



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-1383165

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH APPLICANT

RE: BLUE GUM COMMUNITY SCHOOL

PANEL: **PETER DUNCAN (CHAIR)**
ADRIAN PILTON

OFFICE OF THE IPC: **JANE ANDERSON**
CASEY JOSHUA

APPLICANTS: **JILL McLACHLAN**
MAUREEN HARTUNG OAM
RUTH O'BRIEN
JEFF MEAD
JARROD LAMSHED
CHRIS PALMER
PAUL RAPPOPORT
WAYNE TUCKER
ANDREW MORTON
NOEL CHILD

LOCATION: **VIDEO CONFERENCE**

DATE: **1.00 PM, THURSDAY, 4 FEBRUARY 2021**

MR P. DUNCAN: Good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the lands on which we meet and pay my respects to Elders past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today for the Blue Gum Community School Project. Blue Gum Community School seeks
5 approval for the adaptive reuse of a heritage listed dwelling, Mount Errington, as a new preschool and primary school for up to 80 students and nine staff. My name is Peter Duncan. I'm the chair of this Commission panel. I'm joined by my fellow Commissioner, Adrian Pilton. We're also joined by Jane Anderson and Casey Joshua from the Officer of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interests of
10 openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a full transcript will be provided and made available on the Commission's website.

This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will
15 from one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination. It's important for Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. However, 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
20 our website. I request that all members here today introduce yourselves before speaking the first time and if you could please ensure you don't speak over the top of each or ourselves just to ensure we get clarity on the transcript. Thank you again for being here and we will now begin. Is it Jill? Are you going to lead the discussion, Jill?

25 MS J. McLACHLAN: I think I'm actually going to hand it over to Ruth, but I'm happy to introduce who is here from our team.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. And if we could sort of plan on finishing – you know, leave
30 a few minutes. We've got an hour but if we can leave a few minutes at the end of questions? Okay? I don't know how much you've got to present, but we've given you a range of matters which is, you know, pretty well along the lines of presentation, I assume, if we just allow for some additional questions at the end, if
35 that's okay?

MS McLACHLAN: Of course.

MR DUNCAN: Over to you, Jill.

40 MS McLACHLAN: I'm noticing there's a bit of stereo there. Please let me know if I need to pull my headphones out. It might be better without. But do let me know if there's a problem with the audio. Well, we've got here today, in response to the agenda, we've got a full team here today, which is great, so at different points, as
45 specialist advice is needed. I represent Best Practice Education Group with Maureen Hartung, who is here with me. I am the New South Wales Education Director and the person with the responsibility over the management of the project itself in New

South Wales. Maureen is the executive director of Best Practice Education Group and the principal of our school in the ACT – preschools and school in the ACT. Also here is Ruth O'Brien from Planning Ingenuity, who I will hand over to in a moment, who is part of – is our town planner, along with Jeff Mead, who is not able to be with us today, although he may pop in. I'm not sure.

We've also got Jarrod Lamshed here from Armada Architects, who is the lead architect on the project. Chris Palmer for traffic, with Varga Traffic Planning. Paul Rappoport, and I believe that's Lauren, if I'm looking correctly in the picture, from Heritage 21, our heritage consultancy team. Wayne Tucker from Australia Bushfire Consulting Services. Andrew Morton, our arborist. And Dr Noel Child is here, too, who has played the role as our acoustic consultant and also with sight investigation matters. So I can – I'm not sure if it's best, Peter, to pass back to you or to Ruth, but we're happy to just work through the agenda as you see fit today and respond as needed to those issues that have been raised.

MR DUNCAN: Jill, I think just work through the agenda, please. That will be good.

MS McLACHLAN: Okay. So in terms of the applicant response, I'm actually going to hand that over to Ruth to lead us through that section of the agenda.

MS O'BRIEN: Hello. So Ruth O'Brien, Planning Ingenuity. I think we're quite happy to be here, especially Jill and Maureen, after going through a bit of process already with council going through a DA, so very happy to be at this point. So in terms of the Department's assessment, we support that assessment, which has concluded the proposal is in the public interest and that the impacts are – there are some impacts but they are acceptable and they can be managed by the conditions of consent that the Department has recommended.

