



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1566918

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING

**RE: LORETO NORMANHURST SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT (SSD 8996)
(CONCEPT PROPOSAL AND STAGE 1)**

COMMISSION PANEL: **ADRIAN PILTON (CHAIR)**
 WENDY LEWIN
 JULIET GRANT

ASSISTING PANEL: **TROY DEIGHTON**

LOCATION: **ELECTRONIC PUBLIC MEETING**

DATE: **10.00 AM, MONDAY, 27 SEPTEMBER 2021**

MR T. DEIGHTON: Good morning and welcome to this Independent Planning Commission public meeting for the Loreto Normanhurst redevelopment. I'm Troy Deighton from the Independent Planning Commission and I will be hosting the livestream of these proceedings. COVID-19 restrictions have forced us online for
5 this public meeting. Our Commissioners will be participating in the proceedings remotely from their respective homes, and our registered speakers will be presenting via video conference or telephone. This is not the only chance for people to have their say on this state significant development application. Of course, you can send us your comments via email, post or the Have Your Say portal on our website, and
10 the deadline for submissions is 5 pm on Monday, 4 October. Our panel is standing by to commence proceedings, so let's cross live to the chair of the panel, Adrian Pilton, for his opening statement. Adrian, good morning.

MR A. PILTON: Good morning. I'm Adrian Pilton and I am the Chair of this
15 Independent Planning Commission panel. Joining me are my fellow Commissioners, Wendy Lewin and Juliet Grant. We form the Commission panel appointed to determine this application. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands on which we variously meet today and pay my respects to the Elders past, present and emerging, and to the elders from other
20 communities who may be participating today. Loreto Normanhurst Limited, the applicant, is seeking consent for the proposed redevelopment of Loreto Normanhurst Independent Girls School in Normanhurst.

The application for the redevelopment of Loreto Normanhurst comprises of a
25 concept proposal for new building envelopes, car parking, internal roads, landscaping and staged increase of 850 students. Consent is also sought for concurrent stage 1 works comprising of the construction and operation of a boarding accommodation building, car parking, pick-up and drop-off facilities, through-site road, landscaping works, and an additional 500 students. I note that the Department of Planning,
30 Industry and Environment in its assessment report has concluded that the application is approvable subject to conditions. The Minister for Planning and Public Spaces has asked the Commission to determine this application within eight weeks of receiving the final whole of government assessment report from the Department.

35 In line with regulations introduced in response to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, we have moved this public meeting online, with registered speakers provided the opportunity to present to the panel via telephone and video conference. In the interests of openness and transparency, we are livestreaming proceedings on the Commission's website. A full transcript of today's meeting will also be published on
40 the Commission's website in the next few days. The Commission was established by the New South Wales Government on 1 March 2018 as a standalone statutory body operating independently of the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment and other agencies.

45 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. 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 on any other planning and development matter when
5 requested by the Minister for Planning or the Planning Secretary. The Commission is the consent authority for this state significant development application because more than 50 unique public objections were received.

10 It's important to note that the Commission is not involved in the Department's assessment of SSD applications, nor in the preparation of its assessment reports. 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 application. You can find additional
15 information on the way we manage potential conflicts on our website. This public meeting forms one part of the Commission's process. We have also undertaken a virtual site inspection, a physical locality tour, and met with the Department, the applicant and Hornsby Shire Council.

20 Transcripts of all these meetings and the site inspection and locality tour notes will be published on our website. After the public meeting, we may convene with relevant stakeholders if clarification or additional information is required on matters raised. Following the public meeting, we will endeavour to determine the application as soon as possible, noting that there may be a delay if we find that additional information is needed. Written submissions on this matter will be
25 accepted by the Commission up to 5 pm on Monday, 4 October 2021. We invite interested individuals and groups to make any submission they consider appropriate during this public meeting.

30 The Commission is particularly assisted by submissions that are responsive to the Department's assessment report and recommended conditions of consent. All submissions made to the Department during exhibition of the Environmental Impact Statement and Response to Submissions Report have been made available to the Commission. As such, today's speakers are encouraged to avoid repeating or restating submissions they have previously made on this application. The
35 Commission must emphasise that there are certain matters that by law it is not permitted to take into account while making its determination, and therefore, submissions on such matters cannot be considered.

40 These factors include the reputation of the applicant and any past planning law breaches by the applicant. Before we get underway, I would like to outline how today's public meeting will run. We will first hear from the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment on the findings of its whole of government assessment of the application currently before the Commission. We will hear from the applicant second. We will then proceed to hear from our registered speakers. While we
45 endeavour to stick to our published schedule, this will be dependent on registered speakers being ready to present at their allocated time. Troy, who is in our Sydney studio, will introduce each speaker when it's their turn to present to the panel.

Everyone has been advised in advance how long they have to speak. A bell will sound when the speaker has one minute remaining. A second bell will sound when a speaker's time has expired. To ensure everyone receives their fair share of time, I will enforce time-keeping rules. I do reserve the right to allow additional time as
5 required to hear new information. If you have a copy of your speaking notes or any additional material to support your presentation, it would be appreciated if you would provide a copy to the Commission. Please note any information given to us will be made public. The Commission's privacy statement governs our approach to managing your information. Our privacy statement is available on our website.
10 Thank you. It's now time to call our first speaker.

MR DEIGHTON: Thank you, Adrian. And up first speaking on behalf of the Department, Karen Harragon, Aditi Coomar, Tahlia Alexander, and their consultant Matthew Rosel. Karen, good morning.
15

MS K. HARRAGON: Good morning, Commissioners, Secretariat and members of the public. I am Karen Harragon, Director of Social and Infrastructure Assessments at the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment. I am here with my colleagues Aditi Coomar, Tahlia Alexander from the school infrastructure
20 assessment team, and our planning consultant Matthew Rosel from Townscape. We have a short presentation to present today which will outline the Department's approach that was taken in assessing the state significant development application for the Loreto Normanhurst School redevelopment.

25 The application was referred to the Commission as more than 50 public submissions in the form of an objection were received during the exhibition of the EIS. I will now ask for the Commission to allow us to share our presentation. Thank you, Aditi. Our presentation today will outline the Department's assessment of the application and the key conclusions and recommendations made in the Department's assessment
30 report. The matters that we are going to focus on today include the key issues of concern that were raised in the submissions on the application. These include traffic and parking, built form and tree removal. I will now ask Tahlia to provide a very brief overview of the site and the development. Thank you, Tahlia.

35 MS T. ALEXANDER: Thank you, Karen, and good morning, Commissioners and members of the public. My name is Tahlia Alexander and I am the principal applying officer in the schools infrastructure assessments team. As detailed in the Department's assessment report, the SSD application relates to the Loreto Independent Girls School, Normanhurst campus. The site consists of both the
40 existing Loreto School campus as well as an adjoining residential property located at 4 Mount Pleasant Avenue. The aerial view of the site shows the existing school campus outlined in red, and 4 Mount Pleasant Avenue highlighted in blue.

45 The use of both properties as a school is permissible under the Hornsby Local Environmental Plan 2013. This slide shows the layout of existing buildings across the school campus and the surrounding roads. The campus adjoins Pennant Hills Road to the north, Osborn Road to the west, and Mount Pleasant Avenue to the east.

The closest residential properties to the site are located on the opposite side of Osborn Road and Mount Pleasant Avenue, comprising low density houses fronting the site. The majority of the school campus site is listed as an item of local heritage significance under the Local Environmental Plan.

5

In addition, the site contains remnant bushland comprising critically endangered plant communities, including Sydney Turpentine-Ironbark Forest and Blue Gum High Forest. The school caters for years 5 to 12 and has an approved maximum capacity of 1150 students. A total of 1100 students are currently enrolled at the campus, including 155 students that reside onsite within the school's student boarding accommodation. The school currently employs approximately 254 staff. The site is currently accessed via six stated vehicle entrances located on Osborn Road, Pennant Hills Road and Mount Pleasant Avenue. An onsite pick-up/drop-off facility, including four spaces and two bus space, is located off Osborn Road, and the site contains 187 existing car parking spaces and a service yard.

The application comprises a concept proposal and stage 1 works for the stage 3 development of the school, as detailed in the Department's assessment report. The concept proposal includes the creation of 10 building envelopes across the site for school buildings and associated facilities. It also includes an increase in student numbers by 850 students, and an increase of up to 236 car parking spaces. The concept proposal is intended to provide a long-term school development master plan for the next 30 years. The stage 1 works is the first stage of the redevelopment and includes the demolition of existing school buildings and structures, and the staged construction of three new buildings and associated infrastructure and landscaping works.

The proposed new stage 1 buildings include a five-storey boarding accommodation building for 216 students, with two staff apartments and two single-storey car park buildings with playing courts on their roof. The proposed new stage 1 infrastructure includes alterations to existing school car parking areas, creation of a new through-site road, provision of two new pick-up/drop-off facilities, and sites-wide landscaping. Together with the physical works, stage 1 also includes a staged increase of 500 students, from 1150 to 1650 students. The increases would be linked to the construction and operation of the proposed pick-up/drop-off and car parking facilities. The Department has assessed the key issues of the proposal and concludes that, on balance, the proposal can be supported as it would result in better and improved school facilities.

However, the Department's recommendation is subject to key conditions requiring amendments to the application, in particular, the reduction of the height and scale of building envelope 2 to ensure it does not have an adverse built form impact on the Osborn Road streetscape, the installation of a no right turn restriction for vehicles exiting from Mount Pleasant Avenue onto Pennant Hills Road during school peak times, amendments to buildings and car parking to increase the retention of existing significant trees along Mount Pleasant Avenue and Osborn Road, a requirement that all essential transport infrastructure is provided prior to the first increase in student

population, and the preparation and implementation of key operational management plans, including a green travel plan, operational transport plan, and boarding and accommodation plan. I will now hand over to Matthew who will present further on the key issues of the proposal.

5

MR M. ROSEL: Thank you, Tahlia. Good morning, Commissioners and members of the public. My name is Matthew Rosel and I'm a Planning Consultant from Townscape. First, I'm going to talk about traffic impacts. I will then move on to built form, and finish by talking about tree removal. Approximately 88 per cent of all submissions received raise concerns about the impact of the increase of student numbers on the operation of surrounding roads, as well as queuing onto Osborn Road. One of the main components of this proposal is to resolve and improve the school's pick-up and drop-off operations, and the application intends to achieve this objective through the provision of five new pick-up/drop-off spaces, the creation of a one-way through-site road connecting Osborn Road to Mount Pleasant Avenue, the creation of a capacity for a total of 36 vehicles queuing within the site, and management of pick-up and drop-off operation by traffic marshals, and through other mitigation measures identified in the applicant's Operational Transport and Access Management Plan.

