



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-1535897

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

APPLICANT MEETING

RE: TRINITY GRAMMAR SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT (SSD 10371)

PANEL: **ADRIAN PILTON, Chair**
WENDY LEWIN
SHERIDAN COAKES

IPC: **BRAD JAMES**
KATE MOORE

APPLICANT: **TIM BOWDEN**
CAMPBELL DUNGAN
CRAIG SANDWELL
CHRIS WILSON
RACHEL STREETER
PETER BROGAN
ANDREW PENDER
SUE CAI
MEL FYFE
JOHNATHAN BRYANT
ALLIE BARNIER

LOCATION: **VIDEO CONFERENCE**

DATE: **12.37 PM, WEDNESDAY, 11 AUGUST 2021**

MR A. PILTON: Okay. Thank you. Well, we'll start the formal part of the meeting with a discussions and presentation so I'll have to start again with the introductory speech so bear with me. Good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we
5 virtually meet today and pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting toady to discuss the Trinity Grammar School Redevelopment SSD 10371 which is currently before the Commission for determination. The Council of Trinity Grammar School, the applicant, is seeking consent for the redevelopment of Trinity Grammar School Summer Hill Campus.
10 Summer Hill is located approximately seven kilometres west of the Sydney CBD.

The proposal seeks demolition of some existing buildings, construction of four new buildings, refurbishment of four existing buildings, reconfiguration and expansion of the underground car park, landscaping, external road and public domain works,
15 signage and a staged increased in students and staff. My name is Adrian Pilton. I am the chair of this commission panel. I'm joined by my fellow commissioners Wendy Lewin and Dr Sheridan Coakes. We're also joined by Brad James and Kate Moore 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
20 information is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website.

This meeting is one part of the 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 are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing which we will then put up on our website. I request all members here today introduce themselves before
30 speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin. So I'll hand over to whoever on the applicant's side is going to run this.

MR C. WILSON: Myself. Thank you, Mr Chairman and commissioners. Chris
35 Wilson, Willowtree Planning again. We're happy to field a lot of questions today and we don't have any further presentation material. We do have material available if you wish to ask questions and we can bring up the relevant plans, etcetera but, in summary, we certainly have been on a very comprehensive and extensive consultative journey with both the department and the community and the agencies.
40 We've worked very hard in responding to those and adjusting our plans where we can where issues have arisen and, in summary, we're very comfortable with the instrument of approval – the draft instrument of approval that you see before you prepared by the Department of Planning. We endorse the recommendation and the findings of the report put to yourselves and, as I said, we're happy to field any
45 questions that you may have today.

MR PILTON: I mean, perhaps we could just sort of – you’ve been given a copy of the agenda, I hope.

MR WILSON: Sure, sure.

5

MR PILTON: If we can just run through the points that you’ve said already: that you are happy with the department’s assessment report and, presumably, that include the draft conditions.

10 MR WILSON: Yes.

MR PILTON: Okay. Well, if we could just move on to traffic and the traffic impact assessment. Would you like to maybe expand on the issues that that’s brought up.

15 MR WILSON: Sure. And I’ll hand over to Mel Fyfe who’s our traffic consultant. We’ve heard from earlier in the virtual tour. Mel, if you wouldn’t mind addressing the panel. Thanks.

20 MS M. FYFE: Certainly. Thanks, Chris. Mel Fyfe here. I’m the managing director of Street Level Strategies. As Chris mentioned, I’ve been the traffic and transport consultant on this project. I do have some – I do have some slides that would help to – to take us through this.

25 MR PILTON: Please.

MS FYFE: I’ll just get that up on the screen now. So just basically – just move this over. So just to give you a – a brief overview, so obviously we had the environmental impact statement in 2020 so that was prepared by TTM Consulting. I used to work with TTM Consulting but have been consistent on the project as TTM
30 folded up their consulting branch in Sydney in 2020 as part of COVID. So the traffic impact assessment was done and then since that time after that was submitted we’ve had a number of fires after the response to submission and so we’ve done a fair bit of supplementary traffic information and assessments. So I’ll be referring to that as well. That’s the most contemporaneous information that we’ve got and it – and it’s –
35 and it’s quite robust so I’ll take you to that as well. So I’ll take you through some of the supplementary information, the updated intersection assessments we’ve done in particular as well as the updates in the Green Travel Plan.

40 I’ll take you through the car park design and operations, particularly around that design intent which I’ve already talked about a little bit. The drop off and pick up and the capacity for that as well as the access to and from the street because that’s changing a little bit and becoming more flexible and the proposed roadworks as part of this project that we are progressing as well and, of course, please ask any questions as we go. So our base assumptions for the traffic assessment from EIS all
45 the through to now was that we have a base case which in 2020 was the current year of 2020 but now in 2021 for the supplementary information where we have a baseline of 1655 students on Summer Hill campus and 277 staff. So that’s been

consistent through all of the traffic assessment we've done throughout the entire project and future case, which is a full development scenario, everything's completed of the year 2028 with 2100 students and 327 staff.

5 We have conducted assessments of 11 intersections throughout the course of the project. So these yellow intersections and the orange ones, they were originally assessed as part of the EIS and that as part of supplementary traffic assessment we have conducted assessment on these red intersection and redone the assessment on the orange intersections. So this is Prospect Street here, Hurlstone Avenue, Henson,
10 James. This is Seaview and Prospect Road; Seaview, Victoria Street; Seaview and Hardland; Service and Hardland; Queen and Harland and this up here is Liverpool Road and Victoria Road. So Victoria – this Liverpool Street intersection and these four along Old Canterbury Road are all state roads and the other intersections are all local streets. So in our current initial EIS we had SEARs to undertake assessment of
15 the intersection on Old Canterbury Road and as due diligence for the project we undertook these four intersection assessments for local streets.

As you can see, the – the state roads, we found that they were operating at a core level of service. Adding the development traffic on didn't make them worse but we
20 did propose some mitigation and I'll talk about the roadworks towards the end of this project because propose mitigations. They've changed slightly but I'll talk about that in a little bit more detail. And as you can see, all the local streets are operating at a very good level of service. So A being a – a great level service, no congestion at all and F is typically when an intersection is failing and needs a higher degree of
25 control. So if it's – if it's uncontrolled, it might need some type of control.

When we have done the subsequent work – the – the supplementary work, what we wanted to do was really take a really solid look again at all the modelling that we did and so the approach that we've done for the RFI works is review the previous
30 modelling. We checked it. We tested all the assumptions again, the distribution of traffic and the calibration and we were able to correct a few small errors on the calibration of the model. We undertook a SIDRA network model instead of a single intersection model which was much more appropriate for the site and we focused on the am peak. We did model both am and pm but the am peak for the school
35 coincides with the commuter peak, whereas the pm peak for the school doesn't coincide with the commuter peak and, again, just rehashing the base assumptions, current year 2021 for base case. Future year 2028 when everything is complete.

So with the updated results – so, really, we were trying to – especially for these – the
40 Harland Street and the Queen Street intersection and Victoria Road, I should say, as well these three lot of intersections we were really trying to make sure that we got a level of services C or better, so an A, B or C result for those and thankfully on all of those intersections they're performing quite well. They do have an A, B or C level of service and we reran at the request of the department the modelling for these
45 intersections again taking the network approach and making we double-checked everything from the calibration. We see that the level of service is much better from

what was shown in the EIS and that the impact of the school's development on the – on those intersections doesn't worsen them. So that's actually a really good result.

