



**VIQ SOLUTIONS AUSTRALIA PTY LTD**

ACN 008 711 877

**T:** 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

**E:** [clientservices@auscript.com.au](mailto:clientservices@auscript.com.au)

**W:** [www.auscript.com.au](http://www.auscript.com.au)

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

---

O/N H-1628684

**INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT**

**RE: WESTMEAD CATHOLIC COMMUNITY EDUCATION CAMPUS PROJECT**

**PANEL:** PETER DUNCAN AM  
JULIET GRANT

**ASSISTING PANEL:** JANE ANDERSON  
STEPHEN BARRY  
CASEY JOSHUA

**DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT:** ADITI COOMAR  
KAREN HARRAGON

**LOCATION:** VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE

**DATE:** 12.31 PM, WEDNESDAY, 15 DECEMBER 2021

MR P. DUNCAN: Good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin, I'd 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. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Westmead Catholic Community Education Campus  
5 Project currently before the commission for determination. The Catholic Education Diocese of Parramatta, the applicant, is seeking approval for the redevelopment of the Westmead Catholic Community Education Campus at Westmead, including alterations and additions to existing buildings.

10 My name is Peter Duncan. I am the chair of this panel and I'm joined by Commissioner Juliet Grant. We are also joined by Jane Anderson, Casey Joshua and Stephen Barry from the office of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interest of openness and transparency, and to ensure the full capture of information,  
15 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 in this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the commission will base its determination. It is important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees  
20 and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you're asked a question and not in a position to answer the question, please feel free to take it on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we'll then also put on the website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure they do not speak over the  
25 top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin. Over to you, Karen.

MS K. HARRAGON: Good afternoon – good afternoon commissioners and Planning Secretariat. I am Karen Harragon, director Social and Infrastructure  
30 Assessments at the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment, and I'm here with my colleague Aditi Coomar from the School Infrastructure Assessments Team. Our presentation today will outline the department's approach to the assessment of the SSD application for Westmead Catholic Community Campus redevelopment. The application is SSD, as it is development for the purpose of alterations and  
35 additions to an existing school campus and associated developments with a capital investment value of more than 20 million. The proposal was referred to the commission as City of Parramatta Council objected to the proposal during the EIS exhibition.

40 Our presentation today will include a brief overview of the proposal, the key issues of concern in the department's assessment of the application, and include matters noted in the commission's agendas – agenda for today's briefing. I'm now going to ask Aditi to provide a brief overview of the site and the proposal. We'll move to full  
45 screen for e-presentation.

MS A. COOMAR: Thank you, Karen, and good afternoon commissioners and members of the IPC Secretariat. I'm Aditi Coomar. Team leader of the School Infrastructure Assessments Team. I hope you can all view my screen properly now.

5 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS COOMAR: Thank you. As detailed in the department's assessment report, the SSD application relates to the Westmead Catholic Community College Campus. The site is located within the existing school campus at 2 Darcy Road, Westmead within the City of Parramatta local government area. The existing campus has an area of approximately 12 hectares and currently accommodates three schools, including Catherine McAuley Westmead, secondary girls' school, Parramatta Marist High School, secondary boys' school, and Mother Teresa Primary School, co-educational primary school, along with associated driveways, car parking areas, landscaped areas and ovals.

The existing school campus is outlined in red in the aerial view in slide 2. The two high schools within the site currently accommodate a combined population of 2186 students and 166 full-time staff, and the primary school currently accommodates 420 students with 24 staff. Collectively there are 2606 students enrolled at the three existing schools with 190 staff. The site is located within a wider precinct known as the Westmead Health and Education Precinct, outlined in the Central City District Plan 2018. It's characterised by a mix of uses and buildings – building forms, including health and education services, commercial, industrial and residential; Westmead Hospital being located on the opposite side of Darcy Road. Recently a multi-storey car park with 260 car spaces has been approved by the planning panel on the eastern corner of the campus, mainly to cater for the high school staff and students. It also includes a drop-off/pick-up area.

This slide shows the location of the project site in the context of the campus. It's outlined in blue. The project site is located at the north-west corner of the entire campus, bound by the – Darcy Road to the north, a creek to the west, Parramatta Marist School to its east and Catherine – Catherine McAuley to the east, and the ovals to the south. The project site includes the existing Mother Teresa Primary School, a hockey field, three basketball/tennis courts and minor supporting structures, as well as vegetation, the north-western access driveway, car park and drop-off/pick-up areas. The pedestrian and vehicular access to the site are provided from Darcy Road.

