

THIS PROCEEDING WAS CONDUCTED BY VIDEO CONFERENCE

MR DUNCAN: Good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin, I'd like to
5 acknowledge the traditional owners of the lands on which we meet and pay my
respects to Elders past, present and emerging. There's a lot of background noise. If
somebody could go on mute. Welcome to the meeting today for the Saints Peter and
Paul Assyrian School project. Assyrian School Limited proposes to construct a new
10 primary school for up to 630 students and 35 staff in six stages. The site is currently
a vacant pasture located in Cecil Park approximately 10 kilometres west of the
Fairfields Central Business District, approximately 16 kilometres southwest of the
Parramatta CBD and approximately 10 kilometres northwest of the Liverpool CBD.
The Western Sydney Aerotropolis is located seven kilometres west of the site.

15 My name is Peter Duncan. I am the chair of this commission panel. I am joined by
my fellow commissioner Adrian Pilton. We're also joined by Stephen Barry from
the office of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interests of openness and
transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being
20 recorded, and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the
Commission's website.

This meeting is one part of the commission's consideration of this matter and will
form one of several sources of information upon which the commission will base its
25 determination. It is important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees
and 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 in writing, which we will then put on
our website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before
30 speaking for the first time, and if all members could please ensure that they do not
speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. We will now
begin. Paul, would you like to make any opening comments, or will we go straight
to the agenda? Paul or Ashleigh?

MR P. LEOTTA: Yes.
35

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MR LEOTTA: I have some – leave to Ashleigh to make comments?

40 MR DUNCAN: Okay. Could I also just say, before you get into the opening,
Ashleigh, the key areas, I think, you know, after going through meetings today, for
us, are traffic, parking and pedestrian access, landscaping, particularly around the
wall area – we talked about that onsite – flooding and stormwater management.
tThey're – not to say the other areas are not of interest to us. They're three of the
45 key areas we would like to cover in the next hour, if we can, please.

MS A. SMITH: Ashleigh Smith from Willowtree Planning. Just, Peter and Adrian, I'd just like to extend our thanks for arranging the meeting with the IPC so soon. It's been a very lengthy process since we first lodged the SSDA. There's been numerous consultations with both council and also Transport for New South Wales and VRS.

5 We believe that the development that's put in front of you at the moment does respond to all the queries and comments provided from both Department, Fairfield City Council and also Transport for New South Wales. We're looking forward receiving I guess your questions and providing answers to them accordingly and then also you reaching a favourable determination.

10

MR K. LE GRAS: Hi, Peter. It's Kim le Gras here. I'm representing PMDL, the architects for the project, and I would concur with Ashleigh, and very grateful for the speedy acceleration of this meeting and the assessment to date.

15 MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Are you going to continue, Ashleigh, with any further presentation, or would you - - -

MS SMITH: as discussed on Monday, we'll just jump straight into it. We know what the matters of consideration are.

20

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Why don't we start with the traffic, parking and pedestrian access. And construction is one thing, but I think operation is the key piece, and particularly your long-term operations as well, when the school is full, and how the – Kosovich Place and also the school ground parking and access works. So would you like to cover that for us, please?

25

MS SMITH: I believe we have Tom Steal from McLaren Traffic, our traffic engineer, on the line.

30 MR T. STEAL: Yes. Tom Steal from McLaren Traffic Engineering. We've done all the traffic assessment for this project since its inception. So there's a number works proposed as part of the application to accommodate the traffic and parking impacts of the school. If we start with the traffic, perhaps. We did an initial assessment back in 2018 which indicated that there would be some upgrades needed to the road network, in particular the intersection of Kosovich Place and Wallgrove Road. We worked through a number of different options with Transport. Quite an exhaustive process. And came to a proposed treatment whereby there would be a right-turn auxiliary lane for the north on Wallgrove Road, left-out only for Kosovich Place such that traffic could turn left out of Kosovich Place and use the roundabout to head south if that was the intention, and auxiliary left-turn lane for the south on Wallgrove into Kosovich Place. Supplementary to that, we have proposed some road upgrades on Kosovich Place itself to accommodate a wider carriageway, a footpath and some bus bays along the front of the school.

