



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-1476275

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

ROSEVILLE COLLEGE, SPORT AND WELLBEING CENTRE PROJECT

PUBLIC MEETING

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

LOCATION: **ELECTRONIC PUBLIC MEETING**

DATE: **10.00 AM, THURSDAY, 27 MAY 2021**

MR P. DUNCAN: Good morning and welcome the Independent Planning Commission's electronic Public Meeting into the State significant development application for the Roseville College Sport and Wellbeing Centre Project SSD9912. My name is Peter Duncan and I am the chair of this Independent Planning

5 Commission panel. Joining me is my fellow Commissioner, Adrian Pilton. Before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands on which we variously meet and pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging and to the elders from other communities who may be participating today.

10 The Anglican Schools Corporation is seeking consent for the development of a new sport and wellbeing centre, an 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 swimming pool, a gym, change facilities and amenities, general learning
15 areas, rooftop sports courts, storage areas, basement car parking and landscape works.

I note the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment or DPIE as it is known in its assessment report has concluded that the application is approvable and subject
20 to conditions. The Minister for Planning and Public Spaces has asked the Commission to determine this application within eight weeks of receiving the final whole of government assessment report from DPIE. In line with regulations introduced in response to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, we have moved this Public Meeting online with registered speakers provided the opportunity to present to
25 the panel via telephone and video conference. In the interests of openness and transparency we're livestreaming the proceedings on the Commission's website. A full transcript of today's meeting will also be published on the Commission's website in the next few days.

30 The Commission was established by the New South Wales Government on 1 March 2018 as a standalone statutory body operating independently of the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment and other agencies. The Commission plays an important role strengthening transparency and independence in the decision-making process for major development and land use planning in New South Wales. The key
35 functions of the Commission include determining State significant development applications, conducting public hearings and Public Meetings for development applications and other matters and providing independent expert advice on any other planning and development matter when requested by the Minister for Planning or the Planning Secretary.

40 The Commission is the consent authority for this State significant development application because more than 50 unique public objections were received, and an objection was received from Kur-ring-gai Council. It is important to note the Commission is not involved in the Department's assessment of SSD applications nor
45 in the preparation of its assessment reports. Commissioners make an annual declaration of interest, identifying potential conflicts and their appointed role – with

their appointed role. For the record, no conflicts of interest have been identified in relation to our determination of this development application. You can find additional information on the way we manage potential conflicts on our website.

5 This Public Meeting forms one part of the Commission's process. We have also undertaken a site inspection and met with the Department, the Applicant and Kurring-gai Council. Transcripts of all of these meetings and the site inspection notes have been published on our website. After the Public Meeting we will convene with relevant stakeholders if clarification or additional information is required on matters raised. Following the Public Meeting we will endeavour to determine the development application as soon as possible, noting that there may be a delay if we find that additional information is required. Written submissions on this matter will be accepted by the Commission up until 5 pm on Thursday, 3rd June 2021 and that's next Thursday.

15 You can make a submission using the have your say portal on the website or by email or by post. We invite interested parties, individuals and groups to make any submission they consider appropriate during the meeting, however, the Commission is particularly interested by submissions that are responsive to the Department's assessment report and recommended conditions of consent. All submissions made to the Department during exhibition of the environmental impact statement have been made available to the Commission. As such, today's speakers are encouraged to avoid repeating or restating submissions they previously have made on this application. The Commission must emphasise that there are certain matters that by law it is not permitted to take into account when making this determination and therefore submissions on such matters cannot be considered. These factors include the reputation of the Applicant or any past planning law breaches by the Applicant.

30 Before we get underway, I would like to outline how today's Public Meeting will run. We will first hear from the Department of Planning Industry and Environment on the findings of its whole-of-government assessment of the application currently before the Commission. We'll then hear from the Applicant. We will then proceed to hear from our registered speakers. While we will endeavour to stick to our published schedule, this is will be dependent on the registered speakers being ready to present at the allocated time. I will introduce each speaker when it's their turn to present to the panel. Everyone has been advised in advance how long they have to speak. A bell will sound when a speaker has one minute remaining. A second bell will when a speaker's time has expired. To ensure everybody receives their fair share of time, I will enforce timekeeping rules. I do reserve the right, however, to allow additional time as required to hear new information.

45 If you have a copy of your speaking notes or any additional material to support your presentation, it would be appreciated if you would provide a copy to the Commission. Please note, any information given to us will be made public. The Commission's privacy statement governs our approach to managing your information. Our privacy statement is available on our website. Thank you. It's now time to call our first speakers. I'd like to introduce Karen Harragon, director of

social and infrastructure assessments from the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.

5 MS K. HARRAGON: Good morning, everyone. Good morning, Commissioners and people attending the - - -

MR DUNCAN: Good morning, Karen.

10 MS HARRAGON: - - - Public Meeting today. My name is Karen Harragon. I am the Director of the Social Infrastructure Assessments at the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment and I am here today with my colleague, Brent Devine, from the Schools Infrastructure Assessments team. We have a short presentation to present today which will outline the Department's approach that was taken in
15 assessing the State significant development application for a new sport and wellbeing centre at Roseville College. Our presentation will outline the Department's approach to the assessment of the application and the key conclusions and recommendations made in the Department's assessment report. The application was referred to the IPC for determination as Kur-ring-gai Council objected to the application and more than 50 public submissions by way of rejection were received in response to the EIS.

20 The matters that we're going to focus on today include the key issues of concern that were raised in the submissions and on the application including built form, heritage, residential amenity, traffic and parking. I will now share the screen and I will hand over to Brent who will provide a brief overview of the site and the proposed
25 development and he will speak to the key issues that we considered in the Department's assessment.

MR B. DEVINE: Thank you, Karen, and good morning, everybody.

30 MS HARRAGON: And can I just have the – our screen has been disabled. If we can be able to share our screen. Thank you. We are just getting a message that the host has disabled our screen sharing.

35 MR DUNCAN: We're just working on that, Karen.

MS HARRAGON: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Our apologies.

40 MS HARRAGON: I think it might be actually working so - - -

MR DUNCAN: It's working now.

45 MS HARRAGON: Okay. I'll also proceed to full screen. Thanks, Brent.

MR DEVINE: Thank you, Karen. I actually can't see the screen on – the slides on my screen but - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yes. We're at slide 2.

