



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-933927

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING

RE: LORETO KIRRIBILLI SCHOOL

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

PARTICIPANTS: **KIM ROTHE**
DAVID HOY

LOCATION: **NORTH SYDNEY COUNCIL**
200 MILLER STREET
NORTH SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES

DATE: **10.41 AM, THURSDAY, 30 AUGUST 2018**

MS I. MILLAR: Okay. Good morning and welcome. Before I begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and pay our respects to their elders past and present. Welcome to the meeting today on development application SSD7919 in relation to the Loreto Kirribilli School from
5 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 infrastructure buildings, walkways, stairs and paths, category 1 remediation works and minor landscaping works and stage 1 works.

10 My name is Iona Millar. I am the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me is fellow Commissioner Soo-Tee Cheong and Commission Planning Officer Jorge Van Den Brande. The other attendees at this meeting are Kim Rothe, the Senior Assessment Officer (Planning) from North Sydney Council and David Hoy, Acting Manager, Development Services from North Sydney Council.

15 In the interests 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. Now, this meeting is one part of the Commission's decision-making process. It's taking place at a preliminary stage
20 in the process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision. Now, for these meetings, it is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate, but if you're asked a question and you're not in a position to answer it, please, feel free to take that on notice and provide any additional
25 information in writing and then we will put that additional information on our website.

In terms of process, we've met with the department this morning and we will be moving on for a site visit and meeting with the applicant after this meeting. So we
30 will now begin the meeting. And what would be helpful from our side is if we can get some history of the background of the proposal with council and information about council's submission.

MR K. ROTHE: Sure. Okay. We received the development package the 18th of
35 October 2017. We have – there was an instruction there to provide comment by the 17th of November, but in trying to – trying to get – in trying to get sufficient information in time to get – particularly relating to the traffic impacts, we had to do some internal referrals, so we farmed out aspects of the application to some of our other internal specialists. But of particular relevance was the traffic engineering
40 section. We got our initial response in on the 23rd of November 2017, and, well, we sort of – the intent of the letter would be interpreted as an objection, but it seems the assessment staff treated it more like a list of issues.

45 So when it became apparent that – when we received some further information down the track which included the operational traffic management provisions, we felt it was necessary to re-comment back, clarifying that our position was actually one of

objection. That's – the response was dated the 14th of March 2018. From there, we have this was starting to get some interest from our local to our elected council representatives, so we have recently invited both schools, which both have State Significant Development proposals in, so that's Loreto and also St Aloysius, which
5 also has quite a significant proposal in.

They came and did a briefing session. It was in June. It was semi-formal. It wasn't recorded, but it was – both schools were given around about an hour to sort of present their proposals to the council representatives who were in attendance, which
10 was about five, as I recall. There was a report that was put past the council about whether or not they wanted to make a further submission. The applications were noted that staff had already made submissions. They didn't feel that – there was no sort of clear indication they felt there was anything extra to add to the particular submissions that had been already provided to the department.

15 So, yeah, as it currently stands the last bit of correspondence I had from the assessment officer from the Department of Planning was in relation to the particular conditions of consent which – we've provided some minor feedback but we reaffirmed that we've still sort of got major concerns and we don't feel that the
20 matters relating to the traffic have been adequately dealt with at this point in time. There's no fundamental objection to the – in principle, for a school to, you know, undertake improvement works and all that kind of stuff. But the flow-on cumulative impacts that relate to the which are less easy to manage, are still – still remaining, in our opinion. Yeah. Maybe if you guys want to start asking particular questions
25

MS MILLAR: Okay. Perhaps if you could, you know, describe the, you know, local traffic context in the proximity to the school and give some information about – about that from a council perspective.

30 MR ROTHE: Sure. Okay. It's – the Kirribilli Peninsula is quite a little compact and reasonably high-density area. It's – but it does benefit, I guess, from having two very well renowned and significant schools. And there's also a number of commercial areas in there which are, you know, we've also got the – it's also very
35 well connected to the other side of the train station which is the Milsons Point area, as well, which is quite – very high density as opposed to the Kirribilli half of the peninsula. You do have a train line running through there, and there are very well established public transport links.

