



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-1471350

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

ROSEVILLE COLLEGE, SPORT AND WELLBEING CENTRE PROJECT

MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT

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

OFFICE OF THE IPC: JANE ANDERSON

**DEPARTMENT: KAREN HARRAGON
BRENT DEVINE
TAHLIA ALEXANDER**

LOCATION: VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE

DATE: 2.30 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 landscape works.

My name is Peter Duncan. I am the chair of the commission panel and 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 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 of the
20 Commission's consideration of the matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination. It is important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees to clarify issues whenever it is 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 any additional information
25 in writing which we'll 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 accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin.

30 Karen, we've got an agenda to work through, so I think we'll go straight to you and any opening statement then we work through the agenda.

MS K. HARRAGON: Thank you. Good afternoon. I – good afternoon, commissioners and officers of the Independent Planning Commission. I am Karen
35 Harragon, director of the social and infrastructure assessments at the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment and I am here with my colleagues today, Brent Devine and Tahlia Alexander, from the Independent Schools Infrastructure Assessment Team. So, I'm actually going to be sharing today the video so I – sorry – our slides so I'll just turn that on.

40

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MS HARRAGON: And I'll put that to full screen as well. Start the actual slide. The presentation today will outline the Department's approach to the assessment of
45 the SSD application for a new sport and wellbeing centre at Roseville College. The Applicant is a state significant development as it is a development for the purposes of

alterations or additions to an existing school with a capital investment value of more than 20 million. The proposal was referred to the Commission as Kur-ring-gai Council objected to the application and more than 50 public submissions by way of objection were received during the exhibition of the EIS.

5

The matters that are we going to focus on today include the key issues of concern that were raised in the submissions on the application including built form, heritage, residential amenity and traffic and parking and we are able to also respond to any other matters that the Commission may wish to discuss with us today. I am now going to ask Brent to provide a brief overview of the site and the proposed development and he will speak to the key issues that were considered in the Department's assessment. Thank you.

10

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

15

MR B. DEVINE: Thank you, Karen, and good afternoon, commissioners and members of the IPC secretariat. My name is Brent Devine and I'm a principal planner in the Schools Infrastructure Assessments Team. I'm going to start off today with a brief overview of the site and description of the school campus and as Karen mentioned, I'll summarise the key issues that were considered in the Department's assessment report. So, Roseville College is located in the suburb of Roseville in the Kur-ring-gai Local Government Area and is approximately nine kilometres north of the Sydney CBD. The site subject to this application consists of both the existing Roseville College school campus which is at 27 to 29 Bancroft Avenue and an additional adjoining residential property located at 37 Bancroft Avenue which was purchased by the school in 2016.

20

25

The existing school campus is zoned SV2 infrastructure and is subject to the controls under the Kur-ring-gai Local Centres LEP 2012. The adjoining land at 37 Bancroft Avenue is zoned R2 low density residential and is subject to the controls under the Kur-ring-gai LEP 2015. So this is an aerial view of the site with the subject school campus outlined in blue and this area is subject to the controls under the Kur-ring-gai Local Centres LEP. The adjacent residential property is outlined in red and this part of the site is subject to the controls under the Kur-ring-gai LEP 2015. The school itself caters for students in kindergarten to year 12 and has an approved maximum capacity of 1250 students up to the year 2030. At the time this application was lodged the school had 973 student enrolments and 135 full-time staff.

30

35

So this slide is just to show the existing buildings across the school campus. Probably the most prominent buildings on the site in terms of their size and scale would be the Joy Yeo Centre which is the school's performing arts centre and the adjoining multipurpose school hall which are located adjacent to Recreation Avenue. The student services building is another prominent building and this and this has frontage to Bancroft Avenue. The school also has an existing outdoor swimming pool and this is located beneath the Isobel Davies building which you may have seen onsite today.

40

45

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR DEVINE: Yes. The Applicant has advised the Department that the pool was constructed in 1973 and that this is now nearing the end of its operational lifespan.

