: Well, look, defer to the experts on that one.

MR WILSON: That's – that's a practical answer.

MR HOY: Yeah.

30 MR WILSON: I don't understand that.

MR HOY: Yeah.

35 MS TUOR: Because the – I mean, what other schools have done – and I don't know if this has been explored, but this one is much more that thing of staggered starting times for different year groups - - -

MR HOY: Yeah.

40 MS TUOR: - - - and, you know, buses that pick up students from certain areas and take them to school. That sort of thing.

MR HOY: Yeah. Yeah, I - - -

45 MS TUOR: So - - -

MR HOY: Well, the private schools do that, yeah.

MS TUOR: Yeah, so whether there are management matters that can be addressed in the – in the management plans that are being

5 MR ROTHE: Given the lack of parking they have in the first place, I think they've had to think about it, as far as an operational thing, much more than Loreto ever did in – in the first instance.

MR WILSON: But isn't there parking for staff?

10 MR ROTHE: Well, it's an interesting thing. I mean, the numbers are capped at 339 staff. I mean, that's fairly considerable. If the facilities are going to improve, you know, how are they going to be able to lock down their numbers of teachers

15 MR HOY: There was some confusion about that, I think. They - - -

MS TUOR: That's full-time equivalent, is it?

MR HOY: There was 176 full-time equivalent. So it's - - -

20 MS TUOR: Yeah, yeah.

MR HOY: It's - - -

25 MS TUOR: And that's what the - - -

MR HOY: In terms of parking to – to provide for that number of staff, they're well below, but they're managing now, so they're saying that's their existing, so, um, they're basically fending for themselves. The teachers come in via public transport, which is exactly what they should be doing. They're well-served by public
30 transport, as you can imagine, so – given their position in – in the network, but we wouldn't want a situation where that – that number grows and they're causing problems elsewhere.

35 MS TUOR: Yep. All right.

MR HOY: Not that the staff cause them, but the – the demands on the on-street parking and, um, the travels to and from the – the site.

40 MS TUOR: All right. Well, I mean, obviously, we can only deal with the application that's before us - - -

MR HOY: Sure.

45 MS TUOR: - - - which is one that doesn't propose to increase the numbers, so it was more just getting an understanding about, with those existing numbers, whether there are issues that are already exist with the existing numbers.

MR WILSON: And how we – how we can maybe address some of those issues.

MS TUOR: Yeah, and whether there are positive ways that that can be addressed if there were issues. So maybe if you - - -

5

MR HOY: Well, I think there are conditions in – in the draft conditions that – which would, um, deal with it, but I – I – I would say we'd rather see that up-front and perhaps maybe in some consultation with council's traffic division, um, not so much, um, beholding them to an approval process through that, but at least in consultation with our, um, traffic division to make sure any changes to the on – on – on-street management signage, for example – that can be worked through. Okay.

10

MS TUOR: All right. So the other aspects in your submission.

15

MR ROTHE: Look, we raised the matter of, like, use of the public open space per – like, obviously, the main campus additions will create an attractive, like, rooftop area, not – not least insofar for recreational – full active recreation purposes, but, um, the junior campus will have the new sporting facilities

20

MR WILSON: Provide some overflow.

25

MR ROTHE: Yeah. So, look, um, it probably comes more in the, sort of, realms of just, um, the – like, a – a great new school would have really good adequate, like, sporting facilities and, like, that stuff. We appreciate they've, kind of, worked out in this, so I guess we don't have any sustained ongoing objection in that regard; it's just, um, that we prefer that they could with council a bit more about the use and management of the, um – of our public facilities that, you know, are subsidised by ratepayers and that they, kind of, apparently don't have a lot of consultation in that regard. Um, they just take liberties in, um – um, I mean, a lot – there's a lot of people that like to visit the bridge and sit down in Bradfield Park underneath. Local workers and stuff like that, but - - -

30

MR WILSON: Do you have a formal agreement with council in relation to the use of that land?

35

MR ROTHE: No.

MR WILSON: Right .

40

MR HOY: No.

MR ROTHE: There's no - - -

45

MR HOY: Um, and – but it is a condition, um, the - - -

MS TUOR: We understand that, yeah.