40 However, observationally, we – and via some of the traffic studies that we have done off our own cuff down there, it is known that temporally around times of when the schools are in operation, ie, in the morning when the parents are dropping students off and then again in the afternoon when they come to pick up the students, we have significant problems with the movement of traffic in and around the peninsula to the
45 point where it's not functioning or coping as existing. And, yeah, so tying that fact with – individually, with just the Loreto school in its own right, it supplies the 80 on-site spaces in a little lower basement site. And I'm sure they will take you and show

you those particular spaces. They rent another 20 off the local Kirribilli Yacht Club
..... as well.

5 So it's sort of already established that there's not – there's not really sufficient
parking on-site to meet the current demand. And in doing this potential amount of
works, including, like, very significant excavation, it would have been council's
preference if they would have perhaps come to talk to us in the first place. We
would have articulated that it would be great if they could incorporate internalised
10 pick-up and drop-off and/or an enlarged space inside to accommodate what are their
current needs for parking and not just sort of rely on public network on the street to
sort of overcome the deficiencies and stuff like that. So there was very little thought,
in our opinion, put into the initial sort of traffic problems. It wasn't really till we
pointed these out in our submissions that they responded with the operational traffic
management plan.

15 And while there are some good points in there which encourage the use of –
encourage the use of, you know, public transport, car sharing and stuff for the staff
and the management of parents who want to drop off their children, particularly their
younger children. There was what appeared to us to be a flat out rejection about
20 consideration to trying consider putting any additional parking in onsite. They
claimed it was just unfeasible from a monetary perspective, but over the 50 year
timeframe where you're looking at a \$93 million development, so – if when the
panel, like, make some inspection later today, the parking that they do contain onsite
in the lower street, we felt it wasn't impossible for them to be able to make
25 arrangements to have a flow-through to actually get cars coming off into that space if
they could work on expanding it and have the pickup and drop-off.

Some of what the school presented to us that, they said that was unfeasible because
to get the people up and out of there would be difficult. But again, they didn't seem
30 to want to consider it beyond – that they felt the traffic management But the
problem the Council has is that when people start getting concerned about the traffic,
accumulating traffic, impacts around the area, is they're going to come to us first, not
the school. So if a proposal like this goes ahead, we're left carrying the can as far as
the ongoing traffic management. And when you're looking at a 50 year timeframe
35 for, you know, one – now clear design on one very significant building which is 67
stories with the through and concept on two further building envelopes.

Appreciating that draft conditions have been put together, they're limited to an
increase of only 30 students, but we don't accept that over a 50 year time frame that
40 that is going to be the extent of the potential population increase just to the school
and factoring in that Kirribilli has got high density So we're also earmarking it
for further development. It's over a 50 year timeframe. We just feel that the
dynamics is going to be very different down there. So to miss the opportunity now
for them to, you know, have such a great big concept proposal and not actually think
45 about their parking situation. Yes. It sort of forms the crux of the traffic component
that we have at the moment, so - - -

MS MILLAR: Okay. And in terms of the network, you mentioned the Alo site as well, what – sorry, St Aloysius – what interaction, if any, is there in the local network with existing traffic between the schools

5 MR ROTHE: Well - - -

MR D. HOY: I don't know that that has been analysed.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Yes.

10

MR HOY: And it doesn't seem to be analysed as part of the applicant's submission either.

MR ROTHE: No.

15

MR HOY: Or in the independent traffic reviews. It has been focused particularly on this one – one point. It's one of the points that, I think, we've made that there needs to be some coordination and consultation between the schools in this precinct because it is so isolated. The road network is complicated by its position within the regional road network. You've got the bridge approaches, you've got the tunnel. You've got a very small narrow road network in the Kirribilli precinct which limits the ability to be a functional drop-off and pickup areas within the public domain. So that is inherently going to end in conflicts at key junctions in the local road network.