Overall, I guess the key was that – I mean, the proposal, they've recognised that the proposal allows for the adaptive reuse of Mount Errington as a heritage item and will facilitate its ongoing conservation and recognising – the Department has recognised the project will be in the public interest, providing a range of benefits, including the provision of a new school and preschool for the Hornsby LGA and, I mean, in terms of our overall agreement with the Department's assessment reflects the approach taken by, and led by the school in particular, and the consultant team has been working on this basis just to really work to minimise the impacts and respect the heritage item and create a community – a school for the community.

And in terms of the process we've been through to look at those impacts, we considered in – there were a number of submissions, obviously, is why it has gone to the IPC. We have looked at those very closely and also the comments from the Department and GMLs, the heritage – the independent heritage assessment, and we went through quite a process of looking at different options we might be able to do on the site. That included options such as reducing the car parking such that we could retain more of the garden in the back. So hopefully you had a good look at that

in the response to submissions. If you want us to go through that, we can a bit later on just to outline that, but we are balancing all that. So the key items were the heritage and traffic impacts and that to try to balance those impacts. So we believe, after looking at all those options, we've come up with the best outcome for the site.

5 We have requested a few changes to the conditions of consent which we can go over in a moment, and I would like the IPC to consider and adopt those changes. The applicant would be happy to accept the conditions which are deemed appropriate.

MR DUNCAN: Just on that, we've received those and they're actually on our website. So we've published them from a transparency point of view, so they will be part of our consideration.

MS O'BRIEN: So in terms of – would you like – that's one of the items here. Should I go through those now, just a bit of an outline?

15 MR DUNCAN: Yes, just – I think don't cover – don't feel you have to cover everything but go to the pertinent points, yes. That would be helpful. Thank you.

MS O'BRIEN: Okay. Well, as I mentioned, there's only, I think, about seven conditions, so we won't labour them too extensively. The first one is about the external fire stair. I mean this is just a minor comment. The condition says that it should match the dwelling, which is the lighter colour. So we would just like that to be – it was purposely chosen as a darker colour to match the roof and to appear recessive so to – you know, from a heritage impact perspective.

20 MR DUNCAN: That issue – we discussed that issue this morning with the council's heritage planner as well.

MS O'BRIEN: Right.

30 MR DUNCAN: So we've covered that. So keep going.

MS O'BRIEN: Okay. Perfect. The next one is about the heritage interpretation strategy. Just to request the timing of that to be after – three months after operation because we wanted to – at the moment it says construction. So we just want – the purpose was to get the school operating and then the staff, and community and students in the preparation of that strategy. So, again, fairly minor, but if we could change that, it would be great. The next one was in relation to the operational management plan, but the key thing there was about the hours of operation, so I might just address that in the next comment. Well, actually, the next condition is about contamination.

45 This is one where – so we've provided with the application the report by Noel Childs, NG Child & Associates, which included soil sampling and identified that the site is suitable for the educational use. So we would just like to see – there seems to be a double-up in requiring another level of reporting to do the same thing. So, if possible, we would like to – and there's other conditions which address those

contamination matters. So, if possible, we would like to see that one deleted because it's covered elsewhere.

5 And then the more key one is the operational hours. So we recognise the condition refers to operational hours, so talking about the standard operational hours of the school. So we would just like to add some clarity for that to say outside of those hours there will be ancillary school use, including things like teacher preparation and setting up for the day. So I guess we don't want the neighbours to sort of just pin down to those hours and then maybe have concerns when there's people on site
10 slightly before that. So we're just seeking a bit of clarification around those hours in the condition. And, yes, in terms, also, the no use on weekends, that could also be construed as sort of removing any use of the grounds on the weekends. So if we could clarify that as well.

15 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS O'BRIEN: And then the last one was about the green travel plan which, again, it's not a deal-breaker, if you like, but, it's with the size of the school that it's going to mostly for the staff but, again, happy to prepare one, if that's required.

20

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Well, we will note those comments and take those comments into consideration in our deliberations. Okay?

MS O'BRIEN: Great. Thank you very much. So, then, in terms of – so you've listed a few matters on your agenda. Was that – we read that that you were asking questions but I guess in terms of – we could go over those matters a little bit to start with.

25

MR DUNCAN: You've provided us a short document on this school operation and the model, haven't you?

