



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-1172487

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT

RE: SANTA SOPHIA CATHOLIC COLLEGE

PANEL: DR PETER WILLIAMS
WENDY LEWIN
CAROL AUSTIN

ASSISTING PANEL: HELEN MULCAHY
CALLUM FIRTH

PARTICIPANTS: KAREN HARRAGON
ADITI COOMAR

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

DATE: 10.13 AM, FRIDAY, 20 MARCH 2020

DR P. WILLIAMS: So we'll start the transcript. I'll just read the statement and then we'll proceed from there. 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
5 communities who may be here today. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss SSD9772 for the Santa Sophia Catholic College at number 10 Red Gables Road, Box Hill North.

10 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. Joining us today from the Department of Planning and Industry and Environment are Karen Harragon, a Director of Social and Infrastructure Assessments, and Aditi Coomar, Principal Planner – Social and Infrastructure Assessments.

15 In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one of the Commission's decision making process. It's taking place at a preliminary stage of
20 this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision.

25 It is important for the Commissioners to ask question of attendees and to clarify issues wherever we consider it 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.

30 I would ask that all the participants here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, for the purposes of transcription, and for everyone to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of transcript. So, thank you, we will now work through the agenda. So, Karen and Aditi, I'll hand it over to you, if that's okay, to just basically give us an overview of the project from the Department's perspective, please.

35 MS K. HARRAGON: Okay. Good morning. So, I'm Karen Harragon, Director of Social Infrastructure at the Department of Planning. I'm here with my colleague, Aditi, to outline the Department's approach to the assessment of this application and its considerations in reaching the recommendations in our report. I'm going to provide a high level overview of the proposal, the site and the context of the site
40 within the Box Hill North locality.

45 The Department's assessment report covers a large number of key issues that speak to a range of matters that were raised during the assessment of the project. The Department considers that these issues were satisfactorily resolved during assessment or were addressed by the applicant or will be managed on – by recommended conditions.

You will find that many of these issues are very common to school development and to assist us in getting through, I guess, the issues that are more unique to this project we're going to target four areas in particular as part of our presentation – and that's going to be the suitability of the site, the bulk and scale of the development, the
5 adequacy and suitability of the play areas within the actual school area and also the provisional parking traffic.

So to assist us with today's presentation we've prepared three packages of diagrams for you, and these form only a small proportion of all the documents that were part of
10 the application. We've numbered these so that we can take you to these as we go through our presentation. We've also extracted three conditions from our overall instrument, draft instrument, because we believe these also warrant discussion as they're key to the mitigation and closure of some of the areas that we've discussed in our assessment. So firstly, I'd like you to turn to the Part A pack, and we'll go to
15 page 2.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you.

MS HARRAGON: So it's to give you a general understanding of where the Box Hill Area is located. So Box Hill North is a new release area that's currently under
20 construction located generally between Glenorie and Annangrove. So if you go to figure 2, we've got a more recent new map diagram for you. So, obviously as we've inspected the site that's transitioned from the site being what was a rural precinct, is now delivering the outcomes of the Master Planning work that was
25 progressed by the Council.

So figure 3, we've extracted the Box Hill North Master Plan precincts, so – and figure 3 is on page 4. So that diagram formed part of the package of the planning proposal that was lodged with The Hills Shire Council and which formed part of the
30 local environment plan amendment that was facilitated in the figure 4 diagram – and there was a recent amendment to that as well.

So what I'm going to do is draw your attention in figure 3 to where the site is located, you can see it's in that area identified in the Master Plan as Retail Mixed
35 Use. I also might draw to your attention an area, I guess to the bottom of that, which is coloured School – which is located on – what is – appears to be like a recreation area. Now, that school, we're uncertain as to whether that's being progressed by the Department of Education but we believe that was the intent when the Master Plan was provided. So if you, again, look at figure 4 also on page 4 you will see that the
40 site is located within land zone B2, Local Centre, and that a school is for permissible use within that land use zone.

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry, Karen - - -

45 MS HARRAGON: So - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Sorry, I don't mean to interrupt.

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Just a point of clarification, just I'm comparing – looking at figures 3 and figure 4, the proposed school to the south, I think, of the – looks like a hockey field, I think.

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: It's coloured purple in the figure 3. It hasn't been zoned accordingly in figure 4, so - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yes, look, and I think I'm happy to take this on notice but I think you'll find the majority of these new release areas have stopped actually individually identifying schools. There's been, I guess, a history of sites being negotiated and zoned, that schools infrastructure have not progressed, and a need to rezone them as well.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MS HARRAGON: So I would imagine, from our knowledge of the standard instrument, that education facilities are permitted not only in that business zone but also in the residential zone so it would have no particular purpose to zone it for a special uses zone at this stage.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Thank you for - - -

MS HARRAGON: This is the additional zone that we're talking – additional school site we're talking about.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, that's right, yes.