5 So the extent of physical works to construct the proposed wellbeing centre is concentrated towards that north-eastern extent of the site and I'll provide a more detailed overview of the application and the works proposed in that area in just a moment. To provide a brief overview of the site's surrounding context, this slide shows that the site is predominantly a low to medium density residential area. The areas to the north, east and west are characterised by one and two storey residential dwellings with high density residential development concentrated to the south including four to five storey residential flat buildings along Victoria Street and Boundary Street.

15 The Roseville Lawn Tennis Club and Kur-ring-gai Arts Centre are located directly to the east and these facilities are accessed by Recreation Avenue which is a local road that's also used to access the school site. Roseville Train Station is shown there and it's approximately 400 metres walking distance to the west. We just put down a couple of site images, but you're probably familiar having been out on site yourself
20 but the image to the left is just the view from Bancroft Avenue where you can sort of just make out the existing sports courts and then in the background there you have the Joy Yeo Centre which, I think, is a fairly recent addition to the school campus. Well, in context to the other buildings on the site. And to the right, that shows Recreation Avenue extending off Victoria Street looking north-south and, again, the
25 Joy Yeo Centre is to the left and you have the Roseville Lawn Tennis Courts to the right there.

Okay. So just moving on to talk about the actual development itself, so the application submitted to the Department for the construction and operation of a three
30 level sport and wellbeing centre and this is proposed to include 48 basement car parking spaces over two basement levels, an eight lane, 25 metre indoor swimming pool with associated concourse and grandstand and this'll be located ground level, a strength and conditioning gym, nutrition and food technology space, general learning areas, storage and amenity space, end of trip facilities, mechanical plant, onsite
35 stormwater detention and rooftop sports courts. So to enable the construction of the development the application also seeks consent for tree removal, demolition of the school's existing outdoor sports courts, demolition of a dwelling and associated structures at 37 Bancroft Avenue as well as signage and landscaping.

40 I should also note that there's no increase to the approved student capacity as part of this application. The school's maximum capacity of 1,250 students was approved by Council as part of a previous DA in 2017. I'll now speak to the key issues that were raised by Kur-ring-gai Council and the community during the exhibition of the application and I'm going to start with the Department's assessment of the built
45 form. As I touched on earlier, the site is subject to different LEPs and consequently there are differing height and floor space ratios that apply to the application. The existing campus is not subject to a maximum height building control or a maximum FSR

control under the Kur-ring-gai Local Centres LEP. However, the north-eastern part of the site which comprises 37 Bancroft Avenue is subject to the controls under the Kur-ring-gai LEP 2015 and this includes a maximum building height control of 9.5 metres and a maximum FSR of .3 to 1.

5

The height of the development is to comprise three levels and be constructed to a maximum height of 9.05 metres and its south-eastern corner. The overall height of the building was reduced by the Applicant in its amended proposal submitted with the response to submissions and this ensured that the building would comply with the 9.5 metre height limit. The Department considers the height of the development to acceptable on the basis that it is compliant with the LEP controls. It would be constructed to a height that is lower than several of the existing school buildings including the adjacent Joy Yeo Centre and the multipurpose school hall. It would present as a one to two level development from Bancroft Avenue given that level 1 would be located below ground and the built form would be substantially setback from the Bancroft Avenue street frontage and to the adjacent residential development.

20

25

30

In terms of the floor space ratio, the Department – sorry – the development would exceed the maximum FSR control of .3 to 1 at the north-eastern part of the suite which applies to 37 Bancroft Avenue. In justifying the FSR exceedance, the Applicant noted that the design of the development would result in a large proportion of the building's GFA being located below the existing ground level, therefore resulting in a development that is of minimal bulk and scale. To further reduce the perception of bulk and scale, the Applicant's amended proposal increased the side boundary setback to 39 Bancroft Avenue to enable deep soil plantings and to allow for an appropriate landscaping response. It redesigned part of the level 3 built form to pull back the south-eastern corner of the building away from the eastern side boundary and it also remove the skillion roof along the eastern side of the rooftop sports courts.

35

40

And if I just talk to this slide here, you can see just that dashed red line was the extent of the original SSD design that was exhibited. In the Applicant's amended proposal, they've described it as pulling back the building and we – I think we described it in our assessment report as introducing a step-in height. So that just shows, I guess, the difference between the two proposals. So the Department's assessment concluded that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify contravening the FSR development standard given that a large proportion of the building's GFA would be located below ground level including all of level 1 which accounts for approximately 53 per cent of the building's total GFA and the development is considered to be consistent with the bulk, scale and density of existing buildings that are located across the campus more broadly.

