



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

RE: PYMBLE LADIES COLLEGE - GREY HOUSE PRECINCT
(SSD-17424905)

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT MEETING

COMMISSION PANEL: ADRIAN PILTON (Chair)
 DR SHERIDAN COAKES
 SOO-TEE CHEONG, OAM

OFFICE OF THE IPC: BRAD JAMES
 GEOFF KWOK

DEPARTMENT KAREN HARRAGON
REPRESENTATIVES: ADITI COOMAR
 NAHID MAHMUD

LOCATION: VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE

DATE: 9.30AM, THURSDAY, 1 SEPTEMBER 2022

TRANSCRIBED AND RECORDED BY APT TRANSCRIPTIONS

MR PILTON: Good morning. Is that everybody from the Department, Karen?

MS HARRAGON: We are all here today. Good morning.

MS COOMAR: Good morning, everyone.

MS HARRAGON: Nahid, I'll just get you to turn on your camera, thank you.

MR PILTON: Okay, well, let's begin. Good morning and welcome. Before we
10 begin, I would like to acknowledge that I am speaking to you from Gadigal land, and I
acknowledge the traditional owners of all the country from which we virtually meet
today, and pay my respect to their Elders past and present.

Welcome to the meeting today to discuss Pymble Ladies College - Grey House
Precinct Project, SSD-17424905, currently before the Commission for determination.
Pymble Ladies College, the applicant, is seeking approval for the redevelopment of
Grey House Precinct within the existing campus at 20 Avon Road, Pymble. The
proposal involves the construction of a five-storey building to accommodate learning
20 areas, science, technology, engineering and mathematics laboratories, health and
wellbeing centre, and an early learning centre (ELC) for 90 additional children within
the PLC campus.

My name is Adrian Pilton. I am the Chair of this Commission Panel. I am joined by
my fellow Commissioners, Dr Sheridan Coakes and Soo-Tee Cheong. We are also
joined by Brad James and Geoff Kwok 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
30 produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part
of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources
of information upon which the Commission will base its determination. It is important
for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it
is considered appropriate.

If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take
up the question on notice and to provide any additional information in writing, which
we will then put up on our website. I request that all members here introduce
themselves before speaking for the first time, and for all members to ensure they do
40 not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. We will now
begin. Do you want to lead off, Karen, or - - -

MS HARRAGON: Thank you. Good morning, Commissioners. I am Karen Harragon, Director Social Infrastructure Assessments at the Department of Planning and Environment. I am joined by my colleagues today, Aditi Coomar and Nahid Mahmud, from the Independent Schools Infrastructure Assessment Team. I wish to acknowledge that I am joining you today from Darkinjung land.

10 Our presentation today will outline the Department's approach to the assessment of the SSD application for the Grey House Precinct within the Pymble Ladies College campus. The application is SSD as it is development for alterations and additions to an existing school with a capital investment value of more than 20 million.

The proposal was referred to the Commission as Ku-ring-gai Council has objected to the proposal. Just one moment. The Department received, in addition to Council's objection, the Department received 127 public submissions, of which 124 were objections. Having regard to the IPC provisions in the planning system SEPP, 39 submissions by way of objection were considered unique objections. We also received advice from seven government agencies.

20 Our presentation today will include a brief summary of the Department's assessment of the application, as well as in matters noted in the Commission's agenda for today's briefing. The matters that we are going to focus on today include key issues of concern that we raised in submissions on the application, including traffic and transport, built form and amenity and visual impacts, tree removal and landscaping. Aditi is going to first provide a brief overview of the property and the proposal. I will also ask our presentation to be made full-screen. Thank you.

30 MS COOMAR: Thank you, Karen. Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Aditi Coomar, Team Leader, School Infrastructure Assessments. I will just share my full screen and make sure that the screen is shared properly, so just bear with me for a moment.

MR PILTON: Okay.

MS COOMAR: Can all of you see?

MR PILTON: Yes, thank you.

40 MS COOMAR: Okay. So I'm going to start off with a brief overview and description of the school campus. The site, this - can you all see the slides?

MR PILTON: Yes.