5 We are still proposing mitigations for the Prospect Road intersection. Even though it's technically not needed, it does provide a much better outcome for the community so the school is planning to progress that and it's concluded in the conditions – in the draft conditions of consent as well. In terms of the EIS, the original transport impact assessment, we did include – include a construction and management plan
10 framework in there which is really about just making sure that access to and from the site for heavy vehicles is safe, that vehicles are in and out in a forward direction and covering their loads, they're reducing on street parking so, really, trying to reduce any negative impact on the amenity of the local community and making sure that construction works are undertaken safely.

15 And in this image here you can see the proposed haulage routes. These will be further developed as part of the CTMP that will be developed by the contractor but the main intention with haulage routes for construction traffic management plans are to get traffic off the local network as quickly as possible and the reason why you'll see the red lines are the route in and the green – green lines are the routes out and
20 we've done that because we didn't want the in and out traffic to be on the same streets always. We really wanted to separate that out so that we could provide a bit of relief for the community. In terms of the Green Travel Plan, there was a Green Travel Plan that was submitted as part of the original EIS but we have updated that since and it's – it's much more robust now. It's got 29 key actions that the school
25 has committed to addressing. It is resource-based from a human and financial perspective and is a really strong commitment to the school.

30 So the Green Travel Plan is all about a 10 per cent mode shift towards sustainable transport over the next 10 years and the school's got a really strong track record already and so I'm very confident that the school with the actions that are in the Green Travel Plan will be able to achieve this realistically. It's got five key strategies. One is about increasing active – travel by active transport, increasing travel by public transport, increasing use of Trinity bus services – these are
35 incredibly popular with students – and as – as Tim mentions, the catchment's quite broad. These Trinity bus services service that catchment really well and there's a – there's a strategy and a methodology in place to be able to monitor and expand those services as needed.

40 Of course, reducing the number of car trips. We want to keep on the positive trend that the school is already tracking in terms of that and there's some strong actions there around car pooling for staff and continuing with the remote and flexible learning arrangements and there's a really strong commitment to engagement in governance as well. A lot of work around visibility, making sure that the whole school community is aware of progress and what's important and how the school's
45 tracking in terms of getting there, consultation, its resource and the monitoring – monitoring and reporting framework as well. The school's got a – as I mentioned,

the school's got a strong history. They're – they're already tracking really well in terms of reducing that – that car mode share.

5 Up the top here you can see the drop off and pick up of car has been declining pretty well over the last seven years. So there's been a eight per cent decline in car trips over seven years. So this is what also gives me confidence given we've got this evidence base that the school is realistically going to achieve that 10 per cent mode shift. We're also seeing an uplift in light rail usage, an uplift in train usage and an uplift in walking as well and there's some actions in the plan that will help improve those things even more. In terms of bicycle parking and end-of-trip and, of course, 10 part of the Green Travel Plan is making sure that you've got the hard and the soft measures so there's infrastructure that will – that will go in place as part of the draft conditions. There's a requirement for 40 student spaces for bike parking near Victoria Street which is up here and 40 students near the Prospect Road entrance as well and 16 staff spaces near the staff end-of-trip facilities which is here in the 15 Founders Centre.

20 So these blue markings here are proposed locations for the bike parking. These are student parking here, staff parking here and this is staff end-of-trip and student's end-of-trip is underneath the aquatic centre already. So lockers, showers, everything that boys need is in there as well as staff. There's lockers and showers as well.

MR PILTON: Sorry, can I just interrupt there. Just asking about the - - -

25 MS FYFE: Of course.

MR PILTON: Where – the 40 student bike parks up near Victoria Road, where would that be?

30 MS FYFE: So at the moment we're proposing that as part of – and Sue feel free to jump in here, we're proposing that as we want to locate it somewhere in the vicinity of the car park here. Sue, did you want to talk a little bit more about - - -

35 MS S. CAI: So basically the Jubilee Drive will be the new arrival point. So at the time of submission we've indicated I think about 16 parking there. It has been up to 40 so we're - - -

MS FYFE:

40 MS CAI: Yes. So we are assessing the adjacent – adjacent areas as you enter from Victoria Street for – to accommodate for 40 parking.

MR PILTON: Do you think it might be on the – on the pedestrian zone, as it were, on the new entry or closer towards the school?

45 MS CAI: So this is something we will be looking at in further detail - - -

MS FYFE: Yes.

MS CAI: - - - to make sure that they're appropriately located.

5 MS FYFE: Yes.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you.

10 MS FYFE: Yes. In – in this vicinity here so that it's nice and close to the entry and really legible from a rider perspective as well.

MS W. LEWIN: Mel.

15 MR PILTON: Thank you.

MS LEWIN: May I just ask a question.

MS FYFE: Yes, of course.

20 MS LEWIN: With that proposed 40 spaces for bikes and the intensification of use of that entry of Victoria Street both in terms of pedestrian and vehicular use, have you factored in at this point any increased risk for crossover of pedestrians, bicycle users and cars at that entry point? Have you looked at any other location for those proposed 40 spaces?

25 MS FYFE: Yes. At – at the moment we're working through exactly where the location of those will be and taking – Commissioner, taking those points absolutely into account so that we don't have those conflict areas so that we can keep those separation of uses really nice and clear and still make where the bike parking is nice and legible for – for riders who are coming to the site and making sure that, yes, any conflict opportunity is – is reduced or eliminated as much as possible.

30 MS LEWIN: And would that also be considered as part of the design of the perimeter landscape planting – any new planting so that there's consistent and – and clear visual access to the – the entry points, whatever they are?

40 MS FYFE: Yes, yes. That – that would be right and – yes. It would be – it would definitely be included in the documentation to make sure that – yes – it's – it's – it's clear and consistent and it's included in development packages.

MS LEWIN: Thank you.

45 DR S. COAKES: And – and Sherie Coakes here. Mel, just – just building on Wendy's comment – question there, obviously, from a bicycle cycle access we also know that a lot of the routes leading to the school are on road cycle routes, not off road and obviously we know from some of the submissions and the community's issues around cycleways around that area. So have you given that any consideration?

Because, obviously, that will be a very busy entry, the vehicle pedestrian bicycle access.

5 MS FYFE: Yes. We – we have. We were actually proposing some – some works
and an upgrade to the – so up here in – in this left-hand corner here and – and I’ll talk
about that a bit shortly. We’re – we’re actually – we’re proposing an upgrade to that
pedestrian refuse into a raised crossing facility with an integrated cycle crossing to
really – really help with that crossover and the integration cycle route from Harland
10 Street as well as further south on Victoria Road coming from Hank Street as well as
any routes through the park because there’ll be riders that come through the park.
Then that becomes a really nice arrival place whether you’re coming from, you
know, Prospect Road and you’re coming through the park over to this side or if you
just want to go straight into the Prospect Road side. So, yes, it’s definitely been
15 considered and we’re actually in conversation with council – Inner West Council
right now about that proposed design and how we can integrate really great cycle
amenity as well as pedestrian amenity in the context of the traffic environment as
well.

20 DR COAKES: Okay. All right. Thank you.

MR PILTON: Okay.

MS FYFE: Any other questions on this slide?