The proposal comprises redevelopment of the primary school, including alterations and repurposing of an existing school building and construction of two new buildings. One of the objectives of the proposal is to relocate the Sacred Heart Primary School on this site from the Ralph Street, Westmead site. One of the new buildings would be the new six-storey primary school building catering for 1260 additional students, in addition to the existing 420 within the campus, plus 76 additional staff. The other new building would be a Parish Church fronting Darcy Road with a capacity of 400 seats at the location of the hockey field. The existing

Mother Teresa building would be repurposed to accommodate an early learning centre with 200 places and 25 staff, and also the administrative centre for the entire development. Associated works would include tree removal, access and landscaping, and staged increase in student numbers between 2023 and 2033. The proposed site layout is identified in slide 4.

The six-storey new building includes – which is the primary school building, includes classrooms for the various years from kindergarten to year 6, integrated with open space. It also includes a rooftop open space with a running track. The applicant has advised that the building has been designed to reduce vertical circulation, except for when accessing the larger open spaces on the upper floors. One of the typical floor plans and the integrated undercover open space is shown on slide – slide 5. The church, while being single storey, would present itself as a dominant element on the Darcy Road frontage, as identified on the bottom left-hand corner of this slide.

Our presentation today will focus on the key issues, as itemised in the commission’s meeting agenda. We will start with site suitability. As discussed in the department’s assessment report, we note that the redevelopment of the school would have benefits, including the provision of enhanced teaching and learning environments, and the delivery of increased student capacity to help meet growing demand within the LGA, aligning with the strategic plans that apply to the site. However, the department has two main concerns regarding the suitability of the site for the scale of the development that has been proposed. These are open space provisions for the school and the traffic impacts, including the pedestrian connectivity.

The applicant proposes a vertical school, with majority of the recreational space being undercover integrated within the school building. Post-development the building would largely be surrounded by landscaping with minimal outdoor open recreation space. All these landscaped areas have been identified on this slide. The department notes that ground floor space would be used primarily by students from kindergarten to year 2. There would be no dedicated area of at-grade open space for any other year groups, which would only have access to above ground play areas. While the applicant suggests that on average 8.2 square metres open space per child has been provided, the department considers that this would be – this would not be equitably distributed among all year groups and some would have available open space at the rate of 7.4 square metres per child.

Although the applicant acknowledged that there is available space within the site in the form of ovals to the south, the applicant’s RTS has indicated that the design of the proposed landscaping and open space represents the best educational outcome for the school. At one stage of assessment the applicant advised that the primary school students would have access to the ovals, but later reconfirmed that this was not the case and that the proposal wholly relies on the open space within and around the school building. The department considers that a bare minimum 10 square metre open space per child should be provided on a school site, in accordance with the

Department of Education guidelines, in the absence of which off-site access arrangements to open spaces should be provided.

5 The other important aspect of open space is daylight. With regard to the daylight access, the State Design Review Panel requested that appropriate levels of daylight be provided to the outdoor play areas, particularly given the deep floor plates. However, the applicant has not demonstrated that suitable daylight access is available for the open spaces within the school, as is evident on this slide, mainly during the winter solstice time. The shaded areas on level 4 typically have been  
10 showed – shown in blue. The department has assessed the daylight access study conducted by the applicant, and concludes that outdoor play spaces would receive reasonable amounts of daylight throughout the school hours, but only when an average for the entire year is accounted for, not during the winter solstice period.

15 Throughout their assessment council and department have raised significant concerns regarding the lack of – provision of at-grade undercover open to air open spaces access to primary school children and the resultant amenity issues. However, the applicant has not changed its position in relation to the provision of open space .....  
20 the applicant has – the department has recommended that the school must provide access to the ovals for the primary school students. If suitable access cannot be provided within the site, then off-site arrangements with council or other organisations should be undertaken.

25 Additionally, an open space user schedule for the school building should be provided to ensure that all year groups can access the open spaces without impacting on the curriculum of the other year groups. The department has implemented this consistent approach for other vertical schools where evidence for at-grade open spaces for school students has been requested. Subject to the implementation of the  
30 recommended conditions, the department considers that the site can be suitably utilised by the proposed scale of development. The applicant has not agreed to provide access to the existing ovals until now, as it would require consent from all other owners of the site. However, the department considers that in order to facilitate the development on this site, condition of consent is required to be complied with. The proposal in its entirety relies on various aspects of the campus as a whole, and  
35 this should also be included.