MS COOMAR: Okay. This slide provides an overview of the regional context of the campus. The Pymble Ladies College, or PLC, school campus is located at 20 Avon Road, close to Pacific Highway, and the Pymble Railway Station, and has an area of 20 hectares, with street frontage to Avon Road to the north and west. The campus is zoned SP2 infrastructure under the Ku-ring-gai LEP. PLC accommodates 2,259 students, including 120 boarders and 400 staff. While the campus itself is not heritage listed, it adjoins a heritage conservation area to the southeast and is also located in proximity to some locally listed heritage items. The development site, or the site, is located centrally along the south-eastern part of the campus. The site adjoins the Pymble Avenue low-density residences.

We will now move on the site. This slide provides the location of the site in the context of the existing buildings within the campus. The site adjoins the existing gymnasium and aquatic centre to the south, the boarding houses to the west, and the junior school to the north-west. The section of the campus accommodates particularly endangered plant communities, like Sydney turpentine ironbark forest, or STIF, and blue-gum high forest. A walkway, the Grey House Walk, connects the site with Pymble Avenue and is currently used by students.

The site adjoins low-density residential areas, in particular, 57A Pymble Avenue, and 59B Pymble Avenue to its east. However, the Department notes that the character of the area is not strictly low density, with four- to five-storey residential-flagged buildings located towards the north, at the corner of Pymble Avenue and Avon Road.

So now moving onto the proposal. The proposal involves the construction of a new four- to five-storey building to accommodate school facilities such as STEM areas, the junior school classrooms, health and wellbeing centres, dance studios, out-of-school-hours care, and a new childcare centre for 90 children. The proposal does not involve an increase in the students within the PLC campus, apart from the inclusion of the 90 childcare centre children. The childcare centre is referred to as the ELC in this presentation.

There is an existing car parking located at the Centenary Car Park, next to the aquatic centre, with approximately 238 spaces. The applicant proposes to utilise 37 parking spaces within this car park for use by the ELC. Accessible pathways are provided between the building and the car park.

The proposed building itself includes basement areas following the natural slope of the land, a podium to break the building mass, and recessed upper levels. The ELC is

proposed at the first floor, with an outdoor open space on the terrace. The applicant also proposes to remove any inconsistencies between a previously approved consent proposal on the campus and the current SSD application. The arrows on the diagrams points to the envelope of the consent proposal, which overlaps on a part of the proposed building. The Act allows the consent authority to modify the consent proposal, which in this instance is by deleting all references to the envelope shown on this slide from the approved plans and conditions. The applicant has submitted a notice to the Commission to modify the approved consent proposal pursuant to section 4.175 of the Act. I will ask now my colleague Nahid to speak.

10

MR MAHMUD: Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Nahid - - -

MR PILTON: Good morning.

MR MAHMUD: Can you hear me?

MR PILTON: Yes, thanks.

MR MAHMUD: Okay. Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Nahid
20 Mahmud, Senior Planner in the School Infrastructure Branch, and I will now provide you summary of the Department's assessment. In summary, the Department concludes that the building is required to provide contemporary and improved facilities for PLC students, and would have an added benefit of a childcare centre. The proposed facilities, such as the dance studios, cannot only be used by the school, but also by local organisations after school hours. The proposed landscape plan integrates with the building layout and the overall masterplan for the PLC campus.

30 While the bulk and the scale of the building is not entirely consistent with the directly adjoining low-density residential area, it caters for its functions and it's compatible with other buildings on PLC campus. The building will not cause unreasonable visual impacts on the adjoining low-density residential area due to proposed landscape screening, planting and setback from the common boundary. The building is unlikely to have adverse amenity impacts on the adjoining residents due to overshadowing, overlooking, light spill or operational noise, subject to recommended conditions, including addition of privacy glass and noise-monitoring, et cetera.

40 We have discussed this later in the presentation. The development would not adversely impact on the heritage significance of the nearby conservation area. Given that increase in PLC student numbers is not proposed, the existing drop-off/pick-up facilities are considered sufficient, subject to further implementation of a green travel

plan and operational transport management measures that would impede parents from dropping or picking children at Pymble Avenue.

The car parking within the Centenary Car Park can cater for PLC and is assessed as satisfactory. The development would remove 29 trees and replace those with 37 trees to maintain the canopy cover of the site, which is acceptable.

10 The loss of the Sydney turpentine ironbark forest is offset through appropriate credits. The operational and construction noise would not have significant amenity impacts, subject to implementation of mitigation and management measures. The requested modification to the consent proposal to remove inconsistencies between the two SSDs is acceptable and can be deserved through the conditions of consent.

