



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-1471357

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

ROSEVILLE COLLEGE, SPORT AND WELLBEING CENTRE PROJECT

MEETING WITH KU-RING-GAI COUNCIL

COMMISSION PANEL: PETER DUNCAN AM (CHAIR)
ADRIAN PILTON

OFFICE OF THE IPC: JANE ANDERSON

COUNCIL: SELWYN SEGALL
LEONA GOLDSTEIN

LOCATION: VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE

DATE: 3.31 PM, THURSDAY, 13 MAY 2021

MR P. DUNCAN: Good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin I'd like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to elders past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Roseville Sport and Wellbeing Centre Project currently before
5 the Commission for determination. The Anglican Schools Corporation, the Applicant, is seeking consent for the development of a new sport and wellbeing centre and expansion of the existing school campus at Roseville College which caters for students from kindergarten to year 12. The proposal for the new sport and wellbeing centre includes a new three level building comprising an indoor sports
10 pool, a gym, change facilities and amenities, general learning areas, rooftop sports courts, storage areas, basement car parking and landscaping works.

My name is Peter Duncan. I am the chair of the Commission Panel. I'm joined by my fellow Commissioner Adrian Pilton. We're also joined by Jane Anderson from
15 the Office of Independent Planning Commission.

In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part
20 of the Commission's consideration of the matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination and for information we had a site visit this morning, so we saw the site this morning with the Applicant and we had two community representatives there as well. It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees to clarify issues whenever it is
25 considered appropriate. If you're asked a question and not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide an information – an answer in writing which we will then put on the website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure that we do not speak over the top of each other to ensure the accuracy of the
30 transcript. We will now begin.

As I said before, welcome and I think over to you, Selwyn, to start with and we can then go into the issues on the agenda.

35 MR S. SEGALL: Sure. Thank you. My name's Selwyn Segall and I'm a development assessment team leader for our team and have been involved in this project for the last few years and I'll introduce you to our heritage adviser, Leona.

40 MS L. GOLDSTEIN: Leona Goldstein.

MR SEGALL: Leona is our heritage adviser. We've had of Council's other Departments like engineering and landscaping over the last two years. The – and a number of meetings have been held. So we're at a stage where the most recent set of amended plans and substantially looked at some of the previous issues such as the
45 setbacks to other residential areas, also the number of parking, the other stormwater

issues and those seem to have all been resolved. So at the moment it's now down to a much lower number of issues that we have.

5 MR DUNCAN: Okay. So that might be a – we might go straight to that and it's basically from what we can determine from your letter the issue of number 32, is it?

MR A. PILTON: 37.

10 MR DUNCAN: 37, sorry.

MR SEGALL: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: 37 Bancroft Avenue, isn't it?

15 MR SEGALL: Yes. It's the demolition of that contributory item in an HCA that's one major issue.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

20 MR SEGALL: And the other issue is the development not in keeping with to HCAs which are in very close vicinity to the school.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, yes. Okay. So do you want to talk a little bit about that for us from Council's point of view.

25 MR SEGALL: I'll just talk generally from a planning point of view and then Leona will get into a little more detail especially about the contributory heritage item in the HCA. So basically the school has been there a long time but the area is well-developed. It's unique. It's got these two – it's in the middle of these two HCAs
30 and the school obviously wishes to expand and the problem is, like you probably see at other locations, St Catherine's and Bronte and Knox up in North Wahroonga there's always a problem with local residents and schools that schools are needing to enlarge and provide greater facilities, however, when you try to put in such a large development it is you know, it is out of keeping with the local streetscape. I
35 think, you know, they've gone to some attempt to reduce the height and the bulk of the building but the Council still believes that it is still out of scale and not in keeping with the streetscape in general.

40 They have tried to attenuate it by increasing setbacks, by increasing landscaping, etcetera, by reducing the height of the top floor and like a sort of treatment. So – yes – that is still our concern that such, you know, a relatively large building, 60 metres long on Bancroft is out of character with the area. That's our major situation and our second major situation is the demolition of the item – I think the school board number 37 some years ago. It's a fine dwelling house. You know, knocking
45 down a contributory item is something which Council and our residents are totally against. So – yes. Those are the main issues and I'm happy to take questions from

you at a later stage. But I figure I'll call on maybe Leona to go into more detail about that number 37 Bancroft Avenue.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. That would be good. Thanks, Leona.

5

MS GOLDSTEIN: Okay. Well, number 37 Bancroft Avenue is a fairly intact building. It's a single storey painted face brick federation bungalow. It's got a hipped and gable form roof clad in terracotta tiles. It's also got other features: timber framed windows and timberwork at the front and a veranda and it's a typical bungalow that you get in Roseville. It's got similar setback to the neighbours. The only difference with this bungalow is at the rear it has a really large tennis court and a pool. So it's a very large lot and – but in the heritage controls, the Ku-ring-gai DCP, we have demolition controls and when a building's contributory, we don't allow demolition unless the building is, you know, in – it's totally in disrepair or, you know, it's got major structural issues and then in saying that they have to prove that that is the case.

Well, in this case this building is solid. There's nothing wrong with it. So it does go against that control. The other thing to talk about is, well, the new building as Selwyn has said, it's – it is out of scale with the whole area. I mean, they have – I agree that they've tried to remediate these problems but in saying that, it's mainly a residential area and really large building will – you know, it will have an impact. So, you know, we have controls for vicinity of heritage conservation areas which have regard for, you know, the impact of large buildings and how to – what you can do to make it work but in this case I think through landscaping, you know, they have tried. We've had a lot of discussions about that, how to make it fit in a lot better to the area but I think, you know, to sum up that it really is not going to fit in. So – and that's how the Council - - -

30 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS GOLDSTEIN: - - - regard – yes.

