



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-1535895

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

DEPARTMENT MEETING

RE: TRINITY GRAMMAR SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT (SSD 10371)

PANEL:

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

IPC:

**BRAD JAMES
KATE MOORE**

DEPARTMENT:

**KAREN HARRAGON
ADITI COOMAR
PRITY CLEARY
JASMINE TRANQUILLE**

LOCATION:

VIDEO CONFERENCE

DATE:

9.01 AM, WEDNESDAY, 11 AUGUST 2021

MR A. PILTON: Okay. Morning, everyone. We will start with the usual – okay. Good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land from which we virtually meet today and pay my respect to their elders past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today to
5 discuss the Trinity Grammar School Redevelopment SSD 10371 project 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’s Summer Hill campus. Summer Hill is
10 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, construction of four new buildings, reconfiguration and expansion of the underground car park, landscaping, external road and public domain works, signage and a staged increased in students in staff.

15 My name is Adrian Pilton, and I am the chair of this commission panel. I am joined by my fellow commissioners Wendy Lewin and Dr Sheridan Coakes. We are also joined by Casey Joshua, Brad James and Kate Moore from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interests of openness and transparency
20 and to ensure the full capture of information, today’s meeting is being recorded, and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the commission’s website. This meeting is one part of the commission’s consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the commission will base its determination.

25 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 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
30 request all members here today introduce themselves before 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. Over to you, Karen.

MS K. HARRAGON: Good morning, commissioners and commission secretariat.
35 Good morning. I’m Karen Harragon, director social and infrastructure assessments at the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment. I’m here with my colleagues from the School Infrastructure Assessments team. I’m joined today by Aditi Coomar, Prity Cleary, Jasmine Tranquille. Jasmine will be managing our PowerPoint today and will be opening this at full screen. Jasmine, if you can then
40 just move to the first screen.

Our presentation today will outline the department’s assessment of the SSD application for Trinity Grammar School redevelopment. The application is SSD, as
45 it is development for the purposes of alterations and additions to an existing school with a capital investment value of more than 20 million. The proposal was referred to the commission as more than 50 public submissions in the form of objections were

received during exhibition of the EIS. The matters that our presentation are going to focus on today include the key issues of concern raised in these submissions, and these include traffic, landscaping, built form, heritage, noise, sustainability measures and residential amenity. I'm now going to ask Prity to provide a brief overview of the site and the development, and I'm going to ask Jasmine to share us slides from here on as full screen. Thanks, Prity.

MS P. CLEARY: Thank you, Karen, and good morning, commissioners and the members of the IPC secretariat. My name is Prity Clearly, senior planner from the Independent Schools Infrastructure Team. As detailed in the department's assessment report, the SSD application relates to the Trinity Grammar School Summer Hill campus. The site consists of both existing Trinity Grammar School as well as an adjoining residential property located at 50 to 52 Seaview Street owned by the school. The aerial view of the site shows the existing school campus outlined in red. The adjacent residential property is outlined in blue. The use of both properties as a school is permissible under the Ashfield Local Environmental Plan 2013. Additionally, the school campus is listed as an item of local heritage significance under the Local Environmental Plan. The school currently has an approved capacity of 1500 students, but 1655 students attend the campus along with 277 staff.

This slide shows the outline of the existing buildings across the school campus and the surrounding roads on diagram to the right. Please note the larger diagram is orientated differently to the smaller one. The campus adjoins Prospect Road to the east and Victoria Street to its west. Yeo Park is located to its south, and residential properties to the north, fronting Seaview Street. The school campus includes a number of school buildings. The heritage significant item including the headmaster's residency and chapel fronting Prospect Road and three ovals. In the diagram to the right, two underground car parks are located to the east, marked 1, under oval 2, and 2, under oval 3. Both have access from Victoria Street. The third smaller car park with five spaces fronts Prospect Road.

The application proposes alterations and additions to the school campus in six stages. It involves demolition and/or refurbishment of existing school buildings, including demolition of four dwellings along Seaview Street. It then involves construction of a new five-storey teaching, learning and library building and new three-storey building of the multipurpose pavilion and a new service maintenance and delivery building on Seaview Street, marked in blue on the slide. The proposal also involves alterations and refurbishment of existing buildings, which are detailed in the EIS and department's assessment.

The purpose of this presentation will focus on more significant works. The proposal also includes alterations to the existing car park facilities within the site, include the drop-off/pick-up operations and provide additional parking. We will talk about the details of the car parking in the discussions about traffic matters later. The proposal seeks to regularise the existing student numbers to 1655 and then increase it to 2100 and 321 staff in a staged manner, and infrastructure is delivered within the site.

