



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-1173122

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

APPLICANT MEETING

RE: SANTA SOPHIA CATHOLIC COLLEGE

PANEL: PETER WILLIAMS
WENDY LEWIN
CAROL AUSTIN

ASSISTING PANEL: HELEN MULCAHY
CALLUM FIRTH

APPLICANT: ALAINE ROFF
CASSANDRA NACCARELLA
DAVID DOYLE
JULIEN ASHTON

OTHER PARTIES: KENNY LIM
ALEX NEWBERRY
ROBERT LOUGHMAN
ANTON REISCH
THOMAS LEHMANN
MATTHEW McRORY
ALEXANDRA BOGDANOVA
THOMAS FEHON
MATTHEW SCARD

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

DATE: 8.15 AM, WEDNESDAY, 25 MARCH 2020

DR WILLIAMS: Good morning. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the land on which we meet. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders, past and present, and to the elders of other communities who may be here today.

5

Welcome to the meeting today to discuss SSD9772 for the Santa Sophia Catholic College at number 10 Red Gables Road, Box Hill North. My name is Peter Williams, and I am the chair of this panel. Joining me are my fellow Commissioners, Carol Austin and Wendy Lewin. Helen Mulcahy and Callum Firth are also here from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. Also in attendance at this meeting in various capacities representing the applicant are:, Alaine Roff, David Doyle, Julian Ashton, Cassandra Naccarella, Penny Lim, Alex Newberry, Robert Lowman, Anton Reisch, Thomas Leman, Matthew McGrory, Alexandra Bogdanova, Thomas Fehon and Matthew Scard. Thank you all very much for your patience and for being with us here today.

10
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 website.

20

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

25

I would ask that all the participants here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time for the purpose of the transcript and for everyone to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. It would also, I think, be helpful if when we're not actually speaking – it might be helpful to mute our microphones just to help the quality of the transcript, but also to remember to turn the microphone on when we wish to speak.

30
35

So thank you very much. We'll now work through the agenda. And just by way of beginning, I would like to thank very much all the parties of the applicant for their cooperation and patience in organising this meeting under very difficult circumstances. I'd also like to thank the for providing the video of the site for us. In lieu of the site inspection that video was very helpful. We might have one or two questions in relation to that just by way of clarification. But to begin, what we'd like to do is – just looking at the agenda – is we might begin with the applicant's presentation, which I presume would be the PowerPoint presentation, so I'll hand it over to the applicant, thank you.

40
45

MR DOYLE: Thank you, Peter. So it's David Doyle speaking now.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you, David.

MR DOYLE: I'm the head of school planning, Catholic Education Diocese of Parramatta.

5

We, as CEDP, have 80 schools across Western Sydney, and we have 43,000 students – I'd like to say "in those schools today", but I should say "hopefully dialling in to those schools today as well as present". Those schools are across Western Sydney and the Blue Mountains. We provide safe environments for each of those students.

10

The learning framework that we work to, and certainly when we're constructing a new school, we talk of pre-school to post-school, so we start with early learning and work through the years, kindergarten to 12, and ideally continue to engage with the community, you know, beyond year 12 for post-school learning, and we also look at, you know, for our older students, particularly years 10, 11 and 12, where they're engaging in learning outside of the schools and engaged in the community and have access to various learning pathways that in this day and age are departing from traditional schooling, but – So we see as important that, again, particularly new schools are very much part of a community so that students have access to those various learning pathways.

20

We're also very focused, and it's part of our system intent, that we continue to support the professional development of our teachers and staff, and hence the way we deliver learning, you know, with streams of children and two teachers operating in a space, allows for greater professional development of our teachers and staff, and in that way we're always ensuring that the learning that is being delivered to the children is at the forefront of best practice.

25

Under our current Bishop we are Catholic schools for everybody. We're not Catholic schools just for Catholics. And on that basis, from a strategic perspective, we plan based on market share. So our schools are open to everybody. And we also support diversity. We really, genuinely take children from all walks of life and with different levels of ability and disability.

30

And so that's very much part of how we operate all of our schools, but certainly, you know, it informs the design process when we're looking at a new school.

35

Why are we building a school in Box Hill? The North West Priority Growth Area is forecast to have well over 250,000 residents by 2036. The children who will be finishing school in 2036 were born two years ago. So we have great confidence, provided that the residences can be delivered, that, you know, the population will be there because those children have already been born.

40

The School Infrastructure New South Wales school-age population estimates for the North West Priority Growth Area are in the vicinity of 51,000. Our traditional market share of that would be in the range of 10-13,000 children, which will mean that we need six to eight schools potentially of this size across the North West

45

Priority Growth Area. Thankfully we already have three that operate in this similar frame – different locations but operate a similar pre-school and post-school frame – but therefore we need to provide at least three more. We do have a couple of individual primary schools that operate in the area as well, and we take that into
5 account with our planning, but we certainly do need to increase our presence here, and that will mean in this Box Hill area more than one school.

Noting the panel and the Commission have asked a question about our potential location for a school at Terry Road, just to the south of the site for Santa Sophia, we
10 see that that location will be used to provide our second school in this area. It is a site that the Church has held for some time – and Education has held for some time – but when we looked at that site versus this one, we wanted to keep that site up our sleeve, as it were. The site requires more certainty around planning. It will be a more dense regional centre than this neighbourhood centre area in The Gables. The
15 site also offers us further options for other church and outreach services for that future community.

When we were looking at the two sites, in addition to that, there were concerns about services being available to get this school open for 2021, and it didn't have the
20 advantage that we have had at The Gables, which is working with a very proactive and engaged developer who can assist us in site preparation etc and again make sure that we keep to our timeframes.

So we still see the Terry Road site as having a school on it in the future, but we as yet
25 have only done some high-level master-planning, and we certainly have not started to prepare any lodgement of an SSDA for that site, but we see it as being in the frame in sort of eight to ten years.

With the site at The Gables, we, again as part of having multiple schools across this
30 area – This opportunity came up to have the school here. We wanted to secure the site now because our view was if we didn't secure it now it wouldn't be available in 10 years and so that multi-site strategy for our schools would have fallen over in this area or it would have cost us a lot more to get back into this market with sufficient space, you know, in 10 years' time.

35 We have also in the short term had more certainty around population growth because of the development that Celestino, and now Stockland, delivery, and so we saw an opportunity there too in being the first school to come in to the area to establish a strong market share which helps our own financial viability. And again, we had the
40 opportunity and the certainty around services and the opportunity to work with the developer in terms of preparation for our site etc, so it gave us the best chance of achieving a 2021 opening. It also provides the opportunity for shared use arrangements, supporting the school, supporting our education principles that I spoke about before of being embedded in the community and part of the community, and I
45 think, you know, the whole notion of shared use is something that all communities are now starting to embrace more – and, again, a great opportunity for us. I'll come back to those.