20

The Department has considered the public and Council's concerns in detail in its assessment report and concludes the proposed new pick-up and drop-off facilities, coupled with the delivery of the green travel plan, promoting reduced car usage, would ensure that the facilities are adequate to meet the demands of the proposed development and prevent queuing onto Osborn Road. The Department has recommended conditions requiring the construction and commencement of the operation of all pick-up and drop-off facilities and the through-site road in stage 1 prior to any increase in student numbers. In addition, the pick-up and drop-off facilities must be open at least 30 minutes prior to the commencement of the afternoon pick-up and drop-off to prevent on-street queuing.

30

With reference to traffic generation and intersection performance, the applicant submitted updated SIDRA modelling to analyse the performance of the two key intersections of Osborn Road and Pennant Hills Road, and Mount Pleasant Avenue and Pennant Hills Road shown circled on this slide. Based on concerns from the Department and the community, the applicant has provided additional traffic analysis of surrounding intersections. The updated intersection analysis demonstrates that the proposal would have acceptable impacts on the continued operation of the surrounding road network. Also, in response to concerns raised about parking impacts, the application has been amended to increase the amount of onsite staff car parking spaces, which are now generally consistent with the Hornsby Council's recommended parking rates for schools.

40

The Department has noted in its assessment report that the right turn from Mount Pleasant Avenue onto Pennant Hills Road is a difficult and dangerous manoeuvre, particularly during school peak periods due to the need to cross three lanes of traffic. In order to minimise the risk of accidents, the Department has recommended a

45

condition requiring the amendment of the application to install road signage. The signage would confirm a no right turn restriction from Mount Pleasant Avenue onto Pennant Hills Road during the school morning and afternoon peak periods. The Department notes the Council has recommended that Osborn Road be widened and the intersection be upgraded.

The Department has investigated this request with its independent traffic consultant and concludes the upgrade is not warranted, noting the internalisation of vehicle queuing. The Department considers, subject to the management of the pick-up and drop-off facilities and the installation of new road signage, the proposal would not have an unacceptable impact on the operation of adjoining intersections or the road network. I will now move on to the Department's assessment of built form. Approximately a quarter of all submissions raised concerns about the height and visual impacts of the proposed building envelopes and the proposed stage 1 boarding accommodation building.

The Department's assessment report has carefully considered the built form impacts of the proposed 10 building envelopes. The Department acknowledges that seven of the 10 building envelopes are taller than the Council's height control for the site. However, the Department has concluded that the building envelopes are acceptable as the education SEPP and clause 4.6 of the Council's LEP allows for exceedance of development standards where this is justified. The building envelopes are set back from site boundaries, provide for appropriate heights within the school context, and the tallest building is essentially located within the site, and the proposal would not have adverse amenity impacts in terms of overshadowing or overlooking.

To ensure the development does not have an adverse visual impact on Osborn Road, the Department has recommended a condition requiring the applicant reduce the height of building envelope 2 so that it is no taller than the maximum height of existing school buildings in this location. The Department is satisfied the height and scale of the boarding accommodation building which fronts Mount Pleasant Avenue is acceptable, as its exact footprint provides for an appropriate building articulation and varied setback. The modern architectural design provides for a coherent and well-proportioned building which is not considered to detract from the character of the Mount Pleasant Avenue streetscape, and due to the fall of the land, the height of the building would be largely – would large appear as two different storeys from Mount Pleasant Avenue.

I will now move on to talk about tree removal. Approximately 20 per cent of all submissions raised concerns about the removal of trees across the site. Stage 1 of the proposal includes the removal of 105 trees to facilitate the development. Nine of these trees are identified as being of high significance. To offset the removal of existing trees, the proposal includes a planting of 105 replacement trees. The applicant has stated that due to the location of the proposed buildings and infrastructure, it's not possible to retain the 105 trees identified for removal.

Notwithstanding this, the Department has carried out its own assessment of the impact on trees and has concluded that, subject to amendments to the design and layout of the development, it would be possible to retain an additional nine trees around the boarding accommodation building, and 10 trees within the Osborn Road car park. The Department has therefore recommended a condition requiring the applicant amend the development to retain the 19 identified trees. The Department has also recommended the applicant purchase a total of eight ecosystem offset credits to compensate for the removal of existing vegetation. I will now hand over to Karen who will provide our conclusion.

MS HARRAGON: Thank you, Matthew. Commissioners, this concludes the Department's presentation on the key issues of the application. Overall, the Department concludes in its report that the likely impacts of the development can be mitigated through the recommended conditions of consent. Thank you for the opportunity to present at today's meeting. Aditi, if you could now stop presenting.

MR PILTON: Questions? No? Okay.

MS J. GRANT: No.

MS W. LEWIN: No, thank you.

MR PILTON: Thanks again, Karen.

MS HARRAGON: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioners.

MR DEIGHTON: Okay. Well, next up, representing the applicant, we have Michael Rowe, who is the Director of Ethos Urban, Marina Ugonotti, who is the Principal of Loreto Normanhurst, and Paul Yannoulatos, who is the Director of Taylor Thomson Whitting. Michael, good morning.

MR M. ROWE: Good morning. Thank you. And are you okay for me to present from here?

MR DEIGHTON: Absolutely.

MR PILTON: Yes, please.

MR ROWE: Great. Thank you very much, and good morning Commissioners and members of the public. Thank you for the opportunity for us to present today. We have curated our presentation really to focus on a little introduction from the school in helping understand why this growth needs to happen. I will touch on that from a strategic perspective. Paul will talk to the traffic issues, and – and give a bit of a summary, I guess, about how we think we have listened and tried to respond to the community over the course of this project. So is it – as was introduced before, we have Marina from – from Loreto, myself with a planning background, and – and Paul

who brings technical traffic expertise. So with that, I will pass to Marina who is just going to do an introduction from the school.

5 MS M. UGONOTTI: Thank you, Michael. Good morning, Commissioners, and
good morning to all members of the public joining us today. As Michael said,
there's a whole lot of strategic planning that has gone into this significant
development application. We have been working on the concept proposal and stage
1 plan for a few years now. Following the school's application with Hornsby Shire
10 Council for the early learning centre, it became quite apparent to the school that
traffic and parking conditions on and around our school site required further work
and consideration, and so since that point, we have undertaken quite a bit of work to
review the approach taken for traffic and parking.

15 School purchased a property on Mount Pleasant Avenue which would enable us to
take a different approach, and then totally reworked the approach to traffic and
parking in this application. In relation to the growth in numbers, rather than
recapping what has been previously put on the record and is part of our application, I
guess the final comment I would make is that the enrolment numbers submitted as
20 part of this redevelopment application accord to the long-term working of our master
plan over the 30 years, from both a financial perspective as well as what will enable
us to fulfil our mission, as well as our strategic goals, as Michael said. So thank you,
Michael, for the opportunity to make those comments.

25 MR ROWE: Thanks, Marina. So I just wanted to follow on a little bit from what
Marina's comments were about the growth in numbers, and I – because I can
imagine from a public perspective, you can often wonder, "Well, why do you need
all of that? You know, that kind of" And a big part of this is actually about
adopting a transparent approach to the way that the school will fulfil its strategic
vision. So as Marina touched on, it's important in terms of the broader growth of the
30 school, the culture and from a financial feasibility perspective for it to continue to
grow, and then there's also the anticipated growth of the community that's happening
around us.

35 And so what this – the plan and the proposed approach of increasing our numbers
over a period of time is really about actually having transparency. So many private
schools will incrementally creep. Every few years they will come back and get a few
more and a few more and a few more, and there will be discussions like that were
had around the ELC about the capacity of the infrastructure to cope for it, and so the
approach that has actually been adopted is really about laying out where the school
40 wants to get to in – over a long period of time, and then working out what
infrastructure is needed to support that, and then aligning that infrastructure with the
growth of the school in order to then ensure that the school has a clear certainty
about where it's moving, as well as the local residents and the community around it
in terms of the kind of growth that's anticipated.

45 And so we think this project is actually much better for everybody in terms of
making sure that infrastructure is provided and that there's certainty for everybody as

the school grows. The other thing that we wanted to touch on was about that – as you can see, and if you have gone into all of the strategic documents, and you will see then the streets around you and the neighbourhoods, growth is happening in the northern part of Sydney, and so there is a significant increase in population and with
5 that increase in population there is a need for additional school places. And so when you look at all of the strategic plans that are set at a State Government level all the way down to Council, there is a – there is clearly a significant amount of growth that's happening in the northern district.

10 They're anticipating that we need approximately 22,000 new student spaces over the next two decades, and so Loreto is contributing to providing for that very imminent and direct demand that's coming for student places. And so it also is playing a really important role in our broader provision of infrastructure in the form of education. When we look at the project timeline – and I know many residents have been on this
15 journey with the school, and from before it started its master plan, but it started back with this – this broader process back in 2017, and I went to an initial community consultation with the school and met with many of you in October and November of 2018. We heard that traffic was a key issue.

20 We lodged that application. That went on exhibition in 2019, and we can take responsibility that it probably didn't – or didn't do enough in terms of solving some of the traffic issues that were present but are existing under the current arrangements, and when we had the public meeting for the ELC in December 2019, you would have heard me at that meeting and – and we heard you about the significant problems that
25 needed addressing. And so the school listened. They heard what the community said at that public meeting and realised that it needed to come – go away, it appointed new traffic consultants who you will hear from shortly, and come up with solutions to the problems as best the school could control to allow for resolving those current issues and sustainable growth into the future, and really try and come up with
30 a win-win solution both for the – for the community and for the school in terms of allowing its growth.

And so we really then took on those comments and really had to think about how do we go about solving the – the traffic and car parking issues? And so Paul and the
35 team at TTW went away and looked at how they could go about solving those problems. One of the key things was they purchased 4 Mount Pleasant Avenue which allowed for the through road which was a recommendation that came back from the ELC in discussions with the RMS. We then looked at how do we link the student population with the required infrastructure. So that's why you see there's
40 that staged growth of students over time. And then we amended the proposal and put in that response to submissions scheme that presented the additional traffic modelling, the infrastructure tied with the students, and the broader scope of proposal of adding the car parking and – and the drop-off measures that are part of the application that's subject to approval to the IPC.

45 So with that, we did do a lot of listening. There has been a lot of major amendments over the course of this project. You will see this was what was originally lodged in

terms of envelopes on the right-hand corner here, and then the envelopes that were submitted and – and Matt mentioned before there have been further modifications to those envelopes as part of the Department’s assessment to reduce the scale on Osborn. But there has been a number of major traffic measures that have been introduced. There was deletion of this tall or more contentious building on Pennant Hills Road. The envelopes have all been significantly refined and reduced, and there was a – also a net increase in tree canopy proposed. So there have been significant amendments that have been made in response to the concerns that have been raised by the community. I’m now going to hand to Paul and he’s going to talk to you in a bit more detail about the traffic and car parking.