40 We will now discuss the traffic impacts of the development. The site is located within the Central City District and within Greater Parramatta and the Westmead Precinct. The draft Westmead 2036 Place Strategy also applies to the site and recognises the precinct as being strategically aligned to become a world class innovation, education and health precinct. The department notes that these strategic documents do not set objects for or outline the scale of development that should occur in specific areas, such as the site.

45 The draft Westmead Place Strategy establishes a planning framework which emphasises connectivity, productivity, liveability and sustainability. The applicant has proposed pedestrian connectivity through the site and has committed to

implement a Green Travel Plan to ensure it aligns with the overall objective of the strategy. As such, the department has worked closely with Transport for New South Wales throughout the process to ensure that the proposal addresses the future strategic transport management plans within the precinct. This includes

5 consideration of ..... as well as pedestrian connections through the site, which was also requested by council. The additional requirements for traffic assessment and audits would continue to ensure an ongoing monitoring of the impact of the proposal on the future transport scenario in the precinct.

10 The development would be serviced by the existing car park with 212 spaces, which is shaded in red and blue on the slide, in addition to an approved future multi-storey car park, which is here shown in blue, and 12 new car spaces for the church, shown in red. The site layout retains the existing vehicle access from Darcy Road, circled in blue, opposite Westmead Hospital, and provides two new pedestrian access points  
15 from Darcy Road. A loop road with a new at-grade car park is proposed on eastern side of the driveway, which is this. The applicant has proposed onsite drop-off/pick-up arrangements within the existing car park at the rear of the building, shown here.

Per the applicant's assessment, the proposed 19 bays together could accommodate a  
20 turnover of about 285 cars in 15 minutes. A bus zone is also proposed within the site very close to this drop-off/pick-up area. Council, department's independent traffic consultant and Transport for New South Wales have reviewed the drop-off/pick-up arrangements and have raised no concern with regard to the operation of the drop-off zone, subject to recommended conditions regarding an operational transport  
25 management plan and coach and bus parking management plan. The department has accepted this arrangement based on their assessment and recommended suitable conditions.

The applicant proposes – as stated earlier, the applicant proposes to accommodate an  
30 additional 1260 students on the site, plus 200 ELC students. In responding to department's and other public authority concerns regarding the impact of traffic generated by the development, the applicant amended the proposal in September 2021 and included some additional upgrades to the existing driveways that provides access to the site. These upgrades were proposed to the Darcy Road site access,  
35 which is marked as number 9 on this slide, and the access to the multi-storey car park, which is marked as number 6.

Additionally, the applicant's traffic modelling also assumes that about 30 per cent of  
40 the students would be accommodated within the after school hours, a Green Travel Plan would be implemented to reduce the car dependency by 10 per cent, and the high school traffic would be directed to the multi-storey car park once it's built. With all these assumptions and additional upgrade works, the applicant's assessment concludes that the proposed development would not have an unreasonable impact on the surrounding road networks, specifically the surrounding intersections.

45 The department's assessment of the traffic impacts is based on the independent traffic review, council's and Transport for New South Wales' advice on the proposal.

The independent assessment as well as Transport for New South Wales' assessment have identified data gaps in the traffic assessment and discrepancies in the amended traffic assessment, in terms of delays at the intersections. Due to these, the department considers that the modelling results cannot be fully relied upon to be  
5 satisfied that there will be no unacceptable impacts resulting from the development by 2033.

The department has remaining concerns regarding the impacts of the development on the Darcy Road, Coles and Bridge Road intersection, which is identified as number  
10 10, located to the west of the site, and the department considers that there would be delays at this intersection caused by the development during the AM peak time in 2033. However, the department also acknowledges that the precinct, in itself, will change in the future rapidly, in terms of its traffic impacts and the traffic generation. Therefore, the timing, between 2023 and 2033, around which the development traffic  
15 would start contributing to the deterioration of the intersection operation is not clear as the student increase is proposed to be staged with no details of the staged increase being provided.

Noting the above and in consulting with Transport for New South Wales, the  
20 department considers that intermittent traffic modelling and monitoring would be needed in the future to ensure that the impacts of the development traffic on the road network can be compared each time. This would also ensure that any adverse impacts on the intersection – identified intersection due to the development can be identified and the applicant be required to provide appropriate mitigation measures at  
25 that time, without hindering the overall operation of the school.

