



VIQ SOLUTIONS AUSTRALIA PTY LTD

ACN 008 711 877

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1628687

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH APPLICANT

RE: WESTMEAD CATHOLIC COMMUNITY EDUCATION CAMPUS PROJECT

PANEL: **PETER DUNCAN AM
JULIET GRANT**

ASSISTING PANEL: **JANE ANDERSON
CASEY JOSHUA**

APPLICANT: **SARAH ALDER
JESSICA DUCE
CHARLES GLANVILLE
KEN HOLLYOAK
ROB LOUGHMAN
RY STEPHEN
KATE TUDEHOPE**

LOCATION: **VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE**

DATE: **4.02 PM, THURSDAY, 16 DECEMBER 2021**

MR P. DUNCAN AM: 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 the Elders past, present and emerging.

5 Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Westmead Catholic Community
Education Campus 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. My name is
10 Peter Duncan, I am the Chair of this Commission panel, and I am joined by
Commissioner Juliet Grant. We're also joined by Jane Anderson and Casey Joshua
from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interests of
openness and transparency, and to ensure the full capture of information, today's
meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made
15 available on the Commission's website.

This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will
form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its
determination. It is important for Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and
20 to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. However, if you are asked a
question and you are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question
on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put
on our 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 the accuracy of the transcript. We'll now begin. Sarah,
over to you. We have a – an agenda that sent out which I notice you've largely cover
– you're covering in your presentation. But if you wish to proceed with that and then
we can ask some questions at the end.

30 MS S. ALDER: Great. Thank you. Thank you, Peter, and thanks for that. I think
we're going to bring the slides back up now, but whilst we're doing that, I'll formally
introduce myself. My name is Sarah Alder. I'm the director of Capital Resourcing
at Catholic Education Diocese of Parramatta, and I oversee infrastructure and finance
for the organisation, and I'm going to be taking you through the presentation today
35 alongside my colleague, Kate. So, if we can just go to the next slide which does
have the agenda set out there. As you can see, we've endeavoured to respond to the
key issues, give some overview – some contextual overview for today, and also
respond to some of those issues that were raised on site when we did the walk –
when we did the site inspection earlier in the week.

40 So, if we can just move now please to the next slide, to project overview. If I could
just start by saying CEDP is really committed to providing quality faith-based
learning, educational outcomes for all of our students across the whole of Western
Sydney, and in particular, in Westmead we have strong interest here to continue to
45 do that. At the moment we have a presence of four schools in the area, three of
which are lucky enough to be on the same site, but we do have one, Sacred Heart

Primary School, currently at Ralph Street, that's not part and parcel of this Catholic Community Educational Campus at the moment, And so, we really want to co-locate Sacred Heart to be alongside those other three schools, the Mother Teresa Primary School, and then the Marist Boys School and Catherine McAuley, the girls high school.

In doing so, we want to deliver a new church as part of those campus facilities. We want to deliver new and expanded before and after school care with the Kelkan OSCH facilities so that we can really broadly support members of the community who choose – who choose to educate their children with us. And of course, associated carparking, landscaping and site access of grades are required for us to be able to this. We'll just move to the next slide, please.

So, project need and vision. We have an absolute imperative at the moment to relocate Sacred Heart Primary School. We need to secure play space. Currently, we do not own the land upon which the children play, and – and, you know, we need to have a surety over that space in the future. It's currently on a month to month lease and as you can imagine, that's just simply not acceptable to us as an educational provided that we don't know, you know, the future of that land. In addition, we want to play our part in responding to the ongoing, existing and future enrolment demands for education in this area and we know – we know that we're expecting almost 5000 more homes and up to around 29,000 new jobs to be provided in this area by 2036 and this is going to lead to a shortfall in places in primary and secondary across – across this area. And so, we really want to play our part in that.

