



## AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

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

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

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

## TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

---

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

---

O/N H-1384602

### **INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION**

### **PUBLIC MEETING**

### **RE: BLUE GUM COMMUNITY SCHOOL**

**PANEL:** **PETER DUNCAN (CHAIR)**  
**ADRIAN PILTON**

**LOCATION:** **VIDEO CONFERENCE**

**DATE:** **10.04 AM, WEDNESDAY, 10 FEBRUARY 2021**

MR DUNCAN: Good morning, and welcome to the Independent Planning Commission's electronic public meeting on the State Significant Development application for Blue Gum Community School. My name is Peter Duncan and I am the Chair of this IPC panel. Joining me is my fellow commissioner, Adrian Pilton.

5 Before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands on which we meet and pay my respects to elders past, present and emerging.

Blue Gum Community School proposed the adaptive reuse of an existing dwelling, Mt Errington, which is listed as an item of local heritage significance in the Hornsby Local Environmental Plan 2013. The proposed adaptive reuse is for a new preschool with capacity of 32 students aged three to five years, and primary school with capacity for 48 students aged six to eight years. In total 80 students and nine staff.

10

Commissioners make an annual declaration of interest identifying potential conflicts with their appointed role. For the record, no conflicts of interest have been identified in relation to our determination of this State Significant Development application. You can find additional information on the way we manage potential conflicts on the Commission's website.

15

In line with regulations introduced in response to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, the Commission has moved this public meeting online with registered speakers provided the opportunity to present to the panel via telephone or video conference. In the interests of openness and transparent, we are livestreaming this meeting via our website. As always, this public meeting is being recorded. We will make a full transcript available on our website.

20

25

The Independent Planning Commission was established by the New South Wales Government on the 1st of March 2018 as an independent statutory body operating separating separately to the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment and other agencies. The Commission plays an important role in strengthening transparency and independence in the decision-making process for major development and land use planning in New South Wales.

30

The key functions of the Commission include determining State significant development applications, conducting public hearings and public meetings for development applications and other matters, and providing independent expert advice and any other planning and development matter when requested by the Minister for Planning or the planning secretary.

35

The Commission is the consent authority for State Significant Development applications for which there are reportable public political donations, objections by the local council or more than 50 public objections. The Commission is not involved in the Department's assessment of the project or the preparation of its assessment report.

40

45

The public meeting forms one part of the Commission's process. We have also undertaken a site inspection and met with the Department, the applicant and Hornsby Shire Council. Transcripts of all meetings have been published on the Commission's website, and the State – and the site inspection notes will be published by the end of the week.

After today's meeting we'll – we may convene with relevant stakeholders if clarification or additional information is required on matters raised. The Commission will be accepting written comments from the public up until 5 pm on Wednesday, the 17th of February 2021. That's 5 pm next Wednesday.

Following today's meeting, we will endeavour to determine the development application as soon as possible, noting there may be a delay if we find that additional information is required. The Commission invites interested parties, including stakeholders and members of the public to make submission they consider appropriate. The Commission is particularly assisted, however, by submissions that are responsive to the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment's assessment report and recommended conditions of consent.

The Commission has available to it all submissions already made to the Department during exhibition of the Environmental Impact Statement, and members of the public are encouraged to avoid duplication of submissions they have already made on the application. The Commission also notes that there are factors that by law it is not permitted to take into account in making a determination, and submissions on such topics cannot be taken into consideration.

Before we proceed, I'd like to outline how today's meeting will run. First up, the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment will present the findings of its whole of government assessment of the application, then we will hear from the applicant. We will then proceed to hearing from the registered speakers in orders set out in our published schedule. I will introduce each speaker when it's your turn to represent to the panel. All speakers were advised of their speaking time ahead of the meeting.

It's important that everybody registered to speak receives a fair share of time. As such, I will enforce timekeeping rules, and as chair I reserve the right to allow additional time when it is needed to present new material. There will be a one-minute bell prior to completion of your presentation and two rings at the end. If you have a copy of your speaking notes, or any additional material to support your presentation, it would be appreciated if you could provide a copy to the Commission.

Please note any information given to us may be made public. The Commission's privacy statement governs our approach to your information, and our privacy statement is available on our website. Thank you for attending today's electronic public meeting. It's now time to call our first speaker, Karen Harragon, of the Department. Please proceed, Karen.

MS HARRAGON: Good morning. Thank you for inviting me today. I am the director of social infrastructure assessments at the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment. I'm here to outline the Department's approach to the whole of government assessment and its recommendations in relation to this project. A  
5 detailed description of the proposal is contained in the Department's assessment report. In the interests of time today, I'm not going to provide a further update on that information; however, the proposal as revised in the applicant's response to submissions report seeks approval for the adaptive reuse of an existing heritage listed dwelling, Mount Errington, as a new primary school and preschool.

10 The proposal includes alterations and additions to the dwelling, the provision of onsite parking and access, tree removal, landscape works and fencing. The development would accommodate 80 students, including 48 students aged six to eight years and 32 students aged three to five years. This constitutes a primary  
15 school and centre-based child care facility up to year 3.

I'm going to quickly touch on the project's State Significant Development designation. A State Environmental Planning Policy may declare any development or any class or description of development to be State Significant Development.  
20 Clause 15 of schedule 1 of the State and Regional SEPP specifies that any new school is State Significant Development. So the school component is declared to be State Significant Development, which I will refer to as SSD.

Clause 8, subclause (2) of the same SEPP has a default requirement. It requires that  
25 the Department is to start from the position that the non-SSD components of an application are also declared to be SSD. In this instance, I'm referring to the child care centre. The clause requires that it should only carve out those components of an SSD application if the Department determines that those non-SSD components are not sufficiently related to the development as a whole.

30 In putting its mind to the nexus and interrelationships between the school and the child care activities, the Department is satisfied that it is appropriate that both those components of the development be considered as part of the same application, and that a whole of project assessment is necessary. For this reason, the Department is of  
35 the opinion that the operation of a child care centre is sufficiently related to the proposed school and, as a consequence, the whole of the proposal is declared to be SSD.

I'm now going to speak to consultation in response to submissions process. 54  
40 individual public submissions, including 52 objections and one objection from a special interest group were received by the Department in relation to the exhibition of the application. Council were generally supportive of the proposed adaptive reuse of the dwelling house, allowing for long term conservation, subject to condition requirements, but raised a number of strong concerns and provided comprehensive  
45 comments on potential heritage impacts.

As part of its assessment, the Department engaged the services of a specialist heritage consultant, MG Heritage, who also reviewed the application. Two response to submissions reports have been submitted by the applicant in response to the issues raised during the consultation period. The applicant's response to submissions  
5 responded to issues raised by council, submissions received and the Department's issues, including those in the independent consultant report. The report also included revisions to the proposal.

10 The issues I'm going to focus on in my presentation today are those items that the Department considers are very unique to this site, are interrelated and cannot be considered in isolation. These include traffic access and parking, heritage considerations and managing bushfire.

15 In relation to access and parking and traffic, approximately 89 per cent of the public's submissions to the EIS objected to the proposal on the grounds that the proposed school would result in congestion, with 70 per cent of submissions objecting because of the loss of street parking. A peer review of the applicant's transport assessment was also prepared on behalf of an interested community group, and was included in part of their objection to the EIS.

20 The applicant's RTS states that the peer review traffic report submitted by the residents and dated February 2020 was prepare prior to the lodgement of the SSD application and related to a previous Lakewood development application submitted with council. The submitted transport assessment undertaken by the applicant and  
25 submitted with the EIS considered by the Department had considered those issues that had been previously raised and had addressed them in their EIS.

30 Based on council's and Transport's comments, which raised no concerns regarding traffic generation, and the Department's own assessment, the Department is satisfied that traffic generated by the proposed development can be, and would be able to be, accommodated within the local road network. The applicant proposes, in addition to the assessment risk, more measures such as staggering the drop and pick up times, as well as staff on duty acting as traffic controllers. The Department is satisfied that  
35 this will ensure that the vehicle movements in and around the site do not cause disruption to the community. Appropriate conditions have been recommended in that respect.

40 In relation to car parking and access, as part of the review of the original car parking access arrangements, in response to strong heritage concerns, the Department requested that the applicant explore additional alternative parking and access scenarios, in addition to those that were already provided in the detailed EIS. This information was requested to determine what different options were available to safely manage the efficiency and safety of movements onsite, as well as to reduce heritage impact, including impacts to significant trees, the remnant tennis court and  
45 reliance on street parking.

The applicant has investigated design alternatives and options A, B, C and D were provided in the RTS report, and they can be reviewed online starting from page 53 of

the RTS report. Following its review of options A, B, C and D, the applicant's RTS concluded that onsite parking would be the preferred option in lieu of reliance on street parking, and they considered it would satisfy the council's requirements, as well as responding to community concerns.

5

The Department supports the applicant's revised proposal to include and provide car parking spaces within the site, and for these to be appropriately accommodate necessary staff and visitor parking within the site to reduce any unreasonable impacts on the locality. The Department considers this will provide a balanced outcome between heritage impacts, amenity, pedestrian safety and management of parking. This arrangement would not unreasonably impact on the available car spaces within the street. The applicant's RTS amended the layout of the internal car park and the relocation of car parking spaces to the south side of the existing tennis court area to ensure that amenity issues with adjoining properties was also reduced.

15

The Department considers that the proposed number of car parking spaces onsite as revised is appropriate for the development. Occasional special events at the school would be for short durations, typical to preschool and lower primary school children, activities with their parents. Additionally, the surrounding locality would have capacity to accommodate additional parking demands if needed, and this would include overflow parking for infrequent parent events.