We will now move on to discuss the key issues briefly and then discuss the recommended conditions of consent. I will pass on to a detailed prospectus, move to the next slide.

20 MS COOMAR: Thank you, Nahid. I am now going to talk about the traffic matters. The PLC campus is well connected to the Regional Road Network via Pacific Highway connecting to Avon Road. The surrounding roads are however mostly local roads, with 50 kilometre per hour speed limits. The applicant's traffic assessment concludes that the proposed inclusion of the 90 ELC children would not result in an unreasonable impact on the surrounding intersections. The applicant has also advised that the ELC is mainly proposed to cater to the existing staff, and therefore in reality the traffic generation would be less than that anticipated for 90 children.

30 Based on comments from Council and Transport for New South Wales, the Department accepts the applicant's assessment of traffic generation and the impacts on the nearby intersection performances. Council suggested that the nearby local roads are at capacity, partly due to the school operations, and even the slightest increase in the intensity of the school use would require further traffic calming measures installed on the surrounded identified traffic routes.

40 The applicant's traffic consultant did not recommend this. However, the Department has recommended that a supplementary traffic assessment of the Arilla Road, Mayfield Avenue, Alawa Road Route be undertaken, and the traffic-calming measures, as required, based on this assessment, be installed, subject to endorsement by the local traffic committee, prior to the issue of the occupation certificate. Overall, the Department notes that the community has raised significant concerns regarding the ongoing traffic issues due to the operation of the school.

While this proposal does not propose any increase in student numbers, the Department notes that there is no development consent which caps the current student numbers at the campus. Consequently it is acknowledged that student numbers can incrementally go up in the future outside of the terms of any development consent and this may result in traffic issues within the locality.

10 However, this is not within the scope of this application, to cap the overall students of the school. Notwithstanding, the Department considers that the school should implement a green travel plan or GTP, and take advantage of its highly accessible location in terms of bus and train. The implementation of the GTP, with specific motor-share targets, would reduce vehicle use and improve the current traffic situation in the locality, benefiting the community.

The Department has therefore recommended that the school implements a GTP in the short and long terms, and also monitors it regularly. The monitoring reports should be submitted back to the Department for a period of five years after operations commence. The operational traffic management measures would also resolve the ongoing traffic issues and are discussed later.

20 Moving on the drop-off/pick-up, this slide shows the existing parking and drop-off/pick-up arrangement for the school campus, with approximately 548 onsite carparking spaces throughout the campus for staff and visitors. The school does not allow students to park within the PLC campus. As indicated before, the applicant proposes to utilise the existing car parking facility on a shared basis to avoid the construction of further car parking areas. The new ELC would require 23 car parking spaces under the Ku-ring-gai DCP, which can be satisfactorily accommodated in the Centenary Car Park given that the parking spaces are unused during the school areas, and the aquatic centre patrons would not use the Centenary Car Park at the same time as the ELC.

30 However, the Department notes that the community has raised concerns with the parents who drop-off/pick-up children from Pymble Avenue, leading to the traffic disruptions in the locality. The community concerns appear to be based on ongoing operational issues. The Department concludes that it is mandatory for parents to sign in ELC children. Therefore the parents would likely use the secured carpark within the site.

40 For the junior school students, drop-off/pick-up facilities are available within the school campus, with direct routes of access to the classrooms. Given that the Grey House Walk is key-card access controlled, and no additional students in addition to

those already using, would be permitted to use this walkway from Pymble Avenue would not be a feasible drop-off area associated with this proposed development.

Notwithstanding the above and noting the community concerns, the Department has recommended a condition requiring the implementation of an operational transport and access management plan to ensure that appropriate security measures are installed, traffic marshals are employed to control the current drop-off/pick-up scenarios, and the pedestrian crossings are appropriately managed during the school peak times.

- 10 Moving on to construction traffic impacts, this slide shows the construction site, onsite parking, access and site office during construction. Construction works can be managed wholly within the campus with no need for work zones. The construction route for heavy vehicles is discussed in detail in the Department's assessment report. Entry and exit for construction and construction worker vehicles are expected to be via gate 3 along Avon Road, and would be managed by traffic marshals to ensure the ongoing school operations are not impacted by construction works. Grey House Walk will be closed to students, visitors and staff during the construction work. Onsite parking will be provided for contractor and worker vehicles near the site office. The Department considers that this can be managed through the implementation of a
- 20 construction traffic management plan. I will now pass on to Karen to talk about built-form and amenity impact.