And thirdly, we really do need to upgrade the school's aging facilities. By putting together this project, we're really striving to realise the opportunities that are afforded by the renewal of the Westmead precinct. We want to play our part in responding to population growth and demand, supporting the community and those people that are going to be living and working in the area. We want to provide uncompromised play space for the children that are at Sacred Heart Primary School, and we want to create an integrated faith learning in evangelising community.

We are very passionate about implementing CEDP's modern pedagogical values. We have strategy around pre to post, which is all about taking the – the youngster, you know, the two to three year old's on their learning journey all the way through to adulthood in a very integrated way on one campus, and we have success of this in other schools that we have within our system, and we really want to bring that to this campus. And we really are committed to providing active open space, integrating open space with the built form and enhancing connections between indoor and outdoor learning environments. Ultimately, we want to create collaborative school learning settings and in order to do so, we put this project forward for consideration. At this point, I'll pass over to my colleague, Kate.

MS K. TUDEHOPE: Thank you, Sarah. So, my name is Kate Tudehope. I'm from Ethos Urban. We are the planners who have been working on this project. Jess, I'll just ask you to go to the next slide. So, this first one talks briefly to the early works

DA that we – that we discussed with you earlier in the week on the site. So, in November 2020, the planning panel approved an early works DA that comprised demolition of the existing Brothers’ residence in the north-east of the site, construction of a three storey carpark for 260 vehicles, landscaping and open space works. So, that comprised landscaping along the Darcy Road frontage of the carpark as well as converting an existing ACROD carparking area into additional grassed open space, and some pedestrian access upgrades. So, paths that lead into the site around the carpark.

10 And, we also eliminated one of the existing vehicle cross-overs where that new open space is proposed. So those works are yet to – yet to commence. But they will be in place before the primary school is operational. What it allows us to do is to separate high school pick-up and drop-off from primary school pick-up and drop-off which results in improved impacts – traffic impacts on the network by separating out the pick-up and drop-off, and the parking for both users.

So, onto the next slide which talks to building design and siting. So, as you – as you’re aware this development represents the first stage of a broader master plan, and whilst we’re not seeking approval for the master plan at this stage, the buildings have been sited with consideration of the broader master plan as well as the fact that the development’s occurring within the context of an operating school and so we need to consider project staging. So, an analysis was carried out of the existing building stock which showed that that L-shaped building in the centre of the campus which was built in about 2010 is really the only building that’s worthy of retention.

25 So, the – the master plan shows that in the future, the primary school will connect through that building into the high schools which will be consolidated into the centre of the campus. And what that enables us to do, is to implement a road network with, as you can see, there’s north, south, east, west connections that would provide both vehicular and pedestrian access into and through the site. And that is broadly aligned with council’s master plan for the Westmead Innovation District.

30 Back to building siting, of course we’ve got the parish church in the corner of the site there and that’s been located so that it’s a prominent – a prominent building on the campus and really welcomes the community, both the school community and the broader community, into the campus. But finally, you’ll see that quote in italics at the bottom of the page there, that’s a quote from the State Design Review Panel who we engaged with early on in the project, both on the primary school building and the church itself, but the master plan more broadly, and they’ve given their support to the building siting, the overall master plan as well as the landscape strategy.

40 Moving onto the project timeline. So, I won’t dwell on this, but I thought it was important to demonstrate the work that’s been done by the applicant over the course of the assessment period, even responding to RFIs from the department and council, and also the consultation that’s occurred with the agencies and the subsequent amendments that were made to the proposal in September of this year. I’ve also noted a few key dates there. As we’ve discussed, in November 2020, the early works

DA was approved by council. And, in December 2020, the applicant undertook upgrades to the primary school pick-up and drop-off to increase the capacity of the pick-up and drop-off area, which has resulted in an improvement in traffic movements of Darcy Road. And I think what that goes to demonstrate is CEDPs
5 commitment to implementing these things to make a better impact on the traffic work.

