



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-1176347

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT

RE: SCEGGS DARLINGHURST CONCEPT AND STAGE 1 (SSD 8933)

PANEL:

**CHRIS WILSON
HELEN LOCHHEAD**

ASSISTING PANEL:

**BRAD JAMES
HEATHER WARTON**

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING,
INDUSTRY AND
ENVIRONMENT:**

**MATTHEW ROSEL
KAREN HARRAGON
PRITY CLEARY**

LOCATION:

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

DATE:

3.35 PM, WEDNESDAY, 8 APRIL 2020

MR WILSON: So I'll just start with the formalities before we begin. I would like to acknowledge the Traditional Owners of the Land on which we meet and obviously I think they're different but I'll say it again to all people, but I think we have – we probably given we are desperate, we have different people. I would also like to pay
5 my respects to the Elders past and present and to the Elders from other communities who may be here today.

Welcome to the meeting today, Sydney Church of England All Girls Grammar School, Darlinghurst Limited the applicant is seeking approval for the stage re-
10 development of SCEGGS Darlinghurst campus located at 215 Forbes Street, Darlinghurst, within Sydney LGA.

My name is Chris Wilson. I am the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me is my fellow commissioner Professor Helen Lochhead, Brad James and Heather Warton from the
15 Ofsted Commission are also in attendance. 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 part of the Commission's decision making process. It is taking place at a preliminary stage of the process and will form
20 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 consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and not in a
25 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.

I request that all members here today state their name before speaking each time and for all members to ensure they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure
30 accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin.

So Karen, I understand that you have prepared a presentation, is that correct?

MS HARRAGON: That is correct, thank you. So I'll start off. So thank you for
35 having us today. I am Karen Harragon from the department of planning, industry and environment. I am the director of social infrastructure. I am here with my colleague Prity Cleary and also Matthew Rosel to outline the department's approach to the assessment of this application and the way in which it reached its recommendations that it has made to the IPC.

I am going to provide a high level overview of the proposal, the site and the context
40 of the site in the Darlinghurst locality. 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 at both concept level and also at the stage one level. As
45 set out, the department considers in its assessment that the issues were satisfactorily

resolved during assessment either by being addressed by the applicant or being managed and mitigated by recommended conditions.

5 Many of the issues are common to all school development applications. However today, we are going to focus on a number of the key issues that are unique to this site. These include the demolition of Wilkinson House, amenity outcomes, parking and traffic and residential

10 To assist today, we have prepared two packages of diagrams and plans. These form a small proportion of the documents that are part of the development application. We have numbered these for ease so that we can take you to relevant documents as required. We have also provided an extract of a number of recommended conditions because we will be speaking to those particular conditions as we work through these items.

15 We also have provided to us a number of questions on notice earlier by the Commission. We have actually prepared a response and hopefully shortly this afternoon we'll be able to get our executive director's signature. He unfortunately was caught up in a meeting this afternoon but we are happy to actually speak to those
20 at the end of our presentation in terms of how we intend responding.

So I'll get you to turn to part A and to page two. So as you are aware, the proposal before you is the State's development for the stage development of the Sydney Church of England Girls Grammar School campus known as SCEGGS in
25 Darlinghurst. SCEGGS covers two parcels of land and the subject application refers to the larger southern main campus component at the school as identified in blue on that document.

30 So if you could turn to page three in that same bundle. So SCEGGS was established in 1885 and over the years it has incrementally expanded and that has included a number of changes to their precinct – buildings within their precinct. In 1990 the former South Sydney Council endorsed the SCEGGS 2020 masterplan for the extension of the school and this masterplan has now largely been realised. The concept proposal seeks to build on that masterplan and to provide a longer term 2040
35 vision for the site and to meet the evolving and future needs of the school as it transitions into modern thinking around delivering education.

If you could turn to page four in the same bundle. The concept proposals encompasses a number of existing buildings and buildings that are subject to this
40 application include Barham Building, Wilkinson House, The Chapel, old science and library buildings and the old gym so each of those provided there with arrows pointing to their locations.

45 The SCEGGS side is entirely – in its entirety is listed as a local listed heritage item in the Sydney LEP and it is also included within the east Sydney special character and conservation area identified in the LEP. Not all the buildings are mentioned in the school listing description however Barham, Wilkinson House and The Chapel are all

noted for their architectural, cultural, or social significance. The site also adjoins and is nearby to a number of other local and state listed heritage items.