- MS HARRAGON: Thank you, Aditi. This slide shows the height and bulk of the proposed development in relation to key existing buildings within the campus. The building's appearance would be three storeys on the southwestern side within the campus and four to five storeys within the southeast side, where it adjoins the low-density area. This is due to the fall of the site. The building directly adjoins the rear yards of the dwellings at 57A and 59B Pymble Avenue, and would have a high to moderate visual impact on these residences, per the applicant's reports, and we agree
- 30 with that conclusion.

The Department acknowledges that the proposed building is five storeys, which is not similar to scale of the adjoining low-density dwellings along Pymble Avenue. However, the building also adjoins the large-scale existing buildings within the PLC campus, as well as being located in close proximity to four- to five-storey residential flat buildings along Avon Road, in proximity to the Pymble Avenue intersection.

- 40 Reductions in scale of the building are not warranted and would compromise the proposed facilities that are intended to be delivered, as well as the functioning of the ELC. To mitigate the impacts of the bulk and scale, the applicant proposes a large setback from the adjoining dwellings, a deep podium at the first-floor level to provide

a relevant two-storey scale at that intersection and recess further to the upper levels. Significant modulation of the building in both form and materiality, including recessive colours and finishes, is also proposed.

The applicant also proposes to screen the building's bulk by the planting of a significant number of trees along the common boundary, which would provide additional visual mitigation when they are mature. Counsel has objected to the bulk and scale of the proposal. The Department notes that the Ku-ring-gai LEP development standards do not apply to this school campus, given its zoning.

10

In finalising the design of the building, the applicant has excessively consulted with the State Design Review Panel, who have supported the design, considering the context of the site within the campus and within the locality, as well as the proposed use. The Department also notes that as part of its options analysis, the applicant has demonstrated that there are no suitable areas within the site, other than at this location, to deliver a building that provides for the functions of this development, and also having regard to minimising vegetation removal.

20 The Department considers that the proposed bulk and scale is acceptable, subject to mitigation requirements. I'm now going to discuss details of the proposed setbacks and amenity impacts.

The community council and the Department raised strong concerns regarding potential overlooking impacts associated with the proposed building onto adjoining residences. The relationship between the closest adjoining properties and the proposed building is shown in this extract of the applicant's site analysis. We have added two red lines here to depict the section drawings that we will be presenting in the next slide to show the relationship between the elements of the new development and the two closest residences, being 59B Pymble Avenue and 57A Pymble Avenue.

30

I'm now going to discuss the visual privacy and setbacks in relation to these dwellings, in particular from the proposed building. This slide shows the building setbacks and the likely impacts on the visual privacy impacts to two adjoining properties at 59B and 57A Pymble Avenue. These are the two sections that were shown on the previous diagram, cutting through the proposed development. In this regard, the Department has considered the Apartment Design Guide in its assessment of the impacts of the proposed development on the adjoining low-density dwelling - or, sorry, correction, the low-density dwellings.

40 The Apartment Design Guide does not specifically apply to schools, but the Department has used this as a guide in relation to what is considered an appropriate

setback in relation to these sorts of circumstances. The building separation distance between the proposed building and the closest adjoining residences would be in the order of 19.5 metres from the lower levels, and 25.8 metres from the upper levels, which is generally consistent with the design guide requirements for separation between habitable rooms within residential flat buildings and low-density dwellings.

To minimise the residual impacts, the applicant has reduced the picture windows on the southern façade, proposes a 1.8-metre high balustrade for the level 2 ELC play area, along with planters and non-trafficable areas being set aside, introduced
10 horizontal shading elements, has allocated appropriate uses on the upper floors, as well as providing detailed significant screen planting along the common boundary. The Department generally agrees to the applicant's proposed measures but remains concerned that the junior classroom windows, the retained picture windows and the ELC play areas may overlook the upper level windows of 59B and 57A, as well as the rear yards and swimming pools of these two dwellings. To alleviate this impact, conditions are recommended requiring inclusions of obscure glass to windows on levels 2 and 3, plus obscure privacy glass to the balustrade of the southern façade of the ELC play area.