MR P. YANNOULATOS: Thank you, Michael, and good morning, Commissioners and members of the public. As Michael explained, when TTW Traffic joined the team during the preparation of the amended proposal, we were asked to have a fresh look at the traffic and parking issues, and it was during our inspections that we – you know, we were able to absorb – observe what the key causes and problems were. This diagram here shows us a lot of the congestion and conflict points of the existing pedestrian and vehicle access arrangements. Traffic flows are somewhat disjointed and concentrated. What we saw was a twofold solution. The first was to distribute the flows of traffic, and that is serve the concentration, and also provide – the second part was to provide this additional queuing lengths within the school grounds and not external on the public road system.

The result being a significant increase in queuing lengths, and the separation of the pick-up and drop-off, one on the north end near Pennant Hills Road and one towards the south in Osborn near the ovals. Thank you, Michael. Next slide, please. When we look at the overall traffic flows now, it’s a much better, improved, more coordinated traffic movements. We can see in green the pedestrians accessing from Pennant Hills Road into the main entry gates. We can see the buses in orange there have their dedicated bus drop off, and then we have got the cars in red, and they too have a loop system – a one-way loop system that provides a nice flow of traffic and minimising the conflict with queuing.

Next slide, thank you, Michael. So in addition to the separation of the traffic and the conflict points, other measures that were taken was – included the operational traffic management plan, which is available to staff but also to visitors. There will be traffic marshals at the pick-up and drop-off areas, no stopping signage, and also an important part is the green travel plan. Now, the green travel plan is designed to reduce private vehicle use, and this will help with traffic demand, with parking, and also reduce congestion in the streets. There will also be a dedicated staff and student parking areas, and the students will be required to display their passes.

Another important aspect of the green travel plan is active transport, and there will be plenty of bicycle parking for both the students and the teachers. A lot of time has been taken in looking at the staging of the project, and this is because we wanted to ensure that as the school grows in population there is adequate parking provision. And so the yellow and blue areas there will occur as part of the first phase, and this

will bring immediate – a relief to the congestion because the pick-up and drop-off will be built first. Then there will be additional parking provisions through the purple and red, and that will assist with increasing the parking requirements as the school grows, right up to the fifth element there – shown there for the long-term car park which will be at the – around the oval area.

Next slide, please. Thank you. It's important to note that all operations within the school have been considered, including the early learning centre, and all the modelling and the parking requirements have been considered when looking at all the operations within the school, even to the point where we're somewhat conservative in our traffic modelling. We did assume that the early learning centre drop off peak would be at the same time as the school peak, even though we know the early learning centre starts at 7 am and finishes at 6 pm. And, of course, there will always be construction traffic management plans at all stages of the works. It isn't anticipated to be more than, say, 10 vehicles per hour during construction, construction vehicles. All the construction workers will not be permitted to park in the public streets, and the contractors will be required to provide a proposed parking strategy to ensure that this is the case. That's all I have got at the moment. Thank you, Michael.

MR ROWE: Thanks, Paul. And so just to wrap up from Loreto's perspective, this is really about pursuing their long-term vision for the growth of the school, and preserving its history and its culture, and its ability to continue to deliver high quality education for the growing northern region of Sydney. As I outlined and Paul has gone into in more detail, we really have listened and we have made amendments to the proposal, which include the major traffic management measures that Paul took you through, increasing the car parking, the – making sure that that growth in student populations is linked with the infrastructure delivery, and – and you will note that the school hasn't started the ELC. It intends on, subject to approval of this application, actually commencing on doing the road traffic measures first before it brings on the ELC online, and then all of the – the building and bulk and scale requirements that have been introduced. So we – we understand the community has concerns about traffic. The school has really tried to listen and – and we think this is a really great long-term plan for both the community and the school moving forward. So thank you very much for your time today.

MR PILTON: Thanks, Michael. Wendy, Juliet, any questions? No.

MS LEWIN: None from me.

MR PILTON: Thank you, Michael.

MR ROWE: Thank you.

MR DEIGHTON: Thanks, Michael. Up next, Alex Grey from Greys Traffic Engineering Services. Alex, good morning.

MR A. GREY: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Alex Grey. I'm a principal traffic engineer with Greys Consulting. Our company was commissioned by the surrounding residents' community to undertake a peer review of the traffic and parking study report prepared by TTW. Well, let's – no, I want to actually start
5 with the fact that – yes, that holistic traffic assessment has been undertaken. The – the outcome of our analysis basically showed that most of these analysis are kind of superficial, and a part of that actually could be blamed on the conditions provided by BPI, which hasn't been really customised for a certain type of major
10 developments.

As my colleague Paul mentioned earlier, we have got different peak hours here. We have got queuing along different drop-off and pick-up zones, and a SIDRA analysis, which is a – some sort of a static micro-analytical software, is not really the best. We acknowledge that using SIDRA is a part of the condition, but should really
15 look into deeper issues coming with fluctuating traffic and dynamic demand for the drop-off zone and pick-up zone due to different hours, due to different land use introduced in this development. And I'm of the opinion that SIDRA will not be the best tool to assess this type of development, and perhaps you're looking into more microsimulation modelling to – in order to actually demonstrate how safely – how
20 incapacitated the – the – the road network is to accommodate this amount of traffic which is supposed to travel around the road – around the road networks.

The SIDRA definitely is not going to do that, and unfortunately with the way that SIDRA has been analysed and modelled, it hasn't really considered a validation
25 of the model. We really couldn't find any SIDRA fault, first of all. They were not really provided even to Department of Planning, as far as I'm concerned. And the back of the queue analysis in the base case, they – TTW claim that they have done a drone survey but we didn't find really any evidence of that in the traffic report, in terms of how the back of queues in the base case have been established and
30 calibrated for the model, so that we can build the future model on top of that, so the base model is not reliable enough, in my opinion, in terms of building the future case scenarios.

The other thing is that they have used a lot of default values in the model. For
35 example, at the intersection of Normanhurst Road, Osborn Road and Cumberland Highway and Pennant Hills Road. There is a which is a pedestrian which connects the foot – the pedestrian footbridge, and the increasing the traffic has not been really considered and only 50 pedestrians per hour, which is the default of SIDRA, has been just used in the model. And for the future, the same thing applies.
40 This again shows a bit of – a lack of deep analysis of the – of the pedestrian movements and how the timing is going to be able to – to actually accommodate that demand.

The other – the other thing that actually came to my attentions about the green travel
45 plan, green travel plan, as far as I'm concerned, have been introduced years ago, and the practicality of – I have prepared a few green travel plans, so let me say that first, but the practicality of green travel plans are not really proved yet. And the – the

targets that TTW have considered in their green travel plan are about, like, 10 per cent mode shift, which is very aspirational, and by the industry facilities and number of bikes, and whatever actually industry facilities that they have proposed, I don't think a 10 per cent would be achievable. So just the last point that I wanted to add is
5 the lack of proper road safety audit report to show the potential detrimental safety impacts on the surrounding road network for the increase of traffic, which is a huge part of the missing puzzle. And yes, that's about it. These are just a few additional traffic study and the efforts required to just clarify how the traffic is going to operate in the future. Thank you, gentlemen.

10 MR PILTON: Thanks, Alex. Wendy, Juliet, any questions? No. Thank you again, Alex.

MR DEIGHTON: Up next, Jann Deveridge. Jann, good morning. You're on mute.

15 MR PILTON: You're on mute, Jann.

MS J. DEVERIDGE: Yes. No, I have unmuted now.

20 MR DEIGHTON: Thank you.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you.

MS DEVERIDGE: Can you hear me?

25 MR DEIGHTON: We can. Go ahead.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

30 MS DEVERIDGE: Good morning and thank you for having me speak today. I'm a resident of Mount Pleasant Avenue and I have no problem with the development of Loreto. My major problem with this project is the traffic management. Living in a dead-end street, my major concern was the no right turn onto Pennant Hills Road from Mount Pleasant Avenue. 98 per cent of the time when I leave my street, I turn
35 right, and I have never considered it to be a dangerous intersection, although it is tricky. My kids learned to drive driving out of – turning right out of Mount Pleasant Avenue, and also I think that, you know, really, the safety of school traffic turning right or turning left onto Pennant Hills Road really should be done through the traffic lights on Osborn Road rather than through an intersection having all the traffic
40 turning left onto Pennant Hills Road from Mount Pleasant Avenue. I think it's much safer for all the school traffic to turn right from – right or left onto Pennant Hills Road from the lights.

45 The other thing that I also wanted to mention is that since the opening of the NorthConnex tunnel, there is much less traffic on Pennant Hills Road, so it's a much easier intersection nowadays, and – and it has a good turning bay with good vision. The other thing I wanted to mention was in the assessment the Wahroonga Estate

was mentioned, and that DA was given 12 years ago, which at this stage I would think would have to be obsolete, and – and as they haven't done – one of the things about that Wahroonga Estate was that part of their planning permission was to put a no right-hand turn in at Mount Pleasant Avenue, but as I say, I think DAs do have a
5 lifespan, I would think, and I would think that was totally out of – out of its lifespan by now, and nothing as yet has happened with the Wahroonga Estate apart from the school on Fox Valley Road.

10 In my 11 years of living here, I have never witnessed an accident on the corner of Mount Pleasant Avenue and Pennant Hills Road. I think there's a couple of things that I would suggest, is that if the – if this is going to happen, is that there's a no stopping on the Loreto side of the road in Mount Pleasant Avenue during school hours and for Saturday sport, because it can get quite tricky when people park on both sides of the road, getting up and down the road. And also, as you turn left into
15 Mount Pleasant Avenue, there's a no stopping sign there, and that should be moved further down the street because often it's – people park right to the edge of that no stopping sign and it is quite close to the corner of Mount Pleasant – of Pennant Hills Road. I think that on the whole, I think it's not bad, but if the traffic came into Mount Pleasant Avenue and through the school and out at Osborn Road, I know
20 there is more turning bays and things planned on that side, but they could still enter that way and go into the – into the drop-off zones on Osborn Road and then out onto Pennant Hills Road from the lights on Osborn Road. I would think that would be a much safer alternative than people scooting into the left-hand lane on Pennant Hills Road. That's all I have to say. Thank you very much.

25 MR PILTON: Thanks, Jann. Wendy, Juliet, questions? No. Thank you.

MS DEVERIDGE: Thanks a lot.

30 MR DEIGHTON: Thank you, Jann. Elke Wagener is up next. Elke, good morning. Elke, can you hear us?

MR PILTON: I think you're on mute, Elke.

35 MS E. WAGENER: Can you hear me now?

MR DEIGHTON: We can.

MR PILTON: Yes.
40

MR DEIGHTON: Go ahead.

