

Bradley James

From: Paul Grech [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, 21 August 2021 11:28 AM
To: Bradley James
Cc: Margaret Mason
Subject: RE: Trinity Grammar School Redevelopment (SSD 10371) - Community Stakeholder Meetings
Attachments: Paul Grech Notes from Presentation to IPC 18.8.2021.pdf

Importance: High

Follow Up Flag: Follow up

Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Bradley

Please find attached my full notes used for my presentation to the Commission during the week. I would appreciate that it be considered and accept that it may be made publicly available.

In addition I would want to identify 3 key issues, that have become evident to me as I reviewed the matter further, that seem to be overlooked:

- Apart from all the problems I have already pointed out with the submitted TIA, as far as I can see the documentation does not specify what number of children were present at school on the days traffic counts were taken. This sensibly formed a key part of the traffic analysis discussed in the Court judgements. It is a fundamental flaw in the current traffic analysis.
- The proposal has a capital investment value (CIV) of \$127.7 million, proposes 12,210m² of new floorspace and would generate 543 construction jobs. With it being an operating school, the proposed development will realistically need to be staged over many years. This length of time that residents will be disturbed and the ability to manage the parking and traffic impacts over such a long time should be taken into consideration.
- The school has effectively admitted to committing an offence under the Act by breaching the conditions of its current consent regarding student numbers. I appreciate if Council or others were to take legal action, that the Court would be reluctant to enforce such conditions pending resolution of the current application. But even if the IPC were to approve the development, which I obviously hope not, there could be a significant period where the school will continue to operate above the current cap of 1500 children (which the Court found would impose unacceptable impacts) with no real incentive to do anything. The way the draft consent is structured, by referring to the 'regularisation' of student numbers in the list of approved development on the front page, the school would be granted an increase of numbers over 1500 without proper assessment of the increase from 1500 to 1655 (with no appropriate conditions specifically addressing that increase). The Department has called this "regularising" the consent. I call it a blatant disregard for the Court, the residents and proper process. It is effectively an enforcement issue that the school has skilfully subverted. In my view this needs to be properly addressed and any recommendation of the IPC should include a recommendation for Council to attend to this enforcement issue. I will be separately asking Council to address this.

I am happy to answer any questions if needed.

Kind regards

Paul Grech
Director