



TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

**RE: PYMBLE LADIES' COLLEGE SECONDARY INNOVATION
PRECINCT (SSD-79146716)**

DEPARTMENT MEETING

COMMISSION PANEL:	CLARE SYKES (Chair) JULIET GRANT
OFFICE OF THE IPC:	KENDALL CLYDSDALE ISAAC CLAYTON
DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, HOUSING & INFRASTRUCTURE:	KAREN HARRAGON MADELINE THOMAS TRAKI GOTSIS
LOCATION:	ZOOM VIDEOCONFERENCE
DATE & TIME:	11:30AM – 12:30PM THURSDAY, 2 nd JULY 2026

THE MEETING COMMENCED

5 **MS CLARE SYKES:** Good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge that I am speaking to you from Cammeraygal land and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the lands from which we virtually meet today, and pay my respects to their Elders past and present.

10 Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Pymble Ladies' College Secondary Innovation Precinct state significant development application (SSD-79146716) currently before the Commission for determination.

15 The Applicant, Pymble Ladies' College, proposes to demolish four school buildings and construct a six-storey building in the centre northwest portion of the Pymble Ladies' College campus. The project includes demolition and earthworks, tree removal, construction of the partly four/part six-storey new building, minor changes to car parking and landscaping works. No increase to student or staff numbers proposed.

20 My name is Clare Sykes. I'm the Chair of this Commission Panel, and I'm joined by my fellow Commissioner, Juliet Grant. We are also joined today by Kendall Clydsdale and Isaac Clayton from the office of the Independent Planning Commission.

25 In the interest of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. 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.

30 It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify any issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and not in a position to answer, you may take the question on notice. And following the meeting, the Commission will advise you in writing of any questions taken on notice that the Panel considers requires a formal response to. Any subsequent response or information provided to the Commission will then be published on our website.

35 So, I request that all participants here today to introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other, to ensure accuracy of the transcript.

40 So, we will now begin, and thanks very much for joining. We are sort of working to an agenda which you have received as part of the meeting. So, we might just quickly go around and do introductions, just name and position for the transcript purposes. So, thanks, and over to you, Karen.

45 **MS KAREN HARRAGON:** Good morning, Commissioners. Just for the purposes of recording our participation here, I'm Karen Harragon, Director of Social Infrastructure Assessments, and I'll get my team to introduce themselves and then I'll start the presentation.

MS SYKES: Thank you.

MS MADELINE THOMAS: Hi, my name is Madeline Thomas. I'm a Team Leader in the Social Infrastructure Assessment Team.

5 **MS SYKES:** Hi, Madeline.

MR TRAKI GOTSIS: My name is Traki Gotsis and I'm a Senior Planning Officer in the Social Infrastructure Assessments Team.

10 **MS SYKES:** Hi Traki. So, thanks very much, So, Karen, I do believe that you have presentation material, so over to you to run through each item on the agenda.

15 **MS HARRAGON:** Thank you. Traki is going to be managing the actual presentation slides itself, and he and myself will be sharing the presentation. So, just to start off, as you are aware, I'm being joined by my two colleagues, Madeline and Traki, both from the Social Infrastructure Assessment Team.

20 Our presentation today will provide a summary of the development application for Pymble Ladies' College Secondary Innovation Precinct, and you'll hear us referring to that, for shortness, as the SIP, that precinct, and the development as the SIP Building. And we're going to present today a summary of the issues relating to the items provided, including our understanding and acknowledgement of the agenda items that have also been shared with us through the IPC secretariat.

25 The project was referred to the Commission, as the Kur-ring-gai Council has objected to the proposal. In addition to Council's objection, the Department received two submissions by way of objection from the public. And two submissions from utility providers. Traki is going to present on behalf of the Department today. We'll be happy to address any questions during the presentation, but we're also hoping to provide an opportunity at the end of the presentation as well. Please feel free to ask questions at
30 any point. I will now ask Traki to begin the presentation. Thank you.

MR GOTSIS: Thank you, Karen. Firstly, I just would like to check if there's any issue viewing the slide?