45

So just to summarise the built form, the Department considered it to be appropriate for the site and would not have an unacceptable impact on the existing character of the surrounding locality. Okay. I'll move on to talk about heritage which was a key issue raised by the community and was also a point of objection raised in Council's

submission. So the key concerns in response to heritage related both to the demolition of the dwelling at 37 Bancroft Avenue and then the subsequent impacts of the new built form on the surrounding heritage conservation areas. This slide shows the location – the site location, rather, in context to the surrounding conservation areas including the Clanville Conservation Area which is outlined in red and covers a large portion of the suburb of Roseville and also part of Lindfield. The north-eastern part of the site which is the residential zone land encroaches just within this conservation area and this is indicated on the slide there.

5

10 The Lord Street/Bancroft Avenue is a separate conversation area which covers a much smaller area and this is outlined in green on the current slide. The site is not located within this area but, as you can see, it is directly adjoining. I think it's also important to note that the existing campus buildings are not listed at a state or local level nor is the existing dwelling at 37 Bancroft Avenue. So in terms of the heritage discussion today, I'm going to focus on the Department's consideration of the demolition of the dwelling at 37 Bancroft Avenue and that's show on this slide here and I'm sure you would have viewed it out on site today. The dwelling is identified as a contributory item to the Clanville Conservation Area and this was in response to an independent heritage review that was commissioned by Council in 2010. The Applicant's heritage impact statement that was prepared by Urbis and submitted with a EIS supported the demolition of the dwelling and this was primarily on the basis that it was located on the boundary of the heritage conservation area and that it was an unrefined example of a federation dwelling that has undergone various modifications that have diminished its aesthetic contribution.

15

20

25 The Department subsequently engaged MBRS Architecture to undertake a peer review of the findings of the Applicant's heritage impact statement and this was initiated following the exhibition of the EIS but also prior to receiving the amended proposal with the RTS. The peer review recommended that in order to demonstrate that the demolition of the dwelling was acceptable from a heritage perspective, further heritage analysis and assessment should be undertaken by the Applicant. It was also recommended that options for the retention of the adaptive reuse of the dwelling be put forward by the Applicant including reasoning as to why it's retention was not considered feasible. Our independent reviewer also provided a number of recommendations to reduce the heritage impact of the proposal should the application be approved as it was proposed in the EIS and these recommendations included increased building setbacks, screen plantings along the eastern side boundary, further articulation of the building's eastern façade and also the retention of the domestic garden layout and existing street trees along Bancroft Avenue.

30

35

40

45 In response to the peer review and upon considering the issues raised by Council and the community, the Department requested the Applicant to provide further justification for the demolition of the dwelling including consideration of alternative site layout options and the potential for the dwelling to be adaptatively reused as part of the development. The Applicant's amended proposal which was submitted with their RTS provided a more detailed statement of heritage impact. This was prepared by a different heritage consultant, GBA by memory, and was considered by the

Department to have contained a more comprehensive assessment of the heritage matters and the potential impacts of the development. The Applicant's RTS also included a design options analysis report and this considered six different development design and massing options that included the retention and adaptive reuse of the subject dwelling while also providing for a development of a similar size GFA on the school campus.

The six design option layouts that were considered by the Applicant are shown in the Department's assessment report on pages 43 to 45 and for each of the six options that were considered at least one of the school's existing federation cottages or interwar buildings along Bancroft Avenue would require demolition to accommodate a development of a similar size and three of the six options would require the demolition of multiple school buildings along Bancroft Avenue which includes the student services building, Rose Cottage and Hobbs House and these buildings are shown on the next slide. There they are.

So the Applicant's statement of heritage impact assessed the alternative design options that were presented by the Applicant and found that the proposed demolition of 37 Bancroft Avenue would result in the protection and the retention of the school's existing historic buildings, each of which were considered by the Applicant's heritage expert to be better quality examples of federation and interwar buildings and more prominent buildings within the Bancroft Avenue streetscape. The Department agreed with this statement and this is reflected in our assessment report which states that the existing campus buildings are considered to provide a significant contribution to the surrounding heritage character and the Bancroft Avenue streetscape despite them not being located within the defined heritage conservation area. Accordingly, the loss of one or more of these historic buildings would result in a greater heritage impact.