20

The Department has recommended a condition requiring the layout of the proposed car parking facilities, including parking for bikes, be designed in accordance with the relevant Australian standards. The Department has also recommended that an events management plan be provided and prepared prior to the event on the – the first event onsite which would accommodate more than 50 people.

25

I'm now going to touch on bushfire, in particular, the potential impact in relation to the landscape setting of the heritage item. The child care and school components of the application both result in the development being considered a special fire protection purpose development under the Rural Fires Act. It should also be noted that the existing seniors development which adjoins the site also has the same categorisation under the Act.

35

The extract of the council's bushfire prone map confirms that the site is only marginally affected by land identified as a vegetative buffer along a narrow, short band along the front boundary. Council's bushfire prone map also depicts the subject site as being only partly within the 100 metre buffer from a category 1 – from category 1 vegetation. The dwelling subject to the proposed repurposing as a school and preschool, in this instance, the heritage item, is located outside of that 100 metre buffer zone.

40

The applicant's bushfire report concludes that there is no bushfire hazard that is located within 100 metres of the subject building in any location – sorry – in any direction. The site is required to be managed as an inner protection zone, and the enduring management of that zone must comply with the Planning for Bushfire

45

Protection requirements. The application and the bushfire assessment both refer to the Rural Fire Service, who concurred with the conclusions and recommendations of the applicant's bushfire consultant, including the identified bushfire management measures. The Department concurs with the conclusions reached by the Rural Fire Service in relation to its application of recommended conditions.

Community submissions also raise concerns that the proposed location of the future school would hinder the evacuation of the entire locality during bushfire events, due to the narrow roads and the large number of proposed students. Submitters also indicated that the low water pressure that is experienced in the area would restrict the ability to fight a fire. In addition to the bushfire risks and the identification of necessary management requirements, the consultant also gave consideration to these concerns and, including the suitability of access and egress in the locality, and the provision of services, including the proximity to fire hydrants. Evacuation and access to the services was identified as being adequate.

Council and the community also raised concerns that they would not support the application if further tree removal was required to occur in order for the site to be managed as an Inner Protection Zone. In response, the applicant's bushfire consultant provided an addendum bushfire report. This report is available on the Department's website. The report provides further detailed analysis of the considerations that determine the management of landscaping onsite, having regard to the particular circumstances of the site, and which will be required to be satisfied to achieve compliance for the site being managed as an Inner Protection Zone.

The addendum report prepared by the bushfire specialist provides evidence indicating why no further need to remove additional trees is necessary in order to achieve the requirements for an Inner Protection Zone. The Department finds these conclusions to be reasonable and consistent with the recommendations in the original assessment report that was provided to Rural Fire Service. Further, the applicant indicated that specific consultation with Sydney Water has confirmed that there is no concerns regarding the adequacy of the water pressure or mains in order for appropriate firefighting activities to occur.

The Department is satisfied that the site would be suitable for the development, subject to conditions of consent, is not dependent on additional tree removal or relying on others to achieve a compliant Inner Protection Zone. The Department is also satisfied that the management of the site for bushfire would not significantly impact on the heritage significance of the site, particularly in respect of heritage setting.

I'm not going to speak to more detail about heritage. Approximately 76 per cent of the public submissions objected to the proposal on the grounds that the site – the proposal will have an adverse impact on both the heritage listed dwellings and gardens within the Mount Errington Precinct, as well as the Heritage Conservation Area. Mount Errington house and gardens is locally listed as a heritage item, and it sits within the Heritage Conservation Area of the Hornsby West Side Mount

Errington Precinct. Several adjoining properties are of local heritage significance, as are street trees on Rosemead Road and Dural Street.

5 The significance of the buildings and its curtilage, the contributory elements of the listing, as well as the Heritage Conservation Area, are fully detailed in the applicant's statement of heritage impact. The house, the remnant garden setting, the loose gravel driveway and the mature plantings are all significant heritage elements. Council is generally supportive of the proposed adaptive reuse of the heritage item, as it would prevent the use – the site from being further – being subdivided in the future and  
10 would enable its long term usage and maintenance; however, the – during the exhibition of the EIS council raised significant concerns about several aspects of the development, including removal of the front gates, the removal of trees within the front setback, as well as the widening of the driveway.

15 In response to the submissions received in the Department's assessment of the EIS, the Department engaged an independent consultant, GML Heritage Limited, to review the impacts of the proposal on the heritage values of the site, including the council's comments in this regard and the large number of issues raised by the community in relation to heritage. The GML report concluded that the proposed use  
20 of the dwelling as a school is an acceptable use for the site, ensuring that the house and garden are occupied and maintained into the future. The new use would also ensure that the dwellings remain eligible as a large Arts and Crafts house in a substantial garden setting; however, GML did agree with many of the council's other concerns and made several recommendations in relation to the development,  
25 including the need for potential revise options being investigated.

As a result, the applicant was requested to respond to concerns raised by the heritage peer review report, council's comments and issues raised by the Department. Consequently, the response to submissions report and the supplementary response to  
30 submissions report included a revised proposal, including minor amendments in response to the heritage concerns.

So I'm just going to quickly talk to you about the impacts on the listed building. The proposal, as revised in the RTS, includes further conservation works, including  
35 polycarbonate protection to leadlight on doors, the retention and restoration of the existing timber flooring in the entry foyer, retention of nib walls for interpretation, and slightly moving the rear fire stairs so that it enters the first story of the building through an existing window and still reducing impacts to the dwelling façade's fabric.

40 The applicant's response to submission also explores options to retain the first floor balustrade in situ, but given the proposed use, this was not considered feasible for the safety of children and staff. The statement of heritage impact addendum confirms that the height of the balustrade is balustrade is not compliant with the national  
45 construction code and would need to be amended. The installation of a secondary balustrade to achieve a compliant height behind the existing fabric is not preferred, as it would have negative impacts on the fabric and be intrusive to the elevation.



The response to submission also includes an addendum statement confirming that the existing roof is causing water leakage, and should be replaced with a new roof to prevent further damage. The material and design of that roof would be made to match the existing tiles, including the use of the Canadian Slate. The Department is satisfied, having regard to the evidence provided by the applicant's heritage specialist, that the proposed adaptive reuse as proposed by the – as proposed in the revised proposal would ensure long term sustainability of the significant heritage listed welling, while allowing for the proposed works to the dwelling to be reversed for the potential use of the site as a residence in the future, should that occur.

In relation to the contributory landscape setting, council raised significant concerns regarding impacts to the landscape elements of the heritage site, and council recommended the applicant investigate an alternate driveway design which would retain identified significant trees within the front setback, including the opportunity for a second driveway from William Street, with alternate fencing and driveway material.

Community submissions also raised significant and similar concerns regarding the alteration to the garden fencing and, especially, the loss of tree canopy within the site. The GML report that was requested by the Department concur with the majority of the concerns raised by council. GML, however, indicated that the second driveway crossing on Rosemead Road and the associated tree loss was acceptable, as the trees are of moderate to low significance in that particular area of the site. GML did emphasise the importance of the retention of the gates' post driveway alignment landscape items of significant, T111 and T112, as well as alterations to the proposed fencing.

In response, the applicant's RTS considered four detailed design options, which were detailed – and which were considered in the Department's assessment report in detail. Based on the analysis of options A, B, C and D, which are contained in the applicant's RTS, it was concluded that none of the alternate options could be implemented in their entirety, due to the identified consequential problems each one would create. Thus, the applicant submitted a revised site layout, as contained in the revised supplementary RTS that combined options C and D. This resulted in an amended proposal that had the following changes to the garden and site layout.

Vehicle access into the site would remain from Rosemead Road using the existing driveway, but including realignment and widening to a small extent. Retention of most of the front garden, except for the provision of a new driveway and removal of a small number of trees associated with the new access driveway; however, the proposal includes creation of another access point to the northwest corner to allow one-way internal vehicle movement within the site via a road loop. Widening the existing driveway will also result in the removal of two significant trees in the front setting, reference T111 and T112.

A pedestrian walkway with a covered pergola from William Street and a new gated entry is proposed to ensure the demarcation between vehicle movements and

pedestrian movements. Removal of the existing fence, gate and installation of a new fence and gate to Rosemead Road to match the existing style is now proposed. Interpretation of the remnant grass tennis court as a car parking space with 10 car parking spaces, but with car parking flipped to the southern side is part of the revision. Removal of 41 trees in total and the replanting of three trees and shrubs within the site is part of the revised package.

The Department considers the proposed development as revised, subject to the recommended conditions in relation to heritage, would result, on balance, in satisfactory heritage impacts in respect of the built form and landscape considerations. I'm just going to quickly move to my conclusion.

The Department's assessment, in summary, concludes that the relatively small scale development is a permissible development and the impacts of the surrounding development regarding heritage, traffic, visual privacy, tree loss and noise are considered acceptable. Further, that residual impacts can be managed by recommended conditions of consent. Thank you for your time today.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Karen. I'll now – I'd now like to call on Jill McLachlan to speak on behalf of the Blue Gum Community School. Jill, I understand you're being assisted by Jeff Mead, as well, the school's town planner.

MR MEAD: Thank you, Mr Chair. I'll just start briefly before handing over to Jill. Essentially, the way that we wanted to make our submissions – as you know, we have made detailed written submissions and so we need not go through those in a great amount of detail. I'll hand over to Jill in a moment to introduce the school and their background coming to this site and the clear nexus between the Blue Gum ethos and the proposed adaptive reuse of this site. After that, I'll deal briefly with some planning aspects if time permits.

Our other consultants are not in attendance today, but, obviously, they've made some previous submissions both in writing and orally to the panel in previous meetings, and they'll be available to make any additional submissions following the close of the meeting before the 17<sup>th</sup> of February if there's any matters arising in today's meeting that require some further attention.