35 **MS SYKES:** No, that's fine, thank you Traki.

MR GOTSIS: Thank you. My name's Traki Gotsis, I'm a Senior Planning Officer at the Department in the Schools Infrastructure Assessments Team. And today's
40 presentation will provide a project and site overview and then address the items on today's meeting agenda.

45 So, the Pymble Ladies' College is an established school site at 20 Avon Road, Pymble, within the Ku-ring-gai local government area. It has operated as an educational establishment since 1916 as a primary and secondary school for young women. The campus is a 20-hectare site and the development site for the Secondary Innovation Precinct, which I'll be referring to as 'the SIP' from now on in this presentation, would be located in the central northwest portion of the site, covering an area of approximately 10,000 square metres.

The project would require the demolition of four school buildings to accommodate the part four, part six-storey SIP Building for science, technology, engineering and mathematics teaching. It also includes a Campus Commons which would be a large open space area including an amphitheatre, soft and hard landscaping, and pedestrian connections to the wider PLC campus. The SIP's use would be for secondary school operations and for after hour school runs, special events. There is no proposed change to student or staff numbers.

The wider hectare – sorry, the wider 20-hectare school campus is predominantly adjoined by residential development and is located 200 metres walking distance from the Pymble Train Station, with close proximity to the Pacific Highway. The school campus contains a range of school buildings and facilities and areas of open space. It also contains areas of vegetation consisting of Blue Gum High Forest and Sydney Turpentine Forest as well as non-native vegetation.

The closest adjoining development to the development site is residential properties along Avon Road, and this image shows the development site in the context of the campus boundary and adjoining residential development.

In Council's most recent advice, issues were raised regarding urban design, biodiversity, construction parking, and contamination. Regarding urban design, Council's concerns relate to the six-storey northern façade as it faces Avon Road and the potential for resulting visual impacts. Regarding biodiversity, issues related to the demonstration of avoidance and minimisation by the Applicant, and the loss of high-value trees within the development site.

Council recommended construction worker parking be detailed through the Construction Traffic Management Plan, with efforts made to reduce parking demand. Regarding contamination, Council's preference was that the detailed site investigation demonstrate the site is suitable for the proposed use, or that a Remediation Action Plan be provided prior to determination. This is due to the Applicant not having tested below existing building footprints.

And the following slides will now speak to the items on the agenda and give a brief overview of those aspects of the proposal.

This image shows the SIP Building adjacent to the flagpole. At this elevation, the SIP Building presents as four storeys in a stepped design, and the land falls 9 metres towards Avon Road. At its northern elevation, shown here from an aerial viewpoint, the SIP Building would present as six storeys, with a rooftop plant enclosure. This image also shows the location of the Campus commons in relation to the SIP Building, the adjoining existing and retained school buildings, and the Blue Gum High Forest corridor running along the Avon Road boundary.

Visual impact imagery was provided by the Applicant, and this image shows where the building would lie behind existing trees within the site boundary along Avon Road, and how a person might view the SIP Building through those trees.

Continuing with visual impact, this section indicates potential viewpoints from the public domain towards the SIP Building. What this section suggests is the Blue Gum High Forest corridor would provide a level of screening between the SIP Building and the public domain.

5

Drone imagery was also provided by the Applicant at three different elevations to show the density of vegetation as seen from the northern elevation of the SIP Building. This image represents a 10-metre elevation drone image and shows the density of vegetation at this height, looking towards Avon Road. Or I repeat, what you're looking at here is a viewpoint from a 10-metre elevation looking towards Avon Road, and behind those trees would be residences located along Avon Road.

10

Regarding biodiversity, we can see from this –

15

MS SYKES: Traki, if I can just interrupt there, if that's okay if we could perhaps have questions as we go along. Just back on the visual assessment.

MR GOTSIS: Mm-hm.

20

MS SYKES: It was interesting about the visualisation and the drone imagery provided by the Applicant. Did you have any comment that there was the assumption in the Assessment Report around the adjoining trees reaching 30 to 50 metres in height, but I guess in consideration that vegetation may not be static, you know, or may not reach that in consideration of any potential loss to disease or storm damage. Did you have any comment on that aspect, around that assumption of height?