MS WAGENER: You can. Yes. Hi. I'm Elke Wagener. I live in Osborn Road and have lived here for over 40 years. We have spoken to Loreto as residents of
45 Osborn Road during the last three years and have made them aware of the traffic problems that exist at the moment. We have made suggestions on how to improve the traffic flow. One of them was to fix that slip road for the buses, where the buses

go in, which really cause the poor design causes a lot of congestion coming into Osborn Road at the drop-off times, and also pick-up, actually. We have suggested that they use the bus stop at Road in a northerly direction. They're not using that at the moment.

5

We have also suggested that they allow direct entry into their own grounds so they don't have to use adjoining streets. When you come from northerly direction along Pennant Hills Road there is an entry gate. They're not using that. So I'm not aware that Loreto has taken any of these suggestions on board, have done anything about it.

10

MR DEIGHTON: We have got a really bad connection there so we might move on and come back to Elke, if we can tidy up that line.

MS WAGENER: So the - - -

15

MR DEIGHTON: If we can come back to me and we will go to - - -

MS WAGENER: The situation is not good increase in student numbers which will cause more - - -

20

MR DEIGHTON: Move on to the next speaker.

MS WAGENER: Sorry.

25

MR DEIGHTON: Sorry, Elke. We're having really bad connectivity issues there and we can't hear you. We will try and tidy up that line and come back to you, and we will move on for the time being. We will come back to Elke shortly.

MS WAGENER: Okay.

30

MR DEIGHTON: If we go on now to David Greenwood. David, are you there?

MR D. GREENWOOD: Yes, I am.

35

MR DEIGHTON: Good morning.

MR GREENWOOD: Good morning, Commissioners. My name is David and I'm a resident of Mount Pleasant Avenue. I moved here with my family four years ago, and had I have known of Loreto's plans, there's no way I would have purchased my home. We chose to live on this street to avoid traffic, ironic now that Loreto wishes to use our single-entry street as a major thoroughfare for a 2000-student school. We didn't want a quiet street because we're picky. It's because of necessity for our son Cooper, who is eight and lives with disability. He uses a powered wheelchair for mobility. He attends the local primary school, and one of his big goals is to get to school by himself.

45

But drastically increasing traffic on our little street will take away this small glimmer of independence from him. He has to fight hard to do the most basic things in life because his body just doesn't cooperate. We as parents in turn have to fight hard for the things he needs to live an ordinary life. In fact, through help of NDIS funding,
5 we have spent more than \$400,000 to make our home more accessible for him. Now, Loreto's plans to nearly double their student population and the resulting traffic chaos may force us to move as this road will – simply will not be safe for him. There are no pedestrian crossings. There are no traffic lights. There are long queues of cars already, yet Loreto's farcical plans say traffic is not an issue.

10 They have a green traffic management plan. Then why do they need an additional 443 car spaces? The traffic has already increased since COVID as parents change their behaviours. We have had two near misses with our kids with speeding P-platers on our road, and I have witnessed other kids having trouble crossing Mount Pleasant
15 Avenue at the intersection of Pennant Hills Road. Loreto's solution to turn – to ban right-hand turns only suits them, not residents, and this is the way they have handled the whole plan. What suits them will be. If you don't like it, shut up and leave. There has been a Royal Commission into aged care and banking conduct. However, I believe the conduct of Loreto in this development has been as unconscionable as
20 anything found in either of those, yet no one seems to make them accountable.

Are they using their considerable resources to influence decision-makers? (1) you know, Michael spoke about purchasing a property at 4 Mount Pleasant Avenue. In fact, they bullied the resident there for a number of years to purchase that property.
25 She told us of relentless harassment and intimidation to get her to sell. As an elderly lady living alone, and despite having just renovated her kitchen, she eventually sold off market because she couldn't handle the abuse anymore. (2) when they conducted the traffic investigation, the senior school was on camp and there was a school communication asking students not to use Mount Pleasant Avenue to create a
30 misleading report on current traffic volumes.

(3) Loreto has a habit of doing what they want to get what they want. The DA application for the aquatic centre stated it would be used as a school use only pool, but today it is a community learn-to-swim school which attracts more traffic to
35 neighbouring streets. (4) a more recent example is the approved child-care facility. They designed a lovely green roof space to fit in with the streetscape. Before that construction has even begun, they're asking to remove the greenery and replace it with solar panels. And (5) Hornsby Council recommended approval subject to a widening of Osborn Street to manage flows via traffic lights. Loreto instead uses
40 their considerable resources and influence to avert all traffic to Mount Pleasant Avenue, which makes zero sense except to save the school money.

Further to my concerns around their conduct and flawed management plan, which is diverting all traffic to Mount Pleasant Avenue, I want to ask a question. Why does a
45 boarding school need to impact local residents? By nature, a boarding school does not need to be in a metro area. This is an opportunity for Loreto to do the right thing for the community and actually use their \$130 million to build a secondary campus

where you actually add to the local community, not detract and impact local residents. So please, think about my son and don't take away his dream of independently getting to school. Thank you.

- 5 MR PILTON: Thank you, David. Questions, Wendy, Juliet? No. Okay. Thank you very much, David.

MR GREENWOOD: Thank you.

- 10 MR DEIGHTON: We will return now to Elke Wagener, who I think we have got on the phone now. Elke, can you hear us?

MS WAGENER: Yes, I can hear you.

- 15 MR DEIGHTON: Excellent. We can hear you loud and clear. We might get you to start from the top, because it's really important that we hear everything that you have got to say, and we were having obviously issues with that connection earlier.

- 20 MS WAGENER: Yes, sure. Sure. Sure. So my name is Elke Wagener. I live in Osborn Road, have lived there for over 40 years. We have as a community spoken to Loreto over the last at least three years quite a lot about the traffic issues. Well, the traffic issues as they are at the moment, and they're not good, so we have made suggestions things. One of them was to fix the slip road where the buses from – off Osborn Road go up into the Loreto to drop-off and pick-up. The slip road is
25 poorly designed and the buses have – you know, it's slow for them to get up there, which really hampers traffic flow. We have suggested they improve that. We have suggested that they use the bus stop on the other side of Pennant Hills Road that is a northerly direction.

- 30 We have also suggested that they use the bus stop on the other side of Pennant Hills Road and drive directly their buses into the Loreto and drop off there. I don't think that any of these suggestions have been taken on board by Loreto, and that is disappointing. There's no question that this proposed development will increase the traffic further, much – much more. Now, also some of these – the green plan is just
35 clearly quite ridiculous. This whole thing with – with bicycles, the students going to school by bicycle, I'm – I don't know what percentage of students live locally enough to even be able to go by bicycle. Possibly a small percentage.

- 40 Anyhow, I as a parent would not allow my child to ride along Pennant Hills Road. Pennant Hills Road is not as busy as it used to be but it's still a major road with multiple lanes with 70 kilometre per hour speed limit. It's just too dangerous. It's – it's ridiculous. Encouraging carpooling, I would have thought Loreto does that already, so I don't know how the increase – when the increased traffic comes along, how this is a new thing. I would have thought anyone in this day and age looks at
45 carpooling where we're concerned about the environment. Then Loreto has in the past said part of its green plan would be to keep any car movements out of its own grounds.

That moves the problem to the adjoining streets. It just moves them elsewhere. That's not being particularly green. It's not a reasonable situation and it's certainly – it's not an environmentally sound solution. Loreto needs to take ownership of this problem. It is creating it and it must accommodate vehicle movements in its own
5 really extensive grounds. The grounds are big. It can do it. It's not the job of the adjoining residents to somehow put up with this thing. As long as the current situation is not even adequately dealt with, how can we support the new proposal which puts additional load on – on the adjoining streets with – with all that comes with it, emergency vehicles not getting through, etcetera, etcetera. So I would
10 recommend not to go – that we can't go ahead with this proposal until adequate solutions have been found. That's it from me.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you very much, Elke.

15 MS WAGENER: All right.

MR PILTON: We will proceed to the next – yes, next speaker, please, Troy.

MS WAGENER: Okay. Bye-bye.
20

MR PILTON: Thanks, Elke.

MR DEIGHTON: Thank you, Elke, and thanks for your patience this morning. Mark Westcott is next. Mark, good morning.
25

MR M. WESTCOTT: Good morning and thanks for having me. My name is Mark Westcott. I'm a resident of Osborn Road, resident of 19 years in Osborn Road. I'm glad to hear that – or somewhat satisfied to hear that the objective of the development is to cater towards the growing northern region that Loreto plans to draw students from. What seems to be indisputable is that there will be a greater
30 inflow of traffic into the area. We have heard concerns from various residents around the effects of that increased traffic flow. I would just like to confine my comments to the green travel plan which we have heard referenced a few times so far, which is designed to try and alleviate some of those – or prevent some of those
35 traffic issues from occurring.

So it's designed, obviously, to try and shift journeys away from single occupancy car travel towards other modes of transport. And as it stands, I have got some reservations about the capacity of the green travel plan to achieve this, and there are
40 the three broad points that I would like to speak to. The first relates to the data that's contained in the GTP, the second, the projections, and the third relates to the proposed solution. It would seem to me in order to make good policy and make good decisions, we need good data, and I know that the green travel plan is largely an aspirational plan, but it's an important one nonetheless. So what is the data that we
45 have got in the green travel plan that's being used to inform the decisions about alternative modes of transport?

The report prepared by TTW seems to rely heavily on a questionnaire that was conducted either by them or – or Loreto around how people – how staff and students travel to – to school. Now, we get told that there's a high response rate to the questionnaire. We don't get told how many people responded, which is perhaps a moot point. What's critical I think is – what's missing from that information is the point of origin for those – for those travel – for those journeys undertaken by staff and students. So we have got an idea about how they got there but we have got no idea of where they came from. And if we're going to be – if we're going to be planning alternative modes of travel to the precinct, we have got to know where people actually are starting their journeys from.

And that seems to be critical if they're able to access public transport, whether that be bus or train or cycling, which seems to be the preferred option that's being put forward. I have heard in other submissions this morning the around the projections. From what I can see, 11.2 per cent of the reduction in single car trips is going to become by replacing those with bus – sorry – by bike and – and train. Again, unless we have got individual level data around those points of origin, we don't really know what alternatives there are for staff and students in order to get to – to the precinct, and those kinds of predictions are largely meaningless. I don't really see any informed discussion around how those projections were arrived at.

We have heard again that they're aspirational. Where do those numbers actually come from? Notwithstanding the absence of that modelling, what happens if – if those targets fail to be reached? I note that the Transport New South Wales in their submission have said that Loreto needs to include a mechanism for monitoring the effectiveness and measures of the plan. Given the targets, how is – how does Loreto propose to monitor the effectiveness of that plan, and then how are we going to be – how are they going to be held accountable for making sure that measures are introduced in order to effect those outcomes? Really quickly, the last thing around incentives, picking up on what Elke said, I guess, the – one of the solutions seems to be to ride bikes, bicycle facilities, end of journey facilities for – for bicycle riders to the precinct.