35 MR DUNCAN: Yes. So it's clearly the two levels: the heritage conservation area itself or the two of them and then, of course – yes – the removal of the building as well.

MS GOLDSTEIN: Yes, yes.

40 MR DUNCAN: You said it's a typical bungalow in the Roseville area. I guess - - -

MS GOLDSTEIN: Yes.

45 MR DUNCAN: - - - you mean in this conservation area.

MS GOLDSTEIN: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Is there anything special about it from the Council's point of view?

MS GOLDSTEIN: Look, it's not a heritage item, probably because it's not
outstanding but when I say that in Roseville because it's such a large area of intact
5 buildings interwar federation, we haven't really made a lot of heritage items in
Roseville. Only the very – the amazing, like, really stunning ones stand out. But if
this building was in a different suburb, it could be a heritage item. I'm trying to say
because it's in Roseville it's been just made a contributory building.

10 MR DUNCAN: Right. Okay. Adrian, have you got any questions on this?

MR PILTON: I don't have any questions. No.

MR DUNCAN: I think – yes. And I think Council's position is clear. We've got
15 the second letter or the letter on the – you know, that you've recently sent in so – in
to the Department. Can we maybe then continue the conversation on a couple of
other issues, if you don't mind. Probably for me, one is, you know, should
something proceed, traffic and car parking and residential amenity. Two issues: one
is the – if the proposal were to proceed, there's a landscape approach along the
20 eastern boundary. I think Council has suggested some very large trees on that
boundary. I assume, as you say, sort of ameliorate the scale of the building. Is that –
you know, in Council's view – have you got a view on what that would be, that
planting? Because I know the near neighbours there are concerned about
overshadowing and things like that from the trees themselves, you know, that almost
25 the screen that – it may cause some of the issues. Have you got a view on that?

MR SEGALL: I know that Jeff Bird our landscape officer looked at it in detail and
he was of a mind that – yes – they had gone a long way to improvement. I think
deciduous trees whereby in winter they will lose their leaves goes somewhat to
30 avoiding that issue. So is there enough space to plant larger trees in that sort of
setback and he was quite satisfied after a number of attempts that they had addressed
the – the setback and the situation between the residential area and the school.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. And the feeling was that they would be deciduous trees on
35 that boundary?

MR SEGALL: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Okay. I think that's fine at this stage from me. The second
40 point that I want to make a query about from Council's viewpoint, again, we're
assuming if this goes ahead, then there'll be – there's a laneway there, Recreation
Lane, where the current lawn tennis club is. At the end of that lane closest to the
school there's another littler lane going down into the park.

45 MR SEGALL: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: And when you look at Recreation Lane, it at this stage probably doesn't cater for pedestrians. So if there were a car park to come into there, there'd probably be some treatment required on that laneway. Would Council be – you know, if it were the case, would Council be interested in something like a shared way
5 or something like that to ensure pedestrian safety along there? I'm thinking more of the general community rather than the students because people would use that potentially to access that end of that park.

MR SEGALL: Yes. I think our engineers have looked into it and there are ways of
10 treating that sort of area towards the back of the site. Yes.

MR DUNCAN: There are ways? Is that what you're saying?

MR SEGALL: Yes.
15

MR DUNCAN: Sorry. Okay. All right. Well, they were two of the major questions that I had at this stage. Anything from you, Jane?

MS J. ANDERSON: No. I don't think so, Peter.
20

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Adrian?

MR PILTON: No. I have no comment.

MR DUNCAN: I think the only other issues were that, you know, again, in the Department's assessment they talked about green travel plans and things like that. I assume, again, they'd be the sorts of things that Council would fully support.
25

MR SEGALL: Yes.
30

MR DUNCAN: Okay. I think you've been quite clear on the major issues for Council at this stage. Is there anything else that you'd like to put on the record while we're talking?

MR SEGALL: I know the neighbours, the Bancroft Avenue residents obviously, you know, they are the most vocal and, you know, you could understand their point of view. So we're just mindful about the residents of Bancroft and the impact it'll have, you know, the change, etcetera. But as I said, you know, other schools, St Catherine's and Bronte, you know, Knox and Eversley and PLC, you know, schools
40 have had to change with the times and, you know, this is the one that we have schools in close vicinity of residential areas, it's always going to lead to, you know, not a satisfactory outcome for everyone basically.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. No. And we understand your position on that. I think we
45 have nothing more at this stage. Just probably to let you know we'll take the Department's assessment now and review that. Our role is determination not reassessment and we'll have a public meeting on the 27th of this month and under our

process we will have a determination at some stage towards the end of June. So that's the process we're going through. We've have a stie inspection. We've talked to the Applicant. Talked to the Department and yourselves now and we'll go through with the public meeting will be our next public step in the process.

5

MR SEGALL: The public meeting, I might just follow it but I believe Council won't be asked questions or won't be involved at that stage.

10 MR DUNCAN: We understand so and in that process it's likely that the Department will present – the Applicant will present and then it'll be whoever registers to present. It'll be online and you can follow it. You can go through the live link on our website.

15 MR SEGALL: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR SEGALL: Okay. Thank you very much.

20 MR DUNCAN: Well, thank you for your time today.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

25 MR SEGALL: Thank you.

MS GOLDSTEIN: Thank you.

MR PILTON: Leona, thank you.

30 MR DUNCAN: Okay. All the best. Thank you. Bye.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[3.48 pm]