5 If you could turn to page 5. The school currently accommodates 942 students and 158 staff. It operates during normal school hours and also offers the use of existing facilities to the local community where they don't conflict the day to day operations. SCEGGS currently provides 112 onsite car parking spaces for school use including 105 of these within the basement car parks. There are also an additional seven within the surface car park access area of Forbes Street.

10 So if you can turn to page 6. The site adjoins existing residential properties and these comprise two to three storey residential terraces to the south and west and this includes Bourke Street as well as Thompsons Street and Thompsons Lane. There are also three to four storey apartment buildings and a 43 storey Horizon building that's directly to the east of the site.

20 I am now going to detail some specific elements of the application. So if you can turn to page seven. The actual proposal includes two components. So the concept proposal and the stage one works proposal. So the stage – the concept approval for the three new building envelopes for educational purposes associated with the school and the introduction of a child care centre. In addition the proposal also includes conservation works to Barham building, vehicular and pedestrian entrances and circulation, seven relocated spaces and 15 new car parking spaces, landscaping and associated works.

25 So I might just draw your attention on page seven to where the new building envelopes are. So up in the top left hand corner is the new six storey, multi-purpose building. Down in the bottom of the site you'll see the reference to the new three storey admin building which is another envelope which is proposed under the concept. The conservation works to Barham House are also part of the concept proposal and included in that application is the envelope for the four storey Wilkinson House which also comprises the stage one works that we're going to be assessing or have assessed in detail.

35 So the stage one works include demolition of the existing Wilkinson House building, excavation of a basement and the construction of a four storey - - -

40 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry, sorry, I don't mean to interrupt you but can – if anyone has got their computer on, their microphone on could they turn it to mute because there's a bit of background noise coming through if you don't mind, thank you.

45 MS HARRAGON: So the stage one works include demolition of the existing Wilkinson House, excavation of a basement and the construction of a four storey building for educational use. Although the proposal results in an increase in the size of the school it does not propose an increase in existing school students or staff

numbers. Separately there is an application for a child care centre and that would result in up to 45 additional children and five staff on site.

5 There have been a total of 102 public submissions received and this included 99 objections. Eight of these objections were from special interest groups and these have been provided to the Commission. The majority of community submissions objecting to this development have been lodged by submitters that are located and readily adjoining or nearby the site. The main concerns raised in public submissions include the heritage impacts from the demolition of Wilkinson House, traffic and car parking impacts, the height and scale of the development, whether it's the envelopes or the stage one works, amenity impacts and also concern about incremental increases in student numbers.

15 I am now going to get Matt to speak to you in some detail about the element relating to the demolition of Wilkinson House. Thank you Matt.

MR ROSEL: Yeah, thanks Karen. So my name is Matthew Rosel, can you hear me okay? Yep? Okay. So I am going to now talk about the demolition of Wilkinson House. If you could please turn to page 2 in part B.

20 So Wilkinson House is a locally listed heritage item. It was constructed in the 1920's and originally used as an apartment building and boarding house. The building is now currently used by SCEGGS as its school classrooms. The listing for Wilkinson House states that it is significant as in it's representative of an apartment building constructed in the 1920's and for its use of materials and architectural style.

30 The applicant's heritage impact statement has considered their heritage significance of Wilkinson House and concludes it is of moderate significance for its historic, aesthetic and social value to the school and also as it is a building designed by a prominent Sydney architect Emil Soderston. SCEGGS has stated that it has made every effort to adaptively re-use the building over the past 50 years, however the building has reached the end of its useful life and provides sub-standard teaching and reading environments.

35 Council objected to the demolition of Wilkinson House stating the building was of high significance and in addition 86 per cent of public submissions objected to the loss of Wilkinson House and the potential adverse heritage impact on the surrounding area.

40 The applicant has prepared a detailed options analysis to justify the demolition of the building. This included assessment of three options analysing the potential refurbishment, the building, a cyber attention scheme, and the complete demolition and replacement with a new building. The options analysis demonstrates the refurbishment and façade retentions options would continue to deliver sub-standard teaching and learning spaces, particularly in terms of BCA non-compliance, room sizes, layouts, access, function and comfort.