Santa Sophia. We have 220 students in Santa Sophia today across kindergarten and year one and years seven, eight and nine, so the school has already – this is its third year of operation. That’s occurring on two temporary sites. We have got great engagement with the community. We’re forecasting to have over 500 enrolments in
5 2022. And actually earlier this month, in the first week of March, the school had an open day which attracted over 700 people, and we already have 50 enrolment applications for kindergarten next year – for year seven next year – and over 20 for kindergarten next year. So the community are engaged with the school and, you know, giving us the opportunity to educate their children.

10 At the moment, in the face of the challenges the world is faced with, we are looking at ways to extend our capacity on those temporary sites so that we can accommodate as many of these families and children as possible just in case, you know, we can’t hit the timeframe given everything that’s happening in the world, but we intend to
15 push on and hopefully deliver this school as soon as we possibly can.

. We also offer – When you think of it, traditionally we’re sort of using the word “school”, but we offer five services: we offer early learning and care; we offer
20 primary years learning; secondary years learning; before and after school care; and vocation care. So there are five services that this place will provide to the community: not just schooling between 9.00 and 3.00; those other services which support working families and commuting families that will be living out in this part of Western Sydney. Again, we intend that the school is very much part of that
25 community via that support and is always an open and welcoming place.

In terms of our learning designing, we really are happy with the outcome here in terms of design and the way that BVN and the rest of the team have been able to achieve the brief. We really purposefully design our schools to enhance learning and encourage active play. On this site all of the open spaces will be used for multiple
30 purposes. Right across the day they’ll be used for play; they’ll be used for learning. And also, as an advantage over a traditional schooling environment, the majority of this external space can be used in all weather, all year. At a school like this one, we won’t have those days where the children are locked in their classrooms because it’s raining or because it’s too hot or too windy; they can always get out because there
35 are always covered areas that they have access to.

And another key element of the design is that we have great student supervision, both when all these spaces are being used for play but also when they’re being used for outdoor learning, so groups of students can be outside their traditional, you know,
40 classroom spaces, but the way that the design has come together ensures that we have got great student supervision across all of these spaces as well. We know this approach works. It’s supported by research effective learning project that’s been undertaken by the University of Melbourne.

45 And there’s also great research with regard to activated play space – a gentleman called Hyndman – and it’s one of the only major studies that’s been done in Australia with regard to play space. Activated play space, as opposed to just open grass fields,

gets a better outcome – a better health and wellbeing outcome – for students. It also encourages greater development of social skills because the children are together. But the Hyndman research shows that when children are presented with either activated, you know, purposefully-designed play space and the option of open grass,
5 they move away from the open grass and they move towards the activated spaces, and you get a better outcome across the entire cohort of students with this sort of design.

10 So it works really well. This design has really delivered on that brief and, you know, on the research that supports the approach. So we're very happy with the outcome here. We know it'll be a great place for learning.

15 Just to swing back, if I may, to the shared use arrangements. Again, a question's been asked regarding parking and the sporting facilities. We're again very happy that the parking outcome – And Anton will talk to this later, but the parking and traffic outcomes are very sufficient for our needs.

20 But we also have achieved an outcome where that parking, when not in use by the school, will be available for the community, so the community will benefit from that parking amenity, giving them access to the open space that is around, access to the sporting space, and will be there to also support retail during peak periods of the year, Christmas and Easter and those sort of things, when the school parking would traditionally be locked up and no one would have access. Via this arrangement, that parking will support those other uses in the community, so again, you know, quite a
25 good outcome, we believe, with that shared use arrangement.

30 And the sharing of the sports facilities – the sports fields across the road. It's great to have Council support on that, and again, through our tenure and the tenure of others in the area, the community get a higher level and a higher standard of sporting facility, which again, you know, is something that really accords well with our belief and our desire to be part of this community and supporting this community going forward.

35 So that's quite a spiel, but I'll stop and field any questions or hand on to Alaine, I think.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you, David. That was very thorough and very helpful. Wendy or Carol, do you have any questions at this point in time?

40 MS LEWIN: No.

MS AUSTIN:

45 DR WILLIAMS: Thanks David. We'll move on to Alaine.

MR DOYLE: Thank you. Thanks Alaine.

MS ROFF: Hi. Hi Peter. Hi everyone.

DR WILLIAMS: Hi Elaine. How are you?

5 MS ROFF: Good. Good. So I'm just going to talk through a couple of the planning
issues that have come out of the project and the assessment process. I'd first of all
like to start by commending the Department of Planning for their very thorough
assessment, and we absolutely support their recommendation for approval. We have
10 accepted all but one of the draft conditions that the Department of Planning have put
to us, which I'll discuss shortly, but

So I just wanted to start just on The Gables planning proposal. Celestino initiated the
request to The Hills Shire Council to amend The Hills Local Environmental Plan in
15 2018 as it applied to the Box Hill North Town Centre. The planning proposal sought
to increase the maximum floor space ratio from 1:1 to a range of 1:1 to 2:1 across the
town centre and increase the height of building from 16 metres to a range of 16 to 27
metres. When the planning proposal was lodged, planning for the school had only
really just begun and an indicative GFA and height was included at 20,000 square
metres and a 16-metre height limit.

20
Ultimately, the planning controls in the LEP did not reflect the school design – and
David's talked to the need for the scale of the school. At the moment, the school has
a GFA of 15,090 square metres, which is a little under 5,000 square metres of
underutilised floor space. The developer, Celestino – and now Stockland – have no
25 intention to redistribute that floor space across the site.

Post-exhibition amendments to the planning proposal retain the existing FSR on the
site on the basis that the school would be assessed by the Department of Planning
under the State Environmental Planning Policy for Education. Non-compliance with
30 the development standard would not actually inhibit the planned provision for a
school under clause 42 of the Education SEPP, which actually permits development
standards to be contravened, and we submitted a justification to contravene the
development standards in accordance with clause 4.6 but not actually submitting
clause 4.6.

35
So The Hills Local Environmental Plan was debated on the 24th of January 2020, and
the floor space ratio and the height of building mass reflected the 16-metre height
limit and the 1:1 floor space, but it actually refined the plot boundary of the proposed
school site as there was a bit of a discrepancy earlier on, but that's been revised to
40 reflect the actual plot boundary of the school.