25

MR GOTSIS: Could I just confirm if you're speaking to the proposed replacement tree planting or the existing vegetation along the corridor?

30

MS SYKES: It was Figure 38 to 39, which is, no, the current mature trees.

MR GOTSIS: Current. Well, we did – the Department's assessment considered the SIP Building in isolation and needed to consider whether or not that building presentation was suitable in the context of the residential streetscape, regardless of whether or not there were trees there.

35

MS SYKES: Yes.

MR GOTSIS: Well, I guess we didn't consider the partial loss of those trees and viewpoints if that had occurred. But we did balance the need to assess what was there, being vegetation that provides screening, but also if that vegetation were to no longer be there, would the building itself be suitable. And the conclusion was that due to the architectural treatment of the northern façade through the curved brick design, the colours and materials, the glazing which was minimal I think at 30%, that in the context of an educational establishment adjoining residential area, that that – that the SIP Building and its northern presentation was suitable and acceptable in itself.

40

MS SYKES: Okay. Thank you. That's good.

MR GOTSIS: And so, we're moving onto biodiversity. And we can see in this image that the development site is marked in yellow, and how it intersects with the location of Blue Gum High Forest shown in green. The Blue Gum High Forest within the development site was categorised in the Applicant's BDAR as being of low to moderate value, and this is explained by the history of disturbance within the development site due to the existing school buildings and hardstand areas and general school activities.

The Applicant was required to provide avoidance and minimisation analysis, which included alternative locations for the SIP within the development site, a reduced and redesigned SIP Building, increased height and split building options within the development site. A wider campus relocation analysis was also provided. Ultimately, these options were rejected by the Applicant, who stated that the alternative investigated would either result in an increased biodiversity impact or would not achieve the educational needs of the school.

The NSW Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water were also satisfied at RTS stage that the Applicant demonstrated how the proposal was adequately – sorry, had adequately avoided and minimised impact to the Blue Gum High Forest.

The Department recommends conditions for replacement planting to be consistent with the Blue Gum High Forest species, the appointment of a project arborist to supervise and monitor tree protection during works, and an ecosystem offset requirement of 3 credits. Operationally –

MS JULIET GRANT: Sorry, before we go off that one, could I just ask, when we were talking to Council earlier, they raised a couple of concerns. One was that the BAM Method wasn't suitably implemented because there wasn't sufficient avoidance analysis. But what you've just described, it sounds like you and DCCEEW were both satisfied that there had been sufficient analysis of alternative scenarios to satisfy that avoidance was appropriately thrashed out, so to speak.

MR GOTSIS: That's right. What I can speak to is their most recent advice, which was submitted to the Department through their RTS. At that stage, the Applicant had not provided a wider campus relocation analysis. The Applicant undertook that analysis and provided additional plans to support those studies. And the Department was satisfied that they had undertaken sufficient avoidance-minimisation analysis according to the BAM.

MS GRANT: Would that material, that additional material had been sent to Ku-ring-gai Council, would they have had access to that?

MR GOTSIS: Ah ... It wasn't directly sent to them, no, however, the information was published on the public portal. So, what I mean by that was I didn't send it to them directly, but the information was published on the portal, so it was available for them, yes.

MS GRANT: Okay. So, they may or may not have seen it. One of the other things that they mentioned is that the VMP for that corridor was based on assisted regeneration rather than re-planting, replacement planting and that they were concerned that the regeneration wouldn't be sufficient or fast enough because there were some trees that did need to be removed and so that it would open up that exposure and hence linking back to the built form issue from previously. Do you think does the Department's condition adequately cover the option of whether it's just assisted regeneration versus the additional planting and renewal?

MR GOTSIS: My understanding is, and I can confirm that the VMP included additional planting up to 4,000 new plantings, not all of those would be planted as mature trees, obviously, and wouldn't result in mature trees. But there certainly is replacement planting, it's not just assisted regeneration, from my understanding.