The department has assessed the key issues of the proposal and concludes that, on balance, the proposal can be supported as it would result in better and improved school facilities. However, the department does not agree that the student numbers can be regularised without the delivery of the infrastructure within the site, especially the car park management measures. Conditions of consent have been recommended to this effect. The department has included conditions regarding landscaping, additional planting along Yeo Park boundary, implementation of Green Travel Plan and general sustainability measures. We will discuss the recommended conditions in detail with the key issues. Now I will hand over to Aditi Coomar, who will present on traffic and transport.

MS A. COOMAR: Good morning, commissioners. I'm Aditi Coomar, team leader, School Infrastructure Assessment Team, and I'm going to talk about the key issue, traffic and transport. Thank you, Prity. As the commission would have noted, the adverse impacts of the proposed development and especially the impacts of the increased student numbers on the operation of the surrounding roads as well as queuing on Victoria Street have been raised as a key issue by council and the public.

This slide provides us with details of the site as well the key intersections surrounding the site, shown in yellow circles. In response to the concerns raised by public and council, the applicant has submitted updated detailed SIDRA modelling to analyse the performance of the surrounding intersections on Prospect Road, Old Canterbury Road, Victoria Street and a few other surrounding local streets. Based on concerns from the department and the community, the applicant has put in considerable effort to provide additional intersection analysis for future conditions of surrounding intersections, including scenarios for an increase in student numbers, plus the delivery of a Green Travel Plan, which would likely result in reduced car usage within the site.

The updated analysis of the surrounding intersections demonstrate that the proposal would have an acceptable level of impact on the continued functioning of the surrounding local road network. Notwithstanding, the applicant proposes some upgrades to the Prospect Road-Old Canterbury Road intersection, as detailed in the department's assessment report. Council have not raised any concerns regarding these proposed upgrades, subject to future consultation. The department agrees with the applicant's updated assessment of intersection operations and is satisfied that the proposed regularisation or the increase in student numbers would have negligible impact on these intersections. The department also supports the proposed works on Prospect Road as it would result in broader community benefit in the long term.

We now move on to the main issue, which is related to the drop-off/pick-up and the car park management. The department notes that currently the existing drop-off/pick-up facilities within the site are not satisfactory, which result in queuing on Victoria Street and an unsafe traffic environment, as identified in the public submissions. The department also notes that a previous Land and Environment Court case refused a proposed increase of student numbers by 200 for the school given the unsatisfactory mitigation measures with regard to car park management

within the site. One of the main components of this proposal is improvements to the car parking facility, especially the Jubilee car park, or car park 1, which we had identified in a previous slide.

5 The proposed development's improvements to the car park and the resultant movements are identified on this slide. The key improvements would relate to the increase in the overall car parking spaces by 12, increasing the overall length of the circulation aisle within the car park, and the drop-off/pick-up spaces increased from 18 to 28. As shown on this slide, the existing car parks 1 and 2 are proposed to be
10 refurbished, extended and connected, resulting in an extended circulation route, as shown in the blue dotted line within the car park. This, in turn, would accommodate more cars within the on-site drop-off/pick-up zone and thus reduce the overall queue length on Victoria Street. Due to the proposed refurbishment, the cars would have an alternative exit point at the centre of the car park in addition to the southern existing
15 driveway shown in red.

The department has considered the public and council's concerns in detail and concludes that the proposed measures would significantly improve the current situation of the unsafe traffic environment on Victoria Street. This, coupled with the
20 delivery of a Green Travel Plan with reduced car usage, would ensure that the queueing on surrounding streets are reduced. The department has recommended a condition requiring the implementation of an Operational Transport and Access Management Plan to ensure better management of the car park in the future.

25 Notwithstanding the above, the department notes that the applicant seeks consent to regularise the student numbers with 155 additional students above that approved prior to the car park infrastructure being delivered. The department does not agree that 155 additional students can be accommodated within the site in the current
30 scenario with no adverse impacts on the surrounding road network. Further, this is contradictory to the Land and Environment Court judgment which refused an increase in student numbers due to lack of car park and/or drop-off/pick-up management measures.

35 Consequently, the department recommends that the student or staff numbers should not be increased beyond the previously permitted number of 1500 prior to the car park and drop-off/pick-up areas being completed with the proposed improvements. The department has no concerns regarding the future increase of students as proposed, subject to the timely delivery of infrastructure on the site, implementation of the Green Travel Plan and the Operational Transport and Access Management
40 Plan.