The applicant has recently offered to pay a monetary contribution to the relevant roads' authority towards the improvement of this intersection in the future, in lieu of undertaking the mitigation and management measures that have been recommended.  
30 The department considers, however, that this is outside the scope of this application due to lack of voluntary planning agreements or any discussions that have been commenced. The determination of the application does not preclude these discussions occurring between the applicant and the relevant roads' authority.

35 The applicant will have the opportunity to consult with council, the department and Transport for New South Wales in the future and propose alternative methods, such as payment of monetary contributions, to deliver the intersection improvements if identified via the abovementioned traffic assessments. This opportunity for evidence-based modelling verification is considered a preferable approach as  
40 compared to the department and Transport for New South Wales recommending that the future mitigation requirements be imposed now.

We will now move on to the discussions regarding pedestrian connectivity. Sorry. Sorry about this. Just give me a moment. Bit of a problem with the sharing.  
45

MS HARRAGON: I can take over from you if you'd like, Aditi.

MS COOMAR: Can you all see, Karen?

MS HARRAGON: Yes. We can see the slides.

5 MS COOMAR: ..... right side – right slide now. Okay. Sorry about that. So  
pedestrian connectivity: since the lodgement of the EIS, council have requested that  
the applicant provides pedestrian links with the site and connects the site to Bridge  
Road to allow for broader connectivity within the precinct and also aligning with the  
10 applicant’s own master plan for the site, which was provided to the department as  
part of the EIS. The pedestrian and/or vehicular linkages within the site would  
ensure that the pedestrian traffic is redirected, to some extent, and the walking  
distance for the children is reduced. This to the department has a clear nexus with  
the implementation of the Green Travel Plan, which the applicant relies on heavily to  
reduce the traffic generation due to the development.

15 As a result of prolonged consultation, the applicant has agreed to provide a  
pedestrian link within the site. However, the department considers that the link  
identified by the applicant within the site may not be suitable due to its convoluted  
nature. This is shown over here on the slide on the right-hand side. Consequently,  
20 the department has recommended that a more linear configuration of the path be  
explored and details be provided prior to the issue of the construction certificate,  
which is shown over here on the left-hand side of the slide, and this was proposed by  
the applicant as part of their amended proposal before the supplementary response  
was provided.

25 However, the department notes that the applicant – the department has recommended  
a more linear configuration. Now, the linear path within the site connecting Farm  
House Road to the western boundary may require consent from other owners of the  
site, which is unclear at this point. However, the department notes that the applicant  
30 relies on various aspects of the campus, such as the multi-storey car park, park bays,  
etcetera, to achieve a desirable outcome holistically for the site. This also forms part  
of their future master plan ..... should be undertaken to ensure that a suitable paved  
pedestrian pathway is provided within the site as required by the department.

35 With regard to the extended connection to Bridge Road, the department understands  
that this would require easement arrangements with the adjoining owners to the west  
of the site, however, details of such easements have not been provided by the  
applicant. The department considers the details of this easement can be negotiated  
and explored concurrently with the construction of the school. This approach would  
40 be similar to various other SSD applications approved by the department in recent  
times. I will now hand over to Karen to talk about department’s position on the  
conditions and conclude our presentation. I will also now stop sharing my screen.

45 MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MS HARRAGON: Thank you, Aditi. Okay. I – I’m now going to move to –  
towards summing up and making any – us available for questions. In relation to our

position on conditions, the department recognises and raises no concerns regarding the – the principle of continued educational use at the site and supports the applicant’s approach to upgrade the two site access intersections, providing a pedestrian connection within the site, and internal drop-off and pick-up zones to  
5 accommodate the development traffic in the future without hindering the traffic flows on Darcy Road, subject to our recommended condition.

The department acknowledges that additional infrastructure is required to support the predicted growth of the Central City District by 2036, including the Westmead  
10 Precinct. The proposal presents some benefits, including the provision of modern learning facilities and the delivery of increased student capacity to help meet the objectives of the Central City District 2036. In this regard, the proposal would partly contribute to the health, trading and innovation priorities of the Westmead Precinct. However, despite commitments from the applicant, the department has some  
15 concerns continuing regarding the ability of the site to accommodate the intensification of uses proposed in relation to traffic impacts and open space provisions. The department has recommended conditions to mitigate the impacts of the development in relation to those matters.