So next slide. So I just wanted to touch on the non-compliances with the floor space
and height limits. So we have a floor space ratio of 1.32:1, which obviously does not
comply with the 1:1 floor space, and we have a maximum height of 29.9 metres to
45 the top of the cooling towers on the central building and a height of 28.5 metres to
the top of the plant on the central building. As I said before, justification was
provided in the EIS in accordance with the requirements of clause 4.6, even though

that wasn't necessarily a requirement under clause 4.2 of the Education SEPP. Our justification found that strict compliance with the LEP provisions is unreasonable and unnecessary in the circumstances and the Department of Planning concurred with that assessment.

5

Across the site the average building height is 25.4 metres, which is less than the 27 metres of the surrounding town centre context. The 29.9 metre height limit will actually only occur in two parts of the development: the two chimney flutes above Building Central. The plant rooms and the chimneys would actually not be visible from the public domain. They are set back from the edges of the building and they are not going to be perceptible within the context.

We think that the height of the buildings is appropriate in the town centre context. If we were to stick with 16 metres and 1:1 we would actually have an unworkable school. Catholic Education wouldn't actually proceed with it as it doesn't achieve their education model. And we actually – we did an exercise with Celestino and BVN with an indicative design for the building to the south of the school and that study determined that a future building, whether it be a residential flats building or a commercial building, could actually achieve compliance with the Apartment Design Guide in SEPP 65 in terms of solar access, cross ventilation, building separation and privacy. At this point in time the developer doesn't know what that building will be, but we have worked with them in designing this school building.

So a compliant FSR and a compliant height would actually not achieve a good outcome for the site. It couldn't proceed as a school in its current form and achieve that educational model, and it would actually result in underutilised land in the town centre and would not achieve orderly and economic development on B2-zoned land. So on that basis we support the Department of Planning's recommendation that the justification – compliance is unreasonable and unnecessary.

30

So the next slide. We have one condition, as I mentioned, that we do not accept in the Department's draft conditions, and that's in relation to the design amendments for daylight access. It actually reduces the ability of Santa Sophia College to operate in accordance with its model and in accordance with Catholic Education's standards and it would actually negatively impact on student learning and play. I'm actually going to hand back to David to talk a bit more about that. David, if you can?

35

MR DOYLE: Yes, I'm back on the line, thank you. So I just mentioned earlier that, you know, the design of the school has purposefully looked to the use of space for multiple purposes. The external faces are not just for play. They are also for outdoor learning. The removal of the shade that we have on the upper levels of this building would mean that we would be severely restricted from using those spaces for learning, where, you know, classes are held right through the middle of the day. If we think of this location through the summer months, and, you know, again, most of the year, to be able to use these spaces during the day we need cover; not just to protect the children from the sun and to be sun safe but also from other weather.

45

Removal of these shade structures would severely limit us on those days – and for most of the year – in being able to use these spaces for learning.

5 I think it's also worth mentioning that the children on these upper levels do have other options. They have plenty of options to move to spaces that do not have shade, but these spaces give them the option of having shade as well and, again, you know, mean the spaces can be used not just for play but also for learning.

10 Knowing the condition also talks to the possibility of having operable roofs – our experience in operating those sort of structures is that they just aren't sufficient; they don't work. Any operable roof up here – one is in a high-wind environment – they break down, they leak, you know, and I think essentially, in terms of what I spoke about before, in terms of protecting the children from the sun and the weather so we can use these spaces as designed and as intended, any operable roof would just be
15 left shut for the entire time, but then we'd have the issues with them leaking etc. They're not in that environment, on the roof, you know, suitable to have any sort of operable structure, and again, we think, not suitable to have the shade structures removed entirely.

20 I think also the idea that covered walkways of one to two metres wide on a rooftop, you know, would be sufficient in our view, in terms again of managing wind and rain, again as I spoke about earlier, the great advantage of this school design is all these spaces can be used in all weather, and thinking that on the rooftop there, on a rainy day, that a structure that's maybe a metre wide would be sufficient for the
25 movement of children just doesn't seem to hold for us. So hopefully that's a clear enough explanation as to why we really would ask that this condition is removed because it just severely limits our ability to operate the school the way we intend to and the way the place has been designed.

30 MS ROFF: Thanks David. So on that basis we're actually asking the panel to delete that condition from the consent. Do you need any more information on that one?

35 MS LEWIN: No, I'm fine with that.

MS ROFF: Okay. Let's move on. So next slide, thanks, Kenny. So one of the questions that the panel put to us was in relation to the tree canopy and the choice for
40 14 per cent tree coverage. I think we can say that it is a choice. It was deliberate. The design of the proposal is aiming to maximise play space and areas for learning and play, and large tree canopies and large trees actually impact the ability to deliver on that aim and that objective. So it was a deliberate choice.

45 We have put in an urban tree canopy study with our response to submissions which came from Celestino, and in The Gables precinct they're achieving 28 per cent coverage. When we look at the Urban Tree Canopy Guide which is referenced in a number of documents, it suggests a target of 25 per cent tree coverage in an urban residential area of medium to high density. I appreciate that this is not a high density

precinct, but it is medium density and moving to high density in the town centre. We're actually looking to get a bit more information and a calculation around the tree canopy coverage in the town centre which we'll be able to provide to the panel once we have that calculation.

5

The Government Architect has a Design Guide for Schools, and just a couple of points coming out of that that we think support our 14 per cent. There actually is no natural environment – as you may have seen from the videos, it is a rural area, with very little vegetation – so our landscaping strategy actually responds to the school brief but also the setting of the town centre. The town centre includes tree planting, but the proposal includes tree planting and other planting, soft landscaping that actually enhances the play and learning areas. We think that the proposal ensures the landscaping improves amenity for the kids and it integrates with what is an urban design to help achieve that amenity.

15

There is also a New South Wales Government guideline to creating inclusive play spaces, and that absolutely focuses on providing adequate shade structures to play spaces, and we think that our proposal is absolutely achieving that – it's achieving 85 per cent shade on one of the hottest days in the year, in December, at 1.00 pm, at lunchtime – and so we believe that our shade proposal achieves the objectives of the Government Architect's Design Guide for Schools and also the urban tree design objectives, you know, which is reducing heat island effect, which is really about amenity and shade and reducing local temperatures.

25 So we have our landscape architects on the line, and they might be able to expand on that. Robert, I don't know if you have anything more to add.