The Department's report concludes that the demolition of the dwelling can be supported and that the impact of the proposal on the proximate heritage conservation areas and locally listed heritage items would be acceptable. Further to this, the Department is satisfied that the proposal will result in the ongoing historic use of the site which has operated as a school since 1908 and that the impact of the new built form elements can be mitigated through the retention of the established street trees and the front garden settings to reduce its visual impact. Conditions have also been recommended to address the heritage impact and this requires the Applicant to undertake photographic archival recording of the external and internal areas of the subject dwelling and this is in accordance with the Heritage New South Wales Guidelines and for the preparation of a heritage interpretation plan in consultation with Council that must evidence the school's evolution and growth over the past century.

Okay. I'll now move on to talk about residential amenity which is raised in several of the community submissions and this is particularly in response to operational noise impacts, visual impacts, privacy and overshadowing. Look, I'm not going to go into too much detail about each of these matters as they're all covered in the

Department's report. However, I'll just touch on the Department's findings and recommendations. So in terms of the noise impacts, the Department was satisfied that the proposal can operate in accordance with the noise criteria that is established in the noise policy for industry and this is subject to the inclusion of acoustic
5 treatments and site operational measures that were proposed in the Applicant's acoustic report.

A condition has been recommended that requires short-term noise monitoring to be carried out by the Applicant within two months of commencement of operation of
10 the development and this is required to verify the operational noise levels are not in excess of the relevant noise criteria for both mechanical, plant and the use of the rooftop sports courts. In respect of visual impacts, the Department's assessment found that the height and scale of the development is appropriate which we mentioned earlier. The building will not obstruct significant or important views nor
15 will it obstruct views from the surrounding residential properties. The building would be constructed to a scale that is lower than the adjacent Joy Yeo Centre and the external materials and finishes of the proposed building are considered appropriate for the surrounding context.

In relation to privacy impacts, the Department considered that the siting and orientation of the building would ensure that the privacy of the adjacent residential properties would be maintained. The current slide here shows the proposed
20 landscape master plan for the site and this includes deep soil plantings along the eastern side boundary and would provide a degree of screening and visual privacy particularly to the nearest adjoining property which is at 39 Bancroft Avenue. In terms of overshadowing, the Department was satisfied that an appropriate degree of solar access would be maintained to both the dwelling and the private open space area at number 39 Bancroft Avenue and also the Roseville Lawn Tennis Courts both
25 of which are adjacent to the development site.

All right. I'll now quickly touch on traffic and parking. The current slide shows the surrounding state and regional road network in proximity to the site. The Department was satisfied with the conclusions of the Applicant's traffic impact assessment which considered that the proposal would have an acceptable impact on
35 the continued functioning of the surrounding local road network and that the assessed intersections in proximity to the site would continue to operate at a level of certainty would continue to operate at a level of service A. One of the things that did come out of the traffic assessment or the Applicant's traffic assessment was that there's a really high mode share of private vehicle usage for staff and considering the site's
40 location close to Roseville Train Station and also established bus routes we – the Department introduced the recommendations of Transport for New South Wales which was to provide end of trip facilities and also bicycle parking for staff. So both of those facilities are going to be incorporated or should be incorporated into the sport and wellbeing centre.

45 In terms of car parking, the Department considers the proposed parking provisions to be acceptable and that the additional 48 spaces provided as part of the development

will result in a combined total of 176 onsite spaces which exceeds the minimum 171 spaces required under Council's DCPs. I should also note that the Department recommended Conditions have retained the car parking requirements that were enforced by Council as part of the previous development application to increase the student population and this includes a requirement for the Applicant to obtain an occupation certificate for the proposed car park and to increase the storage capacity of the Victoria Street drop off and pick up area by an additional two vehicle spaces prior to any increase of the school's population between 1000 and 1250 students.

5
10 So this concludes the Department's presentation today on the key issues of the application. Overall, the Department concluded in its assessment report that the impacts of the development can be mitigated through the recommended conditions of consent and that the development would be in the public interest. I'll now hand back to the panel.