We now move on to car parking, sustainable transport and construction traffic. In terms of car parking, the department considers that the proposed 324 car parking spaces within the site, being 12 additional, is sufficient to cater for the proposal.
45 While it does not comply with council's DCP requirements, it is well over the car parking requirements that are prevalent in other parts of Inner West Council.

Additional parking would discourage the use of alternate transport modes by staff and students and, therefore, is not considered a preferred option.

5 To encourage sustainable transport, the department has recommended provision of 86 bicycle spaces within the site, with end-of-trip facilities for the staff.
Additionally, the department has recommended that the Green Travel Plan incorporate these measures to encourage use of bicycles regardless of student increases. The department has also recommended a condition requiring the Victoria Street footpath to be upgraded to council standard to encourage a safe walking
10 environment for the students. The footpaths on the other surrounding streets are considered satisfactory. Finally, the department generally considers the proposed construction staging to be satisfactory and has recommended a condition requiring the applicant to prepare a detailed construction traffic management plan prior to the commencement of works. Karen will now present built form and landscaping.
15 Thank you.

MS HARRAGON: Thank you, Aditi. Generally, in terms of the built form, the department considers that the new buildings proposed to be delivered by the application respect the heritage significance of the site. However, we will detail the
20 heritage matters a little later in our presentation. In relation to the proposal directions that also form part of the application, these works are considered to be minor and would complement the existing and new buildings.

The largest buildings proposed are the teaching and learning building and performing
25 arts building, both of which can be seen here through an elevation. Both of these buildings are up to five storeys in height, plus basement. Due to initial concerns raised by the department, the building heights were reduced marginally in the response to submissions by .5 of a metre. The height of the proposed buildings relative to existing building heights are shown on this slide, with the red outline
30 indicating the height of the existing buildings.

Notwithstanding the intensification of the scale of this development, due to the location of these two buildings in particular, which is central to the site, the department does not anticipate adverse visual impacts on the streetscape of Prospect
35 Road, Victoria Street or Seaview Street. When viewed from Victoria Street, as shown in this slide, the new buildings would visually unify the existing disparate built forms on the site, providing a consistency of theme, architectural detailing, compared to the existing building stock.

40 The proposed new multipurpose pavilion, a much smaller building, would be located at the southern boundary and would also complement the other new buildings due to its contemporary form and the materials. It would be visible from Yeo Park, which is identified as the vantage point in relation to the park in council's documentation. As I mentioned before, we will go into that in more detail in relation to heritage.

45 The height of the proposed maintenance building on Seaview Street, as amended by the applicant, complies with the 8.5-metre height control under the Ashfield LEP. It

is consistent with the low-density residential properties fronting Seaview Street, and it is also considered to be acceptable in regard to visual impact. In response to submissions, the applicant proposed to incorporate a row of lilly pillies to screen a proposed two-metre-high acoustics fence, as shown on the revised architectural plans, and this is proposal on the frontage to Seaview Street. The department agrees with this approach as the fence is required due to acoustics mitigation requirements.

I'm now going to talk a little bit about views and vista impacts. Integral to the built form and visual impacts are the impacts of the development on the amenity of the surrounding residents and the views and vistas enjoyed by the neighbours. The applications and the department's assessment report include a detailed assessment, against the Tenacity principles from the court, of the impacts on the views enjoyed by 157 and 159 Victoria Street. Submissions received raise concerns regarding view loss from these properties. The department considers that there are no significant view loss from 157 Victoria Street, as seen from this view.

And if we would just like to move to the next slide, which is a view from 159, there would be some loss of views of Sydney's CBD. However, it is not considered that these are significant views or water views, and, in our judgment, we do not consider that they're significant. Just bear with me for one moment. The department considers the impact to be moderate. Whilst noting the view lost due to the proposed development, the department also notes that there are no height controls which would apply to the school campus, and, therefore, the proposal does not breach any prescribed planning controls. Further, under the complying development provisions of the education SEPP, if this site had not been a heritage item, a 22-metre-high building could have been built on the site as a complying development. Considering the importance of the view and the overall benefits of the development of the future school population, the department considers the view lost due to the proposed development to be acceptable.

I'm now going to talk to landscaping. The proposal involves extensive landscaping for the school campus, which would be developed over stages. The department is satisfied that these landscaped areas, which include the junior play area fronting Seaview Street, the new outdoor assembly area, or The Agora, and the landscaped pedestrian entry to the Jubilee car park, would all improve the overall landscape setting for the site and the usability and functional attributes for the campus. While the proposal involves the removal of 29 trees, it would also include sufficient landscape replacement planting and broader landscaping outcomes which would improve the landscape character of the site and its contribution to the local character.