35

40

45 With regards to parking, we did a fairly comprehensive assessment of the queueing demands of the school. Obviously it's quite a large school, 630 places in the future. And we found that the queueing impacts can be contained with the 30 kiss and drop

spaces proposed on site, and that is supplementary to the staff spaces. I don't know if you have any questions about the specifics.

MR DUNCAN: I do. The first one is, what's the projected traffic like along
5 Wallgrove Road, particularly when we take into account, you know, Transport's plans for M7, M12 and all the intersection arrangements nearby? What's the view about that, and how would that change the operations of Wallgrove Road?

MR STEAL: It's changed since we started the project. Initially in 2018 when we
10 contacted Transport for their regional modelling and forecast of 10 years growth, they indicated that there would be a slight reduction in traffic every year for 10 years. I think it was between zero and one per cent reduction. We contacted them again late or mid last year, and that had changed to a slight growth of about the same percentage. Long-term, what that meant for the site is there will be a slight growth in
15 traffic along Wallgrove Road based on the current plans to upgrade the M7 and the other projects like the Western Sydney upgrades for the airport. But we've modelled those growth figures as well as the production figures, and there's no change in the level of service on the intersections that are relevant to the site within 10 years.

MR DUNCAN: So Transport's view, even though they do sort of the toll works to
20 the south and those connections, there won't be a major growth in the corridor in the 10 years.

MR STEAL: That's right. There will just be – I can provide you with the detailed
25 figures, but my recollection is there's approximately 1 per cent growth in both directions along Wallgrove Road per year for 10 years from now.

MR DUNCAN: And the arrangements for the sort of – not channelisation, but the
30 turning lanes and bays and things, are – they all meet the desired capacity? Thinking very particularly of, you know, morning peak hour with everybody arriving at once. You know, I could imagine two or three hundred cars. You probably have a better handle on that. But that – they're all quite viable for that scale of capacity?

MR STEAL: Yes. Yes. We've done a queueing assessment using Sidra
35 Intersection which shows that the critical lane is the right-turn lane for the north, but that has more than sufficient capacity to contain the 98th or 95th percentile queue rather, for traffic in the final scale of the school. And that also considered the bus traffic as well.

MR DUNCAN: And you say that's the critical lane because that's where you're
40 expecting the majority of the traffic to come to the school. Is that what you're saying?

MR STEAL: It's the critical lane because that lane is shorter and it has the most
45 conflicts on it in terms of traffic.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Okay. All right. So if we move from the intersection, there was a comment, actually, from Council about the left-turn only out and the view about the need for possible – possibly more physical channelisation there to avoid – you know, rather than just the painted sort of block island. Has there been any
5 discussion with Transport or RMS on that issue?

MR STEAL: My recollection is that we have proposed a concrete island.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.
10

MR STEAL: Just to separate that movement, physically enforce it.

MR DUNCAN: So that's what you're proposing. You're actually proposing a raised island there.
15

MR STEAL: Can I take that question on notice? I - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes. We would be interested in that because obviously, you know, it's important – if it's left-turn only, we want to make sure it's self-enforceable. So if
20 we move into Kosovo Place. We're interested in how, particularly in the afternoon when children are being picked up by parents, how Kosovo Place will work, and on the site, pick-ups – sorry, pick-ups, particularly, because drop-off is probably a little bit more straightforward. And also the interrelationship between the bus bay and the school and how that's actually going to operate once it's operational. We're
25 particularly interested in, you know, children and safety, obviously, mingling amongst the cars and buses and things like that. Just like to understand that process, if you can help us with that.

MR STEAL: Okay. Sure. We've – as one aspect, we've put together a plan of
30 management, which requires the school to place traffic controllers throughout the site, particularly at pedestrian crossing locations, to stop traffic to ensure the safety of children as they use the kiss and drop facilities.