20

25 So what we're saying with the scheme that we have in front of us over the time period we're talking about, there isn't adequate provision within the documents we have in front of us to say that the local road network would cope or even know that the conditions are going to be suitable across the timeframes we're talking about, so – and the scheme we have in front of us is – it's substantial. It's intended to be the official construction of the school, so we understand that. But there doesn't seem to be enough coordination between it and its adjacent land uses which are also

30

MR ROTHE: I mean, clearly, they're both aware of each other's proposal. There's no question of that. They came to the briefing meetings. They knew that each school was going to be in attendance and we didn't – they didn't concurrently present to the councillors, but obviously, they know about it and it was evident that there was no collaboration on traffic because they just were going it alone, each – it's interesting to contrast the two, in that, Loreto does have a better parking situation onsite. Aloysius certainly has the same issues and a lot less available parking and they seem to be clearly indicating an increase in the student population there. So maybe the Council is also adopting a bit of a more holistic approach, looking at both proposals and the potential impact. But one would lead onto the other.

35

40

MR HOY: For the Commission's view and considering the matter before you, the Department of Planning has gone and got their independent traffic analysis done. It's quite a comprehensive document. It warrants a very close look. The conditions that are included in the consent instrument includes a lot of detailed work was to be

45

done after the fact of the grant of consent. I think that should raise a number of concerns for the Commission that we're not in a position to fully understand the impacts arising from this document in front of us on the basis of the information that has been presented to us. Now, the conditions – I can take you to those at the moment, but just back onto the local I want to – I just want to point out using the zoning map that we have here on the wall.

We have – these are the classified roads from the approaches. So this is High Street in North Sydney. This continues on into Gordon Street. The route for the drop-off for the school using Alabac and Carabella Streets. These are local roads which do ultimately end in a circuit, but also come back out in the same route. So the volume and the increase of the traffic generated on this side will have implications at these points further beyond the site and when you get back around here through to other places in Kirribilli Avenue, these three sites here are these Alo sites.

So you, sort of, see it, sort of, connects into the same local road network, so we need to be quite cautious about how we manage the development on their school sites. Regardless whether this proceeds or they move to a different phase of development, this issue is not going to go away. We don't think they've met the threshold here with this development in order to proceed for the full concept and I recommend the independent traffic expert's report as something to be read closely.

MS MILLAR: Any – any more questions before we talk about specific conditions relating to traffic management?

MR S. CHEONG: Well, you mentioned that, you know, there is student increase, but you don't believe that would be the case in the future. Is that your – one way of

MR HOY: Well, across a 50 year timeframe, I think that's unlikely - - -

MR CHEONG:

MR HOY: - - - based upon the 12,000 square metres of floor area that in the development totality. So I don't think that that flows through and we're also restricted – well, our understanding is that there was inability to actually restrict the student population through conditions and consent, so - - -

MR ROTHE: Yes. That's what the second submission is concentrating on. It's quite a short submission and we refer to the department's own planning circular about – that discusses whenever you're looking at school proposals that to actively discourage setting hard and fast numbers and I'm appreciating that that's still – we still have a cap on the student numbering in there. It's actually changed from – they actually did seek around about 120 students in the initial proposal and reduced it to 30 following the Council raising the matters of the traffic. So just that would, sort of, suggest flagging a timeframe. Certainly, they – there's nothing restricting them in

any subsequent DA, but they have to come in for stages to prevent them from asking for the subsequent increases in student numbers. But if we're, sort of, already committed to the concept proposal – yes. It's a little bit hard to, kind of, wind back the clock and re-examine the parking implications and that.

5

MS MILLAR: Okay.

MR HOY: Of the sim that we have in front of us, we don't necessarily have an issue with the configuration of the design of the stage 1 works that they've presented. There's some merit in that. We certainly see the improvement of the school facilities is a real positive. It's more the concept part of this proposal. We don't think it's adequately dealt with, either in the assessment or in the applicant's submission. The timeframes we are talking about are extraordinarily long. We can appreciate the schools has some about where they're going to go with future applications the scope of those works are so broad that we can't possibly wind it back after an approval over a 50 year master plan, so – I just, again, ask the Commission to have regard to that timeframe and that sort of consent is going to lead once it has commenced.

MR ROTHE: We also flagged in the second submission as well that over a 50-year timeframe, it's likely that the development controls applicable now to the site could be significantly different, and maybe in benefit to them, actually have an increased density in any case. So it sort of warrants the question appreciating they want to lock it in, but way a 50-year timeframe. Yeah. So whether that was an intentional attempt to move it into a state significant assessment plan as opposed to local council looking at it, so - - -

MS MILLAR: Okay. Are we able to take those?