MR HOY: Um, that the – yeah, that the department has come up with a condition and – but it just says “consult”.

MR WILSON: Yeah, I know.

5

MR ROTHE: So - - -

MR HOY: Yeah.

10 MR WILSON: We raised that with both the applicant and the department.

MR HOY: Look, it’s public open space. It just – it’s subject to wear and tear. We’re not able to, um, I guess, levy against, um, casual use of that spaces, but there is an impact to it. Um, it’s – it’s no different to the fitness groups that use it.

15

MR ROTHE: Yeah, which is another – that’s a separate issue.

MR WILSON: Okay.

20 MR ROTHE: Um, look, just general observations are the remaining part. Like, um, as far as, like, the overall proposal goes in terms of its overall design and stuff like that, we – we generally believe it is reasonably well-conceived, like, the location of the – the principal additions in the main campus are, sort of, in the spot you would anticipate and not causing an exacerbation of, um, external impacts or extreme
25 unacceptable impacts because they’re rebuilding the wing.

The new additions, kind of, sit comfortable below that. They’ve – you’ve already got measures in play to deal with the privacy concerns raised by the submitters next door might be vocal at your, uh – your public meeting for that particular one. The
30 additions to the, uh – the junior campus hopefully endeavour to sort of keep the bulk and scale on that down, so we’re pretty sure that that has also been generally reasonably well resolved, and the additions to the senior campus are so minor to negligible that there’s really no material impact arising from that. So they really comprise the main thing. I – I guess we’re here now to answer any of the panel’s
35 specific questions if they have it, otherwise - - -

MS TUOR: Uh, do you want to just go through any comments you’ve got on the conditions, or - - -

40 MR HOY: Um, I – I would only note that there are some changes to the main campus additions, which I think the – the commission has probably – probably seen, which is around the reduction of the – the entry portal. And there’s some limitation to shade structures on the rooftop – um, rooftop area. These – um, these rooftop open spaces, they’re – they’re wonderful, in theory, but they’re often highly exposed
45 areas.

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR HOY: Um, all weather conditions – they will be subject to southerlies, driving rain, hot sun, you name it it's going to be on there. So, um, requirements that the shading structures comply with that condition B2 is important. Along with the landscape changes – there was another one there for a larger setback from the parapet
5 – um, I think it was a three-metre landscape zone from the parapet. Um, I think that should be a minimum to that – to the use of that area. Um, you've also noted the events – sorry?

MR S. CHEONG: Sorry. I – just interrupt you. When you suggest a sheet
10 structure, don't you think that will exacerbate the problem of you blocking

MR HOY: Yes. Uh, exactly. Which is why we say if they're designed it and they are going to need those things in the future, that needs to comply with the conditions as – as set. Now - - -

15 MS TUOR: So that plane that they're talking about - - -

MR HOY: There's a plane that they talk about. That's correct. Um, I don't know – the version of the report I've seen – it's a bit unclear where that plain was. Um, I just
20 - - -

MR WILSON: Well, it's still under – under 8, I assume. But it's in the - - -

MS TUOR: Yes. There's a diagram - - -
25

MR HOY: Yes, the one I've seen is quite rudimentary and in black and white.

MR WILSON: Yes. It's hard to view in this report.

30 MS TUOR: Yes.

MR HOY: And it looks – and – and it's very hard to pick where that plane commences along the southern elevation. I guess that might be the top of the parapet, but - - -
35

MS TUOR: Well – well the words it says – it's basically plane drawn from the top of the southern parapet of the replacement northeast building. So I think that's – that there is the spring point for it, because that – you can see where the line is going.

40 MR HOY: Mmm.

MS TUOR: So that's the springing point there. And then – and the top of the existing – oh, the southern elevation of the southeast building. So that's – that springing point there. So it's – it's basically that line there, being those two points –
45 being the springing points for the – the view. What with – um, mention – talked to the proponent about in our meetings with them is whether you actually need that height of parapet, particularly here - - -

MR HOY: On the main part of the building?

MS TUOR: Yes, in that replacement northeast building.