20 As discussed in this presentation, the majority of the conditions relate to traffic matters and open space. Apart from that, the department does not consider that the remaining conditions are excessive, given that the project relates to three very independent uses occurring on the site, which include the early childhood centre, the church and the vertical school. On balance, the department concludes in its report  
25 that the impacts of the development can be mitigated through the recommended conditions of consent, and that the development would be acceptable. I’ll now hand back to the panel for any questions.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Karen. Thanks, Aditi. You’ve covered a lot of the  
30 things that we asked about in the agenda. Two areas that I was interested in, if I could start – if that’s okay with you, Juliet – the – the 8.2 square metres per child for open space, that 8.2 metres, does that cover both the rooftop and the outdoor open space or is it just the outdoor open – the on-grade open space?

35 MS COOMAR: So what the applicant has confirmed to us is a total of 13,828 square metres of open space would be provided as part of the new development, which equates to 8.2 square metres per student. It comprises 7124 square metres of above ground play area across levels 1 to 5 and 6704 square metres within the ground level undercroft and adjacent outdoor area. This is from the applicant’s  
40 information.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. So it is the combination of the rooftop and the at-grade. So  
45 the – the Department of Education, are they guidelines, policies or what are they? Are they – they say 10 square metres. What’s – what’s the status of that?

MS HARRAGON: The – the guidelines prepared by the Department of Education are the Department of Education’s guidelines and there’s no reference to those being a requirement imposed on other parties who deliver education.

5 MR DUNCAN: Okay. So - - -

MS HARRAGON: But certainly, for consistency, the department has used that as an appropriate source for continuity across the – the standard of education in the state.

10

MR DUNCAN: Okay. So it’s almost a benchmark, isn’t it, from - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yes. That – that’s probably an appropriate way of referencing it. Thank you.

15

MR DUNCAN: - - - a public sector point of view? So if they were able to get – when I say “they”, I mean the applicant. If the applicant were able to use the playing fields, that would extend that number to – to about 10 as well, wouldn’t it? They – you’d - - -

20

MS COOMAR: This is what we understand.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. You’d include that – that so, therefore, they do have potential to meet that in totality if – if they can get access to those fields.

25

MS COOMAR: ..... if access to those fields are provided.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

30 MS HARRAGON: Yes. And probably it’s worth raising that – I guess it’s horses for courses. We think a lot of that open space that’s been provided – the recreational space on the vertical floors, probably does have a very healthy contribution to the recreational outcome of the students, particularly during parts of the year where it does have solar access. However, we believe it’s appropriate that a more holistic  
35 approach to providing a range of activities for children, including being able to allow children to have exposure to at-grade activities, such as being able to run as fast as you can and kick a ball as fast as you can and throw a – and throw a ball as fast as you can.

40 We do not have evidence to understand that they – they would ever be able to occur within those vertical elements of the school and I guess our concerns have regard to health considerations, and the surveys that are undertaken by the health department every year would suggest that the children from this particular part of Sydney and this particular part of the state are probably the most – quite vulnerable to health  
45 related matters associated with lack of recreational access.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. All right. The other – the other question I had was around the pedestrian connections. So from Farm House Road to Bridge Road is the connection that, I believe, council were keen to see in place; is that right?

5 MS COOMAR: That's correct.

MR DUNCAN: It wasn't – it wasn't at that stage a complete road. It was a – a pedestrian connection; is that right?

10 MS COOMAR: So from Bridge Road to Farm House Road, did you say?

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

15 MS COOMAR: Yes. So what council has requested, and has been requested throughout, is a vehicular connection is the most preferred connection. However, in lieu of a vehicular connection, even if a pedestrian connection is provided, that would also provide lots of benefits for the community and the precinct as a whole.

20 MR DUNCAN: Okay. So we – we had a walk through the site yesterday. So we were able to have a good look at the site so we're - - -

MS COOMAR: Yes.

25 MR DUNCAN: - - - familiar with that. And the land to the west, I had a feeling that that was Healthland. Is it Healthland or it's – it's for future development, so there is potential for that bit beyond their – their sort of drop-off area to be delivered by another party in the future?

30 MS HARRAGON: The department understands that there are future expectations for the use of that land, but it's not public facing.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Okay. Thank you. All right. That's all I have at this stage. Juliet, do you have any questions?