25 MR PILTON: No. I think you can push on. Thank you.

MS FYFE: Yes. No problem. All right. And car park and operations. So we’ve –
we’ve touched on this a little bit already. So the current design we’ve got Victoria
30 Street here. We saw in the drone footage and everything the entry in and out and as
we saw, vehicles come around here, around this corner into the drop off zones here
and what we’ve found with the orientation of these car parking spaces right now is
that people drive into the car park and I’m not sure if you noticed in the footage even
on a – on a quiet day where you don’t have full students you still have a lot of
vehicles parking in these areas just because it’s – it’s convenient and people like
35 convenience and so you’ve got all these – these opportunities to park and as soon as
people start parking here they start delaying all this traffic and then it ends up
queuing onto the street.

40 So not only are we increasing the interior space and drop off and pick up area but
we’re also removing most of the opportunity for people to park in these circulation
aisle zones so that we actually separate the parking and the circulation functions as
much as possible. So in the future state in the proposal we have this access here and
as Andrew mentioned, we ramp down quicker. We’ve reoriented from this up and
down direction to the east-west direction for car parking spaces. So, essentially, if
45 you want to park we’ve – we’ve removed most of the spaces on the aisle here but if
you want to park you can go down into one of these separate aisles so it separates the
two functions.

So this proposal does a lot to resolve the queuing issue that happens on the street and that's been a huge intent in terms of this project. So vehicles at the moment – and, sorry, I'll just briefly touch as well at the moment in the peak this left – the school essentially forces this left movement down here which creates traffic going onto
5 Harland Avenue. There are people that want to go right but at the moment they have to take a detour to get where they need to go. What this does is it – we have now two entries in and out, both here on the southern access as well as the Jubilee entry here. You can have inward bound traffic from both directions but it also provides the opportunity to provide outward traffic in both directions. This can be managed
10 depending on the use case, whether it's peak or event or whatever might be happening and we've also got the in and out access available down at the southern entry for all types of traffic, not just staff parking.

And with the service vehicle area down here heavy vehicles will be able to come out
15 – in and out of this area but heavy vehicles semitrailers will need to turn right out of this area because the swept path doesn't work to turn left and we're doing a service vehicle management plan as well so that we've already agreed that servicing traffic will only happen outside of the peak hours so that we'll reduce that potential for conflict and we're working through that service plan at the moment. But as you can
20 see from this in and out in both directions provides – provides a lot of flexibility. We reduce the parking on the circulation aisle We increase the pick up and drop off spaces here and the reorientation of those parking spaces is a real key benefit of this design.

25 MR PILTON: So - - -

DR COAKES: Mel. Sorry, Adrian.

30 MR PILTON: Go ahead, Sherie.

DR COAKES: Yes. Mel, just a question there. So in – in coming to that particular design for the underground car parks and the connection of them, did you model a – a one entry, one exit car park?

35 MS FYFE: We didn't – we didn't necessarily model that because that's the existing case. We knew that by putting a proposal like this together where the – the two car parks were joined we – so we've shown this as an – as an in and out kind of like event mode where you bring all the traffic in here and all the traffic out here to increase this internal space through here but there are opportunities to be able to say
40 bring all your traffic through here or you could even swept it. You can have traffic that wants to go right – come out of this entrance and go right. You can have all your left-hand traffic come out of this entrance. So there's a lot more flexibility in terms of operations on how you want to manage the internal space of that car park. You also have all this interior space here that you could potentially use for queuing
45 in, you know, areas of particularly high demand.

Normal use – use cases for the school even in peak am traffic that has the most flow is unlikely to ever need that space but it is there. yes, from a contingency perspective if it is needed. So, yes, we didn't necessarily model, you know, only using one entry or exit in and out but given that that's the current existing condition and we do have a
5 lot more interior space through this proposed design, even if you did only have access to one entry for in and out, you do have a lot more internal space to take any potential load off the street and to be able to keep it all within the interior car park of the school.

10 DR COAKES: Yes. And we can see the – see the reorientation of those car parks internally. I guess the other – the other question – sorry, Andrew, before you jump in – sorry, I keep – I keep asking question but the other question - - -

MS FYFE: That's all right.

15

DR COAKES: No, no, no. I'm just thinking. So – so, obviously, that – that drop off and pick up zone now extends all the way along? It was just that we saw some plans that we thought that it actually extended even further into that proposed car park under oval 3 or does it literally stop where you – you've got it there?

20

MS FYFE: It – it does stop here. It is an extra 65 metres in car parking area which accommodates an extra 11 vehicles in the pick up and drop off. So it is a significant extra space but, yes, it doesn't – it doesn't come all the way through here. You do still have a slight – slight level change.

25

MR PILTON: If I can just jump in - - -

MS FYFE: yes.

30 MR PILTON: The southern entrance is two way in and out, I assume. Is that not going to tempt people if there's a bit of a queue back up on the northern access to continue down and come in the southern access and what effect will that have on the – the traffic inside the car park if people are coming in sort of heading north, as it were, they might cause a little bit of a traffic jam, as it were, at the existing car park
35 where they might be tempted to drop their kids off in – underneath the – or in the oval 3 car park.

MS FYFE: Yes. This is the – the detail of how that all operates is something that we're working through in the operational traffic management plan currently so that
40 we can try and avoid any potential queue jumping or – or rat running that may potentially happen. At the moment although it is quite a wide street, you do essentially have one lane in direction so, you know, if – if there was queue here, if someone were to go around, then they'd essentially be an overtaking – in an overtaking lane. We – we do want to avoid that. So whether it's, you know, traffic
45 control here – so currently in the afternoon peak there is a traffic controller here that, you know, asks drivers to head in this direction. There's all sorts of ways that that can be – that can be dealt with but certainly, Commissioner, to your point, we do

want to avoid any, you know, mischief behaviours or – or any behaviours that might create other issues that we want to try and avoid through the operational traffic management plan.

5 MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you.

MS LEWIN: Mel, where is the exhaust stack to the underground car park? Where is it proposed to be?

10 MS FYFE: Sue, I might get you to answer that.

MS CAI: Yes. So this is proposed in – in the space between oval 3 and oval 2.

MS LEWIN: Do you have knowledge of where that would be?

15

MS CAI: So further down. So the planner will come- - -

MS LEWIN:

20 MS CAI: Yes. So the planner will come through as part of the – the pavilion, pergola element so that will pop out - - -

MS LEWIN: It sits here, doesn't it?

25 MS CAI: - - - above the - - -

MS LEWIN: Yes.

MS CAI: Yes.

30

MS LEWIN: So that will – okay. We'll come to that area later. There's quite a few questions around that. Okay. Thank you.

35 DR COAKES: And – and just one more question as we're in the car park. Just the basis, Mel, for the two minute assumption for the turnover time for vehicles, can you just give us a bit of background on that, please.

MS FYFE: Yes, sure. I've actually got a slide on that but it's essentially traffic engineering industry practice.

40

DR COAKES: Yes.

