

MR A. PILTON: Morning, Barbara, can you hear us? You must be on mute.

MS B. MATCHETT: Hello.

5 MR PILTON: Morning. So can you hear us all right, yes?

MS MATCHETT: Yes, thank you.

10 MR PILTON: Okay. Well, 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 respects to their elders past, present and emerging. 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 the Independent Planning Commission.

15 As you're aware, due to lack of interest, the commission has cancelled the public meeting in relation to this matter which was scheduled for today. We thought it was appropriate to meet separately with those who had registered to speak at the public meeting to hear their views on the proposed redevelopment of Trinity Grammar School SSD10371 project which is currently before this commission panel for
20 determination. In the interests of openness and transparency, and to ensure full capture of recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the commission's website.

25 I note that you have been given an allocated allocation of five minutes. I do reserve the right to allow additional time as required to hear new information. If you have a copy of your speaking notes or any additional material to support your presentation, it will be appreciated if you provide a copy to the commission. Please note that any
30 information given to us may be made public. The commission's privacy statement governs our approach to managing your information. Our privacy statement is available on our 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. So please begin.

35 MS MATCHETT: Okay. I don't have any new information, and I'm not going to be saying anything that wasn't included in my objections.

MR PILTON: That's okay.

40 MS MATCHETT: I suppose the first thing I say is how disappointed I am that there is the lack of interest, and the only thing I can say to that is that I class myself as a supporter of the school, but over the years – the last 20 years, development has been often adversarial, difficult, long and I'm just – you know, I wonder about the cost of that to – on people in terms of personal things.

45

So my objections are, as I outlined, the increase in the student numbers. I was part of the original people that were in – were – gave evidence in the Land and Environment Court, and the limit of the 1500, and we had known for quite some time that there were more than 1500 students at the school, and that was difficult at times, because
5 the days that they did numbers often included days when lots of the boys were absent for various reasons, including whole years of boys absent. So that's always been a bone of contention, but I understand that that's going to be allowed to be increased.

The loss of residential amenity is probably the biggest one for us. It'd be the
10 demolition of four houses in a row. It's a residential street that encloses what's called the quay of Victoria Square, the streets either end of it. It forever changes a residential street. The imposition of the junior school was – is part of that. When those houses were demolished and the junior school built and, in fact, it's the – I know we can't go backwards and we have to go forwards, but it was the
15 implementation of a junior school at Trinity which has forever changed the access and numbers of boys being driven.

When it was an entirely senior school, the school has said that it's between about 70 per cent of the boys came by train, bus, walk and less than 30 per cent were driven.
20 That now is in the absolute opposite. 70 per cent of the boys, because they're at junior school and K to 6, the – 70 per cent of the boys are driven. So that's a huge increase in the number of cars coming along. That has made difficulty, mostly for Victoria Street, and last time I was giving evidence in the Land Environment Court, I was told that, "You live in Victoria Square, why is it bothering you?" and, which,
25 goes again to my point that we live in a residential area.

The school is fortunate. It is a business, but it has charity status. It operates in a residential area, and taking out houses that stop that residential frontage, that's one of our concerns. No longer a row of houses and, particularly, maintenance building is
30 forever changing that street. The big change that will impact us is that the placement of the construction of the maintenance and delivery dock means that ingress and egress is in a residential street. It's not a wide street.

The trucks – I've noted that the schools will say that the trucks can only front egress, they're not – they won't be backing out, but, still, there is no – it is a smaller street
35 than Victoria. You can't – to take a heavy truck up the hill with a stop sign is really – is going to be a big impact on noise, and the operation of that maintenance and delivery dock is not limited to school hours. At the moment, the only trucks that go up that street are the garbage trucks, and the school has the right to have a garbage
40 truck egress.

The plans state that the building of the maintenance block will be five metres high. I don't think I saw that it was reduced from that. This will mean large and heavy machinery operating on suburban street at long hours. I can understand that the
45 school has done that for a safety reason. They want all heavy machinery not going through the school, so there's no contact with possible boys and harm, but I really worry about that building on a residential street.

The whole development seems to be on a massive scale, 127 million capital value in five years. It's extraordinary, really. So that's at least five years of continuous disruption, dust, noise, traffic, displaced traffic. The – one of the great problems is parking. Before the school was – the Land and Environment Court ruled that before
5 they could undertake another building they had to address the problem of the car park, which was when they built their very large car park. Before that, we were constantly parked out. So that has made a big difference.

10 However, you can't increase the – the car park, I understand, is only going to be increased by 12 parking spaces. There's going to be at least another four or five hundred boys coming in in this number. I presume their – they've already said that their teach staff will increase. So that actually means that there's no additional parking being made for the increase, at least, in their teachers, let alone their parents or boys or – the school has a lot. It's not just teaching staff. The school has a huge
15 ancillary staff. So that's another one of my real concerns is the parking.