35 MS J. GRANT: One, I guess, related to the integration of the uses of the site, in terms of if – if there is an expectation of sharing the open space, but also the car parking, what is the department's understanding of the status of – of how the site is actually owned or – or utilised? Because it would seem that it would need some form of a plan of management that would have a – an integrated use, you know, so  
40 that you're coordinating events, you're coordinating parking allocation, coordinating allocation of those open spaces. Has there been any information provided from – from the applicant about that?

45 MS HARRAGON: There's been a number of discussions with the applicant regarding the status in the tenure of those lands and the relationship between all the parties. So all of the lands are part of the Diocese of Parramatta, however, they're actually held by different parts of the diocese. So each of the schools – the – the fee

simple land is actually against different ownerships. So there certainly was a commitment that there was no issues regarding the movement of children through those areas and the use of car parking. You know, certainly if – if the – the IPC felt that it was necessary, we could certainly assist with recommending additional  
5 conditions regarding restrictions as to easement put on to the site or for 88B Instruments to be provided.

So – so part of the integration also is backed up by surveys that were done – so you need to recognise that there's a current primary school operating there, so there has  
10 actually been opportunities for the applicant to undertake surveys that identify that in a lot of instances there were journeys to work where there were children from a number of the schools occurring in one vehicle. So it's never going to be achievable for children to not be coming with their siblings and we actually think what the proposal does is to bring a significant improvement to what was being delivered by  
15 the – the previous council's approval. The council's quite supportive of the improvements that we've been able to deliver through this that actually put an extra layer of road efficiency – driveway efficiency on top of their consent. And certainly we've now embedded further into this instrument the functioning of those pedestrian pathways between each of those car parks to each of the schools as well.

20 MS COOMAR: And we have already included one condition regarding the open space management plan, which sort of tries to – endeavours to integrate the open space usage and it would require some sort of common ownership agreements, I guess, between all the three owners – four owners within the site. However, no  
25 additional conditions regarding event coordination has been recommended as yet.

MS HARRAGON: It may be also helpful to add to that, in addition to the three schools, the Early Childhood Learning Centre of 200 children is a very large facility. Again, the likelihood is that there could be the occasion where a parent is bringing  
30 the child to that facility and will have in their car a child who's attending either the primary school or one of the high schools. And the – there's kiss and drop provided specifically for the early childhood centre where you would – you would expect for the car to be placed in that parking, and the child attending the high school to make their way across the pedestrian pathways to one of the high school sites.

35 MS GRANT: So has there been any discussion about whether or not then the site tenure should be consolidated so that it was one single site?

40 MS HARRAGON: No - - -

MS COOMAR: It – in terms of land, it is though ..... two lots.

MS GRANT: Oh, okay. Okay.

45 MS COOMAR: Sorry, Karen. I was just – yes. So there are only two allotments, otherwise this – it is consolidated.

MS GRANT: And the subject EA covers both those lots? So some of the documents show, you know, the – an outline of the campus versus an outline of the actual project site.

5 MS COOMAR: Yes. So in the consent it covers both allotments.

MS GRANT: Okay. Which is the entire campus; is that correct?

MS COOMAR: Yes.

10

MS GRANT: Yes. I think that's the main queries that I had, Peter.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. I – I don't have any further questions. Jane, have you got anything that - - -

15

MS J. ANDERSON: Yes, Peter. I just had a question if the department could just comment on staging of the application. During the site walk through yesterday the panel saw the various areas, especially the car parking areas, that were required to be delivered through – through – prior to this SSD, and I just wondered if the department could comment on the staging and whether – you know, obviously your comfort on that.

20

MR DUNCAN: That – that's a good question, Jane, and that's – I assume that's the 200 space car park that Aditi talked about that was approved by the planning panel; is that right?

25

MS COOMAR: Yes. Yes. So – so with comment to the staging, the applicant has not specified any staging of the development. There has not been any details of how the student numbers would also be staged or how the constructions would be staged. Therefore, what we have done is, like every other project, we have included a condition which requires the applicant to provide a staging report to our post-approval team.

30

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

35

MS COOMAR: And provide details of staging as to how they're going to construct the – construct the buildings. And then we've also requested that the upgrades, the traffic mitigation measures, etcetera, all be then integrated with that staging report.

40

MR DUNCAN: That's right. And it was that project that talked about – I don't recall the gate number, whether it's gate 1 or 2, but the improvement to those entrances as well. So that's part of that project. I think we – you mentioned the intersection upgrades. There were some improvements to those entrances, I think.