I just want to talk in particular about the Jubilee entry, which is presented in these two slides. With respect to the Jubilee Drive landscaping as seen in these two diagrams, which I might just draw to your attention, they're actually slightly oriented quite differently from each other. So in the one above, it's Victoria Street on the left, where in the image below, it's Victoria Street to the right. The main features of the Jubilee entry, which includes the entrance to the underground car park, the pedestrian access to Victoria Street and the car park, communal outdoor lounge and

amphitheatre seating, soccer net in between ovals, handball court and ping-pong table, the department notes that there would be a level change to accommodate the driveway entrance to the basement and the hard landscape works that sit above it.

5 So if you can look at that pergola form, as you move to the right side of that, you will note that that actually raises above the ground as it starts to form the canopy or the roof of the actual basement driveway drive. So that will actually require fencing to meet the BCA requirements so that there is actually provision of safety for all users. Whilst there's no fine-grain details of barriers and fencing at this time to separate
10 pedestrian and vehicle movements, it is anticipated that during the construction stage, the final landscape details would be provided, and this would include general safety requirements as well as specific BCA requirements regarding height above ground level change. Prity is now going to talk to heritage. Thank you.

15 MS CLEARY: Thank you, Karen. I will now move on to talk about heritage, which was a key issue raised by the community and council to the application. The key concerns in the submissions relate both to the heritage impacts of the proposal, particularly impacts on the character of adjoining conservation areas and the
20 demolition of the dwellings on Seaview Street, in particular number 48. This slide shows the site location in context to the surrounding heritage-listed items and heritage conservation areas. The department's assessment notes that the new buildings would not be located in proximity to the heritage-significant buildings within the site and, therefore, would not interfere with established heritage curtilage.

25 While council have not raised concerns regarding the adverse impacts of the development on the heritage-listed items, they initially recommended further detailed research to assess the heritage impacts of the proposal on the pre-1965 buildings, such as the existing North Quad building, and a conservation management plan. The applicant responded to this request by an updated heritage impact statement. The
30 department has considered this updated report and is satisfied that due to the location of the proposed works, they would not result in material adverse heritage impacts to the significant items on the site. The teaching and learning building would be recessive when viewed against the chapel, as seen on the image on the right on the slide. The new buildings would also be visible from the key contributory buildings,
35 including the headmaster's residence, chapel, chapel gates or quadrangle, as seen on the left image on the slide.

The proposal includes internal alterations and refurbishment to the North Quad but no external alterations that may impact on the significance of the quadrangle. The
40 department notes that, according to council's DCP, a conservation management plan is usually required for places of high heritage significance, such as those on the State Heritage Register or items of state significance. The site is not identified as either of these, and Heritage New South Wales reviewed the proposal and included no such requirements. In this circumstance, the department considers that further research or
45 conservation management plan are not required.

As mentioned earlier, the proposal involves the demolition of dwellings fronting Seaview Street. The applicant's heritage consultant indicates that three of the four dwellings, number 48, 50 and 52, fronting Seaview Street are not within the site's heritage curtilage. The eastern-most property, number 46 Seaview Street, is located
5 within the heritage-listed curtilage, however itself has no heritage significance and is not listed in the LEP. The department notes that these dwellings were identified 30 years ago as contributing to a potential future heritage conservation area known as the Trinity School State, with very limited details regarding any reasons for such contribution. However, this draft heritage conservation area did not progress.
10 Consequently, the department considers that this previous draft conservation area has limited relevance to this development application.

Following submission of additional heritage information from the applicant, council have not raised significant concerns regarding the demolition of the play area at this
15 location. Based on the above, the department agrees with the applicant's assessment and considers that the dwellings have little aesthetic relationship to one another. The demolition of the dwellings would ensure the delivery of the open play area for the junior school and two-storey maintenance building. The proposed demolition of four dwellings on Seaview Street and replacement with an open play area and the
20 proposed maintenance building would change the presentation of the site to the Victoria Square heritage conservation area to the north of the site. In this regard, we note that Seaview Street forms edge of this heritage conservation area, and the dwellings do not front the street, which means the frontage do not have a specific character. Therefore, this change in the presentation would not unreasonably impact
25 on the heritage values of this conservation area.

With respect to impacts on adjacent heritage items and conservation areas, most proposed works are located at the centre of the site, with limited impact on heritage items and heritage conservation areas. The department considered the visual impacts
30 of the proposal on the character of the surrounding heritage items and conservation area and concluded that there would be no significant adverse impacts on the character of the area due to this development.