5

MR DEVINE: Okay. I'll just introduce myself, everybody. My name is Brent Devine and I'm a Principal Planner in the Schools Infrastructure Assessments team and I was involved in the assessment of this application. I'm going to start today with a brief overview of the development and the SSD application that was lodged by Roseville College before discussing the key issues and how these matters have been addressed. So just to start with, 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 that is the subject of this application comprises both the existing Roseville College school campus located at 27 to 29 Bancroft Avenue and an adjoining residential property located at 37 Bancroft Avenue which was purchased by the school in 2016. The existing school campus is zoned SP2 infrastructure and is subject to the development controls under the Kur-ring-gai Local Centres LEP 2012.

20 The adjoining land at 37 Bancroft Avenue is zoned R2 low density residential and is subject to the development controls under the Kur-ring-gai LEP 2015. This image provides an aerial view of the site with the existing school campus outlined in blue and the adjacent residential property to the northeast outlined in red. Roseville College itself is a day school for girls that caters for students in kindergarten to year 12 and has an improved maximum population of 1,250 students up to the year 2030. At the time this application was lodged, which was in October 2019, the school had approximately 973 student enrolments and 135 full-time staff. To provide a brief overview of the site's surrounding context, this slide shows the site location within what is predominantly a low to medium density residential area. The areas to the north, east and west of the site are characterised by one to two storey residential dwelling houses and there is higher density residential development concentrated to the south, including four to five storey residential flat building developments along Victoria Street and Boundary Street.

35 The Roseville Lawn Tennis Club and the Kur-ring-gai Arts Centre are located directly to the east and these facilities are accessed by Recreation Avenue which is a local road also used as an access point to the school and Roseville Train Station is located approximately 400 metres to the west and this is within walking distance of the school. I'll now move on to describe the proposed development. So, the application submitted to the Department is for the construction and operation of a three-level sport and wellbeing centre. The new school facility is proposed to include 48 basement car parking spaces over two basement levels of parking, an eight-lane 25 metre indoor swimming pool with associated concourse and grandstand which would be located ground level, a strength and conditioning gymnasium, nutrition and food technology space, general learning areas, storage and amenities including end of trip facilities, mechanical plant, onsite stormwater detention and rooftop multipurpose outdoor sports courts.

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, signage as well as a comprehensive landscaping strategy. I should also acknowledge that no increase to the school's approved student population has been sought as part of this application and the school's maximum capacity of 1,250 students to the year 2030 was approved by Kur-ring-gai Council as part of a prior development application and this was determined in 2017. I'm now going to speak to the key issues that were raised by Council as well as the local community during the application's exhibition period and I'm going to start with the Department's assessment of the proposed built form.

The development is proposed to comprise of three levels and will be constructed to a maximum height of 9.05 metres at its south-eastern corner. The overall height of the building was reduced by the Applicant as part of its amended proposal which was submitted with the response to submissions. The minor reduction to the maximum building height ensures that it is fully compliant with the 9.5 metre height limit that is established under the Kur-ring-gai LEP 2015. The Department's assessment report concluded that the height of the building would be acceptable, and this is on the basis that it was compliant with the LEP height controls. It would be constructed to a height that is noticeably lower than several of the existing school buildings including the adjacent Joy Yeo Centre and the multipurpose school hall. It would present as only a one to two-level development from Bancroft Avenue given that level 1 would be located entirely below the natural ground level and the built form would be substantially set back from the Bancroft Avenue street frontage.

In terms of the building's bulk and its floor space ratio, the proposal would exceed the maximum FSR control of 0.3:1 at the north-eastern part of the site, noting that this development control applies only to 37 Bancroft Avenue with the remainder of the site not subject to a maximum FSR control. 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 which would therefore result in a development that is of minimal bulk and scale. To further reduce the perception of bulk and scale, the Applicant's amended proposal submitted with the RTS increased the side boundary setback to 39 Bancroft Avenue and this was to – sorry – enable deep soil plantings and to allow for an appropriate landscaping response.

It redesigned part of the level 3 built form to pull back or to introduce a step in height at the south-eastern corner of the building away from the eastern side boundary and it removed the skillion roof feature that was initially proposed along the eastern side of the rooftop sports courts. The Department came to the conclusion in its assessment report that there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify the contravention of the floor space ratio development standard and this is given that a large proportion of the building's GFA would be located below ground including level 1 in its entirety and this account for around 53 per cent of the total building's GFA and the building was considered to be consistent with the bulk, scale and density of the existing buildings that are located across the broader school campus.

So just to summarise, the Department considered the proposed built form of the new development as presented in its amended proposal would be appropriate for the site and it would not have an unacceptable impact on the existing character of the surrounding locality.

5

I'll now move on to talk about heritage and this was a key issue raised by the community and it was also a point of objection raised in counsel's submissions to the application. The concerns in response to heritage related both to the demolition of the dwelling at 37 Bancroft Avenue and the subsequent impacts of the new development on the surrounding heritage conservation areas. So this slide here shows the site's location in context to the surrounding conservation areas, including the Clanville Conservation Area which is outlined in red and this covers a large proportion of Roseville and also part of Lindfield. The north-eastern part of the site encroaches just within this conservation area as you can see on the slide here. The Lord Street and Bancroft Avenue Conservation Area covers a much smaller area and its border is outlined in green.

The site is not located within this conservation area but as you can see it is located directly adjacent. I should also note that there are no listed heritage items on the development site at either a state or local level and the dwelling at 37 Bancroft Avenue is not an individually listed heritage item. The Department's consideration of potential heritage impacts was largely focused on the dwelling of 37 Bancroft Avenue and a few images of that dwelling are shown here on this slide. The dwelling has been identified as a contributory item to the Clanville Conservation area and this is in response to an independent heritage review that was commissioned by Council in 2010. The Applicant's heritage impact statement which was submitted with their EIS supported the demolition of the dwelling and this was primarily on the basis that it was located on the boundary of the conservation area and that it was an unrefined example of a federation dwelling which has undergone various modifications that has diminished its aesthetic contribution to the conservation area.

The Department subsequently engaged NBR Architecture to undertake a peer review of the findings in the Applicant's heritage impact statement and this was initiated following the exhibition of the EIS yet prior to receiving the amended proposal with the RTS. The peer review undertaken by NBR recommended further heritage analysis and assessment be undertaken by the Applicant and that options for the retention and adaptive reuse of the dwelling be considered including reasoning as to why its retention was not considered feasible. The independent peer review 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. These recommendations included increased building setbacks, screen plantings along the eastern side boundary, articulation of the building's eastern façade and retention of the domestic garden layout and existing street trees that are established along Bancroft Avenue.

