



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-1067172

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT

RE: ST ALOYSIUS' COLLEGE REDEVELOPMENT

PANEL:

**ANNELISE TUOR
CHRIS WILSON
SOO TEE CHEONG**

ASSISTING PANEL:

**DAN KEARY
KANE WINWOOD
XANTHE O'DONNELL**

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING AND
ENVIRONMENT:**

**KAREN HARRAGON
JASON MASLEN
ANDREW BEATTIE**

LOCATION:

**IPC OFFICES
LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET, SYDNEY**

DATE:

2.44 PM, MONDAY, 2 SEPTEMBER 2019

MS A. TUOR: All right. 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 on the proposal whereby St Aloysius' College Limited, the applicant,
5 is seeking approval for a concept proposal and detailed stage one works. My name is Annelise Tuor and I'm the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me are my fellow commissioners Chris Wilson and C – CT Cheong. The other attendees of – at the meeting are Xanthe O'Donnell from the IPCN secretariat and IPCN consultants Dan Keary and Kane Winwood, and from the department – if you would just like to
10 introduce yourselves.

MR J. MASLEN: Jason Maslen, Senior Planning Officer.

MS K. HARRAGON: Karen Harragon, Director of Social and Infrastructure
15 Assessments.

MR A. BEATTIE: And Andrew Beattie, the Team Leader of the school's Infrastructure Assessments Team.

20 MS TUOR: Thank you. This meeting is one part of the Commissioner's decision making process. It will form one of the 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 consider it appropriate. If
25 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'll then put up on our website, and 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. We will now begin.

30 So we've done a, sort of, draft agenda and we thought we would just go – start off with going through the additional information provided by the applicant in response to the correspondence sent – I think it was on the 26th, 27th and then finally on the 28th of August. So we've had a quick discussion about that information just before we met you. So did you wish to make any comments of it or do you want just - - -

35 MS HARRAGON: So probably – it might be easier just to speak to – to those appendices quickly, and I'm anticipating that some of the information sitting in that appendix A, the response matrix we're going to be speaking with in more details in relation to item 3 - - -

40 MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: - - - in the IPC's agenda. So in terms of the – yes, so as I said, so appendix A, response matrix, we've considered in detail and we note the advice
45 provided to the IPC by the applicant in respect to the current activities, the future activities and the breaking up of those into ancillary functions related to the school

and in relation to other activities, which would be those matters which are covered by the ESEPP, so we can speak more to that in relation to item 3 when we come to it.

MS TUOR: Yes.

5

MS HARRAGON: In respect to the acoustics design barrier, the work that the applicant's gone – gone to, we note that they've raised some concerns the school has in regards to how that relocated acoustics barrier would function and in terms of how it would be accessed during maintenance. The department has no particular comment, other than to say that the issues they've raised are probably accurate reflections, but it is more of the management of that barrier being set back in from the boundary, rather than it being a preclusion to having that barrier set back in from the boundary. We probably just would note that we – the department had conditioned landscaping boxes in that area, so the alternate might – would be from the plants point of view that we still considered that there was probably a need to bring people back from the edge of the building and we were looking to having the relocation of the ping-pong tables and a few of the activity areas that are used during school hours relocated, as well as having the landscaping boxes stopping people from being right on the edge of the building during out of hours. So the shadow diagrams

20

MS TUOR: So just before we go into that - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

25

MS TUOR: Just on that, part of what we were considering was just, I suppose, the need, actually, for the acoustic barrier, because our understanding is that the glaze barrier is on the eastern side and the southern side, and it's purely there for noise reasons. That's why it's the 2.4 metres high.

30

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MS TUOR: But in relation to noise to the south, the receptors are below the height of the building here. So we're actually just wondering what that barrier is – is doing in terms of noise. It seems to be that the main need for the barrier is on the eastern side, and particularly in terms of the buildings that are immediately adjacent and a bit further to the - - -

35

MR C. WILSON: East.

40

MS TUOR: East, yes.

MS HARRAGON: I can understand your comments around the location and the context for the adjoining properties. Yes, certainly, those eastern adjoining properties have a height which is equal to and then raising above it, and the ones to the – to the south – I – I can only imagine that the applicant has identified that height of acoustics wall because of the modelling that was undertaken. I would think it

45

would probably be in the for it to be less than that, but I do recall we had discussions with the applicant around it also being a – a barrier in terms of potential safety issues. So, yes, the technical report – the acoustics technical report does not give options other than that height for us to take a – a view on whether it could be reduced on an acoustics – acoustics basis.

MS TUOR: And, also, I think the applicant to some extent – but not supporting the setback of the glazed acoustics barrier was on the basis of a – a safety issue with the parapet height that exists, but looking at the RLs, our understanding is that the parapet height is about 1.2 already, when you - - -

MS HARRAGON: So is this in relation to their concern about people having to access that area on the other side for maintenance. Is that - - -

MS TUOR: Well, I think, yes, they said about – they'd have to get through to it to access, but – for maintenance - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MS TUOR: - - - and that the parapet is – you know, they don't say how high it is, but they imply that it – it would be a safety issue if people did get through.

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MS TUOR: But, I suppose, just our reading of the plans is that it's about 1.2.

MS HARRAGON: Yes. I – I wouldn't know exactly what that building – building BCA requirement would be for the height of that parapet to otherwise ensure that it's not an alternate height.

MS TUOR: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: So we'll – we'll get a comment on that.

MS TUOR: And then the other comment, I suppose, was just if it is a safety issue when you're standing here cleaning it, then wouldn't it be a safety issue if it's there and cleaning it? That was just - - -

MS HARRAGON: It – it may be that - - -

MS TUOR: how it would - - -

MS HARRAGON: You actually don't need to access it. Can you remind me what the height is on that one there?

MR MASLEN: In terms of the – the acoustic barrier?

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MR MASLEN: 2.54 metres height.

5 MS HARRAGON: 2.5.

MR MASLEN: 2.4.

10 MS HARRAGON: Yes. So – so I can only anticipate that the – the accumulation of
– of debris on that rooftop between the barrier and the parapet might need for
someone to clean it more often than, say, if it was just a glass, where you were
actually getting someone who’s a glass cleaner to access the building. So that would
be my only understanding why someone would need to access that area – for – for
cleaning purposes or maintenance.

15

MS TUOR: Okay. Yes. So the next one was the overshadowing.

MS HARRAGON: We – we understand that applicant provided amended details to
the Commission and that they revisited those, and I drew to your attention that there
20 was a minor error and reissued them to you. So we didn’t have – we weren’t privy to
the first set to start with. I think that was my understanding of – it was some design
changes sought by the Commission. They were undertaken. Shadow diagrams were
prepared and they’ve just brought to your attention that they’ve redone them and
corrected an error.

25

MS TUOR: All right. Yes, so we’re - - -

MS HARRAGON: So we have no comment on those.

30 MS TUOR: Yes. So we’re still - - -

MS HARRAGON: So - - -

MS TUOR: Digesting those.

35

MS HARRAGON: Yes. Appendix D was the plant room design study. So we – we
recognise that the applicants’ been able to reduce the scale of some of those
envelopes in a number of situations, which would reduce the – the impact. We also
understand that the applicants address some of the potential to bring them below the
40 roof and to have them embedded into the building or to bring them to ground level,
and they’ve indicated that the engineering design and the requirement for them to be
ventilated would not be able to accommodate that relocation. We note that the
applicant has suggested that they could provide as an option to the Commission a hit
and miss brick configuration, which would allow ventilation to be achieved in a
45 smaller built form and housing.