The other thing, I suppose, I feel really strongly about is throughout the development, the environmental impact statement makes a number of statements about, "The sharing of the schools facilities will extend benefits to the wider
20 community, and the future shared use of school facilities would allow the school to function as a social connector for the wider community, fostering social cohesion". Now, that is really, really difficult to understand what does that mean. When it's of benefits to the wider community, is it talking about Summer Hill and sharing as a social connector.

25 One of the difficulties we had with the last development when they placed an Olympic sized pool in an area that only just fitted it, one of the problems we had there was that we said, "Okay, you're going to be putting in a pool". Trinity is the only – only the second place in Sydney that has an Olympic development pool. It
30 has a diving pool, a warm-up pool and an eight lane pool. The only other one is Homebush. So when that pool went in, the – we tried to make a submission, "If you're going to put a big development like a pool in, can we at least try and share it with the local community? Can we get the number of primary schools in the area? Can we get – can we somehow or other have some community sharing of those
35 facilities?" and that was – they said no.

Now, it wasn't that it was after a long and exhausting talk about, you know, whether it would work or what hours or whatever. It was a blunt no. So I really fail to see how the school's facilities benefit our community. Noise, disruption, large trucks,
40 small residential street. Because of the junior school and the number of buses that come to the school – the school organised buses – that often parks eight or nine buses on Canterbury Road waiting with engines idling to get in and come up Seaview and onto Victoria Avenue so they can pick up the boys in the afternoon, and, you know, there's already – and there's a government bus, as well. There are two government –
45 406 and the 402, I think, run up Seaview. So they're probably my main things. I was struck by the Minister for Planning's foreword on community participation planning that good planning must go beyond – ending with the sentence:

Planning must be done strategically and thoughtfully with the community at the heart of it.

5 And I just – it’s exhausting. It is a big development. It is a big school. The likelihood that we can get any influence is negligible. I had a son who attended Trinity for 14 years. I don’t have any angst against the school. I’m not at all a vexatious parent. I’m delighted with the education received. I moved into the area so that he could be closer to school, and it was fantastic, so I have no difficulty at all with having a big school near me. It’s the size and scale of this development.

10 MR PILTON: Okay. Thanks, Barbara. We’re probably running over time a little bit.

MS MATCHETT: Okay.

15 MR PILTON: Is there anything else you’d briefly like to say before we finish?

MS MATCHETT: No, no, that’s great. Thanks.

20 MR PILTON: Perfect.

MS MATCHETT: Am I allowed to stay in and listen or not?

MR PILTON: I don’t know if it’s possible. Brad?

25 MR B. JAMES: No, we’ve scheduled individual meetings.

MS MATCHETT: Okay. All right.

30 MR JAMES: So I believe everyone will be meeting separately.

MS MATCHETT: No worries. Thanks.

MR PILTON: But you’ll be able to read all of the transcripts online, which will be there within, probably, a day.

35 MS MATCHETT: Okay. Well, thank you very much. Thank you for the opportunity.

40 MR PILTON: Thanks, Barbara. Bye-bye.

MS MATCHETT: Okay, then. Bye.

45 **RECORDING SUSPENDED** **[10.15 am]**

RECORDING RESUMED

[10.16 am]

5 MR PILTON: Morning, Adele, can you hear me? Morning, Adele, can you hear me?

MS A. WALSH: Yes, I can hear you. Can you hear me.

10 MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you. Okay. I will start. 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 respects to their elders past, present and
emerging. My name is Adrian Pilton, and I am the chair of this commission panel.
I'm joined by my fellow commissioners, Wendy Lewin and Dr Sheridan Coakes.
15 We're also joined by Brad James and Kate Moore from the office the Independent
Planning Commission.

As you're aware, due to the lack of interest, the commission has cancelled the public
meeting in relation to this matter which was scheduled for today. We thought it was
20 appropriate to meet separately with those who had registered to speak at the public
meeting to hear their views on the proposed redevelopment of Trinity Grammar
School SSD10371 project which is currently before this commission panel for
determination. In the interests of openness and transparency, and to ensure 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.

25 I note that you have been given a time allocation. I do reserve the right to allow
additional time as required to hear new information. If you have a copy of your
speaking notes or any additional material to support your presentation, it will be
appreciated if you provide a copy to the commission. Please note any information
30 given to us will be made public. The commission's privacy statement governs our
approach to managing your information. Our privacy statement is available on our
website. 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. So please begin.

35 MS WALSH: Thank you. I've got a few photographs to show, which I had sent in,
but I can just share that with you, if that's - - -

40 MR PILTON: Yes, please.

MS WALSH: - - - the best way to do it. I'm not sure how to do that, actually.

MR PILTON: Bottom of your screen it says "share".

45 MS WALSH: Yes. Sorry. It's disappeared under - "share screen". Okay. This
one. Is that working for you?

MR PILTON: No, not yet.

MS WALSH: That's better.