So, in responding to the meeting agenda, I'll just step through how we responded to some of those key issues. So, the next slide if we can, Jess. The first of which is
10 traffic. Now, we have TTPP, the traffic consultants on the line to provide technical input during the question time, however in simple terms, our modelling has shown that in 2023, the proposal will result in no additional impact on surrounding road network. Whilst intersections along Hawkesbury Road would fail in the peaks, this is a result of background traffic both alone, and council has noted that upgrading
15 those intersections is outside the scope of this application. However, the work we are doing, particularly relocating the high school pick-up and drop-off actually results in positive impacts on the road network in 2023.

Then, in 2033 when our growth is realised – or our maximum growth is realised.
20 Again, the background traffic growth alone means that the intersects – some intersections along Hawkesbury Road would fail or operate under congested conditions in the AM and PM peaks. But council has also noted that that – any upgrades to those intersections is beyond the scope of our proposal. Also, in 2023, the intersection of Darcy Road, Bridge Road, and the Coles carpark would
25 experience delays once the development traffic is considered. And, so in response to the impacts on this intersection in particular, the department suggested conditions around ongoing monitoring and if necessary, upgrades to that intersection. We'll talk to the particulars of that condition in a moment. But generally, we're accepting of those conditions.

30 And in addition to that, a number of actions have been undertaken, or will be undertaken to improve the operation of the road networks. So, they're outlined just there on the side and include upgrades to the side access points both at the Darcy Road Mother Teresa entry and the Darcy Road multi-storey carpark entry. So, that's
35 at the early works DA site. As mentioned, we've already proposing to split the primary and secondary pick-up and drop-off through the early works DA. We have changes to the primary school pick-up and drop-off area that have already been carried out and are already showing to improve traffic movements. We've got staggered start and finish times, including before and after school care,
40 improvements in connectivity, pedestrian connectivity. Again, we'll talk to the proposal shortly required by the conditions. And then finally, implementation of a 10 per cent GTP mode share shift by 2033, where the 10 per cent equates to, I believe, 66 students, so we really think in the context of this site that's quite conservative, noting all the public transport and the predicted residential growth
45 that's due to occur in this area.

Moving on to our response to open space. So the department has had ongoing concerns about the design and quantity of open space being provided, which we strongly disagree with. The proposal provides over 7800 square metres of purpose-designed, accessible, weather-protected open space across levels 1 to 5 of the building, and – as well as just over 6000 square metres of open space at the ground level around the primary school building.

The CEDP actually has research that's been undertaken by the Learning Environments Applied Research Network and the University of Melbourne which shows that purpose-designed open spaces like this that are age appropriate actually promote more active play from a larger number of students than traditional open-style play spaces do, which only appeal to a smaller number of students. We've submitted a summary of that research with our original RTS back in September 2020.

So in terms of quantity, this SSD provides 8.2 square metres of open space for each primary school student, both within the building and on the surrounding ground plain. In their assessment, the department has noted that that's inconsistent with the EFSG, and, whilst that's acknowledged, I'm sure, as we're all aware, the EFSG is a guide, and it doesn't strictly apply to independent or systemic schools, and we're confident that the quantity and type of open space provided is adequate to meet the needs of the primary school students.

So, notwithstanding that, the ovals on the site are in addition to that 8.2 square metres, and they provide close to 40,000 square metres of open space for all students on the site, so once the ovals are taken into account, there's about 17 square metres of open space per child across primary and high school students.

So, despite the justification and research that we've provided, the department has continued to raise concerns around primary school access to the ovals, and so they've suggested a condition requiring regular access for primary school students. I want to note that the primary school students won't be precluded from accessing the ovals, and they will have access as and when required. However, it's not intended to be their primary play space, and, ultimately management and use of the ovals comes down to the management arrangements between the schools on the campus.

And so, whilst we're willing to accept a condition around open space provision, as we'll discuss shortly, we are proposing that the condition be amended and expanded to include all play spaces and sports facilities, rather than just the ovals, in recognition that there are various other open spaces on the campus that can provide for the sporting needs of the primary school students.