The department notes that Yeo Park is located immediately to the south of the site and has heritage significance, mainly relating to the rotunda, which we have identified on the slide. As discussed earlier, this is also a vantage point in the locality. The multipurpose pavilion would be highly visible from this park but partly screened by a row of trees identified in the slide. Given its distance from the rotunda, the screening, the impacts on the heritage significance of the park is limited.
40 Notwithstanding, to further reduce any residual visual impacts, the department recommends planting additional trees along the northern boundary of the park, as shown in the green bubble. We acknowledge that this will need agreement from council.

45 In summary, the department considers that the proposed development would not have an unacceptable impact on the existing surrounding heritage items and the

heritage character of the surrounding locality. Now I will pass back to Karen, who will present the remaining key issues and the conclusion.

5 MS HARRAGON: Thank you for that, Prity. I'm now going to talk to construction and operational impacts in relation to noise before we conclude. In terms of the construction noise impact, the department notes that the noisiest activity for nearby residents would be the demolition of the existing dwellings that are fronting Seaview Street. To manage this impact of construction noise on surrounding residents, the department has recommended that the applicant prepare and implement a
10 construction noise and vibration management plan in consultation with the affected receivers. This will need to include the preparation of noise and vibration management strategies, which we believe will be successful in reducing the noise impacts.

15 The department has also recommended that construction works be restricted to standard hours as per the EPA guidelines. In terms of operational noise impacts, the department is satisfied that the proposal can operate in accordance with the noise criteria, which is established in the Noise Policy for Industry. Subject to the inclusion of acoustic treatments and site operational measures that have been
20 proposed by the applicant's acoustics report, we believe the proposal can achieve these.

A condition has also been recommended restricting the use of the new junior school play area, which is located adjacent to the Seaview Street, for free play for up to 80
25 students during lunch and recess breaks only and also to restrict noise emissions from the multipurpose pavilion by restricting the operating hours of that building to 6 pm, and this is consistent with the proposal put forward by the applicant. We've also required that all windows will be closed to mitigate noisy activities. These management measures should be implemented in an operational noise management
30 plan as per the department's recommendations. Additionally, suitable conditions are also recommended regarding design of the mechanical plant and equipment to reduce noise emissions in the future.

35 Before I conclude our presentation, I'm just going to mention the development's energy sustainability principles. The applicant is targeting a four-star Green Star rating, and this includes ESD initiatives such as external window shading, installation of energy and water-efficient fixtures and fittings, rainwater harvesting, sustainable building materials and supporting facilities to enable implementation of the Green Travel Plan. The department is satisfied regarding the development's
40 sustainability initiatives and has recommended conditions to ensure that the final development, when delivered, will achieve the four-star Green Star rating or equivalent.

45 Thanks, Jasmine. If you can stop with the presentation. This concludes the department's presentation on the key issues of the application. Overall, the department concludes in its report that the impacts of the development, as amended, can be mitigated through recommended conditions of consent, and the department

considers that the development is able to be approved. I will now hand back to the panel, if there are any questions on the development and the department's assessment. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to present.

5 MR PILTON: Thanks, Karen. There are a few issues that we've got. The leading one, I think, is the Victoria Street entry. It's very short on detail, at least on the information that we have, and I'm a bit concerned about the lack of detail and how this is going to work with the fencing and the grid. It looks to me as if that entry ramp into the car park is very, very steep and will need sort of, you know, rollovers and so on at the top and the bottom, and I'm just wondering if it's really, really feasible. Have you discussed this with the applicant or - - -

MS HARRAGON: No. We haven't discussed it with the applicant. We have a condition that we've recommended, requiring compliance with the Australian standard, which would include grade requirements at the basement drive. What we could also recommend – that an additional post-approval process be involved so that the details of that driveway, including such things as pedestrian refuges as any pedestrian is crossing that area, the suitability of landscaping and grades, particularly in respect to, say, potentially sight distance as people are coming out of that basement – that that becomes a planning secretary sign-off requirement if that's something that we could assist in drafting for you. And an additional component on that, which I – I might actually just check with my team. I thought we had contemplated a safety audit being undertaken. I'm just going to recall whether it's on this particular access point or another.

25 MR PILTON: It's on the other one, Karen.

MS HARRAGON: Yes. So we could also put forward so that then that analysis could be done by an appropriately qualified person to make sure that that interaction between cars and pedestrians is at the highest standard that can be achieved.

MR PILTON: Thank you. Yes, I think that safety audit from the southern access is very important because of the electrical substation there.