The applicant also undertook a structural analysis to consider the façade retention option in detail. This analysis concluded that there would be significant complexities associated with the structural support of the construction which may pose a risk of collapse. In addition demolition of part of the façade would be unavoidable as
5 there is no current way to access the site for construction purposes.

The department considered the proposed refurbishment and façade retention options against the education set and concluded that the two options would fail to adequately address the seven design quality principles. The department presented by council
10 and the public and has considered the likely heritage impacts associated with the proposal.

The department takes very seriously any proposed demolition of a listed building and didn't approach this lightly. However, the department considers the applicant has
15 satisfactorily demonstrated that demolition of Wilkinson House provides the most suitable outcome for the site in terms of its continued delivery of contemporary education and to ensure the current and future education demands of the local community are met.

20 To manage the heritage impact the department has recommended conditions requiring photographic eyeball recording Wilkinson House and preparation of the heritage interpretation claim.

I am now going to talk about and other heritage aspects. If you could please turn
25 to page three in part B. The concept proposal includes a provision of three building envelopes including a six storey multi-purpose building fronting Bourke Street, a three storey administration building fronting Forbes Street, and a four storey replacement Wilkinson House building. The site is subject to a 15 metre height control under the Sydney LEP and the multi-purpose and Wilkinson House buildings
30 would exceed that limit by between 1.3 and 2.5 metres. Objections were raised in public submissions and by council about the height, scale and heritage impacts proposed building

If you could please turn to page four in part B. In response to the initial concerns
35 raised, the applicant reduced the height and scale of the multi-purpose building envelope as shown on page four in part B. The department carefully considered the concerns raised in public submissions and the information provided by the applicant and concluded the height and scale of the building envelopes exceeding some of the Sydney LEP height control are acceptable principally as the multi-purpose
40 building envelope would be a storey lower than the existing old science building and would have a lesser visual impact. It would also provide an appropriate transition to neighbouring properties and is appropriate within its context.

45 And the new Wilkinson House building would be of a similar height to the existing building and the height exceedance is unlikely to be noticeable from a pedestrian perspective.

If you could please turn to page five in part B. With reference to heritage impacts, concern was raised by council and the public that administration building would obscure views towards the retained Barham building. The applicant's heritage impact statement considered the relationship of the proposed building envelopes to neighbouring buildings and concluded that they are appropriate and respect and enhance the appreciation of heritage items within the school and contribute to the streetscape and heritage conservation area.

The department has considered the concerns raised in public submissions and by council and concludes the bulk and scale of the administration and multi-purpose building envelopes are appropriate and would not have an unacceptable heritage impact. In particular, the proposal allows for the removal of visually distracting ad hoc additions to Barham House, restores Barham House and the Chapel buildings, and these aspects represent significant public benefits.

The administration building envelope includes appropriate setbacks from Barham and the Chapel buildings. The applicant's new analysis demonstrates there would be no appreciable reduction in use to Barham building from Forbes Street. The multi-purpose building envelope appropriately aligns with the neighbouring Bourke Street terraces and the administration building envelope relates to the height of the adjoining

With reference to the stage one works the department has considered the proposed design of the Wilkinson House and concludes it would achieve a high standard of design and appearance. In addition, the design, materiality, articulation on the building, is appropriate within its context and would not have adverse impacts on the character of the locality. I'll pass over now to Prity who will talk about car parking and traffic.

MS CLEARY: Hi, my name is Prity Cleary and I am going to talk about car parking and traffic. If you could please turn to page six in part B. The concept proposal includes an increase of 15 onsite car parking spaces from 112 to 127 spaces. This includes the removal of seven existing onsite school staff car parking spaces located within a specific car parking access on Forbes Street, and also the provision of 22 car parking spaces located within the basement level of the multi-purpose building envelope comprising seven relocated school spaces and 12 new child care spaces and three servicing spaces.

Objections were raised in council and the public submissions about the provision of additional car parking spaces onsite. The department considers the relocation of seven existing school car parking spaces is minor in nature and acceptable subject to the deletion of the redundant spaces from the surface car park.