In terms of the vehicle movements, the facility is designed such that parents turn in
35 from the road and then are directed by traffic controllers to either circulate around the car park at the south of the site and then to park in the first available space in the kiss and drop area, or, if those are already full, then park in the first available space on the eastern side of the kiss and drop area.

There's sufficient queueing length in the site, based on our estimations, to
40 accommodate all the school traffic needed during pick-up operations. As you would anticipate, people do generally arrive a little bit early to pick up their children, and we have factored in – our calculations factored in that half the traffic, or thereabouts, would arrive before the bell, and there's enough space on site to accommodate that
45 queue.

MR DUNCAN: All right. Adrian, do you have any questions in this area?

MR PILTON: Yes. That's contrary to what the Council suggests. The Council was suggesting that you would have trouble getting all the traffic into the school and around and so on because of the lane widths and so on. I'm also worried about – not worried. I'm just interested to know if the Road is wide enough at seven metres,
5 if you're going to have people queueing up along the left-hand side, what's going to happen to the traffic. Does that mean nobody else can drive up, or what?

MR STEAL: We've proposed parking restrictions along the south side of the road.

10 MR PILTON: Okay.

MR STEAL: there will be sufficient pavement for two-way passing. And that, in our mind, is sufficient to ensure that there's going to be no gridlock along Kosovich Place.

15

MR PILTON: Okay. The Council was suggesting that there's going to be 272 vehicles coming in to pick up kids, and 90 per cent of those before 3 o'clock, so I'm just wondering what your view is on that number of vehicles. It seems a very high number of vehicles. I'm wondering how you would accommodate them.

20

MR STEAL: That's – I mean, the number itself in the future on a scale of 630 children, that is correct. There would be approximately 272 vehicles arriving in total over, say, a half hour or 45 minute period.

25 MR PILTON: Yes.

MR STEAL: But we've done a queueing calculation based on average stay length which shows that the queue does dissipate after the bell rings such that the traffic will not enter or queue up in Kosovich Place.

30

MR PILTON: Okay, thank you. And - - -

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And - - -

35 MR PILTON: And how about buses? How many buses do you expect?

MR STEAL: The buses, we've engaged to some extent with the bus operator, who has not been able to provide us with an exact number of buses that they will need to run to accommodate the school traffic, but I think they will be based on the demand.
40 Because, as you would appreciate, they can't commit to a number of buses until there's the demand for them. But they have looked over the bus bays that we've composed, and they are of the opinion that the three bus bays would be sufficient.

MR PILTON: Okay, thank you.

45

MR DUNCAN: And just on – while we're talking about the access and parking, also council raised the issue of the turning standards and lane widths and things like

that with the, sort of, I guess the southern car park, cars getting in and around there. From your point of view, Tom, and from what you have you said, it appears that that's all standard widths and appropriate for that type of traffic?

5 MR STEAL: That's right, and it's all designed, actually, to exceed the Australian standards, if we're talking about the southern part of the car park.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, that's right. So it actually exceeds, does it? That's helpful. Okay. And just a couple of other questions related to this but, Paul, this might be a
10 question for you and – you know, if you had to, in operations, make some changes, is there any way – is there any interrelationship between the adjoining church car park and this school can – you know, can there be any overflow or, sort of, use of those facilities mid-week when I assume there's not a peak demand in the church grounds?

15 MR LEOTTA: The church – the church car park could be made available to the school.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

20 MR LEOTTA:

MR DUNCAN: So there are opportunities there, you know, post-operations, if you need to make refinements and for overflow parking and those sorts of things?

25 MR LEOTTA: That's correct. Also, in terms of the school reaching the 630 students, it will probably be 10 years plus from the date construction starts. So it won't be a thing over a short period of time.

MR DUNCAN: Okay, thank you. And I assume, you know, when the – these buses
30 do arrive the children are marshalled and managed so that they're not, sort of, out on Kosovich Place, that they're actually in the school grounds, and those sorts of things?

MR LEOTTA: That's correct.

35 MR DUNCAN: There would be some sort of management process or plan that you'd put in place for that?

MR STEAL: That's right, there's a management plan.