MR LOWMAN: Yeah. So it's Rob here from just add to that. So I mean, we acknowledge the importance of canopy tree planting as part of the Urban Tree Canopy Guide and the important role canopy trees play in reducing the urban heat island effect. As landscape architects, we instinctively look for opportunities to instate trees in our projects, and obviously from an education perspective trees play a vital role in the development of campuses and provide opportunities for naturally-shaded outdoor learning spaces and play. As part of our design process undertaken on this project, we carefully analysed and tested opportunities to instate canopy trees on the site with the project design team.

As part of our design development we have carefully reviewed the planning documents that I think have been referenced, such as the Urban Tree Canopy Guide, Better Placed by the Government Architect, Greener Places, and also the document referenced there that was developed by Gallagher Studio known as the Landscape Review Project. It was an important document to reference as it was developed by one of the landscape architecture industry and it carefully reviewed a number of existing schools. I think it's worth mentioning that because there was careful analysis of existing canopy cover provided by existing schools. Of the 10 schools that were studied as part of the project, the findings were that the canopy coverage ranged from 14 to 26 per cent. The only site that had a canopy coverage of 40 per

cent was Ballina High. I think it's also important to note that these projects have the advantage of existing canopy tree vegetation.

5 And it should be mentioned that in many examples the areas of existing canopy trees are not utilised as play space. They're typically located along site boundaries. The site for our project in Box Hill – I think it's been mentioned – has existing trees. It's also important to note that the Ballina High School, which did have a 40 per cent canopy coverage, no longer retains that amount as a number of existing trees have been required to be removed to cater for the development of the school.

10 And I think just on a closing note there, I think it's important to note the Santa Sophia Catholic College project has strived to create an appropriate proportion of summer shade and winter sun. I think just as an example, but I think it was mentioned there, that has been provided from, for example, where we have got an opportunity to instate some of our canopy trees. But with the 14 per cent canopy coverage provided, in combination with the shade provided by the built form, we achieve approximately 85 per cent shaded play space in the summer at lunchtime.

20 MS ROFF: Thanks.

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks Robert.

25 MS ROFF: So if there's no questions on the tree canopy, I'll just wrap up on the submissions. So look, I think it's important to acknowledge that we're probably only here at an IPC because of the public submissions that we had and the nature of them. Council do not object to our application, and the agencies were actually quite supportive, and we worked with them to resolve any sort of minor issues that they had. We did have 69 objections, and 78 per cent of those really only objected on the grounds that the location of the school was in the town centre and not at the Terry Road site. And as the planning pointed out, the nearest objector actually lives three kilometres away from the site. So I mean the key issues that they have raised, open space, student safety, cover, traffic and drop-off and pick-up – and the next couple of presentations from BVN and Ason are going to dive into those in a bit more detail, so I will hand over to BVN.

35 MR ASHTON: Thanks Alaine. It's Julian here from BVN. Kenny, would you mind jumping through some more slides, please?

40 MR LIM: No worries. Just for everyone dialling in, we're on slide 8.

45 MR ASHTON: Okay. So let's – great. So I mean this slide is, I guess, really encompassing a lot of what has been talked about, and I'll talk certainly to that in the development of this discussion, but, absolutely, the school very much embracing the community and being part of the community and finding that balance between the school's role as a learning space but also a space that contributes to the broader spaces around it.

Can we jump to the next slide, Kenny? That's slide 9. We can go through that fairly quickly because I think Alaine's talked about it.

5 So if we go to the next one. So we'll now be on slide 10. So slide 10 is really, I think, probably talking to us, and has talked to us throughout the development of the school, in terms of the role of the school in the broader community and looking at those connections that are occurring in a broader precinct point of view and the school's role within that, how it engages with that, how it sits on the edge of some of those things, how the school students are able to participate in the broader
10 community and, indeed, how the community is able to participate within the school space.

15 Onto the next one: slide 11. Slide 11 talks to, I guess, some of the surrounding constraints that have been considered from a physical point of view, so looking at prevailing wind conditions, acknowledging that there's a change of level throughout the site in order to actually use that, I think, to our advantage in looking at entries, which I'll talk to in a moment, acknowledging the urban presence along Fontana Drive and, indeed, Red Gables Road and the impact of those in terms of where we would site areas and the entry points to the school and the need to create
20 some separation between the primary kids, the senior kids, the kiss and drop, the CELC, all of which are working on this environment, but an opportunity to create separate identities and entries for each of them.

25 Next one: slide 12. Slide 12 talks to, I guess, the key design moods in terms of what's informed the overall massing and what that might mean. The one on the left talks to orientation for the plaza and pedestrian spine, so I guess acknowledging the entry and access point address the pedestrian plaza and those common spaces. The one in the middle talks to the idea of clear linear forms breaking up the overall building mass which is creating the opportunity for daylight-lit spaces in the school
30 environment. And the area in the red on is the Knowledge Centre, so that's very much the heart of the school, so that's embracing all the elements of those spaces and is again connected to the open plaza. And the third one is creation of the outdoor spaces as they terrace up the building, and we have being quite deliberate in the design of those – indeed, that has evolved throughout – to find that balance of spaces
35 which are able to achieve active outdoor areas but also at the same time providing the right amenity. So they're deliberately terraced, they're deliberately being sculpted around maximum opportunity for daylight, at the same time balancing that against that maximum functionality for the spaces.

40 I'll move to slide 13. So slide 13 really highlights in a master-plan sense the key external elements which are working here, and you can start to see through those the variety of entry points which we have been able to achieve – so areas such as the CELC, drop-off spaces, the separate kiss and drop, main pedestrian plaza, separate access for buses as they come through – so all the different competing needs of the
45 school have been considered in terms of our overall approach.

Slide 14. Slide 14 is obviously then an aerial view showing how the school will sit in the broader urban landscape and urban development. You can see very much the role of the school and how it embraces the entry plaza forecourt area and how that spine works its way through. At the bottom of the screen you're seeing the kiss and drop spaces and that pedestrian plaza. At the top of the screen you're seeing the CELC drop-off spaces, which is one level up from those spaces, so very much those two – ground level, level zero, and level one – are connected ground-plane areas. You can also start to get a sense of those terraces and the cascading nature of them and the different activities which are on them.

Slide 15. So just talking a little bit further about all the elements which we have considered, this starts to overlay the different movement and modality modes which we have thought of in terms of the overall masterplan and, indeed, having design, from pedestrian movement to the southern edge of the school, to kiss and drop, to bikes, to obviously understanding the logistical requirements of the school, service delivery elements of those, and car movements in and around the school itself.