5 MR PILTON: Okay. It's started screen – yes, that's it.

MS WALSH: Good. Okay. Hopefully, you can – all right, and - - -

MR PILTON: Okay

10

MS WALSH: All right. My major concern with the proposal is the traffic. We have terrible traffic at the moment in the suburb. The survey that they took was when year 12 was on STUVAC, so there was 10 per cent of the students away and all these students are the ones that are currently driving. The proposal offers barely any
15 extra parking, indicating that the staff and students will park on the streets. At the moment, they will already park up to half a kilometre away from the school. Out the front of my place there's people parked most days. I live about 200 metres down Prospect Road from the school.

20

One suggested parking area is these buses – where these buses park of an afternoon. This is where a lot of the students and teachers are expected to park in the future. They park there because they have to wait to be called onto Prospect Road, otherwise there's a traffic jam on Prospect Road. There's nowhere else that they could possible
25 park. On any morning or afternoon, I can – this is some students who are carrying – having their mother have help them carry their bags to school, so on any morning or afternoon, you'll find parents parked illegally on the pedestrian crossing or in no stopping zones. They're offloading their kids, they're loading their kids, it doesn't matter.

30

There's also buses parked along Prospect Road, across the pedestrian crossing, unloading kids, loading kids. There's a couple of – sorry, teachers there collecting bus fares. They don't police any of this bad behaviour from the parents or the buses. Kids can't ride or walk, as suggested by the proposal, because they carry heavy
35 luggage and most of them don't live locally. They live a long way away, and the young ones can't take buses, so this is why we've got so many cars over the last 10 years since the – the primary school was put into the property. Before that it was just a senior school, but over the last 10 years, it's just gotten terrible.

40

If this is approved, and they have a habit of being able to get things through, the local residents would like not to have to police the restrictions imposed. In the past there's
45 been restrictions imposed like turning all the lights out at night or advertising that they've got parking in the parking lot or having 1500 limit of enrolments. All these restrictions have been ignored by the school. The most galling is the 1500. It was imposed by a court, by a judge, and they have just ignored it. The grant that they're going to receive over this would be so much better used as – by a more deserving school that doesn't have the resources to put this proposal together and to take it through the legal system.

VIDEO SHOWN

5 MS WALSH: Sorry, this is a – so I'll just leave you with a couple of videos of how
the traffic looks of an afternoon on Victoria Street. This is the car park that they're
talking about that they're going to increase the capacity of the car park and for
people to get in. They have a person supervising the traffic coming in and out of
here. If that person's not there, that "left turn only" is ignored and people turn right.
10 This intersection was listed as good traffic movement in the traffic report. That
queue down there goes for another half a kilometre.

MR JAMES: Hi, Adele. Just noting you're at five minutes.

15 MS WALSH: Yes. I regularly have people park out the front of my place, idling
their cars of an afternoon, because they don't want to have to enter the car park.
They wait for their kids and just sit there in their cars with their – sorry, the next one.

MR PILTON: Can I just ask which street do you live on?

20 MS WALSH: On Prospect Road.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

25 MS WALSH: Yes. And this is another – this is afternoon, I think, just the traffic.
Kids trying to get through it. Yes. It's atrocious. Okay.

MR PILTON: Okay.

30 MS WALSH: That's all. I thank you for your time. I'm hoping that you don't
approve this, obviously, but, thank you.

MR PILTON: Thanks, Adele. If you want to send those photographs and videos in,
we'd appreciate it.

35 MS WALSH: No, I have sent them. Brad should have them.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you very much.

40 DR S. COAKES: Thank you, Adele.

MR PILTON: Bye-bye.

MS WALSH: Thank you.

45

RECORDING SUSPENDED

[10.25 am]

RECORDING RESUMED

[10.26 am]

5 MR PILTON: Good morning. Can you hear us, Neil?

MR N. BETTLES: Good morning. I can, thank you.

10 MR PILTON: Okay. Yes. 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 respects to their elders past, present and emerging. 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 the Independent Planning Commission.

15 As you're aware, due to the lack of interest, the commission has cancelled the public meeting in relation to this matter which was scheduled for today. We thought it was appropriate to meet separately with those who had registered to speak at the public meeting to hear their views on the proposed redevelopment of Trinity Grammar School SSD10371 project which is currently before the commission panel for
20 determination. In the interests of openness and transparency, and to ensure 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.

I note that you've been given a time allocation, but I reserve the right to allow
25 additional time as required to hear new information. If you have a copy of your speaking notes or any additional material to support your presentation, it will be appreciated if you would provide a copy to the commission. Please note any information given to us may be made public. The commission's privacy statement governs our approach to managing your information. Our privacy statement is
30 available on our 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. So please begin.

35 MR BETTLES: Okay. Well, thank you, Commissioner Pilton, for the opportunity to speak directly with you. Can I just clarify, are there two more commissioners listening into this or just yourself?