45 MS FYFE: So typically it takes around two minutes for a vehicle to pull up, for a child to get in, might put their back in the boot, get in the car, buckle up safely and then drive off typically takes around two minutes. So that's industry practice. There's not necessarily a guide or a standard that defines what that is. However, you know, traffic engineers all around Australia do use that two minutes to – for that

5 dwell time and certainly when – when I’ve been onsite or my team’s been onsite we have noticed all the pick up and drop offs within that – that two-minute period. So very confident that that is an appropriate dwell time for that period. We wouldn’t want to make that any shorter because, you know, that’s just sort of, you know, playing with things a little bit. Keep it at two minutes. It’s the standard. Very confident that that – that is currently working onsite and it’s already managed. There’s already no – no dwelling or waiting in those pick up zones so we’re confident we can get the circulation we need, make sure that it is within that two minutes and – and keep it moving and – and nice and safe and uncongested.

10 MR PILTON: And is there any supervision of drop off and pick up.

15 MS FYFE: Yes, yes, and it’s – that’s currently managed by the school. And currently in the existing car park with the aisles that run this way there are barricades that are put up here to keep vehicles moving around here rather than running through the aisles or anything like that. So there are staff who are onsite and do manage the pick up and drop off of students and that will continue into the future.

20 MR PILTON: Okay. Is there any staggering of years, for example? Like kindergarten earlier than senior school or whatever.

25 MS FYFE: Yes. That already happens. The bell times are staggered between the junior school and – and the two halves of the senior school. So all that staggering happens in the am and the pm peak already. So there – there’s good practice happening in the school in that regard.

MR PILTON: Thank you

30 MS FYFE: Any other – any other questions on this before I move on?

MS CAI: No.

MS LEWIN: No.

35 MS FYFE: Just in terms of some metrics, the existing car park here, we wanted to make sure in terms of the strategy for the – for the school if we were to increase the number of students in the school we didn’t want to necessarily create an incentive for people to drive to school by adding a lot more parking so we wanted to maintain as much as possible what was existing in the – in the car park even though we’re expanding the space. So in the future car park in the proposed design there’s 12
40 more spaces added but we are reducing a lot of what’s causing the issues in terms of Victoria Street by reducing those circulation aisle car parks and the – the parking spaces next to the pick up/drop off. We are increasing the length of the pick up/drop off by 65 metres which is great and we’re generally increasing the interior space of
45 the car park as well.

So, again, more flexibility from an operations perspective and, really the capacity to bring anything that might currently be on the street off the street which has been the intention of the – of the school the whole time. So we really want to make sure that any impact are within the campus and not necessarily on the street or having an
5 impact on the community. And in terms of pick up/drop off, yes, some metrics here. I'm happy to provide this to you but essentially at the moment this is from data collection that was taken in – in 2020. We've got the number of traffic that is going in and out of the car park in both the am and the pm and so we can understand what the capacity per hour is of the car park and then what the demand is.

10 At the moment there's – there's more capacity than – sorry – we – we do have enough capacity but because of that issue where people are parking in the aisle it is creating – it is creating some queues so we're resolving all of those issues through the design. And as you can see here, with queueing and queue length required,
15 we've got enough space in the car park with space capacity to be able to take – to take the load of the queuing demand as well as the pick up and drop off – sorry, command – demand so that even as the school grows through this development through the design of – through the design of the car park and to the extension of the pick up and drop off and – and just general operational improvements there's more
20 than enough capacity to be able to take any additional load through pick up or drop off or traffic.

We went through the two minute drop off or pick up so I'll just skip that and I'll
25 move into the proposed roadworks now. So these are captured in condition B12, the drive condition. There is that additional crossing, which I mentioned, of Victoria Street which I'll take you through as well. So just in terms of a bit of a context, so we've got the school here. This is Prospect Road here, Victoria Street here. So there's four key projects. One is the – so you – Commissioners, you may seen in
30 earlier RFIs there was a proposed mitigation to do some intersection works at Prospect and Old Canterbury Road and earlier there was a proposal to put peak clearways on Old Canterbury Road. We have consulted with both Transport for New South Wales and Inner West Council on that.

35 We are keeping the Prospect Road intersection works but we're not proceeding with the clearway works. That wasn't desirable and it – as we redid the modelling work, it didn't actually have any – any positive impact. So that's been removed but we are proposed and continuing forward with the Prospect Street works. We're also proposing to – excuse me – replace the existing zebra crossing with a raised
40 pedestrian crossing which is a much better outcome. We're proposing to upgrade the footpath all the way long Victoria Street and we're proposing a – an upgrade from the existing pedestrian refuge to a crossing facility on Victoria Street. So I'll just take you through those designs which are being developed significantly.

45 So on Prospect Road here – so Old Canterbury Road here, Prospect Road. So a key issue with this intersection currently and the way that it performs is that you've currently got one lane here which has to accommodate both the left turning traffic and right turning traffic and all of the intersections that on any – onto Old Canterbury

Road, the worst – they’re essentially – they perform very well except for the right turning movement from the street on to Old Canterbury Road. That causes delays just because people are waiting for a gap in the traffic. So what this proposed works does is it creates enough space so that you can have a left turning lane here for traffic
5 that just needs to head left and at the spare lane for the right turning traffic so that you can create much more flow and create more movement in the intersection.

What we’ve already also done here, so currently there’s just a – a concrete median that has no space for a person to wait here in the middle of the street. There aren’t a
10 huge amount of people crossing here but what we have done is produce this median refuge here which is to Transport for New South Wales standards which are the three metre by two metre waiting area here. We do move this curve slightly out. It’s still a really good width crossing – sorry – footpath here and we keep the – the garden –
15 the landscaping here as well as a – as a preferable treatment for rather than a fence or anything – anything like that. So essentially we improve the performance of this intersection here in terms of providing that flow and improve the pedestrian experience here by creating a crossing facility at this intersection.

We have consulted with Transport and – and Inner West Council with this and they
20 have both provided their in-principle agreement to this treatment. We’ve also tested the spilt paths on that so that it works for buses which there’s buses coming in and out of that intersection. The Prospect Road crossing. So currently a zebra crossing. It’s not in a great state of great – good repair. Just essentially replacing that with a raised pedestrian crossing. And again we have – we’ve taken this to Transport and
25 Inner West Council. Bot have provided in principle approval and we’re designing this to Inner West Council standard drawings so we’ve been consulting with them again on this recently. So they’re totally across what we’re doing here.

The Victoria Street footpath. And again consulted with Transport and Inner West
30 Council. This will be upgraded to Inner West Council standard drawings and we’ve consulted with the – with them on this again so that we understand what type of graph we need to plant, what type of drawing specifically and so I’m sorry about the quality of the image. I’ll send this to you but excuse me. Essentially, against the frontage of the school the green area is the grassed area. All the trees will be
35 maintained along here and the footpath is slightly widened to 1.9 metres. So fully DDA accessible and compliant and a much better outcome for – for the community and maintaining the driveway accesses as required.

So this is – this is right at the Seaview end of the school. Continuing on, this is the
40 Jubilee entry here just for orientation and then continuing on and this is the southern entry here. Okay. And this is the – this is a new proposal So currently there is a – a pedestrian refuge here. This is the southern driveway access to the car park here. This is – this is the area that has got – that has got the substation here. So part of this design is to improve the experience for pedestrians and cyclists in the area but also to
45 resolve this sightline issue that’s here. So basically we can pull traffic out further. We’re consulting with council on this right at the moment. Integrate the cycleway

crossing here. Raised pedestrian crossing. So we're upgrading the pedestrian amenity and facility here.