30

MS O'BRIEN: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: So we've got that. I'm not sure we need to repeat anything there, but I think the other five matters probably are worth some discussion: traffic, heritage, bushfire management in particular, and associated tree removal, noise matters. So they're probably the key areas.

35

MS O'BRIEN: And would you – did you have particular questions on those matters?

40

MR DUNCAN: Not necessarily. We just wanted to confirm that everything that's in the assessment – and you've done that very broadly – that you're comfortable with, the traffic conditions and traffic matters and things like that. Heritage matters, you've raised one point about the handrail and the colours. Probably the area that we would like to have a discussion is the bushfire management, and particularly the issue of tree removal associated with that process.

45

MS O'BRIEN: Well, perhaps we do – I mean, we're happy to sort of maybe just touch briefly on each of those bullet points and then, if you have anything in particular, we could address them at those times.

5 MR DUNCAN: That would be good. Thank you.

MS O'BRIEN: Okay. So for school operations, as you said, you've received the document sent by Jill, but I think Jill just has a couple of overview comments on that as well.

10

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thank you.

MS McLACHLAN: Thanks, Ruth. I won't reiterate a lot, except we felt it gave a bit of a better/broad understanding of the school to give you a bigger document but it would have been a bit much to labour during the meeting today. In addition to what that document outlines in terms of our approach to learning, we also just wanted to clarify around the structure, that the way in which we see the school being structured on the site is that on the ground floor of the building would be the two preschool classes, which would be two classes of 16. Each of those classes would have both an early childhood educator as well as a second educator in the room, either a diploma or a cert III trained person. So there will be four staff associated with those 32 children on the ground floor.

We've also allocated one of the rooms on the ground floor for our youngest children in the pre- – primary school, excuse me, the kindergarten children. And, again, we very intentionally have small class sizes. So that is a class group of 16 with one teacher. On the first floor, it's a combined use in that the kindergarten children would, at times, be able to make use. We're planning on having library resources in a – if you can imagine we're a much smaller school and so the library looks more like what a library in your home might look like. It's more like a couple of couches and a great big, gorgeous bookshelf, and a place to sit with some friends and read. That would be a space that we would see being used at different times of the day by any of the 48 children in the primary school, but that zone upstairs will be predominantly for our year 1 and 2 children, and that would be with two teachers overseeing that.

Probably worth mentioning, with our approach there's a very strong emphasis on small group work, and one of the things that appealed to us greatly about the house for both the preschool and the primary school is that the rooms allow us to develop those spaces for particular styles and types of learning. So, for example, rather than setting up each of those spaces upstairs in a traditional classroom style, there will probably be one room that had more typical desks and a whiteboard where a small group of maybe 10 or 12 children might be working on a specific topic with a teacher in a more teacher-directed way, but another space might be more of an art studio area where there's different sorts of learning going on in those places. So we see those different rooms as being different hubs for the year 1 and 2 children upstairs with a

central meeting in the middle of that space. So it's a fairly flexible arrangement for us but very suitable to our particular model of education.

5 The only thing that we were also going to mention in terms of the question around outdoor, the way in which we approach learning outdoors, we certainly value the outdoors as a really important aspect in children's learning but certainly we're probably more typical in terms of the outdoor play expectations for the site itself do line up with what you will see in, I think it's table 6.7 of the acoustic report, which outlines what we have worked on as a typical kind of indicative involvement of children in outdoor play. So we've tried as much as possible, given the residential position of the school, to try and give an indication of what would be expected on a typical day.

15 And then the only other comment around typical hours was just wanting to clarify that though absolutely the operational hours of the school sit between 8 am and 6 pm, as you would understand, teachers would typically – we would have at least one person arriving – this is a bit of a guess, but around 7.30 in the morning, you can imagine someone is coming in, unlocking the doors, getting everything set up, checking the outdoor area for safety, children then arriving from 8 o'clock. And typically in the afternoon, teachers do like to leave when the door shuts at 6 o'clock with the children, if they can. But, as you can imagine, with duty of care, if a parent wasn't to turn up right on 6 o'clock, we obviously can't leave the building at that time, and also there are times when a teacher might want to do some packing up or things.