40 MR PILTON: No, no, there's Wendy Lewin and Dr Sheridan Coakes. You can probably see their pictures there, and there's also Kate and Brad.

MR BETTLES: I can only see Bradley James, but that's okay. I'm not particularly familiar with Zoom, so I'll continue, if I may.

45 MR PILTON: Please.

MR BETTLES: Okay. So my name is Neil Bettles, and I've lived in Holwood Avenue for over 20 years. This is the first time I've objected to a development plan

from the school, but having reviewed the application, I felt obliged to do so on this occasion. I recognise that a school needs redevelop and upgrade. I have no issue with this aspect, but I also appreciate schools must take into account future demand and consider expansion when necessary; however, I feel the growth should be
5 calculated based on demand from student growth and the need to create the additional capacity required in the infrastructure.

Trinity have based their development on a vision of what the school should look like. If you have unlimited space and there are no impacts to the community with no
10 contributions from government, that's fine, but otherwise it should be based on methodology which can be validated. So I wanted to start with a couple of omissions that I feel have been left out of the documentation, and the first one is capacity.

So Trinity state that the proposed development has been designed and oriented to
15 accommodate the forecast student population, and that's what you'd expect, but despite efforts to validate the capacity increase proposed by Trinity, and I have been requested the submissions, as well, they haven't provided any evidence. They've just reiterated that the student numbers are expected to be 2100 at the target.

So because of the – because the development expands beyond the current boundary
20 of the school, and also outside the building profile, then I think it's important that we know why it's expanding that much, because it isn't evident in the documentation. If it was and there was a valid need to have that capacity to accommodate the growth of students in the inner west, then I have no issue with it. So – also, in terms of the
25 building, generally – generally my complaint is that the expansion isn't justified, and if I – I'd like to just raise one particular example, and that's the training and learning building, which, obviously, is dependent on student capacity. Trinity Grammar have actually stated that in the report, that it's built on the student demand.

So if there's no link to the actual scale of that classroom building, then, again, we
30 don't know whether the scale is appropriate to the student numbers and, also, the terrace on top of that building is not really a teaching amenity. It's earmarked for examinations, but I believe that that is actually an entertainment and function centre, and so, again, I'd like to get justification for the height with those two aspects.

35 Going onto the second thing that I think there's an omission for, and that's the student numbers. Again, it's linked to the above in that the student numbers dictate the capacity and, possibly, building in excess capacity, but the student numbers in the inner west is projected from numbers from the New South Wales Department of
40 Education and, in particular, 1500 – they're expected the non-government sector to take 1500 student growth in the inner west.

Now, Trinity accommodating 445 of those, and so that seems to be disproportionate, and there are another 37 non-government schools in the inner west. Just doing a pro
45 rata calculation there, I would say the demand is three per cent, not the 30 per cent that Trinity Grammar School are saying they would actually acquire. Again, there's

a difference in logical figures there, and it would be good to have a rationale as to why they're so different.

5 So it seems to me that the forecast is grossly overstated, which again questions the scale of certain buildings. Obviously, new facilities are required, anyway, but those – the scale that's dependent on student numbers seems to be excessive, and this wouldn't be an issue at all if they were keeping within the current boundary, but they're actually not. So I think it deserves attention to explain why they're expanding outside of the current boundary and building profile.

10 So, really, they're the two points I'm wanting to raise. So from the perspective of the community, I think, it's essential that the scale is proportionate and appropriate and that there's some kind of validation, and it has been asked for, but it hasn't been forthcoming to date, and I was just going to say that I am pleased that there are
15 conditions going to be entered into the development approval, and that was good from reading the report from the department, and one other point I'm wanting to make is that in the applicant meeting transcript, it says that the headmaster had no complaints about noise in the three and a-half years at school.

20 I don't know what that means is a complaint, but, certainly, in the submissions there is plenty of objection to the additional noise that's being created based on the noise that is currently in place. For me, personally, it doesn't affect me, because I am two buildings away from the boundary, but it does quite a few of the residents around the perimeter. So I just would like that to be, kind of, clarified, really, and that really is
25 all the points I wanted to raise. Thank you very much.

MR PILTON: Thank you very much, Neil. Okay. That's fine. Thank you.

30 MR BETTLES: Okay. Thanks.

MR PILTON: Okay. Bye-bye.

MR BETTLES: Bye-bye.

35 **RECORDING SUSPENDED** **[10.36 am]**

40 **RECORDING RESUMED** **[10.36 am]**

MR PILTON: Hi, Lee, can you hear us?

45 MS L. GREENAWAY: Yes.

MR PILTON: Okay.

MS GREENAWAY: It's on. Let's start.

MR PILTON: Let's start. Good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land from which we virtually meet
5 today and pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging. 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 the Independent Planning Commission.

