



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-1628686

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH COUNCIL

RE: WESTMEAD CATHOLIC COMMUNITY EDUCATION CAMPUS PROJECT

PANEL: **PETER DUNCAN AM**
JULIET GRANT

ASSISTING PANEL: **JANE ANDERSON**
CASEY JOSHUA

COUNCIL: **MARK LEOTTA**
MWFANWY McNALLY
PAUL SARTOR
RICHARD SEARLE

LOCATION: **VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE**

DATE: **12.32 PM, THURSDAY, 16 DECEMBER 2021**

MR P. DUNCAN AM: Good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin today, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land from which we meet virtually and today and pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Westmead Catholic Community

5 Education Campus Project currently before the Commission for determination. The Catholic Education Diocese of Parramatta, the applicant, is seeking approval for a 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 a chair of this Commission panel and I'm 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 full capture of information today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on
15 the Commission 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 the Commissioners' consideration of this matter and it is important
20 for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify each issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and 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 also put on our website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time
25 and for all members to ensure they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure the accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin. Martin, we've sent through an agenda and we've had the opening statement. Would you like to make some comments on council's behalf to begin and then we can just work through the agenda as – the

30 MR M. LEOTTA: Yes. Thank you for that. And, you know, I'm Mark Leotta. I'm the group manager for development and traffic services at the City of Parramatta Council. We have other staff with us today. I didn't know if I should just quickly introduce them or would you prefer, when they speak, potentially, to introduce at that
35 point or - - -

MR DUNCAN AM: Maybe we can do both for the record. That would be good. Thank you.

40 MR LEOTTA: Sure. Mwfany did you want to go?

MS M. McNALLY: Sure. Sorry. Just finding the mute button. I'm Mwfany McNally. I'm manage the City Significant Development Team and we tend to look after most of the State significant development applications that relate to Parramatta.
45

MR DUNCAN AM: Thank you.

MR LEOTTA: Richard.

MR R. SEARLE: I'm Richard Searle. I manage traffic and transport. So I look
5 after the planning and operational aspects of traffic and pedestrian safety at council
and I apologise for not having a camera today. Thank you.

MR LEOTTA: And from the

MR P. SARTOR: My name is Paul Sartor. I'm a development and assessment
10 officer in the City Significant Development Team under Mwfanwy's leadership, and
I am responsible for dealing with the response to all the submissions.

MR DUNCAN AM: Thank you. Okay, Mark.

MR LEOTTA: All right. Well, firstly, thank you very much to the IPC for inviting
15 us along to have a discussion with us and thank you to DEFI for their thorough
assessment and consideration of our concerns. We're satisfied that they have
certainly turned their mind to our issues and also to the applicant or the proponent.
You know, they have endeavoured to work with us through the process. So we're
20 thankful for that.

Look, this is a very important precinct for the City of Parramatta, not just for the city
but, of course, it is – has much far – wider-reaching significance as a medical
precinct and perhaps the fundamental concerns for us in relation to this proposal and
25 also as we develop this precinct is around the traffic and transport implications. So
that theme would have come through in our submission to you. But, you know, look,
council does support educational facilities in general and is overall supportive of this
proposal as assessed by DEFI. We've looked at the recommended conditions and, on
that basis, we raise no objection to the proposal.

30 We understand on some level that the proponent may have some issues with some of
those conditions. We're not sure, but, as drafted, as we've seen them, we're satisfied
with them. And, specifically, I sort of note the ones around the community of shared
use of the overalls, the access through the Farm House and endeavouring to provide a
35 pedestrian linkup through to Bridge Road are probably the main ones and also the
traffic sort of review conditions. I think they're A10 through to A14 where we have
– well, sorry. DEFI has suggested a condition around a timeframe for review. I
think that has moved from 12 months to 24 months. We don't have a particular
concern with that. We think that's probably a reasonable timeframe.