MS TUOR: Yes, so just a couple of comments that – that we're – we're still, obviously, considering our position on this, but we've also noticed that – I suppose the concern is that a lot of effort was done to, basically, try to maintain the overall height of the existing structures and the new infill buildings, you know, didn't exceed
5 the existing parapet height and reflect the parapet height, but then post that, there's been, you know, things that have, sort of, stuck on top and there seems to be a fair amount of fluidity as to how big they're going to be and exactly where they're going to be located, etcetera, etcetera, and that, sort of, includes also just these stairwells and lift, but the stairwells that are on this – on the side, which I've just noticed
10 actually don't have a roof, so at the moment, they're shown as just being open and the practicality of those being left open – it's questionable. You'd think there'll have to be a roof structure. So I think – I – and then – and then also the relocation of some of the plant rooms hasn't ever been notified, etcetera, etcetera, so it's all getting a bit fluid. So part of our thinking is whether it would be better if it was just – if we
15 established principles about what any roof structures should try and achieve and that it be subject to further approval from the secretary, and that would include, you know, any roofing of the stairs and also, I think, that condition would also preclude any temporary structures, except for within that height plan that's been established, because, again, that's something that's something that there's been a fair amount of
20 work done on – in establishing a height plan between there and there to minimise structures – but then they're, sort of, popping up in other locations.

MR MASLEN: Just – just to touch on the point about the stairwell - - -

25 MS TUOR: Yes.

MR MASLEN: We did raise that during the assessment of the application and the applicant confirmed that it would be an open arrangement, so it was an intention – it was intentional that that would be the design. Yes.

30 MS HARRAGON: So, noting that the Commission's raising a concern about that being an appropriate response, but, I guess, as much as we can confirm, there's not going to be a roof appearing without us understand that to be the case, which might be a new – new – new impact, so – because I'm understanding it would probably be
35 two issues that Commission would have – if – if it would be ultimately enclosed later and it hadn't been assessed and whether not having a cover on it's a good outcome in terms of safety. Yes

40 MS TUOR: Yes. Yes, it – it seems like it's not necessarily that practical to not have a roof on it.

MS HARRAGON: So – so that's the emergency egress, isn't it? So - - -

45 MS TUOR: And there's also one here as well, which comes up, so they service all the floors below that.

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MS TUOR: So if water's going in there, it would - - -

MS HARRAGON: It keeps going. Yes. So we – I – I can suggest that – I think the applicant might be able to provide a bit more of a response as to the appropriateness
5 of it not being covered, because we certainly took them to that, as to whether that was a good outcome. Even putting aside whether it's compliant under the BC Act – you know, whether that's a good outcome for the uses proposed from it. So back to your other suggestion regarding methodology where the final location of some of the build form that exceeds the – the height of the – the roof – how it might be dealt
10 with. So we could assist the Commission in articulating that in a condition set – what the designed outcome was that the Commission wanted, because I'm imagine there would potentially be some, you know, footprints that you wouldn't want it to be moved from there and an overall height that it can't be an greater than that, and – and probably an envelope that you'd be wanting as well. So there's a – I guess,
15 there's a series of them, though, isn't there, because it's not like it's just in one location. There's, sort of, like, two key areas where there is going to be a – a resolving impact.

MS TUOR: Yeah. I mean, for a start, I – I think we couldn't approve the drawing as it currently stands because at the moment, it doesn't – this one is meant to be
20 going and it just has a bubble around it and doesn't have any notation, and when you look on the elevation, it's the same. It's just still on the elevation with no notation, so it's unclear that it actually – it's been deleted, um, because that - - -

25 MS HARRAGON: Is - - -

MS TUOR: - - - was meant to go and it was then meant to go here and below – below – be below parapet height. This one has now got smaller and it's moving forward towards the street, but – which has some advantages in terms of, I think,
30 views from that direction, but then it also increases your height. Now, like, this will be viewed as coming further along and – and this didn't exist before, so that's a new structure, so what that looks like from when you walk along the bridge, I don't know, because we don't have any information about it, and this one, again, has changed shape. So it – it's all, um, I suppose we're just feeling it's a bit – um, a degree of
35 uncertainty in terms of - - -

MS HARRAGON: So can I just - - -

MS TUOR: You know, do we keep going back and - - -
40

MS HARRAGON: Can I query this - - -

MS TUOR: Mmhmm.

45 MS HARRAGON: Um, this plan set came to the Commission in response to a particular request?

MS TUOR: This is in response to – this came in on Friday. This is - - -

MS HARRAGON: Okay.

5 MS TUOR: There were a set that was, um - - -

MS HARRAGON: Predated those.

10 MS TUOR: - - - predated that, which had it here. That – moving it to this location and, um, you know, changing the size.

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

15 MS TUOR: Um, but this is the la – the last response.

MS HARRAGON: And was there a – a key set of objectives that the applicant was given in terms of revisiting the location of

20 MS TUOR: It – it was just exactly what was in the letter that went out.

MS HARRAGON: Okay.

MS TUOR: Saying about it - - -

25 MS HARRAGON: Opportunities to reduce height and - - -

30 MS TUOR: Yes. I mean, our – our position is that there's a lot of additional floor space being added to the main school campus – that there's been a lot of effort to keep envelopes matching the existing height and – including a condition that requires a, um – you know, a height plane that goes from the parapet there down to this parapet here. So the – there's all been all that effort and then, all of a sudden, there's just all these boxes that are popping up on top, which, um, you know, they just incrementally add to intrusions into where you view – it's a highly visible site that is visible from the public domain, in terms of the bridge and locations, as well as
35 visible from a huge number of apartments.

MS HARRAGON: Is there some value in - - -

40 MS TUOR: Um - - -

MS HARRAGON: - - - looking at the val – um, the volume of extrusions that currently exist, because - - -

45 MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: 'Cause I certain recall from our view analysis looking over the harbour and looking to the bridge that for some, it was a – a better outcome in terms

of, um, people's views from those adjacent properties, and for some, it was a – a – a degradation of their view, but to a minor extent. So we could do an analysis of how – of how much volume was popping out of the parapet to start with, or that – that height to start with to see whether it was a like for like amount.

5

MS TUOR: Yes. Although I - - -

MS HARRAGON: Because we could - - -

10 MS TUOR: I – it's largely, I think, that there's a lot of - - -

MS HARRAGON: Greater.

15 MS TUOR: - - - um, emphasis placed on that lift – that stairwell overrun. Now, there has been statements made that that was never approved, so we don't know whether it was or not, so we're just not - - -

MS HARRAGON: Oh, okay.

20 MS TUOR: We're not going there. We're just accepting that, yes, that did have an impact and that impact's now being removed, um, but I think it's – as a starting point, it's just that the plant – obviously, where it's below the parapet here, that's a good outcome. That's – no complaints about that. That's fine, but when it's something that's just added on as a, sort of, minor addition, our starting point would
25 have been, "Why didn't you look at it in your internal planning?" I know you have to have ventilation, but that can just be achieved by the hit and miss brick work. So you could presumably have had it in here and had your hit and miss brickwork all around, and similar here. They're doing an extension here. You know, potentially you could have extended that or done it within here. So our starting point would
30 have been, "Why didn't you think about it as part of your overall design, so when you were doing all your internal layouts, why didn't you, as part of that, have an area – like you've got areas for store – have an area for plant that, sort of, just had opening?"