Before handing over to Jill, we note that we support entirely the assessment by the Department. It's a thorough assessment, and concludes that the proposal is in the public interest and the impacts of the proposal are acceptable and can be appropriately managed by the recommended conditions of consent. We accept the recommended conditions of consent, but for some very minor changes that are the subject of our written submissions, and we need not go through those in any detail, given the minor nature of some of those changes that we request.

The assessment recognises that the proposed development will allow for the adaptive reuse of Mount Errington, and will facilitate its ongoing conservation. The

Department has recognised that the proposal is in the public interest ..... and that there is an acceptable level of impact.

5 We note that the outcomes on the site and recommendations of the Department are testament to the positive approach of our client. The proposal through the assessment period off the back of comments both from council and the Department's officers, as well as the consultants on our project team, have led to exploration of a number of options for the site. There's been testing of very – of a vast range of different ways of approaching this site and its planning, and that has been the source of much discussion with the Department throughout.

10 In our view it's that tireless working of options and testing that has led to the solutions on the site that lead to such a positive recommendation. I'll hand over to Jill now, but for closing to say, again, we thank the Department for their assessment. 15 It's thorough. We agree with its conclusions and we accept the recommendation and the conditions that are put forward. I'll hand over now to Jill.

MS McLACHLAN: Thank you, Jeff. Well, good morning to Commissioners Duncan and Pilton, Director Harragon, Mayor Ruddock, fellow speakers and those 20 watching online. I would like to begin today in the same manner as Commissioner Duncan did, respectfully acknowledging our First Nations People, past, present and emerging. In particular, today I would like to acknowledge the Darug and Guringai Nations, recognising them as the original custodians of the country on which Mount Errington was established. As the current caretakers of this land, may we go forward 25 in a manner that suitably honours the values, teachings and culture of this nation's first peoples, following in their footsteps as teachers, learners and protectors of this site.

30 Mount Errington has also benefitted from other faithful custodians over the years. To talk of custodians is to speak of those who watch over, oversee, protect something or someone. I would like to take this opportunity as the New South Wales education director of Blue Gum Community School to offer my thanks to all those present today, both those standing in support and those objecting to the Department's assessment for the different ways each of you have worked to protect the future of 35 this important site. Thank you also to Hornsby Shire Council, the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment and the Independent Planning Commission for your professionalism and attention to detail throughout this application process.

40 Noting that the purpose of today's meeting is for the Commission to hear views on the Department's assessment report, I would like to speak to the key issues that were identified in the report, namely, historic heritage impacts, traffic impacts and noise impacts. Firstly, in relation to historic heritage impacts. In 2017 Maureen Hartung, executive director of Blue Gum Community School, identified the Hornsby Shire as the best fit region in Sydney for the establishment of a new campus of our Canberra 45 school. The Hornsby community's strong focus on the arts, protecting the environment and planning for the future resonated strongly with our own hopes and intentions as a school community.

If Blue Gum were to establish a sister school in New South Wales it would be for and within the Hornsby Shire. Once our location of choice was finalised, the search began for a suitable site to establish a small early childhood school. What many may not realise is that we were definitely not looking for a heritage listed dwelling to  
5 purchase. If I had known in advance how hard this mountain would be to climb, I may have just run for the hills.

When Mount Errington was open for expressions of interest in December 2017 my husband, Kurt, and I simply went to an open house for a stickybeak. Little did we  
10 know where that would lead. My first ever walk through Mount Errington was an emotional one. As we moved through the home, and then as we walked out into the rear gardens I couldn't escape the thought that this remarkable site could be a perfect setting as it was for our hoped for early childhood school. The rooms were large, centred around foyer spaces ideal for our approach to teaching and learning. The  
15 gardens were expansive and flourishing. So many other sites in Hornsby of a similar size were in industrial areas, barren of trees and beauty.

With the 4.3 million dollar price tag at the time, I was walking through the impossible dream, but as we were to learn nothing is impossible. The untimely  
20 passing of the much loved previous owner of Mount Errington meant the home was taken off the market in early 2018. Even before then, the lack of interest from residential buyers, council's advice to potential developers that subdivision of the land would not be acceptable and a dropping housing market meant that the unaffordable Mount Errington was slowly becoming more of a possibility for our  
25 not-for-profit school.

After many months of discussions with the new owners, who initially considered partnering with us in the project, in August 2019 Best Practice Education Group Limited finalised the purchase of the site for \$2.9 million with an intention from day  
30 1 to celebrate and protect the house as it is.

We love the home's history, and feel its significance is the perfect reason for it to be reimaged as a school with its doors wide open to the community. It shouldn't be a private jewel locked away for a privileged few. The DA alone has done much for the  
35 recognition of this site locally and beyond, giving it a platform of public acknowledgment. We agree fully with the conclusion of both the council and the Department that our proposal is in the best interest of the site in the way that it will ensure a viable long-term use of the dwelling and ensure its conservation.

40 The assessment report outlines the many recommendations made and the concerns raised by council throughout the lengthy assessment process. At a recent meeting Ben Jones, town planner for Hornsby Council, concluded succinctly that council's concerns have been adequately addressed within the assessment report and the recommended conditions. This was reinforced by the comments of Alison Bangs,  
45 Hornsby Council's heritage architect and planner, who stated:

*Overall, we've deemed it to be a minimal adverse impact, so we, council, have no further issues in terms of heritage and any outstanding issues have been covered in the conditions of consent provided.*

5 From our perspective, both Ben and Alison's comments represent the success of the ongoing consultation that was undertaken with Hornsby Shire Council. We have been pleased to work alongside them and the Department at all stages of this process to ensure the best outcome for this site from multiple perspectives. As perhaps best articulated by our heritage consultant, Paul Rappoport, director of Heritage 21:

10

*We have taken a cautious and considered approach to this design, keeping uppermost in our minds the conservation of the building and the gardens.*

15 The designs – the design applies what Paul describes as “maximum reversibility”, meaning that all of the interventions into the building can be removed without damage to the heritage building. Positioning the new entry, the car park and the children's outdoor play areas to the rear of the property were all designed with protection of views to the front façade of Mount Errington. The alteration of the railing on the first floor veranda represents one change which was required for reasons of safety compliance. As stated in the Department's report:

20

*Department representatives noted during the site visit that the existing balustrade is extremely low and not safe for use, even as a residence.*

25 The proposed design of the new railing was prepared in consultation with our heritage architect, ensuring the new balustrade echoes the current design, albeit at a safer and more suitable height for any future users of the site. Making the same point, the Department's assessment report notes:

30

*The applicant's design encapsulates the spirit of the original while complying with relevant standards.*

We would like to acknowledge today that one unavoidable impact is associated with the proposal resulting from the widening of the driveway, and it is the removal of two historically significant trees likely to have been early plantings on the site. These two trees are, firstly, a large clump of giant strelitzia and, secondly, a mature cabbage-tree palm. With a name like Blue Gum, please know that we would not accept the removal of one tree on this site without cause. We appreciate the Department's assessment of many alternatives – the many alternatives considered in the return to submissions stage. Each of these options was assessed from multiple points of view to ensure the final design chosen was, on balance, the proposal that would lead to the smallest overall impact to the site.

35

40

45 It is perhaps worth highlighting that while the proposal does impact these two significant plantings, it protects many more than that number. Those protected by this proposal also listed on the State Heritage Inventory include the English Oak, the Bunya pine, the liquidambar and the lemon scented gum. The proposed circular

driveway and new exit onto Rosemead Road has also been designed carefully to further protect ..... trees on our street frontages on Rosemead Road and William Street, as well as minimising the impact on the heritage listed gardens at the front and eastern side of the property.

5

Now, in relation to traffic matters we recognise that traffic is one of the key issues of concern to neighbours who have objected to the proposal. Minimising potential impacts from traffic and parking has been a priority to us through the design and assessment phases of this process. We were pleased to read in the Department's assessment that the surrounding road network has capacity to accommodate traffic and parking demand generated by the school, subjected to the recommended conditions regarding onsite traffic management. We also note that Hornsby Shire Council and Traffic New South Wales have no concerns regarding traffic generation due to the development.

15

In relation to acoustic matters, in our opinion, schools belong in neighbourhoods. Residential streets are the most common locations for schools to be situated, and we do not believe the noise of children playing outdoors is a negative impact on the community. That said, it is of utmost concern to be respectful and aware of any potential noise impacts on residential receivers. We have been pleased that the proposal has not triggered objections from the many neighbours who adjoin our property on the eastern side of our block.

20

Notably, the home that adjoins our side on the western boundary is set back 35 metres from the dwelling and proposed outdoor play area. This represents a generous acoustic barrier – buffer on the western side of Mount Errington. Given the substantial setbacks and the mitigation and management measures proposed, we are in full agreement with both the council and the Department's assessment that operational noise emissions from the site would have no significant impacts on nearby residents.

25

30

Having now responded to the key issues of the Department's report, I would finally like to draw your attention to an important, but seldom mentioned positive impact of this proposal. With this adaptive reuse, children will benefit greatly from learning in this unique context; invited to dwell in a place of great beauty both in and out of doors. The generous, grand and homely spaces on both levels of the building offer a distinctly non-traditional context for schooling, inviting children to think and play in a place of beauty shaped by aesthetics.

35

As adults, we are drawn towards beautiful spaces. They inspire us and activate our imaginations. Certainly, the same can be said for children. We believe strongly in the importance of providing educational contexts for children that are full of beauty. Mount Errington offers us that.

40

History has shown that the most – the world's most passionate and influential environmental warriors are those who fell in love with nature – in love with nature as children. It makes sense, and what better place to fall in love with the natural world than in the

45

lush gardens of Mount Errington, or exploring other parts of the Hornsby Shire that are within walking distance of our gates.