40 MR DUNCAN: Okay. There's one already, is there, Tom?

MR STEAL: Yes, yes, we had to put one together for the

MR DUNCAN: Yes. And the – there – it wouldn't be possible to locate the buses
45 within the school grounds, would it?

MR STEAL: No, the bus operator would not allow that, they were very concerned about the delay involved in coming in and out of the school.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

5

MR PILTON: But the council – the council would have to give approval for bus parking on the street, I understand?

MR STEAL: That's right, I mean, all the - - -

10

MR PILTON: - - -

MR STEAL: - - - Kosovich Place would need to go to the local traffic committee.

15

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Yes, so it's the traffic committee, really. And the traffic committee wouldn't have seen this at this stage, would they?

MR STEAL: No, they have not.

20

MR DUNCAN: Okay. All right. I think I've – that's it for me on traffic and parking, Adrian, are you - - -

MR PILTON: Yes, I'm – that's enough for me too. Sorry, one more question. The council is also suggesting that Wallgrove Road might well become a dual carriageway. Do you have any comment on that?

25

MR STEAL: I was - - -

MR PILTON: And what effect that would have.

30

MR STEAL: I was not aware of that. I would have to take that on notice.

MR PILTON: To - - -

35

MR STEAL: To my knowledge that hasn't been - - -

MR PILTON: you think it's likely?

MR STEAL: It could happen but, look, it would take away – to my knowledge the M7 is the road that is meant to provide capacity for that route and that Wallgrove Road is kind of secondary.

40

MR DUNCAN: If that - - -

45

MR PILTON: - - -

MR DUNCAN: If that amount of minimum growth they're talking about is correct it doesn't seem likely in the immediate or even medium future, does it? One per cent growth on that road you wouldn't think would bring on a dual carriageway, when you've got the capacity on the motorway.

5

MR STEAL: That's right.

MR DUNCAN: And we may talk to transport in this process. So could we go on, then, to – unless there's something more you wanted to add, Tom?

10

MR STEAL: No, that's it, thank you very much.

MR DUNCAN: Could we go, then, to landscaping, and with particular attention to the retaining wall along the eastern boundary. So can we have a talk about the landscape concept there? Sorry, I think – was it Derek?

15

MR D. OSBORNE: Yes, it is, yes, sorry. I'm representing Arterra, the landscape architects for the project. So would you like to direct questions to me about that?

20

MR DUNCAN: Well, there's two questions, and Adrian might want to say something as well, but the - - -

MR OSBORNE: Yes.

25

MR DUNCAN: The of the very high wall, to start with, it say it's shotcrete and it's treated as a green wall; we just want to understand a little bit more about that. And also, in talking to the Department, they're concerned that the, sort of, almost planter box treatment at the base is not large enough, and that they'd wish to see that a lot wider, or - - -

30

MR PILTON: Also at the told of the wall, I think.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, that's right. So just - - -

35

MR OSBORNE: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: - - - get your opinion on both of those issues, and probably explain to Adrian and I how this green wall approach works.

40

MR OSBORNE: Yes, okay. My understanding – and I could be wrong, but my understanding from the Department was that they were looking to increase the setback from the boundary at the top of the large wall. So currently it's 750 from the boundary to the back of the wall, and they're looking to increase that to 1.5 metres at the same plane as the existing ground level adjacent to the – of the adjacent

45

neighbour. My reading of their comment was not so much about the lower planter or the width of that and, in fact, I thought there was a suggestion in there that that could possibly be done away with; was my understanding. The – or reduced.

The wall is a piled wall with shotcrete between the piles, and our intention, then, is to plant climbers at the base of the wall – so there will need to be a garden of some sort at the base of the wall, most definitely – and that the climbers cling directly onto the wall. So such as ivy, Boston ivy, possibly, you know, Ficus pumila, those species.

5 That's what we've proposed. There are other options, of course, we could fix a mesh to it and there would be a much broader range of species that we could use if we were to fix a mesh in front of the wall itself. Now, at the base of the wall if we were to do away with the planter, the planter wall is 300 wide, we could have a garden at the level of the footpath. And, you know, plant trees in there as well as the planters.