If required, we can provide that additional context after the meeting. However, my understanding is that there is actually additional planting within that VMP area. There's two management zones for the VMP, and across those two zones – I can't remember the exact figure; however, I know it was over 4,000 new plantings, and those plantings would be consistent with the Blue Gum High Forest.

MS GRANT: Thank you.

MR GOTSIS: We've moved on to operational staff and visitor parking. Operationally, there's no increase in staff numbers proposed, however, the project would result in loss of 10 staff and visitor parking spaces due to the conversion of six board member spaces into a shared staff and board member allocation, and four spaces being removed from the flagpole area. Five spaces would be reinstated at the Centenary Car Park which is currently being used for storage. So, the resulting permanent loss of staff and visitor parking would be five spaces.

Special events such as robotic competitions and school presentations within the SIP Building's auditorium would be run after school hours, where on-site parking demand would be reduced.

The school has a live Green Travel Plan in place which commenced to reduce staff vehicle mode share from 77% to 65% within three years, with annual monitoring and annual reporting requirements to the Planning Secretary until approximately 2032, and then every two years thereafter.

Conditions recommended by the Department include the requirement for the school to retain a minimum of 426 spaces and for special events to be capped at 10 events per calendar year. A standard condition for an Out-of-hours Event Management Plan for events of 100 people or more is also recommended in the consent, which would include traffic and parking management strategies to accommodate the out-of-hours events.

Moving onto construction worker parking. During the estimated 24-month construction phase, construction worker parking would be provided on site. A total of 50 spaces would be provided; 40 would be provided at the Kelso Car Park, with a

further 10 spaces provided on the service road behind the SIP. The estimated demand for construction parking was 46 spaces, and that was estimated by the Applicant. And that was based on 115 workers with a 40% private vehicle mode share.

5 To address the potential for overflow parking off site, the Department requested that
the Applicant conduct on-street parking surveys to demonstrate the ability of streets
surrounding the site to accommodate construction worker overflow parking if that
occurs. Survey results show that on-street parking was at or near to capacity. To
10 address this, the Department recommended a construction worker transportation
strategy through a standalone condition, which would detail the provision of parking
on site and any other measures such as carpooling initiatives to minimise the demand
for on-street parking. Yes.

15 **MS SYKES:** Could we possibly go back to the previously slide, which is – oh, the one
previous to this, the staff and visitor parking. We’ve noted with our discussions with
the Applicant, and that the staff numbers ... The staff numbers, you know, there’s
currently no cap on staff members at the PLC. And we’ve also noted that the, you
know, that staff numbers have increased over the years, and I’m just wondering if you
could comment on any measures, you know, what measures has the Applicant
20 implemented to demonstrate that a corresponding increase in staff parking is not
required.

Like you note there, there will be a sort of overall school site loss of five. But
certainly, history has shown that the staff numbers have certainly increased over the
25 years. So, I just wondered if you could comment on that.

MR GOTSIS: Yes. I appreciate that question, and I would assume the increase in staff
may or would be as a result of an increase in students, which was formalised through a
DA consent from Council in 2024 which increased student numbers to 2,550, which
30 corresponds with the current student numbers lodged with the EIS. Therefore, student
numbers – pardon me, staff numbers have increased.

What we’ve considered is the Green Travel Plan. A Green Travel Plan was lodged
with the EIS. Although it doesn’t contain specific details to reflect the SIP proposal,
35 the reduction of car parking spaces for staff, it also – it doesn’t speak numerically to
other parts of the school campus and previous consent. So, it’s an open live document
which applies to staff and students generally.

And what that Green Travel Plan does is provides quite detailed objectives to reduce
driver mode share across students and staff, particularly with staff, the survey results,
40 where that 77% currently drive to school, and their target is to reduce that to 65%.

MS SYKES: Okay.

45 **MR GOTSIS:** The Department understands that that is a working document and those
targets haven’t been met at present. However, with the annual reporting requirements
and annual surveys that the school will need to do, in combination of its location close
to Pymble Train Station and bus routes along Pacific Highway, we were satisfied that

we weren't necessarily required to, in our opinion, press the issue of the staff numbers at the stage of lodgement.