Finally – couple of final points. It's important to note that there'll be no additional demand on councils, ovals or sporting facilities as a result of this SSD, and in response to the re-exhibition of the application in September and October, they have given their support to the proposal on open space grounds, and they've supported our open space strategy.

So I think, just to sum up on open space, the open space we're providing is purpose designed, available in all weather conditions at all times of the year, and we think it'll ultimately result in a better health and wellbeing outcome for the students throughout the year. And whilst we're willing to accept the proposed condition
5 around open space, we think it should be broadened to include more than just the ovals, and we'll discuss that in a moment.

So just moving on to pedestrian-accessing connectivity. So together the SSD and the early works DA will create a number of new and safe site entries on Darcy Road. So
10 if we just look to this diagram, and perhaps moving from east to west, we are proposing to relocate the main pedestrian entry at Darcy Road to the eastern side of the access driveway, so students don't have to cross over the main threshold at Darcy Road. We're also providing a pedestrian crossing there further into the site, where students will be able to cross safely. At the Darcy Road frontage, there's also a
15 pedestrian refuge going in, so people who do need to cross over can do so safely.

Further along Darcy Road, we have two new entries which are at the landscape embankment there, next to the parish, which will provide access into the primary school and the site, and then further along we have the entries to the multistorey car
20 park. Shown in red there, we have the through-site link that will provide a connection between the multistorey car park and the primary school, CELC and parish on the western side of the site.

In addition, and in response to the concerns raised by council and DPIE, the
25 applicant is committed to providing an east-west student link within the site, which is shown just there. Again, we'll talk about this further when we discuss the conditions; however, the link would be for use by school students, staff and CELC users only, and would be available during school hours only.

It would not be publicly accessible. Having the public on the campus is a serious
30 safety concern for CEDP and the landowners, and it can't be accommodated at this point, until the master plan is developed and safety lines and fences and so on can be installed. Further, there are conditions requiring provision of an easement, which, we are suggesting, are necessary, particularly for this link. It's on the school's land,
35 and so there's no need for an easement over that.

Just finally, with respect to the connection from the western boundary through to Bridge Road, that's something that we are willing to explore. However, that
40 connection would ultimately be delivered by others, consistent with the conditions, although we are willing to provide a connection to that within our site.

Moving on, now, to site suitability. So the department has raised concerns about site suitability and the ability of the site to accommodate the proposed development. So,
45 firstly, I want to reiterate that the proposal is consistent with the Strategic Planning Framework that applies to the site. As noted on the slide, the proposal is consistent with New South Wales state priorities in the regional plan, as it provides new education facilities to meet growing demand.

It's also consistent with the vision outlined in the Central City District Plan, which seeks to transform Westmead into an innovation district and identifies a need for existing schools to grow to accommodate approximately 90,000 students by 2036, of which 32 per cent of that growth is expected to occur in Parramatta LGA. It's also
5 consistent with the State Infrastructure Strategy, as it proposes investment in a non-government school sector to provide modern learning facilities.

It's also consistent with the Future Transport Strategy, as it supports the ongoing provision of education facilities in what is undeniably an location. And, finally,
10 it's consistent with the draft Westmead Place Strategy, as it provides increased primary school capacity to support growth that's set to occur in Westmead South and Parramatta North.

Just on the next slide – summarise the site suitability more broadly. So it's clear that the proposal is aligned with the Strategic Planning Framework applying to the site –
15 Jessy, I'll just flick to the next one – which identifies residential growth and a need for additional schools. As Sarah outlined, there's said to be close to 5000 new homes and nearly 29,000 new jobs in this area, which is going to result in a significant shortage in primary school and high school places.

20 The site is appropriately zoned and contains existing schools, so the proposal is effectively an extension of existing education facilities on the campus, which is required to support an identified need and, obviously, the urgent need to get the Sacred Heart Primary School off the Ralph Street site.