5 It does meet the warrant for Transport for New South Wales so it's completely appropriate to go here. The other thing that we've found with the existing condition at this – at this intersection here was that as Craig mentioned, there's buses that come through here and there's also garbage trucks and other heavy vehicles that come through here. At the moment the swept path when we ran it for the buses meant that the bus was essentially crossing into the oncoming traffic lane as it went around this corner so we wanted to resolve that problem from a safety perspective. So by putting in a crossing and by replacing the refuge with a crossing, we actually get a much better outcome for buses here.

15 We resolve the sightline issue, improve the access and amenity for both pedestrian and cyclists as well as maintaining the traffic flow and amenity in this area as well. So we are consulting with Transport – sorry – with Inner West Council on this right now, provide them precedent drawings, all the designs. So we're waiting to hear back from them to progress this design even further. And that's it from me.

20 DR COAKES: Mel, can I just jump in there. Sherie again. Just - - -

MS FYFE: Sure.

25 DR COAKES: In terms of the crossing or pedestrian access to the school from Victoria Street up near Seaview Street is there anything proposed in that part? We know - - -

MS FYFE: Not – not currently.

30 DR COAKES: No.

MS FYFE: Not currently. There – there aren't – there aren't that many pedestrians crossing at that location.

35 DR COAKES: Yes.

MS FYFE: It's – it's actually pretty low. It's – it's less than a dozen - - -

DR COAKES: Okay.

40

MS FYFE: - - - in the peak hour from what I know.

DR COAKES: Yes.

45 MS FYFE: But we're not proposing anything there at this current time.

DR COAKES: Okay.

MR PILTON: Can I just confirm, are you saying that by doing this raised crossing and so on it removes the problem of the substation sightline?

5 MS FYFE: Yes. So at the moment there's a substation here.

MR PILTON: Yes, yes.

10 MS FYFE: And with this – yes – with this – sorry – access here essentially vehicles inch out a little bit further into the intersection to be able to see past that substation. It is something that we do actively want to resolve and also – by providing a better, safer outcome. So part of the reason why this little kerb blister is here is so that – and essentially – and you'll see that the existing traffic lane – sorry – sorry – the existing – you can see the line markings of the existing - - -

15 MR PILTON: Yes.

MS FYFE: - - - lane here so we essentially moved everything slightly to the west.

20 MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you.

MS FYFE: And, yeah, create a better – so – so it essentially just moves – moves the street to the west so that it creates that distance to be able to see fully in each direction as you exit the car park.

25 MR PILTON: Can I just ask, Mel, that you send that information to the Commission, please, that presentation.

MS FYFE: Of course.

30 MR PILTON: Thank you.

35 MR P. BROGAN: And, Commissioners, Peter Brogan speaking, just to set the – set the scene on these external works, the works were – were brought out of consultation with Department of Planning via the RFI process and actually sit under B12 at the moment in the conditions with proactive – as Mel mentioned, with proactively discussing a design resolution with the applicable agencies.

40 MR PILTON: Thank you. Okay. So that's the traffic and the parking. All right. I'm just looking through the agenda here. Maybe we could go on to some questions of heritage and we've got – I believe we've got someone there from Heritage.

MR J. BRYANT: Yes. Jonathan Bryant here.

45 MR WILSON: Jonathan Bryant from Urbis.

MR PILTON: Yes, no.

MR BRYANT: I'm co-lead director on our heritage team.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you. We had a meeting prior to this one with the council - - -

5

MR BRYANT: Uh-huh.

MR PILTON: - - - and they were very insistent that they would like to see much more of a conservation heritage plan going back throughout – through the history of the school showing the layering and so on of development. Is there any sort of pushback against that or - - -

10

MR BRYANT: No, not necessarily but – but I would like to point out that Trinity is listed for its Horbury Hunt design headmaster's house and the chapel. So we've done a full heritage assessment of the whole site and found that apart from the headmaster's house, the chapel, the dining hall and the cloister that there are no buildings that are really worthy of retention. They're quite low quality. Yes. We'd be very happy to – to write a CMP for the headmaster's house and the chapel.

15

MR PILTON: Yes. I think – I think the thought was that the community could benefit by having sort of an overview of how the site has developed.

20

MR BRYANT: We've written that already.

MR PILTON: Is there any diagrams? I haven't – sorry, I haven't - - -

25

MR BRYANT: Yes. We've – we've done a full heritage assessment - - -

MR PILTON: All right. I haven't - - -

30

MR BRYANT: - - - of the whole site.

MR PILTON: Thank you very much. The other question that – the other thing that they suggested was you might think about putting a link through to Yeo Park from close to where the multipurpose hall is.

35

MR BRYANT: Uh-huh.

MR PILTON: I don't know if - - -

40

MR BRYANT: I'll – I'll leave that up to the designers.

MR PILTON: You don't – don't see any heritage benefit?

MR BRYANT: I – I don't.

45

MR PILTON: I mean, there would be physical problems, I imagine, bridging over the accessway and so on.

MR BRYANT: Absolutely.

5

MR PILTON: Yes. Perhaps you could – whoever the – the architects could take that on – on notice.

MR BRYANT: Sure.

10

MR PILTON: Okay. Wendy, Sherie, have you got any other points or questions?

MS LEWIN: Yes. Jonathan, hello.

15

MR BRYANT: Hi Wendy, how are you?

MS LEWIN: Very well. Thank you. Jonathan, I have read your heritage impact assessment report and – and I just have a couple of questions. Prior to those Noni Boyd from council, who you would know - - -

20

MR BRYANT: Yes.

MS LEWIN: - - - is going to respond to the – our – in – in our earlier meeting to the Commission's request to provide more detailed understanding of – or material of what council and the community, of course, considers to be of value on the site and a short description. So that will come to us and it will be put on to the website and perhaps that's something that you might also wish to make comment on. Having gone through the – your report, I – and I – I understand that there is a – a methodology and – and it's fairly rigorous in the way in which you make comment about the various qualities and values of items. So this is – this is not meant to be in any way a negative question. I'd like to it to be a – a little bit more – more to do with opening up the discussion.

25

30

MR BRYANT: Sure.

35

MS LEWIN: So this is taking a part of that – one of the early parts of that – in the summary you've said that:

40

Further, given new development would replace buildings of no identifiable significance and this would be of high quality contemporary character –

Etc, etc. So I'm just wondering in you as a – having gone through that methodology in assessing the significance of or lack of significance of many of the pieces of building on the campus, how did you – on what information or criteria did you base that conclusion that it's of – because there's very little material that - - -

45

MR BRYANT: Most of it is based on - - -

MS LEWIN: - - - is available for the – for the - - -

MR BRYANT: - - - physical inspection.

5 MS LEWIN: - - - for the – okay. No, no.

MR BRYANT: Everything after about 1957 – I’m sorry, I’m going to be rude to the school now – has been of very average quality in terms of materials and design and it’s sort of grown like Topsy.

10

MS LEWIN: I understand that. Your comment about the proposed work being of high quality and, of course, contemporary in character but in terms of the qualitative statement, with the fairly – there’s very little real information about the architectural design, the proposed application of materials and the real consideration on this.

15

MR BRYANT: Yes. Absolutely.

MS LEWIN: Is that something that you have access to that - - -

20 MR BRYANT: Well, we would like to - - -

MS LEWIN: - - - would – would give you a more substantial reason to say that the new proposed work is of, in your view, in that – in terms of that methodology of high quality?

