



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-938883

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING

RE: DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION SSD7919, LORETO KIRRIBILLI SCHOOL

PANEL: **ILONA MILLAR**
SOO-TEE CHEONG
JORGE VAN DEN BRANDE

PARTICIPANTS: **ANNA DICKINSON**
DANIEL MAHON
PETER BROGAN
BYRON WILLIAMS
ELIZABETH CARPENTER
KATHERINE TRACEY
TOM HEAL
KATE TUDEHOPE
KATE McELHONE

LOCATION: **IPC OFFICE**
LEVEL 17, 201 ELIZABETH STREET
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES

DATE: **11.19 AM, TUESDAY, 11 SEPTEMBER 2018**

MS I. MILLAR: Okay. Good morning and welcome. Before I begin I'd like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land upon which we meet, the Gadigal people of the Eora Nation, and pay my respects to their elders, past and present. So welcome to today's meeting on development application SSD7919 in relation to the Loreto Kirribilli School from Ethos Urban Proprietary Limited, the applicant, who is seeking concept approval for the redevelopment of the site in three stages comprising demolition and construction of current infrastructures, buildings, walkways, stairs and parks, category 1 remediation works and minor landscaping works and stage 1 works.

10 My name is Ilona Millar. I'm the chair of this IPC panel. And joining me today is my fellow commissioner Soo-Tee Cheong and commission planning officer Jorge Van Den Brande. We have a number of people here on behalf of the applicant, so I will let you introduce yourselves for the record in a little bit. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting will be recorded and as full transcript will be produced and made available on the commission's website. This meeting is just one part of the commission's decision-making process. It's taking place at a preliminary stage in the process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the commission bases its decision.

Now, during the process it's important that the commissioners can ask questions of attendees to clarify any issues whenever we consider it appropriate. But if you're asked a question and you're not in a position to answer it, then please feel free to take it on notice and provide any additional information in writing. And then anything provided in writing will also be put on our website. So we will now begin. If I could perhaps ask for the applicant to provide an overview of the proposal. Perhaps talk to the presentation and just walk through the nature of the development and how you've also responded to submissions that you've received along the way. And – sorry – an introduction for the record would be great as well, thanks.

MR P. BROGAN: I'll start. I'm at the head of the table. Peter Brogan, Bloompark Consulting, Loreto's project manager.

35 MS A. DICKINSON: Anna Dickinson, principle of Loreto Kirribilli.

MS K. TUDEHOPE: Kate Tudehope from Ethos Urban, the planning consultant.

MR T. HEAL: Thomas Heal from McLaren Traffic Engineering.

40 MS E. CARPENTER: Elizabeth Carpenter from fjmt Architects.

MS K. TRACEY: Katherine Tracey from fjmt Architects.

45 MR B. WILLIAMS: Byron Williams, Bloompark Consulting, project management.

MS K. McELHONE: Kate McElhone. I'm chair of the school committee.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Great.

5 MR D. MAHON: Daniel Mahon, director of human services at Loreto Kirribilli.

MS MILLAR: Great. Thank you very much. Okay. Over to you.

10 MS DICKINSON: So thank you, everyone, and thank you for providing this opportunity for us to be here and to talk about our building proposal. Back in 2014 Loreto Kirribilli developed a strategic plan – it was called Navigating the Future – and from that strategic plan developed a master plan – a 50-year master plan for the school. So we've been working on that master plan now for over three years. The master plan had three main goals and the first was to enable innovative learning
15 practices, such as STEM with dynamic spaces and design studios, that would meet the needs of our 21st century learners. The second was to ensure that we could get better use out of our landlocked site. And the third and very importantly was to ensure accessibility for students, staff and parents with disabilities because of the number of levels of the school and the stairs that we have in the school.

20 We've been working on the master plan itself for over two years in terms of the consultation process. So we began three years ago, but we've been consulting with community for more than two years, not only through the normal consultation process you would engage in, but really trying to reach out to our community to
25 better understand their needs, to support them, but also to ensure that the school was able to deliver its three main goals. And, most importantly, the teaching and learning goal. We do have an excellent reputation with the local community and we have – we know that our school supports the local community, as well, in a number of ways. Not just by accessing their local community shops, etcetera, but by being a school in
30 the local area and being part of the community. It's a really important aspect to our school and we've been doing that for over 110 years now.

I just wanted to close as before I move over to Urban Ethos by saying what does our innovation the first build do and what doesn't it do. So the first thing that it does
35 do, it will provide for innovative learning practices and the development of contemporary 21st century skills, so collaboration, communication, creativity and critical thinking. What the building won't do: it will not increase enrolments. The building won't add to traffic issues. The building won't add a number of – add events to the school. So the building itself has a purpose. It's – there is a current
40 building there and we are enhancing that building for learning. So it's not there to change the operations of the school, and I think that's a really important point to make. And I'll hand over to Urban Ethos.