5 MR HOY: I - - -

MS TUOR: Because it's - - -

10 MR HOY: I suspect that's possibly more to do with the roof plant. Like, a recess area for the mechanical plant, which is dealt with part C of condition B2. I think it's a - it's a little bit unclear about that there. Yes.

MS TUOR: Yes, well, obviously if you - if you make the parapet lower, then you would see more of the plant if the plant is in that location.

15 MR HOY: Yes.

MS TUOR: But we've asked them to go away and look at both the plant and the - and the need for that kind of - the parapet to see if that - those springing points could be, perhaps, brought down, but then your point about fitting in the - um, any shading structures below that is an issue.

MR WILSON: Shading structures, yes.

25 MS TUOR: And also - - -

MR WILSON: Becomes an issue.

30 MS TUOR: This - this is always - is just a line that deals with views from what's behind; it doesn't necessarily deal with people's ability to view the roof structures this way. Although I think this was they would be read against the other buildings that exist, so I don't think that's such an issue.

35 MR HOY: No, I don't think it's a visual thing. Uh, from the various angles you might see it, it's the view loss issue, um, I guess.

MS TUOR: Yes.

40 MR HOY: So you don't want to, um, exacerbate that. Uh, there are circumstances where the council has required covenants to be established on title about the use of rooftop terraces. I don't know if the commission wants to go down that path, and we would certainly have to be, um, of a mind to see who - who the interest parties in any - any sort of covenant for the use of the rooftop area. Um, but it is - is something that the commission might wish to have regard for.

45 MR WILSON: The - uh, we mentioned already the department recommended a trial period on which to - - -

MR HOY: Yes. This is more just to do with structures.

MR WILSON: Oh, okay.

5 MR HOY: So furniture, umbrellas, awnings – those sorts of things.

MR WILSON: Sure. I – I guess my question is, with your experience in terms of trial periods and rooftop activation, as you – as – as you put it – the trial period – mean, the recommendation is to just go with complaints and compliance.

10

MR HOY: Yes. And - - -

MR WILSON: I mean, we're wondering whether or not they need to be more formal monitoring of – of rooftop activities.

15

MR HOY: I guess that would come back down to who is responsible for monitoring that.

MR WILSON: Yes.

20

MR HOY: I see there are some operational management plans to be developed as part of the conditions in consultation with council. We would welcome that.

MR WILSON: Yes.

25

MR HOY: Obviously, if the design goes through as it's put it's going to be a fantastic space for the school's events; we just want to make sure that's appropriately managed.

30

MR WILSON: Yes, sure.

MR HOY: Things like, um – yes.

35

MR WILSON: I guess my question is, you know, waiting for a complaint to manage something is not necessarily the best way of doing things.

MR HOY: Agreed.

40

MR WILSON: I mean, do you do formal monitoring of these types of facilities? Or is it just difficult – not equipped?

MR ROTHE: We're not really

45

MR HOY: Um, we don't have – we don't have them with this type of use.

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR HOY: Generally, they are communal rooftop areas associated with a flat building.

MR WILSON: Okay.

5

MR HOY: Occasionally you will have an office building, but those are different spaces to a school. They are going to be having social events there, no doubt, fundraises – New Year’s Eve, I think, is mentioned in there, and why wouldn’t they?

10 MS TUOR: Mmm.

MR HOY: We just want to sure that the types of occasions are something that’s built into the management plan and it’s something we can work with.

15 MR WILSON: Sure.

MR HOY: These things have, in the past, caused issue with neighbours. So if we are to be in a position to take action – compliance action, we want to have something where we have been engaged with the – um, the school about.

20

MR WILSON: Well - - -

MS TUOR: So previous events that have been held at the school, you’re saying, there have been some issues with them, or - - -

25

MR HOY: There’s no rooftop space in this location now.

MS TUOR: No, but they’ve had the quadrangle, and – and they’ve used the roof for music before, so - - -

30

MR ROTHE: They’re all - - -

MR CHEONG: Not to my knowledge, but we have had that in other areas not – not – not associated with the school. No, no.

35

MR ROTHE: See - - -

MS TUOR: In other areas? Okay. I wasn’t sure. Okay. So the current – any of the events that have been held currently by the school out of hours, you’re not aware of there being any issues with those?