The department considers the additional 15 car parking spaces are acceptable as the proposed childcare centre is separate land use to the school and therefore there would be no increase in total number of school car parking spaces. Additional car park – I'm sorry – the additional childcare centre staff, pick up/drop off and visitor spaces

comply with the maximum Sydney LEP car parking controls for childcare centres and the provision of off-street and centralised servicing bays is appropriate.

5 As the proposal does not include an increase in the number of school staff, student or car parking spaces, the traffic generated by the proposal would relate specifically to the operation of the childcare centre and the service vehicles.

10 The applicant's traffic impact assessment concluded that the proposal resolves in only a minor increase in traffic movement and would not have noticeable impact on intersection performance.

15 To address concerns raised by council and the public that the physical expansion of the school might result in an increase in student and staff members, and in turn result in adverse traffic impacts, the department has recommended a condition permitting the school staff and student numbers to existing and the childcare centre to a maximum capacity of 45 children and 5 staff.

20 The department concludes the traffic impacts of the proposal are acceptable and can appropriately be managed and mitigated subject to the recommended conditions the school population.

Now I am going to put you back to Matt.

25 MR ROSEL: Thanks Prity. It's Matt Rosel here again. I am now going to talk about amenity impacts. If you could please turn to page seven in part B.

30 Several existing residential properties surrounding the site enjoy a range of city skyline and district use over the site. Concerns were raised in public submissions the proposal would obscure existing private residential views. In response to the concerns raised the applicant amended the proposal by reducing the height and scale of the multi-purpose building envelope. And this amendment significantly reduced the impact on views experienced by surrounding properties. The department has considered the views currently enjoyed by nearby properties and the applicant's analysis in relation to the view loss is expected. The department concludes the location, height, and scale of the proposal is such that impacts all neighbouring views are , nil or negligible in scale. Sorry, impact with exception of level two Horizon building which would have only a minor visual impact.

40 The department concluded that the view loss analysis undertaking adequately demonstrates that view loss impacts would be acceptable.

45 If you could please turn to page eight in part B. Concerns were raised in public submissions about the potential overlooking of adjoining properties by the multi-purpose building and the replacement Wilkinson House. It's the department's view that the consideration of privacy, impacts associated with the multi-purpose building, is best reserved for future development application stages and has recommended condition in this regard.

The department report confirms that privacy of adjoining neighbouring properties would be protected to the use of architectural features as shown on page seven in part B. The department considered the replacement of Wilkinson House building would not have an adverse overlooking impact on properties in the Horizon building, St Peters Lane, as there would be no increase in overlooking compared to the existing situation and those neighbouring properties are located between 20 and 40 metres away.

If you could please turn to page nine in part B. Concern was raised in public submissions and by council about potential overshadowing from the multi-purpose building on neighbouring residential properties at Thompsons Street, the south of the site. The applicant's overshadowing analysis indicates that following the reduction in the height of the multi-purpose building envelope, additional impacts on adjoining properties is negligible.

The department has recommended a condition requiring future development applications include overshadowing analysis and demonstrate the overshadowing impacts on neighbouring residential properties has been minimised. As the replacement Wilkinson House building is generally of the same height as the existing building the replacement building would not result in any adverse overshadowing impacts on neighbouring residential properties.

Concern was raised in public submissions about the potential impacts of construction noise. The applicant has agreed to prepare a construction noise and vibration management plan for future detailed applications relating to the use and construction of buildings within the building envelopes. The department considers subject to the preparation of this plan construction noise can be managed and mitigated where necessary.

The applicant's noise report indicates that construction works associated with Wilkinson House which is the stage one works has the potential to exceed noise management levels by up to 12 decibels during demolition works. To address this noise impact, the applicant proposes mitigation measures including provision of noise holding barriers and shrouds, a selection of feasible and inclusion of construction noise and respite periods.

The department recommended additional noise mitigation measures including compliance with council's recommended hours of construction, compliance with an interim noise management guidelines, noise management levels, construction vehicles to arrive only during construction hours, and then noise generated during construction not be of offensive noise as classified under the Protection of Environment Act. The department considers subject to the mitigation measures – pardon me – subject to the mitigation measures noise impacts can be managed and mitigated when they are necessary.

I will now hand over to Karen to conclude.

MS HARRAGON: Thank you for that Matt. So I am just going to conclude on behalf of the department's presentation. There were some earlier questions I noticed that we have been successful in getting our executive director's signature to and I have actually provided those to the secretariat. I am going to go through some of those answers, whether there is value in actually having that document in front of the Commissioner's, I will allow the secretariat to make that call. So I'll just do our summary and conclusion.