40 Look – so today, along with my other planning colleagues, actually, Richard Searle
who introduced himself. Now, Richard is our manager for traffic and transport of the
city. He's fully across the finer grain detail and, if you, you know, wanted to
understand in depth our rationale for encouraging or trying to persevere rather with a
45 – with the pedestrian link access through the bridge, then, you know, he would be
more than happy to discuss that with you and answer questions. Do you have any
questions from me, particularly, at this time?

MR DUNCAN AM: No. Thanks. Thanks, Mark. That's a good introduction. I think the issues that we would like to talk about are generally traffic and the pedestrian link. So maybe if Richard wants to elaborate on that at the moment and then we can ask some questions of him.

5

MS ANDERSON: Okay. Thanks, Richard. Thank you, Commissioner.

MR SEARLE: Thanks, Mark and Commissioner. The main – there are several intersections of concern that we have in the precincts, but we would also look to, you know, what's attributable to the proposed Catholic Education Precinct more significantly contributable. So the driveway that they currently have on the north of the site and the new proposed multilevel car park access to the north-east of the site, all those have been considered through the assessment process and the final proposed product is completely supported by council and have also made some improvements on the site during the assessment process which have been beneficial.

The main remaining intersection is – that is of concern, it's a sort of significantly attributable to this development is the intersection of Bridge Road, Darcy Road and the Coles car park. Now, during the assessment process, council was promoting the idea of having a secondary access to Bridge Road for vehicles into the site, but also more importantly for pedestrians. If I can get Mwfany to put up a diagram just showing those connections, that might help as well, to take control of the screen.

MR DUNCAN AM: Yes. That would be helpful. Thanks, Richard. Mwfany.

25

MS McNALLY: Sorry. My computer is a little slow today. I am getting to that. Won't be a moment.

MR SEARLE: I might be able to do it. Okay. So the pedestrian access – well, it's – sorry. Talking about the vehicle access, the idea that that vehicle access could then bypass the intersection of Bridge Road and Darcy Road would have alleviated the concerns that we have about the congestion and delays at that intersection. Basically, it would have taken a significant portion of the school's traffic away from that intersection. But through the assessment process, they didn't – it wasn't sort of supported. Obviously, it would have taken the applicant and the landowner's agreement. So the focus for those road improvements goes back to potential improvements at the intersection at Bridge and Darcy.

In terms of the pedestrian access, the idea of the through-site link was important for walkability for the school, you know, to get improved access to that catchment and reduce vehicle trips, but also that section of Bridge Road near the vehicle access could have acted as a bit of a – a little overflow pick up and set down area as well for when times looked particularly congested. The long-term vision for that is for a degree of having reciprocal rights, I guess. So the school students would be able to use that link across to the west of – and through that site and then sort of vice versa. We understand that that site may be a location of a high school and primary school in

40
45

the future so that those students could also get direct access across the Catholic site and reduce their walking distance as well.

5 So that's kind of the broad principles of how council approached the precinct in terms of the access and the main issues that we saw for the school. There are, of course, a lot of other works and intersection upgrades in the area that were – will benefit the school and the precinct and, of course, they've sort of being funded by other organisations which probably is an important factor to consider when looking at sort of how we condition or put conditions on the Bridge Road and Darcy Road
10 intersection.

I think that was all from a point of view. Thanks.

15 MR DUNCAN AM: Thanks, Richard. Well, while that map is still there, perhaps we can just talk a little bit about the pedestrian access. Obviously, half of that – the red sort of access line is in – through other property. So that's outside of the school sort of remit in a way. The half that's on the school property, what do you actually mean by “pedestrian access from council's point of view”? Is it complete full 24
20 hour public access or is it simply pedestrian access for school and school family?

MR SEARLE: The interest in it is having it for the schools noting that, like, council's understanding is there's a lot of interest in having two schools on that western part of the block. So the – it's the hours of the day that's probably the most important. So something along the lines of 7.30 am to maybe 9 or 9.30 and 2.30 to 4
25 are sort of the times that we have said benefiting both those sites.

MR DUNCAN AM: Okay. Thank you.

30 MR SEARLE: And I don't think it's practical to sort of take – just limit it to students in a practical sense. It will be the public using it, but it's the time of day that's more of interest.