5 If what I have said is true of nature, that the best protectors of the natural world are those who have learned to love it as children, we propose the same is true of heritage. The best way to ensure the ongoing protection of Hornsby's history and heritage in the generations to come will be to allow children to enjoy it in the present. Appreciation follows encounters. We look forward to the possibility of fully stepping into our custodial role of this beautiful site by opening the gates of Mount  
10 Errington to children, their families and the wider community. I thank you for providing an opportunity to share our views on the Department's assessment report in this public meeting, and if there is time I'll hand back to Jeff Mead to conclude our presentation.

15 MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Jill. Yes. Jeff, quickly, if there's anything more you wish to add.

MR MEAD: Thank you, Jill, and thank you, panel members. I don't have much to add in the sense that Jill has dealt largely with many of the technical issues to the  
20 extent of the conclusions made in the assessment, and has also given a very good background to how Blue Gum have come to this site and what they're trying to achieve for the site. What we would say in planning terms, a classic adaptive reuse of a heritage item. Unless there's any questions on our submissions, that is all we have to say and, again, we thank the Department for their report, the assessment and,  
25 again, endorse its conclusions and accept the recommended conditions of approval. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Thank you, Jeff. We have no further questions at this time. Thank you. I'd now like to introduce Elizabeth Roberts, Hornsby Shire  
30 Historical Society. Please proceed, Elizabeth.

MS ROBERTS: Good morning. I'd like to thank the Commission for allowing me to address them on behalf of the Hornsby Shire Historical Society. I'd also like to thank Jill McLachlan for inviting me to visit and show me the restoration they have  
35 carried out. Although a lot of the issues in our original submission have been addressed by the GML report, we still have a number of concerns about converting one of our major heritage listed houses into a school.

The main issue I wish to address today is the gardening and the widening of the driveway. We recall we have a very early photograph, circa 1910, of Mount  
40 Errington that shows the garden. We have sent you a copy in two parts. It shows the original plantings and the front fence. The photo shows what I believe is a young cabbage-tree palm, and the well-established clump of Giant White Bird of Paradise. These are shown as the trees 111 and 112 that other people have spoken of. The  
45 photo also shows the Bunya pine in the street and Stag horns.

We strongly object that it's proposed to cut down the 100 year old cabbage-tree palm and remove much of the 100 year old plantings of the Bird of Paradise. The photo show this section was an area of plantings, while the rest of the front garden was lawn, garden beds and a hedge. We believe it would be a better option to sacrifice  
5 the 12 to 15 year old lemon scented gum, tree 114, than to – than the approximately 100 to 120 year old cabbage-tree palm and the 100 to 120 year old clump of Giant White Bird of Paradise. The garden has evolved over time, now having much less lawn than it used to, and contains plants that are not now seen in modern gardens.

10 Another issue we're concerned about are school excursions. The plans show the front garden will be used for school excursions. This is a major concern, especially with the car parking on the tennis court. The playgrounds are quite small. As a long time parent-activist, I can see parents pressuring the school to allow the older  
15 children to spend lunchtime and morning break and before school in the front gardens. If consent is to be given to the school to go ahead, there needs to be an added clause to protect the heritage listed front gardens.

Something along the lines of the front gardens can only be used as a passive learning area during class time, and must not be used for free play, especially during  
20 lunchtime, morning and/or afternoon breaks or before or after school hours. The front lawns are not to be used for fetes, weddings or garden parties; conducted garden tours and supervised working be permitted.

That's the sort of clause we would like to see you adding. The Jacaranda Trees are  
25 also of heritage significance. Mrs Roberts, the wife of Oscar Garibaldi Roberts, the original owner of the garden, was particularly fond of Jacarandas, and as new houses were completed in the streets around, particularly William Street, she propagated and delivered these trees to all the new residents as they arrived, and these trees can still  
30 be seen as street trees and garden trees in Rosemead Road and William Street.

To recap, we want the 100 year old cabbage-tree palm to be retained. We want most, if not all, of the Giant White Bird of Paradise to remain. We want restrictions on the use that can be made of the heritage listed front garden, and as a side issue, I think  
35 the school name is an unfortunate choice, given that the local pub has long been known as the Blue Gum. Thank you, and that's my submission.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Elizabeth. Thank you for your presentation. I'll now call on Jan Primrose to make a presentation. I believe, Jan, your presentation will be  
40 audio only; is that right?

MS PRIMROSE: That's correct. Are you hearing me clearly?

MR DUNCAN: Yes. We can hear you.

45 MS PRIMROSE: Terrific. Thank you very much. Good morning, Commission, Chair and members. This proposal does not achieve a balance between the low level benefits of a small school providing a small number of jobs and little economic input,



just \$600,000, and managing, minimising or mitigating the impacts on the heritage and biodiversity values of this heritage listed item, the magnificent Mount Errington Estate, which the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment, we'll call them DPIE, reports acknowledges is of significant heritage value. We categorically reject  
5   Hornsby Shire Council's assertion reiterated by DPIE that:

*The proposal would ensure a viable long term use of the heritage listed dwelling and gardens.*

10   It is currently a five bedroom home of 464 square metres. That's smaller than many of the McMansions we have around Dural and Glenhaven. DPIE and council's statements infer that this heritage listed home can't be guaranteed a viable long term use without it being turned into a business. That is nonsense, and not just a home business. A business that will have significant, irreversible, detrimental impacts on  
15   the heritage values of this outstanding intact heritage home in perpetuity. A school.

Mount Errington was purchased by the applicant in July 2019 for 2.59 million. Just six months ago, a similar home in Hornsby, the Summers Estate, a grand 1890s Queen Anne style home was sold as a family home for 2.75 million. Council knows  
20   there's a demand for these prestige homes. DPIE and council's statements about ensuring a long term – a viable long term use are simply a justification to support this proposal and are not based on facts.

Mount Errington has a viable use as a highly sought after heritage home. I myself  
25   have lived in heritage houses for most of my life, and have enjoyed the benefits of these well-built spacious houses with extensive mature gardens. They're irreplaceable, and we don't just have metaphorical philistines living in this shire.

The applicant has made little, if no attempt at effective community engagement. We  
30   received an invitation to discuss the development with the applicants, and another community group for the first time ever four days ago. At such short notice we, obviously, couldn't meet that. The DPIE report conclusion that:

35   *The proposed external alterations to the building, the gardens and removal of trees would have some impacts on its heritage significance.*

Is a masterclass in understatement. This is a rare intact Arts and Crafts masterpiece that hasn't yet been tampered with. Yet is the key word. Once modifications occur, the heritage values of these homes decreases significantly. The next modifications  
40   will then be justified on the basis that the home is no longer intact. Hornsby Shire Council will then agree, because it doesn't effectively argue to protect the shire's heritage against appropriate works.

Hornsby Shire residents are fed up with seeing the last of our intact heritage  
45   businesses and curtilages being irreversibly altered with little basis and merit and poor justification from the applicants and council alike. After almost 20 years of neglecting heritage, current councillors have now instigated a complete LEP

inventory. I'll detail some of the appalling alterations that will irreversibly alter the heritage values of this home.

5 The front balcony is to be removed and raised. That will ruin the lines and balance of the front arched portico with balcony above that form central visual feature of the façade of the building. These heritage buildings are finely proportioned, and changing the balcony will ruin the balance of the front façade of the building. Since when is it okay to make heritage buildings ungainly and ugly.

10 The front gates are being removed. At first it was said they were too narrow, and when that didn't work, it was said that they were old and rotting. They're timber gates, so they can be easily fixed if there's a real desire to preserve the heritage significance of this property. The gates must be retained, and retained in situ. Residents don't want to hear that the replacement gates will respect the original ones.  
15 We want the original heritage kept, otherwise it's not heritage, is it. It's just a poor facsimile.

A hole will be punched through the slate roof to install a skylight. Internal walls are being demolished on the first floor. Doorways are being widened. The whole of the  
20 upper floor is to have the timber floor replaced. If the floors aren't integral to the fabric of the building, I don't know what is. They'll replace lovely old wide hardwood floors with cheap pine flooring, just because they have to put in soundproofing for a school. Who on Earth agreed to this.

25 We don't care if council didn't object to that. This council has an appalling record for preserving heritage. To replace heritage flooring, usually, the skirting boards have got to come off. Heritage buildings aren't Lego sets. I've restored enough of them to know that they don't go back together again like Lego blocks.

30 The existing slate roof is to be replaced. That's the original slate roof. Slate rooves last hundreds of years. If there's leaks, then fix the leaks. Don't replace the roof. Next, we'll have an interpretive sign that says, "Mount Errington was here". Council did that to the oldest cottage in Epping, because – wait for it – the original fabric had been altered and, euphemistically, replaced. So that applicant said the heritage  
35 values had been irreversibly diminished and the cottage got demolished, and all of the above is before we even get to the proposed damage to the heritage listed gardens of Mount Errington. We're stunned that section 6.1.45 of the DPIE report says that trees – that the trees to be removed:

40 *...within and adjacent to the tennis court compromise plants – comprise planted species with low retention value and poor contribution to the site's heritage values.*

45 These are Black Oak trees of the locally significant Blackbutt Gully Forest that are up to 25 metres in height and half a metre in diameter, and the arborist report does not say that they have a low retention value. They certainly do contribute to the

heritage value of the site, because they're remnant and regrowth forest, as referenced in DPIEs report.

5 We are similarly outraged that 41 trees are being removed, with only three replacement trees. That's even contrary to council's Green Offsets Code, which requires at least the same number of trees be replaced. Hornsby Shire councillors have already rejected a proposed new offset code that suggested shrubs as replacement for trees, which this report is trying to do. The council's staff keep agreeing to it anyway.