45 MS TUDEHOPE: Now, we were planning on now talking through the schedule of our proposed changes of conditions.

MS MILLAR: Perhaps could we get to that at the end of the presentation and maybe if you could talk through what is actually the proposed development - - -

MS TUDEHOPE: Okay.

5

MS MILLAR: - - - first, if that's all right hand over to you.

MS CARPENTER: Yeah. Sure. So this first stage is actually about one of the conditions, but I can just talk generally, if you like, about it. That's about it. So, look, really, when we came on board with the school, it was, I suppose, to look at this idea of how can we lift Loreto into this next future learning strategy, which they've already started to do with their – a number of their precincts which they have developed already: so the science precinct, for example. So we were then tasked to look at both the master plan and then also the first stage of the development. So the innovation centre is actually the first stage of this development, and, as Anna said, it's just looking at this new way of learning, future-focused learning. So, really, what we're providing is these open, flexible spaces, which then enable the school to, I suppose, learn in quite a different model to how they're learning now. So – well, not – no. Sorry. That's not quite correct. To actually use these new spaces to continue on how they're learning now.

So, look, really, the building is a container for this. When we did it, we were very mindful of the urban constraints of the site. We set up a number of design principles. We're very conscious of, I suppose, the neighbours around Loreto and that we sit in a very dense residential area, and I think the design that was then put forward considered all those aspects, really, and so height was very important, to keep that down as possible. So we chose to actually dig deep into the site. What this building does is it actually provides connection to a of precincts within the school. So the idea was we also solve our accessibility within each development which takes place in the school campus, and, look, I think that's probably generally the design in a way. Yeah. So it's quite a sort of complex site. There's over 35 different levels on the site that we had to resolve. So it just gives you a bit – and I know, when you walked around, it just gave you a bit of a sense of the way the topography works and how it sits on the peninsula.

35

MR S. CHEONG: Can you walk us through what is the first stage, second stage and the third stage

MS CARPENTER: Look, probably the best thing to look at is the actual planning design report. So we don't have them as slides, but we do have the planning report here. Can I just bring this over to you? Is that the easiest thing to do? So what we did is we divided it into precincts. So stage 1 is in the western precincts. So, essentially, what you have is the innovation centre, which is here. We have a small addition to the existing gymnasium to provide some seminar rooms, some storage space and some additional staff accommodation, and then we also are resolving the landscape round here, because the site is quite constrained. So as much – we need to use as much of the external areas as possible for outdoor learning, and

45

then also what we have here is a new staircase, which is actually resolving, as you know when you're on site quite confused so it's really providing, like, a much more direct access in this precinct of the campus. So yeah. So - - -

5 MS MILLAR: Can we just ask, in terms of the site boundary, is it the red dotted line there for the site boundary - - -

MS CARPENTER: No.

10 MS MILLAR: - - - or is it the heavy red line? Yeah.

MS CARPENTER: It's the heavy red line. What happens is there a sliver of land which is owned by a separate owner to this property here. So, I mean - yeah.

15 MS MILLAR: Okay. So - and there - there's no easements or anything like that. So - - -

MS CARPENTER: No. No. No. No. It's just this quite strange sliver of land that is owned by someone else.

20

MS MILLAR: Okay. That - - -

MS CARPENTER: Yeah.

25 MS MILLAR: That's great. Thanks for clarifying that.

MS CARPENTER: It's - yeah. It's unusual.

MS MILLAR: Okay.

30

MS CARPENTER: Okay. Great.

35 MS MILLAR: okay. Perhaps, before we get to the conditions, it would be useful to just hear a little bit about the traffic management situation with the pick-off and drop-off arrangements and also whether, as part of the master-planning approach, you had look at other options for internal pick-off and drop-offs within the school boundary.

40 MR HEAL: Sure. When we first started assessing this site and, I guess, throughout the entire process, I think the main feature of our assessment has been that, really, there's no significant change in the traffic characteristics of the school as a result of this development. I know there's been a very comprehensive peer review, which has resulted in a number of different conditions and issues being raised by the department, but I'd like to just highlight and reiterate that, really, the before and after
45 situations of the school are going to be exactly the same.

There's not going to be any extra traffic or parking generation, and what the school has done is to take a proactive approach in the management situation, in that they have appointed a traffic warden, and they're going to implement further traffic management plans to improve the situation as it is currently, and, in the future, after
5 the development, due to these management methods, it's almost certainly the case that it will be better in terms of traffic impacts than it is at the moment. In terms of other options, there have – there were some investigations of the site in terms of providing other vehicle access or any option to provide on-site pick-up and drop-off, but the constraints of the site are such that it's impossible.

10 MS TUDEHOPE: Just to touch on that the site's very steep. There are heritage items on the site. I don't know if Katherine or Elizabeth – but we did look at options to convert the car park on Elamang Avenue into the sort of pick-up and drop-off location, and that proved unfeasible for a number of reasons

15 MS CARPENTER: Yeah. Because the angle of the Elamang has actually quite sightlines. So it was actually quite unsafe for local traffic as well. So it's really the constraints of the site.