MR DUNCAN AM: Right.

35 MS J. GRANT: So – can you just clarify, Richard. So you're saying it's predominantly driven a desire for the future potential land use of that Bridge Road western side rather than assisting with the current school arrangements to have access – pedestrian access across to the train station or that direction?

40 MR SEARLE: Yes. It's the schools that initiated the interest in the pedestrian access. It – the link across the western site to Bridge Road, that really benefits the Catholic Education Precinct and because they've already got access to Farm House Road, but also vice versa. The link across the Catholic Education Precinct land would benefit the future or potential future schools on the Bridge Road sites.
45

MS GRANT: So, when you're referring to schools on those Bridge Road sites, where is that – is that part of the precinct plan or where is that future planning

document? Because I was under the impression it's Department of – it's Health Accommodation at the moment.

5 MS McNALLY: I might just step in quickly there, if that's okay. So the most recent planning work for Westmead is the – I think it's a draft place strategy. Apologies. I get the name muddled. Yes. The Westmead draft place strategy, 2036. That was out recently. The – and it highlights that adjacent site as health education, the future sort of uses. I suppose that's hedging their bets slightly, but that's the idea that that will be regenerated there. I think in terms of the precinct – the draft place
10 strategy picks up on this, but from council's point of view, this is a very large block. Permeability is a big problem. So our view is that the school itself here with its increase in numbers generates a demand for better access to Farm House Road and I think they've amended their proposal to include that, but we're just seeking to formalise that so we can secure that permeability across their site as part of this
15 application and, as Richard said, there is Athletics Australia significant benefit in the future if we can then create that second link across when that site then comes into its development potential as that comes forward and so all we're asking for this site is that these secured so that, if that does come forward, that same access is afforded across the entire site to Farm House Road and, again, the benefit for the Catholic
20 Education School is they can get into Bridge Road which does have significant benefits for their – so we're seeing it sort of a win-win and it just helps to future proof that access across such a large section of Westmead which is really missing at the moment. But we understand that they can't provide that access through the adjacent site. That's not what we're asking. Just to future proof that link.

25 MR DUNCAN AM: Okay. And, Juliet, if I can ask another question. Mwanfany, would that easement then – would council become responsible for the maintenance of it or would the school be expected to maintain that future pedestrian link?

30 MS McNALLY: Yes. Our understanding is that it – the pedestrian link they're providing anyway and the easement is just to secure the opening hours. So we would – the applicant would be maintaining that.

35 MR DUNCAN AM: All right. So, from a public liability point of view, they would have to take on that risk of the – of a broader public using it as well. That would be the process?

MS McNALLY: In terms of the - - -

40 MR DUNCAN AM: Because I can see the need for a link. It is a big site. I can see why – yes, from a planning perspective, that would be desirable, but just thinking of future management and ownership of it.

45 MS McNALLY: Yes. Not putting words into Richard's mouth and he will correct me if I'm wrong, but, in terms of broader public, we're seeing really the people associated with school drop offs and pickups as being the broader public. So we can't just limit it to students because, obviously, we've got mums, dads, carers, that

are coming. So we mean that by “broader public” and limiting it to the hours, we’re really only the school population still. So we’re not seeing a broad – we understand the concerns with members of the public walking through all day. We’re really trying to seek that school community.

5

MR DUNCAN AM: Okay. No. That’s fine. Thank you. Juliet, did you have a question on that? Further question?

10 MS GRANT: No. I – no, no. That clarifies that. I’m just – I mean, given that it’s across a school site, if it’s only for the school community, then access is already available for the school community. I’m not sure what the added benefit of an easement there, how that helps. But it’s more a logistical management sort of – I guess, internal management issue.

15 MR DUNCAN AM: That’s right. And, for the – for council’s benefit, we went out to site with the applicant on Tuesday – Tuesday, yes, and had a look and actually noticed that there’s gates at the top near Farm House Road and there is a – an access way that we, in fact, walked ourselves down that route. I think, in step with – the red line, instead of being on the sort of northern side of the sort of park and ride or park
20 and drop, was on the sort of southern side of that.