How do we know that that's what will induce a change in behaviour? As Elke has pointed out, given the location and – and this is in the green travel plan as well. There aren't existing bike paths. They don't – the – the prospect of travelling to Loreto would seem to be limited if we look at the existing bike paths, the existing road routes, and we don't know whether there's a preference from staff or students to actually travel to school by bike. I could pick-up on the car pooling but – that Elke has already spoken to as well, and the – the limited bus routes that are available. So I think there are some – some real issues around the green travel plan that need to be addressed at the very least. Thanks for your time.

MR PILTON: Thank you very much, Mark. Okay. Next speaker. Thanks, Troy.

MR DEIGHTON: Our next speaker is Matthew Gee. Mr Gee, good morning.

MR M. GEE: Good morning, and thanks for allowing me to talk briefly about this state significant development. So my name is Matthew Gee. I live with my family on Mount Pleasant Avenue, which is one of the dead-end streets that flank the school. I have to say it was good to hear from Greys today. The applicant's
5 modelling seems flawed in many, many respects. Software modelling validated by selective drone footage on a day when some of the school was away on an excursion and year 12s had already finished smacks of an overly simplistic analysis that simply cannot and should not be relied upon. Today I want to talk about two things that have concerned me as I have read the DPIE assessment report: (1) the maths the
10 applicant, their reps and the DPIE does not reveal, and secondly, the maths they do reveal but have wrong.

Firstly, the maths they don't reveal. Today's meeting is being held as there were significant community objections. Most of these I note were from residents from
15 surrounding streets. Now, there are about 200 homes in Mount Pleasant Avenue, Osborn Road and its five feeder streets. According to ABS stats for Normanhurst, only about 130 of these would be owner-occupiers and the rest are renters. It's fair to say that mainly it's going to be owners that object to DAs. Now, there were 78 objections to the applicant's RTS. Fair to say then that's 60 per cent of owners from
20 all surrounding streets who have objected to this development. To have way over 60 per cent of affected residents complaining is highly significant, and it should indicate to the IPC just how deep this community objection runs.

Obviously, the applicant hasn't presented the DPIE such data as it's damning for
25 them, but it needs to be said here today. The second thing that concerns me about the maths, the assessment report does actually reveal but has so clearly got it wrong. The queuing analysis of cars on the Loreto property is flawed, yet it has been accepted by the DPIE. The analysis states 12 cars will be able to internally queue on the lower Osborn drop-off and pick-up, and 24 cars on the Osborn/Mount Pleasant
30 Road link road – Mount Pleasant Avenue link road, but at six metres per car, as per the Australian Standard, which seems to have been ignored, these figures should actually be not 12 and 24 but nine and 14.

This, of course, means that the extra cars queue not internally but on Osborn Road,
35 impacting significantly on residents and the flow of traffic around the school. Secondly, as Mark Westcott has just argued, the GTP is aspirational. It has certainly not taken into account COVID – COVID or actually the relative attractiveness of driving to school now that NorthConnex has taken some of the heat off Pennant Hills Road. So where does the extra traffic go that the GTP doesn't say? It goes down
40 Osborn, Mount Pleasant Avenue, Normanhurst Road, and probably even onto Pennant Hills Road. It's noted that Member for Kuringgai, Alister Henskens SC, MP has also questioned the aspirational nature of the GTP in several submissions he has made to the DPIE.

45 Thirdly, selective drone footage provided by the applicant's reps indicates a current maximum queuing at nine vehicles on Osborne Road. Can this be relied upon? The queuing of nine is consistent with the drop-off and pick-up stats provided by the

- applicant, but I note a couple of things: (1) what about the teachers and the students who drive to school? According to Loreto's figures, there are about 330 additional cars currently coming from these groups onto Osborn Road each morning; (2) the analysis focuses on drop-off and pick-up, but it's not the only traffic. The applicant conveniently forgets about these 330 cars but they're significant. 90 per cent of teachers are driving in each day. You have got a whole bunch of year 11 and 12 students there who are driving into school and they're not included in the drop-off and pick-up.
- And what about all of the residents that want to use the road as well? Not included in the analysis. How reliable are the traffic assessment reports, number 2, that the surveys – and Mark has commented on these. What was asked? Who crunched the numbers? Can we rely on SurveyMonkey figures that the applicant has presented? And how are we really – have we really just assumed that the extrapolations from there are correct? What we need – and Alex from Greys said this – is quantitative data, and how can the government not demand it? Let's not even get into the traffic snail that's going to be created across Normanhurst Road, where there are two big schools, Normanhurst Public School and Normanhurst Boys High School.
- It's easy to see how Loreto's problems then end up extending into Thornleigh's problems. Look, at the end of the day, the IPC has to look at the development and ask themselves whether the applicant has truly done their homework on all of this. Also, surely the IPC must contemplate whether this growth can be sustained given the site and the low-rise residential community that the school finds itself in. I wonder whether the nuns 150 years ago would have ever thought that their small boarding school of 20 to 30 students would aspire to have 2000 students and 500 teachers streaming in every day via just two single-lane dead-end cul-de-sacs. To my mind, it's all quite simple here. If Loreto want to expand, they should bear the economic cost of doing so, and they should ensure that the social costs are not shafted onto the residents, all for the sake of growth. Thank you.

MR PILTON: Thank you very much. No questions? No. Thanks, Matthew.

- MR DEIGHTON: Thanks, Matthew, and thanks, Adrian. We will take a break now for morning tea. Be back at 11.35. Don't forget though that for the latest information from the Commission you can check out our news page on our website, or follow us on Facebook or Twitter. We will see you at 11.35.

RECORDING SUSPENDED [11.09 am]

RECORDING RESUMED [11.36 am]

45

MR DEIGHTON: Welcome back to the Independent Planning Commission public meeting. Into the Loreto Normanhurst Redevelopment. Standing by should be Moira Hutchinson.

5 MS M. HUTCHINSON: Yes.

MR DEIGHTON: Ms Hutchinson, good morning. Can you hear me?

MS HUTCHINSON: Yes, I can. Thank you.

10

MR DEIGHTON: Our Commissioners are standing by. You're free to start.

MS HUTCHINSON: Right. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I'm Moira Hutchinson. I've been a resident of Mount Pleasant Avenue since 1976, and
15 in that time, I've seen many submissions of DAs by Loreto and numerous amendments by them to the conditions set in these DAs. In this current DA, I am deeply concerned about the lessening of pedestrian safety in both Mount Pleasant Avenue and Osborn Road and especially the Mount Pleasant Avenue intersection, where no study regarding pedestrian safety seems to have been undertaken and
20 Frank will further elaborate on some of the points that I raised. I and my neighbours have witnessed on his way home from school.

MR PILTON: Troy, can we - - -

25 MS HUTCHINSON: - - - sorry? Can't you hear me?

MR DEIGHTON: No. Moira, sorry. We're having a few technical issues there. It's - - -

30 MS HUTCHINSON: It's still technical issues?

MR DEIGHTON: Just a really bad - - -

MS HUTCHINSON: I've turned off - - -
35

MR DEIGHTON: A really bad connection. What we might do is move on to James Phimister.

MS HUTCHINSON: Well, we could move computers. I wonder would that help.
40

MR F. HUTCHINSON: We can move to another room. So we'll log off here.

MS HUTCHINSON: To another room.

45 MR HUTCHINSON: And we'll connect up to the other room, and when our time comes, we can try again.

MS HUTCHINSON: All right.

MR HUTCHINSON: Okay.

5 MR DEIGHTON: What we'll do is we'll call you offline, and we'll move you down the schedule so we can hear from you. But right now, we'll move on to James Phimister. James, are you there?

10 MR J. PHIMISTER: Yes. Good morning. Can you hear me?

MR DEIGHTON: We can. Thank you. Please go ahead.

MR PHIMISTER: Good morning, everyone. Thank you for facilitating this meeting. My name is Jim Phimister. I live in Currawong Avenue, one of the feeder
15 streets of a giant cul-de-sac of which Osborn Road is the only exit. I have three points I wish to make and to comment on Loreto's corporate social responsibility and social licence to operate.

The first is the apparent glossing over and dismissing of Hornsby Shire Council's
20 submission to widen Osborn Road. The submission was made on the 6th of July but could not be found on the DPIE portal. It was embedded in the IPC portal, but that's not a place most residents would have looked, as anyone engaged with the development had been guided to the DPIE portal. In the DPIE assessment, the Council recommendation was dismissed by Bitzios, the consultant engaged by the
25 DPIE, as too difficult, but with no explanation as to what this difficulty is. Clearly, the Council traffic engineers did not regard the widening as too difficult. When I contacted the Council, they were yet to receive a formal response to their submission and advised a traffic engineer would be addressing this IPC meeting, but perhaps their submission will be dealt with in a different forum.

30 The widening of Osborn Road with two lanes on the eastern school side all the way down to gate 3 would be a good engineering solution which has been proposed by the Council who are an authority on the subject. As much as I'd like to protect the trees along the road, this seems to be a compromise that I believe most residents
35 could come to terms with. Most if not all residents have been denied the opportunity to comment on the proposal and have been denied procedural fairness.

Secondly, the relocated drop-off and pickup areas allow for 36 vehicles and a road length of 139 metres. As alluded to by Matt Gee, simple maths shows this is only
40 3.86 metres a car. Australian standard 2890 requires a minimum of six metres a car for safe queuing. This is a crucial error in the consultant document and renders the recirculation solution impractical. Thirdly, the Green Travel Plan is an implausible, aspirational document and should not be relied upon for predicting future traffic flow, particularly in an ongoing new COVID world and which relies purely on the
45 goodwill of the parents and cannot be enforced.

Corporate social responsibility is a company's commitment to manage the social, environmental and economic effects of its operations responsibly and in line with public expectations. Loreto has shown none. Neither has Loreto grasped the concept of social licence to operate. Social licence exists when a project has the ongoing
5 approval within the local community. It must be earned and then maintained. Loreto has no social licence to operate in our community. There have been 80 objections from residents and the aged care home. Every one of these objections has been battled away by consultants engaged by Loreto to do just that. There is not a single submission in favour of the development.

10 I urge the IPC to do the following. Understand that the community feels it's not really being listened to and is very angry. Understand that Loreto does not have a social licence to operate and in current form is a very unwelcome neighbour. Ask the DPIE to look again at the Council recommendation to widen Osborn Road, which
15 would be a good engineering solution that does not rely on an implausible and aspirational Green Travel Plan. Ask the DPIE to go over the Bitzios and other consultant reports with an impartial eye on the errors and deficiencies pointed out by myself and other speakers. Scale back the development from 2000 students, which is an increase of 74 per cent from the current 1150 students, and cap the number at, say,
20 1450, which is still a very significant 26 per cent increase. And advise Loreto to completely reconsider the scale, scope and impact on the community. Thanks very much.