10 As you're aware, due to the lack of interest, the commission has cancelled the public meeting in relation to this matter which was scheduled for today. We thought it was appropriate to meet separately with those who'd registered to speak at the public meeting to hear their views on the proposed redevelopment of Trinity Grammar School SSD10371 project which is currently before the commission panel for
15 determination. In the interests of openness and transparency, 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.

I note that you have been given a time allocation, but I reserve the right to allow
20 additional time as required to hear new information. If you have a copy of your speaking notes or any additional material to support your presentation, it will be appreciated if you could provide a copy to the commission. Please note any information given to us will be made public. The commission's privacy statement governs our approach to managing your information. Our privacy statement is
25 available on our 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. So please begin. Over to you.

MS GREENAWAY: Thank you. Look, and thank you for the opportunity to
30 express our objections. Look, before I point that when I looked it up there were over 80 written submissions from the public, so I don't think there is a lack of interest, and I'm probably reflecting the views of most of the neighbourhood in my objections, so not just myself. I live in Service Avenue, which is one street back from the school – the school's entrance in Victoria Street. So that's their main
35 vehicle access in Victoria Street.

We have lived here for 25 years, and over that time, certainly in the last few years, the traffic has gotten much, much worse, and it is school traffic. Most students
40 purely seem to come from another area, so parents are driving them. Obviously, we pay the rates, not the school, and the location is really – the school's been there for a long time, but the location is really not suitable for a further increase in traffic. The streets are narrow, residential, it's a heritage precinct area, and it's not going to change. That's – they're narrow streets and they're not going to get any bigger.

45 It's already gridlock in the morning and the afternoon, because there's nowhere for that traffic to get out to. So only a few years ago the school had one big redevelopment, and we noticed that the Land and Environment Court put a cap on

their numbers then of 1500, which I think they've gone over, anyway, but this new expansion would put it up to 2100. So the school has counted that. The department and the council have repeated raised objections about traffic problems. So the school has proposed a new underground car park, which would have better flow to alleviate the queuing on Victoria Street, and that may work, but it only moves the queuing from going into Victoria Street to then coming out and trying to get away.

So there's nowhere – really, nowhere to get away to. It would be directly largely down to Harland Street, which is an even more narrow street, which then goes out onto a very busy intersection. So that's certainly my main issue, and I think the surrounding streets continue to have problems, as well. The department seems to accept this as a solution, but I don't think it will be a solution. I think it will just be shifting the traffic from one street to another street even smaller.

The traffic assessment – the traffic impact assessments looked pretty inaccurate to me. Certainly, the intersection of Harland and Queen Streets as being – claiming that they would be acceptable level of service didn't seem correct at all. It certainly doesn't reflect the reality of our situation on the ground. I see queues there all the time. Nearly every day. So we don't even bother trying to get out of our street sometimes. It's a problem now and, obviously, with increased level of cars, because of increased numbers of students, that's only going to get much worse.

I did note also that they put up a Green Travel Plan, which looked particularly vague and insubstantial, and I really couldn't see how it could make any difference to alleviating those problems. So, certainly, that's how we feel from where I am in this particular street, but I think it's an issue for all of the little streets around here. Obviously, it's a bigger issue for the whole city. We've got ourselves into a situation where parents are criss-crossing the city every day from all over the place to deliver their students to a school that's nowhere near where they live. That's the situation that Sydney has got itself into.

I think if we're going to plan something, then we need to be thinking about the mistakes that have already been made and try not perpetuate them, try not to just make them bigger. So that would be, I suppose, as well as my own point of view, thinking across the city. I guess the fundamental problem for us, look, the school, I think, is – it's in a fairly confined site, even though it's bought up a couple of streets around it. It is a heritage area. The school can't really expand any further here. It's – the local streets are small. It's already congested with traffic, and we really feel like the school has reached its capacity, and that an increase in numbers would not be viable; would not be sustainable, really. So that's our main idea. Does anyone need to ask a question?

MR PILTON: No, I think I'm happy. Wendy? Sheri?

DR COAKES: Yes. Just one, Lee. What has been the relationship, Lee, between the school and residents in that – you know, in proximity, such as yourself? You

know, you're only, as you said, a street away. I just wondered what has been the relationship between residents and - - -

5 MS GREENAWAY: Look, they're pretty good at giving you leaflets.

DR COAKES: Yes.

10 MS GREENAWAY: The boys are fine. I have no problem with the boys. The – so they let you know when things are going to happen, but – and, look, I don't know, maybe they're ameliorating all sorts of other issues, but they can't really do anything about the traffic, so they just seem to be pretty set on doing an expansion, after they only expanded a few years ago, and it just really isn't a good site for it.

15 DR COAKES: Thank you.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thanks, Lee.

MS GREENAWAY: Okay. Thank you.

20 MR PILTON: Transcripts will be up very soon. Thank you.

DR COAKES: Thank you.

25 MS GREENAWAY: Thanks so much.

RECORDING SUSPENDED [10.45 am]

30 **RECORDING RESUMED** [10.47 am]

MR PILTON: Morning, Paul, can you hear us?