40

MR HOY: No.

MR ROTHE: No. But the issue, especially for New Year’s – the whole point is, like, closed off. There’s no vehicle access and stuff like that, so - - -

45

MS TUOR: Yes. I think what – we think - - -

MR CHEONG: New Year's happens everywhere.

MS TUOR: I think we just agree that New Year's is chaos.

5 MR ROTHE: So they need to talk to us if they're going to be a generator of, like, up to or over a thousand people to use that roof. We're going to...

MR ROTHE: So they need to talk to us if they're going to be a generator of, like, up to – over 1000 people to use that roof. Ah, we're gonna need to start working
10 management in on that. It's not just something they can be let to roam free on it. Um, so - - -

MR WILSON: They've suggested a maximum, haven't they, through – somewhere
15 in the documentation?

MR ROTHE: And anyone who – like - - -

MS TUOR: 800.

20 MR ROTHE: Obviously, the local community, anyone who's gonna complain, they're gonna come to council first. So, um, you know, if we're gonna respond adequately, there needs to be the – so we – look, we're supportive of the idea fine, as long as they consult with us.

25 MS TUOR: But I think what Chris was asking was do you have an opinion about, during the trial period, whether, um, the condition in relation to the trial period, which isn't actually in the draft conditions that we've got at the moment, should include – some of them include a requirement that, um, you know, the applicant
30 engage an independent, um, noise expert that's agreed to by, you know, the department and the applicant to undertake monitoring of – during the 12-month trial period, or is it just something that you have occur in accordance with the management plan, and then, if people complain, then - - -

MR ROTHE: I think independent person – appointed person would be better.
35

MR WILSON: So you'd establish specified trigger levels, have monitoring and ensure that they meet those trigger levels. Yeah.

MR ROTHE: Yeah. So, um, especially during one of their sanctioned events to
40 make sure that – yeah. Well, I mean, that's what a trial period's for. So, yeah, as long as they're an independent person, I think that's fair and equitable. The residents will have an expectation, too, that, um – that it's someone independent.

MS TUOR: And do you think it needs to be of the traffic generated as well, or just
45 the noise?

MR WILSON: And if it was the traffic, how would you do it?

MR HOY: Don't want that one.

MR ROTHE: No. Ah, I mean, if they had a big event on that wasn't, like – like I said, Milsons Point is closed during off during the New Year's event, but if they're
5 having another one of these other big events that's outside of that time where the vehicle access is present, it would be nice if they'd undertake a parking survey - - -

MR WILSON: Yeah.

10 MR ROTHE: - - - in and around. I'd - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

MR ROTHE: Like, a survey that would happen before the event was in is in play
15 and then something during in play so that we can have some meaningful feedback as to whether or not, um, we're having a – ah, and, again, the nature of the activities proposed. I mean, are people going to catch public transport, um, to one of these things or not? Is that gonna form part of their traffic management plan or not? I don't know. Like, people always get worried about night-time events and how
20 they're going to get home, not relying on public transport for those kind of things. So I don't think we have, ah - - -

MR WILSON: The parking restrictions or parking limitations - - -

25 MR HOY: They'd apply anyway.

MR WILSON: - - - extend throughout the day.

MR HOY: Yeah.

30 MR WILSON: 24 hours, aren't they, I mean, basically?

MR HOY: Apply – they'd apply anyway.

35 MR WILSON: Yeah.

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MR ROTHE: Yeah.

40 MS TUOR: So it's pretty much just, what, two-hour parking unless you're a resident - - -

MR HOY: Yes. Yeah, that's right.

45 MS TUOR: - - - is it all around that area - - -

MR ROTHE: Yeah.

MR HOY: That's right.

5 MS TUOR: - - - till sort of 10 o'clock at night?

MR HOY: Yes. It's lesser in – closer to the commercial areas.

10 MR ROTHE: Because without collecting the information, there's not really any benchmark there for us to say - - -

MR WILSON: That's right.

15 MR ROTHE: - - - that it's good or it's bad or it's otherwise. So I think if they want to have a due duty of care to us and themselves, they probably should think about that while they're doing it if they want to be factual in how their trial period went.