MR SEARLE: Yes.

25 MR DUNCAN AM: So - - -

MS McNALLY: I think just to – sorry.

30 MR DUNCAN AM: Just – also we’ve received something through today which we forwarded on to you and you might want to take this is a question on notice, but council had made some suggested amendments – not council, the – sorry. The applicant has suggested some amendments to the draft conditions. We would like if you had a look at those, if you had any comments on them, to let us know your thoughts.

35 MS McNALLY: We’re absolutely happy to look at them in detail. We have – had a quick glance. We only just got them.

MR DUNCAN AM: Yes.

40 MS McNALLY: I think we can understand the applicant’s concerns in relation to the hours that have been suggested. As I mentioned, that’s not council’s primary concern. Our primary concern is future proofing the school body of anything that might happen to the west also being able to use that link during school times.

45 MR DUNCAN AM: Yes.

MS McNALLY: So we're keen for that broader group, but to future proof the west – any potential western school population coming across as well.

MR DUNCAN AM: No. That has helped clarify it in our mind.

5

MS GRANT: Can I – sorry. Can I just ask are you aware of any other examples where schools or – have opened up access? Like, if you say in future proofing it, for use by the future development to the west, are you aware of any other sites where that has happened? And I was – because I can't think of any where a school would have a stream of people walking through a school being sort of a sensitive use, that wasn't – that aren't related to the actual school community? Just in terms of, I guess, the security and operation.

10

MS McNALLY: I can't think of an example off the top of my head. No.

15

MR LEOTTA: Richard, are you aware of any? I wouldn't be, as far as just general public access coming across. We understand that and I think the intent here, you know, sort of, very large development, it would be the largest in Parramatta we've seen and the intent here is really to capture all those persons associated with the school, students and their care givers. So, if a definition of "student use" means and their associated carers who may come with them, then that's fine and then corralling those times to, for security reasons, no doubt, for the school make sense, you know, that essentially drop off and pick up and for high schools, probably a greater extension of hours arguably. They tender to stay longer at school for activities, etcetera. Classroom, yes.

20

25

MS GRANT: I guess I'm just trying to distinguish between what you – if you are just simply restricting it to the school – broader school community, but that's if Mwfany was talking about future proofing it, then it's not just the school community, it's the other future development as well. So I'm just trying to get that
- - -

30

MR LEOTTA: Yes. I think some of the future proofing is – you know, it's an increasing enrolment. So we will get increasing visitation and use of the site. So, you know, they will start off, I think, it's 660 or somewhere around there, but they're working upwards on students, which is understandable. So it's to accommodate it going forward.

35

MS GRANT: Right.

40

MR DUNCAN AM: Yes.

MS GRANT: Thank you.

45

MR DUNCAN AM: Okay. So maybe we can move on, Mark, to any residual concerns about the proposal. Is there anything other than this particular link? Now, the – it has sort of been an evolving process, I guess, but what conditions and, you

know, backwards and forwards. So I was just wanting to know whether you have any other views that we need to be aware of.

5 MR LEOTTA: Other than the traffic matters. No, look, I think permissibility we raised initially, but we're – I've read DEFI's view on that. Happy to accept that. Around – that was the place of public worship aspect. There was a financial contribution amount. I saw that was levied in line with our plan. What were the other one there? I feel like I'm missing one – an obvious one now. Just a minute. And we will take The use of the ovals, the shared community use and we're
10 happy that that has – there's a framework around that to explore that. So condition. Mwfany, was there anything else that jumped out at you there? I think that was - - -

15 MS McNALLY: No.

MR LEOTTA:

MS McNALLY: They're our key ones. Yes.

20 MR DUNCAN AM: One issue – and I'm not sure where that has got to in the backwards and forwards. conditions that was the car park entry to Coles and the sort of occupancy where a review of that potential upgrade of that in the future and I think the applicant had put forward a view that they would rather put some money into that now than, you know, push that off into the future. What was
25 council's position on that?