35 MS HARRAGON: The side of the - - -

MS TUOR: Yes, because you've got – you haven't got one uniform roof plane. You've got stepping roof planes, so you can always – there's opportunities to have your plant at the higher level for this building here. So – so that's our starting point,
40 and I think it would be some sort of condition that has the objective of it being, you know, look at it being located internally or at – at the very least, you know, have it as being as an integral part of your building. So, you know, maybe you do allow it here, but this all needs to get tidied up, because when you look at this section here at the moment, it's a bit of a dog's breakfast with, you know, chillers and all the rest of
45 it, so make that an – an element that, sort of, gets redesigned that – you know - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yeah. I – I – I guess the concern will be in that cleaning it up, it actually, by default, ends up being a bulkier solution. So it's – it's, sort of, hard to prejudge what - - -

5 MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: - - - the response might be to that sort of condition set that doesn't ultimately deliver a – a – an – an impact that's worse than, you know – than little - - -

10

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: Little pop ups that are occurring at the moment.

15 MS TUOR: Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: It – you know, it's – has been a challenge in terms of do you put it further away from the parapet – parapet because, you know, from lower down in the building, you can't see it - - -

20

MS TUOR: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: - - - and as you move it further towards the southern boundary, it does then start to be, you know, a horizon pop up. So - - -

25

MS TUOR: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: - - - I – I think it's very hard to have a winning outcome for every single unit.

30

MS TUOR: No, no. Of course there won't be.

MS HARRAGON: No, no. And they're not

35 MS TUOR: That's – and that's not just from the units. That's also - - -

MS HARRAGON: No.

MS TUOR: - - - from the public domain.

40

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MS TUOR: But, I suppose, it – I think what our feeling is – is that at the moment, it's – it's a, sort of, design exercise in itself that, rather than going to and fro – to and fro, it probably - - -

45

MS HARRAGON: Just sets an objective criteria.

MS TUOR: Objective that it then needs - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

5 MS TUOR: A further approval, I think.

MR S.T CHEONG: Can I add – just add something?

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

10

MR CHEONG: Now, what we are talking about is looking at the design quality, in a sense, that you're talking about. Not only the view from the residents - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

15

MR CHEONG: Adjacent residents, but you're talking a view into this property and you heard all the elevation – you know, could be issues with elevation.

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

20

MR CHEONG: This, in particular, is a very important one, you know. You can see it from the public domain - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

25

MR CHEONG: - - - on the bridge. You've got a lot of units looking down onto it as well, so what, ah, Annelise was saying – that you – you virtually have a, like, a dog breakfast e – every

30 MS HARRAGON: Yes. So – so that if you vista is gonna be proportionally taken up by the top of this roof, that's it's one – that's it's, um, contributing to what lays in front of you, rather than detracting.

35 MS TUOR: Yes. It's just, normally, as – as CT said, you can just pretty much design a building from street level and - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

40 MS TUOR: And your elevations, but because this is viewed by so many people, it's almost like you do have to design this elevation as well to make it not just be a whole lot of things stuck on.

MS HARRAGON: Um, so, I mean, we're more than happy to work with you on what that – that criteria might look like - - -

45

MS TUOR: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: - - - um, and that particularly, maybe we even divide it into group zones, because it might be that the criteria that you wanna achieve for a particular area might be slightly different from the other, although I'm – I'm understanding having silos of these utilities is probably where you're not wanting to end up because of that, you know, negative contribution of, um, you know, not integral parts of – of architecture with the add on - - -

MS TUOR: Yep.

10 MR CHEONG: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: - - - result that's occurring.

MS TUOR: Yep.

15

MS HARRAGON: So - - -

MR A. BEATTIE: So in the – in the applicant preparing it's – it's response to that condition, I guess – just, sort of, forecasting, so they've provided a submission of the Planning Secretary. Would there be an expectation that there'd be an amended view impact assessment submitted as part of that if they've – or is it just by virtue of meeting the objectives set or the criteria set in the condition, we would be able to consider that as department people, rather than making the applicant to go – you know, go – go back and undertake a formal view impact assessment or an amended one from both public domain and – and residential apartments.

20
25

MS TUOR: I think it would depend on the extent to which things change. You know, if it – if it's all pretty much in the same location as before, then you've got that assessment, but - - -

30

MR BEATTIE: Yep.

MS TUOR: You know, this one wasn't there before. I don't think there's any issues we've used that way, but - - -

35

MR BEATTIE: Yep.

MS TUOR: - - - maybe you do need to just add it - - -

40

MR BEATTIE: Yeah.

MS TUOR: - - - in that way.

MR BEATTIE: I'm just thinking, I mean, if we're looking at an objective-based approach, would that allow, I guess, greater flexibility for the applicant to – to look at other locations within that, sort of, roof space or we'd be hoping that they'd be

45

trying to confine, you know, any change to roughly the locations that they're already proposing those, sort of, rooftop plant equipment.

MR CHEONG: I think - - -

5

MS TUOR: So - - -

MR CHEONG: We were questioning also whether some of them can actually go into below the roof space, because you've got a - - -

10

MS HARRAGON: Yes. Yes, I - I definitely heard in your explanation that that was one of the goals - - -

MR CHEONG: Yeah.

15

MS HARRAGON: That you were looking at it being, um, you know, an identification of a finished topper - topper development. Um, perhaps, though, as per Andrew's suggestion, we could come up with the, um, the - these - these criteria, unless you can demonstrate that you had negative - no - no impact if it's located elsewhere, because it could be that the alternate solution that someone does come up with which is smart and clever - we're not forecasting that might look like. It, at least, would allow us to provide something that's not 100 per cent consistent with the criteria, but allows us to approve it if they're able to do a view analysis - - -

20

25 MR BEATTIE: Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: - - - that demonstrates without question that there was no change to - to view.

30 MS TUOR: Yep. Yep.

MR BEATTIE: Thanks.

MS HARRAGON: Or - or impeding - or impeding.

35

MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: 'Cause there - there will probably be a change to view. So I'm just thinking, say, they decided to take a bit of the - the - the top of the rooftop off now and to - to put them in the side, you know, it might look different - - -

40

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: - - - but whether impedes view.

45

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

MS TUOR: I mean, one of the things we asked a question about was just – they've got the existing lift motor room. I don't know if I've got any photos here. Um, um,
5 yeah, so the existing lift motor room that is quite a large - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MS TUOR: - - - element, which we haven't actually been inside it, so we don't
10 know, but our understanding would be that you don't need that height for your lift overrun, etcetera, etcetera. So there potentially could be opportunities within just that existing space to put - - -

MS HARRAGON: Repurpose it.

15

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

MR BEATTIE: Yep.
20

MS TUOR: To get some plant in there.

MS HARRAGON: Yep.
25

MR BEATTIE: So an objective could be to minimise the height and bulk scale of that.

MR CHEONG: Yeah.
30

MS TUOR: Yep, yep.

MR BEATTIE: Yeah. Existing elements.

MS TUOR: Yep. Yeah, and - - -
35

MR BEATTIE: Or put those elements - - -

MS TUOR: Retain it. Put it within your existing envelope – approved envelope as
40 – as far as possible, and then if it's not, then you need to justify it because of X,Y,Z.

MR MASLEN: There's certainly existing different considerations around the different plant areas. So if you're at that upper level, it's about appearance, particularly from the bridge and other vistas.
45

MS TUOR: Yep.

MR J. MASLEN: Less so in – and in terms of, you know, private viewing packs.
So, um, we'd – we'd – we'd certainly consider that in framing conditions and objects

5 MS TUOR: Yep.

MR MASLEN: --- around the different areas.

10 MS TUOR: All right. Good. What's the next one? I think, probably, just
following on from that is also about the lift overrun for this lift that goes up to the
level three terrace and the level four terrace. It's the one that's in that corner there

15 MR MASLEN: Yes.

MS TUOR: --- which, again, when you look at the elevation, it's quite a bit higher.
Ah, it's this, which was a glazed lift. So the applicant has got back to us as to the
query that we had about it. Our – our query is, again, that it's – given that it's
services – needs to be that high, because it's servicing the upper level ---
20

MS HARRAGON: Terrace.