So overall the department concludes the impacts of the development are acceptable and they believe that they can be appropriately managed or mitigated through the implementation of the recommended conditions of consent. So in summary, the department considers that the proposal is in the public interests as it would provide for contemporary teaching and learning facilities and adaptable and collaborative learning spaces to improve education outcomes. In addition it would generate between 180 and 690 construction jobs.

I am just going to briefly talk further about the demolition of Wilkinson House. The department takes very seriously any proposals where a contributory item is being demolished as part of a proposal and it certainly sought more detailed and more technical information to support the applicant's position that there was no other option other than to demolish that.

So the options analysis submitted in support of the application demonstrated to the department's satisfaction that the demolition of Wilkinson House is the most appropriate beneficial outcome for the site and the heritage impact of the demolition of the existing building was acceptable given the circumstances of the case and the overall benefits to the community.

The department has concluded that the proposed form and the skull of the development is acceptable in the context of the existing site, the surrounding development and the site constraints. The department acknowledges that there was significant modifications to the project that the applicant undertook moving from the EIS proposals through to the RTS and they in themselves considerably address issues that the department had raised and also the community had raised when the EIS was first exhibited.

So that probably draws to the conclusion our actual presentation. Would the IPC like me to run through the questions I noticed that we had received? Hello? Sorry?

MR JAMES: Yeah, no, Karen, we would appreciate that thank you.

MS HARRAGON: Okay. So I am just going to quickly get that up on my screen.

MR JAMES: Yep, Chris, Helen, sorry Brad speaking. I have just forwarded through the department's response so you should have that in your email now.

MS HARRAGON: And apologies, the department was really hoping to have got that to you yesterday so you could have the opportunity to review it and if necessary ask us further questions. However, we'll go through that item by item.

5 So the query regarding number one in relation to the number of remaining examples of Wilkinson House type architecture, the department is unaware of how many in the buildings from that period remain or where they are. So in relation - - -

10 MR WILSON: So Karen, we have – just let me interrupt, sorry – we have asked that question of the applicant as well and we got a very detailed response so - - -

MS HARRAGON: Okay.

15 MR WILSON: - - - I – we are happy with that so.

MS HARRAGON: Thank you.

MR WILSON: Yeah, continue.

20 MS HARRAGON: Okay. So the second question relates to the competitive design requirements that are embedded in the Sydney LEP. So the query was in relation to the threshold issues. So it's just appropriate for us to make a statement here in relation to – the council's view is that the threshold matter is still a relevant matter. The department's view is that the provisions of the education SEPP specifically turn
25 off the requirements to undertake the competitive design requirement process. So in that respect you know, we just want to draw a difference to that position because we don't believe it is a CIV threshold issue at all and the department has been given legal advice to that extent as well. We also ensure that the applicant received its own legal advice in relation to that as well.

30 So notwithstanding the question regarding competitive design process, we also thought it would be appropriate to just talk about the commitments that the applicant has made even though the competitive design process has been turned off. So in section 6.2.3 of the department's assessment report we make mention to the
35 applicant's commitment to continuing and pursuing a regress design process in relation to the envelopes and the buildings that are going to be delivered within the envelopes, and this includes design guidelines and development perimeters to guide the design of future buildings.

40 The department's confident in signing off on its assessment reports that the buildings shown in figures 10, 11, and 24 of the assessment report are each capable of achieving design excellence in relation to the delivery of indicative – in relation to buildings within those envelopes.

45 Specifically in relation to the stage one works, the department supports the design of the proposed redevelopment of Wilkinson House. The department's assessment report concluded that the Wilkinson House replacement building achieved design

excellence and resulted in a building which had been designed and articulated to appropriate fit within the serving context without having an adverse impact on the character of the locality.

5 So I am now going to move to question three from the Commission: Did the department independently verify view loss concerns, particularly for the level two viewed from the Horizon units?

10 PROF LOCHHEAD: Sorry, can I just ask - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yeah sorry?

15 PROF LOCHHEAD: Sorry Karen, can I just ask a question? Just in your – the first paragraph where it says “concept proposal”, it says it’s “committed to a regressed design process which includes consideration of the SLEP design excellence criteria for all buildings notwithstanding the do not strictly apply to the project.” So when you said the project, are you talking about the Wilkinson building or what are you talking about?