25 The site support growth and is separated from sensitive receivers, which, obviously, reduce impacts associated with the proposed development. The site is well located in proximity to existing and future public transport, which will support the proposed GTP and mode share targets. And, finally, the impacts identified
30 during DPIEs assessment can be mitigated through the imposition of conditions relating to traffic, open space and pedestrian connections.

So that sort of concludes that part of our presentation. We were now proposing to step through the conditions, but this reflects the letter that was issued to you
35 tomorrow – sorry. Tomorrow – this morning. So do you want us to step through these one by one or focus on any conditions in particular? Is there a preference?

MR DUNCAN: Thanks Kate. Look, we have the information the two issues is the open space issue – pedestrian access, I should say, across – near the open space,
40 and also the intersection upgrades on Bridge Road. They're probably the two major ones.

MS TUDEHOPE:

45 MR DUNCAN: Juliet have a discussion about those two?

MS J. GRANT: Yes, that's fine. At some stage, I wouldn't mind just a minute or two extra of your time, Kate, to explain the master plan as well, just

5 MR DUNCAN: I agree, Juliet. Could we go back to slide 6, which is the master plan slide. Would you like to

10 MS TUDEHOPE: Yes. So, yes, would you like me just – okay. So, broadly – or the future intention is that the high schools will be consolidated into the centre of the campus - - -

MR DUNCAN:

15 MS TUDEHOPE: - - - which, obviously, enables the introduction of the east-west and north-south connections. And then, in the future – and this would be subject to a planning proposal and a rezoning and, obviously, a lengthy planning process – the intention is that there would be collaborative uses around the edge of the campus that would tie in with what's happening elsewhere in the Westmead and Innovation Precinct. So it could be, you know, innovation spaces, commercial spaces, research,
20 Westmead Precinct.

MR DUNCAN: So, Kate, the road system you show there – does that become a public road system in

25 MS TUDEHOPE: It would be, yes. It would. Under the master plan, those roads would be public.

MR DUNCAN: And you use up the existing sort of bus turnaround and car space in this proposal - - -

30 MS TUDEHOPE: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: - - - but I assume car spaces are then, what, accounted for in the multistorey?

35 MS TUDEHOPE: And there would be a basement car park as well.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. And then the buses would be on-road bus drop-off

40 MS TUDEHOPE: Correct, yes. I think on that – obviously to be determined, but on that east-west link, I gather.

MR DUNCAN: And you reduce down to one playing field and a couple of courts there.

45

MS TUDEHOPE: That's correct. And, similar to the strategy that's being adopted for the primary school, the intention is that some of the open space needs for the high school will be accommodated within the building and on rooftops.

5 MR DUNCAN: And you end up one playing field, and then you allow for that just roundabout there, a link across to the west.

MS TUDEHOPE: Correct. Through to Bridge Road, ultimately depending on what happens on that neighbouring site. I will – just on the open space discussion, some
10 very preliminary numbers have been run, and I believe it's shown that it can meet the EFSG open space target across the campus.

MR DUNCAN: Juliet, do you have a question?

15 MS GRANT: No. That's great. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: All right. Well, if we could go to the pedestrian – or the student link that you talk about, access talk about - - -

20 MS TUDEHOPE: Yes. In response to the condition?

MS GRANT: Yes.

MS TUDEHOPE: Okay. Actually, I think that's B1, Jess – might be the best one to
25 go to. Yes. There we go. Obviously, this relates to a couple of different conditions. So CEDP is willing to provide a connection, but there are real concerns about having the public on the campus, so we're wanting to reframe the conditions slightly, just to make it very clear that it's an internal student link for students, staff, CELC.

30 The condition further on talks to also the parish users being able to use it, and there's some concern that it'll be difficult to distinguish parishioners from the general public, so we're proposing that they wouldn't use the link day to day, and that it would just be for students, staff and CELC. So - - -

35 MS GRANT: So, Kate, where you've used the word there for "student", is that – council expressed this morning to us the desire that the term "student" would, could or should use – also incorporate parents and carers. Is that what's intended?