35 MS HARRAGON: As well, yes.

MR PILTON: I assume that it takes quite a long time to move a substation if it's necessary, so I think we need to look at the timing of - - -

40 MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MR PILTON: - - - when that audit is required.

MS HARRAGON: So if we can assist you in drafting a condition, we will actually also nominate the interaction of that particular piece of infrastructure in the dynamic of sight distances and view lines for pedestrians and vehicles that are moving through that area, so - - -

MR PILTON: Thank you. Just one other small point. If I can just clarify, Aditi said in her presentation that there was 86 bicycle parks. I thought it was 96, off the top of my head, just to clarify that point.

5 MS HARRAGON: Okay. We will take that on notice and - - -

MS COOMAR: We will just take that on notice.

MR PILTON: Yes. Thank you.

10

MS COOMAR: That may have been an error. It's there. The correct number is there in the report.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you. And while we're talking about bicycle parking, 15 you've recommended 40 near the Victoria Street entry and 40 near the Prospect Road entry.

MS HARRAGON: Correct.

20 MR PILTON: Have you identified any areas where those can actually occur? Just looking at the plans that I have, it would be pretty difficult.

MS COOMAR: We think there are quite a few landscaped areas where they can fit 25 in bicycle racks, but, no, we have not specifically identified those. We did have quite a few discussions with the applicant, but then finally we've done it as a post-approval requirement for the applicant to come forward and show where the bicycles would go in.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you. Wendy or Sherie, would you like to ask any 30 questions?

MS W. LEWIN: If I could just come in on the back of Adrian's last question, 35 regarding the Victoria Street entry or the Jubilee entry, we've all, obviously, appreciated that there is going to be a significant intensification of use and varied use from Victoria Street along that processional way, let's say. At the moment, it's very difficult to understand from the documents exactly how that is going to fall out. The landscape proposals in the documents don't necessarily speak to the architectural documents, and the renders that we see, which represent most of what's proposed for the architectural resolution, also don't reveal anything in any sort of detail about the 40 Jubilee entry.

With the proposed 40 bicycle spaces, with the dual access of cars in and out and now 45 pedestrians, whether they're students or not, into the site on either side of the vehicle entry, there is going to be, as we've just discussed, likely issues related to visibility, risk and so on. But, in addition, with the proposed use behind the ramp of that space between the two ovals, you've got bleacher seating, handball courts. You've got proposed planting. Some of it is under the canopy of the pergola and so on. And I'm

just wondering how the department has to date really addressed that with the applicant in relation to likely risks and design resolution, because it brings with it, as you've also said, issues to do with BCA compliance.

5 But there will be high-level fencing. There will be low-level fencing. There will be balustrades around the vehicle access. Where the bleacher seating is at its highest, there will have to be something that will prevent objects being thrown into the car park entry and so on. Has that ever been discussed in the early stages with the applicant?

10

MS HARRAGON: Aditi, you might just provide an update on what discussions we had had and also what potential solutions to get a more fine-grain detail available as a post-approval item.

15 MS LEWIN: Thanks, Karen.

MS COOMAR: Yes. No, we did not discuss this with the applicant in detail during our discussions with them. We did ask them quite a few questions regarding how the car park will work, but our general understanding is that the car park will be active during the peak hours because that's when it will be used as a drop-off/pick-up area, and the staff, when using the car park, would literally use it in the morning and in the afternoon periods. Therefore, during the daytime, unlike other commercial premises, the car park will not be in continuous use when the school is in operation.

25 We also thought that with regard to the risk assessment, under the BCA requirements, they would be required to provide safety bannisters where the ramp is entering the site and the proposed pathway. There is a level change between the two. So that was our basic understanding, but if the commission requires, we can provide for additional post-approval conditions requiring them to provide the fine-grain details to us regarding the risk that is associated with these areas and the proposed safety measures.

30

MS LEWIN: Thanks, Prity. We will also address this with the applicant later on today. The application, as you know, is for approval of detailed built form, and detailed built form is part of this consideration of the Jubilee entry and the interstitial spaces between the two ovals, so that is something that we, obviously, will address, and maybe it is something that needs to be brought forward, depending on how the process runs – would be brought forward now rather than as a post-approval item. It's quite consequential in relation to the approach or the strategy to the design of this entry.

40

Anyway, the other question that I had relates to the – and it's possibly a small one in relation to many of the other elements, but in the department's assessment, there is a reference to the quality of the project in terms of design, and I'm just wondering, from the very limited documentation that we all have, how did the department arrive at that assessment that it is of high quality? Because there's almost nothing other

45

than screens and colour to base an opinion on. Is there something that we haven't got, I suppose, is the question. Do we have all the information from the department?