45

In response to the independent 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 submitted with their RTS provided a more detailed statement of heritage impact and this was prepared by a different heritage consultant and was considered by the Department to have provided a more comprehensive assessment of the potential heritage impacts.

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 adaptative reuse of the dwelling while also providing a development of a similar size gross floor area on the school campus. For each of the six options that were considered in the design options analysis report at least one of the school's existing federation cottages or interwar buildings fronting Bancroft Avenue would require demolition in order 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 including the student services building, Rose Cottage and Hobbs House and these buildings are shown on the next slide.

The Applicant's statement of heritage impact assessed each of the alternative design options that were presented by the Applicant and concluded that the demolition of Bancroft Avenue would result in the protection and retention of the school's 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 agree 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 a defined 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 would 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 front garden settings as well as additional landscaping elements to reduces its visual impacts. Conditions that have been recommended to address the heritage impact requires the Applicant to undertake photographic archival recording of the external and internal areas of the dwelling in accordance with the Heritage New South Wales guidelines and the preparation of a heritage interpretation plan including consultation with Council that must evidence the school's evolution and growth over the past century.

I'll now move on to talk about residential amenity and this was raised in several of the community submissions and this was particularly in response to operational noise impacts, visual impacts, privacy and overshadowing and I realise I'm coming to the end of my allocated timeslot so I'm just going to cover these quite quickly. They are covered comprehensively in the Department's assessment report so I'm just going to

touch on the Department's key findings and recommendations. In response to potential noise impacts, the Department was satisfied that the proposal can operate in accordance with the noise criteria that it established in the noise policy for industry subject to the inclusion of acoustic treatments and site operational measures that have
5 been proposed by the Applicant in their acoustic report.

A condition has been recommended that requires short-term noise monitoring be carried by the Applicant within two months of commencement of the development and this is required to verify that the operational noise levels are not in excess of the
10 relevant noise criteria for the use of mechanical plant and for the use of the rooftop outdoor sports courts both during school hours and for any out of hours activities. In respect to the visual impacts, the Department's assessment found that the height and scale of the development is appropriate as I discussed earlier. The building will not obstruct significant or important views, nor will it obstruct views from any of the
15 surrounding residential properties. The building would be constructed to a scale that is lower than the adjacent Joy Yeo Centre and the multipurpose school hall and the external materials and finishes of the proposed building would be 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 soils plantings long the eastern site boundary that would provide screening and visual privacy particularly for the nearest adjoining residential property which 39 Bancroft Avenue. In relation to
25 overshadowing, the Department is satisfied that an appropriate degree of solar access would be maintained to both the dwelling and private open space area at 39 Bancroft Avenue and that the Roseville Lawn Tennis Club courts – sorry – and also the Roseville Lawn Tennis Club courts both of which are adjacent to the development
30 site.

I'll now quickly touch on traffic and parking and this slide shows the surround state and regional road network in proximity to the school site. The Department was
35 satisfied with the conclusions of the Applicant's traffic impact assessment which considered the proposal to have an acceptable impact on 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 service A which is an acceptable level of service and we also note that there's no increase in the student population as part
40 of this application. In terms of car parking, the Department considers the parking provisions to be acceptable, noting that the additional 48 spaces provided as part of the development will result in a combined total of 176 spaces on the site and this exceeds the minimum requirements under Council's development control plan.

I should also note that the Department's recommended conditions have retained the
45 car parking requirements that were enforced by Council as part of the previous development application that sought to increase the student population. This includes a requirement for the Applicant obtain an occupation certificate for the car

park and to increase the storage capacity at the Victoria Street drop off and pick up area by an additional two space prior to any increase of the school's population beyond 1000 students. The Department has also recommended the school implement a green travel plan and this is to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes and to reduce the reliance on private vehicle usage, particularly for staff. So that concludes the Department's presentation today on the key issues that were assessed as part of the application. Overall, the Department concluded in its report that the likely impacts of the development can be mitigated through the recommended conditions of consent. I'll now hand back to the panel.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks, Brent, and thanks, Karen. We have no further questions at this time. So, thank you for your presentation.

MS HARRAGON: Thank you.

MR DEVINE: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: We'll now move to the next speakers and it's the Applicant on this occasion represented by Deb Magill and supported by Stephen.

MS D. MAGILL: Well, thank you, sir to the Commission and the Commissioners and planners present for the opportunity to talk briefly today. Just as we start we too would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians on the land with which the school is placed, the Kameaigal people of the Eora Nation, and we pay our respects to those people and to leaders past, present and, of course, emerging. My name is Deb Magill and I'm the principal of Roseville College and I'll introduce who else is in the room with me: Michell Scott, who is our Business Manager at the school; Stephen Earp, who is our Planner on this project; Andrew Hjorth who is our Architect; and Jordan Graham who is our Project Manager. I would like to make just a couple of opening remarks before handing over to our planner who will go through the rest of our presentation but I would like to acknowledge the detailed nature of the Department's presentation made just then and you may be pleased to know that I'll reduce my presentation because much of what I was going to say was covered.

The school's plan for this building really started in 2016. The previous DA has been discussed with you and I present it to you now regarding our application for increase in student numbers and the requirement for Kur-ring-gai Council at that time for increased car park spaces. The opportunity became available for us to purchase number 37 Bancroft Avenue as we discussed previously, and we started to consider the opportunity then to the college of the options available to us at that time. The opportunities were and they still are now five years down the track to replace an aged outdoor swimming pool that is really at the end of its life, to build some much needed agile learning spaces and to devote our resources to the wellbeing of our students who are always at the heart of what we do.

We have a good history of great care and stewardship of our property and of our assets, so we don't want to impose. We're really conscious and proud of our place as part of this local community. The process the school went through to decide the worthiness of this SSDA has been thorough and worthwhile in itself. For example,
5 we did some precinct zoning to determine the best use of all campus space. We did a thorough options analysis. We did analysis of the needs of our students. We did analysis of the needs of our teaching including curriculum changeover time but also have an awareness and necessity to replace assets like the pool and also the opportunity to resolve some campus layout issues. We have also valued the time of
10 community consultation as part of the SSDA process and our submission back to the Department we believe truly considered the submissions made by members of our community and Stephen will talk more to that in a minute. But finally, I wanted to reiterate the purpose of this building and that it is absolute for our students. Our students both now and our students into the future. It is reflective of what we value
15 as a school which is each one of the girls here and this building has a clear purpose. It is to enable our girls to be well, to be engaged, to be active, to be challenged and to be part of a community and the community that cares for them and their wellbeing and their wellbeing for learning and their wellbeing for life and we're really delighted to present that and I'm happy to expand on any of the information provided
20 today. I'll now hand over to Stephen Earp who'll provide some further details. Thank you.