20 MS HARRAGON: So any school application that’s been delivered under the education step there is a clause that actually turns off the requirement to undertake competitive design process in relation to developments over a particular CIV. So there’s been an ongoing dispute of that by Sydney City Council who believe that the education step does not turn off the competitive design process and they have been
25 pursuing this as being - - -

30 PROF LOCHHEAD: No I understand, I just don’t understand what you’ve written. It says – I understand that but I don’t understand what you’ve written. It says, “the applicant is committed to a regressed design process which includes consideration of the SLEP design excellence criteria for all buildings notwithstanding they did not strictly apply to the project.” So are you saying – I mean, so I’m not quite sure what you’re saying.

35 MS HARRAGON: I do understand what you’re asking for. So – and it might be that we can provide a little bit more detail. So we’re suggesting that if a competitive design process had been pursued there were a series of process – or there is a series of design criteria for buildings to have met as part of that process, so whilst - - -

40 PROF LOCHHEAD: All right, so okay, so because it’s switched off they’ll not apply to this project but notwithstanding that they have got their own design guidelines to guide the - - -

45 MS HARRAGON: They still followed, yeah, they still followed the framework in terms of the approach of design excellence.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: There's just not a competition that's part of that process.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay, thanks.

5 MS HARRAGON: Okay. So item 3, the view loss. So Matt did go into a little bit
more detail around the tenacity principals that were undertaken by the applicant.
One of the improvements delivered by the RTS was significantly reduced building
envelopes for one of the buildings that you know, had the potential to impact the
greatest, so we've not undertaken an independent review. We're comfortable that
10 the built envelope and the impacts of a future development assessment are sufficient
to enable it to be supported as it stands at the moment.

Okay so item 4, we've just provided a little bit more detail regarding noise and traffic
and Prity can speak to some of those so I probably will just take that and leave that as
15 – for the Commission to read any further detail. It's a summary of some of the
information that Prity just provided in our presentation.

Okay so in relation to the adequacy of construction noise, we touched on that a little
bit earlier in relation to some of the most affected receivers. So we have detailed
20 here some of the conditions that we believe will appropriately manage and mitigate
those impacts. We also wanted to draw attention specifically to the stage one works
and the mitigation noise measures that the applicant has proposed as part of their
implementation plan, and these include the installation of a 2.4 metre boarding
around the construction site, selection of the quietest visible construction equipment,
25 and the provision of respite periods. As part of the conditions set that were
recommending there is a need for a construction environmental management plan
and a construction noise vibration management plan to refine the noise mitigation
measures, and so those conditions are listed there for the Commission.

30 So in respect of specifically vibration, we again draw attention to that construction
noise vibration management condition that's referred to in the concept proposal and
there's also vibration criteria which are to be applied to the building of the stage one
works to ensure that the impacts of adjacent buildings are not detrimental. So we
have provided references to those conditions that have been recommended including
35 the need for a dilapidation report. Then in particular we would like to focus on the
specialised engineer's report that will be required to manage vibration impacts during
construction and that's a fairly non-standard condition and that's been in, but that has
been imposed on this project in recognition of the potential impacts and the
proximity of buildings and potentially there being buildings that are more sensitive to
40 vibrations in this locality.

So thank you for the opportunity to present today. Are there any other questions
that the department can assist with?

45 MR WILSON: Yeah. We have got a question on the conservation works. Heather,
do you want to ask that question?

MS WARTON: Yeah, sorry Heather Warton, you made mention of the public benefit of the conservation works to the Barham Building, but I note that that's in the concept part of the application and not the stage DA. What assurance or guarantee or – I couldn't see any conditions to ensure that that public benefit part of the application would ever, would ever proceed. Presumably they'd lodge a DA, a
5 separate DA for the multi-purpose building, they could just lodge a separate DA for the admin building, but there's nothing to actually ensure that the conservation works which has been considered in the mix of your assessment will ever happen.

10 MS HARRAGON: I do recall we queried the applicant on that matter and look unfortunately I can't recall the justification as to why those works would be prioritised. So can I take that on notice to come back to the advice that we receive from the applicant? But I also recommend that that advice be provided directly to the IPC from the applicant.