MR ROTHE: Absolutely. No problem.

MS MILLAR: Great. Thank you.

MR HOY: Have you been given the council's submission in full?

35

MR J. VAN DEN BRANDE: Yes.

MS MILLAR: I believe I have.

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: We have now all the council's submissions.

MR HOY: Just referred to in the officer's report, which - - -

MS MILLAR: No. We have the version – the submissions that were on the department's website.

45

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: On the website.

MR HOY: Right. Okay. That's all right.

MR ROTHE: Yeah, no, no, no.

5 MS MILLAR: Although

MR ROTHE: That's fine. They're the developed ones.

MS MILLAR: Yeah.

10 MR ROTHE: Just the hierarchy. You know, like I said, we always interpret our first one as being an objection, but it was taken as a submission as well. We made it much – abundantly clear in the second one.

15 MR VAN DEN BRANDE: We had that one. Then we had a second one where you had the meeting with Milsons Point

MR ROTHE: Yes.

20 MS MILLAR: So I - - -

MR ROTHE: No.

MR HOY: There's submissions on heritage.

25 MR ROTHE: Yes. There was – no. We met with the Milsons Point precinct, but that was for – specifically for the St Aloysius one.

MR HOY: Okay.

30 MR ROTHE: Proposal. So at that point in time that we wrote our initial submission, there hadn't been any precinct committee meetings.

MS MILLAR: There's – I have from the department's website the 27th of

35 November 2017, 23 March 2018.

MR ROTHE: Yeah. They're the same ones

MS MILLAR: Okay.

40 MR ROTHE: So anyway - - -

MS MILLAR: While we're on traffic - - -

45 MR ROTHE: Sure.

MS MILLAR: The specific views on the conditions proposed by the department?

MR HOY: There's two phases. Obviously there's the construction management. The traffic report talks about the serviceability of certain intersections and their inability or likely inability to handle – articulate with construction vehicles. That needs to be looked at. I think that's adequately dealt with through the conditions.
5 But if we go into the schedule 3 conditions, which is the conditions relating to the stage 1 works, it comes back to the conditions around the safety evaluation and the operational transport access management plan.

There's some timeframes given in those conditions that are actually quite tight.
10 You're talking six months to go through and develop an operational transport access management plan in consultation with other parties. I don't think that's long enough. It really needs to be given a little bit more time and importance to make sure it's been done in a robust manner. And there's some questions about the work travel plan being developed prior to occupation of that scheme. So there's some really good
15 facts identified in that, but the council would say those things should've been dealt with up front, not as part of the consent conditions.

MS MILLAR: Okay.

20 MR HOY: So just for the Commission, that's conditions A18 to A25, and to A28, sorry.

MS MILLAR: Now, with the conditions proposed by the department, the applicant has provided comments and been in discussion with the department on those. One of
25 the things that they're looking to vary – and – or have raised as a concern about the proposed conditions from the department relates to – what is it – the timing for construction traffic, and also the timing around rock blasting

MR HOY: Rock blasting?

30

MS MILLAR: So this - - -

MR HOY: Are they doing blasting?

35 MS MILLAR: So – or rock breaking, sorry.

MR HOY: Rock breaking.

MS MILLAR: Excuse me. Rock breaking

40

MR HOY: This is a live issue in North Sydney at the moment.

MS MILLAR: Yes. Sorry. Apologies.

45 MR HOY: Rock blasting.

MS MILLAR: No. So D5 - - -

MR HOY: Sorry. Condition D5 in schedule 3?

MS MILLAR: Yes, in schedule 3. So I'll just start with that one.

5 MR ROTHE: extend the hours or - - -

MS MILLAR: Seeking to extend the hours, so rather than having a two-hour relief period, they would be looking at a one-hour relief period.

10 MR HOY: I don't know that that's a – that's not a council condition. It's a condition from the department.

MS MILLAR: Department.

15 MR ROTHE: But we have to note there are a lot of residential premises down there.

MR HOY: Absolutely.