MS TUOR: Terrace – the chapel roof terrace.

25 MR CHEONG: Directly from the street.

MS TUOR: Directly from down here, and that that chapel roof terrace gets used on
a fairly limited basis. It's not core to the school's activities. It's used for, I think, the
activities that are in that schedule, that, on balance, I think our feeling is that the need
30 for that – going to that level and the impact that it has – hasn't been justified by the
usage of that upper terrace and that you could probably deal with it by going up to
level three roof terrace, which means you service all of that and it – it would come up
slightly higher than the level of this parapet, but you could get to this, um, upper
level, either by a ramp or a, um, platform lift. That would mean that you could get
35 disabled access up, um, without – you know, you would just get out here and most of
– you know, a lot of things would be happening here and then if you wanted to get up
here, people would just walk up the stairs or go up a ramp or a platform lift.

MS HARRAGON: So, um, the applicant's position about it being a – an
40 improvement on – I think they suggested, um, for people who'd been injured. I think
they were talking about stretchers and things like that.

MR CHEONG: Yep.

45 MS HARRAGON: Um, that the alternate is that those ramps will – if you're going
to be able to maintain it – we'd be putting to the applicant – for all of those levels
other than the chapel roof.

MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: In which case, a, um, an appropriate ramp between the two levels would accommodate the same outcome.

5

MS TUOR: Yeah, or a platform lift or something like that.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

10 MS TUOR: It's not – 'cause it's external. It's not as if it – it's internal and you've got - - -

MR WILSON: Mmm.

15 MS TUOR: - - - to go outside, whether you - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MS TUOR: - - - get out there or you get out here.

20

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MR WILSON: Mmhmm. Um - - -

25 MS TUOR: So I think we'd be looking for a condition that addresses that.

MR WILSON: Yep.

30 MS TUOR: Um, and then we're on to the use of the roof terrace out of school hours.

MS HARRAGON: Okay. So we – we might go to the commission's, um, correspondence dated the 28th of August and probably just speak to each of those items, if that's okay - - -

35

MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: - - - by the commission.

40 MS TUOR: Yep, that's fine.

MS HARRAGON: Okay. So the first item was the use of the roof terraces out of school hours.

45

Is the department aware of any relevant approvals applying to the use of the chapel terrace roof for external group venue hire events or if they were carried out as an incidental and auxiliary use to the school.

So, um, in responding to the commission I will refer to the applicant's advice to commission in its correspondence of 29 August in relation to these use – the uses of the chapel terrace roof for external group venue hire events. In particular, um, the applicant's advice that these uses are incidental or auxiliary to the – the use of the school or, um, alternatively, they are, ah, for the physical, social, cultural or inte – intellectual development or welfare of the community as per the ESEPP. The department finds that the uses nominated by the applicant, um, would either be, as per the applicant's position, um, either an auxiliary use or a use otherwise permitted under the ESEPP. We also note the – the council did not raise any concerns in relation to the permissibility of existing use in its submission to the application. And the department only makes that comment in as much as the current operation of the school is by a current per cent, um, issued by the – the council in this time. So there's any questions regarding that particular item?

15 MR WILSON: Ju – just in terms of the nominated uses, what – can we just revisit those again?

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

20 MR WILSON: Because if there is - - -

MS HARRAGON: All the existing?

MR WILSON: No, no, for the – for the proposed.

25

MS HARRAGON: So – so - - -

MS TUOR: We're just dealing with the existing at the moment so, yeah.

30 MR WILSON: Oh, dealing with the existing. Okay.

MS TUOR: Yep, yep.

MS HARRAGON: So, yeah, so I think we can talk to them further then. So item two, um, the commission – I'll just quickly read it out.

35

The com – commission seeks further details of the addition external group hire.

The commission then goes on to – to quote, um, the permissibility of those activities which are contained in the – the applicant's table, um, and for the department to advise its opinion in relation to whether it's ordinarily incidental or auxiliary or whether they're permissible in relation to the – the ESEPP. So, um, in do – undertaking its assessment, the department had regard to the information provided by the applicant in its RtS, its EIS and more lately in relation to the additional information provided to the commission. So in terms of the permissibility, um, we had regard to the provisions of the Act, the relevant EPIs and the ESEPP and the zoning of the land, in terms of the – the broader use of the land and the site.

45

In relation to, um, the information contained in our assessment report, the department considered that the underlying or dominant use of the – the land was that as an educational establishment, which was permitted in the zone. Um, and that it was also permitted under the ESEPP, um, and under the – the zone that applies to the – the
5 two campuses. In relation to the permissibility of the proposed use of the site, we also had regard to the proposed uses and activities that were set out in the Environmental Impact Statement.

10 In particular, the proposed uses of the rooftop terrace, the multipurpose hall and the other internal spaces, including both usual daytime student activities, before and after school care, extracurricular activities, wider school community events, local community meetings and events, as well as the external group hire activities which are proposed by the applicant. And in doing so we've, um, used as a basis for our
15 assessment, the work undertaken by the activan – applicant, including their EIS and the applicant's RtS and – as well as the information contained in our assessment report. And we also note the additional information that the applicant has now given to the commission on the 29th of August.

20 We note that that additional information that the commission, um, received from the applicant on the 29th of August is consistent with the information that was currently before the appli – ah, before the department so we would say that no significant additional information has come to you that we haven't otherwise already put our
25 mind to. On the basis of the information provided as part of the EIS and the RtS, the – the department concluded it was satisfied that school-related ac – events would be ordinarily incidental or ancillary to the use of the school as – ah, site as a school. In relation to the external group venue hire events of up to 10 occasions a year, the proposed uses would be for the physical, social, cultural or intellectual development or welfare of the community, as provided for under the ESEPP.

30 We note that the range of activities proposed by the applicant are not, um, an unusual activity for many of the educational facilities that the department considers, whether the applicant be a state, um, school or an independent school. The merit and the impacts of the proposals, um, in the department's, um, opinion are on the basis of a
35 case-by-case basis in terms of the potential impact. In terms of the expectation that, um, uses of schools, um, become an activity which is, ah, fairly, um – or appropriate to be considered as part of an application, the ESEPP also takes, um, the reader to clause 35.6 when it asks the determining authority to ensure that it – the school has been designed to be shared with the community.

40 So it also suggests that it – it should be a part of the design of the school to have regard to whether that activity is able to be accommodated. Although, it doesn't oblige the applicant to do so, it certainly takes the determining authority to have that
45 in their mind. So, um, we don't believe that any of the uses would be such, as being a use that would be considered to be prohibited, um, in this instance. We consider that the – both the school events and the non-school events would be permitted under the current, um, planning instruments that apply.

MS TUOR: All right. Um, so just in terms of the information that's come in from the applicant, um, about clarifying, um, about the proposed uses. Um, I think they've said that they don't actually have, um, detail about the 10, um, external venue hire events, um, but they want to provide the space for commercial purposes to
5 external users, um, and there are no current plans for who those external users might be. Um, only that the space would be available for their use, subject to a commercial agreement. So I suppose what we're grappling with a little bit is, um, in terms of – clearly the – you know – the commercial uses are permissible, um, under the infrastructure set. Um, but then you've got the test in the - - -

10

MS HARRAGON:

MS TUOR: - - - ah, education set as being, you know, blah, blah, blah, for the community. So the question is the community. Is the school community clearly - - -

15

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MS TUOR: It's of benefit to the school community. It – it raises money having commercial activities. But the preliminary – the community also includes the local
20 community and – and – so if it's a commercial use, then the commercial use – and it's a subject to an agreement, it could be for a – a wedding or 50th birthday party or – so it sort of can become sort of, like, a function centre use. And given that this school is fairly unique in terms of its location, it's sort of, um – you could anticipate that it could be quite successful. So potentially you have then – I think it's about –
25 over – over 40 uses that already – no, over 50 uses that occur out of hours with over 100 people on the chapel terrace roof. That – that's what happens now.