MS A. COOMAR: And I would agree with Karen on that, it's a permissible use in both those residential zones there.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay, thank you. Thanks, Aditi.

MS HARRAGON: I'm – so we're just going to start drawing you closer to the site, so page 5 is an extract from the applicant's RtS, and it's starting to show what were the future uses that are likely to occur within that immediate locality. And you can see to, again, to the north is a retail and mixed use development, it has similar build form outcomes to what we're considering on the site and which were facilitated in both the DCP and the LEP for the site. And you can see surrounding the site is high density residential development and across the future Fontana Drive, although out of this image, is the lower density areas.

So I'm going to take you now to page 6, so this is a much better understanding of how that actual site is located within the actual Box Hill precinct itself. And as we

go through the presentation today we'll come back to this at certain times, and this is a useful document to identify where some of the activities and key deliverables of the school are going to be located.

5 Okay. So, I'm now just going to talk a little bit about the development itself. The proposal seeks approval for the construction and operation of a new school, which includes an early child care centre. The school would comprise a four to six storey building, provided in four linked elements which will accommodate learning areas, creative and performance hubs, open space and sporting facilities.

10 The development will accommodate 1860 kindergarten to year 12 students and a centre-based child care facility for 60 students, all of which will be operated by the Catholic Church. There will be 130 full time equivalent staff, and that staff number comprises both the teachers within the school as well as the teaching staff within the
15 – and administration staff within the early childhood centre.

The town centre has a prevalent – and, again, if you look at the image on page 6. The town centre has a prevalent north/south axis which will visually connect the public recreational area proposed to the north, which is just off this image here, flow
20 through a plaza which you can see just to the bottom part of the school and then along a pedestrian thoroughfare connecting it to the hockey fields down in the south of the image.

25 So, the pedestrian thoroughfare is supported by rights of way that are being created through the DAs surrounding the site, and these DAs have been facilitated by the other – the Council as local development applications. And the intention is that that will be a spine, an open spine, that will connect the town centre through the two recreation areas – being the hockey fields and another recreation area to the north of the site, on the other side of the proposed mixed use building.

30 So in relation to submissions, which I'm going to just touch on here because it's helpful to understand in going forward the rest of our presentation what the nature of those are, there were 74 individual public submissions and these included 69 objections – and this included one objection from a special interest group.

35 There – the Department would remind you in regards to that previous image of the work that's currently underway out there, that there are no currently any development that has occurred within the town centre so there is actually currently no adjoining residential land owners in relation to this development.

40 And not to undermine the nature of the submissions, but it's worth noting that the nearest submitter was three kilometres south of the site and the majority of the submitters were located in areas in other parts of the Hills LGA. I'm now going to talk to site suitability, then I'm going to get Aditi to just draw some attention to some
45 elements of site suitability including the Box Hill scale and also the access to amenity for the play areas in the school facility.

Okay, so approximately 78 per cent of the public submissions to the EAS objected to the proposal on the grounds that the development was not a suitable location within the Box Hill North Town Centre for a school. So whilst not considered relevant to the Department's assessment of the application before it, it is worth drawing
5 attention to the content in the applicant's RtS that confirms that an alternate school site at 40 to 46 Terry Road, Box Hill, was originally purchased by the applicant for the purpose of developing a school.

10 The applicant advises that the zoning of that site did not permit the use of the site as an educational establishment and it, as yet, does not have any necessary infrastructure or servicing in place to support a new school at this location. Noting that the population projections within Box Hill North and the constraints of the Terry Road site, the applicant considered that the current proposed site was more suitable for the delivery of a school in this region and it also identified that the ability to
15 deliver a school within a shorter timeframe was facilitated and supported by the rezoning of the lands and the master planning that had been progressed by the council at that time.

20 Although the department notes that the Terry Road site has not been identified as a school by council in any of its strategic directions, the department does not believe the location of a school in the Box Hill North area would in any way undermine an application or another – or a new applicant progressing discussions with the council on that Terry Road site in the future. And, obviously, these would be subject to the council supporting a rezoning of that site and any other strategic processes that it
25 would require. The department is satisfied that the siting of the school within the town centre of Box Hill North appropriately responds to the strategic context of uplift within that region.

30 Its location on a site where educational establishments are permitted is also recognised. The department agrees with the applicant in that the site would be located centrally within the future precinct town centre, and this offers high levels of connectivity with the surrounding residential areas, as well as with the public open space areas that are going to be delivered as part of the town centre development. Colocation of the school with the mixed retail development which is proposed to the
35 north – immediately to the north of the site is also going to provide synergies in activating the town centre, including the activities that can be facilitated within the adjoining plaza and the pedestrian spine.

40 The school's design ensures satisfactory access control measures, including fencing, will be provided to separate the uses within the town centre and provide safety to students, while still maintaining a seamless connection with the town centre plaza on the eastern side. And, again, I'll just draw your attention back to that page 6 and you can see from the brown parts of that diagram, which are the school, that a lot of the building has been set off from that pedestrian spine, providing an open setting for the
45 plaza, which will be enjoyed by others within the town centre.