15
MR DUNCAN: Thanks are you happy to take some questions now, Karen and Brent? Adrian, have you got some questions to start off?

MR A. PILTON: I guess my real questions are about the eastern boundary. I realise that it's been taken back – stepped back from number 39 but talking to the owner of 39 this morning he's concerned about the likely density of planting between the building and his fence which he thinks will block out the sky – the view of the sky from his guardian which is substantially lower than the tennis courts. I'm just wondering where that planting came from. Was it Council's requirement or the Department's requirement or what?

20
25 MS HARRAGON: Would it help if I actually go back to – share again the slide? That might help - - -

30 MR PILTON: Yes. That'd be good. Yes.

MS HARRAGON: - - - that perspective. So I'll just quickly do that.

MR DUNCAN: That would be good. The slide shows it quite well, doesn't it?

35
MR PILTON: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: I just think I'm going to try again.

40 MR DUNCAN: The drawing number

MS HARRAGON: If there's a better slide, I'm happy to go to that. I'm just thinking this might be a good one to at least start the conversation because it shows that section through at least from the street.

45
MR PILTON: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: So I guess what – probably what we would probably need to reference is the independent heritage consultant that we had engaged had identified what they considered were potential heritage mitigations in relation to, you know, the general impact and that included the provision of additional screen planting. I
5 wouldn't necessarily say that the Department pursued a specific requirement for planting other than just a general expectation of trying to maintain an amenity in relation to streetscape and privacy between these buildings. So I don't know if there's another diagram, Brent, that might also – we could also go to the landscape to look at sort of - - -

10

MR PILTON: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: Because I think at the moment if you're looking at - - -

15 MR DUNCAN: Yes. Maybe have a look at the landscape plan.

MR PILTON: Or the perspective from the south.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. There was a good photograph – perspective you did sort of
20 from - - -

MR PILTON: From - - -

MR DUNCAN: - - - from above.
25

MR PILTON: - - - Recreational Road sort of thing.

MR DUNCAN: That's right.

30 MR PILTON: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: I'm going to attempt to take us to that. I probably will go – is
35 that - - -

MR DUNCAN: That's it.

MR PILTON: That one.
40

MR DUNCAN: That's it.

MR PILTON: That one. Yes.

45 MR DUNCAN: Perfect.

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MR PILTON: Now, I think – yes – it’s a bit simplistic, I guess, because it shows all the trees along – inside number 39’s boundary, they’re not there. There’s sort of a hedge along there.

5 MR DUNCAN: A hedge of trees. Yes.

MR PILTON: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

10

MR PILTON: But the owner of 39 doesn’t want all those trees planted between his property and the school because it’ll block out to the view of the sky which seems a reasonable point of view when you see it from his back garden.

15 MS HARRAGON: Yes. And particularly if we recognise that quite large and significant tree with a significant crown is probably already casting significant shadows onto his property and providing some sort of landscape setting between the two buildings. So - - -

20 MR PILTON: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: - - - we’d be happy to take that on notice and to provide to IPC a potential redrafting of the landscape condition.

25 MR PILTON: Okay.

MS HARRAGON: Or otherwise we could pursue or the IPC themselves an amended landscape plan before the matter’s determined.

30 MR PILTON: Well, we could write something and send it to you for comment. That’s probably the best way.

MR PILTON: Yes.

35 MR DUNCAN: And there’s more.

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MR PILTON: You can see at the edge up on the upper level - - -

40

MR DUNCAN:

MR PILTON: - - - there’s sort of a structure - - -

45 MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MR PILTON: - - - between the tennis court – yes.

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MR PILTON: Again, he doesn't think that's high enough because he thinks that the
5 – it's only about 1.2 metres high and he thinks the students will stand up on that area
and look down over his property destroying his privacy.

MS HARRAGON: So there's actually – just – there's two screens here. There's
this structure here.

10 MR PILTON: That one there. That's the one he's referring to.

MS HARRAGON: Yes. But sitting inside of that there's actually a security fence.

MR PILTON: Yes.
15

MS HARRAGON: See that line behind it? So you're not going to actually –
students won't even be able to access this wall.