20 MS DICKINSON: And the surfaces that exist within the car park itself and the nature of that car park being cut – it's a sandstone – almost a cave-like structure with services within it, not appropriate for little children to be dropped off, but, also, driving in and out would create huge traffic issues on Elamang.

25 MS CARPENTER: And safety is the primary concern.

MS MILLAR: Yes. Now, I understand from council there are other school development proposals in the local area. Was any consideration given to potential cumulative impacts with the increased traffic that might be going to those other
30 developments?

MS DICKINSON: Well, first of all, we are – I think it's important to mention the fact that we are – it is another school. We weren't in consultation with that school at the initial stage because we had developed a master plan, you know, a number of
35 years ago. It's only been in recent times that that school has started to consider – and, you know, it will take time for them to go through the processes that we've gone through. So we're quite confident that they won't overlap, but that school had the right to present their master plan to the community as well. We're not a system of schools. We're separate entities. So we're independent schools.

40 MS MILLAR: Okay. Shall we move on to the presentation, then?

MS TUDEHOPE: Sure. So, as mentioned, that presentation really talks to the conditions around the rooftop and - - -

45 MS MILLAR: Okay. That's great.

MS TUDEHOPE: So – but these – the schedule of conditions, I suppose, sits independent of that. So we thought we might go through these conditions and then come back to the rooftop conditions at the end in relation to the presentation, if that suits.

5

MS MILLAR: Soo-Tee, are you happy with that?

MR CHEONG: Yep

10 MS TUDEHOPE: Okay. So this is, as you know, the outcome of a discussion with the Department of Planning a few weeks ago. It has changed marginally from what you've received there, but our position still remains much the same. So condition A5 – the school had concerns about the implications of this condition and has sought some independent legal advice on the matter. We appreciate that it's now standard,
15 and we're willing to accept it at condition A3 of schedule 3, but we still have some concerns about it as it relates to the concept plan, predominantly because future stages of the concept plan may not be SSD. It's possible that they won't meet the threshold and would go to council or the Sydney Planning Panel. So to have these conditions which relate back to the planning secretary seems a little bit at odds with
20 potential future development pathways. So I believe that's our comment on that one.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

MS TUDEHOPE: So our preference would be for that condition to be deleted from
25 schedule 2. Condition A7, this was a condition that we discussed with the department. It has had a little bit of back and forth. It was agreed that the term “full-time equivalent staff” would be added to that condition for clarity and the school has requested an added layer of clarity that it be full time equivalent staff as documented in annual Commonwealth census data. That's data that the school has to collect on
30 an annual basis. It's published online. I think it just adds an added layer of transparency and clarity about exactly how those figures are calculated and where the public can find that information.

As mentioned, condition A3, we are now willing to retain that condition, so we're no
35 longer proposing to delete that condition. Condition A17 relates to the workplace travel plan. There was a small error: the department didn't reference the date of the report accurately, so we're just requesting that that date be included. There was also some discussion with the department about the timing and frequency of reviews of the workplace travel plan and the department inserted the wording “from time to
40 time” to try and overcome those concerns. The school's position or comment on that is who determines what “from time to time” is, what does “from time to time” mean, and the department said, well, that's really at Loreto's discretion. So we're proposing to include that wording so the school can determine when the WTP needs to be reviewed and amended.

45

Condition A22, this is another condition about staff numbers, and we're just proposing to include that wording to reflect the Commonwealth census data.

Condition A24, this was another one that there was quite a lot of discussion with the department about. Loreto was originally proposing to have this condition deleted. However, the department, I think, helped us understand the intent of the condition and that it was a requirement from Transport New South Wales, so we now
5 understand the intent and the need to retain it. However, we're requesting that that list of items from (a) through (c) be a "such as" list. The department indicated that there was some discretion around what we might implement and that wasn't supposed to be exhaustive and they seemed quite open to that change in wording just to reflect the intent and the flexibility a little bit better. Condition B5 relates to the
10 rooftops. We might come back to that - - -

MS MILLAR: Okay.

MS TUDEHOPE: - - - at the end. Condition B12 relates to bicycle parking. We
15 just have a plan here. The bicycle parking was originally proposed in Centenary Hall. So the bicycle parking was originally proposed in Centenary Hall and there's since been some further discussions with the school about that's used as a HSC space, so at certain times of the year it's out of bounds, so it's really not practical. So it's now proposed to relocate the bicycle parking spaces to the science building,
20 along Elamang Avenue frontage, so we can still provide 20 bicycle parking spaces there and it can still be accessed in the same way as they previously were. We did discuss this with the department and they were open to the change in location, however, procedurally they weren't able to substitute the plans at that stage. So if the commission would be open to us submitting a revised plan, that would be ideal.
25 If not, we appreciate that might have to be a modification, but if we can resolve that now that would be appreciated.

MR CHEONG: What level is the bicycle parking situated at?

30 MS CARPENTER: It's the same level as the Centenary Hall.

MR CHEONG: Yeah, which is?