Locating the development within the town centre has also provided an opportunity to access future public transport networks that will evolve as the release area comes on line. This includes quite a large system of cycling and pedestrian linkages through the town centre and also through the residential areas, which will be part of the Box Hill release area. So I'm going to talk a little bit later about, I guess, parking and traffic. So I'm now going to hand this to Aditi to talk about some of those key issues that we identified as quite unique to this site, in particular, given that this is, again, one of the first vertical schools that we've done outside of the Sydney CBD.

10 MS COOMAR: Thank you, Karen. I'm Aditi Coomar. I'm the principal planner at the Department of Planning Industry and Environment. I work with the social infrastructure assessments team. Can you hear me all right?

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

15

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, thank you. Thanks, Aditi.

MS COOMAR: I will start with a key issue that was identified in a number of submissions to the EIS, as well as in department's assessment of the vertical school, and that is in regard to the bulk and scale of the buildings. Now, as we know, as we have noted in the department's assessment report, the site is subject to about building height control of 16 metres and an FSR of 1.1 to 1. As a background, the panel may note that at the time of lodgement of this application, a planning proposal was being considered by council for Box Hill North Town Centre to increase the FSR and building height for the site, as well as the town centre as a whole.

20
25

The planning proposal since lodgement of the application got approved September 2019. However, the FSR and the height control for this site was not amended at that time. Council in its recommendation decided that this site would likely be developed as a school under the ESEPP, therefore, controls would not apply to the site anyway. However, all adjoining sites were subject to an increase of FSR and building height under this planning proposal. The LEP was subsequently amended in December 2019. I would request the panel to have a look at figure 9 of part B, please, which is on page 8.

30
35

So this figure identifies that the sites to the east and the south of the school site are subject to a 27 metre building height control and that FSR varied between 1.7 on the eastern side to about 2.3 to the south. With this background, the department has assessed the Vulcan scale of the development considering the likely future character of the town centre and the adjoining residential developments. The building would reach a height of up to 29.9 metres from the existing ground level, however, this exceedance would occur only at the points where there are flutes above the plant rooms. If the panel could now please look at figures 7 and 8 of part B, which is in page 7.

40
45

We will note that the building north facing future road B would have a maximum height of about 17 metres, plus the wire mesh screen on top for the sports court.

Only the fitness centre on top of this building would be about a 21 metre height when viewed from the street frontages. Apart from that, the building in its totality would have a maximum height of about 25 metre if we consider the majority of the building mass including the plant rooms. Now, noting the future height plane of the adjoining sites, which has been marked in figures 5 and 6, as well as 7 and 8, we will note that the future height plane for adjoining buildings are about 27 metres.

Noting this, the department is satisfied that the building height, although it exceeds the current building height controls for this site, will generally be compatible with the likely future character of the locality. Similarly, the FSR of this building would be about 1.32 to 1, for which there is a 32 per cent variation to the permissible FSR of 1:1. However, it is still within the permissible FSR that is applicable on the adjoining sites. Therefore, the department considers that in the future the building would fit in with the anticipated density of the Box Hill North Town Centre. During the assessment of this application, the department had raised some concerns with the applicant regarding the impact of the building height and the setbacks on the amenity of the future residential developments to the east and the south.

The applicant's RtS and the subsequent additional information that the building south, which is basically the building that's located along the east-west axis – and I'll point to figure 2 of part B, which is on page 3. This building south would be located adjoining a future residential development to the south of the site. This building was moved a bit to have a setback of more than six metres from the boundary, which is the usual safe 65 requirement. Therefore, the – and, with solar access diagrams, the applicant has demonstrated that the building south's location would not compromise solar access to any future the adjoining site.

Similarly, the future buildings on the eastern side of the building, which is on the – adjoining the town centre plaza, would also be located at a considerable distance from the Santa Sophia buildings, and therefore, noting the extent of our diagrams, which we'll come to a little bit later, in part C, the department concludes that the building on this site would not restrict solar access to future residential developments on the adjoining sites. The department considers that the bulk and scale of the development represents that of an institution and would result in generous floor to ceiling heights, concentration of the bulk along the site boundaries, and the road frontages would ensure that a plaza can on the eastern side of the site and seamlessly connect with the town centre plaza.

The department also understands that government architect did not raise significant concerns with regard to the exceedance of the bulk and scale of the building, noting the use of the site and the proposed design. I would now talk about the other issue that is also a result of the bulk and scale and the student density on the site that has been identified as a key issue by the department, and that is the open-space functions and the adequacy within the site. As highlighted in the department's assessment report, the development is for a vertical school with a unique approach towards the design of open space and recreational areas, noting that the site is outside Sydney –

Sydney's high-density areas. Now, if the panel could please have a look at figure 11 of part B, which is on page 10.

DR WILLIAMS: Excuse me.