10 If we are – if we're going to keep that planter as it's shown in the typical section there, then, of course, we need to look for that 750 mil elsewhere.

MR DUNCAN: Right. And that would mean you don't – you wouldn't want to narrow the road widths and those sorts of areas. It would mean, sort of, moving

15 everything down the hill a bit, wouldn't it?

MR OSBORNE: Yes, which is not - - -

MR DUNCAN: Not - - -

20

MR OSBORNE: - - - easy to do. I'm not the architect, but the Department itself did, when they were discussing this issue, talk about the constraints on the western side of the building. So, yes, it is a difficult thing.

25 MR PILTON: I'm just a little bit confused by this section. I'm looking at your drawing LSBO2.

MR OSBORNE: Yes.

30 MR PILTON: And it seems to show some kind of blockwork facing to the piled wall, I'm not quite sure where the blockwork toning comes from. You can see the drawing. I mean, from what you're saying it'll just be shotcrete, so I don't know what the shading is supposed to show.

35 MR OSBORNE: The shading is possibly representing the shotcrete between the piles.

MR DUNCAN: Okay, okay.

40 MR OSBORNE: The piles will be thicker than the shotcrete. The piles are likely to be, you know, - - -

MR PILTON: Yes.

45 MR OSBORNE: - - - 450, possibly more. And whereas the shotcrete would only be typically 150 mil, yes.

MR PILTON: You may not be the person to answer the question, but what's the capping on the wall?

5 MR OSBORNE: The pile capping?

MR PILTON: Yes.

10 MR OSBORNE: Yes, so that ties – that's a beam that runs across the top of the piles to - - -

MR PILTON: Yes, but - - -

MR OSBORNE: - - - tie them together, structurally.

15 MR PILTON: - - -

MR OSBORNE: Concrete, concrete, sorry, yes.

20 MR PILTON: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Given it faces west it'll be very hot, so I imagine that's quite a tricky thing that's going to need some fairly strong treatment to make it establish.

25 MR OSBORNE: The planting? Yes. Yes, it does need to be the right planting, that's right, yes. But it is possible with the right plants, it's – I mean, it's not in – we're not proposing that it's ferns, you know, like, a lot of the green walls that you see, particularly in the city, with the, you know, the planter boxes and pots and they have trickling water running down, they have some quite delicate ferns.

30 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

35 MR OSBORNE: That wouldn't work there, no, it's way too hot for that. Which is why we've proposed a climber from the base running up the wall, yes. And that can be irrigated at the base, so we're quite confident that we can get a plant to work there, it won't be a soft tropical plant, but we can get species to work, yes.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

40 MR S. BARRY: Excuse me, Stephen Barry here. We've got somebody in the waiting room with the mobile number of 0417 628 730. Does that make – does anybody recognise that number? Paul, perhaps?

MS SMITH: SLR.

45 MR BARRY: Yes, there's no identification beyond the mobile number.

MR DUNCAN: Are you expecting somebody else to join the meeting?

MS SMITH: Just when the agenda was sent out or reissued this morning, Peter, there was comment about the noise and the operations of the school.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

5

MS SMITH: So we contacted out acoustic consultant, SLR, and he is on the road and he was going to dial in, so it may well be him. Let me just check if I can find out his mobile number. Apologies.

10 MR LE GRAS: He's just sent a message through to me to say that his laptop battery has died and that's probably why he's dialling in.

MR DUNCAN: Okay, okay. Well, I think let him in, Stephen.

15 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

MS SMITH: Thank you, Member.

20 MR DUNCAN: We can identify him once he comes in. Is – hello, who has just joined us? What's - - -

MS SMITH: Matt - - -

25 MR M. BRYCE: It's Matt Bryce from SLR.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Thanks, Matt. We've started the meeting - - -

MR BRYCE: I apologise.

30 MR DUNCAN: We're well into it, we didn't recognise your number so we just wanted to check that it was you.

MR BRYCE: No, I was in before but my laptop died.

35 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR BRYCE: Ran out of battery.