There's over 50 of them with over 100 people on the chapel terrace. And the chapel terrace is quite a long way from most residential uses. It's sort of – quite a good
30 location for it. Um, and then you'd be the other uses that are much closer to the, um, adjoining – you know, the residential properties. I – I think there's no concern about the ones that are – the additional, you know, school-related ones, which is really only, um, the parent event for 1180, which is only one event a year and the father/son barbecue which is 400. And the New Year's Eve we can talk about
35 that, you know, there's a – it's - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MS TUOR: - - - a big jump in numbers. But they're just – they're – they're once a
40 year so presumably you can accept that, you know, there's a – big events that are happening once a year and there's only three of them. But then if you add the extra 10 commercial ones that have, you know, 300 people, you're getting quite a lot of events happening. You – you're almost getting 60 or so events happening out of hours with pe – more than 100 people. So it's cumulatively – is – is that what
45 community use is expected?

MS HARRAGON: A – and in our assessment we also acknowledge that probably a cluster of those would have – will likely occur in the summer season rather than the – the winter season so you’re probably going to have that in a certain, um, you know, band of the year - - -

5

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: - - - more so than spreading everything throughout the year. So, you know, it certainly – it – it brings to it the element of, um – the degree of impact. Um, I – I know that’s not what the commission is specifically asking us about because, um, you’re looking – you know, I – I believe you might be asking – in terms of that ESEPP – about – on balance. The – the relationship with the uses and the community.

10

15

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: Um - - -

20

MS TUOR: I think we’re grappling with it as to what is the community, you know? Like, it’s – it’s - - -

MS HARRAGON: And we put our mind to it as well because - - -

25

MS TUOR: Mmm, mmm.

MS HARRAGON: - - - it’s not – not defined.

MS TUOR: Mmm.

30

MS HARRAGON: Um, and we did put our mind to does the Act have another reference to it, you know?

MS TUOR: Mmm.

35

MS HARRAGON: Like, is it the school community, the broad – immediate community or a very broad take on the community.

MS TUOR: Mmm.

40

MS HARRAGON: In terms of – and we actually put our minds to some of the activities that are already occurring, in terms of - - -

MS TUOR: Mmm.

45

MS HARRAGON: - - - um, you know – we note that one of the non-school activity is events hosted by the Society of Jesus. So there’s certainly - - -

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: - - - quite a significant range about what does a non-school
event actually entail, you know, from the – potentially the – the greater impact being
5 a full commercial venue hire.

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: As compared to, you know, the consequences of a, um – a
10 hosted event by the Society of Jesus.

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: And what – what does that entail. So – but, um - - -
15

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: And I guess, for the department, that's where we landed on.
The need for a trial to form - - -
20

MR WILSON: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: - - - an opinion, rather than - - -

MS TUOR: Mmm.
25

MS HARRAGON: - - - um, at the moment, prejudging its management and the –
the worst case scenario, which is always how we go about it to - - -

MS TUOR: Mmm.
30

MS HARRAGON: - - - to actually take a view as to, um, the nature of the impacts
and how they're managed.

MS TUOR: Mmm.
35

MS HARRAGON: I – I don't think there's, um – I don't think anything other than –
we – we also acknowledge it is a significant number of events when you bring them
together, in terms of the existing ones and the future ones.
40

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: In – in terms of how many are likely – or – um, to occur over a
year on a weekly basis. The department would acknowledge that is the case.
45

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: That there are quite a large number.

MS TUOR: And I think the other concern was just this 1 – you know, logistical things. Like, if you're serving alcohol to people on a commercial basis, you have to
5 get a liquor licence so - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MS TUOR: And also in terms of noise, you – once you get a liquor licence, then
10 you're meant to comply with the standard and there's already a degree of non-compliance recognised in the, um, noise assessment. But that was done at the 2.1 metre high fence, not the - - -

MS HARRAGON: For the acoustics, yes.
15

MS TUOR: but, um, our understanding is that the properties behind, there's no acoustic fence there. And because they're higher than the terrace the – the acoustic fence won't have any benefit for them. So it - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.
20

MS TUOR: - - - it's the – you know, whether there's – is going to be the potential for noise complaint, um so - - -

MS HARRAGON: Ce – certainly, they were included as receivers in the - - -
25

MR WILSON: Mmm, yes.

MS HARRAGON: - - - noise assessment. The ones – I think it's the horizon the
30 – the ones on the – the - - -

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: - - - northern side. So, um – because, obviously, if they had a
35 need for an acoustics fence it would have come before as part of that re – packaging recommendations.

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: Um - - -
40

MS TUOR: Anyway, I suppose it's just something that, you know, we have to keep thinking about it. But – but I think, um, again – I think because – I think we're feeling that it did probably – it's a – almost like a little DA in its own right, that it
45 may be something that, rather than it be part of this application – I know you – the – there was the suggestion of the trial period. But to some extent, the trial period – it's very hard to sort of close the gate once you've opened it and maybe it's better to

actually have it that those 10 uses don't get approved as part of this application and the – an application will then get put in for the approval of the secretary for any commercial uses and they could look at all these things, like, um, you know, the, um, liquor licence and they would have been able to, presumably, monitor how these
5 other events have gone, say, the father-son barbeque and done proper noise readings of that.

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

10 MS TUOR: And then you'd have something that would, sort of, be a more empirical, um, assessment of a 400 person event occurring.

MR WILSON: I guess what we're saying, Karen, is that there's a level of
15 uncertainty with all these proposed events – that maybe it's better to determine that the ones that are actually connected to the school are determined to work first and then – and then – then – then it might be acceptable to – to deal with the 10 extra, which are – which are less – less integrated into school – into the school – operation of the school.

20 MS HARRAGON: Can I, um – and I – and I – I'm, sort of, just without - - -

MS TUOR: Yep. Yeah, yeah.

MR WILSON: Which is – which – which carries - - -
25

MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: Forethought.

30 MR WILSON: Which is the opposite to your trial – is another way of doing.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah, yep. And – and I totally understand - - -

MR WILSON: You – you – yeah.
35

MS HARRAGON: - - - the basis under which the Commission's making that suggestion, so I – I think, um, it equally recognises the challenge of the situation and it is – alternate way of achieving, potentially, for the school an outcome that they're still looking for, but within a different planning pathway.
40

MS TUOR: Yeah, yeah.

MS HARRAGON: Um, I'm – I'm just maybe turning my mind to the current schedule of uses, because, I guess, one of the concerns we just were discussing at the
45 moment was additional uses. I'm just wondering whether there's any opportunity for the uses that were already occurring on the chapel terrace - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah, to keep going.

MS HARRAGON: - - - to be allowed to be

5 MS TUOR: Yeah, yeah. No, we were - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep, okay.

10 MS TUOR: - - - just saying - - -

MR WILSON: Yeah, no.

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

15 MS TUOR: - - - accept the status quo.

MS HARRAGON: But – but so – but for them to move from the chapel roof to be on top of the other roof?

20 MS TUOR: Well, no. At the moment, they're – they're saying that they're keeping them on the chapel roof.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah. Yeah, yeah.