25 MR PILTON: Thank you, James.

MR DEIGHTON: Thanks, Mr Phimister. I believe we've got Moira Hutchinson on the telephone now. Moira, can you hear us? We may have lost Moira again. We'll move on. Colin Watson. Mr Watson, are you there?

30 MR C. WATSON: Yes. Can you hear me?

MR DEIGHTON: We can. Please go ahead.

35 MR WATSON: Very good. Thank you very much. I would like to thank everyone for giving us this opportunity to speak. My name is Colin Watson. I live in Mount Pleasant Avenue. I want to speak about the scope and scale of the changes. Before moving to Mount Pleasant Avenue, I lived at the junior school of Abbotsleigh Girls School, where I was the chaplain of the school and a member of the executive of the school. So I believe in girls education and I believe in schools like Abbotsleigh and
40 Loreto.

During my time at Abbotsleigh, we also had to make decisions about student numbers. It was decided after much consultation with students, parents, teachers and families that not increasing the size of the senior school would help keep the culture
45 of the school that had also been in existence for over 100 years. Traffic was also already heavy at Wahroonga, and one of the issues was that we could not increase

traffic further around that area without affecting nearby residents and parents trying to pick-up their own children.

5 A different decision, however, was made at the junior school across on the other side of the road of the Pacific Highway, and they also built an Early Learning Centre. The building works did occur, and while they look great, unfortunately, a lot of green space was taken up and students had a much lower level of grassed area to enjoy morning tea and lunchtimes. This had an effect on the culture of the ability of the girls to run around during these times. Also, the traffic did become a huge issue, even though queueing had been looked into and was improved, but it soon became the norm that people would stay away from Wahroonga Shops at drop-off and pick-up times. This also affected the livelihood of the shops at Wahroonga during that time.

15 One doctor one morning needed to come to the school, and it took him 45 minutes to get from one side of the Wahroonga Shops to the school, which would have been a distance of about 1.5 kilometres. He could have walked faster. I think we totally underestimated the effect of the extra cars dropping off and picking up students. We even had a few parents who would park their cars outside the school at the start of the day and then go shopping so that they could have their car ready and waiting to pick-up their child. In the end, they had to change the parking to one hour parking in the streets so cars didn't queue up on the streets, and it made me think perhaps we need more one or two hour parking on Osborn and Mount Pleasant Avenue with parking permits for residents only so we have a better flow through, and the promise of cars being parked inside Loreto school, well, that will be kept.

Now, why have I gone on about Wahroonga and Loreto? Well, I see a lot of similar issues but possibly worse here at Normanhurst. We have two small dead-end streets, an Early Learning Centre operating from 7 am to 6 pm, traffic heading down towards Normanhurst Road past the public school, who are also very nervous about how their own parents will pick-up children from Normanhurst Public School at these peak times. I spoke to someone from Normanhurst Public School the other day. They said this is going to be a nightmare. We will have huge trucks coming up and down Osborn and Mount Pleasant Avenue for many months or years, and the promise of them not parking in either of the streets will be something that I hate to say I don't have a lot confidence in, but there will be queues.

And when the building work is completed, the culture of the school will change just because of its great scope and size. This is huge. But the culture of our streets will also change, as many residents have attested to this morning and before in their submissions. As has been stated, traffic flows have been looked at from a school perspective, but we have around 300 houses in Osborn and Mount Pleasant Avenue, as well as a retirement village at the end of Mount Pleasant Avenue. At present, two cars cannot get past each other when cars are parked on two sides of Mount Pleasant Avenue at present. Can you imagine the chaos when an ambulance or a fire truck has to get down to the retirement village during peak hour drop-off or pick-up or a fire engine having to get through one of the streets with cars parked on both sides, trying to get there to fight a fire?

I would ask Council and everyone who's looking at this that if they do approve this proposal, even in part, because I think it needs to be restricted – but we need to restrict parking on both sides of these roads to two hours perhaps with residents having permit stickers. This is not only for the sake of the residents, but also for the
5 sake of Loreto parents doing pick-up and drop-offs all the time. The flow that we've been given doesn't work now. How will it work when traffic is doubled or tripled? I urge people to come now and see the difficulty it is already in cars having to wait for cars to stop in opposite direction. Bigger is not always better, and I don't want everyone to underestimate the size of these plans. It will change the community but
10 also the school community, as they will have to battle through very congested streets. Thank you very much.

MR PILTON: Thanks, Colin.

15 MR DEIGHTON: Thanks, Mr Watson. Thirdly time lucky, I think. We'll have Moira standing by. Moira, can you hear me?

MS HUTCHINSON: I can hear you.

20 MR DEIGHTON: Perfect.

MS HUTCHINSON: Can you hear me?

MR DEIGHTON: Yes. Go ahead.

25

MS HUTCHINSON: All right.

MR DEIGHTON: Thank you.

30 MS HUTCHINSON: Right. Thank you very much. As a resident of Mount Pleasant Avenue since 1976, I have seen many submissions of DAs by Loreto and numerous amendments by them to the conditions set in these DAs. In this current DA, I am deeply concerned about the lessening of pedestrian safety in both Mount Pleasant Avenue and Osborn Road and especially the Mount Pleasant Avenue
35 intersection, where no study regarding pedestrian safety seems to have been undertaken, as there is no marked crossing there, and Frank will further elaborate on some of these points. I and my neighbours have witnessed several serious accidents in Mount Pleasant Avenue itself, including one involving a seven year old boy hit by a car on his way home from school and several vehicular accidents of cars turning
40 right from Mount Pleasant Avenue into the Barry Wing Car park, which is dangerously situated at the crest of the hill at the bend in the road.

At the intersection itself, it's not only fatalities that should be looked at, but serious accidents that have impacted on people's lives. We residents are aware of at least
45 one fatality at the intersection in 2015, but I would like to draw your attention to two other accidents which have had significant effects on those involved. The first was in October 2012 when a nurse from the Adventist village turning into our street was

involved in a serious accident for which she was hospitalised. I recollect that there was some uncertainty as to whether she would be physically able to return to the same busy work.

5 The second case was of an elderly gentleman who was very active as a resident in the Adventist village. He lived independently and, together with neighbours and Loreto, represented the village in the quest for a signalised intersection. Not only did he attend numerous meetings about this, but he wrote to politicians and councillors, and this is a quote from his letter to the premier, Barry O'Farrell, in 2012:

10

We ask that the situation at the intersection as it stands today be allowed to speak for itself and that the traffic engineers approach the problem with the objective of providing a safe intersection for the whole of the Mount Pleasant Avenue community.

15

Two years later, in 2014, this gentleman suffered severe injuries in an horrific accident at the intersection. After months of hospitalisation, he was unable to look after himself and sadly had to move to high care. He is not recorded as a fatality statistic, but I'm quite sure this accident led to his untimely death shortly after.

20

Since we moved here in 1976, the volume of cars using our street and the intersection has increased manifold, yet no pedestrian safeguards have been installed at this dangerous intersection. We have all experienced near misses at the intersection, especially if children who, in the panic that they will never be able to cross to the other side, either run out or ride their bicycles out between cars waiting to exit the street. When turning left from Pennant Hills into Mount Pleasant Avenue, you have no vision of pedestrians until you are just about to turn because of the high brick fence at the corner.

25

30 The pedestrians who use Mount Pleasant Avenue at the intersection include both primary and secondary children from Loreto, Normanhurst Public School, Normanhurst Boys High, Turramurra High, who catch the bus outside Loreto's main gates, and other school children going to and from the station. This intersection is also the crossing point for parents walking their children to school, sometimes with strollers and other small children tagging along, commuters and residents, including the elderly.

35

Let me illustrate the problem by telling you what I experienced at the intersection on the 11th of May 2020. This was the first day of the return to face-to-face learning in New South Wales after the lockdown period. And if you could put up the first photo? Thank you. Throughout New South Wales, students were able to attend school only one day per week, so student numbers on any one day were expected to be relatively small - - -

40

45 MR DEIGHTON: Could we put that on the screen?

MS HUTCHINSON: - - - about 20 per cent of the total. On that day, Loreto trialled an afternoon pick-up of students where parents would enter the grounds via Osborn Road, pick-up their waiting child on the school oval, and then exit via Mount Pleasant Avenue, with strict orders to make a left turn only into Pennant Hills Road.

5 School numbers, remember, were only about 20 per cent. A staff member acted as the marshal at the Mount Pleasant Avenue intersection. He and neighbours in attendance and I'm sure the school parents were horrified at ensuing chaos.

10 A left-hand turn only at this intersection was stipulated by the residents. The line of cars waiting to exit Mount Pleasant Avenue stretched for approximately 600 metres along Mount Pleasant Avenue, and the photo shows from the intersection looking south. The timing of school pick-up overlaps with changeover times for staff at the Adventist retirement village, whose only access is via our street. Cars of both the residents of our street and the village staff were unable to progress south, as the street
15 is restricted to one lane of moving traffic when cars are parked.

And if you could up photo 2, please. This day, there was definitely no room to pull over to allow anyone through, so cars were banked up to enter the street for Pennant Hills Road. The whole thing quickly degenerated into a very dangerous situation for
20 the pedestrians trying to cross Mount Pleasant Avenue, and these were mainly local schoolchildren trying to make their way home. If it were not for the help of neighbours or the school marshal, I don't know what would have happened.

Between phone calls to the school outlining the dire situation, the marshal put
25 himself in danger by trying to control traffic both in Pennant Hills Road and Mount Pleasant Avenue so that cars could exit and we neighbours tried to safely cross the children by holding their hands and taking them across the road every time they were able to make a gap between vehicles both exiting and entering the street. The cars
30 were so close together trying to exit the street that young children would not have been seen, nor would parents with strollers, children on their bikes or our resident school child in a wheelchair have been able to move between the vehicles if we had not been there to separate the cars and help people across.

Now, David has already spoken about the difficulties with wheelchair access, and I
35 would like to add to this. The road safety audit on the 21st of the 10th 2019 for the ELC found that at the Mount Pleasant Avenue intersection:

The curved ramps at both corners are poorly aligned and direct pedestrians towards Pennant Hills Road.
40

It also found that this was dangerous for both vision impaired and mobility impaired pedestrians, saying:

Mobility impaired pedestrians may be affected, especially if using a wheeled device, since there is a natural tendency to roll down or up the ramp in a perpendicular trajectory to the ramp.
45

This trial of Loreto's traffic flow as obviously an unmitigated disaster and was never repeated until now for in this development the school proposes to bring half the school drop-off and pick-up traffic by the Mount Pleasant Avenue intersection, plus all staff and all year 12 students who drive. On current school numbers, that would
5 equate to approximately three times the traffic produced on May the 11th 2020, let alone with the increase in student numbers and staff being sought. Loreto argues for a Green Travel Plan, but according to their flyer issued to residents, this was already in effect before May 2020.