35 MS: Yeah. So there's a stair - - -

MS:

MS: Yeah.

40 MS: level.

MS: No, it's one level up.

MR CHEONG: One level - - -

45 MS: So it's one level above.

MS: From Elamang.

MR CHEONG: Okay.

5 MS: Above the car park.

MS MILLAR: And there was a bike route to – for - - -

MS CARPENTER: That’s right.

10 MS MILLAR: For the - - -

MS CARPENTER: We have a bike way - - -

15 MS MILLAR: Yes, okay.

MS: Along the existing stairs.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

20 MS CARPENTER: Quite steep, but - - -

MS DICKINSON: It’s quite a good location for it, actually.

25 MS CARPENTER: Yeah, out of the way.

MS TUDEHOPE: Peter, I might pass over to you in terms of condition C28.

MR BROGAN: Thanks. Just in relation to C28, we’re just looking for a minor
30 modification there in relation to construction vehicle movements. The current
condition has a time limitation from 7 am to 2 pm. That time limitation actually has
been taken out of our construction management plans as part of our submission. It
was primarily – it was – the timing was specifically around demolition and
35 excavation movements only. That was that timeframe. It wasn’t to do with the
whole construction period. We’re just looking to see if we can have the construction
traffic movements align with condition D3, which takes it through till 5 pm. We are
clearly aware of the pickup and drop-off times and we’re more than happy to have
those two times – the morning and afternoon – to be conditioned, but we’d just like
40 that extension, if we could, of the construction timeframe through to 5 pm, aligning
with D3.

MS TUDEHOPE: It’s important to note that if the condition were to be retained as
currently drafted it would pose enormous constraints for things like concrete pours
and so on. That really just wouldn’t be practical to - - -

45 MR BROGAN: Definitely extend the duration of the project.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

MR CHEONG: Have you give any consideration to the hours of work during school holiday period that – which would exclude the - - -

5

MR BROGAN:

MR CHEONG: - - - exclusion that was drop-off and pickup period.

10 MR BROGAN: Yeah, we've taken that on board. We take every opportunity to do as much work as possible, and if that allowed us to extend our construction period outside of school term, we would definitely take that opportunity and shorten the program for the construction.

15 MS TUDEHOPE: Moving on to condition D5 regarding rock breaking and rock hammering and so on, the department's response on this was that those hours are standard. We are aware of a couple of other applications that have had those hours changed. But we acknowledge that perhaps it's standard for most schools. Our acoustic report assessed the impact of those activities happening between 9 and 5
20 with an hour respite break rather than a two-hour respite break. And so we will be proposing to reduce the respite from two hours to one hour. I think some rough calculations indicate that that would reduce the construction program by six weeks, which to us seems like a better outcome. In particular, people are generally at work during the middle of the day.

25

Condition E3, again, we're asking to insert the wording "around the Commonwealth census data" and we're also just proposing to limit – not limit, sorry. Rather, clarify the increase in student and staff numbers to the cap that's going to be imposed on the condition, and when we met with the department they were comfortable with that
30 proposed change. Condition E17, well, again relates to the roof – top and roof garden, which we'll come back to. Now, E25. I might pass over, Anna, for you to talk about this one, about the event management plan.

MS DICKINSON: So we understand that there is a requirement for an event
35 management plan. But our concern is with the term "consultation", because the – that term implies that there is an opportunity for council to say that we can't have these events. And, as I said at the beginning, this new project is not going to change the conditions of the school. So why would council be wanting to impose a consultation process. And, indeed, when we spoke to them – I spoke to the state
40 planning. They said, no, council doesn't want to do that. They basically just want the information. So I thought it was important that we change that word from "consultation" to "information". And the other was about them having to publish that information around security matters. So we would ask that we not be asked to impose that obligation on the school, but, indeed, provide that information to council,
45 which was what the intent was in the first place.

MS TUDEHOPE: And I'll just also quickly, Anna, touch on E25A, which says that events can't - - -

MS DICKINSON: That's correct.

5

MS TUDEHOPE: Will have to commence after the evening peak, which is just impractical.

MS DICKINSON: Impractical for a school. We have parent and teacher opportunities that begin at 3 pm, will go through to the evening. Our school is one where the parents are heavily engaged in the life of the school. It is a quality school. And therefore to impose a restriction of you can only come to the school at this time at night, they wouldn't be able to meet with all of their teachers, so that immediately is an issue. But we also have other opportunities. For example, we have where the grandparents come to the school and a part of their – daughter's learning. Forms of schooling, as it was in the past, where parents stayed at home and the school ran: that's gone. All of the latest information that is provided for educators and parents is that parents should be engaged in the life of their child's schooling. That is quality schooling. That condition would absolutely remove our opportunity to engage our parent community and our broader community of our ex-students, etcetera.

10
15
20

MR CHEONG: How often do these events take place frequency of this event and whether they are weekdays or weekends?