25

MR BRYANT: I – I think what I could say is that the proposal has the potential for that and at the moment it’s of very disappointing aesthetic character.

30 MS LEWIN: Right. Okay. So that – that might be something that you might comment again in – in relation to your heritage assessment report - - -

MR BRYANT: Sure.

35 MS LEWIN: in the executive summary. I – I think that’s it and I suspect that council will – will have a further conversation with you – Noni, anyway, will with you, Jonathan. Thanks.

MR BRYANT: Sure. Thanks, Wendy.

40 MS LEWIN: Okay. My pleasure.

45 DR COAKES: Jonathan, Sherie. Just one quick question. So and it’s – this comes more from a community – community lean. At – in your opinion, do you feel that – so the local community’s raised quite a few issues around local heritage value and as you know site sits within a – a broader area which has a number of – of different heritage conservation areas that are defined. Can you see clearly in your expert opinion how those heritage values have been incorporated in the design process?

MR BRYANT: Yes. Absolutely they have. I mean, we've done a very careful analysis and I noticed that quite a few other of my colleagues over the years have conducted similar assessments. I think GBA Heritage and NBRIS have both been involved on the site and they've been – you know, we've – we've carefully looked at
5 – at this site and we feel very comfortable with our analysis.

DR COAKES: And just on that, has there been any engagement in your assessment with the local community around the – the – the values - - -

10 MR BRYANT: Look, I - - -

DR COAKES:

MR BRYANT: I probably would like to throw to the school for that one.
15

MR PILTON: I might just jump in with a question here. We're having a bit of trouble trying to understand the physical characteristics of the Jubilee entrance. I'm just wondering if it's possible to get a sketch just showing, you know, the levels and so on, perhaps a long section through the drive strip and a cross-section through –
20 between the – the two playing fields. From the drawings that we have available to us it's very hard to understand.

MR A. PENDER: Commissioner, it's Andrew Pender. If you'd like – in response to the agenda, we've pulled up a couple of study elements that might give you some – some of that and not – it's not a formalised presentation. If you'd like, I can share those at this point

MR PILTON: Yes, please. Thank you.

30 MR PENDER: So I'll probably jump around a bit with what I've got. Okay. So you can see that black and white - - -

MR PILTON: Yes.

35 MR PENDER: - - - cutaway? Yes. So that's from above the oval 3 boundary with Victoria roughly looking down towards oval 2 existing buildings and you can see there the gradients of the – of the ramp and then the – the platform above the current Jubilee Drive, just where this - - -

40 MR PILTON: Yes, yes.

MR PENDER: - - - figure is here. And so that becomes a – a – a landscape – a hard landscaped platform with a element over which is at the level of the oval 2 and I might just jump then to – sorry. Things are going wrong now. This view which is
45 from oval 3 which demonstrates the – the level difference between oval 2 which is at the top of this platform and oval 3 which would be reinstated at near enough to its

current level which is also the off to the – off to the right. So you can see there's a series of tiered seats here with the - - -

MR PILTON:

5

MR PENDER: - - - pergola and off to the – out of the left of view is the car park entry which dives down more rapidly as we say a minute ago which I think is - - -

MS LEWIN: Excuse me, Andrew. Where is the exhaust stack from the car park?

10

MR PENDER: So I should just – yes. Certainly, Commissioner. I should just clarify that. The current design development is relocating that to a location behind the viewpoint of this view. Let's see what I've got. I don't have an illustration of that at – at present. It is work under development but, essentially – maybe here. Essentially, we're talking about an area down in the embankment to the Yeo Park corner end further away from the pedestrian precinct is where that is now proposed to be

15

MS LEWIN: Near the car park entry?

20

MR PENDER: In that general vicinity. Yes.

MS LEWIN: All right. Thank you.

25

MR PENDER: In terms of – in terms of the Jubilee entry itself, Mr Chairman, I think you were interested in that.

MR PILTON: Yes.

30

MR PENDER: Probably on this – no – probably on this sheet you – you may have seen this view in - - -

MR PILTON: We've – we've got that one. Yes.

35

MR PENDER: So this – and so what I should point out here is the obvious, that this is not a – a complete view in terms of the ball catch net on oval 2 which currently exists here nor the – the balustrades and barriers that will be required on each of those. So I suspected from the agenda points this might've been a – a question that the Commission might have had in relation to how that's – that will work in detail.

40

MR PILTON: Yes.

MR PENDER: So there are – in – in the developing design – again, this is, you know, a view for a purpose – there are barriers and – and the like through there. I can share some.

45

MS LEWIN: Whilst you're there, Andrew, can we - - -

MR PENDER: Yes.

MS LEWIN: Just to discuss the transparency that's suggested in this render through
to the central tiered seating where the trees are would not be transparent because of
5 the uplift of the bleacher seating and the handball areas behind and obviously the –
yes – in that area.

MR PENDER: In this area here.

10 MS LEWIN: And - - -

MR PENDER: Yes. I - - -

MS LEWIN: And also the – the balustrades and so on that are required.
15

MR PENDER: Yes, yes.

MS LEWIN:

20 MR PENDER: Yes. That – that's correct. This perspective was – was not prepared
to, you know, to provide the detail on that so I'm sorry if that's misstated. The - - -

MS LEWIN: Thank you.

25 MR PENDER: If I go to here, the detail of the landscape plan, you can see now
more - - -

MR PILTON: We've got that one. Yes.

30 MR PENDER: - - - more detail. Yes. So that then indicates where the barriers are,
the accessibility, the separation of - - -

MR PILTON: Okay.

35 MR PENDER: - - - the – the need to cross – for pedestrians to cross the – the
driveway. So regardless of direction of approach they have an accessible route into
the main part of the school through here and you can see there the extent of the tiered
seating which shows the levels. There's about two and a half to three metre
difference between ovals 2 and 3.

40

MR PILTON: Okay.

MS LEWIN: And thank you, Andrew.

45 MR PENDER:

MS LEWIN: Whilst you're on that drawing, you have in writing in the – a drop off. Is that seriously proposed as a drop off zone? Because that is a concern.

5 MR PENDER: I – I apologise. I have not even noticed that before. No. That's clearly wrong. It's a driveway. Many apologies.

MS LEWIN: Okay.

10 MR PILTON: Off the top of your head, Andrew, do you know what the grade is on that ramp?

MR PENDER: No. My colleague Sue may have that off the top of her head but – but it's all been through the civil and traffic people for their sign off.

15 MR PILTON: Okay.

MS LEWIN: And the access for pedestrians is DDA compliant and equitable access compliant?

20 MR PENDER: Yes, it is, and we are managing – in fact, in detailed design we're managing to achieve gradients of less than one in 23.

MS LEWIN: Okay.

25 MR PENDER: So whilst at – at the DA – the middle stage we're looking at one in 18 so there ramps, we are now able to achieve one in 21 through all this area.

MS LEWIN: Thank you.

30 MR PILTON: Could I just ask that you send through black and white drawings through to us We haven't had those at least - - -

MR PENDER: Certainly. They're – they're internal study pieces but if they're of use to you, Commissioner, certainly.
35

MR PILTON: It would be just useful. Yes. And whilst we've got that drawing, I'm wondering where we might put these 40 bicycle parking stations for students. Have you thought about that?