5

MS COOMAR: You will – you'll note that the proposal provides integrated open-space areas vertically within the site through the provision of expansive recreational areas at the ground and level 1 and then through walkway decks outside of the classrooms for the upper levels, mainly from level 2 to level 4. Finally, on level 4, a multipurpose sports court has been provided, with an adjoining fitness centre and a covered open space with running track. The applicant's RtS advises that the upper level sports courts and the fitness centres will primarily be used by the senior school students. If the panel could now look at figure 10, which precedes figure 11 in part B, page 9.

15

Figure 10 shows that the open spaces for the childcare centre at the ground level and level 1 – basically at level 1 – would also integrate with sections of the open play-space areas within the level 1 of the school, and the applicant advises that this would allow the preschoolers to interact with the school environment from time to time.

20

The applicant has submitted an open-space analysis to clarify the usage and functionality of the recreation areas. What the department understands from their analysis is that, in principle, the school proposes the ground level open spaces to integrate with the future town centre plaza, creating an activated an engaging space which also sort of celebrates the entry to the school. Vertical play elements have been proposed linking the levels for student play and collaborative learning. There is an adventure play zone and an exercise course that have been located also around level 1. We have provided details of the vertical play spaces and how student can access in our assessment report.

25

30

So can go through that section in detail to understand how the vertical spaces have been linked. In – in addition to that, the applicant has also provided a program of staggering the open space use within the site and considers that through the staggered use and the splitting of the functionalities vertically, the school can achieve up to 10.1 square metres per student, which is consistent with the DOE guidelines for public schools. The department in the – at the beginning during the assessment of the EIS raised some concerns regarding staggered breaks within the schools. The applicant has provided us with examples of other schools, such as St Patricks at Parramatta North which they have used as a guide where staggered breaks have been used consistently and have been quite efficient in maintaining open space and the usable open space within the site.

35

40

45

Government architects have generally supported the location and the layout of the schools, especially the scene with the town centre. However, the government architect considers that the method of calculation of the open space area is not acceptable. And that is because a number of circulation areas within the walkway decks, such as areas in front of the staircases have been included as open space which would practically never be used as a recreational space. Government

architect have also raised concerns regarding the lack of solar access areas – areas of the open spaces, especially between levels 2 and levels 4. While I do not want to go into details of ease of the plans, I have included these plans of the levels in part B so you can go through the walkway decks and how they open spaces in these areas are functioning.

Now, the – the department has gone back to the applicant and consulted with the applicant with regard to how the amenity of the open spaces work. In response, the applicant has provided a daylight study which is based on spatial Daylight Autonomy, sDA metric. The sDA metrics evaluate the floor area where the target illuminance level is achieved for at least a given person date of time. And in this case their target illuminance – luminance level was 400 and their analysis concludes that approximately 80 per cent of the outdoor areas would receive 400 or more for 50 per cent of the occupied time of the school. Considering this, the applicant’s report and advices, the open spaces would receive a satisfactory level of daylight access throughout the year.

The department is generally satisfied with the proposed functionalities of the open space. The inclusion of the passive areas, such as the mighty purpose hall in the open space calculation as well as sharing of facilities with council. And in this regard I should mention that the department did raise concern about the open space provision within the site, and the applicant has now provided sufficient evidence to the department to demonstrate that any sort of deficiency of open space within the site for organise voting activities can be carried out within the hockey fields that – that are looking out to the south of the site.

They have provided grade access through the shared footway running east of the site, and pedestrian crossing on Red Gables Road. And the hockey fields are literally located adjoining the site with only the one residential flat building site in between. Therefore, for organised voting activities throughout the week, the students can access council’s – councillor owned hockey fields in the future. So the department in this regard is satisfied that through the staggered program of using open spaces and using the council owned hockey field that the site can provide adequate open space in terms of the floor area.

Considering the ESD principles and the requirement for sufficient covered areas in the school to protect children from uncomfortable glare and heat, the department considers that the level of the illuminance that the applicant has proposed would probably be reasonable for a school within a few high density town centre. However, the department recognises that the daylight access study is based on an average daylight amount for the year. It is not based on the worst case scenario which is the winter solstice. In this regard, I would like to point to part C of the package B of the package that we have sent you. So there are several shadow diagrams within this package. Each page includes shadow diagrams for different months of the year. If we – if the panel can please note just the June shadow diagrams, the hourly shadow diagrams which is the first line – the first row.

We will see that during winter solstice there are quite a few sections of the open spaces that would be – they’re probably overshadowed during the occupied hours of the school and that is between 9 am and 3 pm as well. In this regard, the department concurs with GNSW’s argument that the children would need more exposure to sun during winter months and during these months, overshadowing of open spaces in levels 2 and 4 may not be acceptable. Therefore, there should be more uncovered areas within the site which the children can access during the winter months, if not summer, and use those areas as recreational areas or open spaces. And the department in this regard also notes that throughout the year about 37 per cent of the open spaces would receive less than 400 lux for a minimum of 50 per cent of the school hours which is their targeted illuminance.