MS TUDEHOPE: Yes, it is. It's - - -
40

MS GRANT: You know, Mum or, you know, a carer can actually walk a child into school on - - -

MS TUDEHOPE: Yes. That's certainly the intent. And staff and CELC – you
45 know, early learning parents dropping their small children – the CELC. That's all anticipated. But, yes, that is the intent. Yes. So we can look - - -

MS GRANT: So if it was “school community”, rather than “student”, or something like that.

5 MS TUDEHOPE: Yes. I’m sure wording like that would be acceptable, yes, as long as it’s very clear that it’s not public – is the concern.

MS GRANT: Yes.

10 MR DUNCAN: So, Juliet, that was where I was heading as well. Okay. Well, let’s move on to the traffic one, and particularly the intersection upgrade issue at is it Bridge and Coles?

15 MS TUDEHOPE: Yes. Bridge, Darcy and Coles, yes. Okay. So we might just go to the one above this as well. So we have some comments about conditions A10 and A12. So, as I’m sure you know, this condition is part of a suite of conditions around traffic modelling and growth in staff and student numbers, and this condition, A10, sets out the requirements for the future traffic assessments that we need to do, and the trigger, if you like, for when we have to implement the mitigation measures.

20 So, you know, we agree to this condition in principle, but we think, as it’s currently worded, it could be interpreted to mean that if we have any contribution to the deterioration, then we are solely responsible for the upgrade. So we’re just asking that this one be amended to say that the traffic generated by the development would need to be the primary contributing factor to the level of service deterioration, before
25 we’re required to upgrade the intersection or contribute to the upgrade.

MR DUNCAN: I understand. Somewhere else you actually mention capping the contribution as well.

30 MS TUDEHOPE: Yes. That’s the next one. So that’s condition A12, which flows on from that one. So this condition, as it currently reads – if the traffic modelling shows that we need to do mitigation works or upgrade the intersection, that essentially the requirement to do that rests solely with the applicant, which raises concerns, because we have a pretty minimal operation of the intersection into 2033.
35 I think it’s modelled at about eight per cent.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

40 MS TUDEHOPE: And, as you probably saw when you were on site, if any road widening is required, there would be land acquisition needed, and I think that’s beyond CEDPs scope, to be acquiring land, or it would be very difficult. And, further, that our contribution to any upgrade is really open-ended, and there’s no parameters around what that contribution would be, and, again, given that our impact is pretty minimal, that raises concerns.

45 So we had suggested to the department could we just pay an upfront contribution, and the department had concerns with that approach. They would need to enter into

a VPA. So that's still, I think, a preferred option for us – is to be able to make a contribution and move on and grow, so we're just hoping to be able to change that condition to make it more explicit that a monetary contribution is and could be an appropriate alternative to actually doing the upgrade works.

5

And, you know, we appreciate why the department at this stage didn't want to commit to a dollar figure or a particular percentage cap, given that we haven't, you know, done a detailed design of the intersection or anything, so we were suggesting that maybe it could be capped at one per cent of the total development cost, which aligns with council's contributions plan, and, based on our eight per cent impact on the intersection, I think it would be – you know, equate to an intersection cost of about \$10 million, which, based on some preliminary numbers we've done, is very generous.

10

15 MR DUNCAN: Yes. So you're suggesting that it would be eight per cent of \$10 million. That's the sort of formula that

MS TUDEHOPE: Correct, yes.