40 MR PENDER: The – the number drive conditions and developments increase beyond our initial expectation. I think – and that can be accommodated. I think it will require modification in tis zone here towards the top of the stairs. You can see that there is a substantial level difference between Victoria Street and the playing fields both in – at this end of oval 3 and at the northern end of oval 3 and at the
45 northern end of oval 2 up beyond the top of the page.

MR PILTON: Yes.

MR PENDER: So our opportunity to achieve a gradient, really, is only at this point. So, yes, in order not to have – have stairs so I imagine we'll be needing to look at the top of these stairs and use a zone in here in some fashion.

5 MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you. I suppose a question also arises as to the 40 bicycle parking off Prospect Road.

MR B. JAMES: Hi Adrian

10 MR PILTON: There's nowhere that's obvious. Sorry?

MR JAMES: Sorry to interrupt, Adrian. We just have Allie Barnier from Urbis in the waiting room. Just checking in

15 MR PILTON: Yes. Please let her in. Yes.

MR JAMES: Sure.

MR PILTON: Or him, whatever.

20

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It's her.

MR JAMES: Back to you.

25 MR PILTON: Okay. Sorry. I was just asking about the likely sites for bicycle parking near the Prospect Road entrance. There's nowhere that's really obvious to me anyway.

30 MS CAI: Sue from PDML jumping in on this. So from Prospect Road we've nominated two locations if you recall what Mel showed previously.

MR PILTON: Yes.

35 MS CAI: One is from the existing gates closer to the pedestrian arrival. So that is closer to the staff end-of-trip facilities. So we're suggesting 16 bicycle parking in that location and for the 40 student bicycle parking, we are nominated adjacent to the Centenary Centre as that's the main student arrival point.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you.

40

MS CAI: That

MR PENDER: So if you can see there, my – my cursor, Commissioner. Sort of in that area.

45

MR PILTON: Yes. Thank you.

MR PENDER: And – and – and Sue was previously referring to this area here where there was a separate set of gates.

5 MR PILTON: Yes. Thank you. I might just ask the school, do you have any complaints from the neighbours about noise?

MR T. BOWDEN: Thank you. Time Bowden, the – the headmaster here. I've been headmaster here for three and a half years. There hasn't in that time been a single complaint about noise.

10 MR PILTON: Thank you. Sorry. Okay. Wendy, any more questions?

MS LEWIN: I'm not sure whether we go to landscape later but just where you were, Andrew, on that drawing, the planned drawing, there is a proposal to have rather large trees in the bleacher seating to the oval and some of them are shown underneath the canopy. Are you proposing to develop deep soil planting in there? I – I – I mean, we've – we've got access to some of the renders from the landscape documents but - - -

20 MR PENDER: Yes. Just talking about these.

MS LEWIN: Yes. And they are in triangular beds in the seating area. But how – how – is that to be developed in any sort of consequential way or is that just for the renders at this point in time? Because in the car par for deep soil planting.

25 MR PENDER: That – that's correct. I don't know that deep soil planting opportunities exist there but there are some – there are some opportunities in the void areas behind the tiered seating if you – if I can refer you to this black and white again. So the level differences – this void area here is where the tiered seating starts to come down and so the – the – the top of our storage areas beneath and plant areas beneath and other areas are a substantial way down. So if you don't mind, I'll take that on notice for our landscape consultants but there is – if not deep soil planting, there's – there's opportunity for substantial soil volumes there.

35 MS LEWIN: Thank you.

MR PILTON: Sherie, any questions?

40 DR COAKES: No, no. I'm fine. Thank you.

MR PILTON: I don't think I have any more questions. So, Brad or Kate, do you want to say anything?

45 MS K. MOORE: No.

MR JAMES: Adrian, sorry, is there anything else on the agenda you'd like covered?

MR PILTON: I think – I think we’ve covered most of it one way or the other.

MS LEWIN: Could I then ask questions about ESD, some of the materiality issues and - - -

5

MR PILTON: Yes, please.

MS LEWIN: - - - fire engineering and acoustics, some of the things that have been left out. So this is going to be a question that, perhaps, the school and the architects can respond to. There is – the ESD report is – is very general and doesn’t have a particular application or reference to the proposed project other than as a – a – a kind of a series of umbrella statements. So in relation to how you would manage ESD considerations to do with shading and daylighting as a start, the preliminary concept indicates that the elevation facing Victoria Street – and this is from the – from the report – the architect’s report – for the west wings are provided with shading elements consisting of perforated mesh:

15

The external shading scheme helps increase natural daylight whilst minimising unwanted solar gain and glare.

20

So in relation to minimising wanted solar heat gain, how is that achieved when the material is simply perforated mesh? There’s no thermal mass. There’s no insulation as far as we can determine from what’s been presented. And – and maybe these are questions that you could come back to us, take them on – on notice. It goes on to state that:

25

This will facilitate using glazing treatment that reduces natural light transmission.

I’m wondering if that’s the case at all. We can’t see any analysis that would support that sort of conclusion. Quality of internal air. That section is quite unclear. All of – all of the classrooms in the large western façade common areas are to be provided with mechanical ventilation through local façade penetrations, it says, on each level to ensure adequate fresh air for all learning, teaching spaces, etc, etc, to minimise thermal leakage from air-conditioned zones. I’m not sure what that means actually but does it indicate that those – there’s going to be pressurisation to – to prevent leakage if there’s also incoming passive air and there’s also mechanical systems in place? Heat exchanges, etc, etc. The – there’s many questions. Maybe I should just put them to Brad and Kate and ask them to be sent through for – for answers.

40

But it – it concludes that there is an informal four – four star rating able to be achieved or assumed to be achieved and I guess my – my question then to the school is you’re a significant cultural, educational institution and an informal four star level of achievement in ESD performance is really very low. It’s at least below the standard expected in – by the department which would be five stars. I’m wondering whether in relation to the pedagogy of – of the school and your teaching of STEAM and STEM subjects and the ethics of – of – that are embedded in the pedagogical

45

teachings, would you not want to achieve a higher level of performance in ESD? So it's – it's – it's a bigger question than just the design proposed. It's – it's something that I think would be expected from such a significant education institution.

5 MR WILSON: May I just add, Commissioner – Chris Wilson from Willowtree
Planning. I – I understand and we can hear from Tim and potentially Andrew in a
moment that the intent is, of course, to employ best practice ecological sustainable
develop initiatives where we can. The difficulty that his particular site does, in fact,
10 present, as you would be aware, with the two local heritage items on it. It's very
hard to upgrade those buildings to actually get them to be retrofitted. It's very costly.
It's very, I suppose, counterproductive to Jonathan's work that he'll be doing on the
buildings themselves. It's very hard to get what are old buildings that have some
heritage value and retrofit them with current – today's ESD practices but, certainly,
15 with the new buildings and the like, the – the school's intent is to employ further
detailed, you know, ESD provisions and – and – and implementation measures and
construction measures where they can and operational measures for that matter.
Tim, did you want to add anything to that?