40 MR DUNCAN: Okay, thank you.

MR BRYCE: Now, I'm on the phone.

45 MR DUNCAN: All right. So we've just – I think, Adrian, we've got to the end of the landscape issue, is that right? Is there any more you want to - - -

MR PILTON: Well, I just might ask Kim, if we were to ask for this plant base to be wider what are the implications, can you move the building, like, a metre to the west, or anything like that? Is that feasible?

5 MR LE GRAS: Are you – it's very difficult. I wouldn't say it's impossible, but because we are lining up some of those driveways and entry points with the levels of the road it does put some restrictions on it. I do believe we can probably get most of the distance that you had asked for and, as Derek said, if we can reduce the path perhaps the size of the planter at the bottom, and then we can - - -

10 MR PILTON: Okay.

MR LE GRAS: - - - that extra distance. But, really, anything much more than a couple of hundred millimetres is going to be a little tricky for us.

15 MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Adrian, I – from my point of view I wouldn't want to lose too much of the width in the bottom out of this - - -

20 MR PILTON: No.

MR DUNCAN: Because it – you know, to get that effect - - -

25 MR PILTON: - - -

MR DUNCAN: We've got a bit of background noise.

30 MR PILTON: someone It sounds like it's the kids getting out of school.

MR DUNCAN: It must be, yes. All right. Well, let me move on. Maybe, given we wanted to talk about noise we go to that, seeing Matt has dialled in it might be – Matt, you might be able to give us just a short summary of noise from school operations.

35 MR OSBORNE: Sorry, Peter, if I may, just before we move on. Could you just clarify in your response about the planter at the base.

40 MR DUNCAN: We will do that, yes. We will do that in our process, yes.

MR OSBORNE: Excellent.

MR DUNCAN: We'll come back to Ashleigh if we have any questions.

45 MR OSBORNE: Okay. Great. Thank you very much.

MR DUNCAN: So Matt, do you want to provide us your summary of the noise?

MR BRYCE: Yes, of course. Sure. No worries. Matt Bryce from SLR. I've done the noise assessments. As far as the operation is concerned, schools are not particularly noisy and the noise that they do produce tends to be just children playing and lunchtime activities, a bit of sport on the oval, that sort of thing. Most don't
5 find that too offensive or out of character, so – we have also looked at some other sources associated, such as mechanical plants. Very much a high-level assessment's only possible at this stage - - -

10 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR BRYCE: - - - but we've sort of got a rough plan to look at that in more detail, but the noise assessment thus far really just provides a proof of principle that it is possible to run all your cooling equipment and air conditioning and those sorts of systems. They'll require a bit of consideration in the detailed design. And any
15 mitigation that is required will just take – take the form of, you know, carefully considered equipment, choosing low-noise models, using noise barriers or screens around them and things like that. And certainly, the location of them will be considered as well. So we don't see that to be much of a concern. We've had a look at the traffic noise, particularly along Kosovich Place.

20 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR BRYCE: It's a little bit of a concern because we're – we have some buses and several hundred vehicles where there's presently none, so we go – or very few, I
25 should say. The M7 does provide a lot of existing noise, I guess, from residual traffic. The criteria tends to take that into account, though, so studies thus far show that the increase in the traffic noise level relative to what's already there is fairly low. It's only about two decibels, which most observers or most people would not notice an increase of about two to three dB. Or, sorry, three dB is about where the
30 threshold of noticeability begins, so yes, certainly, the noise provided by the - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes. So existing - - -

35 MR BRYCE:

MR DUNCAN: Existing neighbours and adjoining properties won't notice from either road or operations of the school any discernible increase.