10 The times of drop-off and pick-up have already been acknowledged to overlap with traffic generated by the ELC, as well as to Adventist staff changeovers and peak times for school children and young families trying to cross at the intersection. All of this traffic is being poured onto a road which is totally lacking in pedestrian safety and exits onto a major arterial road, the A28, at an intersection which is already
15 highly dangerous, with no pedestrian crossing or traffic lights.

We all want the best education for our children and to have it provided in a safe environment. As a social worker and former teacher, I recognise that education encompasses not only academic achievement, but social responsibility. It is our duty
20 as adults, be it as parents, teachers or school board members, to make our children socially aware and responsive to their community's needs. And could you please show the last photo now, photo 3. In fact, Loreto promotes itself as acting responsibly, as their advertising slogan shows, "We do what's right, not what's easy." Thank you.

25 MR PILTON: Thank you, Moira.

MS HUTCHINSON: Thank you.

30 MR DEIGHTON: And, Moira, if you could send us through your speaking notes as well, that would be wonderful. Frank Hutchinson. I believe, Moira, you're handing over the phone to Frank?

MR HUTCHINSON: That's right. I now have it.

35 MR DEIGHTON: Wonderful. Please proceed.

MR HUTCHINSON: And – sorry. You were – we were transferring when you spoke. So you would like Moira's speaking notes, is that correct?

40 MR DEIGHTON: Yes. That would be wonderful if you could send those through to us.

MR HUTCHINSON: Okay. Certainly. Right. So am I on?

45 MR PILTON: Yes.

MR DEIGHTON: You are. Please proceed.

MR HUTCHINSON: Okay. Thank you very much. And thank you for this opportunity to address the panel, and good morning to everybody there. Look, I
5 wanted to start by saying that really my – I have a few issues that I would like to discuss, but due to time concerns, I will just confine myself to the traffic issues in regard to Mount Pleasant Avenue and some safety matters which perhaps support what Moira has said. For a start, I do believe that the wrong model is being used, and as we heard from Grey's Engineering, Alex Grey, that there is no agreement
10 between traffic engineers on the right way to analyse Mount Pleasant Avenue intersection. Grey's believes a microsimulation model should be used, and this is being resisted just on the grounds that the development is not of sufficient scale to warrant the extra work involved.

15 Now, as a resident, I find that an alarming response. This is a state significant project costing well over \$100 million, so surely it's big enough to warrant the extra work and expense of running the best model. The impact on residents of getting it wrong could be huge. Between Mount Pleasant Avenue and Osborn Road and all their feeder roads, there are, in fact, approximately 300 houses, villas and apartments,
20 plus an aged care facility. In effect, all of us have either Mount Pleasant Avenue or Osborn Road as a driveway, because if the intersection is blocked, then we're stuck. So as noted by TTW, the Austroads Guide to Traffic Management says microsimulation is the best model for large scale analysis, and the RMS Guide to Traffic Generating Developments says exactly the same. So I would like to suggest
25 that it's the right tool to use here and the analysis should be done again because a lot of what I see just does not fit with my experience of Mount Pleasant Avenue.

Now, in terms of the no right turn, we've seen that coming for a long while, but it has never been done until this and I have not seen any analysis of whether or not it will
30 improve things, and I'm still not sure if there's any analysis now. It's certainly the slower turn, but both turns actually operate in parallel to a fair extent. So removing even the slower one might well mean that the – that fewer cars can get through the intersection, and so queue might actually increase as a result of that. That's why I think it needs to be studied and at the very least there needs to be an analysis of what
35 happens when the right turn is blocked.

So my second point. There is one critical study on which I can find no information, and I think this is the main study for us residents of Mount Pleasant Avenue. So in the morning peak, 47 vehicles currently leave the street, according to the traffic
40 count, but 95 will leave in the afternoon peak. So that's twice the morning peak. And by 2026, the afternoon peak will be much greater than the morning peak because, well, there's the natural growth of those 95 vehicles, plus there's half the pick-up traffic which currently goes out Osborn and that will now go out Mount Pleasant, plus all the year 12 self-drive students, they currently go out directly onto
45 Pennant Hills Road, but they will come out behind Mount Pleasant, plus the staff that currently park in the Osborn car park, they will now park in the Mount Pleasant car park, plus all the ELC traffic.

The current approval is a fifty-fifty split between Osborn and Mount Pleasant Avenue, but this proposal would actually reverse that, and so everything will come out at Mount Pleasant. So all of that happens in the afternoon, not all in the morning. So the critical study for Mount Pleasant Avenue is the afternoon peak study, and so
5 that 2026 after development – main part of the development is completed, that study needs to be done, and I can't understand why I can't find the papers. I don't think it has been done.

10 The other thing – and I think it has been mentioned by somebody else – is that there is another state significant development in our street, and that's an expansion of the retirement complex down at the bottom of Mount Pleasant Avenue. That has already been approved. There are, I think, five precincts from memory in that. The first four are probably all near completion now. So I would think that any time the fifth precinct, which is the Mount Pleasant precinct, could possibly start, but I've seen no
15 inclusion of any of that traffic in the analysis.

Nextly, NorthConnex. TTW seem to be relying on some traffic reductions from NorthConnex, but I've been to a meeting and so has Moira been to a meeting where RMS have said that they expect the traffic volumes in Pennant Hills Road will return
20 to NorthConnex – to pre-NorthConnex levels five years after the opening of the tunnel. That is around the time of completion of the detailed DA. There is not likely to be much help coming from NorthConnex.

25 Safety audit. Now, there was a safety audit for the Early Learning Centre, and that has now been included in the papers for this development, but there's almost no mention that I can find of the important issues that are identified by the safety audit and what their implications are here. Firstly, there is an issue for Mount Pleasant Avenue. There is an issue of poor sightlines when turning out. The problem arises because of a high brick fence.

30 And could I have picture 1 up now, please. Now, the high brick fence means that to see along Mount Pleasant Avenue, particularly along lane 1, the kerbside lane, you have to take your car right to the corner. And basically the whole line is right to the edge of the – and you can see that bit. It's right at the edge of the carriageway, the
35 Pennant Hills Road carriageway, and the safety auditor took a photo of – and it's not here unfortunately, but of a car trying to – actually going beyond that and having its nose poked out into Pennant Hills Road, and he mentioned that that happens quite a bit, and it does, and it's quite dangerous. So people do it because they can't see what's oncoming. So it is a very poor intersection for sightlines.

40 So this leads vehicles – sorry. The next point I wanted to mention was that this also happens with cars turning in to Mount Pleasant Avenue. It's not raised in the safety audit, but it's caused by that high brick fence, and cars turning in until they're right at the intersection can't see more than about 10 metres along Mount Pleasant
45 Avenue. And given what Moira has just said about school students trying to sort of duck out from about maybe, you know, two or three cars back from the intersection, this is a significant safety issue.

The next one is merging left onto a major arterial road. The traffic auditor said that that's an inherently dangerous operation. And in regard to Mount – into Osborn Road, he wanted the no left turn – sorry – left turn for middle on stopping sign removed. He didn't mention it for Mount Pleasant Avenue, but it's exactly the same
5 issue and perhaps more dangerous because of our poor sightlines.

Finally, then the environmental limit of Mount Pleasant Avenue has not been discussed at all. RMS says that for a residential street, this should be 200 vehicles per hour, with an absolute maximum of 300. This is a safety issue, and RMS says it
10 is set at a limit for safely crossing the road. With all the traffic on – excuse me – on Mount Pleasant Avenue on school afternoons, I would think that even 300 would be exceeded close to the Pennant Hills Road intersection. This should be examined.

The question of queueing. TTW are saying that there won't be a problem with
15 queueing because there will be a recirculation of cars and so that will stop cars queueing up behind the pick-up bays, but I think that's the wrong queuing that they're looking at. I believe the problem is the Mount Pleasant Avenue intersection. And just bearing in mind what Moira was talking about – and I will ask you to put up photo 2 here – that queue went for 600 metres down Mount Pleasant Avenue.

20 Now, that's – if that happens again, that's enough to go straight back to the – it's only 80 metres to where the slip road will now come out onto Mount Pleasant Avenue, plus about 250 metres across the school grounds, plus another, what, 70 or 80 metres along Osborn Road, and you're back out to Pennant Hills Road. So it's
25 that – and once that has got even beyond 80 metres, it's blocking up all the traffic coming out of the through-site road, and so at that point, recycling simply won't work. And I don't believe that that has been looked at all. I can't find any analysis of this queueing issue on Mount Pleasant Avenue. And the other point I wanted to make is that once parents have been recycled a couple of times, I think that they will
30 stop using this facility. They will just be dropping children and picking up children in the surrounding streets, and that's exactly the opposite of what the through-site road is supposed to achieve.

Finally, a very brief mention of the construction traffic. The current proposal sees
35 trucks coming in and out of the Mount Pleasant Avenue gate, gate 1, but this has previously caused problems as the gate is located near the crest of the hill and at a double kink in the road – sorry – with real visibility problems. Could I see photo 3, please. It is also - - -

40 MR PILTON: Wrap up soon, please, Frank.

MR HUTCHINSON: Sorry?

MR PILTON: I said can we wrap up pretty soon? Thank you.
45

MR HUTCHINSON: Yes. I'm finished now. So I just wanted to say that – so to solve this problem of cars and trucks coming in and out right at the crest of the hill

where there's poor visibility – and the safety auditor pointed to that – the better solution was done before, and that is to use the gate at the bottom of Mount Pleasant Avenue, stops having to back up, there's – and everything is then moved around by conveyors on the site. So I would – and it also has more limited hours, and I would
5 love to see the construction plan amended to the above as a consent condition. Once again, thank you for the opportunity to bring these matters to your attention.

MR PILTON: Thank you, Frank.

10 MR HUTCHINSON: Okay.

MR DEIGHTON: Thanks, Mr Hutchinson. Next we have Michael Wensley. Mr Wensley, can you hear us?

15 MR M. WENSLEY: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Michael Wensley of Mount Pleasant Avenue, and I want to speak to you today about the loss of residential amenity. Local schools enjoy a rate-free status in their communities because they are part of their social fabric. They educate our local children, and our local parents gather at the gates and community is formed. The nearby Normanhurst
20 Public School educates local children. The Loreto of past decades educated local children. Today, however, Loreto has firmly shifted its focus to business profits and expanding its market. That would be its own business if it happily covered all the costs that align with its profits. However, over the last few decades, their costs have been progressively pushed onto surrounding residents in the form of unacceptable
25 traffic issues and now with this proposal a substantial change to vegetation and our physical streetscape.