20 MR DUNCAN: All right. Okay. I think I understand that situation. Juliet, anything further on that?

MS GRANT: Just one query. Have you had any conversations – I'm just trying to put this in the context of, you know, the place strategy and the broader state infrastructure contributions around the, you know, GOP and Westmead, and wondering whether or not there'd been any discussions along the way about what are some of the underlying assumptions in that broader strategic modelling and infrastructure identification, I guess trying to unravel how do you identify whether you're the primary contributor, versus what that bigger, you know

25

30

MS TUDEHOPE: Yes. That's a good question, Juliet, because, obviously, there's a lot happening in Westmead, and we're a tiny contributor. Ken, I don't know if you've got some more technical thoughts on that that you can offer.

35 MR K. HOLLYOAK: Yes. My name is Ken Hollyoak. I'm the director of TTPP, the traffic engineers. What we have done in trying to establish what goes on in the future is that Transport for New South Wales issue traffic growth factors over the next 10 years, and that allows for as much development as they know as what's going on at the time at which they give that growth factor.

40

So we've allowed for traffic growth, and it's quite a significant traffic growth as well, and on that basis we think we can contribute about eight per cent of the traffic in the future. So that's how we get to those numbers, and in the consideration of what's going on in the future, we use the Transport for New South Wales growth factors to give us that information.

45

MR DUNCAN: If I could ask a further question, Ken. Do Transport and/or council accept that eight per cent contribution factor in the estimates?

5 MR HOLLYOAK: It hasn't actually been put forward to them, but it's based upon the traffic modelling that they've seen.

MR DUNCAN:

10 MR HOLLYOAK: So it's a factual number, but I don't think we've ever discussed the number in terms of a contribution.

MR DUNCAN: I understand. Okay. Thanks, Ken. Juliet, have you got any further questions on this one?

15 MS GRANT: No. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: All right. Well, I think those are the key issues: the open space pedestrian link and that intersection. Is there anything else, Juliet, that you want to pursue at this stage?

20

MS GRANT: Have you got – were there other conditions, Kate, that you had queries – so we've talked about that pedestrian link.

25 MS TUDEHOPE: Yes. So we've spoken about the pedestrian link.

25

MS GRANT: The easement or covenant - - -

30 MS TUDEHOPE: Yes. So part C of this condition here – this is requiring an easement over the school link – the student link, however we want to call it, and that's just simply not necessary, because it's on the school's land, and we don't need an easement for it. The second part there is suggesting an easement to allow public access, should the Bridge Road connection become available in the future, and, you know, as we've mentioned, public access over the site is a significant concern for us, so we're asking that that be deleted. Moving to the next page, Jess - - -

35

MS GRANT: That sounds really a staging issue, though, doesn't it? Because if you move to your master plan, it is - - -

40 MS TUDEHOPE: Correct.

40

MS GRANT: You provide a public access link - - -

MS TUDEHOPE: Absolutely. Yes.

45 MS GRANT: - - - as a consequence of the master plan.

MS TUDEHOPE: That's right, yes. But at the moment it's really just not – it's not feasible or safe to do so.

5 MR DUNCAN: Just before you move on, Kate, what was the timeframe of the implementation of the master plan?

MS TUDEHOPE: It's a bit uncertain right at – 2033, probably, you know, when we've reached the maximum growth of the primary school. So 10 years.

10 MR DUNCAN: It will be 10 years or post-10 years. But Juliet's point is correct. You're not ruling out public access, but whilst ever it's inside the school, it's an issue for you, other than school

15 MS TUDEHOPE: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: But post the implementation of the master plan, it certainly is provided for.

20 MS TUDEHOPE: Yes, indeed. Yes. Formal roads and footpaths, and it will definitely be public at that point.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks.

25 MS TUDEHOPE: This condition here is the condition requiring the primary schools to have access to the ovals. As I spoke to, we're very confident that the open space we're providing is suitable to meet the primary school's needs, and whilst primary school students might be precluded from accessing the ovals, that's really a management issue for the school, and not something that we think ought to be a condition.

30 So we're asking that that condition just be amended to be a little bit more flexible and refer to play spaces and sports facilities more broadly, to, you know, cover sports courts, some of which, you know, are indoors, and some are outdoors, as well as the ovals and other spaces on the campus. So that's our response to that one.