MS SYKES: Okay.

MR GOTSIS: So, we received ...

MS SYKES: Okay. So, just to clarify there, so it's really the Green Travel Plan and the implementation of that and the monitoring of that, that will ensure that any future increases – or would address any sort of adverse traffic impacts related to potential increase in staff over a time.

MS HARRAGON: And can I perhaps answer, just in terms of clarifying. There's a previous approval issued by the IPC that imposed a precinct-wide or a school campus-wide Green Travel Plan that Traki is speaking to. If the IPC is of the view that it would be of a more strident instrument that we could provide a condition that specifies that this development be operated in accordance with that, so that there's a direct link between the two.

At the moment, it was just determined that we didn't want to put another Green Travel Plan, that there was already a campus one, but we could certainly provide an additional condition that is very clear that is the operation of this facility is linked to that, which was issued under the other instrument.

MS SYKES: Okay. Thanks Karen and Traki, that's great.

MS GRANT: And just to confirm, the condition, the consent, the 2024 consent that you mentioned, that kind of set the staff and student numbers, is that an operational consent?

MR GOTSIS: It was just to – it was a Council consent just to increase student numbers, it didn't increase staff numbers.

MS HARRAGON: We're only privy to seeing the instruments, so we would only be making assumptions on what the Council put in their mind when they were determining that the impact of those increased student numbers were going to have more broadly and holistically. But there's no evidence that we've had put in front of us that, that the numbers that were being told that are operating on this site have caused serious detrimental impacts to the management of the road network.

MS GRANT: Yes, yes. Thank you.

MR GOTSIS: Thank you.

MS SYKES: And Traki, if we could just pause on the construction worker parking. I'm just wondering if you had any comment on the Applicant demonstrating that construction vehicles accessing the gate (Gate 2) will not impact the use of the Kelso Car Park, which is a good proportion of the current spaces for construction and it will operate at a tandem arrangement.

MR GOTSIS: Definitely appreciate that question, and what we had lodged at RTS stage was an aerial plan of the car park showing the location of the parking spaces. We weren't provided with details of the construction routes and areas as they relate to those car parking spaces within the Kelso Car Park. Those details will be provided in the final Construction Traffic Management Plan. So, further than what was provided in the RTS, we don't have any additional details to that.

MS SYKES: Okay. Thank you. So, that will be inclusive of information on how the proposed tandem parking arrangement will operate in practice.

MR GOTSIS: That's right. It will provide a car park layout plan to demonstrate that the 40 spaces that they're seeking in the area of a 30-space parking area would work, and it would also provide details of construction vehicle movement within that area, full details will be provided in that plan, yes.

MS SYKES: Thank you. Juliet, did you have any more questions on either the staff or construction worker parking?

MS GRANT: Only that Council queried whether 40% private vehicle mode share was achievable. And if we're relying on the Green Travel Plan that was previously imposed, the campus-wide one which, you know, it functions as one whole campus, so that makes sense. Does that Green Travel Plan, is that consistent with a 40% vehicle mode share for construction workers, or did that Green Travel Plan not relate to construction and was just operation?

MR GOTSIS: Correct, it's just to operation. And I would suppose that, pardon me, it's the Department's ... Within the assessment period, we had considered the point that you're making in relation to 40% private vehicle mode share. We subsequently asked for on-street parking studies to be conducted, to show whether or not the on-street parking availability would perhaps be able to accommodate any overflow vehicles, if that 40% wasn't achieved. So, but to answer your question more directly, the Green Travel Plan doesn't cover construction worker parking, it's just for the operation of the school itself.

MS GRANT: Okay. And which consent was that, was that the Grey – the other, the most recent precinct development, that that Green Travel Plan was linked to?

MR GOTSIS: That's right, the Grey House Precinct consent provides a detailed Green Travel Plan condition with monitoring and reporting requirements.

MS GRANT: Cool, thank you.

MR GOTSIS: Five to six years after operation commences, which I believe is now or soon, later this year. So, it ties in with the consent, the potential consent of this application, the timing.