20 MR ROTHE: I mean, we provide a concession of one hour to the hours of construction for the buildings up here that are under construction, but there's a mix between dedicated commercial and some high rise residential. But – yeah. So - - -

MR HOY: Sorry. I don't understand the issue with the condition D5.

25 MS MILLAR: So D5 has a two-hour window between 12 and 2 pm which – you know, which is I guess relief from blasting.

MR HOY: Right. I see. Relief.

30 MS MILLAR: They're looking at essentially being 1 pm to 5 pm, so - - -

MR HOY: I guess it's a question for the department, but I'm assuming that reflects in the EPA's industrial noise guidelines. There would also be break periods within the operational period anyway, so I don't know why that's in there. The council
35 would be more sensitive to early and late finishes because of the land uses.

MS MILLAR: Okay. And then the second one which would be good to get your views on is C28, which is the construction and environment management plan, where they're looking to qualify that by reference to excavation vehicle movements rather
40 than all construction vehicles.

MR HOY: Sorry. Is there a reference there they raise an issue there?

MS MILLAR: So the applicant at the moment C28 in - - -

45

MR HOY: As opposed to delivery times?

MS MILLAR: So at the moment, the hours of work for construction delivery times are restricted to be between 7 and 2 pm. The applicant is opposing that that is only for excavation vehicle movements, so effectively other construction vehicles could access the site at other times except the peak time.

5

MR HOY: Okay. That's something we would have to speak with our traffic manager on, and it may be something that the local traffic committee wants to comment on. I appreciate the view on that. Delivery is different to construction vehicle access – sorry – demolition and excavation vehicle access, so I guess we can understand it, but we will need to go to the traffic committee and the traffic manager to give you feedback on that.

10

MS MILLAR: Okay.

15 MR ROTHE: Yeah. Well, it needs - - -

MR HOY: It might be okay on that.

20

MR ROTHE:

MR HOY: They might be okay within limits. And you would be talking concrete delivery as well, which would – at certain stages would be quite – pretty much back to back, given the size of the slabs of some of these structures, so – so, look, we'd have to give you advice on that.

25

MS MILLAR: Okay. That's great. Soo-Tee, any - - -

MR CHEONG: One of the objections you have is with the drop off and pick up - - -

30 MR HOY: Yes.

MR CHEONG: - - - zone. You're suggesting that there should be an internal drop off and pick up, because school is actually on the upper level, you don't need – would not be – probably not really a convenient area for pick up and drop off at the lower

35

MR HOY: Will it? I don't know. I – we don't understand the – we did speak with the school about this. They seem to be relying on the existing facility as being inadequate, and we're talking about a 50-year time master plan, and it doesn't really follow that you can't resolve that over that timeframe. I appreciate the concerns around the junior school and having the need for parents to do a physical drop off and handover, but there really needs to be something better than what is currently on offer put in place over the timeframes we're talking about.

40

45 They've pointed to sight line issues and point of entry to their existing basement, so it might be a good idea to review that existing basement and propose those as part of their upgrades on the site. If it's deficient – if it's a deficient piece of infrastructure,

they need to really look at augmenting it to make it work better for their operations. It's not for council to resolve their onsite requirements in the public domain. There is probably going to be some works some need for some coordination between design for drop off area. Our point of view is that shouldn't happen within the
5 private parts of the site and not in the public domain.

MR ROTHE: Yeah. Look, this is the only plan I can quickly locate that shows the lower car park existing, but we just don't see why it can't be augmented, you know there's a lift going in anyway. I appreciate they may not want to rely on the lift
10 to get up there, but they could have an externalised footpath coming up and around if it was a master plan. It can be incorporated. It's not an impossible thing, anyway, so – but look, as you said, it's not for us to design it for them or anything like that, but just to put the problem to them.

15 MR CHEONG: The majority of students being drop off and pick up, as I say, in the junior school which is actually on the top level - - -

MR ROTHE: Up the top, yeah. I understand that.

20 MR CHEONG: And the logistics of getting them down to 16 metres or more down to this level may - - -

MR HOY: The site is very challenged in terms of its topography, so we appreciate that, and we can see in the concept scheme there's a lot of discussion about the
25 vertical transmission of students between levels. That's just the reality of their site. That's – they need to resolve that. It's not – we can't change that constraint. They need to.