10 The report states that the removal of significant trees 111 and 112 are unavoidable for safe access, ie, for the new driveway. Then the heritage site simply isn't suitable for the new driveway. Justifying the removal of those trees by saying it will open up views of the house, we think, is a bit facetious. Full frontal views of homes were never the ..... intent of heritage gardens. The DPIE report says that no more trees will be removed for the bushfire Inner Protection Area, and that conditions of consent will protect the rest of the trees in perpetuity.

20 How can any tree be protected in perpetuity. It can't. It's a hollow promise. All the native trees will eventually be felled, because the first big branch that drops, as native trees do, the school will say the tree is dangerous to children and it'll be felled, and why a black paling fence. That's not just historically inaccurate. It's downright ugly. It's a modern architect's poor, unimaginative interpretation of heritage. Someone needs to give these people a copy of Colour Schemes for Old Australian Houses by Ian Evans, Clive Lucas and Ian Stapleton, respected heritage architects. 25 Nothing was painted black. Nothing. That was the colour for funerals and mourning clothes, and it should be nowhere on this site, including those ugly black monolithic fire stairs.

30 In conclusion, we think this is one of the worst examples of adapted reuse of a heritage listed dwelling that Hornsby Shire has seen. A more long term, sustainable option for the site is to maintain and retain the dwelling and gardens as a prestige home. Council knows it could ensure the site would be protected by a subdivision. It could even do a lot size amendment during its current LEP heritage review. In 35 conclusion, this proposal does not achieve a balance between the low level benefits of a small school, which provides a small number of jobs and little economic input, again, just 600,000, and managing, minimising and mitigating the impacts on the heritage and biodiversity values of this magnificent heritage listed item, nor can any residual impacts be managed by consent condition. We believe this proposal should 40 be resoundingly refused. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks, Jan. I'd now like to introduce our next speaker, Philip Ruddock. Mr Ruddock, I should acknowledge that you're the mayor of Hornsby Shire Council; however, I believe you're speaking as a local resident today; is that 45 correct? Sorry. We haven't got your audio for some reason. Still not there. Is – are you on mute.

MR RUDDOCK: I hope I am now.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. We can hear you loud and clear. Thank you.

5 MR RUDDOCK: Thank you very much. My apologies, first. Can I welcome the opportunity to participate with you. Can I share in the acknowledgement of country and pay my respects to our Indigenous forebears, and can I say that I do come to speak as the mayor, but I do not speak on behalf of council, because we do not have a resolved position. I suspect if we were asked to have a resolved position, I may be  
10 given that authority, but I don't have it, but you should not read too much into that, because it's not a matter that we have considered.

I don't usually participate in these forums. I watch. I welcome the work that you undertake, but I don't offer views, because, essentially, the planning decisions have  
15 been taken from us as a council, but, occasionally, there are matters that I regard as being of particular significance, and when you have more than 50 objectors, you know that people are very concerned about what is being proposed.

We've been doing a lot of planning work recently, and if we get some – over 20  
20 submissions, we feel we're lucky. 50 means there is very, very considerable local interest, and the impacts on the heritage qualities are a part of it. The tree loss, the traffic generation, the safety of vehicle movements, bushfires, noise are all issues that have been raised.

I want to enforce, because I think it was suggested by two people that council doesn't value it's heritage. Councils come and go from time to time, but I have to say that we do not have many significant examples of heritage buildings. Parts of shire, Pennant Hills, for instance, was the third place of European settlement. It was the pennant on the hill. When I think of the nature of the properties that we have that are  
30 of a heritage quality, for an area that was part of our original history in this way, they are few and far between.

I want to make the point about the Arts and Crafts movement. It's not the federation buildings. They're a smaller genre of heritage items. Frank Lloyd Wright was the  
35 original proponent of this heritage form of architecture. I have visited some of the Arts and Crafts residence that are kept in Chicago that were designed by him. We have few examples of this character in the shire. We're going to see very significant development around Hornsby in the future, and Hornsby is being very careful about where we are planning it, and we are wanting to see the open space areas able to be  
40 linked with the higher development that will occur around the station area itself.

It's going to present, in the longer term, very significant traffic issues. More significant than we have now, and I think, in that context, with the establishment of what is going to be called the Centennial Park of the north, on the old quarry site,  
45 adjoining Rosemead Avenue, as you know, heritage buildings in this particular area are, in my view, going to be more important than ever, and the way in which I see

this particular development, I see it as being, and I use this term very deliberately, an incremental degradation in the heritage qualities of the building.

5 I acknowledge that the developers have brought forward a very considered plan to be able to use this building for the establishment of its school and to try and acknowledge the heritage, and I recognise how they've tried to deal with that, but in my own judgment I don't believe that you can make sufficient modifications that will ..... the heritage of it. In other words, I see the proposals as being incompatible with its heritage character. The fire stairs have been one aspect. The building areas that  
10 are going to be altered are another. They're adjusted, because you have to have regard to children's needs, but they do derogate from the heritage.

I think it's known that Hornsby is putting a great deal of emphasis into its bushland character. It's a unique area, and we have been very anxious to ensure that we're  
15 able to retain our character into the future, and when you have developments of this sort, where you're going to take out something like 40 trees to facilitate the development, I see that as being incompatible with it. The residents have highlighted that the proposed work, including the driveway changes, the footpaths and other facilities have a significant impact upon them, and I think they are part of the  
20 incremental derogation that I particularly find unwelcome.

I acknowledge that efforts have been made to try and accommodate our particular desire to deal with what is seen to be a State Significant Development, but I have to say the planners may think it's appropriate, but I look at the, sort of, developments  
25 around schools and preschools in urban areas as providing very, very significant challenges, and I think it needs to be done in a much more thoughtful way than it is, and if you haven't gathered, I think this site doesn't lend itself to this development no matter how much effort is put in to trying to ensure that it can be made responsive to some of the concerns that I have outlined.

30 MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Mayor Ruddock. Thank you for your presentation today. We will now have a break and we'll return at 11.40. Thank you.

35 **RECORDING SUSPENDED** [11.10 am]

**RECORDING RESUMED** [11.39 am]

40 MR DUNCAN: Good morning, and welcome back to the Blue Gum Community School proposal public meeting. I'd now like to ask the next speaker, Richard McGee, to present. Go ahead, Richard.

45 MR McGEE: Thank you. So good morning, my name's Richard McGee. I'm a paediatrician and a local resident, and I'm also a father of two young children, and I'm delighted that an application has been made to set a preschool and primary

school in the Mount Errington Estate. We need this school more than they need us. I've followed the progress of this application from the outset, and I would like to commend the applicant for being transparent, sensitive to feedback and persistent in the face of constant criticism.

5

I want to address three concerns. First, that the heritage value of the estate will be diminished. There's no value in having a heritage estate that cannot be accessed, and by becoming a preschool and school, this will allow the next generation of residents to experience the estate and breathe life into it. The applicant's sensitive restoration of this site maintains and in no way diminishes the historic value of the site. I think that's an important point.

10

Second, the landscaping and treescape. The ethos of the proposed school is to embrace Australian context, environment and inheritance. Apart from a few necessary removals for safety, the landscaping is not going to be significantly affected, and the professional arborist reports bear this out.

15

Third, relating to traffic congestion and noise, the professional reports do not bear out the concerns of others about this. This is going to be a small school. Many of the people attending are likely to be local and walk or ride there, and so there won't be that many cars added to the current level of – the current traffic volume, and I have not seen any evidence submitted by others that negates the professional impact reports. So I want to make those three points and, again, make the point that we need to rely on the professionals and their opinions.

20

25

Personally, I can testify to the difficulty in finding appropriate preschool and primary school facilities in the area and, in particular, none that incorporate the values that I love about this community, with the integration of environment and history in the curriculum. So I wholeheartedly support the application, and say again that we need this school more than they need us. Thank you.

30

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Richard. We now have Joseph Nicita as our next presenter. Joseph, can you hear me?

MR NICITA: Hello to all of our residents following along at home. After such an incredible number of submissions, I know there's probably a lot of you out there. My name is Joseph Nicita. I'm a local resident in this beautiful Hornsby Shire of ours, and a councillor representing Ward B, in which this development is proposed, of some three years.

40

Over my time on council, I've come to adore the rich local history and bushland setting of the land on which we live. Things that I think 1 Rosemead Road, or Mount Errington, exemplifies in every way. It's a well maintained federation home of an Arts and Crafts style, having stood since the late 1800s, nestled amongst a strong bushland setting, which is quite at odds with the bustling modern CBD just a short walk down the road.

45

It's my view that this site and its condition are integral to the heritage conservation area in which it sits, and represents a part of our local history that we can't afford to see diminished. It's not fit for purpose as a school, quite simply. While attempts to minimise some impacts have been made, it is important to consider the intact value of the site as it is, and how changes to the fabric of the structure or alterations of the

5

What's being proposed here is a school, and no matter how reversible it's claimed to be, in adjusting for that we will risk compromising heritage, especially when we're looking at future use at a day when the school is long gone. I first call your attention to my council's own EIS comments, namely, that the first floor balcony serves as a highly significant heritage element in the context of the dwelling. Any change, such as the balustrade, proposed will have an irreversible and detrimental effect on views from the street, that visual character that's so important for a heritage property like this.

10

15

Similarly, we found that the fire stair was likely to impact significant fabric and the visual integrity of the site. You know, there's also a modification that will turn a window into a door to access this stair. It's hardly an easy thing to reverse, and we're also losing floors and an original slate roof, as well, and the value of those can't be understated.