20 This slide provides hourly shadow diagrams, showing impacts on the development on the adjoining dwellings within Pymble Avenue. A detailed assessment of the overshadowing has been provided in the Department's assessment report. The Department has assessed the shadow diagrams and is satisfied that the northwest-facing windows of neighbouring properties and their rear yards would receive at least four hours solar access, complying with the requirements of the DCP affecting this area.

The proposed new planting may result in some additional overshadow in future, when the trees are matured, but given the positive impacts of this visual screening, and given
30 that it would not be a total blocking-out of sun, we consider this to be acceptable. I will now ask Aditi to talk about landscaping and heritage.

MS COOMAR: Thank you, Karen. The proposal involves removal of 29 trees, including clearing of Sydney turpentine ironbark forest. The Environment and Heritage Group at the Department had reviewed the applicant's BDAR and are satisfied that the removal of the STIF would not have a significant adverse impact on the local biodiversity, subject to conditions requiring the retiring of two offset credits. The removal would also be mitigated by the provision of 37 new trees, as well as extensive shrub and ground cover plantings, the majority of which would be native.
40 As such, a total of 28 per cent canopy cover is proposed. The landscape plan also

includes landscaping on levels 0 to 2 and level 4, which has been supported by the State Design Review Panel and the government architect, as shown on this slide.

I now move on to heritage impacts. The site is located near Pymble Avenue conservation area and near heritage-listed items identified in schedule 5 of the Kuring-gai LEP. Given significant community concerns, the Department engaged an independent consultant, GML Heritage, to review the impacts of the proposal on the nearby heritage items and conservation area. GML Heritage concluded the proposed development would not have any significant impact on the adjoining conservation area and surrounding heritage items. The applicant has submitted an Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessment Report, which demonstrates that the development would unlikely impact on any Aboriginal cultural heritage values in the area. I will now pass on to Nahid to speak about the remaining matters in the agenda.

MR MAHMUD: Thank you, Aditi. The application includes a noise assessment report, which includes that the operation of the development, including the use of outdoor play areas, would not have an observable impact on the locality, subject to inclusion of a barrier to the perimeter of the level 2 ELC external play area, built of solid material, such as glass, with the height of no less than 1.5 metre over the finished floor, restricting the dance practice with amplified music within the submerged dance studio, adopting the AAEC guidelines for child care centre acoustic, being 2.5 hour of outdoor play, with a buffer of 1.5 hour of additional activities.

The Department has recommended the above conditions. The Department has also reviewed the noise generated by the construction activities and considers that this can be managed through the implementation of a construction noise and by additional management plan.

The applicant's EIS stated that environmentally sustainable level operating measures would be implemented to achieve a sustainable lighting that is equivalent to the five-star Green Star design. The Department has allowed similar social infrastructure developments to follow equivalent pathways other than Green Star rating. A similar approach has been adopted here. I will now ask Karen to talk about recommended conditions and close the presentation.

MS HARRAGON: Thank you, Nahid. I'm now going to touch on some of the key non-standard conditions, which include requirements that SSD-5314 be modified to remove any inconsistencies between this application and the development consent SSD-5314 in relation to the relevant building envelope. This ensures that both the plans and the conditions relating to that envelope are removed from that approval.

We've also required a final green travel plan be implemented to reduce vehicle usage, be monitored and reported back to the Department for five years after the commencement of operations to address existing behaviours and seek improvements in terms of the movement of access to the site onto non-vehicle access. A supplementary assessment is also required to be undertaken, with traffic mitigation measures implemented, if identified as being required under that additional assessment.

We also require the inclusion of privacy glass to relevant balustrades and windows.
10 We've also imposed a requirement that post-operational noise monitoring be undertaken to verify the modelling that has been undertaken as part of the original application. Offset credits are also required to be retired for the impacts on the listed vegetation, and we have also imposed a contribution in accordance with the council's contribution plan.

Thank you for the opportunity to present to the IPC on this matter. The Department is able to assist in any other matters that the Commission may have for us at this time.

MR PILTON: Thanks, Karen. I think we've probably got a few queries. Maybe if I
20 could just kick off with the – in your assessment, clause 6.3.25, it says that the Department's assessment of the scale of development is consistent with the Ku-ring-gai LEP, as it seeks to transition in scale and so on between the development and the residential. Can you explain the rationale for that a little bit further? It seems to me that it's a very large building, very close to the boundary, and then you have the residential, you know, just a few metres from the fence.