25 MS TUOR: So they haven't asked for that, so – and to some extent, the chapel roof is a better location, because it's further away.

MS HARRAGON: 'Cause we – so we see the New Year's Eve is on the chapel roof.

30 MS TUOR: It's on both, yeah.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

35 MS TUOR: It's on both.

MS HARRAGON: So that's probably – so, I guess, whatever the condition set that comes forward would need to probably recognise that if that was okay, events that were going to – that were already occurring would be allowed to - - -

40 MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: To occur on both of them.

45 MS TUOR: Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

MS TUOR: And I think in our amendments to the conditions, we tried to identify that, where we said chapel roof didn't need a trial period, because you're already doing it - - -

5 MS HARRAGON: Yep. Yep.

MS TUOR: - - - but you should do a management plan for those activities, whereas the proposed use – proposed roof terrace, it, um, was a trial period and management plan. So now the question is whether with the proposed roof terrace,
10 you still require a trial period or you just accept that there's three events that are going to occur that are, you know, these ones that were down in the – down in the courtyard before, so the parent event, the father-son barbeque and the – New Year's Eve and just accept that they're going to occur, but actually require some monitoring of, say, the father and son barbeque, which can then be used if they want to apply for
15 any further use of that terrace out of hours.

MS HARRAGON: And – and that would provide the applicant an opportunity to do accurate - - -

20 MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: - - - noise - - -

MS TUOR: Yep.
25

MS HARRAGON: - - - reporting - - -

MR WILSON: Actually - - -

30 MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: - - - rather than modelling - - -

MS TUOR: Yep.
35

MS HARRAGON: - - - verification - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah, from - - -

40 MS HARRAGON: - - - and, um - - -

MS TUOR: - - - actual sources.

MS HARRAGON: - - - to hone whatever management needs to occur - - -
45

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: But on a basis of having potentially more control of attendees, given their all school related.

MS TUOR: Yeah.

5

MR BEATTIE: We could have a register for complaints as well - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

10 MR BEATTIE: - - - so they could use that - - -

MR WILSON: Yeah.

MR BEATTIE: - - - to form - - -

15

MS HARRAGON: During the time as well.

MR BEATTIE: Yeah.

20 MS TUOR: Yep.

MR WILSON: Yep.

25 MS TUOR: Yep. So then there'd probably be more accurate data for if they did want to then apply.

MS HARRAGON: So – so, um, the department is able to assist the depart – um, the Commission in refocusing the condition set that - - -

30 MR WILSON: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: - - - you've already prepared for us to - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah.

35

MS HARRAGON: To capture that.

MS TUOR: Yeah.

40 MS HARRAGON: And, I think, probably just a statement about the other uses not being permitted. Like, I think it needs to be quite succinct - - -

MS TUOR: Yep.

45 MS HARRAGON: Where the Commission's position is on that - - -

MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: - - - um, but we – we might provide a couple of versions, um, and maybe even get some legal advice, such that it's, um, able to be modified - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah.

5

MS HARRAGON: - - - or revisited - - -

MS TUOR: Yep.

10 MS HARRAGON: - - - by the planning secretary.

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

15

MS TUOR: I mean, it may end up having to be a mod or something like that, but - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

20

MS TUOR: - - - at least - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

25 MS TUOR: - - - you know, that's always – and we can report where I - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MS TUOR: - - - explain our rationale for deleting from this approval.

30

MS HARRAGON: Okay. So – so I think that then potentially covers off a conversation that we would have had at item 3 anyway, unless you just wanted us to quickly talk to you regarding some of the elements that we didn't just touch on. So we just mentioned in terms of out of hours activities in terms of noise, which I think the Commission's resolution would allow, um, the methodology for managing that to be quite succinct. So the other matter was, um, in relation to the traffic and parking, particularly, um, any events that were related to the out of school, so I think given the numbers that are attending for those under your current conditions, that we would continue to say that the impact would not a significant concern, given the level of public s – um, transport service in that locality.

40

MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: So go to item 4. We've spoken, too, already about the new rooftop structures.

45

MS TUOR: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: And item 5 of the Commission's letter was about the reduced roof form and lowering of the ridge height. Um, so we – we - - -

MR WILSON: Junior – um, junior school.

5

MS HARRAGON: Of the junior school.

MS TUOR: Yep.

10 MS HARRAGON: Um - - -

MS TUOR: And they've clarified that they want to do that as a – a formal amendment to their application, so - - -

15 MS HARRAGON: Yep. So we've done, I think, some revision. So would the Commission be happy for us to just quickly speak to probably two of the areas of conditions that we might just like to provide the Commission some - - -

MS TUOR: Sure.

20

MS HARRAGON: - - - feedback on.

MS TUOR: Yep.

25 MS HARRAGON: So we've done some minor edits and we'll just provide a copy of that to the Commission - - -

MS TUOR: Yep.

30 MS HARRAGON: - - - but in particular, um, we wanted to talk to you regarding, um, the conditions for the staging. Um, we just wanted to alert the Commission to the purpose of why the AAT and the – the Commission's looking at deleting - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah,

35

MS HARRAGON: - - - on page 12.

MS TUOR: Sure. And – and it was done on the basis that we thought it was a repetition.

40

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

MS TUOR: But – but if there is a reason for it, then - - -

45 MS HARRAGON: Yeah. So the – the – this is specifically regarding the strategies, plans and programs and so what it allows us to do is that, particularly in developments that are staged – that, and particularly on schools, we – we actually

have this come up quite often. When you're decanting students and you're actually often completing pieces of work, um, piecemeal rather than the entire three stages at once, this allows some of the management plans to come in that a – um, appropriate for that stage of work rather than the whole stage, and so probably some good
5 examples of why it's quite important to allow any of the – any of the CMP's strategies, plans and programs, for instance, would be condition B8, which is about external cladding. We require details of that come – come in. This would allow the applicant just to provide the external cladding for the first stage, rather than the detail. The other which they may not have yet finalised a – a tender agreement with
10 or a thing such as that. Equally, the details for which is equitable access, where you'd need to do final details. We would allow – it would allow that to come in. The storm water equally at B10. The certified drains at C4. Um, C5, protection of infrastructure, so it – it basically facilitates the delivery of all of those management plans and the detailed drawings, whether it's to the secretary of to the certifier, to be
15 staged out.

MS TUOR: Okay.

MR BEATTIE: Can I just add, Karen – and I can see why we're – why we're
20 responding this way – because it's a pretty hot topic at the moment, um, with a lot of our applicants and we've just gone straight on – not on the defensive, but we're, you know, justifying why we – why we've been serving a particular condition.

MS TUOR: Yep.
25

MR BEATTIE: But what the Commission has acknowledged - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MR BEATTIE: - - - is that we've got A11, which is staging, combining and
30 updating strategies, plans or programs.

MS TUOR: Okay.

MR BEATTIE: And we've got A14, which is a - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

MR BEATTIE: Staging condition, which is our relatively new condition that we've
40 been, you know, um, dealing with other applicants on, and then we do have the repeat - - -

MS TUOR: Okay.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

MR BEATTIE: - - - at A18, which is staging, combining and updating - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MR BEATTIE: - - - strategies, plans and programs.

5 MS TUOR: I – I think - - -

MS HARRAGON: that?

10 MS TUOR: I think we just thought that 18 to 20 was a repeat of 11 to 13, which I thought we'd put in it somewhere. I thought we'd put that comment in as to why we'd done it, yeah.

MR BEATTIE: Oh, so is that done

15 MS HARRAGON: I think – can we just take that one away?

MS TUOR: Yeah, yeah. Yeah. I mean, we have no concerns about what was being, ah, said. It was just whether there was a duplication.