MR CHEONG: Yeah. And how does it help if you have internal drop off?
30

MR HOY: Look - - -

MR ROTHE: double parking.

35 MR HOY: Yeah.

MR ROTHE: Queueing to – on the street as existing – the upper street is the narrow of the two.

40 MR HOY: The lower street.

MR ROTHE: Sorry, sorry. And – yeah. When there's already cars – local residents' cars already parked there, even though it's already quite windy, you're trying to get around, the flow of the traffic is already interrupted, so it's just
45 exacerbated with the additional movements of the parents. With the now – they've now started thinking about the traffic and how they're going to do that, and they've specified now that it's sort of more critical to have the younger children dropped off

and encourage the more senior students to – hopefully a bit more mature and sensible and can get themselves so – yeah. But that plan was it was only in response to what we raised, so - - -

5 MS MILLAR: Then in terms of the on-street parking in the local network, is it a two-hour limit for parking, or are there exceptions for residents?

MR ROTHE: They can get a parking permit, as we understand it.

10 MR HOY: Residents? Yes. If they don't have off-street parking, which is – that's quite common in Kirribilli. Because of the heritage significant of the area, it's very difficult to get on-street parking, and also just the constraint of the land and the topography. Yes, resident parking is available.

15 MS MILLAR: Is there anything else that you'd like to raise with us?

MR HOY: I don't think so.

MR ROTHE: I mean, Dave's already said it's not a fundamental issue with the proposal in itself, that we've got any actual problem with the school, and that itself is

MR HOY: It's the broad scope of the proposal in front of us.

25 MR VAN DEN BRANDE: Apart from the issues that the department has presented on their report, do you think the council – this is the traffic is the main reason why, drop off and pick up?

MR HOY: Yeah. It has to be traffic, parking and transport – access to all of these things.

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: Okay.

MR HOY: Okay. So you cannot divorce the traffic generation from the school from its position within the public transport network, but also the public road network as well. So all of those things will need a lot more work and coordination.

MR CHEONG: I understand your concern with the 50-year timeframe, but what would be your view in, you know, the change in transportation mode for students within that time? Would it be - - -

MR HOY: Well, that's a good point. The traffic reports we've seen has put a lot of emphasis on coming through the public transport modes, through the ferries, through the train station and the pedestrian environment. The pedestrian environment as it currently exists in Kirribilli is not wonderful. It's really – it needs a lot of work in order to improve its suitability for high-volume pedestrians. It really is a local footpath network that's designed for residents, not so much large populations coming

through. So if you envisaged a larger increase in school population, that's something that just needs to be looked at, and not only that, but its links with the other public infrastructure like the parks, Bradfield Park, the community centres, all of those sorts of things.

5

MR ROTHE: Well, again, they have – the schools haven't collaborated, and you've got two separate schools that have a very significant population forensic order students arriving. So there's been no collaboration in the – that I'm aware that on each other to St Aloysius now. It's just really a problem with that particular one too. But there's no – they're not talking to each other, and maybe, you know, they could come up with a combined solution that sort of alleviates some work and the impacts between them and the local residents as well.

10

MR HOY: When you go out there today, I'd suggest - - -

15

MS MILLAR: Just for the transcript, we're looking at an aerial photograph of the site.

MR HOY: The things we'd suggest that you do is do the walk along Fitzroy Street through to Carabella Street to the main entry of the site on Carabella Street, but then also consider the pedestrian and vehicle environment in Elamang Avenue on the low side of the sight. There's no pedestrian link publically through the school at the moment. It will be something that's available for the school community, to walk through the school in those directions. But this walk along Fitzroy Street to the intersection with Broughton Street is the most likely pedestrian route for access to the train station, which is just here. So that's the sorts of environment we'd be looking for improvement, or even up to Burton Street as well. So those sorts of things the school needs to investigate in terms of improving its pedestrian access.

20

25

MS MILLAR: Soo-Tee, anything else from you?

30

MR CHEONG: That's all from me.

MS MILLAR: That's all from you. Okay. Great. Thank you very much for your time. That's been very, very helpful for us. And I'll close the meeting.

35

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[11.18 am]