20

So we're looking at a significant intact heritage item with an incredible amount of the original fabric and interior layout preserved, and proposing to make changes to those very things in a big way just to allow it to function for this new purpose it – to my mind, it's quite unacceptable.

25

Without a new balustrade, without the fire stairs, without the demolition of walls that comprise an original layout this structure wouldn't be fit as a school, so as is it is quite simply not fit for purpose without changing the very nature of the dwelling. All these changes are for a school, and yet the EIS actually allows community uses in outside hours, as well, which I found quite interesting.

30

While it's nice to have a commitment to warn neighbours of this, at least, and the noise that may be created, there's no actual details, as far as I could find, of what these uses would entail. I think it's important to note that it's not just children who could damage or in some way impact this piece of heritage, and it's important that we know more about these uses, as well, before anything else goes forward.

35

Heritage isn't just coming from the house itself, though. In the GML report, much is made of the grounds, citing a wide range of tree ages and encircling green backdrop of surrounding bush and a dominant tree canopy as significant to the visual heritage of the property. Dominant. Dominant tree canopy. Is that what removing 41 trees is. Is that what a measly three replacement and a host of shrubs will return to the site. I very much doubt so.

40

45

Mount Errington deserves the best. It deserves a proposal that is able to accommodate the fabric and form it already has without such changes that impact the visual setting in such a way. We're lucky to have this great heritage item still standing in the face of developments, and we can't afford to lose it. What's being  
5 proposed here might seem harmless, but the loss of flooring, construction of fire stairs, removal of gates, destruction of interior walls and layouts, canopy decimation, alteration of driveways, fencing off of gardens, these are a death by a thousand cuts to an item that demonstrates the best of our built and environmental heritage. Thank you.

10 MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Joseph. I'd now like to call our next presenter, Rena Friswell. Rena, are you there? Are you on mute, Rena?

MR TIMMS: Commissioner, it's Daven Timms. So I'm next on the list. Do you  
15 want me to go next?

MS FRISWELL: I don't mind. I've just found my unmute, so it's up to you, Daven. Please - - -

20 MR DUNCAN: We have Rena. Could we please proceed with Rena, Daven. My apologies. If you could just wait five minutes.

MR TIMMS: Thank you.

25 MS FRISWELL: Sorry about that.

MR DUNCAN: Go ahead.

MS FRISWELL: Hi. My house is next door but one to the proposed development.  
30 It's on the corner of Rosemead Road and William Street. I want to object to the proposal to convert 1 Rosemead Road into a private entrance school and child care centre. I want to start with some general observations about the DPIE assessment, before raising a couple of specific issues, and if I go more than my five minutes, please cut me off.

35 I think the assessment conducted by the DPIE does not adequately consider the adverse impact of the proposed development of the location on the amenity for local residents, and it states the – overstates the presumed benefits of using the location. The DPIE assessment does not appear to start from a neutral position, rather it seems  
40 to look for ways of allowing the development to proceed.

It assesses amenity in terms with compliance with individual regulatory standards, rather than assessing the cumulative impact of the extra noise, traffic and people and the reduction of trees and heritage on the character of the neighbourhood and,  
45 therefore, on the experience of amenity for the residents. It largely discounts community concerns about the validity of noise and traffic assessments and the value of tree canopy. Furthermore, it appears to accept uncritically some of the assertions



made by the proposer and others, for example, that the development will be adaptive, rather than maladaptive; that without the development the site would be in danger of subdivision or the property would remain unused and unmaintained, for example.

5 Okay. So those are general comments. Against the background of those comments, I now wish to raise a couple of specific reasons that development, I think, should not be approved. First of all, traffic impacts. Under the most recent version of the development proposal, all of the traffic leaving the development would pass my property. Most vehicles would pass it on two sides, on Rosemead Road and William  
10 Street, and vehicles turning into William Street are heading uphill, so they're accelerating revs as they go.

In my view, this is going to contribute to traffic noise experienced at my house and the other houses around the intersection, and this hasn't been adequately considered  
15 by the DPIE assessment. I also wish to draw to your attention the fact that the front of houses 1, 1A and 3 Rosemead Road are staggered to minimise overlooking, and as a result of this configuration, all the vehicles leaving the proposed school will look directly at the northern bedroom windows of my house, and the northern bedroom and living room windows of 1A. The development proposal and the DPIE report  
20 don't seem to address this reduction in our privacy.

The layout of the houses on the street wasn't designed to deal with the possibility of non-residential traffic, and so I think 1 Rosemead Road is not an appropriate location for a commercial development that generates such traffic. The DPIE assessment  
25 dismisses problems of congestion and visibility on relevant local roads. Arguments are based upon traffic volume guidelines for different road types, and on assumptions about road use and behaviour contained within consultant reports.

There are a number of problems with this approach. Firstly, the assessment does not  
30 acknowledge that school traffic will exacerbate the snarl of vehicles and pedestrians at the eastern intersection of William Street and Peats Ferry Road. The area is complex. It's got badly designed traffic flows and it's quite hazardous during peak times, and school traffic is only going to add to that problem for the local community.  
35

Secondly, the assessment dismissed valid community concerns about the safety of adding school traffic on William Street, given the road frequently narrows to a single lane as a result of road width and ..... parked vehicles. That is DPIE assessment did not distinguish the theoretical road capacity from the actual road capacity.  
40

And, thirdly, the DPIE assessment relied on consultant traffic and noise reports which assessed threats to road safety using outdated 85th per centile thinking. That is you design traffic for the typical 85 per cent behaviour, and it relied on all road users doing the right thing. This is at odds with current safe systems thinking in road  
45 safety, the thinking that's adopted by Transport New South Wales and other national and international regulators – sorry.

Really, we should be focusing on traffic design that minimises the likelihood of and protects against the consequences of atypical and erroneous behaviours. So in the case of the development we're talking about, this would mean acknowledging that not all drivers will take the corner of Dural and Rosemead Road at slow speed and,  
5 occasionally, there will be vehicles blocking site lines as cars turn into Rosemead Road from Dural Street. This is examples.

I also wish to raise a comment about out of hours and weekend use of the facilities, as Joseph Nicita just did. It's not clear to me what the final draft conditions are, but  
10 there really isn't enough detail for either the community or the DPIE to assess the impact of whatever those might be. There's also no provision for residents to stop a proposed activity, and there's no way for residents to assess whether or not noise guidelines have been managed successfully, or noise is managed.

15 MR DUNCAN: Rena, we've, sort of, used the time up.

MS FRISWELL: .....

MR DUNCAN: Would you like to sum up now, please.  
20

MS FRISWELL: Yes, I would. I think there's quite a few issues that the DPIE assessment does not adequately consider and, yes, I've raised a couple of them. I'd like to send in the text of my comments and the comments that I have not yet made, and - - -  
25

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MS FRISWELL: If you would be happy to receive them.

30 MR DUNCAN: Thank you, and you're welcome to send them in, and we have until next Wednesday at 5 pm for all submissions.

MS FRISWELL: Yes. Yes.

35 MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MS FRISWELL: All right. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. I'll now ask Daven Timms to present.  
40

MR TIMMS: Thank you. Members and residents and applicants. Mr Ruddock mentioned there were over 50 submissions against. There were actually 89 against in the first instance. The community is quite outraged at the proposition. It's at an isolated pocket in Hornsby. Yes, it's up a mountain. There's really one road in and  
45 one road out. Dural Street is one way in one section. It's a duck and weave in and around parked cars from railway parking.

I want to specifically mention noise and traffic, and also the particular situation of our studio apartment one metre from the boundary of the proposed school. The – I don't feel we've had natural justice. I don't feel the Department has adequately listened to our experts in this area, particularly in noise.

5

Our noise consultant concluded that the fence would reduce the noise by less than five decibels, and the outdoor play area would exceed the noise goal by six decibels. Triple the intensity of the noise goal, and using the midday averages, the outdoor play area would increase the background noise by 14 decibels, six times the background noise, and also the car park would triple the intensity of the noise goal, even if it's flipped over it would increase the intensity. Local traffic would double the intensity of the noise goal.

10

We've mentioned the loss of 41 trees. I like the background in Rena's submissions, she's still there online. They are the trees, are they not, that will be cut down. Part of the 41 trees. The high retention value of 111 and 112, the cabbage-palm and the strelitzias has been mentioned. Over 100 years old. The streetscape would be changed forever, indeed, the area would look more like a school playground than a heritage home.

20

Looking at the traffic assessments, we did put in a new submission, a revised report, which doesn't seem to be – have been looked at. He criticises – the expert criticises the 10 minute parking block – or 10 minute arrival block. He says it will create congestion. He also criticises the buffer to the entrance. 26 metres from a busy corner, Dural Street and Rosemead, whereas you need 69 metres to stop effectively. We don't believe adequate attention has been given to our traffic report.

25

The noise report. In a nutshell, our expert says that the applicant's expert is not qualified. He's not qualified to say anything. They – he doesn't give calculations for many of the things he says. So I direct you, Commissioners, to our addendum noise report dated the 14<sup>th</sup> of December. Just in summary, the reduced – flipping the car park, so the cars park away from the fence, would make very little difference, and there's no calculations. The calculations should be provided.

30

There's also other things that require response. We've had no response. We haven't been heard. Non-compliance with the acoustics industry standard. Significant errors in the table titled Potential Sound Reductions. No calculations on traffic noise. It concludes at the end of section 1 of that report:

35

*It was concluded in our peer review that due to the many fundamental errors in their report, a revised report by a member firm should be produced.*

40

They're not specialists in acoustics, not a member firm, thank you, and the assumptions should not be listened to. Lastly, we have a studio apartment office one metre from the boundary. It is not a garage. It is one metre from the boundary, approved for living with a toilet and a shower. It was clearly stated, in my

45

submission, it's incorrectly referred to in the expert's reports for the applicant. It's a living quarter. It's not a garage.