Now, to ensure optimal solar access to the students throughout the year, the department has recommended the removal of the roof over the level 4 fitness centre – not the fitness centre but the open space around the fitness centre and the running tracks and also the level 4 walking decks. I would have to take you back to part B, please, just to show the plan and that is figure 4 on page 5 of package B. If you look at figure 4, you will see there’s a covered open space around the fitness centre which is north of – sorry, which is west of the multipurpose sports court. So the department recommends that this roof be removed or be replaced by an openable or retractable roof and then the covered roof over the walkways also be removed so that we can have more access to uncovered open space.

Considering the applicant’s requests regarding heat and glare, we have recommended that these areas have openable roof or retractable roof. We have provided another diagram which is figure 11 of this package B and we’ve pointed out the sections of the roof which the department is recommending to be removed so that more open space access – more open space can be provided for the site. The department’s recommendation is consistent with the consultation outcomes with government architect and the department considers that this would result in the provision of additional recreational spaces that can be accessed by the students at all times of the year within the site and would compensate for the deficiency in the design of open spaces within the walkway decks. Openable roofs, retractable roofs in these locations would equally facilitate the same outcome and can be opened during appropriate times of the year and as needed.

That’s all from me. I would now pass on to Karen to talk about the traffic matters. Thank you.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you.

MS HARRAGON: Before I get into the traffic, I probably would like to just revisit the site suitability and the size and scale of the school. So the State Government is aware of the challenge ahead of the State, particularly around Sydney in being able to meet the educational needs of the forecast projections, third children within the Sydney and outer-Sydney area. So the department is obviously key to ensuring that schooling that is delivered for the State is of good quality and we take that role really

seriously. So we obviously were quite concerned when we visited Box Hill to understand why it was necessary to have a vertical school in what was, at that time, quite a rural setting.

5 So we actually did quite a bit of investigation with talking to council and the regional team in terms of what the actual built form outcomes were going to be of not just the town centre but the density of the immediately adjoining residential areas. And I think we're satisfied that a compact outcome for a school is probably going to be necessary for not only this release area but for other release areas that the department and local councils are progressing. So we're also aware of the obesity challenge
10 faced by a lot of western Sydney. I know this is northwest Sydney, but the obesity challenge that is faced by a lot of school children in that area. And we believe that easy to access and functional open space in schools is key to that. The challenge is how to get that balance right, given that Australia has some of the highest UV levels
15 in the world and how to get that balance right.

So we took quite seriously what our role was and how to, I guess, land on what we think is a good balanced outcome for delivering adequacy of open space, functional open space, but still ensure that there was adequate solar access because during
20 winter months this is still key to people's mental and physical health. So we hope that we've done a good job in presenting how we've come to the conclusions in relation to this school. So I'm now just going to quickly touch on the parking. There is quite a significant – also and more so, just traffic and transport more generally. The traffic section is quite a large section in our report which is some, I think,
25 fourteen-twelve pages in our report. So I'm not going to go through each of those elements here, other than to draw on some particular things that are unique to this site.

So I'm going to get you to go back to part 8 – part A of the pack and to take you to the diagram which is on page 6 and is called figure 6. So I'm going to quickly take you to the unique areas in relation to the delivery of parking and also kiss and drop. So there is a well located five bus layover area which you can see at item number 3, that little – above or at number 3 on the diagram is where the buses will be dropping students and picking them up at the end of the day. There are three drop-off areas.
35 There's a 10-space drop-off area which is the bubble 1 and that's for the childcare centre which is quite near the site. And that will allow children who are preschool to be able to move very easily and safely between that drop-off area, because they will obviously be accompanied by their parents, into the childcare facility which is located quite close to that area.

40 I'm going to draw your attention to the package that we provided to answers to IPCs earlier questions where I made a reference to that actually also being a staff parking area. That's actually not a formal staff parking area and I'm going to talk about that staff parking area later. However, I think the likelihood of that being able to be used
45 by additional staff who might come and go during the day, I believe it's quite normal for there to be a cook that comes in to do lunches. And I would imagine that a staff

member would be able to park there when it's not during the peak collection and drop-off areas – or peak collection and drop-off times.

5 So opening of the school, that 10-space drop-off area will be provided. On opening
of the school at bubble 2 there will be a 12-space kiss and drop area along what is
referenced as “future road B.” And we have as a condition of consent that the
proposed kiss and drop area which will be targeted for senior students in Fontana
Drive be actually delivered based on a trigger of student numbers and timing of the
10 school opening. We recognised that the school won't be at its full capacity on day 1,
term 1. So that eight – that bubble at number 8 which is shown up in the left-hand
corner of diagram figure 6 is actually where the senior drop-off area will be. And in
that package at part C, we've actually given you an extract of that condition of
consent so you can see that we've enforced when the delivery of that will be
achieved.