20 MS HARRAGON: Yeah. Okay. And I – I - - -

MS TUOR: That's all.

25 MS HARRAGON: I believe that will resolve the matter, that understanding.

MR BEATTIE: Yes.

MS TUOR: Yep.

30 MS HARRAGON: Apologises for that clarification. Um, we – maybe can we go to page 15 to just - - -

MS TUOR: Yep.

35 MS HARRAGON: Talk to the condition regarding the landscape plan. Um, we just – we just wanted to confirm its intention regarding the garden bed being 1.2 wide and that it's to go up to the height of the solid – solid sandstone. I think that's what it's suggesting. It's probably just not quite clear at the moment.

40 MS TUOR: Yeah. I - - -

MR CHEONG: That – that is at the lower level adjoining quickly the - - -

45 MS HARRAGON: Yep. So - - -

MR CHEONG: The adjoining - - -

MS HARRAGON: As in per that? I think that might be the – the differentiation between the external - - -

MS TUOR: Yes.

5

MR CHEONG: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: - - - boundary wall and between the sandstone - - -

10 MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: - - - um, foundation rock, yeah.

MS TUOR: Yeah. So at the moment, the ground level of Craiglea is pretty much at
15 the same – at that level, I think. It's the same level or that level? That level.

MR CHEONG: The higher level, yeah.

MS TUOR: Yeah, where the bottom of that sandstone wall it. That's right, yeah.
20 It's there. And what's proposed is this is gonna get excavated quite a long way down
- - -

MR CHEONG: All the way down to - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah, quite a long way down and that – and that's where they're
25 putting that screen along - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MS TUOR: - - - and it was going to be a screen that went along that wall and then
30 up above the sandstone wall, but in terms of addressing the concerns raised by
Craiglea and improve the relationship between the two, what we thought was it
would be better to keep that level there for a width of 1.2. So you get – basically, it
would be a planter box that would go along that wall and then you can put plants in it
35 that achieve a similar – you know, a screening effect similar to what exists now - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MS TUOR: - - - as opposed to that wire mesh screen. They can still put their wire
40 mesh screen on the new retaining wall that they're putting in on their property if they
want to, but it was really to just try and maintain, you know, that relationship that
exists and that, sort of, landscape screening that exists now by putting, basically, a
planter box that goes from there down to their new level.

MS HARRAGON: So, um, it might just be worth, um, considering - - -

MS TUOR: Re – rewording it.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah. No, I think – I – I think - - -

MS TUOR: Yep.

5 MS HARRAGON: We could just – there’s probably just some small tweaks for that
- - -

MS TUOR: Yep.

10 MS HARRAGON: - - - that we could suggest.

MR WILSON: Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: But probably in relation to how that condition operates in
15 relation to the next one, which is the supporting structures - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: - - - because I am just a little bit concerned whether we might
20 almost end up with, um, the outcome where you’ve got the sandstone wall on one
side, 1.2 metres, and the wire mesh and, basically, having no plant being able to have
a crown development, because it’s sandwiched between the two.

MS TUOR: Yep. Yep.
25

MS HARRAGON: So it might just be that, um, instead of it being a continual –
regarding that, um, condition B4D, which could, in effect, be a continual grid of that
mesh - - -

30 MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: - - - that maybe there’s some opening, so that you’ve actually
got that crown development occurring, ‘cause otherwise you – you potentially could
end up with quite deformed and – vegetation once it clears the – the, um - - -
35

MS TUOR: Well, maybe that should only go to the height of, um, the ground level,
so it should only go as high – up to there and not go higher, so it’s – really would be
just something that screens the retaining wall for the school, if you understand what I
mean.
40

MS HARRAGON: Yeah, even though I think their intention was for it to be
screening for, um, Craiglea.

MS TUOR: Yeah.
45

MS HARRAGON: Yeah. Um - - -

MS TUOR: But with this one - - -

MS HARRAGON: Perhaps you can just - - -

5 MS TUOR: You – yeah, you could just do it to there - - -

MR CHEONG: So – but - - -

10 MS TUOR: - - - which could screen for them, and then this gives screen - - -

MR CHEONG: Could – could the screen be still on the – on the stone wall side – on the boundary, rather than brought forward.

15 MS HARRAGON: Oh, well, not - - -

MS TUOR: No. I think it has to be on the retaining wall.

20 MS HARRAGON: Not quite that condition, ‘cause I just think – and it might be that you might even wanna look at offsetting some of it, ‘cause I’m just a bit concerned that - - -

MS TUOR: I agree.

25 MS HARRAGON: - - - between the wall and the grid, you’ve almost got a canyon that no plant - - -

MR CHEONG: Yeah. That’s

30 MS HARRAGON: - - - can be – a crown of no vegetation greater than 1.2 will ever be able to occur.

MS TUOR: Yeah. Yeah.

35 MS HARRAGON: So by the time it finally breaks through of the – the wall - - -

40 MS TUOR: Well, I think there’s stairs there, but it, basically, would be keeping your ground level along here with trees, and then along that – inside of that face there – is where they could have their, um, little wire mesh thing, which would give them – like, rather than having a concrete wall, it would just give them some screening. Do you understand that?

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

45 MS TUOR: So - - -

MS HARRAGON: But – but maybe not - - -

MS TUOR: - - - it's layered.

MS HARRAGON: But maybe not continual.

5 MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

10 MS TUOR: Yep.

MS TUOR: I mean, maybe they just have to submit further details. So it would be – that would go, that – that top bit and it would just be down - - -

MS HARRAGON: Okay.

15

MS TUOR: - - - the bottom.

MS HARRAGON: So the – so the end – so – so do you think, um, it might be in the Commission's interest to actually nominate a – a finish height of those trellises then?

20

MS TUOR: Yeah, or unless it – you just do it by the – they submit it for further approval, which I think you have that condition already.

MS HARRAGON: So just in terms of being clear what the objective is, um - - -

25

MS TUOR: Yep. The - - -

MS HARRAGON: - - - are there residents that are not comfortable with the visual or - - -

30

MS TUOR: Yeah, yeah.

MS HARRAGON: Okay. Okay.

35 MS TUOR: The Craiglea submission - - -

MS HARRAGON: 'Cause we weren't sure whether the - - -

MS TUOR: They suggested about having a landscape screen along here.

40

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MS TUOR: And I think it makes sense. So it's really just wherever the existing – it's just – this planter box down here, it doesn't do, really, anything for next-door.

45

So it's getting that planter box - - -

MS HARRAGON: Higher.

MS TUOR: - - - up higher so that you can get some screening along here. And then the masonry wall that they – you put in, they can put the – this sort of treatment along that. So - - -

5 MS HARRAGON: Yes. Yes. And the view experienced by Craiglea is not of a metal screen. There's some vegetation, but vegetation on their side of the screen.

MS TUOR: Yes. Yes. Yes.

10 MS HARRAGON: Okay.

MS TUOR: So, basically, this here - - -

MR WILSON: Vegetation

15

MS TUOR: - - - gets replaced with a proper vegetation screening that comes out of the planter box. And you can still have that lower bit.

MR MASLEN: If the applicant wishes to.

20

MS TUOR: If – yes.

MR MASLEN: Yes.

25 MS TUOR: We don't care.

MR MASLEN: So the Commission's objective is to - - -

MS TUOR: Yes. It's - - -

30

MR MASLEN: - - - get more elevated natural planting.

MS TUOR: Yes. Yes. Yes. So however that needs to be expressed

35 MS HARRAGON: Just one more minor matter, which is the C14. No, actually, I think there might be two

MS TUOR: What page is that on, sorry?