Next slide: slide 16. When we talk internally, we have also done a lot of work in terms of mapping where the kids will go. At maximum capacity it will have approximately 1,900 students so a lot of work was done in thinking about where the different learning spaces were provided and how the students would move in and around those areas to create those external areas which work as circulation spaces but also education and play spaces. Detailed studies were done looking at different models and movements.

And we move to slide 17. Slide 17 – people flow – then talks about how those elements have come together. So there's a combination of spaces which have been created. So we have wide major circulation spaces, the intention being in the majority of instances the students and teachers would be moving using those stairs, but we have also recognised that we need to provide lifts in an environment like this, so there's a group of three lifts centred around the Knowledge Centre that's providing connection through that space but also gives the opportunity for some students, should they need it, to access the upper levels of school space, in addition as well the circulation spaces stairs.

Next slide: slide 18. This talks to the daylight study. So in terms of the design of the spaces, the design of the school, the design of the outdoor areas, a lot of what we have been looking to do is to find that balance between providing external space but spaces of an appropriate quality. This touches on some of the work that has been done there, which talks to you about 80 per cent Spatial Daylight Autonomy. Now, that's in the measure of 400 lux for at least 50 per cent of the operating hours of the school, so it's between 8.00 and 5.00, Monday to Friday, and we're achieving 80 per cent as a broad figure, but indeed on some of the upper levels – levels 5 – up to 95 per cent. There has been detailed modelling around that. Indeed, the ultimate form of the terraces has been informed by that, in the introduction of light wells between the external – between the learning spaces and the external decks you can see there in the middle of the central building. Again, that's been informed by that, but very

much it's been a quite deliberate push and pull of effective spaces with creating new appropriate external environments for them.

5 Slide 19. In combination with that has been the idea of the amenity of the spaces and
creating different characters on each level depending upon the age group of the kids,
the age-appropriateness of those spaces, the age group of the kids who will be using
those spaces. Each level has been quite deliberately designed around the kids who
are likely to use it – not to the exclusion of others, but to recognise that there should
10 be an opportunity for specific spaces associated with each age group – and, again,
that's been mapped and modelled to look at areas per student in each of those zones.
Indeed, another exercise was also done to look at when the kids would be using
certain spaces. So detailed modelling has been done around before school, recess,
lunchtime, after school, and where the kids will be in each space, to ensure that we
15 have thought about that and considered how the spaces can best be used.

Next slide: slide 20. This is obviously a 3D image. This is on level two, looking
across one of the external play spaces to the learning spaces beyond. This really
highlights, I guess, the character of the spaces and what they're looking to create.
Quite deliberately there's a variety of materials that you see in that space, so the
20 grassed areas in terms of the play areas, circulation space is defined, graphics on the
structural columns which are introducing the idea of the building as a building of
play or building as teacher, a variety of ceiling treatment which are looking at
lighting levels and, indeed, acoustic performance between those spaces, and the
opportunity to look from this space to the areas above and the staggering nature of
25 the terraces, so that's reducing, I guess, the idea of the vertical form and breaking it
up so the mass is seen as a smaller thing. And in the background of that you're
seeing the Knowledge Centre – so an element I talked about before, in terms of the
heart of the school – that's sitting in the rear of that image.

30 The next slide: slide 21. At the same time, in terms of security for the students
there's certainly been an ongoing conversation – and, I think, evolution – of the
approach for that to provide a secure environment for the kids but also not to create a
fortress-like element which then precludes the community and others being able to
access the school at different times. So this highlights, I guess, the idea of school
35 mode, but there's an opportunity – and the school will be secure in those spaces – but
very much where you're seeing entry points and those elements, those are designed
in and folding screens and elements which can slide away to create those with
more open, permeable public spaces so the school can work in different ways.

40 Next slide: slide 22. This is then picking up on the ground plane. So this is the
ground plane at level one, so one level up from the main entry at level zero. I guess
this starts to highlight some of the variety of spaces which have been created and
some of the bespoke nature of those in response to the particular kids' needs. So on
this area here you're seeing the early learning – the CELC spaces, the
45 Knowledge Centre at its lowest level and a whole series of different play spaces for
the younger-aged kids – so the kindy kids. Directly accessed – directly adjacent is
then the CELC drop-off space, and that's in immediate proximity to the CELC kids

being able to come into that space and their parents being able to drop off in that space.

5 Next, slide 23. That's then a three-dimensional view of that space, and we can see that's then looking at that forecourt area. So we have introduced some trees, planters in those areas, such as a suspended concrete structure in those areas, a variety of shade structures, as well as the balcony areas themselves, and again the use of different material to delineate movement areas from play spaces for the kids.

10 Next slide 24. This then starts to look in a bit more detail around the analysis of the different outdoor spaces. Again, a lot of work was done looking at the area we're providing for those. So that shows you in detail the types of spaces and how we have done that detailed work to look at areas which are fully open versus those which have terraces or other spaces on top of them and trying to find the right balance of those in
15 support of the different activities.

Next one: slide 25. This is again a view from one of the upper images – the upper terraces – and I guess this one really does highlight the cascading nature of those balcony forms and how they're being utilised as they cascade as you move your way
20 up through the building.

And that's now my bit. Any questions?

25 DR WILLIAMS: Thanks. Thanks Julian.

MS AUSTIN: It's Carol. I have a question. From a security point of view - - -

MR ASHTON: Yeah?

30 MS AUSTIN: - - - is it possible for the children to climb over those balconies and obviously fall down? How do children being children, climbing over those balconies - - -?

35 MR DOYLE: Carol, it's David speaking. We're confident this will be a safe environment. From a compliance perspective, you know, the balustrades etc are compliant and of the required height. Multi-level schools and schools with balconies are not new. We have a number of them already. All over this country and the world there are schools with balconies and, you know, in that sense this will be no different. These spaces are compliant, but we're confident that they're safe because
40 we already operate spaces with balconies and we haven't had those type of incidents occur. There are probably some other design features perhaps that Julian might swing back to if we need to, but we're very confident it's a safe environment.

45 MS AUSTIN: I understand balconies are a normal part of schools, but when you're integrating play activities with balconies you're encouraging children to engage in activities that would involve potentially, but also a heightened sense of excitement. They're the sort of things where kids are more likely to do risk-taking

activities than where, say, they're simply walking along a corridor where there's a balcony.

5 MR ASHTON: So there's – It's Julian speaking here, and others might want to contribute. There's certainly been a detailed security analysis done around that. There was a specific investigation into that. Consultants looked at specifically that concern around risk and what that would be. And certainly the layout of those external spaces and design of those which we have done, but together with, responds directly to some of those concerns.