MR LEOTTA: I think this is on – we discussed where – because we don't know – and I'm – again, correct me if I'm wrong here, Richard. Because we don't know exactly what we may need to do there, it was not just a matter of entering into some
30 sort of agreement for a momentary amount without really knowing – having a project around some administrative and other aspects to that process – be a complications. Richard, did you have a view on that?

MR SEARLE: Yes. They had the two offers, the one per cent – sorry. Eight per
35 cent of the value of the works intersection or one per cent of the value of works at the school and they both have sort of administrative issues and concerns about not knowing what the works will be. Just another factor though is that – I mean, if we were take that approach more broadly, then we might be looking for, you know, a percentage of value of works at other intersections as well.

40 It's an unusual precinct for council in that it's kind of dominated by – well, the State Government hospitals in Western Sydney University and State Government infrastructure. So – but sort of approach of – like, of – like a development contributions plan, I guess, doesn't – hasn't worked so well and that's kind of their –
45 I guess, the approach of an eight per cent or the value of the upgrade. It's kind of inconsistent with the approach that we've taken with other development. As an example, the intersection of Darcy Road and Mons Road has been recently upgraded

and that was fully funded by the hospital car park on the south-east corner of the intersection. That was all.

5 MR DUNCAN AM: I guess the question we had, Richard, was, you know, to put something off into the future and, as you say, this area is the focus of a lot of development. It's going to be difficult in, what, a few years down the track to try and determine the impact the school may or may not have had on that intersection.

10 MR SEARLE: I think we can work that out. I take the same view as transport in that that could be calculated. It's with a – you know, with the survey work that's proposed in the condition of consent that should be able to assess that.

15 MS GRANT: And is there a funding mechanism associated with the place strategy? I mean, obviously, this area falls within the So the big picture, sort of, regional upgrade has sort of been identified and – for funding. Is there a - - -

MS McNALLY:

20 MS GRANT: Yes.

MS McNALLY: Sorry. And I think it's at the very early stages yet. So they haven't quite worked that out.

25 MR DUNCAN AM: Okay. I don't have a lot more questions, Juliet. Do you have anything further you wish to ask?

MS GRANT: No. No, I don't. No.

30 MR DUNCAN AM: We've got another session with the applicant this afternoon. So we will be assessing this over the next few weeks, but, if you have any comments, Mark, on those – the applicant's comments on the draft conditions, we would be happy to receive those and anything further that you wish to - - -

35 MR LEOTTA: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN AM: Thank you.

40 MR LEOTTA: Yes. Thank you. What was the timeframe for you on that or as soon as possible, I would suggest?

MR DUNCAN AM: Well, yes, but, given the time of the year, we're mindful that, you know, people are going on leave that sort of thing. So potentially mid-January.

45 MR LEOTTA: Okay. That's much longer than I thought. Okay. Well, that's fine. Thank you. Yes.

MR DUNCAN AM: Well, our issue is we can't do a lot of our public process over the next few weeks - - -

MR LEOTTA: No.

5

MR DUNCAN AM: - - - or - - -

MR LEOTTA: Of course not.

10 MR DUNCAN AM: Christmas and New Year shutdowns and things like that. So, to be fair to you, if you have anything further to say, it would be good to receive it by mid-January, if we could.

MR LEOTTA: Very good. Thank you.

15

MR DUNCAN AM: Okay. Jane and Casey, anything from the Commission? Anything further?

MS ANDERSON:

20

MR DUNCAN AM: Okay. Well, look, could I thank everybody for your time today and for helping us with questions and we know it's a busy time of the year. So thanks and best wishes for the end of the year.

25 MR LEOTTA: Yes. Likewise and thank you. Lovely meeting you all.

MR DUNCAN AM: Thank you very much. Thank you.

MR LEOTTA: All the best.

30

MR DUNCAN AM: The Commission may stay on line. Thank you. I will close the meeting now.

MS McNALLY: Thank you.

35

MR LEOTTA: Thank you.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[12.59 pm]