MS GRANT: Thank you.

MS THOMAS: It's Madeline here, I thought I would just add too, the Green Travel Plan more of an operational document whereas there's specific conditions requiring a Construction Worker Parking Plan as well. And as part of the Department's consideration, we've also factored in the fact that the staff, in terms of being established users with patterns of driving to work, it'd be quite a different nature to construction workers potentially. And have also factored in that the site is readily accessible by public transport, with the train station being 200 metres away.

MS SYKES: Thank you. Thank you for that. I think we're good to proceed, Traki.

MR GOTSIS: Okay, thank you. During the construction phase, staff parking would be temporarily re-shuffled – 59 spaces will be lost at the Condo Car Park and 30% – 30 spaces, pardon me, would be lost at the Kelso Car Park. Forty-six spaces would be added at the Back Court Car Park, sorry, I'll backtrack slightly – the 59 spaces are lost at the Condo Car Park is to accommodate for 14 demountable school buildings that will be placed there during the construction phase.

And moving onto what spaces will be added. Forty-six spaces would be added at the Back Court Car Park, which is currently used for the Grey House Precinct construction worker parking. And four spaces would be provided at Junior School, two surrounding the flagpole. And 24 spaces would be formalised along the southeast portion of the oval. A further seven spaces would be provided at the Gordon-Pymble Uniting Church, which is an off-site location approximately 700 metres from the main gate entry, that being Gate 1. And an agreement between the school and the church was provided by the Applicant in their documentation for their use of that car park during the construction phase.

MS GRANT: Is that off-site parking for construction or for relocating of staff parking?

MR GOTSIS: Staff parking.

MS GRANT: And is there any issue with that being off-site and that church not, the church having its own consent for how it operates, and an assumption, I guess, that the spaces at the church are for church purposes?

MS HARRAGON: We'll have to take that one on notice, thank you.

MS GRANT: The Condo Car Park, you said with the loss of the 59 spaces, did you say that's where demountable classrooms were going?

MR GOTSIS: Correct, that's right, yes.

MS GRANT: And so, was there an assessment of what the impact of having classrooms there for that period was?

MR GOTSIS: We required the Applicant to provide a cumulative impact assessment to consider the location of those – the loss of the parking spaces and the location of the demountables. Originally, there were little details regarding the demountables; there

wasn't a location plan or any indication of where they may be, and through the assessment we required that information. Subsequently, they provided an indicative location plan to show where they would be, and it confirmed that the loss of 59 spaces would occur. So, there was some level of assessment.

5

MS GRANT: I was thinking of assessment of, if you've got, if you've got demountable classrooms there close to the edge, close to the resi boundary, assessment of noise or impact from the classrooms. But maybe that's a temporary ...

10

MR GOTSIS: That's right, it is temporary. To answer the earlier part of your question, there was no specific noise assessment undertaken for those demountables and the potential noise impact on the residents.

MS GRANT: How many demountables are there?

15

MR GOTSIS: Fourteen.

MS GRANT: All right.

20

MS HARRAGON: So, I will get this clarified, but my understanding is that those demountables are being installed through an alternate pathway that the Department doesn't have power to otherwise not allow to occur.

MS GRANT: Okay.

25

MR GOTSIS: Yes, I'll clarify as Karen has, that those demountables didn't form part of this application.

MS GRANT: Oh, okay.

30

MS HARRAGON: Yes, we do definitely an overarching holistic understanding of impact, there is a separate SSD guideline that forms our expectation on cumulative impact considerations. But there's a limit to which we can, you know, overarch on something that's got its own pathway of approval.

35

MS GRANT: Yes, I understood, that's why we haven't really heard about those 14 demountables, now it makes sense, yes.

40

MR GOTSIS: Thank you. Construction noise. This image shows the SIP shaded in blue and the proximity of the development site to the three closest existing school buildings. And noise modelling of these existing school buildings was not conducted by the Applicant, and therefore the Department has recommended conditions for noise modelling of all sensitive receivers, including retained school buildings, to be conducted before work commences.