10 DR WILLIAMS: Sorry, it's Peter Williams here. Is there any provision such as in the BCA that deals with these sorts of minimum standards and requirements in this sort of situation?

15 MR ASHTON: Peter, yes, there is, and we have exceeded the BCA requirements in terms of the overall heights which are required for those areas.

DR WILLIAMS: Do you mean the actual heights of the balconies themselves?

20 MR ASHTON: Yeah, that's correct.

DR WILLIAMS: Thanks Julian. Is that all, Carol?

MS AUSTIN: That's fine.

25 DR WILLIAMS: Have you any questions at this stage?

MS LEWIN: No, I'm fine, thanks.

30 DR WILLIAMS: Thanks. We'll continue with, Who would like to go next? Thank you.

MR REISCH: Maybe that's me. It's Anton Reisch from Ason Group. We have obviously looked at the traffic side of things – traffic and transport. It's been a very iterative process from the very beginning because obviously we have got a town centre building up around us and a residential community building up around us, so we have obviously looked at a number of security scenarios into the future, and I believe that's been in, consultation with Council and Transport for New South Wales.

40 There's a couple of issues that have been specifically raised in submissions which I will speak to in a second, but I think I just want to start by saying that this is a school. It's like any school anywhere, you have a busy 20 minutes in the morning and a busy 20 minutes in the afternoon, so, very careful in terms of what infrastructure you put in place for the school that maximises the safety of students and staff but that is simply not sustainable or economically viable. In this case – I have been looking at schools for many, many years – I think that we have provided

45

significant infrastructure with regard to buses, drop-off/pick-up areas, parking, that it is going to make a successful venture in regard to transport issues.

I think it's also important to note that Council is suggesting a number of
5 proposals of this infrastructure. technical term, but I know in regards to that because a lot of that infrastructure needs to just be provided on There's more supervision of students given issues with So what Catholic Education is doing here I think is fantastic. And on the submissions from Transport for New South Wales and Council, I think that's a conclusion.

10 So I'll just move to the slides. I have only just got a few. Ready, Kenny? So slide 1 is in regard to our drop-off and pick-up strategy. These again have been developed from the outset with and with Council in particular and are designed to meet the needs of the school as it grows and also while the town centre grows. In the short
15 term spaces are going to be provided in Road B, which you can see there, and, as the school grows and that demand becomes higher, the spaces in Fontana Drive will also start to be used more. At this stage we think we probably have a split with Road B for primary school and Fontana Drive for high school.

20 Again, the 20 spaces in Fontana, they will actually sort of be developed from the outset as part of the local road development as part of the site, so we are very confident that that can accommodate the demands for drop off and pick up. The pedestrian crossings are located so that there is safe and easy access to those spaces, and again that will be under the supervision of staff.

25 Sorry, I'm just breaking from the spiel for one second. That picture there – and a number of the earlier slides – indicates a signalised intersection at Gables and Fontana. That is actually going to be a roundabout in the short term. We have been having numerous discussions with Transport for New South Wales in regards to the
30 warrants for a signalised intersection. We personally feel that it would be a great idea to have that there given that you have students coming from all parts of The Gables, but again that's going to be the subject of future further discussions with them.

35 So next slide, please. Our parking strategy has been very enthusiastically agreed by Council. Again, any parking. So what we have is 110 staff parking spaces they're going to be on the adjacent site school. And then in the longer term they will be provided within the town centre directly across the road. That is going to be the subject of a deed which can perhaps describe for you. There's going to be no
40 student parking with Catholic Education's policies. There's a visitor We have estimated possibly up to 25 vehicles that might be generated during the day. is going to be provided on the street. We have something like 650 parking spaces within 400 metres of the site – on-street spaces, we see without any significant commercial or other demands, so we see no issue at all with those spaces being
45 utilised by visitors for short term use.

Finally, just the last slide in regards to planning. So that's public transport planning. We have a busway in Fontana Drive, adjacent to the school. buses. specifically because buses have the opportunity to circulate to the north of the town centre and the school and then come back to that busway as they are called.

5 It's a strategy that buses are staggered so that you don't have a massive in the drop-off area – sorry, the pick-up area – and also so that buses don't extend out onto the road and disrupt traffic. So the buses in the short term, there probably won't be very many. Obviously they too will need to grow as the school grows. In the first instance the expectation is that they would go to sub-regional centres such as Rouse
10 Hill, and then in the longer term they would extend out through the suburbs and probably as well.

Finally, just in terms of active transport, The Gables just provides a wonderful active transport network. We have cycle routes, shared ways, pedestrian routes, every
15 street – there's the whole recreational corridor. And then on providing for some 250 bicycle spaces on the site. There are crossings – pedestrian crossings – on roads. So again we're very confident that as the school grows, with some 3,000 houses – sorry, 2,000 houses – within approximately one kilometre of the school, that cycling and walking will be modes of transport that a lot of students will
20 undertake.

So I think that that's probably the highlights. I'm obviously happy to take any questions.

25 DR WILLIAMS: So yes, I have just one question in relation to – it's Peter Williams here – just in relation to the 110 parking spaces across the road in the town centre that will be used by the school, and that's subject to a deed between Celestino and Catholic Education Diocese of Parramatta. In the transfer of the town centre now to Stockland, will still be subject to that same deed in regards to the car parking?
30

MR REISCH: That is my understanding. Perhaps David might just elaborate on that. But yes, that's my understanding.

35 MR DOYLE: Yes. It's David talking now. Peter, that is the case. There will be a novation of all existing agreements with Celestino across to Stockland, and, you know, those documents are currently being reviewed now that that transfer of the precinct has been announced, and so that's the intent, and Stockland have certainly indicated to us their full support of the entire scheme.

40 DR WILLIAMS: Right.

MR FEHON: Peter, it's Thomas Fehon from Stockland here. I just thought it'd just be worth quickly noting – to support David's comment there. Yes, we're fully aware of those commitments and obligations and are fully supportive of all of those
45 requirements.

MS MULCAHY: Have we lost the meeting? Have we lost Peter? Oh sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It went quiet for a second, but I can still hear you now.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah, we're still here.

5

MS MULCAHY: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We're still here.

10 MS MULCAHY: Is Peter there then?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have lost Peter.

15 MS MULCAHY: Ah. Because I dropped out before and I phoned it back in again. Sorry, it's Helen. Okay, so we have lost Peter. Right. Carol, can you - - -?

MS AUSTIN:

MS MULCAHY: Peter is back.

20

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, I am back. Sorry.

MS MULCAHY: Okay. I'll leave it back to you, Peter. Sorry.