40 MS HARRAGON: So, page 19.

MS TUOR: Yes.

45 MS HARRAGON: That we just – for clarification, that we refer to following the completion of the final stage of construction. Because, obviously - - -

MR WILSON: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: Yes. Because - - -

MR WILSON: Stage - - -

5 MS HARRAGON: - - - that will occupy three times stage. And we're just seeking – just providing some advice about specifying it's the Council's Traffic Committee. So, on page 21, the Council's Traffic Committee is specifically nominated rather than just Council. And we would provide to the Commission that perhaps it would be best for Council to form that opinion as to who would be - - -

10 MR WILSON: But that was Council's request, Karen, that - - -

MS HARRAGON: It's come in, has it?

15 MS TUOR: Yes.

MR WILSON: The Council's requested because all the other agencies are represented on the Committee.

20 MS HARRAGON: As well.

MR WILSON: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: Which is the justification for removing Transport?
25

MS TUOR: Yes.

MR WILSON: Yes.

30 MS HARRAGON: Okay.

MS TUOR: That was - - -

MS HARRAGON: So was that – is that - - -
35

MS TUOR: - - - supposedly Committee.

MS HARRAGON: Was that advice given straight to the Committee – the Commission from Council?
40

MR WILSON: Yes.

MS TUOR: Yes.

45 MS HARRAGON: Okay. So see that.

MS TUOR: So it will be on the transcript.

MS HARRAGON: I think that might be it.

MS TUOR: Okay. So the other things, you didn't have any concerns on that?

5 MR MASLEN: Now, there's a couple of other conditions that that particular comment touches on in terms of reference.

MS TUOR: Yes.

10 MR MASLEN: There's condition E26(b) in relation to the raised garden bed. We can discuss that and those comments that follow on from that.

MS TUOR: Yes. Yes.

15 MS HARRAGON: And we've just gone through the conditions – yes, so in terms of the secretary, we put in the word “planning secretary”.

MS TUOR: Yes. Yes.

20 MR MASLEN: Okay. That's right.

MS HARRAGON: clarifications.

MS TUOR: Yes.

25

MS HARRAGON: Yes. Otherwise, they don't materially change the intention.

MS TUOR: And the new definition of “heritage item”, I think that was latest version.

30

MS HARRAGON: Yes. So thank you for that – yes, giving us that update.

MS TUOR: Okay. And then we've just added in the conditions – the amended ones that were put in in relation to the - - -

35

MS HARRAGON: For the sets of approved plants.

MS TUOR: Yes, the elevations

40 MR MASLEN: Just one of those dates do need to be updated. We'll provide that in our comments.

MS TUOR: Okay. And then, again, when we get to the part – schedule 3, once we – there were – I deleted the render one because it was actually incorrect. When you
45 look at the levels I think we had some concerns about – I think we have it here. But I think everything else was

MR CHEONG: I've got a question on the requirement for the prior to commencement of the works.

5 MS TUOR: What page are you on? It might be different because you've got a different version.

MS HARRAGON: What we – so we noted the Commission's reference specifically to Craiglea.

10 MR MASLEN: C5.

MR CHEONG: Yes. Yes.

15 MS HARRAGON: And at Kirribilli Avenue.

MR CHEONG: I thought the Department usually has a standard condition so that it will actually be consistent with the requirement for post-construction dilapidation survey. Because if you're not mentioning it pre-construction, then how do you do a post?

20 MS HARRAGON: Yes. Yes. So we might come back to you with further – so I know there was a broader conversation about zone of influence.

25 MR CHEONG: Yes. That's right. Yes.

MS HARRAGON: Yes, previously. So - - -

MR CHEONG: I think it was on project.

30 MS HARRAGON: Is that where it came from? Thank you.

MR CHEONG: Yes.

35 MS TUOR: So there was a previous condition?

MR CHEONG: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

40 MS TUOR: So if that's the standard

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

45 MR BEATTIE: We've normally got the two conditions prior to commencement of a construction. One is the dilapidation report and the other's the protection of public and private property infrastructure. And then we've got similar conditions post-

construction as well. So that's our standard. But, yeah, we'll have to take that on notice, looking at consistency for this one.

5 MS TUOR: And is it – I suppose the question is whether you say zone of influence or whether you pretty much - - -

MS HARRAGON: Nominate - - -

10 MS TUOR: - - - determine now that what's gonna – the zone – the area that's likely to be affected - - -

MR MASLEN: Yes.

15 MS TUOR: - - - is 88 and 49.

MS HARRAGON: And certainly we would typically be informed by the information contained in the noise and vibration report, because its whole purpose would be to identify vibrations that were potentially level to cause issues that need to be managed specifically. But we've got no problem in helping determine those in particular that haven't created a risk.

MS TUOR: Yes.

25 MS HARRAGON: Particularly even if the noise and vibration identifies that it can be managed. But where there are buildings that might be more sensitive to that activity, yeah picked out.

MR BEATTIE: So we don't actually use zone of influence in our standard.

30 MS HARRAGON: No. So can I just talk quickly again to the trial? Should the Commission land on a trial, the only thing that we would suggest that, um, that any trial period potentially be clear that it starts from hours rather than a generic from the start of operation.

35 MS TUOR: Yes.

40 MS HARRAGON: Because it – it's not – probably not an issue that the lower levels of the school might be being occupied while the upper level's being worked on. So just that it's cleared from the, um, first activity, just - - -

45 MS TUOR: Yes, that would make sense. And one query I had was just, um, in terms of the existing approval that exists for the school, just, um, making sure that there's no conditions in that that need to be amended by this consent. So that they're – to ensure that there's consistency between the two. Because two

MS HARRAGON: We'll take that on notice and make a set available to ourselves to have a look through for you.

MS TUOR: Yes. Yes. Um, what else? And, um, just in relation to the submissions that were put in, the one from Craiglea that was put in by a planning consultant – so many pieces of paper – made quite a lot of suggestions about conditions. And I think we've taken onboard some of them. But there was one, I think, where they just made
5 a recommendation about rather than certain things like the lighting plan and, I think, the landscape plan and a few other things being, um, subject to approval by the, um, certifying authority, that they should be subject to approval by the, um - - -

10 MS HARRAGON: Planning secretary.

MS TUOR: - - - planning secretary. So we've sort of gone through a little bit and changed, um, the certifier to being the planning secretary, um, particularly where it's anything that requires a judgment as opposed to a tick-the-box.

15 MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MS TUOR: So – and the only thing that's likely to have a degree of, um, public interest Um, if you can perhaps just – when you're going through the conditions
- - -

20 MS HARRAGON: Yes. I – we've already - - -

MS TUOR: - - - see what

25 MS HARRAGON: We've already noted those references.

MS TUOR: Yes.

30 MS HARRAGON: And we probably might turn our mind to the ones that the Commission may not have amended.

MS TUOR: Yes.

35 MS HARRAGON: Because often it's, um, actually better if the whole CMP and plans come to the one authority, because it gets quite complicated when half of the CMP goes in one direction then the other.

MS TUOR: Yes. Yes. Yes.

40 MS HARRAGON: So we'll give you some – the Commission some feedback in that area.

MS TUOR: Okay.

45 MS HARRAGON: Okay. Thank you.

MS TUOR: All right. Anything else?

MR WILSON: No.

MR MASLEN: No.

5 MR WILSON:

MS TUOR: Did you have anything, Kane? Nothing? So – no? All right. Well, thank you very much for coming. That's been very productive.

10 MS HARRAGON: Thank you.

MR MASLEN: Thank you.

15 MR WILSON: Thank you.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[3.53 pm]