MS DICKINSON: Yeah. It varies. So, for example, we would have a number of events that occur over the year, and they tend to be standard. For example, we have graduation ceremonies. We have masses for the students. We have events on the weekend because we have sport, like all schools have sport on weekends independent schools, and we have the facilities for that. So – and our families would come along and watch the students. So it can be up to 37 events in a year. Sometimes it's more than that, but it will vary each year based on our calendar. For example, this year, we're 110 years. So we have events specially for that. Next year, there won't be the 110 years. So to again limit us – but there are some core things that every school must have to be a school that is about community, and that is at the heart of Catholic education, and it would be to deny us that opportunity to be a community school.

25
30
35

MR CHEONG: All right. So we could say it's roughly about one and a – one event every one and a half weeks

40

MS DICKINSON: Yeah. At least.

MS MILLAR: And that's with over 100 people involved.

MS DICKINSON: Yes.

45

MS MILLAR: Yep. Okay.

MS DICKINSON: Yeah. And the reality of that is that, you know, it might happen a couple in one week, and, other times, there's nothing for a couple of weeks. So
- - -

5 MR CHEONG: Yeah.

MS DICKINSON: - - - you know - - -

10 MS TUDEHOPE: Moving across to condition F1, this is the same comment as condition A17, relating to the workplace travel plan and that, from time to time, being at the school's discretion. F2 is again about events and the need to provide an event schedule, and I don't know if you want to add to what you've said, other than providing all these details in the public arena is a concern for the school's safety perspective. Condition F8 relates to the rooftop, as does condition F9. So I might
15 pass over to you, Elizabeth, to talk

MS CARPENTER: Great. So what we've just done is just put up the conditions. So just running through them, condition A – hang on

20 I'll just get a bigger copy that I can read. Condition A was to delete the raised roof garden. Condition B was the floor level must not exceed 34.5, which is acceptable if it remains as a concrete roof. C was to restrict any access to the roof except for maintenance, cleaning. Condition D was remove the 1.5-metre-high glass balustrade and propose alternative balustrades. E was access for circulation or fire egress purposes is restricted to the area between Marian Centre and the lift and stairs, and then F was to remove any lift
25 opening on the northern side. It also applies to E17, which is the roof above the learning hub must not include a roof garden, F8, the roof above the new learning hub to the western precinct is to only be used for maintenance and cleaning and not for any other use, and then F9, which is about noise.

30 So the roof area between the Marian Centre and the learning hub and up to the southern side of the building is to be used for circulation between the two buildings, to avoid any adverse amenity impact on the surrounding residents. So the next slide basically just goes – shows an extract from the report identifying the removal of the 1.5-metre-high balustrade and also the removal of the roof garden, which you can see
35 behind the balustrade, and just

note the 1.5-metre balustrade is actually 1.2 metres, not 1.5. So it's just – it's actually 300 lower on our drawings. So

40 just really focusing on B5. It's important to note that the concerns with regards to privacy are from one apartment, unit 9 on 111 Carabella Street, and also it's actually stated in the Department of Planning report that the recommended modifications will marginally improve the water views of unit 9, which is actually incorrect. So we'll just show you that on the following slides, because it's actually, yeah, not visible.

MS TRACEY: That's page 48 and 49 of the department's report.

45 MS CARPENTER: Yeah. So what we just wanted to show in the next slide was the unit in question. The views are – you'll note they're actually quite – they're quite oblique. So you're not – your direct view is actually looking right into the Marian

- Centre, and the main living area is actually obscured by the Marian Centre, and also just to note the relationship between the whole apartment block and the outdoor learning area which is currently in existence, with the art rooms of the Marian Centre, which we looked at when we were on site. So the two highlighted areas
- 5 show the living and the kitchen of unit 9, just to give you a sense of where that is. So this slide – next slide just identifies the – each of the modifications for condition B5, and also relates to condition E17 and F9. So that just goes through each of the points which we've previously spoken about.
- 10 MS TRACEY: So the orange highlighted area relates to the area that has been requested for restriction.
- MS CARPENTER: Yeah. Which is – yeah. And that's immediately opposite the unit in question and then the area between the Marian Centre and the new learning
- 15 hub. So moving – the students moving towards the staircase in the distance is actually then concealed by the – the plant area to the west as well. So I will go through these in more detail as well. The next one is slide is actually showing the – a view which we have taken from the living room of apartment 11 and - - -
- 20 MS TRACEY: You mean apartment 9.
- MS CARPENTER: Sorry. Apartment 9, and to note that that's an oblique view. This next slide is a comparative view. So that's from approximately a similar
- 25 viewpoint, which is taken from our computer model. Note that the vegetation is not shown in this view. Therefore, it's a simplified view of the headland. So, obviously the trees are actually obscuring some of the water. So here you see quite a lot of water. This view here is then a comparison of the two height planes. So we have the LEP height plane, which is the complying envelope, which is in orange, and the DCP height plane and the non-complying envelope, which is in red. So you just see those
- 30 two. So what we've done is the non-compliance in red has been carefully positioned so there's no view impact from the unit and the – note the view loss implications of the complying envelope. So the orange basically obliterates out any of the view from unit 9. You can just see the headland underneath.
- 35 So this is the view of the new learning hub, and then the two elements which been modified in this view are the amendment to the glazed balustrade to remove the 1.5-metre balustrade and to propose alternative balustrades and the removal of the rooftop planter. I might just point them out to you, actually, because they're quite hard to see. So this is the – the glazed balustrade is through here, and then that's the
- 40 rooftop planter so this next one is the same view with the overlays of the complying and then the small portions of the non-complying envelope. So you'll see that the complying envelope is substantially higher than the current glazed balustrade. This is the same view with the two requested amendments. The rooftop planter has been removed.
- 45 However, the glazed balustrade has actually been retained at its correct height, and we did actually retain the materiality of it to maximise the transparency. We actually