MR S. EARP: Thanks, Deb, and thank you to the IPC panel and everyone present for hearing us out this morning. Just to capture on some of the planning elements
25 that set the scene for this entire State significant development application, as has been mentioned, the two prior DAs that have been approved by Kur-ring-gai Council – excuse me – relating to student numbers and relating to car parking have been brought in to this application but not just those at the time in 2016 when 37 Bancroft was purchased and the school was able to start looking at options there. A change of
30 use DA was submitted and at the time that we were looking at all of the works around change of use at 37, the need to replace a full asset and also the delivery of the two prior DAs.

That was all wrapped up into one clean project which allowed for greater oversight
35 by authority but also greater input by the community and that started the process on this State significant application. So, it has been quite a while in the making. In terms of the development application itself, a submission was made in November 2017, however, in the lead-up to that submission consultation and design development was carried out in accordance with the secretary's environmental
40 assessment requirements. Through that process there were at least two occasions where we met with Kur-ring-gai Council to discuss in detail the project and also other discussions were with authorities through that time. The EIS that was submitted detailed the submission as a part one to three storey structure at a maximum height of 9.75 metres which was just slightly over the height control.
45

As has been covered by the Department in their presentation about the other planning matters such as FSR and setbacks and matters that were raised became very relevant

at the response to submission RTS stage when a total of 77 submissions were received which comprised seven authority submissions, one organisation submission, 68 including one late objection and one letter of support. In response to those submissions, that package was received in January of 2020 and what followed that
5 process as can be seen in the report from the Department of Planning is a very detailed and lengthy and thought out response that took 12 months to form.

Can confirm it was not slowed down by COVID. But, in fact, what took place was an opportunity to have another further two meetings with Kur-ring-gai Council to
10 discuss both design and landscaping issues and also arrange for a couple of conversations to discuss plans with the owners of number 39 Bancroft Avenue, and through that consultation process the design has been amended in a number of ways also covered by the Department of Planning but essentially reduction in height, increase in setbacks, increase in deep soil landscape planting opportunity, a response
15 to reduce elements or remove elements of the building that were not desirable to the neighbours and also provide certainty in response to a number of matters that Council had raised on landscaping issues including tree number 7 that is on Bancroft Avenue and a few other matters that have essentially resolved a large portion of authority and public issues remaining, as we've noted through the IPCs
20 meetings, that Council has maintained the two key outstanding issues are the demolition of number 37 Bancroft which was also discussed by the Department in their report and also the impacts of the new built form on the heritage conservation area which have been also assessed in architectural design options analysis and heritage assessment reporting.

25 So the response to submission package was lodged with the Department of Planning in January 2021 and what has followed from there has included a number of additional requests for information with which we have clarified matters relating to car parking, matters related to landscaping and some other issues that we note have
30 come out in the Department of Planning's recommended conditions of consent which we have reviewed two rounds of review of those consents. They reflect the commitments provided in the EIS. It reflects the outcomes of the conversations had through the RTS stage as well as the request for information stage after the RTS was submitted. There are no objections by the Department and similarly there are no
35 issues from the college's side in accepting the recommendations of that report. We – essentially, I don't have much more to cover because of thorough presentation provided by the Department but would just like to note that we were going to drop off the call at the end of this but we understand there are public submissions later. We'll take instruction now from the IPC as to whether you would like us to remain
40 available to answer any questions.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks, Stephen. We won't require any further questions at this stage but you're quite welcome to stay on the call or to stay on the Zoom session.

45 MR EARP: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Is that the end of your presentation?

MR EARP: Yes. That's the end. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thanks, Stephen, and thanks to – and all that are with you
for the presentation. Thank you. We'll now move to the next presenter, Wayne
5 Leamon. Wayne, can you hear us?

MR LEAMON: I can hear you. Could you hear me?

MR DUNCAN: Yes, quite clearly - - -
10

MR LEAMON: Okay.

MR DUNCAN: - - - so please proceed. Please proceed.

15 MR LEAMON: Thank you. Well, thank you to the Commission for the opportunity
to present to this meeting. I represent myself and my wife. We're the owners of
number 39 so we are the only property that directly borders onto the development
that's under consideration. So, I have a few points I'd like to make including an
opening statement. The school has a history of growing with disregard for the local
20 neighbourhood. Students are in the very vast majority not local. The expansion of
the college both in its physical dimensions and student numbers provide no benefit to
the local community, in fact, the opposite. With every expansion comes large, out of
character buildings which wreck the very character of the surrounding area and
diminish the heritage aspect of the Clanville Conservation Area and adjacent heritage
25 areas and, in particular, the streetscapes of Bancroft Avenue and Victoria Avenue.

We also get increased noise, increased traffic, increase numbers of parents parking
across our driveways. In short, local residents do not want this development. We
should be allowed to live peacefully in the homes we acquired in our case over 20
30 years ago without the threat of constant overdevelopment in what is and should
continue to be a residential area. I note the school has the capacity to increase
student numbers further and no doubt they will apply in future to increase numbers
beyond that number of 1250. I say that the school owns a number of other houses in
adjacent conservation areas which no doubt have been earmarked for future
35 development.

I also the Department's comments about the heritage nature of the buildings that will
be retained, namely, Rose Cottage at number 31 and the buildings at number 29 to
25. I have no confidence that these buildings will be retained in the medium to long
40 term. The land on which they stand is zoned educational and my understanding is
those buildings have no protection at all from future demolition. Therefore, the
preservation of number 37 is of paramount importance. It's part of the heritage
conservation area and these areas were gazetted to protect the character of areas of
special heritage significance. The college knew this when it bought number 37 and
45 it, like every other citizen, should be bound to comply with the legislation which
protects those houses. They should not be granted special consideration because of
the dollar value of the development or that it is educational in nature, although,

actually, it's a recreation facility, it's not a learning establishment as outlined already by the Department.