45

MS COOMAR: Yes. So we have requested that – this is condition A18 and A19 of the consent. We have requested that the intersections be upgraded prior to the school

opening year in 2023. This is the site access and the access to the multi-storey car park. The – yes. Sorry, Karen.

5 MS HARRAGON: And I was just going to say, we want to stress though that the applicant actually put forward those recommendations in order to mitigate some negative impacts that were shown in the traffic impact assessment. So the requirement that the department's imposed is the timing one.

10 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS HARRAGON: So they – they were detailed plans that had been provided by the applicant, in respect of both of those two driveways.

15 MS COOMAR: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

20 MS COOMAR: As – as far as what we understand, they intend to construct all the buildings together unless they want to stage the construction later, which we can – which can be facilitated through that staging report condition.

25 MR DUNCAN: Okay. So this – this other project is, however, beneficial to the overall outcome for the precinct, isn't it, by separating – even though it's a separate approval, it – it does go to the – the overall precinct outcome, doesn't it?

MS COOMAR: Oh, yes. Of course.

MR DUNCAN: It's important. Okay. Jane, does that cover – cover your question?

30 MS ANDERSON: ..... Peter.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

35 MS HARRAGON: So maybe we might just – just to close out so that there's clarity, the – the department has obviously recommended these – that further condition, which is the potential for degradation of that – the additional intersection at a particular point in time, where we've actually imposed a hold on student numbers until that matter is resolved, and that's the one that the applicant now wishes to resolve through – through a payment, but we have a number of conditions  
40 that require that the – the verification of the impacts – and I'll get Aditi to reference the three particular roads that are relevant to that one – so that there's an actual hold in any uplift from students beyond that point that our traffic assessment suggests that there will be no – no degradation beyond a particular student number.

45 MR DUNCAN: Oh, I see what you're saying, Karen. So this was where the concept of – of making a payment now to upgrade the - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yes. So they're – yes. So they're short-term mitigations, and they are the detailed plans that the applicant has provided and they are conditioned to be provided before the school opens at all. And then there's the – the further one that – I think is it 2030, Aditi, where - - -

5

MS COOMAR: 2033. Yes - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yes. Whether it's that year or whether it's a student number that we've identified through working with our own independent consultant on where we believe that the point of student movements would be starting to compromise that particular intersection, and we've actually placed a hold on that so that that matter is adequately resolved before there's further uplift from that student number onwards.

10

MR DUNCAN: So - - -

15

MS COOMAR: And – yes.

MR DUNCAN: Was – was it Transport's view that they – they didn't wish to take a payment at this stage, they wanted to study it further before they decided what upgrades may be required?

20

MS HARRAGON: The - - -

MS COOMAR: We have - - -

25

MS HARRAGON: The offer of money came at condition discussion.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS HARRAGON: It's not one that we think the department's in an appropriate position to have raised. We think – we think it would actually form one which would need to have a voluntary planning agreement entered into with – with appropriate parties, and it really wasn't appropriate for us to start that at this stage of the assessment of the project.

30

MS COOMAR: We have discussed with Transport regarding the applicant's offer and the last supplementary RTS that was provided to us. Transport have advised that because, Bridge Road/Darcy Road, that intersection is managed by council, it would really be up to council to go forward and accept any monetary contributions. They did not have any issues in principle of the applicant providing a monetary contribution, but they said that it was – it was not up to Transport to make that decision, given Bridge Road is council owned.

35

MR DUNCAN: Okay. And, Aditi, has – sorry – council had any comment about the potential for an upfront payment?

40

MS COOMAR: No. That – because it was done at the last minute - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS COOMAR: We did just provide the information to council, however, I have not received any comments back from council on that.

5

MR DUNCAN: Okay. All right.

MS GRANT: And – sorry, Peter. Just in – in terms of that, then, the – the way that you’ve proposed to structure the conditions with the requirement for the regular spacing of the Transport traffic modelling, is that to underpin – rather than have one threshold where you identify a date or a student number, you’re proposing more of a sequenced approach. How – how does that - - -

10

MS HARRAGON: It – yes. So – so that condition set was prepared with significant consultation with Transport, and very much were workshopped with Transport. So the – the sequencing of those – I think it’s a two-year verification modelling activity – allows there to be verification by that first one as to consistency with the modelling activity that has occurred now, and validation as to the – the emergence of the – I guess, the problem about to occur. The problem that we face is that this is going to be a – potentially a very changed road network as a result of the light rail operating, potentially as a result of the Place Strategy work that may or may not occur, which is unknown to us at the moment.