propose that the glazing is actually the best solution to provide the transparency, and also we do want to have the balustrade to meet the school's obligations for the work health and safety as well. So the next slide just goes through each of those – our proposed modifications to the requested amendments in red. So A is as per the red text. So A was to delete the raised roof garden. Here, we want to retain the planter to provide increased visual amenity from the unit 9 and also to reduce any area of the roof. So you find that the planter is actually taking up the majority of that roof plane. B - - -

10 MS TRACEY:

MS CARPENTER: Sorry.

15 MS TRACEY: The reason for that was in response to community consultation, which we'll go through a bit later, but the reason why we do have that planter was to specifically reduce areas. We couldn't allow students to congregate on the roof – and to improve the outlook for the neighbours.

20 MS CARPENTER: B was the fall of the roof must not exceed 34.5, which is fine as long as the roof remains as concrete. So if we did change the materiality of that roof, we would then have to look at that level, obviously. C is to restrict any access to the roof above the learning hub except for maintenance and cleaning purposes only. We have actually retained the access for circulation purposes. Look, a key principle of the master plan is to improve legibility, orientation and wayfinding, and it's very important that access to the new innovation hub from the Marian Centre actually aligns with this principle, and it provides a diversity of movement for the students.

30 I've also got a section which actually will just help explain to you the connection on the slide here. So here you can see the Marian Centre is on – the building on the right-hand side of the slide, and then, on the left-hand side, you can see where we've got the new innovation centres. So, essentially, what we have is the four levels underground, and then we have the two levels and – plus the roof access, which is connecting back into the teaching and learning areas of the Marian Centre.

35 So it's really important that we have that sort of diversity of connection around the whole campus, and, really, the intention of the master plan was to put that connectivity through the centre of the campus, and so this then gives the students a new route to the Marian Centre, and I think, when you're on site, you experience that – the route that they currently have along Carabella Street. So this is really the master plan improving that circulation around the whole campus. Okay. Just going to this slide here, the other principles were principle D, which we want to amend, which is retaining the glass balustrade, which we do actually need for protection of – for falls and also – what else that was also the planter, looking at planting – potentially planting the western planter to provide some additional visual privacy is something which can be done.

45

MS TRACEY: And also just the area in purple, which is the area recommended for access to be limited to, is actually closer to unit 9 than the area which is recommended to be restricted for access. So we just thought we'd highlight

5 MS CARPENTER: And if you can recall when we were on site, that purple area is actually the bridge. It's the alignment of the existing bridge. So that's already in use by the students on the level below. Okay. So then the next slide is looking at the potential of having some additional landscaping on the western planter, which then could provide some additional visual privacy as well, which could be quite good for
10 the use of some carefully selected planting.

MR CHEONG: Just can you show me on plan - - -

MS CARPENTER: Sure.

15 MR CHEONG: - - - where the brick wall is.

MS CARPENTER: That's right. Yeah. If you just go back to that – yeah. This one here. So this is the western edge here. This is the we're talking about here. So
20 that's so this is what this apartment is actually looking across to.

MR CHEONG: All right.

MS CARPENTER: That's when we have our glazed balustrade through here, and
25 then this is the existing balcony of the Marian Centre, and this is a plant area, which is

MR CHEONG: And you pointed out there was a setback of 15.5 metre from the boundary. Where – where's that

30 MS CARPENTER: Yeah. So this here is the distance from this bridge to is actually around 16 metres.

MS MILLAR: And then what about the lift opening on the northern side? If that
35 was removed, what would the impact of that be?

MS CARPENTER: Look, the reason why we wanted to diversity of access for the children who can't use the stairs, and so, essentially, what that will mean is, then, the students who are coming up they can then transfer down into the innovation
40 hub. So they have that bit there, the other students. So to think about the quality of access is really important, and that was one of the guiding principles in the master plan as well. We really do want to address that on It's a topographically campus.

45 MR CHEONG: What is the distance from 111, that window, to the H of the roof
- - -

MS CARPENTER: To here?

MR CHEONG: Yeah.

5 MS CARPENTER: Look, we can – if we need to give you the exact dimension, we don't have it here.

MR CHEONG: No, that's all right.