MR BRYCE: No. No. That's what we've looked at so far. I do see in the
40 conditions or the draft conditions there's a consideration requirement for buses. We haven't looked at buses yet, but we can add those into the assessment and see if that makes any difference to the outcome thus far. In relation to the other draft conditions, there's a requirement there to consider noise intrusions into the church. We haven't done any assessment of the church yet. Our understanding thus far is
45 that it's a – what we call a related entity.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR BRYCE: It's not exactly part of the school, but it's all under the same umbrella, so to speak, so any noise impacts there would be not likely to result in complaints. But obviously, the operators want to make sure that the – you don't lose the function of the church – functionality of the church. So we don't want too much noise getting in there. And we can look at whether the church needs any upgrades or things like that to keep noise out, particularly during the busy peaks of drop-offs and pick-ups. But there wouldn't be a lot of overlap with the school and the church use. I think maybe just some funerals and things like that. So we can certainly look at that. I should say, we've also looked at the location itself for the school as part of the DA assessment or the SSD assessment just to make sure that noise from the M7 and any other sources of noise in the environment doesn't get into the school.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR BRYCE: Obviously, the school's got to be fit for function there, fit for purpose, so I think there's some glazing requirements recall off the top of my head, but it wouldn't be particularly onerous, so we'd expect to meet that criteria using fairly standard construction for the school; nothing specific or over the top as far as acoustic requirements is concerned.

MR DUNCAN: I'm happy with that, Adrian. Are you?

MR PILTON: I'm happy with that, thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks. Thanks, Matt. Appreciate it. And then the next point is flooding and stormwater management; specifically, the flooding area. I'm not sure, Paul or Ashleigh, who will – who should cover that.

MS SMITH: Have we got – Kim, is the team on the – is Martens on?

MR T. HARVEY: Yes. Hi.

MS SMITH: Yes. There we are.

MR HARVEY: I'm Terry Harvey from Martens and I'll be answering questions regarding flooding and stormwater.

MR DUNCAN: Flooding: are you covering that, Terry?

MR HARVEY: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Okay. Please proceed. If you could – just a little bit of a summary of it. One thing that did come up with council was the potential for some flood modelling, and I just wanted to get your views on that.

MR HARVEY: Currently, the way the proposed development is situated, there's not much encroachment into the floodplain, where all the earthworks and all the

developments above the 20-year, including the irrigation area for the wastewater. The 100-year extent is slightly changed and, by our calculations, there's an additional few cubic metres of flood storage onsite. I think it's two or three. Yes, a couple of cubic metres. So we're not taking away flood storage and there's no
5 obstructions to the flow. And so the 100-year flood extent is only changing very, very marginally, so I think any flood model would just reinforce that. There's not an impact or change to any flood hazard category or significant material impacts to any sort of flooding characteristics or – you know, including offsite impacts. So I don't really see the need for a flood model in this instance, but if it's required to provide
10 clarity, yes, I'm sure it can be done.

MR DUNCAN: My understanding of the council's question was more – from their point, it's sort of standard practice in this environment that they do model flood impacts. I'm not sure whether council had their own modelling – own facility or
15 ability to model flooding, but if it were required, is it a big deal? Is it something that takes a long time and very expensive? What's the arrangements to run a 20 and a 100-year flood model for a development like this of this scale?

MR HARVEY: Yes. If we were to set up a model, there'd be a bit of work in it. I
20 believe, from my understanding, which I don't know if council is here to confirm, but I think council have already got some regional flood models in the area, so it would be simpler if we could get council's flood model, make the minor changes and re-run it.

MR DUNCAN: I think that's what they're suggesting. So that would be a simpler
25 exercise than starting from scratch, obviously.

MR HARVEY: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Okay. And with the landscape proposals along the creek line,
30 that won't have any impacts from a stormwater point of view or flood point of view.

MR HARVEY: I don't have the landscape plans in front of me, but as long as there
35 wasn't any significant introduction of additional obstructions to flow in the lower-lying parts of the site, I don't think it'd be a significant issue.

MR PILTON: Can I ask you to take this on notice: could you have a look at the
40 landscape architect's plans, because there is extensive tree-planting down at the bottom of the site which may or may not have an effect on flows through there, which would – it'd be disturbing if we had to remove all of the tree-planting.

MR HARVEY: Yes. I haven't got the landscape plan in front of me. It should be a
simple enough concept to just incorporate that into any flood modelling - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR HARVEY: - - - to determine if there any impacts. And if there was any impacts found from any additional vegetation or any landscape – proposed landscaping features or elements, that could be worked through relatively simply, I think.