MS HARRAGON: So there's probably a couple of things that I might mention in terms of setting the scene for my comment. The LEP determines what the outcomes are for a particular zone by its implementation of development controls. Ku-ring-gai
30 Council has chosen not to impose height or FSR requirements on this particular zoning but it has imposed them on the adjoining land and it also has imposed another height and FSR on the high-density development, which is located at the top of the corner of Avon and Pymble Avenue.

So our reference in the Department to the methodology that the architect has used in relation to this building bulk is to step the building down from its maximum height to a two-storey podium, as it aligns and adjoins the part of the common boundary with the low-density development. This provides a transition between the larger, already
40 significantly larger buildings on the PLC campus, it provides a transition between those buildings to the low-density which adjoins it in that particular area. So that's the reference to where our comments came from.

MR PILTON: Thank you. Soo-Tee or Sherrie, would you like to ask questions, or - -
-

DR COAKES: Thanks, Adrian. Karen and team, I would just note in the previous development assessment and consent, there was very much a strong emphasis on increasing those setbacks further than the limits and also minimising the height and obviously as a result of that we saw a lot less concern raised by community around that. Just your comment on that. I mean, obviously the original height of the health
10 centre in its previous form, as it was intended to be, was lower than this particular building. Yeah, just interested in your perspective on that, given that was such a strong justification in that previous consent.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah. So the reference is to the health building is that envelope that we've referred to in our application, which was a quite small activity, and had a very low sort of level of functioning. So clearly in order to deliver the increased functionings that the school has considered is necessary to meet the needs of the school, they've had a need to increase the scale of that building. So certainly we would agree that the difference between that envelope that was approved under the
20 previous development is fairly substantial in change. Notwithstanding that, our view would still be that the maintenance of what would be more than reasonable setbacks to this new increased-scale building warrants there to be justification as to allow it to still continue and be reasonable and supported.

DR COAKES: Okay. Thanks, Karen. And just one other question. Obviously the government architect, is their third round of advice, continued to raise that issue around solar access for those two residences in particular. The Department is comfortable that that's been addressed adequately, in terms of, you know, from a social impact perspective, there is definitely a social impact on those two residences,
30 given their proximity, and it will impact, I guess, their way of life, in terms of how they use their properties. There's a number of rooms obviously that back directly, which are used for bedrooms and studies and living areas. Yes, I, do you - you're comfortable that the solar access issue is adequately, has been adequately addressed?

MS HARRAGON: Yes, the Department, when putting its mind to solar access, has regard to what relevant considerations it puts its mind to. There are often different circumstances in terms of the background provisions that might exist in a local GA, a local government area - - -

40 DR COAKES: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: - - - as compared to another. So in this instance we've used the standards that the Ku-ring-gai Council itself delivers for providing certainty for what's acceptable impacts to low-density residential development and it's on the basis of that that we consider the impacts are to be, are reasonable, and I guess that would be the approach that the Council would be taking, if it was actually considering an adjoining house being built on any land, as to whether that four-hour access is achieved and this development, whilst substantially larger, has still managed to achieve the same sort of standard that is required by Council for all other developments that would be local development. Even though it is quite a large building, it's for that reason that it's stepped back at the podium to that next storey, that next podium height.

10

DR COAKES: And we acknowledge there's obviously been some quite considerable changes to the building as a result of that, as a result of some of those issues. Okay. Thank you.

MR CHEONG: Hello, team. In your report, and also the applicant's report there, all referred to ADG as a standard for, to justify the bulk and scale in the setback, but the ADG is more for residential, the residential situation. In this case, you've got a different use to a low-density residential. Would you not expect a buffer zone between the two uses?

20

MS COOMAR: I will take that question. Thank you. Yes. So we have used Apartment Design Guide just as a guidance because, as we understand, there are no LEP development standards that apply to that, that particular campus and that particular zone. So that basically leads us to just do a merit assessment of that development, while acknowledging that ADG applies to residential and residential, the intent of the ADG is to retain the amenity of the low-density environment, as well as the high-density environment, when there is a zoning transition and the two types of developments are located next to each other. In that circumstance, we consider that the ADG controls can be applied logically to this sort of a development. The Department has considered similar other developments, such as the sports centre for Sydney Grammar School, where we had applied ADG just to understand how the buffers can work, and whether the low-density developments amenities can be retained. So noting that, we used that guidance, and the applicant used that guidance as well to apply the buffer zones.