10 MS CARPENTER: But I would say that it's approximately – if you take this line and that line, I'd say it's between – somewhere between 25 and 30 metres. But we can clarify that for you. So also what we wanted to do was just go through the changes which were actually implemented with the community consultation. So this is a view of the pre and the post community consultation. So the community
15 consultation was done prior to actually submitting in the SSD. So what I'll do is go through these changes in a little bit more detail, but there were actually some substantial modifications which were made with regards to the use of the roof. So we're just looking in a little bit more detail at stage 1. So here you can see that there was basically the removal of a high level covered canopy and also some substantial
20 façade changes, as well.

So the next slide – this is just looking at a view from model. And then this just points out where we have the changes. So number 1 is reduce the parapet in height – so you can see number 1 there – to to create an integrated plant in the parapet, so
25 unit 9 could actually look across to – across the plants. Number 2 is where we actually increase the roof garden to provide – limit the trafficable area of that roof. So, again, it was just really improving that outlook of the neighbours. Number 3 was the western boundary, the façade articulation. So what we introduced as high level windows to actually, again, reduce that overlooking, and we put detail into the
30 façade.

MR CHEONG: So what are - - -

MS CARPENTER: That's – they're actually into service and storage rooms. That's
35 where they have – the school has their wet areas and there's storage. So they're just really giving high-level light into the learning spaces. Four was where we relocated a mechanical plant and that will be acoustically treated. Five was we actually set the building back further – this here, which was in response to the concerns from the neighbour down on Elamang. So we actually substantially set the building back. On
40 number 6, we actually removed the louvered roof, because that was, like, quite a – on a higher Number 7, we actually changed the lift from being a solid lift to a glazed lift. And, number 8, we actually reduced the bulk and scale of the whole of the stairway form. So in between sort of community consultation, which is quite – a very detailed section, and then going to SSD, we did make quite a lot of changes to
45 the scheme. So I think it's quite important to understand how much was actually modified in response to the community issues that were raised.

Just showing you as well. So probably the biggest change that you can see here on the roof is the removal of the rooftop-covered trellis and then the introduction of the new raised planter to improve that outlook. We've also removed the which are on the roof and introduced the planter to the west, as well, that improves the outlook from unit 9. This just gives you a sense of the changes to the western façade. So this is the view of the new learning hub from unit 9, 111 Carabella Street. Pre the community consultation – so here you can see the solid lift, the roof canopy, and then also the large vertical window which runs down.

10 MS TRACEY: And the high – high parapet.

MS CARPENTER: And the high parapet, as well. Yes, that's right. And then – and the next one you can see where we dropped the parapet down. We actually incorporated a glazed lift. We introduce high-level windows. We've created the privacy screen, the plant, and then also the brick detailing to create more interest in that outlook. And this is a – just a view to complete – finish off – so hopefully that gives you an outline of the changes which were made and our modifications requested.

20 MS MILLAR: Okay, great. Soo-Tee, did you have any further questions about the design?

MR CHEONG: Yeah. I was looking at the – so page 47 of the department's report, the view impact has been quite a bit of problem for 111, especially the unit 9. Can you explain to me what are the different shades of - - -

MS CARPENTER: Yeah.

MR CHEONG:

30 MS CARPENTER: So the red is actually the envelope of the new learning hub. So that's actually the non-complying and the complying envelope.

MS TUDEHOPE: So the red does represent non-compliances.

35 MS CARPENTER: Yes, that's right. Yes.

MS TUDEHOPE: But in that view what I believe you're seeing there is the non-compliance with the DCP height plane. So the DCP requires a 45 degree angle from your setbacks. So that's what's contributing to that red there. I believe that's LEP compliant at that - - -

MS CARPENTER: That's right, yeah.

45 MS TUDEHOPE: - - - point.

MS: Yeah.

- MS CARPENTER: So I guess what those two images are demonstrating is that there is a minimal on that right-hand side still got the expansive view of the ocean on the – of the harbour.
- 5 MS TRACEY: Yeah, and that's taken from an oblique view across the site. So bearing in mind that they have an oblique view looking straight - - -
- MS CARPENTER: Yeah.
- 10 MS TRACEY: - - - which we have done an analysis on.
- MR CHEONG: Earlier you have clarified the boundary on the midpoint at the western boundary you are actually touching onto – at one point there's no setback from the boundary. Am I correct?
- 15 MS CARPENTER: That's correct. Yeah, just that the - - -
- MR CHEONG: Yeah.
- 20 MS CARPENTER: Show you that plan. Are you – is it just that – the tongue – the corner where the boundary stands? Is that correct?
- MR CHEONG: Yeah.
- 25 MS CARPENTER: Yeah, that's right. Yeah.
- MR CHEONG: So that means that's non-compliance with the setback requirements - - -
- 30 MS CARPENTER: On that – that's right. Just in that one corner, correct. Yeah. But that doesn't – didn't have an impact on the view loss. Yeah.
- MR CHEONG: I don't have an oblique view if you take that corner to be the setback, would that improve the view?
- 35 MS CARPENTER: I don't think so, because it's actually quite low at that point. That's where we had the lower parapet. And then this – you see the stair, as you can see the higher stair beyond, as well.
- 40 MS McELHONE: I though the view was mainly on that - - -
- MS CARPENTER: Yeah, yeah, the – unit 9 is where there's view – yeah. There is – there's the ocean view from unit 9. And then the two units in the front have actually got more of a direct view. So if you could imagine their windows are the whole width of their apartment. And so the oblique view, you do have view loss, but
- 45 they have a straight-on view which is actually all of the harbour. So yeah. That probably demonstrates it really well, actually.