35 MR P. GRECH: Yes. Can you hear me?

MR PILTON: Yes. Fine. Thank you. Good morning and welcome.

40 MR GRECH: Thank you.

45 MR PILTON: Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging. My name is Adrian Pilton, and 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 the Independent Planning Commission.

As you're aware, due to a lack of interest, the commission has cancelled the public meeting in relation to this matter which was scheduled for today. We thought it was appropriate to meet separately with those who had registered to speak at the public meeting to hear their views on the proposed redevelopment of Trinity Grammar School SSD10371 project which is currently before this commission panel for determination. In the interests of openness and transparency, 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.

5 I note that you have been given a time allocation, but we'll extend that to the 15 minutes, as you've requested. I do reserve the right to allow additional time as required to hear new information. If you have a copy of your speaking notes or any additional material to support your presentation, it would be appreciated if you would provide a copy to the commission. Please note any information given to us will be made public. The commission's privacy statement governs our approach to managing your information. Our privacy statement is available on our website. 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. So please begin.

20 MR GRECH: Thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to present to the commission. My name is Paul Grech. I have resided 200 metres from the school at 1 Victoria Square with my wife, Heather, for the last 20 years. There are lots I would like to say, but I'll confine myself to two issues that have the most impact on us. That's, firstly, the maintenance building on Seaview Street and, secondly, student and staff numbers and traffic, the maintenance building.

30 Victoria Square is a fantastic community resource. It's a popular walking route for us and many in the community walk up Victoria Square, up Seaview Street and down Victoria Street to go to Yeo Park. Unlike the main school site, the four dwellings to be demolished in Seaview Street are zoned residential R2. I don't think there's ever been enough emphasis given to the fact that, obviously, that has a different objective to the main part of the school.

35 The proposed building as amended is described as being a two to three storey, and compatible with the streetscape, but it's not. It's a 10 metre high three storey building that presents like an industrial style building. This would have to be the worst looking building on the whole of the school site. The site is so large, surely the maintenance building could be placed in a less prominent location inside the site and not on a residential street. The upper two levels are to be used for offices and storage. These functions do not need a street presence.

45 The traffic impact study, the TIA, shows the proposed wide driveway not typical of a residential setting will cater for heavy rigid vehicles. It's not apparent that these will be able to safely enter and exit the site. Nor is it clear from the swept path diagrams that they will be able to do so without crossing on the other side of what is a narrow street at the crest of a hill. Seaview Street is a light traffic thoroughfare.

The documentation in the DA glosses over the impact on this aspect of the development. The heritage impact statement original and updated has one small stated that the proposed building is of a suitable scale and in keeping with the residential context, but does not adequately address the significant visual impact on
5 the catchment of Glentworth heritage item, which is located on the opposite corner of Victoria and Seaview Street. The removal of large figs in this part of Seaview Street on request from the school, because they were damaging the existing dwellings, ironically, filed an application to demolish those dwellings, will make the maintenance building prominent in the street.

10 The kind of freedom village where Glentworth heritage item is located has restored his building only recently, and its setting providing us a magnificent uplift to the area. I'm very proud of what's happened in the area, but only to have it trashed by a maintenance building. The proposed form is not akin to a residential dwelling. The
15 unfortunate legacy of the current school buildings on the street – on Seaview Street, which are mostly disguised by the larger figs that are kept in that pack, which not be emulated in this location opposite the heritage conservation areas.

20 The blank, two metre high rendered and painted walls are not appropriate to the street, even with the tokenistic planning, and it's not clear if the proposed wide metal gate shown on the amended drawing will be solid or not, adding to a poor streetscape presentation. A prominent part of the building extends substantially forward of the building line, if you look at the plans carefully, which is just not suitable. If this was a DA for this building only, you would question the suitability of its structure and its
25 function opposite residents and directly adjoining the remaining non-Trinity dwelling on the corner of Seaview and Victoria Street.

The addendum heritage statement by Urbis that address the heritage significance of the four dwellings to be demolished concludes there is none, but the loss of
30 streetscape values and the character of the street and the suitability of the building that will replace them, in part, is not adequately addressed. As a local resident, one despairs about the erosion of the local residential amenity due to continual expansion of the school. The department's assessment fails to adequately assess the heritage and streetscape impacts, as well as the functional aspects of the traffic movements of
35 this building. The school does not need to have the maintenance depot located in such a prominent location. This aspect of the development needs to be refused and the facility relocated within the site.

40 The second issue is about the increase of student numbers and resulting impacts. The proposal is to provide an increase of 1.2 hectares of additional floorspace. An increase from 1500 students to 2100, that's 600 more students, and an increase of 277 to 321 full-time equivalent staff. I urged the panel to read the judgments of the 2007 and 2015 court cases, as they give a good overview of the facts of the existing development and the longstanding issues that will be exacerbated by the proposal.
45 The 2007 court case. The school had argued that there was no power for the court to impose a condition limiting student numbers, but to the contrary, Senior

Commissioner Roseff concluded that there was an obligation to impose a limit of 1500 students based on the traffic conditions at that time.