15 So in relation to the temporary carpark, you will see that at – again on figure 6 and
that's shown at the bubble 14. So that's actually facilitated by a local council
approval which has facilitated the temporary carpark being there. So this is an
interim outcome. We've sent – spent considerable time working with the applicant
20 to minimise any risk with that interim carpark being able to be used up until when
the permanent carpark is to be provided. Now, there is a contract of sale which
ensures that the previous landowner, who also is the developer of the town centre,
will deliver the required staff parking or somewhere within the town centre.

25 So we've actually gone one step further to ensure that there is no risk to the consent
authority by actually requiring that that be a restriction as to user on title. We've
gone to some level of detail in the condition of consent that relates to that to not only
identify how it's to be delivered and when it will be delivered, but also and to ensure
that there will be restrictions on user should there be something that will happen
30 where this land might be on-sold to someone else in the future. And the approach
that we've done in that is quite consistent with how we approach BPAs for similar
matters on other applications. So I will probably now close our presentation. As I
mentioned to you before, we believe that this compact vertical school will be a good
co-location within the town centre.

35 We believe that an application where there are opportunities to share car parking so
that they can be used by others outside of peak areas is actually a good outcome for
everyone in the community, not just for the school. And we also believe that the
sensible design of the town centre in relation to the recreation areas that surround this
40 site is also a sound basis for the planning and design of the school. So I'm happy to
take any questions from the panel.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you, Karen and Aditi, that was very thorough and very
helpful. And also you - note also the – thank you very much for the response to the
45 questions that we sent to you. We just got these this morning, so we've still got to go
through those ourselves, but thank you for those responses also. We will read those
with great interest. I might just start the ball rolling with just one question and I will

hand it over to Helen and to Carol. Just about the use of the council's hockey field, is – are you aware of any agreement that has been entered into between the applicant and Blacktown Council for the – sorry, the Hills Council for the use of the hockey field during school time?

5

MS HARRAGON: The – thank you, it's Karen. The department doesn't take on face value comments made in applications that agreements will be in place or have been negotiated. So at the time it was lodged, we had no certainty around what that agreement was. We also had an understanding that there were going to be other users for that hockey field. So I'm going to be able to confirm that that agreement is now in place. So, Aditi, are you able to confirm that is the case as well?

10

MS COOMAR: Yes. The council sent us a letter around September or October last year confirming that they permit the use of the hockey fields by the school. I think I have provided that letter to IPC because it has not been published on our website.

15

MS MULCAHY: I will check that for you.

DR WILLIAMS: We will check that. Well, we will check that from this end. Thanks, Aditi and Karen, and - - -

20

MS COOMAR: Yes. Otherwise, I can provide it anyway.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Look, thanks for that. What – that's what we might do. We will check to see if we've got it and, if we haven't, just as a follow-up action for us, we will get in touch with you if we need to, to just – so, yes, we would like to see a copy of that letter as well.

25

MS HARRAGON: And I can confirm what we also wanted to know about the certainty of the delivery of that hockey field.

30

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: We're not interested in delivering a school and having a recreation area delivered in a decade. So we understand that's actually under construction now.

35

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. Good.

MS COOMAR: And there is also a recommended condition of consent where we have requested that evidence of proof – evidence be provided prior to operation of the school that all hockey fields are operational and that all agreements are in place.

40

DR WILLIAMS: Okay. That's excellent. We will look – we will have a look at that one as well. Thank you.

45

MS COOMAR: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you. I might hand it over at this stage for Wendy and Carol.

MS LEWIN: Yes.

5

DR WILLIAMS: Wendy, would you - - -

MS LEWIN: Yes. Wendy Lewin. Karen and Aditi, thank you. I just want to revisit briefly the comfort and amenity of the open spaces and outdoor areas proposed with a question. Is the department aware of any wind analysis or modelling having been done for the proposed precinct – for the town centre which includes also the detailed proposal for the school, either together or separately?

10

MS COOMAR: I can answer that I'm not aware of any wind analysis being done separately for the town centre considering the detailed design of the school. But we can take that on notice and do some research on that and let you know.

15

MS LEWIN: Thank you. And - - -

MS HARRAGON: And what we can perhaps do in addition to that is to look at how we might be able to deliver that as a post-approval outcome that has a requirement to come back to the secretary, demonstrating any recommendations of a wind analysis and that that be delivered as part of the development.

20

MS LEWIN: I think it – there has been such consideration of heat and solar access, thermal comfort and daylight, it would be unfortunate if some of those areas because of a lack of consideration of wind effect and comfort – cause for some of those areas to not be used in the way that are proposed in the business case, I guess, and also the design, the way in which the areas are programmed to be used. So any information at an early stage would be most welcome. Thanks.

25

30

MS COOMAR: So if I may answer that. There is a wind assessment done for the school. There was a pedestrian wind assessment submitted to the department as part of the EIS.