25 So we just wanted to clarify that we had, I guess, some grace around – we interpreted operational hours from our education lens, I suppose you could say, as when the children are in the building and when we are actually doing the work of education in the site itself. So we just wanted to make sure that, with the consent conditions, there was a reasonable amount of grace on either side of that to make sure – for example, if there was a plumbing issue that was not suitable to address during the week and we needed to have someone come in on a Saturday, we just wanted to make sure there was flexibility for that kind of access at other times during the week. So I don't know if there's any other questions that I haven't addressed with that, but that's what I have prepared, but happy to take any questions beyond that.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. I think we understand what you mean with the hours issue. Adrian, do you have any questions on the operational model?

40 MR PILTON: No. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: All right. We will move through the other points then.

45 MS O'BRIEN: Okay. So traffic matters. We have Chris Palmer here. May I just give a short overview but, if there's particular questions, we've got Chris to respond. So just noting in the Department's assessment, they agreed that the surrounding road network had the capacity to accommodate the traffic and parking demand generated

by the school, subject to some conditions relating to traffic management which we've proposed in our model, such as left in and left out, and we're also proposing staggered drop-off and pick-up times for the children just to spread out the demand for the parking.

5

Yes, we noted the Department's assessment aligns with the comments from council and also Transport for New South Wales, who had no concerns in terms of traffic generation and parking. Obviously, the parking complies with the DCP requirements in terms of the number of carparks and having a drop-off facility. And, also, the carpark was purposely put in the rear of the site which the trees there are the lower significant trees which needed to be removed and also it has benefits. It's not visible from the street. So just an overview. If there was any particular questions you had in terms of traffic? Sorry. Just to mention - - -

10

15 MR DUNCAN: Sorry. You're breaking up a little there. I didn't catch that last bit.

MS O'BRIEN: So Jeff – Jeff Mead – is also in the room with me now.

20

MR DUNCAN: Hi, Jeff. How are you? I think there was a question just simply about how you're going to manage it on site with, you know, people all arriving at the one time, that sort of thing. If you could just explain that for us a little. Particularly, I guess, you will have two separate peaks, by the sound of it, with preschool and the primary school?

25

MS O'BRIEN: Correct. I might put this over to Jill, but, in general terms, we have got different hours for the operation. So it's the preschool starting at 8.30 and the school at 9 o'clock, and also having those staggered pick-up times in 10-minute blocks. But I might – Jill is very across the detail so I must just ask her, if that's okay, Jill, to - - -

30

MS McLACHLAN: That's fine. Actually, the preschool starts at 8 am. So rather than seeing it as two peak times, we hoped by staggering the beginning of the day, focusing on opening the preschool for preschool parents who actually need to park and come into the facility and sign in their children would be from the 8 o'clock mark in the morning. That meant that, at 9 o'clock, when the operation of the loop driveway was in action, we're not having any demand from parents who are wanting to actually get access into the carpark and out. So it was wanting to separate those two access purposes, I suppose. It's perhaps not the correct planning wording for it. But so the other end of the day was delaying the preschool pick-up to 3.30. So, again, at 3 o'clock, when the primary school is finished for the day, the opportunity is there for a full 20 to 30 minutes' worth of opportunity for the loop driveway to be staff-supervised and organised so that those parents could come through and a teacher would be on site to make sure that those children are helped into the vehicle, that parents stay within the vehicle.

45

And, of course, all of this could be documented into a traffic management approach, the benefit of that being that it helps parents go in and out. We're a very small

school and very family-oriented. We expect that we will have family groupings. The reason for extending the preschool day is that it makes it much easier for use then to ensure that a primary school child could be picked up at the same time, be delayed and have a later pick-up with their preschool sibling at the same time. So
5 we're hoping to actually limit the number of trips by being able to give more flexibility in family groupings for drop-offs and pick-ups across a day.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Okay, Jill. The one that we were thinking about and talking about this morning was how you were going to deal with preschool and drop-
10 offs and, you know, having to bring the children in. From your comments then, are you envisaging that they will actually park in the rear carpark and bring children in?

MS McLACHLAN: There would be allocated spots that would be temporary spots for parents to do that, to be able to come in. I suspect that, given that there is a lot of
15 available parking in the surrounding streets, that some preschool parents would choose to park on the streets surrounding the school and walk in, but it's hard to predict that ahead of time. Chris may have more to speak to you about the approach to that, but does that help clarify that, Peter?