MR WILSON: But if it doesn't work it's not – it's not very good for the ongoing use of the terrace, so it needs to for everybody I guess.

20

MR HOY: There's some fairly comprehensive around this in the office's report. I really wouldn't want to step too much further into it than those. It does require a lot of consultation with council, adherence to their – I wouldn't call – wouldn't call them patrons – guests – number of guests, I think is 1110. That's something we would be looking for, so - - -

25

MR WILSON: Okay.

30 MR HOY: Ticketed events was the other one. No gate crashers. They will be a popular place at certain times of the year.

MS TUOR: So any other comments about the conditions, or - - -

35 MR HOY: Sorry, the construction traffic management. The conditions don't require consultation with our traffic committee. I would actually recommend the condition be amended to require that, mostly because that includes representatives from the local police and traffic management.

40 MR WILSON: Yeah.

MR HOY: So I – I think they would probably want to do that anyway, but when it comes to construction phasing, if they are in – if they're operating at the same time as other construction sites we want to make sure that we are aware of it and able to manage it. We don't need to have extended running on multiple sites on the peninsula all at once, so - - -

45

MR WILSON: Yeah, no, good point.

MR HOY: - - - that's – that's the intention of requiring that – that process.

MS TUOR: And a lot of the management plans, some require consultation with council and some – they're signed up by the secretary of the Department and some
5 are signed up by the PCA. Did you have any comments on, you know - - -

MR HOY: No, not - - -

MS TUOR: - - - just any ones that are critical that they should be the Department
10 signing them off, or - - -

MR HOY: Not generally. I'd – I'd – I'd probably anticipate the applicant is going to want to clarify who and when they want to do with at particular points.

15 MR WILSON: C18 seems to address your issue, but maybe – maybe it doesn't. It seems to.

MR HOY: Yeah, I – I would just simply say that it needs to specifically refer to the
20 - - -

MR WILSON: Are you – committee.

MR ROTHE: The council's

25 MR HOY: The council traffic committee, and there - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.

MR HOY: There's something that exists.
30

MS TUOR: So C18(b) - - -

MR ROTHE: (b), yeah.

35 MR HOY: Yeah.

MS TUOR:

40 *Be prepared in consultation with council and its traffic committee.*

MR HOY: Yes.

MR ROTHE: Yep.

45 MR HOY: And – and, look, that traffic committee is, um – it's part of council's role as a roads authority, not so much as a consent authority. So it's – really is about management and knowledge and sharing and communicating with the residents.

MR CHEONG: The traffic committee of the council would include transport for
- - -

MR HOY: New South Wales, yes.

5

MR CHEONG: - - - New South Wales, anyway.

MR HOY: Yeah, that's correct. Yep.

10 MR CHEONG: Yep.

MS TUOR: So you cover that as well.

MR CHEONG: Yep.

15

MS TUOR: In one go.

MR HOY: Yep.

20 MR ROTHE: For both - - -

MS TUOR: You could delete "and tier".

MR CHEONG: Yep.

25

MS TUOR: Okay. All right. Are there - - -

MR WILSON: Nope, I'm right.

30 MS TUOR: - - - any other questions?

MR WILSON: Nope, I'm fine, thank you.

MS TUOR: Any other questions?

35

MR CHEONG: Just a general one. Ah, the setback and height, of course, is, ah – for this, ah, development don't come under council's, ah, vote. What is the normal setback for a three-storey building in – in North Sydney that you require?

40 MR ROTHE: Well, council doesn't maintain a development control plan or any specific development standards to educational establishments, so the only comment I can make on there – we'd – we'd adhere – for a general or three-storey building, we – I would assume you're talking about a residential flat building or mixed-use building.

45

MR CHEONG: Yep.

MR ROTHE: In recognised mixed-use building zones, you can build to the boundary, um, and to the height control for the lower portions of the building, and then, as you move up into the residential parts, the separation requirements of SEPP 65 come into play. Um, as far as residential flat buildings go, we try to adhere
5 closely to the, ah, separation distances as per SEPP 65 as well, so, ah, look, setbacks for a flat building would be in the order of, preferably, six metres to the boundary for a three-storey building. Ah, mixed-use buildings could be to the boundary, depending on the zoning, but this is an SP zoned site, and - - -

10 MR CHEONG: Yep. It has the setback on the eastern boundary of 4.08, ah - - -

MR ROTHE: Sorry, which campus are we talking here?