30

MR PILTON: What about noise during construction? Are there any suggested conditions about hours? Because that's very close to the boundary with heavy machinery and so on. I haven't looked at the conditions yet, so - - -

40

MS COOMAR: Yes, there are conditions of consent for standard construction hours and respite periods, plus community consultation requirements which may impact on the respite periods, and should be acknowledged and amended through the construction noise and vibration management plan.

MR PILTON: Thank you. And the dance studios - I note on the drawings that the dance studios that are facing the properties have got double-opening doors out onto the terrace. Do you know why they have double-opening doors? Will they open those doors during dance sessions, or do students want to come out and dance on the terrace,
10 or what? I can obviously ask the applicant this, but - - -

MS COOMAR: No, that's okay. So our understanding from the noise and vibration assessment report is that the majority of the dance studios would actually be submerged, therefore they will be acoustically proofed. With the double-opening windows, the double-opening doors are most likely due to maintain the acoustic insulation. The acoustic report recommends that those doors be closed during all dance programs, and there are specific requirements, so we have recommended all those in our conditions of consent, and additionally the Department has also
20 recommended another condition requiring the applicant to monitor, to undertake a noise assessment and monitoring within two or three months after they commence operation. Once they do the monitoring, they need to validate the results against the recommendations of the noise assessment report.

MR PILTON: Thank you. Sherrie, anything else?

DR COAKES: No, no, nothing else from me, thank you.

MR PILTON: Soo-Tee?

30 MR CHEONG: One other query I just wanted to say. In the Department's assessments, point 3.27, one of the bullet points point out that the design of the building is a result of the function of requirements. Who actually determined that requirement? How do you arrive to justify the bulk of the building, the requirements as essential for that?

MS HARRAGON: So I might just make some commentary around the role of the State Design Review Panel. So there's actually a process by which the applicant goes through with the State Design Review Panel that arrives at why the building that's part of the development is actually going to be delivered, and that includes their approach
40 to how they're making decisions on the site and how the functioning of the building occurs. So whilst I'm not giving you a hundred per cent answer to that, it's just by

way of background, that that process is actually one where they have to go through those three steps to generate a level of agreement from the State Design Review Panel that their methodology in approaching the outcome is an acceptable one.

Clearly, there's some envelope or plate sizes that are needed for some of those activities in that building to allow them to function, such as some of those more accessible areas for the gym classes, or, sorry, for the dance classes. We don't find their conclusions to be inconsistent with what would be a reasonable evolution of design needs being interpreted into an actual final development and I don't believe
10 SDRP found any problems with that development either, in terms of the evolution of need of the functions of the building.

MR PILTON: Thank you. Can I just ask a question, which may or may not be relevant? You say there's no cap on numbers. Is there any chance that in the foreseeable future the Department would put a cap on numbers for the school? All of the other schools I've been looking at in the last year or two all have caps.

MS HARRAGON: I can understand where the IPC's interests, and also obviously the council's and community's interests are, in relation to the cap. I guess foremost in our
20 mind is the requirement that we need to have regard to the nexus between this actual application and student numbers. If there was a scenario under which this application was actually asking us to visit and make a determination on whether current student numbers were adequate or should be allowed, I believe it would be open for the consent authority to form a view on whether a cap or current student numbers is appropriate. We just don't believe that the scope of this application before us would provide that reasonable grounds under which a nexus could be directly related to an imposition of student numbers, given that this application doesn't seek to increase student numbers at all, but that's something that the IPC could revisit themselves.

30 MR PILTON: Thanks, Karen. I don't have any more questions to take. Soo-Tee, Sherrie?

MR CHEONG: I don't.

DR COAKES: No, all good. Thank you.

MR PILTON: Well, thank you very much, Karen and Aditi and Nahid.

MS HARRAGON: Thank you for the opportunity to present.
40

MR PILTON: Yes, thank you.

MS COOMAR: Thank you, everyone.

MR PILTON: Goodbye.

MEETING CONCLUDED

[10.13am]