25 DR WILLIAMS: Sorry about that. Sorry, Thom - - -

MR DOYLE: Peter, it's David. Did you hear Thomas speaking, Peter?

30 DR WILLIAMS: No, sorry. I just missed that, I'm sorry. Sorry about that.

MR FEHON: No worries, Peter. It was just quite brief. I was just stating that Stockland are fully aware and supportive of all of the – the novation of all of those requirements to do with the car parking in the deed as David mentioned.

35 DR WILLIAMS: Right. Thanks very much, Thomas. Thank you. Sorry about that.

MR DOYLE: I suppose - - -

40 DR WILLIAMS: Hello?

MR DOYLE: It's David talking again. That's the end of the presentation as planned, so I suppose from this point we'll field any further questions.

45 DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you very much to you all. That was very helpful. I might just kick off just with one or two questions, then I'll hand it over to Carol and Wendy, if that's all right. Just a couple of points of clarification. In the video that

we were sent, which was very helpful – thank you very much for that – various zones were referred to. We presume they mean the different building – where the different buildings are located, like Building South and Building Central and the Knowledge Centre and so on. Is that correct?

5

MR DOYLE: Yes, that is correct, Peter. It's David speaking again. Yes, the person who took that video for us is the construction contractor representative and I suppose he had his own lens on the site in terms of the zones they have got for the construction job.

10

DR WILLIAMS: That's fine.

MS NACCARELLA: If I could add to that, David. It's Cassandra Naccarella here from TSA. Just immediately prior to the meeting today that question was raised and we did send through an image which describes which zone is referred to in each of those numbers, so I will send that through again immediately after this meeting.

15

DR WILLIAMS: Right. That would be very helpful. Thank you very much, Cassandra, for that. Another – Just also looking at the video, obviously there's site preparation works and road works that are going on, I presume – on and around the site. I presume that's all in relation to approved by – development applications that were lodged with The Hills Shire Council?

20

MS NACCARELLA: It's Cassandra Naccarella here again. Yes, there are road works happening around the site. There is also an early works DA which was approved that had some civil works and some retaining wall works which is what you can see on site.

25

DR WILLIAMS: Right, great. Thanks Cassandra. I might just hand – I might have a few more questions, but I might hand it over to Carol and Wendy at this stage.

30

MS AUSTIN: Thanks Peter.

35

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS AUSTIN: Can I ask some broad, contextual questions? This development is innovative, which is a positive thing. So David, could you explain if you have any other sites that implement this model of teaching – the multi-level and the play and outdoor spaces? So is this a new model for you or are you replicating a similar model used elsewhere?

40

MR DOYLE: It's a practice that we have in place elsewhere. The most recent whole school example is St Luke's at Marsden Park which, while only going to three levels, very much focuses on the adjacency use, play space to learning space, and it can be used for outdoor learning and a multi-use of space across that site. It's a site where the building footprint is across about 1.6/1.7 hectares, but actually, interestingly, we have 8 hectares of land where that school is, but it demonstrates that

45

we don't sprawl even if we could. Our intent is to bring all of the learning together so that the disciplines interact, and our project-based approach to learning is the driver behind that.

5 Also, we are building – we have recently built and are currently building or rebuilding – various primary schools across the diocese and we again have, you know, learning spaces but with greater adjacency to outdoor spaces for play and for learning and similar approaches to shade and shade structures and the like that are very similar.

10 So this is our only school that is currently of, you know, five to six levels, but the concepts for learning approach is something we have been doing for some time, and we have been building schools, you know, in this way, for some time and have live projects doing it now as well as existing ones. So yes, it's very much part of our
15 overall approach across the diocese. Of course we have some legacy assets, some older schools where these approaches are a bit more difficult, but we're working through those as a system.

MS AUSTIN: So I appreciate with legacy assets you have to make a number of
20 compromises. In looking at this site, and again what we want developments to be is what we consider best practice, that when other people copy it we are replicating best practice, because that's certainly in the interests of the community and society in general – So what are the major compromises that you have had to make? If we are thinking about if we decide we had a blank sheet of paper and you could redesign it,
25 the orientation of the buildings – have they been compromised by the size of the site or the way in which the boundaries are constructed? And the reason I'm raising that is that this is a commercial venture; it's something you have to work within the constraints of. But from our point of view, it would be interesting to understand if the developer, in thinking about how they chose the boundaries, took into account the
30 constraints that you have had to work with, and in a perfect world how would you have liked to have seen the design – the site boundaries done differently to perhaps give you a different orientation of the site – or of the building, I should say – orientation of the building?

35 MR DOYLE: Okay. I really – I think the work with the developer on the choice of the site and the process we have been through over the past couple of years has been, you know, positive and very well supported. Initially when the high-level sort of concept was agreed on by those at the top we were looking at 4,000 square metres. We worked with the developer on the fact that, you know, that would – that certainly
40 wouldn't be sufficient and we increased to the size that we have today. We have worked with them to get, you know, the panhandle that provides access to the early learning car park as an addition as well – and that dual access – and that's separated access for those really young kids. There's been a key outcome there, and I think learning we have had through the process that is part of this outcome. You know,
45 we're very happy again, you know, with the learning spaces and the adjacencies to outdoor and outdoor play. That's worked quite – you know, extremely well.

We are applying this – I don't know if I should bring in another project, but we're about to lodge another SSDA for school buildings in Westmead and we're absolutely applying some of the outcomes we have had here in Box Hill for Santa Sophia College to the design of that school. And so we're seeing this as very close to best
5 practice in terms of the design of the learning spaces and, again, the adjacencies of those outdoor spaces when we're in a multi-storey environment. The Westmead DA will be a six-storey place predominantly for primary children and we'll be using rooftop play and play space, you know, and outdoor learning space, you know, on each of the levels of the building. So we're seeing this design outcome as something
10 we have been able to apply forward and are very confident in applying forward.

While the only – I think the thing I should add that we'd like to apply to – If we were faced with, you know, The Gables Mark II or any other development, in terms of access to the sporting fields, which here is a great outcome – it gives us a great
15 place for delivery of our PE curriculum – the only thing I would apply to a future precinct would be that those sporting fields were contiguous and not separated by a road. That just means it's a bit easier for us to get the kids there and we can – Not so much easier but faster. But again, here it's a great outcome having those, you know, high-quality sporting fields just across the road, but we'd just get the kids
20 there, especially smaller children, a little bit faster if that road wasn't there. It's not something we can change here, but I'd apply that thinking going forward for a future greenfield site.