15

20

We didn’t think it was appropriate for there to be imposed at this stage an onus on the applicant to upgrade that intersection, although our evidence that we hold at the moment suggests it is going to have an – a negative impact, but we want to do the right thing by this applicant and allow there to be verification of what might occur over the next 10 years or so.

25

MS GRANT: Right. So rather than just saying that it – that it is required, this gives them actually some flexibility?

30

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MS COOMAR: That’s correct. We workshopped this with council as well. Although council have raised - - -

35

MS GRANT: Yes.

MS COOMAR: - - - some concerns regarding the modelling as to how we can differentiate between the background traffic and the development traffic in the future, in principle they were quite supportive of this approach. And – and it was because of the lack of staging, of lack of us understanding exactly where the student numbers are increasing.

40  
45

MR DUNCAN: And, Karen, Aditi, that – I guess that was the nature of my question. The difficulty with so many things changing in the precinct to be able to assess the outcome, you know, in - - -

5 MS HARRAGON: Yes. It's very much a – a precinct – and this is the edge of the place making activity. It's a precinct influx and what – we've got two obligations we consider as a recommending authority to ensure that there's not a significant safety or efficiency impact on the regional road system, in particular on the delivery of the light rail, because the original modelling that we did have in front of us before some  
10 of these additional right and left-hand turn bays showed that there was going to have a significant detrimental impact on the functioning of the light rail.

So for that – we've got a number of hats that we sort of feel that we're wearing here. We want to make sure that we're appropriately providing a nexus to obligations that  
15 we're placing on the applicant, but we're also having to represent the interests of both the local and the road – local and regional road authorities in ensuring that – any significant degradation, that the nexus is appropriately sitting with the right party when it does occur.

20 MR DUNCAN: All right.

MS HARRAGON: You know, I would – I would say, we do believe there is some value in an agreement being negotiated with the council for a monetary payment, and we understand the motive behind – we believe why the applicant thinks that it's  
25 probably a preferable thing, because the timing for that if – otherwise, you know, we're talking many, many years down the track and I think for certainty – I think the applicant would be better placed and the council better placed to having some certainty if they were able to achieve that, but I think, for the same reasons we've just outlined, the challenges of having certainty for traffic modelling – I think  
30 determining what that monetary value is will probably be an equal – equal challenge to – to council and the applicant as well.

MS COOMAR: And – and the applicant has suggested that it be capped at 800,000, which is sort of considering eight per cent of the traffic volume through that  
35 intersection. However, there's not been sufficient evidence being provided at the moment to decide on that amount.

MS HARRAGON: To even know how the upgrade would occur and what the costs of that would – that would be a part of the – a normal negotiation to actually have  
40 undertaken that work to a standard agreed by all parties before negotiations commence.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

45 MS GRANT: And is there any way of tying that in with the – the broader ..... that's been done for the precinct, or is what you're saying, that's still a little bit too unknown and uncertain to put it in that framework?

MS HARRAGON: Yes. So I guess what we were doing is working with two authorities that we believe have a fairly influential role in the place making discussions and workshops that are occurring, which is Transport, who have the significant lead in that future transport work, and obviously council, who have a role.  
5 So we think both of those are better placed in their role in facilitating the outcomes for the strategy to see fit where – where solutions .....

MS COOMAR: And I have today forwarded an email to Jane which she will definitely pass on to all of you, where we have basically got some information from  
10 the strategic team within the department providing some status of where that strategy is and what their views on that is.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thank you. I think – another question similar to the one that I asked on open space: Karen, is it possible to – to get a link or a copy of the  
15 Department of Education’s guidelines on the 10 square metres?

MS HARRAGON: Yes. We can provide that.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Thank you. All right. Any further questions, Juliet?  
20

MS GRANT: No. I don’t think so. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Karen and Aditi, that’s a good presentation and very thorough. Thank you very much.  
25

MS COOMAR: Thank you very much. Thank you commissioners. Thank you, Jane - - -

MS HARRAGON: Thank you. And – and this is probably our last presentation to  
30 the commission and the secretariat this year, so merry Christmas.

MS GRANT: Merry Christmas to you too.

MR DUNCAN: .....  
35

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: .....

MR DUNCAN: Best wishes for a happy and – happy and healthy 2022.

40 MS COOMAR: Yes. Same wishes for you. Thank you very much.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. All the best. Bye-bye.

45 **RECORDING CONCLUDED** **[1.17 pm]**