The noise would be completely unacceptable, and further the Department  
5 recommends assessment and monitoring after they move in. No. The community has a right to have such assessments conducted prior to the moving in. Also, incorrectly stated today and in the report, the eastern side neighbours complained. It's in the submission. One of the 89 submissions against to Hornsby Council. It's in an email to devmail, 22nd of January 2020:

10 *Hello, Benjamin. We are the residents of 52 William Street on the eastern side and would like to lodge an objection due to traffic and safety, also the noise will be unacceptable. We're next to the playground. It will be unacceptable for the peaceful enjoyment of our property.*

15 So the application is unfounded. It should not proceed. The residents are against it. I've highlighted some of the concerns of particular interest to us. Noise, traffic and a residence – part of a residence one metre from the boundary. Thank you.

20 MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Daven. I'd now like to ask the next presenter, Graeme Wells, to present. Graeme, please proceed.

MR WELLS: Yes, Commissioners. Thank you for the opportunity. I say at the outset I am an ecologist, but I am, as a resident of this area for over 40 years, totally  
25 opposed to this proposal. I find that decades ago councils consultants, Tropman & Tropman Architects, gave their wordings as to the heritage significance of this area, and the heritage which ended up being accepted by Hornsby Council was a heritage zoning based on the trees and the rocks.

30 As other people have mentioned today, we are on the top of a mountain. Mount Errington. A very special place. We now have a proposal to remove over 41 trees. This, to me, is a disaster. So here we have a heritage zoning by council, which is based on the trees, and now there's a proposal to remove over 41, most of them being the eucalypts, the Blackbutt Eucalyptus pilularis.

35 I ask also why didn't council have this property listed as heritage with the New South Wales Heritage Council. The council's got number 8 Rosemead Road listed. They've got a tree on number 12 Rosemead Road, a Norfolk Island pine, listed. So why not this house, which was originally the home of the first mayor of Hornsby  
40 Council, Oscar Garibaldi Roberts. I just cannot believe this proposal.

The traffic issues are going to become immense, as many people have spoken, and I am beyond me for people not to understand this. In the 40 years that I've lived here, I've had stone pillars of letterboxes wiped out by cars, telegraph pole hit twice by  
45 cars, other trees just further down from the intersection of Rosemead Road and William Street, trees hit by cars, because people get inattentive. There are blind

corners on this section, and we're going to have a school for 80-something kids and before and after school, so they tell us.

5 Well, what I'm asking is council, this is Hornsby Council, should purchase Mount Errington. They should purchase it for the public at whatever moneys, but to have a school there, it is inappropriate in this location. I consider the Hornsby Council in what they have done in our area over the years is tragic. We've lost the Mount Errington tree, a tree here that was here before white settlement. We've lost the Gallipoli pine in Hornsby Park, opposite the council chambers.

10 We've lost the Country Women's Association building, also, at the corner of Hornsby Park. We've lost the original sandstone paving that was ripped up years ago by Hornsby Council consultants and chucked away. I mean, we live in a heritage area. An area where the artist, Arthur Streeton, used to live. An area where  
15 Dame Nellie Melba went to school to go to Abbotsleigh, down in Wahroonga. We've got a William Lambert, who was the painter for Gallipoli, down in William Street. That's where he painted some of the great paintings that are in the New South Wales Art Gallery.

20 We've got heritage, heritage, heritage. We've got ..... down the bottom just over the valley here from where Marcus Clarke used to come across from Mount Wilga to get his coachman to take him up to the railway station 100 years ago. Hornsby Council wouldn't have a clue about some of this stuff. So what – when I first moved to Hornsby 40 years ago, I can remember people playing croquet on the property, at the  
25 front of Mount Errington. It always used to touch me that that was heritage. It doesn't happen any mor.

And the tennis court. Just because some trees have grown up on it, I consider that as the area is for the trees, for the heritage zoning, that's what we should have, and so  
30 my request is to totally oppose this proposal, but I also request that Hornsby Council put in moves to purchase this property, Mount Errington, for the residents of Hornsby Shire, in particular for their terrible record of destroying heritage in this immediate area. Thank you.

35 MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Graeme. I would now like to ask our next presenter, Malcom Foubister, to present. Malcolm, please proceed.

MR FOUBISTER: Thank you, Peter. I'd like to also echo my acknowledgment that the proposed development's on the Darug and Guringai lands, pay my respects to  
40 elders past and present. I'd like to thank Commissioners Peter Duncan and Adrian Pilton for first, reviewing our original submissions and secondly, for hearing our views following the assessment by the New South Wales Department of Planning.

45 Having read the assessment report, I note it refers to public interest of the proposed development in several sections; it, however, seems to disregard the public interest and overall amenity of the 48 members of the community who have objected and live within less than five kilometres of the development. I appreciate the signatures of

the report have visited the site, but, if approved, it will be the local residents who have to live with the development forever, not the assessment panel.

5 The community traffic report has been dismissed. I read there was a proposal for an entry/exit on William Street, which subsequently has now been determined as a collector road, which allows over 300 vehicle movements per hour. I'd ask how a collector road can be classified as such when vehicles have to give way to oncoming traffic regularly. This is also the case on Dural Street with a sharp and blind left turn into Rosemead Road.

10 The assessment in the beginning refers to business hours of 8 to 6 with no planned community use. As we get to the end of the 96 page assessment, community use has been mentioned, business hours of 7.30 to 6.30; however, I note the planning assessment has not recommended the extended hours. So with no extended hours or  
15 afterhours use is planned it will become the first school that I have had an association with that does not entertain parent-teacher evenings, open days, Easter parade, Christmas pageant, grandparent's day, fete, fairs, dance concert and the list goes on. Dural and William Street are regularly full with commuter parking, so none will be available if these extra functions are there for parents and friends.

20 The heritage aspects are being covered with more action and reports than I care to mention, but I'll say that this property was and always should be a private residence. I'd just like to – a couple of little points in the report, and section 6.3.41. The department acknowledged the points raised in our peer review; however, they note  
25 that it was conservative, saying the nearest resident on the western side is 35 metres from the outdoor play areas and cannot – and that – look, it won't – basically, won't disturb them. I reside 35 metres from the park in Dural Street, and when my lovely three neighbour girls are playing there, I can hear them quite loudly. I can only  
30 imagine how much noise will be generated when there are 80 children actively playing.

My penultimate point, I guess, refers to assessment report section 6.3.44, and to address the concerns of noise prior to occupation an additional noise assessment to be undertaken, a noise management plan within two months, and other noise  
35 monitoring, and the monitoring should be repeated in a year's time. I can't imagine anything will change here after the sums in excess of not only the purchase price, but the development cost of \$600,000, plus the horse will have bolted once approved. Again, we, the residents, will have to live with it, and I trust a qualification check of the professionals who provided reports has been checked as part of the original  
40 assessment.

Finally, the comprehensive report refers to many State planning goals, public interest, Acts in general, legal speak and legislation. There is little mention or concern for my, my family's and my neighbour's amenity, as there seems to be now  
45 law or Act to define this. We purchased here 21 years ago, as it was a quiet residential area close to bush, flora, fauna, not a school or any other disruptive commercial developments. I'd like to thank you for your time today.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Malcolm. I'll now call on the next speaker, Bob Sendt. Bob, please proceed.

MR SENDT: Good morning, Commissioners, or good afternoon, I should say now.  
5 Thanks for the opportunity of presenting today. Look, a lot of the things I say you will have heard from other previous speakers. Unfortunately, I wasn't able to listen to all of them, but the three issues I do want to address: firstly, the concept of a community school, the heritage aspects of Mount Errington and, finally, traffic and parking.

10 On the first, the proposal is labelled a community school. I think that's a complete misnomer. Clearly, the local community doesn't want the school, but, also, the local community doesn't need it. I'm sure the staff of the IPC would be able to access ABS census data at a small level. You'd see that the local community is much more  
15 established, much older.

I probably know 40 families in this local area, just to speak to in passing. I can only think of two families that have children of primary school age or preschool age, and both of those are at the upper end of primary school age, anyway. It's not a  
20 community of young families. I would think the majority of families are probably 50, 60, 70 and older, with very few children of any age at home. So, clearly, this school is aimed at a wider catchment area. That's clear from the fact that it advertises itself as a provider of a unique style of education. So community, as I said, a misnomer.

25 Does Hornsby need another school. There are four preschools in Hornsby, west of the railway line. That is this side of the Hornsby railway line. There's a major new early learning centre being developed adjacent to Hornsby South Public School, which will be open some time this year, I believe. The original application  
30 misrepresented the proximity of the nearby schools. There's a major expansion opened last year at Waitara Public School, I think a net addition 30 classes. So I don't believe there is any crying need for a primary school or a preschool in this area. In any event, it's only providing 80 places in total, only making a minor contribution, particularly to the supply of primary education.

35 In terms of Mount Errington heritage, as Graeme Wells mentioned earlier and, possibly, others, Oscar Garibaldi Roberts was a very well-known member of the local community in the early 1900s. He was a partner in Fairfax & Roberts jewellers, which still exists today. The other half of the partnership, Fairfax, was  
40 part of the Fairfax Media dynasty. He was the provisional shire president in 1906 when the government – or Parliament passed the Local Government (Shires) Act to force municipalisation, I think that's the pronunciation, on communities, and he was a member of the council after election for – on and off for at least a decade.