MR DUNCAN: Yes, it does. It does. And, Adrian, does this cover your comments
20 from previous discussions?

MR PILTON: Sort of, yes. I'm just concerned, Jill, about the traffic plan shows six
25 vehicles can get into the drive strip but knowing, you know, very little children, they're not going to get out on their own. The mother or father will have to get them out, take them in, sign them in and all that kind of stuff. Will that not lead to a backup out onto Rosemead Street?

MS McLACHLAN: Well, certainly the preschool children wouldn't be a part of the
30 strategy of the loop driveway. The loop driveway kiss and collection zone that would be moving through the property would be only for the primary school children's pick-up. So you're right. The preschool children would have to be with a parent and parking and so that would be why we've tried to ensure that the access to that driveway is fully available to preschool families to come in and to park and to
35 move out during the day or access through the different pedestrian entries on either side – either boundary of the site.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: That's fine, Jill. Thanks very much. All right. I think that covers
40 - - -

MS McLACHLAN: Chris, did I miss anything? Sorry to interrupt, Peter. Did I – is
45 there anything that you would add to that that I've missed in the - - -

MR PALMER: No, Jill. I think that was everything. You covered it well.

MS McLACHLAN: Thank you. Sorry. Just wanted to check.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks for that. Heritage matters.

5 MS O'BRIEN: Heritage. Okay. So just to comment we have Paul Rappoport and
Lauren from Heritage 21 on standby. Just to note that, I guess, in formulating the
proposal, we did – there was the number of comments on heritage from Hornsby
Council, which, no doubt, you have been over with them. So we went through those
10 in a lot of detail, Jarrod, from an architectural perspective, to try and take those on
board as much as we could. So we did make quite a few changes in response to that,
such as repositioning the fire stairs to use an existing window opening, sort of
retaining some wall nibs or demolish wall, and we – in terms of the front gate and
posts was a key issue raised, so, there, we're replacing those with new gates because
15 we needed to widen the driveway slightly, but we're using that consistent style and
also adding a matching gate to the exit driveway. There's changing the front fence
from metal to a lower timber picket fencing. And we also went through a number of
– in our option analysis, we went through a number of options to see what we could
do in terms of retaining the trees of heritage significance. So, yes, Paul, whether you
20 would like to make a few comments overall on the heritage approach that has been
taken?

MR DUNCAN: Yes, and we - - -

MR RAPPOPORT: Yes. Thank you. If I may, I will be very brief. Okay. So we
25 have taken a cautious and considered approach to this design. We've been working
with Jill and the architect for at least what seems to be 18 months, but it might be
shorter than that. At all stages of that interaction with the client and the architect and
the sub-consultants, we have had uppermost in our minds the conservation of the
building, and that's important. All decisions have been based on the significance of
30 the heritage fabric with the aim of removing as little of that as possible. As far as we
see it, we have facilitated a new use while also conserving the heritage fabric, and we
have applied what we call maximum reversability, which means all the interventions
into the building, such as the attached fire stair, all of these things can be removed
without any damage to the heritage building, and that has been our approach with the
35 parking area, with the internal garden fences and the fire stair as well as the internal
fabric that we are dealing with.

And then, finally, I would like to say that as a result of this collective effort,
including the planning panel, I think that the net result will be positive to the heritage
40 item because it will expose a lot more of the local people and the users and visitors of
the building to the wonderful qualities of this incredible heritage building and its
garden setting.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Paul. That's helpful. Back to – just before we go,
45 Adrian, did you have any questions on heritage?

MR PILTON: No.

MR DUNCAN: We covered most of them this morning, didn't we?

MR PILTON: I'm happy.

5 MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thank you.

MS O'BRIEN: Okay. Bushfire management is the next item. So I believe the concerns that are raised on this was regarding the management of the site as an asset protection zone and in a protection area and that could require additional tree removal. So we have – we provided a detailed response on that matter from Wayne – Wayne Tucker from Australia Bushfire Consulting. So that was with the response to submissions, which confirms that additional tree removal is not required for bushfire management purposes. But, perhaps, Wayne, if you wouldn't mind maybe just providing – would you like a bit of elaboration on - - -

15 MR DUNCAN: We would like to talk to Wayne about it. Wayne, I think that's the key issue and whether the RFS in fact agrees with that issue in their process. So that was something that was raised this morning as well. So I would like to hear your view of that, Wayne, in line with – we've got the copy of the letter you sent on 29 October 2020.