5 MS HARRAGON: We would probably have to take that on notice to just clarify what package you have in terms of the full set of architectural drawings that were submitted as part of the application.

10 MS LEWIN: Okay. We have what was on your site, of course. It's very difficult to understand anything other than the screened armature that is the link building, the Arrow Building. Behind that are new buildings, and there's nothing really there other than screens. So thanks, Karen. That would be helpful.

15 MS COOMAR: So I'm assuming you had access to the architectural design reports as well?

MS LEWIN: Yes, absolutely.

MS COOMAR: Yes. Okay.

20 MS LEWIN: Yes.

MR PILTON: It just seems to me, if I could just make a comment, that the drawings were at a very early stage, more conceptual than I've previously seen on DAs, which have a lot more detailed indication of actually what's happened with the building.
25 As Wendy said, it's very hard to fully understand the design.

MS LEWIN: It is entirely about screen, armature and a kind of strategy rather than materiality in a real sense, design strategy and special resolution. It's very difficult to understand from any of the documentation, and I think that also runs to the ESD
30 documentation as well or assessment at this point. On that note, does the department generally consider this informal pitch to a four-star rating to be acceptable in an educational or cultural project?

MS HARRAGON: The department does not have any policy in respect to a
35 commitment to enforce any ESD rating. It's just an internal goal that our team has been seeking. As a stretch, we pursue a five. It's particularly challenging, we find, for existing developments where you're actually doing development that's set within existing buildings to often achieve that when you can't have a fresh palette to put the building in the right place, but, yes, there is no policy position that is transparent to
40 the public or applicants in relation to ESD.

MS LEWIN: Thanks, Karen. Thanks for that.

45 MR PILTON: Sherie, do you have any questions or - - -

DR S. COAKES: Yes. Just - - -

MR PILTON: Sorry. Were you going to say something, Aditi?

MS COOMAR: Yes. Just going back to Wendy's previous questions regarding the design, we did rely on comments from the government architect with regard to how
5 the design and the internal design, etcetera, work, and to some extent, that is one of the main areas where the department relies on when taking decisions on designs and with appropriateness of a design, and that's what we've done in this case as well.

MS LEWIN: Thanks, Aditi. Okay.
10

MR PILTON: Sherie, do you have any questions?

DR COAKES: Yes. Just one. Just a very quick one. Given the community's issues around unofficial parking in local streets, which was raised, I think, quite extensively
15 in some of those submissions, and also given that the key strategy here to manage that parking issue is your Green Travel Plan, I just wondered what is the basis for the 10 per cent target around modal change? Does that come from any particular basis? I know we've seen that target in other conditions previously. I'm just interested in what the basis of that is.
20

MS HARRAGON: In relation to green travel plans, we work in partnership with Transport for New South Wales and the council in terms of the likely achievement of some of the goals that schools set for themselves, and I guess it's often dependent upon where they're starting from in terms of the modal split that they're already
25 experiencing because, obviously, a modal split is only successful in relation to active alternate infrastructure – active internal – active – other public methods of reaching the school. So Transport, in this respect, considered that 10 per cent to be feasible.

DR COAKES: Okay.
30

MS HARRAGON: But, obviously, the conditions that we've imposed requires that ongoing auditing to confirm that that success is achieved and, if it's not, for them to revisit how they're going to achieve it using alternate influences.

DR COAKES: Okay. Terrific. Thanks, Karen.
35

MR PILTON: Anything, Sherie?

DR COAKES: No. That's fine for me.
40

MR PILTON: If I could just seek a little clarification for my own point of view, on the drawing that you showed of the drop-off/pick-up facilities in the car park, it seemed to me that the zone for that along the eastern side of the car park is longer than I saw in some of the drawings. Is that something the department has suggested?
45

MS HARRAGON: Jasmine, can we just pop that – I think it's the basement car park, Adrian - - -

MR PILTON: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: - - - that you're probably talking about.

5 MR PILTON: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: - - - because I think there were some earlier discussions that we had as a team in terms of where the safe location of having children leave cars and make their way through the car park, so - - -

10

MR PILTON: Yes. I'm not sure, to be honest, but it seemed to me that the one on the bottom here - - -

MS HARRAGON: The yellow?

15

MR PILTON: Yes. The yellow one is longer than what I saw on some other drawings from the architects.