MR CHEONG: So if you – if you are to comply with a setback and take the corner
..... would that impact on your design or the operation of - - -

5 MS CARPENTER: No actually really - - -

MS TRACEY: No - - -

MS CARPENTER: - - - would affect the view at all.

10 MS TRACEY: Because the - - -

MS CARPENTER: Yeah.

MS TRACEY: - - - is sticking out from there - - -

15 MS CARPENTER: Yeah, that's right. So this is probably the one in question. So
what we did here is this view is actually a straight view. So this is the straight view
here, and this is actually an oblique view. So they've always had this – the straight
view - - -

20 MS MILLAR: So is that - - -

MS CARPENTER: - - - from their apartments.

25 MS MILLAR: - - - for unit 9, as well?

MS CARPENTER: No, no.

MS MILLAR: So that - - -

30 MS CARPENTER: These are the front units.

MS MILLAR: These are the front units.

35 MS CARPENTER: That's right.

MS MILLAR: So it's the back units that I think the - - -

MS CARPENTER: Yeah. The back units are the ones which - - -

40 MS MILLAR:

MS CARPENTER: - - - were actually the question of the condition, that's right. So
these units weren't a question, but the back units were ones, because they were the
45 ones to have the view loss, rather than the - - -

MS TUDEHOPE: Unit singular. It's only really that unit 9.

MS CARPENTER:

MS TUDEHOPE: It would be - - -

5 MS CARPENTER: These guys were actually – there wasn't – there was no issue with their view.

MS TUDEHOPE: Yeah.

10 MS CARPENTER: Because they do always have that direct view.

MS TRACEY: So this is a close up plan. So if you did set that back, there's still - - -

15 MS CARPENTER: There's no - - -

MS TRACEY: - - - and the stair.

MR CHEONG: All right.

20 MS TRACEY: So what we did, we actually aligned – there's an apartment building beyond, which you will see in the view - - -

MS CARPENTER: This one can't see the view.

25 MS TRACEY: - - - which dictated that setback.

MS CARPENTER: Because that's way too oblique. So their view is actually coming out this way, and that's where the over there, the ocean. But that one was

30 by the below.

MS MILLAR: So they're looking - - -

MS CARPENTER: Correct.

35 MS MILLAR: - - - across that way, so they can't actually see that corner at all.

MS CARPENTER: Anyway.

40 MS MILLAR: No.

MS CARPENTER: It's far too oblique. You'd have to lean right out of the window.

45 MR CHEONG: Okay.

MS CARPENTER: Yeah.

MR CHEONG: Thanks.

MS CARPENTER: That's okay. No problem.

5 MS MILLAR: Any further questions? Let me just see.

MR CHEONG: So just to clarify again with the student numbers. You're explaining earlier - - -

10 MS DICKINSON: Yes.

MR CHEONG: - - - there's no increase.

MS DICKINSON: No, because our student numbers are currently – we went to a
15 sixth stream many years ago and that sixth stream is rolling out. So whether we had
the building or we didn't have the building, the numbers of students that we have
documented as our total amount that we will have into the future would be the same.
So it has got nothing to do with this new building. It's to do with the fact that we
20 many years ago decided the school would go to six streams in year 7. So our total
figure in our report that we have is the total figure we would have, building or not
building. And there is no intent of increasing numbers, because we haven't got the
physical space for that, and we have a point of difference as a school of being a
school with a certain size where we know our girls and know the students, so that is
of real benefit to us anyway.

25

MS MILLAR: And are those numbers fixed between junior school and senior
school places?

MS DICKINSON: They are.

30

MS MILLAR: Okay.

MS DICKINSON: Our junior school is fixed to the figure – the number that it has
at the moment, which is approximately 250 plus – 252. And the senior school
35 numbers are the ones that will take it to the figure.

MS MILLAR: Great.

MR CHEONG: No more for me.
40

MS MILLAR: No, I have no more questions. Thank you very much for your time
and your presentations today. That has been very helpful to us and, as I said in the
opening, you know, this is the information gathering phase of our analysis and, you
know, we have now met with the council and the department and – so from here if
45 there's anything else that you would like to provide to us in writing, please feel free
to do that in the next couple of days to Other than that, thank you very much for
your time today, and I will close the meeting.

MS DICKINSON: Thank you.

MR CHEONG: Thank you.

5

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[12.12 pm]