5 In the 2015 court case, the State said there is 320 car spaces onsite, whereas the proposal indicates there are 317. So there's a factual issue. In 2015 the school sought to modify the condition to increase the numbers to 1700, an increase of 200. The panel need to reconcile, as I cannot, why the tested court evidence was based on traffic analysis based on two hours peak period and not one hour peak using traffic counts taken over five days both inside and outside of school holidays.

10 The court accepted expert evidence that a 234 student increase would result in 145 additional trips in the morning, for example, whereas the current traffic impact assessment states with an increase – there'll be an increase of four hundred and forty – with an increase of 445 students only 196 additional vehicle trips result. The traffic reports analysed the impacts on Victoria Street as a local collector road, and this type of analysis is absent from the current traffic impact assessment.

The court refused the 200 increase in student numbers. The judgment notes in paragraph 60:

20 *In my assessment of the evidence, the proposed increase in the number of student numbers at the campus will have a significant environmental impact on traffic volumes, particularly in Victoria Street.*

25 Paragraph 61:

From a quantitative perspective I am of the opinion that the increase in vehicles generated by an additional 200 students at the campus is significant.

30 Paragraph 62:

As the expert and resident evidence stands I am of the opinion that Victoria Street is not presently coping with the current traffic generated by the school under the original consent.

35 So in summary what all this means is that the school has disregarded the conditions of a court granted development. Rather than being punished for blatantly committing an offence under the Act, because that's effectively what they've been doing, the department is recommending that they be rewarded. I'm astounded the at the department has so little regard to the Land and Environment Court and appropriate process that it appears to have simply adopted the position to regularise the offence of the additional student numbers.

45 The fact that the EIS and the traffic report fails to identify the current constraints put into question the analysis or impact presented. The increases being proposed is not from a 1655 to 2100, but from 1500 to 2100 students. A 40 per cent increase. The fact that at least 230 car spaces in the car park were required for the existing facilities

is completely at odds with the proposal that with an increase of an additional 12,000 square metres only provides an additional 12 car spaces.

5 The application glibly states that the actual DCP requires too many car parking spaces and is not consistent with government policy to encourage public transport usage. The information provided in the EIS of the modal split, even this – even if this is accurate, it is evident that the school is heavily reliant on travel to school by car and not by public transport. It is not particularly close to public transport. It's about a 20 to 25 minute slightly uphill walk to either Summer Hill or Ashfield
10 Stations. The assessment report recognises that no student or staff cycle to the school.

I can tell you as a resident of 20 years, it's uncommon to see students and staff walk to the school. I can probably tell you, I could recognise them individually. In any
15 case, it cannot be assumed that in post-COVID times there will be the modal split as there was in one survey conducted in October 2019. It's statistic – statistical reliability being unknown. Contrary to the statement in the plan of management, a significant number of students do not use public transport. Only 47 per cent, and only 16 per cent of staff. More than half of the 47 per cent that use the public
20 transport is via Trinity buses that currently struggle to find anywhere to park in the local area, which hasn't been assessed what's going to happen with those buses and if you're going to increase them.

As 84 per cent of the staff drive, the additional 44 staff alone would require 37 car
25 spaces. Despite a significant increase in student and staff numbers, car spaces on the site will increase by only 12. From 312 to 324. The result will only be a further impacts on residents' street parking.

The greatest flaw appears to be that for such an increase in student numbers, the
30 traffic impact assessment is based on traffic counts taken on only one day, that's Tuesday of 4th February 2020, and that it comes to the conclusion that the resultant traffic impact will be acceptable, and they rely only on SIDRA analysis on the congestion at traffic intersections. No assessment about mid-block traffic or environmental capacity.

35 It is unbelievable that the current intersections, anyway, all operate at a level of service A at peak times of the school, and adding a 40 per cent increase of students will not affect the level of service. The traffic counts need to be taken on several occasions on representative dates throughout the school year. At the beginning of
40 term, year 7 students all attend an offsite camp. So it's not known if this was the case when the counts were taken. For such a significant increase in student numbers, a more detailed traffic impact assessment and independent review is required. That's not been done.

45 The regional traffic impact assessment did not identify and address the significant queuing issues that occur every morning along Victoria Street, and the congestion in Holwood Avenue and Harland Street. The traffic impacts are not merely one of

service and intersections. The measures – that measures impacts on traffic flow, but also that of residential amenity. That needs to be assessed. This is not addressed in the EIS or the department’s assessment report.

5 The original traffic impact assessment did not address the impacts on other significant intersections, including Harland Street and Holen Street – Holden Street, Victoria Street and Liverpool Road. The updated traffic impact assessment dated June 2021 undertook more traffic counts, again, one single day, 21 April 2021, and that was the second day back of term and it’s COVID times, so it cannot be
10 representative of normal traffic volumes.