15 MR WILSON: Yeah that's fine Karen.

MS WARTON: Sure.

20 MR WILSON: Helen?

PROF LOCHHEAD: Sorry, am I on mute? Sorry.

MR WILSON: No, we can hear you. No, you're on mute now.
25

PROF LOCHHEAD: Sorry. My main – I had a question essentially about the views from the public domain and in the first presentation you noted that you wouldn't actually see the increase bulk from the public domain but I question that on what basis you made that assessment?

30 MR JAMES: So could you just explain that a little bit more in terms of the - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: You're talking about the visual impact of the new development from the public domain so it was set back and it wouldn't be visible
35 from the public domain. It clearly would be visible from the public domain because the existing buildings which are set back quite a long way have a significant visual presence so on what basis did you make that comment and why do you think that's the case?

40 MR ROSEL: I don't recall saying it wouldn't be visible from the public domain. In terms of Wilkinson House they are of a similar scale. In terms of the multi-purpose building it's of a - - -

45 PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes, the multi-purpose building on Bourke Street, I think that was the comment you're making with regard to it because it was stepping back.

MR ROSEL: That's right. So it's proposing to have a street wall height that matches very closely to the existing terraced buildings. It is closer to the street but it takes its queue point from that terrace house. It's then set back before rising up to a height which is less than the existing building which is the old library building and old science building there. So it's not that it won't be visible, it certainly will be visible, it's just that it's scale is different, it's articulated and set back differently and overall in the department's opinion it's a good response to that part of the site.

10 PROF LOCHHEAD: Okay.

MR WILSON: Karen, if we just go back to the multi-purpose building, obviously it's just a concept envelope at this stage but the department's report I think articulated that there were many ancillary functions, similar to what we do wishes, but it's not addressed anywhere in the report, probably because it's a concept plan but is that something that will need to be considered in the future?

MS HARRAGON: Yes, it would need to be considered in more detail in the future and we'd certainly be mindful at the time of that assessment in terms of the level of scrutiny that the expectation is now being placed on for all the department's applications for schools as a result of the previous discussions on other projects with IPC. We recognise and understand the need to specify out each of the sorts of activities that would occur in there and who would occupy – who would have those uses and for what sort of times. We could if the Commission was of the mind put down a recommended condition around the level of detail that should accompany that application.

MR WILSON: It's just that yesterday in their presentation the applicant said that the roof tops would not be – would only be used during school time so whatever school time is, nine to three, but you know, we all know how valuable those roof top terraces and so forth are in terms of holding events and so forth. So look it might be something to consider yeah?

MS HARRAGON: Yes, we can take that on board.

35 PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah I would agree with that. The other issues that we talked about was understanding it's a school and it's got quite prescriptive kinds of uses, it would be good to understand notwithstanding what you said earlier that you think it's not too bulky, I think it's much more bulky than the current development because of its proximity to the street, and it would be good to understand the programme accommodated within that envelope because for example, if there's a number of smaller spaces which could be arranged in a different way or distributed in a much more fluid way that could actually go some way to mitigating the bulk of that building and its proximity to the street if smaller spaces can be carved up.

45 If it's for example one big auditorium space or a gymnasium space which has very, very prescribed dimensions which doesn't enable that, I could understand that it pretty much has to fill that envelope to fit in. So, that sort of programmatic brief

would really help us understand where things might be able to be massaged to just ease that tiering up, because they do note that it does actually not comply with the DCP set backs and it may be that in some places it could better set back from the street to diminish the bulk and scale. So that's a question as much as anything.

5

MS HARRAGON: So does the Commission think that they would view this by getting further information from the applicant around that functionality issue for the envelope or do you think additionally that the applicant be asked to provide the evidence base for why the built form outcomes need to be delivered under the next application? Obviously there's a risk involved in that evidence based coming at the later stage and in some ways the applicant feeling that the envelope is you know, already a done deal. Is there – because we – the department can assist in either of those options.

10

15 PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah, and I - - -

MR WILSON: So, I'll - - -

PROF LOCHHEAD: Sorry, it looks quite detailed to me, it's not just an envelope, you know like a blocking diagram that you might use in a planning document, it looks quite like – quite a detailed design, so I would suggest that they probably have got more detailed plans and they just haven't provided them because they're not necessary for this application.