5 Consideration regarding number 37 should be to the heritage conservation area impact only and that house should be retained. This will also set a precedent which will protect the other houses that are owned by the college in adjacent areas to the campus which also sit in heritage conservation areas. I also note recently the relevant New South Wales Minister said:

10 *This government wants to see heritage not only protected but celebrated and activated for communities. We know the best way to keep our heritage alive is to use and reuse it.*

15 This should apply to number 37. This house should not be demolished and should be retained in its current form. I'd now like to move on to the impact on number 39, our house. I note in the Department's assessment at 6.4.20 they make various observations which include the built form would not obstruct views from any surrounding residences. They also say the development would ensure the privacy of adjacent residential properties would be maintained and the few windows proposed
20 to level 3 are appropriately setback to ensure that they do not overlook the private open space of the rear of 39 Bancroft Avenue. We totally reject this assessment. It ignores the ability of dozens of people to stand on the tennis courts and look directly into our garden area, our swimming pool, directly into the windows on the southern and western side of our house.

25 In short, we will have total destruction of our privacy from the views not only from the windows but also from the full length of the tennis courts which run the entire length of our house and beyond. We face living with our curtains constantly closed, unable to enjoy our outside areas and have any privacy in our own rear garden. In
30 fact, we will be on show for everybody who is on the tennis courts pretty much day hour available in the week except Sundays. And, secondly, in order to create some artifice of privacy Council have required large tree plantings right along our boundary which will block a huge amount of our natural light and create another barrier which is unwanted.

35 I'd also then move on to the heritage aspect, briefly. I note the NRBS Architecture heritage report which is completely at odds with that put forward by the college. The recommend that the proposed development is excessive, totally out of scale with the existing streetscape and clearly not conforming into the existing character of the area.
40 I won't repeat the rest of it, but I am in total agreement that it is completely out of character with the area. I then move on to acoustic and other reports. Having noted the independent heritage assessor's divergent view, it's self-evident that any consultant employed by the Applicant has a conflict of interest and will tilt their report as far as possible in favour of their employer, in this case the college. I
45 therefore urge the Commission to engage independent consultants to peer review the acoustic report and any other report which set out obligations for measuring and limiting construction, vibration and noise.

I don't believe the acoustic report or the other reports represent an unbiased view and I think that the outcomes noted in those reports are the ones that are most oppressive – oppressive, that is, oppressive for residents and neighbours. This is both during demolition and construction and post-completion. I also note in the Department's
5 report at figure 43 shows an acoustic shield on the rooftop courts. This shield does not appear in any elevation drawings or anywhere else in any submissions I can see. It appears to be a solid two-metre-high fence that runs around the entire boundary of the courts. This will create perceptions of additional bulk and impact visual impact from every angle. So, I – once again, this is a negative impact.

10 I also note at 6.4.8 it's a recommendation of ongoing use. It talks about amplified instructions or music and it says sporting activities should cease at 9.45 pm with no amplified music or instructions. The original submission for the school were operational hours of 7 am to 6 pm during the week, 7 am until 2 pm on Saturday.
15 Nothing after those hours. The conditions of consent also seem to imply that the courts can be used up until 10 pm. I put it to the Commission that the conditions of consent should be amended so that the hours of use are 7 am to 6 pm Monday to Friday and 7 am to 2 pm on Saturday and at no other time and there should also be limits placed on the number of people able to access both the rooftop courts and the
20 facilities themselves.

Moving on to the bulk and scale, I've already referenced that the heritage peer review talked about how big the buildings are and how they dominate. In 6.2.13 the Department say the design is low scale built form. It talks about the FSR. It says:

25 *An FSR control of .3 to 1 was not considered compatible with the objectives of the RT zone. It does not provide enough GFA to enable other land uses.*

This is nonsensical. The land is almost 1300 squares. A .3 to 1 ratio allows a
30 dwelling of up to 400 square metres which is a large family home and larger than the home that's there. So it's completely false to say that there's no other use apart from this. I also note at 6.2.22 the Department says that the building height will be low within existing Joy Yeo Centre and the proposed development is consistent with the bulk and scale and density of existing buildings across the broader school campus.
35 In effect, what the Department are saying is we already have buildings that are incompatible with the local area so let's approve some more. It seems to miss the point that the existing buildings are already a significant intrusion on the character of Bancroft and the proposal's no way consistent with anything on Bancroft Avenue. Also, the GFA terms will breach anything that would be allowed under the Kur-ring-
40 gai KLEP and so for that reason once again number 37 should be retained and the school should not be able to completely build over the land mass of number 37.

And so once again we reject the Department's conclusion at 6.2.26:

45 *The proposal would not have a significant impact on the established low-density residential character of the surrounding area.*

Completely disagree with that. Turning to conditions of consent, there's a condition of consent there regarding outdoor lighting. I'd like the condition of consent to be clear that the only lighting should be foot lighting and night lighting. There should not be any court lighting to allow use of the tennis courts after 6 pm. Construction
5 hours. I submit that there should not be any construction allowed on a Saturday. At C7 of the conditions, there should not be any rock breaking or heavy work allowed on Saturdays. At C15, the vibration condition, that should be extended to include excavation, not just construction. And at C17, it should be eliminated because it overrides the protections from vibrations which are included at C15.

10 I also note in post-occupation of the condition's consent at E1 out of hours is not defined but it talks about conditions of where more than 100 people are accessing the facility. I don't think this is acceptable and I've already outlined that the hours should be restricted to those that are set out in the original submission by the school.
15 I'll also be making a written submission which will have some more detail including those points and the last point I'd like to make is that the Commission shouldn't underestimate the human impact that this has on not only myself and surrounding residents but our families. You know, we think that because of the amount of noise, vibration and so on we may well have to move out of our house for a period of 18
20 months at great cost to ourselves. We're not sure that we can live here while that construction goes on. We're extremely worried about the damage that'll be caused to our house from the vibration and the construction and it's already having significant mental anguish and harm being caused to our family so I'd ask the Commissioners to take all of that into account, and that ends my submission. Thank
25 you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Wayne. Thanks for your presentation today. I'd now like to call on the next speaker, Hamish McIntosh.

30 MR H. McINTOSH: Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. It's important to point out why I'm speaking. I live directly opposite the proposed development at number 28 Bancroft. 28 Bancroft is an individually listed item in the Lord Street/Bancroft Avenue Conservation Area which is referenced as C36 and the house is also referred to individually as item 199. My daughter also attends Roseville
35 College. I think it's important to point out no site inspection has taken – has been taken from my property and the bulk and scale will certainly be affected and from my front fence and front door visually there will be an impact on property.