MS HARRAGON: We will just double-check, in terms of consistency, if there's any outstanding architectural that we've maybe not changed - - -

20

MR PILTON: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: - - - as a result of any changes for the supplementary RTS.

25

MR PILTON: Yes. That's going - - -

MS COOMAR: This should be the most updated one.

30 MR PILTON: Okay, because that's going down quite a steep ramp there in between the two car parks, so I'm not sure about the grade and drop-off, what the safety requirements are, but that's something we can look at in detail.

35 MS COOMAR: Yes. And we do rely on council's comments in relation to the car parking grades, gradients and driveways, and in this case, council have not raised any comments. Usually, councils do raise concerns when the grades do not comply, but, yes, as Karen said, happy to look into that as a post-approval matter.

40 MS HARRAGON: And we also have a requirement for compliance against the Australian standard for internal car parks and private property as part of the package.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you. Yes, go on, Wendy. Go on.

45 MS LEWIN: Sorry. Just one thing. Karen, I may have missed this in the proposed conditions of consent. The entry off Victoria Street – you would, obviously, prohibit, even in frustration, a drop-off zone at the entry to the ramp from – between street – that threshold, which would be very tempting for people, generally, to do a

short-cut and drop their kids off, but you would have a condition that would prohibit a drop-off point.

5 MS HARRAGON: So, potentially, we could look at that earlier suggestion of framing a condition around a safety audit to include necessary signage. Look, if it's considered that there's a high risk, behaviour is often the problem. Like, a school sets rules. A school sets goals. It's often behaviour and non-compliance that causes a problem. We could suggest as well that a permanent camera be mounted there to record people coming and going. That would indicate to the school they're not using that as an appropriate use. I could see how, it being so close to the ovals, people might have an inclination to make that a quick drop for a child that's running late for an activity. But maybe, in addition to that, fencing that simply excludes access at that location would make it a, you know, utility that doesn't achieve anything as well.

15 MS COOMAR: Yes. And - - -

MS HARRAGON: It's a bit like management of safety, engineering an outcome so that there can be no non-compliance.

20 MS LEWIN: Yes. Design mitigating risk.

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

25 MS LEWIN: So yes. Yes, it's twofold, isn't it.

MS HARRAGON: Because in many respects, having that not as the focal point for vehicle movement and pedestrian movements is probably the goal here so that the entry points and the ability to enter those ovals is not occurring at the same locations as where cars is occurring is probably the priority for the design solution for fencing.

30 MR PILTON: I'm assuming that there will be a temptation for people just to drop off in Victoria Street along the kerb rather than waiting to get down into the car park. Has any thought been given to signage and so on, "No stopping" or whatever?

35 MS COOMAR: Yes. So because the residents also park on that street, a majority of the local streets, we are finding – it gets very hard to implement conditions where we are requiring no-stopping zones or no drop-off/pick-up zones temporarily on the local streets because that has to also go through council's local traffic committee
40 - - -

MR PILTON: Yes.

45 MS COOMAR: - - - which needs to be agreed with, it being a local street. So this is our general experience with the schools now in a lot of suburbs, that this is not something that's encouraged, to put in all these no-stopping areas, temporary or permanent. So in this case, we did not consider that on the Victoria Street. We

rather thought that if the OTAMP gets implemented, then the school will be able to manage that through the Operational Transport and Access Management Plan.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

5

MS COOMAR: But, yes, there is no guarantee. I agree.

MS CLEARY: I just wanted to add to that. I'm just having a quick look at the street view, and I can see there's some signage saying "No stopping" at the moment already there, just along Victoria Street, near the entry.

10

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you. You will appreciate it's a bit difficult for us at the moment because we can't do site inspections.

MS HARRAGON: Yes. We were lucky to have gone to that site before we were all in this situation.

15

MR PILTON: Yes. We're having a sort of virtual site inspection later on this morning, so that will be interesting. Okay. I don't have anything more. Wendy?

20

MS LEWIN: No. I think I'm fine. Thank you very much.

MR PILTON: Okay. Sherie?

DR COAKES: No. I think the only other question I had about the car park was, was there any discussion early on with the applicant around, I guess, looking at a one-entry, one-exit car park underground?

25

MS HARRAGON: No.

30

DR COAKES: No. Okay.

MR PILTON: Okay. Well, we can wrap it up there. Thank you very much, Karen, Aditi, Prity and Jasmine. That has been very helpful.

35

MS HARRAGON: Thank you for allowing us to present today.

MR PILTON: That's okay. Thank you.

MS COOMAR: Thank you very much.

40

MS CLEARY: Thank you.

45 **ADJOURNED**

[9.52 am]