45 The house is part of a cluster of private dwellings with heritage significance, and it's regarded as the centre of the Mount Errington neighbourhood. It's fairly unique in that it's one of the – well, certainly, one of the finest examples, I believe, of the Arts

and Crafts style of houses in the Upper North Shore. There are other heritage – other houses of heritage value, but it's – it has a unique characteristic. It was part of the Mount Errington Estate, which was the land owned by Oscar Roberts and his wife, Anne Roberts, which many of the speakers today live in houses that occupy what  
5 was originally the Mount Errington Estate.

Hornsby has lost many fine dwellings over the years with heritage value. The expansion, or the building of the Westfield and Northgate Shopping Centres in the 1960s necessarily involved the demolition of many fine examples of heritage  
10 architecture. In terms of the DPIE report, I think it glossed over many of these aspects. It seems to see adaptive reuse as a virtue in itself.

Now, adaptive reuse is fine where the original intention or purpose of a building is no longer available. You know, a power station, a warehouse, a factory, a wharf and, perhaps, even a casino that may no longer be able to function as a casino, but there's  
15 no reason 1 Rosemead Road can't continue to function as a family home, and I don't see any reason to change that.

The structural changes that have been – that will be involved in converting this to a school will be very difficult to reverse. It's easy to take a demolition saw and carve  
20 out a wider doorway, but rebuilding that to convert rooms back into bedrooms, for example, as we saw yesterday, where one room is being opened up to allow a fire escape access, that sort of change is not likely to be easily reversible, nor the removal of a toilet block within the house. So the reality of this proposal if it goes ahead is  
25 that this house will be lost as a private dwelling virtually forever.

Traffic and parking. The original application ignored the traffic impacts on William Street. William Street is used substantially for commuter parking. I will ask your staff to run a short video in a moment, it only takes about 30 seconds, if I have time,  
30 but commuters use parking – use William Street for parking all the way up to Rosemead Road and then walk to the station. Now, the classification of the road as – by the RTA or TfNSW as a connecting road ignores the fact that it is, effectively, a one lane road for most weekdays.

I don't know if you saw this when you were driving up, but cars park on both sides. There is unlimited parking, and the road is then only wide enough for one car to pass – one car to drive. If there's a car coming in the other direction, and if the staff could  
35 run that video now.

40

## **VIDEO SHOWN**

MR DUNCAN: Okay. We can see that.

45

MR SENDT: I'm not sure if they can.



MR DUNCAN: We can see that. Yes. It's happening.

MR SENDT: You can see it, can you?

5 MR DUNCAN: Yes, we can, Bob.

MR SENDT: Okay. I was going to interrupt it at a certain point. You can see going up there's cars on the right and the left parked. It's not as busy as it normally would be, but frequently cars have to pull into a driveway to allow cars coming the other way, and sometimes that happens twice to individual drivers pulling into a driveway, if you can find one. Sometimes I've even had to reverse to allow cars coming the other way to get passed. So it's a very narrow street. Every additional car or vehicle added to that traffic flow is going to create difficulties.

15 I assume you've seen the video now, and I hope that gives you some impression of how narrow that street is. There are two chokepoints, in addition, where there are substantial – or have been substantial old trees, and the road is narrowed around those. So it's totally unsuitable for the volume of traffic it has now, let alone any additional traffic, let alone any additional parking that may eventuate from this school. That's all I have to say, Commissioners, so thank you for hearing me.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you for your presentation, Bob.

MR SENDT: Thanks, Peter.

25 MR DUNCAN: Our next presenter is Jo-Ann Moffat. Jo-Ann, I'll ask you to go ahead, please.

MS MOFFAT: Yes. Thank you very much. Good afternoon, Commissioner, Chair and community members. Thank you for providing me the opportunity to speak today. I have lived within walking distance of Mount Errington since 1995, some 25 plus years, and in the last 11 years resided in my own heritage listed home, namely, Kuranda at number 8 Rosemead Road, a neighbouring property to 1 Rosemead Road, and also of Arts and Crafts significance, and I know personally the importance of heritage in keeping my property as true to its heritage value.

I strongly oppose to the adaptive reuse of the historically significant home, Mount Errington, being turned into a preschool and primary school. This proposed adaptive reuse is not suitable for this home site. It is not wanted by our community and screams bastardisation of an intact heritage home. Mount Errington has survived fully intact for, what, 130 plus years. As time goes on, the heritage significance of this family home becomes more and more important for Hornsby Shire and the residents of Hornsby Shire.

45 It is very hard for me to take the emotion out of my speech, and if the school is allowed to go ahead on this site, the effect on my family, my neighbours and their family will be immense. Jill McLachlan calls her proposed school Blue Gum

Community School. The community do not want this school. Please tell me where the “unity” is in the name Blue Gum Community.

5 Phil and Mary Blasie were the previous owners of 1 Rosemead. They ran a business for many years from their home. It was a successful business that had no impact on neighbours’ quality of life, no impact on traffic and, certainly, no impact on heritage. I am not against businesses running out of Mount Errington, but when the proposed business is a school, the impact will be significant and should not be allowed.

10 My children went to Barker College, one still goes, only a 1.5 kilometre journey from my home. In 2017 it took a round trip by car eight minutes. Now, the same trip takes on average 22 minutes. Students travelling by car to Mount Errington will certainly use at least 50 per cent of my current route. A traffic report is just numbers. My experience is real. I am extremely concerned how our heritage listed streetscape  
15 will change with the approval of this primary school.

The removal of 42 trees with open the skyscape and provide view of the buildings on the Pacific Highway, now known as Peats Ferry Road. More concerning, the two  
20 approved tower blocks to be built in the imminent future will be in view from Rosemead Road. A primary school will bring no parking signs, restricted parking signs, slow down children signs, limited parking signs, school name sign, no turning right into driveway signs, turn left only into school bounds and, perhaps, up to three schools flashing 40 zone lights on Rosemead Road, Dural Street and William Street. The impact on the heritage landscape of Mount Errington Precinct will be  
25 detrimental.

I am unaware of any other location in Hornsby that has a heritage precinct like ours that includes a number of heritage listed homes, heritage listed gardens and heritage  
30 listed streetscape. Mount Errington heritage home is the heartbeat of mount heritage precinct. Heritage retains its heritage when not tampered with. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Jo-Ann. Our next presenter today is Ron Black. Ron, I’ll ask you to proceed.

35 MR BLACK: Yes. Thank you. Can you hear me okay?

MR DUNCAN: Quite clearly. Thank you.

40 MR BLACK: Thank you very much. Thank you, Commissioner, and just thank you to all those who spoke today for their efforts, both financially and emotionally, as well. I respect both sides, and I thank you for the opportunity to speak today as the homeowner of 6 Rosemead Road who purchased here because of the peace and the natural environment. With regret, I was not able to hear the comments preceding me today; however, I did hear Karen Harragon, Jill McLachlan and Mr Ruddock  
45 speak.

My concerns are (1) the modification of the heritage building to accommodate the business model proposed (2) the modification of flora and fauna to accommodate the same. I do take on board the need to provide a safe environment for all concerned. I believe others will have covered this in detail in previous correspondence. It would  
5 be devastating to see any of the blue gums removed, as this is what makes the Mount Errington area what it is, a heritage precinct, but to the safety of children in a school, I fear it will be given.

10 However, my main concern as a resident in Rosemead Road situated between Dural and William Street is that I cannot be advised as to what reclamation of public road kerbside will occur in regards to no parking, no standing or any proposed entry for vehicles or pedestrians to accommodate such a school. As a resident, I have one driveway, as do all my neighbours. I have two vehicles on the street, sometimes three, and one in the driveway. The street space is shared with an approximate total  
15 of 11 plus vehicles, and five immediate neighbours that also have to use the road space, not to mention those visiting families and the aged care homes in William and Dural Street west of Lisgar Road.

20 In addition to the immediate issue of local parking, I am concerned about the volume of traffic that will be required to meet the needs of allocated times coming into and exiting William and Dural Streets. I feel that this will clash with the traffic peaks wishing to exit and enter both am and pm. In William Street, Dural Street and Rosemead are really only a one-way flow from Frederick Street 24/7. At present, we rely heavily on the courtesy of one driver always to give way. When service vehicles  
25 are in operation in the morning peak, such as waste collections, sometimes Ausgrid line maintenance or others, there is no choice but to wait.

30 The roads in their current form do not allow two-way traffic flow, due to local resident parking and other commercial vehicles servicing local residents. One last comment/question is where do the parents park on special days that all schools have in their agenda, such as open days, parents nights, Mother's Day, Father's Day events, concerts, etcetera. I assume parking somewhere in William, Rosemead and Dural Streets will be the go to.

35 In conclusion, I'm not objecting to a suitable business model, as such, but objecting to the business model of a school that requires traffic volume for child security and employees to facilitate such a venture, as such a venture gives me concerns that without widening the roads it will add to the many issues for residents and customers to face daily in the commute meeting designated appointments. It is one thing to  
40 control the staff and the students to come in, but it's a difficult one to control the residents exiting or entering. Now, just, finally, to thank you for allowing me to present my concerns. Thank you.

45 MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Ron, and thank you to all our presenters. That brings us to the end of this electronic public hearing. Thank you to everybody who has participated in the process. Adrian and I have appreciated your input. Just a reminder, in the interests of openness and transparency, a full transcript of today's

meeting will be made available on the Commission's website in the next few days. The Commission will be accepting written comments from the public up until 5 pm on Wednesday the 17th of February 2021. That's 5 pm next Wednesday.

- 5 You can submit your comments using the Have Your Say portal on our website or by email or post. At the time of determination the Commission will publish its statement of reasons for decision, which will also outline the – how the panel took the community's views into consideration as part of the decision-making process. For now, though, thank you for watching this IPC electronic public hearing on the
- 10 proposed Blue Gum Community School. From all of us at the Commission, your input to this process and presentations today are greatly appreciated. Good afternoon.

15 **RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**[12.28 pm]**