MR TUCKER: Yes. Look, I've been through the landscape plan and I've worked with Andrew to monitor the tree removal/tree retention schedule. When combined with the site in the context of its considerable distance from a bushfire hazard, the performance of an asset protection zone has been functioning to protect the building. The ongoing management of the site will include removal of fallen leaf litter. Obviously significant trees will need to be inspected as part of a school's routine for dead-wooding and making sure that they're safe, and that all helps the ongoing management of the bushfire. The tree removal/tree retention plan meets the performance requirements of both the New South Wales rural fire document in planning for bushfire protection in that they refer to standards for asset protection zones as a complete guide to the APZ. So that document elaborates more about the intention is to reduce the fire impact and get the fire out of the Crown as it approaches the site, and we have 100 metres of roads and other properties that surround this site that provide that benefit to us as well.

MR DUNCAN: Adrian?

MR PILTON: Look, Wayne, I'm a little bit confused by all of your stuff because I've been reading through all the documents and there seems to be several contradictory things. I mean, for example, in your letter, you're talking about another document, the Standards for Asset, APZ, A Complete Guide, and you go on to talk about native trees and shrubs should be retained as clumps or islands and should maintain a covering of no more than 20 per cent of the area. I'm just wondering how that leads to the 15 per cent in the other document?

MR TUCKER: Adrian, and that's a very good question and it's one that's often asked amongst us consultants. The Rural Fire Service's response to the Department actually refers to that document in their APZ standards as well. So there is that conflict between the 15 and 20 per cent. We really need to look at what are we
5 trying to achieve, that some interlocking canopy is permissible as long as you don't have a continuous canopy connection from a hazard to an asset. There is significant canopy break, not just two to five metres, so that that's achieved as well. But I do acknowledge the conflict that you've raised, and it is in there and it is in the New South Wales Rural Fire Service's documents. All that aside, those technicalities, the
10 overall net result of what we're doing here is providing an asset protection zone that will protect the property from bushfire impact and improves the protection to the existing asset.

MR PILTON: Thank you. Are you happy – I don't know if you've seen the draft
15 conditions, was it A26, have you seen that one?

MR TUCKER: No. I have not seen the draft conditions. Sorry.

MR PILTON: If I just read it to you. It says:
20

From the start of building works and in perpetuity, the entire property must be managed as an IPA in accordance with the requirements of appendix 4 of the Planning for Bushfire Protection 2019.

25 That says to me that you absolutely have to comply with those things in appendix 4, two to five metres distance, crowns not touching and so on. The wording worries me a bit, that it's a little bit too prescriptive.

MR TUCKER: And, again, that's where appendix 4 actually says go to Standards to
30 Asset Protection Zones for a complete guide, and that's where – that document actually says retain trees in clumps. There is that discrepancy between the two documents and they both refer to each other, and I acknowledge that, but when we look at what we've got here, it's meeting the intention of those performance requirements and we have retained tree canopy in clumps or islands as per appendix
35 4 in the Standards for Asset Protection Zones. We've done that to preserve the significant trees. But we've also provided a better bushfire protection on site.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thanks.

40 MR TUCKER: And when established and the ongoing maintenance, I believe we meet that condition.

MR PILTON: Okay. I'm just wondering if, between you and Ruth, if you could
45 have a look at the wording of A26 and see if you can improve on it, if there's any changes you would like to make. If you're happy with it, could you let us know?

MR TUCKER: Yes. And, look, I'm comfortable that the consent conditions that require the retention of specific trees will – the Rural Fire Service's other policies, although not directly applicable to this land, that will ensure that you are retaining the trees that the Department intend to.

5

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks. Thanks, Wayne. We will do what we can to clarify things along the way as well. Okay. That probably brings us to tree removal itself. We've got Andrew Morton's report. I don't think – and we've covered it in the bushfire process as well. I don't think we need more on that, do we? Adrian, is there anything you wanted to ask?

10

15

MR PILTON: I've got no queries. I'm happy with Andrew's report.

MR DUNCAN: I am, too. All right. I guess the other question was raised about acoustics. Is there anything you want to add to that, Jill? We've got the report, so I don't think we need more at this stage.