MS AUSTIN: Okay. A related point on design. So the Department has come up
25 with suggestions about a retractable roof. You're saying that we should accept the existing design. Is there another option between what the Department is suggesting and what you're saying – doing nothing? Is there alternatives? If you were faced with a choice of putting a retractable roof in, would you come back to us with a third option?
30

MR DOYLE: I don't believe we would. The spaces have been purposefully designed so that we can use them for play, for learning and for circulation as well, and the outcome we have got is a really good outcome. We – to my knowledge – haven't looked at how else we could do that. What we have got is the optimal
35 outcome that we want. BVN have hit the brief and provided a design that really does allow us to operate the school and provide the learning in the way that we want to. Again, to reiterate, an operable structure just have it closed all the time, but then you'd have maintenance issues and leaking issues and those structures in that, you know, rooftop environment. I think the general experience is they just don't cut it
40 over time. But a third option? No. I think the option we have put forward and why we would like that condition removed is that, you know, what we have got in this design is what we want and what gives the best outcomes.

MS NACCARELLA: Carol, it's Cassandra Naccarella here, if I could also add to
45 that. The design has been carefully considered, particularly the outdoor spaces and how they're utilised, how they work for learning, how they work for play. The condition that has been imposed, we believe, would seriously detract from that as a

workable solution for the play element or the learning element. And we were also questioning whether or not it achieves the outcomes that it sets out to achieve, which is why we have highlighted that these spaces already are achieving sufficient daylight. That does not change. That does not actually improve when you delete
5 those because they're already achieving it. It does detract from the all-weather conditions and it reduces the usability of those spaces. So any of the compromise solutions that we were considering were all going to be a lesser outcome than what we currently have in our opinion.

10 MS AUSTIN: Thank you.

MS LEWIN: Well, Carol, you have covered my question, which was in relation to alternative options with regard to operable or non-operable roofs. given the comprehensive presentation information for us to digest and so perhaps I'll leave
15 it at that for now, Peter. And Carol, I'd like to go through, as you do, the analysis – the very long report – and then look at the proposal in light of a number of other issues that have been raised today. But I have no questions at this point in time to add.

20 DR WILLIAMS: Thanks. Thanks Wendy. It's Peter Williams again. Sorry, just one, and I think I might have missed it; I wasn't sure. In the presentation it's also mentioned that there will be staff management of the children, which is at pedestrian crossings, I presume, So there will be sort of procedures in place where teachers
25 to ensure the children, for example, cross at the pedestrian crossing – for example – and no other in terms of, you know, getting to and from the school and drop-offs, for example?

MR DOYLE: Yeah. David here, Peter. Yes. "Yes" is the short answer.

30 DR WILLIAMS: Right.

MR DOYLE: We'd have all of that.

DR WILLIAMS: Right.

35

MR DOYLE: Sorry?

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Sorry. Okay. No, I was just wondering in terms of whether there might need to be any treatment, in terms of some form of barriers around part
40 or parts of the street there, to stop children from crossing at places they shouldn't be crossing. I'm not sure whether that might be something that - - -

MR DOYLE: Yes. I might take that one on notice, I think, unless others have something to contribute on that specific one.

45

DR WILLIAMS:

MR REISCH: A practice at other schools run by Catholic Education has been that for buses, for example, and for crossings, that the students are, so you have a little walking bus, for example, down to the key crossings etc, and then they are supervised. We need to look at that, flows and pedestrian flows. At some of the
5 intersections I think we would probably qualify for a crossing – you know, via a crossing. But as I say, my experience with Catholic Education on a number of their schools has always very much impressed with how their staff take on those roles both before and after school. Full details of that – We have said from the outset we’re going to have to develop a comprehensive management plan –
10 operational management plan – but we would certainly be taking existing practice from Catholic Education’s other schools because we have seen how

DR WILLIAMS: Right. Right. Thanks very much for that. Helen, have you got any questions at all?

15 MS MULCAHY: No. No, not at this point.

DR WILLIAMS: Right.

20 MS MULCAHY: I think we’re okay and everything was covered very comprehensively.

DR WILLIAMS: Right. Right. Carol and Wendy, anything else at all you would like to add or ask?

25 MS LEWIN: I’m fine.

MS AUSTIN: No.

30 DR WILLIAMS: Thank you very much, all, for today. It’s been difficult, I appreciate, for all of us, but we do very much appreciate the very helpful presentation that the applicant and all the applicant’s representatives have given to us today and the efforts they have gone to to provide this information for us. It’s been very good. The fact we haven’t been able to on site I don’t think is problematic.
35 The video was extremely helpful. The presentation and the information that’s been provided to us has also been very helpful.

Just in terms of going forward, we have worked to a public meeting, I think, on the 3rd of April, which of course all these sorts of things have now been cancelled.
40 We’re still as if the public meeting was to proceed and 10th of April. Those submissions are given the same weight as an oral presentation at a public meeting. So we’ll wait to see what submissions come in. If the applicant wishes to make any further submissions, they’re more than welcome to do that. But as I say, my understanding is the closing date for written submissions generally will be – for the
45 general public – will be the 10th of April, which I think happens to be Good Friday. We will as a panel consider what submissions we receive straight after

Easter, and at that point we'll be able to then finalise our report and our determination. Is there anything to that to add, Helen, as far as the timing goes?

5 MS MULCAHY: No, I don't think so. I guess what I would like to say is, you know, once we have had the chance to digest all the information that you have presented to us today, I guess we reserve the right to come back to you with any points of clarification, so I hope that's okay. But yes, Peter's correct: the submission date – or the closing date for submissions is Good Friday. We'll convene shortly after Easter and proceed with the determination.

10 DR WILLIAMS: Right. Right. Thanks, Helen, for that. Helen, Wendy and Carol and Callum, do we want to stay online for a little while just to do any housekeeping we need to attend to?

15 MS MULCAHY: Yeah, that's probably a good idea.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, that's all right.

20 MS LEWIN: Yes.

MS AUSTIN: Yes.

25 DR WILLIAMS: Yes, okay. I'll formally close the meeting now. And once again, thank you all very much for your attendance, it's been very much appreciated, and we will be getting back to you, possibly with questions but certainly, as I said, moving on, with the determination straight after Easter. So I think we'll stop the transcript at this point. Once again, thank you very much for all your help and cooperation this morning. Thanks very much, everyone.

30 MS MULCAHY: Thank you.

MR DOYLE: Thank you, Peter, and everyone else.

35 DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MR DOYLE: Thanks very much.

MS AUSTIN: Thank you.

40 MS LEWIN: Thank you.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[9.36 am]