35

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: So we might just want to – we will just go and look in more detail whether that has actually gone to the levels above the ground level.

40

MS LEWIN: Yes. Perfect. Thanks very much.

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: So that's one of the actions where, if that's okay, we will – if we could just get, yes, some advice just on the extent of the wind analysis as part of the OIS.

45

MS LEWIN: Yes, and it's – yes.

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

5 MS LEWIN: The upper levels are quite crucial, as you would imagine. Is Carol with us?

DR WILLIAMS: Carol, have you - - -

10 MS C. AUSTIN: Yes, sorry, I was just going off mute. I would just like to ask a broader question. As you mentioned, given the need for additional schools given the population movement, it's important that the new developments exhibit design excellence and, indeed, these early ones that are done on greenfield sites will be used as role models for future developments. So I just want to ask the question, there has
15 been a number of modifications to allow for open space, etcetera. If you look at this in its totality, how do you feel that it stacks up as best practice for a concentrated school development?

MS HARRAGON: It's Karen speaking. So the government architects were
20 reviewing this application as part of their design review panel. So they do have some concerns with, I guess, some opportunities that were lost in terms of the orientation of the buildings where they feel it could have been orientated to have access to the sun penetration. And that perhaps that the alignment of that major part of the building which is the most northern part of the building has, I guess, in effect,
25 reinforced the – from the beginning the overshadowing of the other parts of the site. So, clearly, you know, the – there would be observations that excellence in relation to that built form could have been achieved in other ways.

30 So, you know, I guess, beyond refusing the application, we've attempted to achieve an outcome where access and solar access to areas of play space were delivered through other ways.

MS AUSTIN: Thank you.

35 MS HARRAGON: And I totally do agree with you that design excellence, particularly for these new release areas, is actually critical because it does set a precedent, it does set the expectation for what good development and good design outcomes are for schools. And that's why we've been, I guess, quite challenging to the applicant in terms of them demonstrating how their methodology and
40 approaching the design and delivering of a school on that site has been to the betterment of the students and the staff and the rest of the community.

MS HARRAGON: And if I may add – sorry, this is Aditi speaking. If I may add to Karen, the reason behind them building the buildings along the edges was so that the
45 entire – all of the building open after the town centre plaza. Because what they're anticipating is that, in the future, a number of buildings will come up on the eastern side and the applicant has wanted to ensure that the building design connects

to this plaza and that is one of the reasons why the buildings have been designed in the way they've been.

MS AUSTIN: Yes. Thank you.

5

MS HARRAGON: So it's Karen. What, I guess, we're unable to present to you will be the additional information that the applicant has in terms of the – each of the levels of the building and how they relate to the ground level and, also, how they relate to, I guess, accessibility at each level. So there's certainly a significant piece of work that has gone with this application that we've had the access to and which forms part of the application that I do believe the applicant will present to you when they come to speak to you as well.

10

MS AUSTIN: Thank you. That's helpful.

15

DR WILLIAMS: Just one question related to that, the overall design excellence, I guess. Is - the department's view on the level of tree canopy cover, I think it's about 14 per cent that's proposed on the school site which is a bit low. Is that just unavoidable, given the function of the size and shape of the site itself?

20

MS LEWIN: Have we lost contact?

MS AUSTIN: No, no.

25 MS HARRAGON: Yes, it's - - -

MS AUSTIN: I can hear you. Sorry, Karen, you can go on.

30

MS HARRAGON: Yes. Look, I do believe it is a challenge. Certainly, this is a very compact town centre. We were very much working with the regional team and the council to understand, I guess, the intensity of development that they expected to see delivered here. It was quite challenging to have this, I guess, as the very first built form going in that town centre of a scale and a density which was quite unlike anything else in that area. I do believe that there will be a setting around that town centre where there will be much larger opportunities for tree and Crown development. And I will just see if I can quickly take you – so at the moment, it's a very cleared rural pastoral land. So I understand there's a significant piece of work that the council is delivering with the applicant in relation to pedestrian open space networks that connect this to other areas within that locality.

35

40

And I'm hoping that the outcome for those will be at a much higher standard from some of the residential areas that you actually see, to go to page 3 and look at figure 2, and you look at the housing that has been delivered previously. I hope that the standard for the future release area - - -

45

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: - - - we get to see a tree canopy much higher than what you see in that diagram.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. It's quite incredible, isn't it, the new development. It - - -

5

MS HARRAGON: It's quite challenging to see.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, yes. Yes, it's amazing.

10 MS AUSTIN: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: And, I guess, that's part of – we've had a lot of involvement with also the Department of Health in the work that they've done in terms of the human health outcomes for children in western Sydney and this relationship to landscaping. Because it impacts on their ability to walk to school, particularly when you've got urban heat effects in outer Sydney area.

15

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: And we understand that that journey to school is actually just as critical as the time spent within the school because it's one of the few times of the day where you're not going to get that UV level that's quite unpleasant and inappropriate to be exposed to. So it's that linkages that are – is just as important as to what goes on within the school.