MR PILTON: No. But the fence – I think the fence – yes. Just looking at drawing
20 12, the fence is right behind that - - -

MR DUNCAN: That screen.

MR PILTON: - - - that hedgy structure – it's a sort of planting frame or something.
25

MS HARRAGON: Yes. So we've got this frame - - -

MR PILTON: Yes.

30 MS HARRAGON: - - - and behind that we've got a quite significant what I imagine
and we understand to be a sort of height that you would expect around a normal
tennis court.

MR PILTON: Yes. I think it's - - -
35

MS HARRAGON: You know, probably - - -

MR DUNCAN: That's - - -

40 MR PILTON: - - - three metres or something.

MR DUNCAN: That's correct.

MS HARRAGON: Yes.
45

MR DUNCAN: And it's right on the edge of the screen, Karen. I think all he's saying is that is a line of site directly into his bedroom, in fact, and all he's really saying is if it's 1.2 it should probably be, you know - - -

5 MR PILTON: 1.8 or - - -

MR DUNCAN: - - - 1.8 or whatever and it seems to be relatively straightforward thing that could be tweaked, if you like.

10 MS HARRAGON: Yes. So there's an opportunity there for a potential condition so that this can be a matter resolved to the satisfaction later including - - -

MR PILTON: Yes.

15 MS HARRAGON: - - - sight line elevational diagrams being provided that demonstrate and require that that height be achieved for a range of, you know, site locations.

MR PILTON: Yes. We'll draft some changes and send them to you for comment.

20

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

25 MR PILTON: Otherwise, I don't have any - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Well, I've got a couple more. With the green travel plan – and I note that that's yet to be drafted is there any concept of trying to get, as we've done previously, a modal shift into that? Any thought about that?

30

MR DEVINE: Yes. We did – I think we did look at modal shifts for students but we recognise that the school has a policy which is a no cycling policy for students.

MR DUNCAN: Right.

35

MR DEVINE: So I think – we respect that policy and they enforce that for the safety of their students. I think achieving a significant modal shift without allowing students to cycle to school would be quite an ask for the school.

40 MR DUNCAN: I guess where we were coming from is, you know, it's within 400 metres of a station, bus services. You know, that was the question, I guess, to see if there could be more done in that sense.

45 MS HARRAGON: What we could suggest and work with the IPC on is conditions that require auditing so that there's some verification and some targets set.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS HARRAGON: And demonstration so that there's a committed strategic objective for the school to actually work towards that.

5 MR DUNCAN: I suppose that's all we're really suggesting is - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

10 MR DUNCAN: - - - you know, if you're going to put a green travel plan in place, set some sort of opportunity to see some improvement there. So the next question I had sort of goes to transport and traffic as well. Recreation Lane, which we're looking at actually, there on the left, you can see there's a little – another lane goes down off the bottom of the page. That actually goes - - -

15 MS HARRAGON: This one.

MR DUNCAN: - - - to the local park. So it's a pedestrian access but if you look – Brent showed a photo along that edge past the Yeo Centre.

20 MS HARRAGON: I'm hoping I'm going in the right direction. That one.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: So - - -

25 MR DUNCAN: Yes. That one there. You can see it's not - - -

MS HARRAGON: It terminates it back there.

30 MR DUNCAN: It's not currently geared up for pedestrians and traffic and the car park entry will be off there. So is there anything that can be done – and it's a public road as far as I know- anything that can be done there in the way a shared way zoning or some sort of pedestrianisation and, you know, the concept that motor vehicles understand there are pedestrians there? That's probably a question for Council but just wanted to know

35

MS HARRAGON: Yes. Because I think there's probably a number of tools that could be used including signage, including pavement marking. Probably, you know, one of the solutions that isn't available for us is that both of these properties are privately owned but – so looking to Council for the solution on constructing a footpath is not probably going to be achieved. But one of the opportunities could be whether some of this landscaping could be turned into a footpath within the Applicant's property. Although I do think that's going to – you know - - -

40

45 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: It's a narrow lane. The question becomes - - -

MR DUNCAN:

MS HARRAGON: - - - whether you want to isolate the pedestrian movements or slow the traffic down and identify that it's a shared area.