Wayne touched on some certain things like the NBRIS Architectural heritage report
40 in terms of number 37 Bancroft. I don't believe and nor does my family that the removal of this building is in the public interest. It is a contributory item and no matter which way you look at it, that is the case. I would also reference the judgment of Helou v Strathfield Municipal Council [2006] NSW and Harbour Port
45 Constructions Proprietary Limited v Woollahra Municipal Council. I think there's a direct parallel between these cases and what we're speaking to here and that simply is that the value of these contributory items. 37 Bancroft is a contributory item to the heritage conservation area that has been recognised and the retention of the dwelling is desirable and that the proposed demolition of the dwelling would adversely affect

the heritage significance of the Bancroft Road precinct and heritage conservation area.

5 The second thing that I'd raise in regard to that is the cost of rectification and repurposing of this building is not an unreasonable burden. Both of those court cases talk about a number of tests that need to be applied and from what I understand, you know, this building should be retained. There's been comments about the bulk and scale which I'm not really going to touch on but one of the principal concerns for my family and myself is the noise impacts and the acoustic report that was prepared,
10 specifically, operational noise from the outdoor rooftop sports courts. Wayne talked about this briefly. There is a draft condition of consent proposed which recommends a two-metre noise barrier with a one metre high cantilever canopy. I'd just like to share the screen for the minute which talks about what this would actually look like and how far the barrier is. That is the proposed barrier that we're talking about.

15 If you talk about the property that I am in, 28, 26 and 24 Bancroft which are all directly opposite, all of these buildings are listed. I mean, this barrier is – if it goes ahead as proposed is going to be a significant burden on these properties, on the views, on the heritage significance of these. It doesn't conform to the existing
20 character of the local area. It's going to have an unacceptable impact on these houses and the heritage. It doesn't conserve the significance of these items or its fabric, setting or views and, obviously, the bulk and scale we've discussed. I'd also like to show briefly what that – what it would look like – what the proposed – excuse me one second. I'm not sure you can see that. Can you see the proposed barrier?

25 MR A. PILTON: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, yes. We can see it. Yes.

30 MR McINTOSH: I mean, obviously, the proposed barrier is going to have an impact, I mean, when you look at that. It's either a straight 3.1 metres or the one above that and then the suggestions for what it would look like are now on the screen. Now, how anyone can suggest that that doesn't have an impact on the local
35 heritage of Bancroft of Clanville or the listed items including number 28 which is directly opposite is beyond me. So, I mean, I'm very concerned about the acoustic effect and what the draft conditions of consent area. And when you look at all of the diagrams that have been proposed, none of these take that into account. I think most of the points that I wanted to discuss were raised. I would welcome a site inspection from number 28 Bancroft. I really do believe that – that the three listed
40 houses on Bancroft haven't really been considered nor have the impact upon those houses. I also would speak to the point that if it is approved in any way, shape or form I think the landscaping on Bancroft should be significantly increased.

45 The elevation of the rooftop courts is approximately 600 above the current ground level. This doesn't show up in any of the documents, clearly, and also, I agree that work should only be allowed Monday to Friday. Thank you very much for your time.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you very much, Hamish. Thank you for your presentation today. Our next speaker is Tim Archer. Tim, can you hear us?

MR T. ARCHER: Yes, I can. Can you hear me?

5

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Please proceed.

MR ARCHER: Okay. Thank you. Look, I also appreciate the opportunity to speak. I live on Bancroft Avenue fairly close to the school. I'm opposed to the
10 development. I completely support the comments that have been made by Wayne and Hamish just now and actually hearing them speak I'm kind of concerned it appears that none of what they're raising was addressed in the earlier presentations. It seems to me that perhaps the process hasn't been sufficiently comprehensive. But also, I'm kind of realistic. I understand that it's government policy that, you know,
15 large developments get supported over and above residents' objections but I do want to raise one particular issue that the others haven't spoken about which is road safety.

The – so the school is situated on local residential streets, as you know. It's got approximately 1000 students a significant portion of which are dropped off by car
20 which contributes a significant amount of traffic to local roads. Now, I appreciate that the development isn't seeking to increase the number of students that's already been approved but it's obvious that infrastructure like this is actually required by the school to support those additional students. So, in effect, this – you know, this building or this proposal and others that will presumably follow are necessary to
25 support that growth or will result in the actual growth in enrolments of the school.

So, my concern is principally around the way that cars use the streets to access the school. There are no sort of purpose-built drop off or pick up zones for the school. There's fairly limited road space for parking given that cars are – the streets are often
30 parked out for people accessing the station and it means that people who are dropping off students at the school are typically using no stopping zones, you know, residents' driveways, pedestrian crossings, as I'll show you in a moment, to drop off their children and the school seems to have no concerns about this. Virtually on a
35 daily basis I see parents stopping in a no stopping zone next to a pedestrian crossing while teachers on duty are, you know – it's visible and they seem to have no concerns.

There's essentially no road safety culture at the school. I'll show you a couple of pictures by – as an illustration of that. This is a chartered bus from the school that's
40 stopped in the middle of the roadway next to a pedestrian crossing to disembark passengers. You can see some cars building up behind it and, you know, cars are sort of trying to get through the street there.

MR DUNCAN: We're not seeing that

45

MR ARCHER: You're not seeing that. Okay. It shows that I'm presenting. Sorry. I just need to click okay. Sorry about that.

MR DUNCAN: No. That's okay. Thank you.

MR ARCHER: So look, this is kind of standard practice for the school. This is how they use the surrounding area and this is the – this is the, I would say, lack of
5 courtesy and probably worse than that shown to residents and others who use these streets or live in these streets. Just a couple of other images here. Look, buses typically stop in no stopping zones to let out students. Buses will double park, park across residents' driveways, stop in the middle of the roadway. This is all adjacent to a pedestrian crossing. And so my major concern here is that the development will
10 support increased traffic on these roads. The school does not have the facilities or the culture or programs to use the road safely and I want to particularly draw your attention to the intersection of Bancroft Avenue and Wandella Avenue which is heavily used by traffic relating to the school.