20

MS McLACHLAN: No. We've sent an additional response through this morning to Jane. I'm sorry. We just got that to you today. No. We feel comfortable with what is out there. Very happy – I'm sure Noel is happy to field any questions that have come about. But, other than what has been provided, I don't have a - - -

25

MR DUNCAN: We will look at what has been sent through today as well. So we will certainly look at that and, if we need to, we can come back to you on that issue. Just rounding back to one point on traffic. It was mentioned this morning in the Department's discussion about you using marshals or people during the peak times. Are you actually planning on having teachers, or somebody, in that driveway area?

30

35

MS McLACHLAN: Yes. So I imagine, initially, there would be more than there would be long-term. I think it's one of those situations where we are going to have to start with a very rigorous approach so that we're planning for – it may be that, in our initial stages, we actually have someone at the front gate who's guiding people in and keeping an eye on what is happening on the street and then someone who is actually managing the processes on the site. I imagine it would be an evolving plan that as we see how it's working and what's needed we can adapt that. So as things move smoothly, it may be that, in the end, we actually have one teacher on duty, once people are used to that, who stands in the driveway in a very specific spot and guides traffic through.

40

45

One of the reasons that we have felt that this option of the circular drive on Rosemead Road offered us some additional benefits was the ability to keep an eye on the traffic on one side of our property. It's a much more manageable approach for us as a school if we have two teachers that are actually standing, working on making sure traffic is moving smoothly on that one roadside. It's a much more achievable task than having people trying to keep an eye on what is happening at an exit that's –

it's quite a distance. When you come on the site visit, you will see it's quite a distance from the entry on Rosemead Road to the Williams Street boundary. But, yes, absolutely, there would be a teacher on duty for the – and it may be that there needs to be more than one teacher on duty.

5

As is often the cases in schools, you end up with a much bigger team managing that process in term 1 at the beginning of a school year as people get used to the routine, and then it becomes quite a well-oiled machine and you find that actually it gets easier and easier as the year goes through, as new families get used to the process.

10 But we would be looking at scheduling the staggering in the afternoon. So rather just saying in 10-minute breaks with the pick-ups, it would also be that families would know what 10 minutes, “We would like you to arrive at 3 o'clock.

15 These families, we would like you to come for your pick-up at 3.10,” so that we're actually staggering the arrival to try and avoid a buildup of people in that period of time. We've seen that work successfully in Canberra. We've seen that work in other schools that we've been associated with and we feel confident that we can keep that as a priority. We are really very keen to keep good relationships with our neighbours and so it is not in our interest to have this part of our project fail. We actually want
20 this to work very efficiently and are going to work very hard to make sure that it does.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. I don't have any further questions at this stage. Adrian, do you have any?

25

MR PILTON: Just a small one about the waste collection. In your comments on the draft conditions you're saying that waste collection will be via council kerbside collection and you can't control the times. I got the impression from the council this morning they think you will have to have a commercial waste collection. Have you
30 talked to anyone about that?

MS McLACHLAN: I've had extensive conversations with council, actually, about that when we were working with Ben Jones in an earlier iteration of this DA. We looked at the amount of waste that we needed to collect and it seemed to fall within
35 the commercial services of the council. So we weren't looking at their residential pick-up as much as their commercial pick-up but it still uses the typical residential size bins. Of course, we would need more of them, as is outlined. At the moment, those times for the commercial pick-up for our particular street fall on a particular time during the week. They're pre-set for the commercial pick-up.

40

But we don't feel that we will be actually creating enough rubbish to require a larger scale arrangement or – the other benefit of using the commercial operation and more standard sized bins is it meant that we could store those bins in a more compact way. It also meant that we could protect the heritage façade by actually including it in a
45 more residential style structure for the bin around the garage area. We weren't wanting to put a large Skip bin anywhere in the carpark or anything like that. And one of the things that we pride ourselves on is trying to reduce waste as a school. So

we've put the worst case of scenario of the type of rubbish quantities that we think that we will create in the school and it came under what was considered acceptable in terms of using the commercial council pick-up and so that's where the reasoning is, I guess, behind that approach.

5

MR PILTON: Thank you.

MS McLACHLAN: No worries.