As an example, contrary to the conclusion made about the Victoria Street and the Liverpool Road intersection, the problematic leg is turning right into Liverpool Road from Victoria Street, which is already a level service of D. Non-COVID times, I
15 walk through that intersection every day. In the morning peak, this intersection is choked back past the roundabout at the intersection of Victoria Street and Norton Street, which is one intersection back, yet that intersection was not analysed.

So you can’t even drive through that intersection, because of the traffic backing up from Liverpool Road. In the morning peak, this intersection is frequently choked
20 back – sorry. The Victoria Street, Liverpool Road intersection currently does not work and it cannot – can only get worse. I’m not a traffic expert, but I question the level of service averaged across the intersection legs as done in the traffic impact assessment. All that individual legs clearly show diminished and unacceptable drop
25 in level of service.

Surely, you can’t – surely, a drop of level in service in any leg should be considered not the average. I don’t understand how they can average the level of service across the leg – all legs and say it’s okay. At the moment, there is one access point on
30 Victoria Street out of the car park used by parents. The school has a self-imposed ban on right turns out of the car park during peak hours, which means only those that ignore the sign inside the school driveway, which there is a little sign there, or those that turn left and then do a U-turn, causing traffic chaos and safety issues, can then travel north along Victoria Street to go to Liverpool Road.

35 The proposal to introduce a right-hand turn into Victoria Street will be a complete disaster for the environmental amenity of residents along Victoria Street, which currently don’t get the traffic going north, because – well, not most of it. Only the one – the crazy people that try to go that way. Because of the backing up of
40 Liverpool Road, and the disaster for people like us using – like us, when traffic will look for alternative routes via Clissold Street, so that’s where I’m worried about was we’re just going to get more people coming – finding whatever ways they can find to get out of the area. The problem for us is the traffic noise, access out of our driveway, traffic congestion and safety. There are already periodically accidents at
45 intersections such as Clissold Street and Victoria Street, which most aren’t recorded, so you won’t have statistics on them.

MR JAMES: Paul, sorry, just noting we're at the 15 minute mark.

MR GRECH: Okay. I'm nearly finished, if I can finish.

5 MR PILTON: Yes. Continue, please. Yes.

MR GRECH: Thank you. The streets being parked out near us occur only occasionally at present, mainly during special events, but that's as far down as we are. We're about 200 metres away, but the proposal can only make this a regular
10 occurrence. There is no consideration of other special events, as was undertaken for the court cases, which will now either be more frequent or have a higher number of attendees. It appears that the department has accepted the applicant's traffic impact analysis, as there are some technically-based, not amenity-based, mitigation
15 measures proposed, and with what appears to be very little scrutiny. There is only eight short paragraphs of supposed assessment of this critical issue.

Was a traffic expert engage to interrogate reports. It is the role of the assessment body, not the council when traffic use – or Traffic New South Wales do so – Transport for New South Wales to do so. I add that I say this not from my own
20 observations as a resident of the mayhem, including unsafe driver behaviour, and I've sent Bradley a video this morning taken by another resident about what happens, but as a town planner with 39 years experience, who has been involved with over 500 appeals in the Land and Environment Court, and I can tell you there's simply not
25 enough analysis done either by the applicant or in the assessment.

This goes to the heart of the consideration under section 4.15 of the EPA Act by the commission in regard to the suitability of the site. The traffic impacts on local residents will not be alleviated in any way by the somewhat afterthought proposal mentioned in the traffic impact assessment that there will be a Green Travel Plan. It
30 is highly unlikely that parent behaviour will change, in fact, it probably will get worse post-COVID. A large number of boys will be driven to school, and in later years they'll drive themselves, because that's what happens now.

This is likely to be, as I said, more so post-COVID. In any case, the submitted plan for management, which contains only a description of the development and no actual traffic and parking management measures makes no mention at all of the proposed
35 Green Travel Plan. This is simply inadequate information provided to understand the impact of the development, but based on the more detailed analysis undertaken by the court, which can only have got worse with background traffic growth, it's
40 unbelievable that any increase in traffic numbers beyond the last increase up to 1500 students granted by the court could ever be justified.

I urge the panel to refuse the development, but if you're not prepared to do that, then defer the application for an independent review of the traffic report by an external
45 expert and take the opportunity to revisit some of the basic design issues, such as the maintenance building in Seaview Street. I thank you for your time.

MR PILTON: Thanks, Paul.

MR GRECH: I'm happy to answer any questions if you have them.

5 MR PILTON: I don't have any questions. Wendy? Sheri?

MS W. LEWIN: No, Paul, that was comprehensive. Thank you very much.

10 DR COAKES: No, thanks, Paul. Appreciate you attending today.

MR GRECH: Okay. Thank you.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

15 MR GRECH: Bye.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[11.09 am]