15 It's a very difficult intersection for pedestrians to navigate. Cars com flying around there. There is a hump there that's intended to calm traffic but it doesn't actually slow down cars. It actually congests the road and this intersection is actually used by Roseville College children who are coming down from bus stops elsewhere. It's used heavily by children going to Roseville Public School. It's used by children
20 visiting Bancroft Park and I think that it's just – I think it's just a substantial risk, that of injury or death from an accident in the surrounding streets or in this intersection. So look, my principal submission is that, you know, if the development is contemplated to be approved that the school would be required to do three things: (1) would be to fund pedestrian safety improvements to that Bancroft/Wandella
25 Intersection. (2) would be a dedicated drop off and pick up infrastructure and (3) would be a program to improve road safety culture in the school.

But just in the remaining minute or so I would like to reiterate concerns around the – the lack of respect for the heritage protections around the school. I mean, I think the
30 school, in a sense, derives some element of its character from the fact that it sits within a quiet residential area and it's a relatively sort of low rise and it is – you know, appears to be a welcoming and friendly environment and I would ask that they would actually consider their responsibilities as a custodian of this area to think maybe it's not right that we just ignore the idea of heritage and demolish buildings as
35 we see fit. I think there's really something to be said for having some respect for your local area.

Our final point is simply the zoning. That site, 37 Bancroft Avenue, is zoned residential only. I don't see why everybody else has to conform to those zoning
40 requirements, yet this Applicant can just completely ignore it. So look, thank you. I would like to emphasise the point on road safety. This is not a trivial matter. It was not addressed by the Applicant and it hasn't been addressed in any of the submissions so far. I think if you were to personally try to cross that intersection yourself at – you know, at sort of 8 o'clock in the morning before school you will
45 find that is a genuinely difficult thing to do and then you think about how is a 10 or 12 year old child going to do that and I see it every day. It's particularly alarming. So I would urge consideration of that. I don't think it – you know, you can – the school can actually fix this stuff without sort of losing their dream to build, you

know, giant buildings. It is actually, I think – you know, would earn the respect that I think that they need to among the local community. Thank you.

5 MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Tim. Thank you for your presentation today. I'll now ask our next speaker, David Mulholland. Can you hear us, David?

MR D. MULHOLLAND: I can. Thank you. Can you hear me?

10 MR DUNCAN: Yes. Please proceed.

MR MULHOLLAND: Okay. Thanks very much. So along with my wife we own 32 Bancroft so we're the house that's directly opposite number 37, the house the school wants to demolish as part of its sports complex and obviously opposite the highest point its related to. So we're, I guess, also fairly significantly impacted. We bought our house in 1985 so we've been her for quite a long time and during the late eighties I remember sitting through a couple of meeting at Kur-ring-gai Council. Both times the school was seeking to enlarge its enrolment and both times questions came up about how far the school wanted to go, what their intentions were and again both times we were assured this was as much as we wanted to do, this is as far as we wanted to go. We're a small boutique school. We don't have any intentions for further expansion but obviously that's not true and so we're faced with a situation where proposal for enlargement. It's a very significant one.

25 And like the others have mentioned before me, the – our biggest objections are to the demolishing of 37 and to the scale, the form and siting of the sports centre. As has been pointed out, the peer review is very critical of the proposal. Kur-ring-gai Council have opposed it. The Friends of Kur-ring-gai Community Group have opposed it. Nearly all the submissions that came in and I think you've got to realise that for every one submission that came in there was probably dozen residents who were equally unhappy about it but didn't bring themselves to write something. And even when we get to the revised impact statement by the GBA Heritage, they concede that 37 Bancroft has merit. They mention that despite alterations and additions over time it's a bungalow that has retained its characteristic features and style.

35 So they come – after that they come to reasons for the demolition though to me they seem to centre around the fact that 27 and 31 are better or 27, 29, 31 are better examples of heritage architecture. And that because number 37, the one nearest Wayne on 39 is at the very western extremity of the HIS. The problem I see with that and Wayne sort of pointed this out earlier is that in that HIS the – they repeatedly stress that Roseville College properties are not listed as heritage items and so I can't see there's any guarantee that they will even retain those buildings in the short term. They also claim that they're better examples of heritage architecture and I think that's disputable because 27 is – has been, you know, modified with different coloured bricks top and bottom. It's got steel framed windows interwar rather than a federation building.

And in the design option analysis report they claim the retention of 37 will result in a worse outcome because it means demolishing one or more of 27 to 31. But you can't help but wonder if that's just self-serving to the school. It's their report. They – you'd expect they get what they want to hear and I wonder whether like Wayne
5 whether it should be peer reviewed or they should engage a more heritage oriented architect or they really should settle for a more modest building. On the actual building that's proposed the – or the revised building plan note that the NBRHS heritage peer review comes to the same conclusion as the Council and the FOKE Community Group and people who objected to it that it's totally out of scale with the streetscape and doesn't conform to the existing character of the area. There has been
10 some minor alterations to that building but it still presents as a very box-like building with commercial style finishes and a tennis court on top.

I take the point that Tim raised and really hadn't been aware of it or well-aware of it until he mentioned it and it is a condition of consent that there's a two to three metre acoustic barrier built on all sides of the tennis court which brings me back to the school's revised heritage impact statement which repeatedly stresses the tennis court mesh that provides views through to the – or better views through to the brickwork at the back of the court and leaves an open view to Rose Cottage but that's
15 plainly not true. So there's a number of elevations. There's a number of illustrations and perspectives none of which show that. So to all intents and purposes that HIS is invalid because it – I even wonder whether the person that wrote it was aware of those – that acoustic barrier. So I'm just not sure how much time I've got here but
20 - - -

25 MR DUNCAN: You're actually - - -

MR MULHOLLAND: - - - also kind of - - -

30 MR DUNCAN: You're out of time.

MR MULHOLLAND: Sorry?

35 MR DUNCAN: You're out of time, David, but we'll give you another minute or two to wrap up if you

MR MULHOLLAND: Okay. Okay. Can I – so can I just touch base on this traffic situation that Tim was talking to because – because I've got some other pictures here that I think bear witness to what he was saying. So this is just buses line up
40 pretty early and I guess for excursions, sports events, school outings, that sort of thing doesn't look too bad there but when we get to a little bit later in the morning this is actually looking down Bancroft Avenue. So east of my street where you've got a bunch of buses lined up. Traffic's more or less become gridlocked at this point because there's also a lot of traffic that travels using back roads to get to
45 the city. It's not uncommon for – not uncommon for there to be real incidents off road rage where, you know, people are blasting horns.