15 MS TUOR: The main campus.

MR CHEONG: Main – main campus.

MR ROTHE: Okay, yeah. Like I said, I think they've thought about the design in this particular instance, about where they're putting the building it's – rather than
20 just plonk it on the top of the existing building, you know, like, it actually makes sense to, ah, put it where they have and create the opportunity for the rooftop terrace, so that explains my comments earlier that, you know, this quite well-resolved proposal in terms of its immediate design. They don't – council doesn't
objection to that.

25 The bookends of the building, as they exist, are already quite close to the boundary anyway, and the – the adjoining residential flat building has – obviously the school was there before the flat building, and they had regard for the positioning of that school in the first instance, so, um, I think the design has been well thought-out in
30 terms of trying to minimise the impacts that can be created, so council is not really raising a specific objection to the setbacks per se, provided that the outcome of the assessment and the impacts is deemed acceptable, so – which – I believe you couldn't really do it much better than what they've really done, so, um, there's no specific comment on the setbacks, I guess. That's fine. It works.

35 MS TUOR: Right. Any other questions? Anything else you wish to say?

MR HOY: Sorry. There was something else on the agenda.

40 MS TUOR: Mmm?

MR HOY: Ah, the relocation of the stairwell. I wasn't quite sure - - -

MS TUOR: Oh, I think that's probably meant to be more the, um, entry - - -

45 MR WILSON: Applicant.

MS TUOR: It's the - - -

MR HOY: Oh, the portal?

5 MS TUOR: The – you know, the stairwell on the top, that - - -

MR WILSON: On the eastern - - -

MS TUOR: The changing the - - -

10 MR WILSON: On the eastern side of the - - -

MS TUOR: The door in it.

15 MR ROTHE: So is that just the

MR WILSON: No, it's the relocation of the eastern stairwell off the - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah.

20 MR WILSON: Off the – I'll show you. it's here.

MR HOY: I'm sorry, we didn't pick that up in the assessment report.

25 MS TUOR: Yeah.

MR WILSON: Here. This one.

MR HOY: 110 pages. We missed that.

30 MR WILSON: Yeah, right. The relocation of this.

MR HOY: That southeast corner, isn't it?

35 MR WILSON: Yeah. Over - - -

MR HOY: So - - -

MR WILSON: Over here somewhere.

40 MR ROTHE: Okay.

MR HOY: Okay. I think we'd support that.

45 MR WILSON: Because of the privacy and noise issues.

MS TUOR: No, no, no - - -

MR CHEONG: No, no.

MS TUOR: They're not relocating it.

5 MR CHEONG: No, it's just putting the door.

MS TUOR: All they're doing is that door there is going to - - -

10 MR HOY: Is going that way.

MR WILSON: Okay.

MS TUOR: And then they're going to extend this.

15 MR WILSON: I'm at the totally wrong end of the stick.

MS TUOR: Yeah, yeah.

20 MR HOY: Well, I think, with the - - -

MS TUOR: We did.

25 MR HOY: With the condition around setbacks for greater – for landscaping along those edges. That's – that's going to be a small – very, very small issue, so we wouldn't - - -

MR WILSON: Yeah.

30 MS TUOR: Yep, yep. Yep, yep.

MR WILSON: So that was – that wasn't

MR HOY: And - - -

35 MS TUOR: No, so, sorry, we – that was a bit unclear as to what we wrote.

40 MR HOY: And – and I think the – the assessing officer has, I think, not done a bad job with how he's – how he's dealt with, um, some of those issues, um, in the amendments in the conditions. I – it was just some tidying up some of those conditions as we've suggested, so - - -

45 MS TUOR: Yeah, I think we've got quite a few comments just on the conditions in terms of tidying up, but – all right, so we've got our public meeting next – um, on the 8th.

MR HOY: Okay.

MS TUOR: At Kirribilli. So thank you very much for coming in. We're now ahead of schedule.

5 **RECORDING CONCLUDED**

[3.18 pm]