45

And for a communication protocol requiring noisy works to be scheduled according to the school calendar, written notification [clears throat], pardon me, requirements during expected high noise and vibration periods, and for points of contact between the school and construction contractors to be established before works commence.

MS SYKES: Traki, just to clarify there, that includes the Science and Colonnade buildings which obviously would have existing students and staff?

5 **MR GOTSIS:** That's right.

MS SYKES: Great.

10 **MR GOTSIS:** Yes. Regarding contamination. As existing building footprints were not tested as part of the detailed site investigation, the Department has recommended conditions requiring further site investigations to confirm the full nature and extent of contamination within the development site. If any contamination above safe levels is found, a Remediation Action Plan would need to be prepared by the Applicant.

15 Lighting. The Applicant has stated that after hours use of the SIP would be limited to ground and lower ground floor areas, such as during special events in the auditorium, and that the design and installation of internal and external lighting would meet the relevant Australian Standards.

20 The Department has recommended conditions requiring evidence to be provided that all lighting, external and internal, has been designed and installed to comply with the relevant Australian Standards. These standards met a maximum light – sorry, these standards set maximum light levels (known as LUX) before and after 10 p.m., with the aim of ensuring that light spillage from internal and external building lighting is not
25 offensive or obtrusive.

MS GRANT: In that assessment, that offensive and obtrusive, relating obviously to the nearby residential development, was there any thought to what it also did for the biodiversity – the fauna in that vegetation corridor?

30 **MS HARRAGON:** I'm happy to answer that. It's not unusual for us to have regard to biodiversity and typically we would be identifying that where there was evidence in the BDAR of a species that might have issues, particularly fauna, that might be light sensitive. We've certainly had projects before, where we've put very strict conditions
35 on where there might be a nursery for flying foxes. We're not aware of there having been any fauna picked up in the BDAR that would suggest that they were light sensitive, but we can certainly speak back to our colleagues in that agency to confirm that for you, if you'd like.

40 **MR GOTSIS:** I'll move on. So, to conclude, the Department considers that impacts have been appropriately assessed, and impacts would be acceptable subject to conditions to manage residual impacts. The project delivers modern secondary education facilities and new Campus Common open space, with no increase in student
45 or staff numbers.

Impacts on biodiversity have been avoided and minimised, with residual impacts offset and managed. Construction and operational impacts can be appropriately mitigated through conditions and post-consent monitoring. And the project is consistent with the SP Zone, SP2 Zone and applicable SEPPs and is not contrary to the public interest.

The Department recommends the project be approved, subject to the recommended conditions of consent. Thank you for your time, Commissioners, and that's the end of my presentation.

5

MS HARRAGON: Thank you, Traki, you can stop presenting your slides. So, we're available if there's any other matters that the Commissioners would like to raise or ask of us.

10

MS SYKES: Thank you very much, Traki, for that presentation. And from my perspective, the next agenda item is about the Department's recommended conditions of consent, whether there was anything in that aspect or any other matters to raise as part of the meeting. I think that from my perspective I have covered the main questions and points throughout the presentation, and thanks very much for covering those as we interrupted you, Traki, through your presentation – that was very helpful to do that as we sort of had that fresh in our minds.

15

Juliet, did you have any questions or matters you wished to raise?

20

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

MS SYKES: Okay. Well, with that in mind, I just wanted to invite, Karen, Traki and Madeline, whether there were any other points you wished to raise that have not yet been covered.

25

MS HARRAGON: No, we're satisfied that we've presented today, that represents the outcome of the recommendations of the Department. So, we will take on board and deliver to the IPC those matters that we've agreed to respond to, and also the follow-up matter. Thanks.

30

MS SYKES: Okay. Thank you very much. And so, with that in mind, I think we're probably ready to close the meeting a little ahead of time, get a bit more time back in the day, and thank you very much for your time today to cover those items, and we'll draw the meeting to a close.

35

MS HARRAGON: Thank you.

MR GOTSIS: Thank you.

40

MS GRANT: Thank you.

THE MEETING CONCLUDED