20

MS HARRAGON: I would think that they've had very detailed consideration of their needs undertaken and I would agree with you that I would think their thoughts around the delivery of the space within that envelope is probably well advanced.

25

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yes. And you know, completely understandable, but if it's really water tight, you know, it's vacuum packed, then that's important for us to appreciate, but if it looks like it's quite a flexible space and it could be configured in a different way to you know, at the moment it's like the street wall, get that, but then there's another street wall and another street wall sort of you know, tiered up in a very prescriptive wedding cake way and it may be that there's a bit of flexibility in those upper levels which would reduce the kind of bulk.

30

35

MS HARRAGON: Can I maybe ask the Commission to turn to part B and look at page three because this might help articulate that particular element of that envelope? So that's the diagram which is called figure two on page three.

40

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah, yeah.

MS HARRAGON: And so that building envelope – so what I'm understanding is that in particular there's an expectation or a request for a more detailed justification for those – that area of exceedance, not necessarily just for that exceedance but how that building's delivering particularly to that elevation - - -

45

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: - - - to warrant why in this instance that exceedance is justified on the basis of you know, so there's different ways of looking at it as the IPC would be aware, there's looking at it in terms of what is the level of impact, but what we're
5 wanting to have from the applicant is more certainty around why there were no other options other than for this exceedance to deliver the same functions and objectives that they were looking for, for the school site.

10 PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah, yeah.

MR WILSON: So, I'll just add to that. I think what we need to understand, and we raised this with the applicant, is the functionality of that building and that space. While we do understand that it's less of an impact in terms of height and so forth in
15 that area, you know, we just need to understand the functionality of the building which warrants it still – its ongoing non-compliance. Does that make sense? That's basically what we're trying to find out isn't it Helen?

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah. And also a better – just a more nuance design solution in the longer term. So if we block that envelope in, we're pretty much locking in that building form whereas if in fact there is a bit of wriggle room perhaps the envelope could be more compliant or compliant and then that wouldn't you know, enable a different longer term solution. I think equally when we looked at Wilkinson House and the very detailed analysis they did of their options, it actually demonstrated that
20 the retention of the façade was quite easy to be able to be accommodated or you know, partial retention was able to be accommodated. You know, that was a choice that they made. So it did actually help us understand what the programmatic drivers were as much as the constructability, drivers, and those sorts of things.

30 MS HARRAGON: So would it assist if the department worked with the secretariat in terms of better detailing what that additional information is being asked to – the applicant to provide? To close out some of that justification to support their variations for the multi-purpose building?

35 PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah, I mean I think it doesn't necessarily have to be so pointed because I can guarantee they're going to do – I think it would be useful to ask them for the planning of those – the internal planning of those buildings to explain the programmatic requirement for that envelope.

40 MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MR WILSON: Yeah, a reasonable request.

MS HARRAGON: I can understand that.
45

PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah. And if you know, if it's three gymnasiums on top of each other, well then maybe that has to look exactly like that but if it's you know, a

lot of smaller spaces added together, they could be added together in a slightly different way. I guess my assessment, but I don't know and I can't say it, I can't say what's possible without knowing what's driving it.

5 MS HARRAGON: Yep. And so what we're needing to understand is what are the drivers that delivered that floor plate? That the envelope that would be to support
- - -

10 PROF LOCHHEAD: Yeah, what's the internal programme of the building?

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Do they have any indicative floor plans that they have developed for that building that we could – that they could share?

15 MS HARRAGON: Yep. And we can certainly assist the IPC in seeking that information.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Thank you.

20 MR WILSON: So I don't have any further questions at this stage. Helen, do you have any?

PROF LOCHHEAD: No. No. I'm fine.

25 MR WILSON: Well, that's it. Thank you very much. Brad, are there any administrative things we need to address?

MR JAMES: No matters that I can think of Chris.

30 MR WILSON: OK. Well then, we thank you very much for attending this meeting.

MS HARRAGON: Thank you.

35 MR WILSON: Thanks. Bye.

PROF LOCHHEAD: Bye, thank you.

MR WILSON: So Helen, I wasn't – I didn't impede your question did I?

40 PROF LOCHHEAD: No. I - - -

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[4.26 pm]