MR BOWDEN: Yes. Thanks, Chris, and – and thanks, Commissioner, for the
20 question. Yes. Look, I think I'm a little perturbed at the perception that the school
isn't placing a priority on – on doing these things really well. We have independent
of this project this year appointed a specialist environmental educator who's leading
a kind of environmental and horticultural drive through our primary school years
which feeds into our remote studies precinct down at Jervis Bay where the boys – all
25 boys resides for a term and as part of that have an immersive environmental
experience built in. So woven through the story of the school, we are taking
environmental education really seriously along the way. On the question of the ESD
path that we're indicating in this planning, we're taking the advice from – from our
consultants in – that recommend that this is actually the best way to achieve those –
30 achieve those outcomes and to be able to tell the story to our community around that.
Peter, I don't know whether there's something in specific that I ought to be
referencing here or - - -

MR P. BROGAN: No, Tim. Thanks for that. Peter Brogan. Commissioner, thanks
35 for your question. We're – we're actively progressing condition C9 and F15 that
relate to ESD and we're actively working through the alternate certificate process
with our ESD consultant at this point in time. As Tim mentioned, we're doing
everything in – in consultation with the school and what they do operationally. I
think it's also important to say and continuing on from Chris's comment that while
40 the renewal project is quite a large project that's canvassed, there is a substantial part
of this campus that will still be retained in its current format inclusive of 1940s,
1950s, 1960s buildings with – with – with challenging ESD opportunities. So I – I –
I'm positive and – and confident we're putting our best foot forward and linking
what we're our obligations under the conditions but also with the – the
45 opportunities with the – the school itself and – and their teaching and learning
environment of sustainability goals.

MS LEWIN: Okay. Thank you. The fire engineering report. Could you take us through the requirements in the new Arrow Building related to fire egress and deem to comply provisions for that an whether – and whether fire separation or isolation will have – for any of the elements will have an impact on the proposed design of the steel scaffold or armature that supports the screens and panels. It's used a corridor for circulation - - -

MR PENDER: Yes.

MS LEWIN: - - - and there's multiple stairs. Are any of those stairs required stairs or fire egress?

MR PENDER: Commissioner, in the most general terms, yes, they are in some cases – in – in many cases and the view that we're – well, the strategy that we're trying to develop with this is to make that a – an open and easily accessed circulation system which also provides those means of escape. So we're talking about minimal loads and the like and they're getting outside of buildings or the – or the principles. The – that's been supported as a strategy to date. The issue with the – this particular site is that the – the buildings have been built all abutted and adjoined and connected to each other so there are quite complex issues of where compartmentation stops and starts and that has been take into account.

But I think trying to couple a safe and appropriate size access and egress in an operational sense as well as in an emergency sense is the aim of – is the aim of that – externalising that circulation as a – a low – a low fire load engineered egress solution. It also uses the depth to provide the shade your earlier question, you know, in a layered fashion and I'd be happy to respond to those questions you've raised if you wouldn't mind sending those through in a bit more detail for our response in terms of the way that that level of shading reduces the thermal load on – on the façade and allows us to have, you know, a reasonable of – of western penetration and that has been – has been modelled and we can make that – make that work in terms of the requirements. So just going back to your earlier questions which I'd like to take on notice, if you can please provide those to us and I hope I've answered your question on the fire engineering. I'm not sure I have.

MS LEWIN: Not quite but I – I just wondered if in terms of the – what is being considered for a deem to comply or a fire engineered solution, is it envisaged that there would be any physical changes required to the design of the stairs, the corridor, the physical presentation of what appears to be an open armature or scaffold.

MR PENDER: Okay. Sorry. I understand better where you're heading with that question now. Thank you. But no, no. The fire engineering work supports keeping those stairs open and I should that the buildings throughout here are all sprinkler protected as well so that we have that other – that other benefit but, no, the – the intent was not to have massive enclosed fire stairs and that's what we're aiming to achieve with that fire engineered solution.

MS LEWIN: Right. And probably one of my last questions on this. The screens. The extent of screens on all the renders which is, I guess, all we have to work with, the screens are intermittent. There are large areas on the façade, particularly where the stairs are traversing the façade over all the levels. That's open. There's no
5 screens there. There is a section in the performance of the screens as protective elements against the south-westerly winds and the western sun, into that area for thermal comfort. Is that the case? That there are no screens in that – those substantial areas adjacent to the stairs? Are the screens only in particular areas of the façade and can that result in the achievement of the comfort levels that the report
10 suggests?

MR PENDER: Certainly, Commissioner. Yes. The modelling that we've had done at this stage through our, you know, environmental consultant based on the JB3 methodology does support that. If I may just share my screen quickly.

15

MS LEWIN: Yes.

MR PENDER: I think you may have had the – have seen this view at some point but what I'll – I'll point out here is that the screens exist on both the front and rear
20 planes of the circulation system and in some cases in both so that the coverage overall of the façade and that's all, as I say, the – I'm sorry, I haven't hit the share button entirely yet. My apologies. So the – the screens exist on both the front and back planes of this device and in doing so we achieve significant coverage over all – the vast majority of that façade and – and in some cases in – there's overlapping so
25 that – that has been demonstrated in the modelling to provide the necessary coverage. In terms of your question about wind, we have done wind studies of all the public areas around. We did find a couple of hotspots in that modelling early on and they've been rectified and the modelling rechecked.

30 MS LEWIN: Okay. And they are fixed screen panels? They are not

MR PENDER: Correct.

35 MS LEWIN: Thank you.

MR PILTON: I might just raise a couple of topics here. You're probably saying in the conditions that the department are suggesting that you can't increase numbers until all the car parking is completely. Is the comfortable with that?

40 MR BROGAN: Commissioner, I'll – I'll talk to that. Sorry, Tim. Peter Brogan. Yes. Absolutely. The – the staging which I'm happy to talk about if – if there was a question there articulates our intention to complete all car parking works under what we're calling stage 1 and 2 and that also includes the external works that Mel went through under condition B12. So our intent from day 1 on this project was to – to
45 ratify and rectify the – the perceived issues around traffic and parking as early as possible and we acknowledge that condition accordingly.

MR PILTON: Thank you. The other issue is the out of hours activities. I understand from the documents that the doesn't envisage any real changes to those that are put in the spreadsheet. Is – is that still correct?

5 MR BROGAN: It is, Commissioner. Peter Brogan again. The – you'll see the usage profile that was issued as part of the RTS in – in early 2000 or late 2000, sorry – 2020, sorry. The intention is to continue with the current usage profile that the – that the school undertakes on a yearly basis with the renewal project essentially covering as per – as its name indicates, a renewal of the existing facilities and the
10 usage profile will stay very close to – to what's currently there. We understand also that the conditions around – out of hours, condition F1 – F17, sorry – acknowledge those – any additional items outside of the existing usage would have to be under a separate request via Inner West Council.

15 MR PILTON: Thank you. Well, I don't have any other issues. Wendy?

MS LEWIN: No. I – I'll provide some of the questions related to ESD and other things in – in writing to - - -

20 MR PILTON: Thank you.

MS LEWIN: - - - Kate in due - - -

MR PILTON: Sherie?

25

DR COAKES: No. I'm fine, Adrian.

MR PILTON: Brad and Kate, have you got anything to add?

30 MR JAMES: Nothing from me, Adrian.

MS MOORE: Nothing further. Thanks, Adrian.

35 MR PILTON: Well, in that case we can wrap up the meeting. I'd just like to thank all of you that turned up today and – and the you've answered the questions has been very helpful and we look forward to resolving this as soon as we possibly can. So thank you and goodbye.

40 **RECORDING CONCLUDED**

[1.55 pm]