5

MR DUNCAN: I think given that sort of – you know, whilst it is pedestrianised – a pedestrian route potentially, it's probably not high usage and it's not actually a major pedestrian route into the school. But thinking more of a shared zone so that the – and probably not taking away the amenity of the landscape but - - -

10

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: that it's quite obvious. Again, it might be something that we can take to Council about because - - -

15

MS HARRAGON: Yes. One of the things we actually thought there would be value in is getting an independent audit of the road and pedestrian regime outside of this side and - - -

20 MR DUNCAN: I think we've lost - - -

MS HARRAGON: - - - any recommendations that come forward need to be delivered.

25 MR DUNCAN: Sorry, Karen, we – you dropped out for a moment there.

MS HARRAGON: We had discussed in terms of being provided that certainty and surety that this is a safe pedestrian environment is to require the Applicant to engage the services of an independent audit - - -

30

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS HARRAGON: - - - road safety audit - - -

35 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS HARRAGON: - - - specifying that it's in relation to not only road movements but also pedestrian movements between not just this site but also the adjoining tennis club.

40

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Subject to discussions with Council we might be able to suggest something there as well in the way of wording.

MR PILTON: Yes.

45

MR DUNCAN: Yes. That's it from me. Adrian, anything more?

MR PILTON: Nothing more from me.

MR DUNCAN: Jane, do you have any questions?

5 MS J. ANDERSON: I guess just to note that we had some discussions about potentially allowing community uses of the proposed pool and courts on Saturday mornings. I just wondered if the Department had any comments about that.

10 MS HARRAGON: Brent, can we actually just confirm the Applicant's current position in terms of what they've included in this proposal in relation to out of hours operations.

15 MR DEVINE: Yes. I think the existing pool on the is used on Saturday mornings as it is but that's only during the warmer months of the year so my understanding is that their intention is to continue their out of hours use on Saturday mornings, only that it would probably be more of a year round operation as opposed to just the summer and spring months.

20 MR DUNCAN: Yes. They advised us in our discussions similar to that that whilst there is potential for particularly the swimming pool to be used by the community, there were no active plans for that. So – and they were talking about the courts probably between 7 am and 5 pm, scheduled sports days, Saturday mornings 8 till 12, also netball usage on those venues as well. There was no lighting and they were saying that there wouldn't be usage on Saturday afternoons and Sundays. That was
25 sort of the - - -

MR DEVINE: Okay. Is that specifically for the sports courts or for the pool as well?

30 MR DUNCAN: Sports courts and - - -

MR PILTON: Sports courts. Yes.

35 MR DUNCAN: - - - they did say - - -

MR DEVINE: Yes.

40 MR DUNCAN: - - - for the pool that they would like to do or I think there's potential to do swimming lessons there which - - -

MR PILTON: Yes. Learn to Swim.

45 MR DUNCAN: - - - which could be quite discrete given that they have car parking access straight off this lane and it's an enclosed pool.

MR DEVINE: Yes. My understanding is that they've always intended to have Learn to Swim classes before and after school and on Saturday mornings. But in

terms of the usage of the rooftop sports courts, they – we haven't got anything definite from the applicant in terms of how often that they would be used or the hours that they would be used.

5 MR DUNCAN: Again, I guess we're considering, you know, adjoining neighbours and usage of those and, you know, to give some relief for some time of the week

MS HARRAGON: Yes. And probably what might be appropriate to partner that with an operational management plan that actually specifically targets those out of
10 hours uses and that document has to come into the secretary for endorsement so that gives them confidence around that impacts on the adjoining residential area is not like a seven day a week thing.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.
15

MR PILTON: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. That's good. That's all I have.

20 MR PILTON: Yes. Nothing from me.

MR DUNCAN: Jane?

MS ANDERSON: That's all from me. Thank you.
25

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thanks, Karen, Brent - - -

MS HARRAGON: Thank you.

30 MR DUNCAN: - - - and Tahlia.

MS HARRAGON: Thank you for giving - - -

MR PILTON: Thanks guys.
35

MS HARRAGON: - - - us the time today.

MS ANDERSON: Thank you.

40 MR PILTON: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: All the best. Bye

MR DEVINE: Thank you.
45

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[3.07 pm]