20

MS COOMAR: Yes, this Aditi. Just regarding the tree canopy cover, the panel would have noted that there was a document submitted by the applicant with its RtS on the tree canopy cover. And in that document, we have based our assessment to some extent on that document because that document provides a tree canopy cover for the entire Box Hill town centre precinct which was developed as a part of The Gables Master Plan. And as Karen rightly pointed out, that whole town centre has a setting where all these recreational reserves are presented outside of the town centre itself and that would include street trees and recreational reserves to maintain the overall canopy cover for the master plan area.

25

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. Great. Thanks, that's very helpful. Thanks, Aditi. I've just another question in relation to the drop-off areas, the kiss and drop areas. It makes a lot of sense that for infants and primary school – I think it's drop-off point 2 on future road B – and the high school students are a little bit further away from the school at future Fontana Road at drop – at bubble number 8. You said that will be conditioned. I'm just thinking of the practicalities of ensuring that you only have high school students dropped off at 8 and only primary school students dropped off at number – at drop-off number 2.

30

MS HARRAGON: So if you go to page 6 and figure 6 - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

35

40

45

MS HARRAGON: - - - the applicant has identified that there will be a concierge control within that car parking area 2. And they've – our report also speaks about the commitments that the school has made in terms of the visor of the –
5 I think it would because, once you've – obviously, you're going to have a car that might have high school students with their younger siblings.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes, yes.

10 MS HARRAGON: But I think these things are taken fairly seriously by traffic wardens - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

15 MS HARRAGON: - - - that are usually appointed by all schools and which the Green Travel Plan commits to appointing. So we would think that the compliance of that would be fairly high.

DR WILLIAMS: Right. And I guess related to that, to ensure that the students that
20 are dropped off at bubble 8, the high school drop-off point, actually cross at the pedestrian crossing at that which is number 12 - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

25 DR WILLIAMS: - - - at Red Gables. Would there be any fencing or something like that proposed around the footpaths at the intersection there to stop students from just, you know, crossing the street anywhere or that forces them or, you know, directs them down to the pedestrian crossing?

30 MS COOMAR: That has not been proposed as part of the – as part of this proposal. However, the condition of consent regarding the operation of traffic and access management plan has requested the applicant consider all these and then as part of their management plan. However, at the moment there is no such proposal of a
35 fence.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

MS HARRAGON: We could possibly add that as a line item to that operation and
40 management plan where we actually get them to consider – not necessarily specifying but consider - - -

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: - - - the need for staff to be allocated at that intersection to
45 ensure the cross at the controlled pedestrian pathway.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes. I mean, that's normally what happens with most schools, I understand, with both traffic wardens and teachers, you know, that are rostered on to do this sort of management. But you want students that leave the school by accessing the access handle not just to cross over the road anywhere, but obviously
5 walk down to the pedestrian crossing and then walk back up again.

MS COOMAR: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: But, obviously, at the end of the day for that to be managed
10 properly, it's the responsibility of the school itself. But at least if it's a line item in there in that management plan, it's something that we ask them to consider - - -

MS COOMAR: Yes, we can do that.

15 DR WILLIAMS: - - - if that's a possibility.

MS HARRAGON: Yes. We can actually take that on board. That would be an action that we will provide an updated condition for that one.

20 DR WILLIAMS: Condition. That would be fantastic, Karen.

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Thank you very much. Helen, have you got any questions at all?
25

MS MULCAHY: No.

DR WILLIAMS: Okay.

30 MS MULCAHY: Not specifically. No, I think we've covered it all.

DR WILLIAMS: Right. Carol, have you got any more questions?

MS AUSTIN: No, no.
35

DR WILLIAMS: No, no.

MS AUSTIN: I think it was a very comprehensive presentation and it has addressed the areas of concern that I had.
40

DR WILLIAMS: Right. Wendy.

MS LEWIN: No, also, that's fine. Thank you.

45 DR WILLIAMS: Right. Look, once again, Aditi and Karen, look, thank you very much for presenting for us. The materials you've provided are very, very helpful, very clear. And, also, the responses you provided to our questions as well, we will

have a closer look at those. So I might thank you both very much. Is there anything else you wanted to add in conclusion?

5 MS HARRAGON: No. That's good. Thank you.

DR WILLIAMS: Right. Right. We might – sorry, Aditi.

10 MS COOMAR: Yes. I just wanted to ask, the actions, the follow-up actions, will I be receiving any now from Helen or - - -

MS MULCAHY: Yes, I can do that for you, Aditi.

MS COOMAR: - - - from someone at IPC.

15 MS MULCAHY: Yes.

DR WILLIAMS: Yes.

20 MS MULCAHY: That's

MS COOMAR: Thank you.

25 DR WILLIAMS: Right. Well, in that case, we will stop the transcript now. I'm just stopping.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[10.55 am]