10 MR DUNCAN: Just rounding off, Jane or Casey, do you have any questions?

MS ANDERSON: Nothing from me, thanks, Peter.

MS JOSHUA: None from me either. Thanks.

15

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Jill, I think that's it from our point of view, but is there anything that you would like to wrap up with now? We've got planned, as you're aware, a site visit next Tuesday, I believe, and we have a public meeting coming up at the end of the month or start of March. Is there anything you want to add at this stage?

20

MS McLACHLAN: I think at this stage it's just to say thank you for the time that you've given to review it. We feel that the adaptive reuse of Mount Errington is a really hopeful project for the Hornsby area. We're a school that cares deeply about being positioned within the community and giving back to that community. We love the fact that the school is potentially going to be built in a building of such significance and, in a neighbourhood context, we actually see that as enormously beneficial for cross-generational interactions. We've had some early conversations with the manager of the retirement village that is on our eastern boundary about – we've been inspired, as many people have, by the ABCs work around – I can never remember the name of the program, but where pre-schoolers – interactions between pre-schoolers and retirees, bringing them together in different contexts. So I think it's a unique site.

25

30

35

We're really excited about the possibility and very present in our mind is how to approach this in a way that, you know, in the future people look back and go, "Actually this has actually enhanced the immediate area," rather than being something that has taken away. So that's our great hope and our intent to act in that way in whatever way we can. So, yes, and we're open, if there's any questions that come up between now and whenever, we're very happy to field those as they come up, if that's necessary. So please feel free to contact us with anything.

40

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. And Jane will continue to be in contact if we require anything. Could I also take the opportunity to thank you for your thorough presentation and all of your consultants attending today, and we will talk again, I believe, next Tuesday at the site visit.

45

MS McLACHLAN: We will look forward to seeing you there.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. At this point, I will close the meeting. Thank you.

5 MS McLACHLAN: Thanks.

MR MEAD: If I may, just as a procedural question for the site visit next Tuesday,
we just want to be very clear on how the Commission would like that to play out to
the extent of the interplay between objectors, ourselves and the Commission
10 members.

MR DUNCAN: Jane will probably be the contact. But just to confirm it, we see
these site visits as another piece of information collection by the Commission and,
really, it's for us to see the site. It's not another – if you like, another input of
15 general information. We actually usually invite observers to come along. In this
case, I think there will be four observers and, really, they're there to see, you know,
and to fulfil the transparency requirements of our process, and, really, from our point
of view, we just wish to understand and see the site well. We will see the issues,
such as fire management, traffic, obviously heritage in this case and the trees and the
20 building itself. So that we would be on site for a maximum of one hour, I would
imagine.

MR MEAD: Okay. Thank you.

25 MR DUNCAN: Jane, I think you will be in contact with further details before then
as well?

MS ANDERSON: Yes. Jeff, I've shared our site visit guidelines with Jill, so I can
share them with you as well, but it would be great if you could review those before
30 the site visit next Tuesday.

MS McLACHLAN: We've distributed them amounts all the attendees from our
team. So that's great. At the moment, for your reference, Ruth and Jarrod, myself
and Maureen will be there. But if bushfire management, if there's something where
35 you would actually like to speak to us on site, please just let us know. If there's
someone missing from that list that would be beneficial to be there, we would be
happy to see what we can accommodate.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. We will, Jill, and we don't suggest you need to bring
40 everybody along. We will bring - - -

MS McLACHLAN: Just like a good party.

MR DUNCAN: But under the COVID processes we need to keep things pretty tight
45 as well.

MS McLACHLAN: Of course.

MR DUNCAN: But we're just looking forward to seeing the site. Adrian and I spoke this morning. The context is really important to us, to actually see it.

MS McLACHLAN: Of course.

5

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thanks everybody for your time.

MR TUCKER: May I add, Jill, then, in the context of the bushfire management, it's just important that the site is looked at as what is proposed to be and the fuel management that will occur rather than just what's there at the time and the benefits that will have.

10

MR DUNCAN: We understand. Good point, Wayne. Okay. Look, thanks everybody, and I might ask the Commission participants to stay on the line, if that's okay. So thanks, everybody.

15

MR PILTON: Thank you.

MS McLACHLAN: Thank you.

20

MATTER ADJOURNED AT 1.48 PM INDEFINITELY