They're – I've had – I lost a mirror on my son's car one morning when he was parked outside. There's no – there's never any school representatives or any sort of form of traffic control that's helpful and it becomes not just an irritation – it's difficult to get out of your house – but it's actually quite dangerous. There's a lot of kids that walk and cycle to Roseville Public School and they use these streets or the pathways largely and it's just – it seems like irrespective of what happens the school should be obliged to have some sort of traffic management plan that involves probably a traffic management crew that control this traffic. Often it comes down to just the bus drivers doing it which really isn't satisfactory. So I'll leave it at that.

5 Thank you very much for your time and I hope the school and their planners can take some of this on board and just realise what a dramatic impact they're proposing to have on the whole community and the wider community.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, David. Thank you. I'll now ask our final present, Paul Sampson, to present. Paul, can you hear us?

MR P. SAMPSON: Yes. I can hear you. Can you hear me?

MR DUNCAN: Yes, clearly.

MR SAMPSON: Okay. Thank you. My name's Paul Sampson. I own number 36 Bancroft Avenue together with my wife. We've been residents here for 15 years. I am also a former parent at Roseville College. My daughter went there for about eight years so I'm generally a supporter of the school. However, this recent development has caused me along with my fellow Bancroft Avenue and surrounding street residents to lodge some objections and I'd just like to take a few minutes just to summarise some of the points I raised in my written objection some more than 12 months ago and I'd like to start by focusing upon the scale and bulk of the structure. I know this is something which has been mentioned by most of the speakers this morning but I'd just like to reiterate my views.

In my view and my wife's view and my fellow residents' views, the proposed structure is clearly incongruent with the residences and the school's own building that face Bancroft Avenue. I think if you can just cast your mind back to slide 6 shown by the Department, you could see that we had a large, flat, glass-faced, straight, flat-topped structure imposed between two traditional style buildings with sloping roofs, normal sort of housing whether that be the residence to the east of the school or the school's own buildings on the western side of the proposed building. In my view, the Department's assessment fails to explain why the development would not have a significant impact on the established low density residences and streetscape.

Instead, the Department focus upon the bulk form of the building in the context of the existing campus and surrounding streetscape. None of the school's existing buildings facing Bancroft Avenue are of this bulk or have these sort of finishes. Rather, they are of traditional housing in their appearance. The Department also rationalise the building – proposed building in the context of site constraints and I

think herein lies the key issue. The proposed development represents an overdevelopment of the college grounds. Just a few words which everyone has spoken to already about the destruction – the demolition and destruction of a heritage residence. It is very clear in the Department’s own clear review expert report that the residence which is proposed to be demolished contributes significantly to the heritage of the Clanville Heritage Area.

I don’t think I need to say any more. We have one chance to save this house and one chance only. We have also spoken quite a bit about the traffic impacts around the college and particularly on Bancroft Avenue. I was pleased to see in the earlier submissions by the school and reference to the green travel plan and the construction workers’ transport strategy in the Department’s recommendations and report but I pose a question to the Commission which is we will have between 35 to 85 workers, ie, tradie types working on the school for the duration of the construction and we’re going to ask them to park somewhere else or we’re going to ask them to car pool or we’re going to ask them use public transport.

Like most streets – places around Sydney at the moment we’re seeing a lot of just private residences be upgraded, being reconstructed and the like and just for one house you see five to six tradie vans in the street just for one small residential development. This large development will have, as the school acknowledges, between 35 and 85 workers. This is going to have an immense impact on the local streets. I fail to see how a construction workers’ transport strategy will be put into effect. The green travel plan. Well, this could also be, in my view very cynical. The school has been asked for the last 10 years to take more of an interest in the way the students park on the streets, the way we have lots of parents parking on the streets, particularly with after school activity events. I have personally asked the school to open up their car park to allow people to park in their car park when they attend the school. All those have been rejected by the school.

I fail to see how a green travel plan where targets will be set and monitored will have any impact at all. We do know that other schools – other private schools particularly in built-up areas have a much sterner view and that they really stop their students whether it be boys or girls driving to school. At the moment from 7 am in the morning the street gets parked out. The impact of that on the traffic of buses as you’ve already seen in photographs suggested by other speakers. I’d also just like to point out an untruth, I will call it, in the school’s submissions that they provide parking currently for 129 staff and students. I speak to the students on the street because I ask them to move their cars or not to park so close to respect the one metre distance parking rules and they tell me the school provides no parking for them.

There is a requirement for them to provide a certain amount of parking for year 12 students and that currently isn’t done. Lastly, my point is regarding school pick up and drop off. What happens is that the school via the Council increased the number of pick up and drop off parkings on the street which just pushes the traffic further down to the street. I think there is a strong responsibility and onus upon the school within their property to provide drop off and pick up facilities. I’ve seen – I’ve

witnesses the congestion now for many years this creates at drop off and pick up time in Bancroft Avenue and more so in Victoria Avenue where there are younger children getting in and out of cars and I just don't understand why the school cannot provide a dedicated – whether it be a bay or U-turning or something facility for the
5 parents to come in, pick up their children and drive out rather than the parents double park on the street, park in the standing zones or park across residents' driveways.

That's the points that I would like to make to the Commission today, but I would also – I understand the Commission panel members have inspected the site. I hope that
10 we see your report on that inspection at some point and I would also like you to go back to slide 6 at some point and just in your own minds understand how this development cannot be incongruous with the residential streetscape of Bancroft Avenue. Thank you for your time.

15 MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Paul. And just to follow up on the site inspection, notes and photographs are provided on the Commission's website.

MR SAMPSON: Okay.

20 MR DUNCAN: Thank you to all our speakers today. That brings me to the close. Thank you. This is end of the Public Meeting for the proposed Roseville College Sport and Wellbeing Centre Project. Thank you to everybody who has participated in this important process. Commissioner Pilton and I appreciated your input. I'd
25 like to remind you that it's not too late to have your say on this application. Simply click on the have your say portal on our website or send us a submission via email or post. The deadline for written comments, as I said before, is 5 pm on Thursday, 3rd of June 2021. That's next Thursday. In the interests of openness and transparency, we'll be making a full transcript of this Public Meeting available on our website in
30 the next few days.

At the time of determination, the Commission will publish its statement of reasons for decision which will outline how the panel took the community's views into consideration as part of its decision-making process. Finally, a quick thank you to
35 my fellow Commissioner Adrian Pilton and thank you for watching today. From all of us here at the Commission enjoy the rest of your day. Thank you.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[11.23 pm]