5

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you.

10 MR DUNCAN: All right. Thanks for that, Terry. I don't have a lot more questions, Adrian; do you?

MR PILTON: No. I think that's covered everything that I want to know.

15 MR DUNCAN: So Ashleigh or Paul, do you wish – is there anything you want to say now in summing-up before we close the meeting?

MS SMITH: Just very quickly. Thank you both again, Peter and Adrian, for your time. In principle, we're in agreeance with, I guess, the assessment report from the
20 Department and the draft conditions, but one thing we just wanted to note – and it may be something that we – for our submission to the IPC by next Friday – is just around the conditions where council and/or Transport for New South Wales have referred to or they've got to endorse particular aspects of the project. Just with the history and the movement of how quickly particularly council and also Transport for
25 New South Wales have acted on this application, some of the conditions that are in the draft conditions have no – they don't include any accountability or timeframe for when they actually have to endorse a particular aspect of that development.

Noting, though, that condition A15 does state where there is a dispute between the
30 applicant and public authority that the planning secretary will step in to be the moderator, I guess, to resolve that dispute. But then, I guess, you question what constitutes dispute. So what we're looking at is whether there's opportunity to actually – if we identify conditions, to actually put a timeframe for either council or Transport for New South Wales to be able to respond to. And if they haven't
35 responded or endorsed that particular aspect between that – within that timeframe, then the planning secretary steps in to be the moderator to ensure that the project actually keeps moving forward and that it's not just the consent that – or the determination that we issue is not going to be just delayed further throughout the process.

40

MR DUNCAN: Yes. I think we all note that, Ashleigh. I think also the fact that you do – if you did proceed and you do get a condition A15, it is a step ahead of where you are at the moment because you don't have that mechanism at the moment, do you?

45

MS SMITH: No, not at all. So whether that's what the wording of that condition is meant to enforce that – does it refer all the conditions in the consent itself and that

where there is a dispute – but again, it's what constitutes a dispute. Is it when they're not responding or if they are responding, are they dragging their feet and not providing – endorsing in a timely manner?

5 MR DUNCAN: Okay. Well, we take your point and we'll consider that in the process.

MS SMITH: And I do believe, Tom, if you're still on the line, you do have a query around condition B13 as well. Still there.

10

MR STEAL: Yes. Yes, that's right. Condition B13. There's a condition in there – I think it's 4 – B4, which requires us to do works only to the west of the centreline of Wallgrove Road.

15 MR DUNCAN: It's not B4. That's stormwater, I think.

MR STEAL: B31.

MR PILTON: B what? 31, did you say?

20

MR STEAL: Yes. B31(b)(4).

MR DUNCAN: Details - - -

25 MR PILTON: technical. B31.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS SMITH: B13.

30

MR DUNCAN: We might have different numbers.

MR PILTON: Maybe you could put those in writing and send them to us.

35 MR DUNCAN: I think that's - - -

MR PILTON: draft conditions with suggestions for improvements.

40 MR DUNCAN: That's probably helpful if you did it that way rather than try and do it on the run now.

MS SMITH: We're happy to document those and put it back in writing to the IPC.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

45

MR DUNCAN: That's helpful. Adrian, anything more.

MR PILTON: I don't have anything, thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Stephen Barry from the commission office, do you have any questions, Stephen?

5

MR BARRY: No, I don't.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thank you. All right. Paul and Ashleigh and everybody presenting, thanks for your time this afternoon on a Friday afternoon. Is there anything you'd like to add in summing-up?

10

MS SMITH: Nothing further from our end. Just again, thank you for your time.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thank you.

15

MS SMITH: Any that you have, please do not hesitate to contact us.

MR DUNCAN: Certainly we will, and, you know, we don't have a long timeframe because there's no public meeting in this process, so we'll see how we go, and if we need to, we'll come back to you fairly quickly, okay. Thank you. I'll close the meeting at that point.

20

MATTER ADJOURNED at 4.47 pm INDEFINITELY