35 MR DUNCAN: Good.

40 MS TUDEHOPE: And then this is just sort of administrative, to reflect that change to the previous condition about primary school access to the ovals. The next one, Jess – yes. This is community access to recreation facilities. So, in line with previous comments about public access to the campus, we've got concerns about opening up the ovals and sports facilities to the public.

45 Also, as the schedule that we provided to the department shows, the schools use the ovals after hours, and OSHC also has access to the ovals after hours, if and when required, so it would conflict with the schools' existing use of those facilities after hours. So - - -

MR DUNCAN: Just a question on that one. I would assume particularly the senior school would host events or sporting events where other schools will attend, particularly those in - - -

5 MS TUDEHOPE: Yes, that's correct. Yes. So there is school use of the ovals after hours.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. So there's no sort of – it's not that there's no community use, but it's usually other schools – access

10

MS TUDEHOPE: Correct, yes. Correct.

MS GRANT: Is there an opportunity in school holidays? I'm just thinking, you know, the state government schools have that sort of open access, joint-use sort of provision. Is there a potential in school holidays or other times that could be

15

MS TUDEHOPE: Yes. I think that's something we'd probably have to go away and discuss with the landowners. As we mentioned, there's sort of a complex land ownership structure on this site, and we'd have to talk to them about that possibility, I think, before we committed to anything

20

MS ALDER: Kate, could I highlight as well there will be holiday care as well that's provided by OSHC, so – yes. And they have access to those fields. I actually imagine that they are actually utilised during the school holidays for the children that are being cared for during school holidays.

25

MS TUDEHOPE:

MS GRANT: Yes. Okay.

30

MS TUDEHOPE: The next condition is, yes, the though-site link. So this is, again, just that language, whether it's student, school, community, whatever it might be, and just reiterating that there is no easement required for the internal site link.

35 And that's the end, and that's just an overarching conclusion how the proposal is really intended to meet the needs of the growth of the community, obviously strategically aligned. And CEDP has already implemented a number of measures to improve traffic and open space, and is, obviously, proposing to do so via implementation of the conditions.

40

MR DUNCAN: Thanks Kate and thanks Sarah. I don't - - -

MS GRANT: Can I just clarify something. Sorry, Peter. Can I just clarify in my mind those conditions. Are you saying, Kate, that you're comfortable with the concept of the ongoing traffic modelling and the funding arrangements? You'd prefer it was an upfront payment, but query the legality of the mechanism to be able to do that, so

45

overarching what's currently proposed by the minor tweaks - - -

MS TUDEHOPE: Correct. Yes, that's right. So we're comfortable doing the modelling that's required under condition A10. Condition A12 – as I said, we have concerns around the obligation sitting solely with the applicant and it being open-ended, and so, on that basis, an upfront contribution would be our preference, if
5 that's possible.

MS GRANT: Okay. Thanks. Sorry, Peter. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: No, that's okay. Anything else, Juliet?
10

MS GRANT: No. I think that's clear. Thanks.

MR DUNCAN: All right. Look, I think we're comfortable with what we've got now, and we have to do our work now, but over the next few weeks – there'll, obviously, be a bit of a shutdown for a couple of weeks over the Christmas/New Year period, but if we need to, we'll come back to you, Sarah, I assume, or Mark, about – if we've got any further questions.
15

MS TUDEHOPE:
20

MS ALDER: Yes, that's fine. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Is there anything you'd like to add in conclusion further than what you've already provided?
25

MS TUDEHOPE: No, nothing from me. Thank you for the opportunity to present.

MR DUNCAN: Well, thanks everybody for coming today. I'll formally close the meeting there, and best wishes for the end of the year.
30

MS TUDEHOPE: Thank you, and you. Bye.

MS ALDER: Thank you. Thanks everybody.

35

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[4.44 pm]