The Department concludes that the proposal was in the public interest and backs that up with not a skerrick of value added to the local community. Their recommendation
30 is based on jobs, hundreds of construction jobs, but at an unacceptable cost to others. I am here today to ask you, Juliet, you, Wendy, and you, Adrian, to amend this proposal to ensure that it really is in the public interest, and I'm asking for four things: the widening of Osborn Road in order to properly manage the traffic that they generate, the boarding house to be reduced in height from five storeys to a
35 maximum of two storeys, the boarding house to be relocated to the centre of the site, and finally, enforceable conditions to protect all trees located on Council land.

Let's get specific about the loss of amenity. The dictionary defines "avenue" as "a broad roadway lined with trees". I moved into Mount Pleasant Avenue in the late
40 90s. The two most striking aspects were tall trees arching over the avenue and almost exclusively single storey homes. The area was zoned low density residential, with Council records showing the Mount Pleasant edge of the Loreto oval as potential single building blocks. My children could play in the street. They could walk safely to Normanhurst Public School. Resident motorists could move freely in
45 local streets, including making the short trip to Normanhurst Public if it was raining.

Now, to speak to the widening of Osborn, in early 2000, Loreto dramatically increased the size of their business and pushed the costs on to residents. We lost the ability to freely move in our supposed low density residential streets. Spillover Loreto traffic created chaos for the pickup and drop-off of our local primary school children at Normanhurst Public, despite them not increasing in size. And as noted by our state member, Alister Henskens, in his July 2019 submission, there have been seven crashes at the end of Mount Pleasant Avenue, including one fatality. Hornsby Council recognises the severity of the traffic issue and has recommended widening Osborn.

The planning panel that assessed Loreto's 2019 proposed childcare business also acknowledged this history and the significant loss of residents' amenity from Loreto's traffic. Despite the relatively smaller scale of that proposal, in September 2019, the then panel deferred their initial decision and asked Loreto to explore working with the Council to widen Osborn Road to increase the capacity of the existing traffic light cycle. When the panel reconvened some weeks later, it was argued by Loreto that the issue of widening could be put on hold until their master plan, that is, this proposal currently before us today. Sorting out the traffic is simply a business expense that Loreto wants residents to fund. Instead, please consider the accidents, consider the voice of our MP, consider the voice of our Council and consider what was promised by Loreto to the last planning panel.

I want to turn to the boarding house for my second point. I understand that Loreto tried it on and applied for six storeys, but the Department is offering five storeys. Sure, it's only a doubling from single to two storeys at the northern end; however, at the southern end, that is, where the street level is at or below the oval, absolutely nothing will hide this from being anything other than a five storey building, wrongly placed in a residential low density zone. Can I ask for more time? I have one more page.

MR PILTON: Okay. Make it as fast as you can, please?

MR WENSLEY: Let's be clear. This increase in students is not needed to support the educational needs of our local community. I ask you to consider if the catchery construction jobs could possibly make up for this loss of amenity in the public interest. Ethics and transparency are, however, definitely in the public interest. While it's not disclosed in their application, it may interest the panel to know that Loreto has just this month put the home at 45 Mount Pleasant Avenue on the market rather than face a devaluation. This home is directly opposite where the garbage trucks will access the boarding house. They've put that in while asking for approval in the public interest, yet they have only considered their private interests and importantly the impact of the looming loss of amenity for a home opposite in another example of them putting their costs on someone else.

My third point is the positioning of the boarding house. Over the years, the athletic Department moves the oval alignment around. Why can't the panel ask the school to simply rotate the track slightly clockwise and then build their five storey building

house between the car park and the track? Our streetscape is important to us, and by keeping it well away from both Osborn and Mount Pleasant, the panel could provide an option for them to still build their monstrosity. The current plan to remove 70 trees, perhaps all of those 70 trees could be saved as well by moving it.

5

My fourth and final point is in relation to the trees on Council land. Loreto has long lost the trust of the residents. I'm fearful for those trees. If Loreto is true to historic form, they will find a way to remove them. It may be scope creep, future amendment, something else. My ask is that you add a condition that places a significant multimillion dollar penalty on Loreto to protect those trees.

10

MR PILTON: Can we wrap up there, please, Michael? I think we've given you a couple of minutes extra.

15

MR WENSLEY: Thank you so much. Four points: widening Osborn, five storeys to a maximum of two, boarding house moved into the middle of the property; enforceable conditions to protect the trees. Thank you, Adrian, Juliet and Wendy.

MR PILTON: Thanks, Michael.

20

MR DEIGHTON: And, of course, Michael, if you have anything else to add, you can put it in writing to us before 5 pm next Monday.

MR WENSLEY: Will do.

25

MR DEIGHTON: Up next is Victoria Wensley. Ms Wensley, are you there?

MS V. WENSLEY: Yes, I am. Hello.

30

MR DEIGHTON: Welcome. Please go ahead.

MS WENSLEY: Yes. Good afternoon. Well, I'm Victoria Wensley. I'm a resident of Mount Pleasant Avenue, and I wish to speak on Loreto's submission to the development – Department of Planning – sorry – regarding the removal of trees in this plan and other effects on the biodiversity of the area. Please note that there are some significant objections by residents and, indeed, Hornsby Council that have not been appropriately addressed. Loreto's decision to remove 105 trees from the local landscape primarily from the stand at Mount Pleasant Avenue will have consequences not just on the human residents, but also on the native wildlife that, of course, is their home.

35

40

Now, in section 4-4-9, the report notes that despite the presence of native vegetation, no threatened species were recorded within the study area during the targeted surveys on the site. This may, in fact, be true, as the length of time of the targeted surveys are not specified, nor was it determined whether the surveys were conducted diurnally or nocturnally. There are, however, many native species accessing the site, including at least two threatened species.

45

At the end of Mount Pleasant Avenue, approximately 400 metres from the site where the trees are to be moved under this proposal are a pair of permanent resident powerful owls, classified as a threatened species. This pair of owls has nested here for over 10 years, producing just six chicks in that time, and returning to the same
5 nest sites every year. They are a regular feature in the trees at night, where their distinctive call can be heard as they hunt, including in the stands of trees whose survival is in question. Powerful owls are landscape managers, resting away from their nest and hunting across a two kilometre radius at night, requiring this biodiversity in range to survive. Medium and tall trees are important to their success
10 as they harbour the smaller birds, possums and sugar gliders, along with rodents that make up their diet.

Needless to say, the loss of so many native trees would have a significant impact on the owls. In the report, please note that Hornsby Council objected to the loss of high
15 retention trees on the site, calling it concerning. As a local resident who has avidly observed the native fauna in this area for over 20 years, I agree with their concerns, as do many other residents. The powerful owls are apex predators and play an important part in this ecosystem, as well as being treasured by the locals. The bush trail where the powerful owls nest is in the Wahroonga Estate, which is the bushland
20 property managed by the Seventh-day Adventists. They employ staff there to manage the environment and encourage biodiversity, including the use of wildlife cameras and regular spotlighting to keep statistics on the wildlife population.

I've listed some but not all of the other birds that live and feed in the area, including
25 in the Loreto bushland, are as follows: boobook owls, eastern rosellas, Donnell birds, magpies, butcherbirds, Sulphur-crested cockatoos, galahs, rainbow lorikeets, corellas, whipbirds, eastern spinebills, currawongs, golden Whistlers, tawny frogmouths, red-browed firetails, king parrots and, of course, the channel-billed cuckoos as they migrate through. Many of the birds listed here have been witnessed
30 by residents on our street feeding and nesting over many years in the trees within the stand on Mount Pleasant Avenue that Loreto wishes to destroy in order to build such a large project.

Other local residents are the variety of bats that inhabit this area. There are four
35 varieties that live in the valley, including the southern myotis, which are the microbats, the grey-headed flying foxes that feed through this corridor regularly and the Gould's wattled bat. The most significant bat, however, is the eastern false pipistrelle bat, with a status similar to the powerful owl in terms of conservation and vulnerability. Their colony is situated close by, just over the other side of Fox Valley
40 Road, but like the birds are a landscape species that feed in our area, including Loreto and the trees in question. I can see no mention of this particular bat in the report. This issue does need further research.

Any standard mature native tree provides habitat connectivity for native fauna. With
45 the urban landscape steadily increasing and with so many species resident in this area, it's a harsh proposal to remove so much of the habitat. Hornsby Council has noted, too, that no significant trees should be removed. Not only are food sources

and nesting sites removed, but the increase in artificial light further disturbs nocturnal species. Increase in human activity always reduces wildlife activity. Jaiden Streetfield, the environmental officer at the Wahroonga Estate, has noted that on the advent of COVID lockdown and with significantly increased foot traffic
5 through the bush areas, many of the species are exhibiting a drop in sightings. With the increase in foot traffic and so many extra students and boarders and commuters tripping through the local areas, this trend is sure to continue.

10 In conclusion, I ask for the committee to please reconsider the unconvincing and minimal detail paid to protect our local biodiversity and, indeed, our local community. In section 9-57, the report states that the objects of the EP&A Act are to promote the social and economic welfare of the community and a better environment by the proper management, development and conservation of the state's natural and other resources. Currently, this project looks instead to greatly increase foot traffic,
15 school and traffic noise, gridlock traffic, excessive light pollution and commuter chaos. I only have a little bit to go.

What is removed, though, is the natural beauty of a treelined avenue, accessible roads, sunlight in the afternoons for those blanketed by a five storey building in a
20 low density housing area, natural filtered shade, greenery and treasured and protected members of our native fauna. I request that further studies take place to ascertain the dangers this project places on the native flora and fauna and that strict ongoing controls be placed on Loreto regarding any lighting on buildings, pathways, gates, carparks, ovals or fences, such that any development that proceeds does not
25 distribute light pollution throughout the neighbourhood. A five storey building with boarders that will be asking for safety and, therefore, lights everywhere in this matter needs clarification now before any building should commence, for a massive high-rise lit up all night is simply untenable.

30 This project is very extreme, it is ecologically damaging and reduces all aspects of quality of life for residents, humans and animals alike. A five storey boarding house must be scrapped. There is no clear plan here limiting excessive light pollution or explaining just how the replanting offered provides adequate recompense for the loss sustained for native fauna and residents. The report does not make clear just how the
35 replanting will occur or where, the types of natives planted and where they will be sourcing aged trees from. Trees planted as biocredits 100s of kilometres away are of no use to us. It is simply disingenuous to remove 105 aged trees and replace them with saplings and claim due diligence to the environment and the community that has been paid. I ask that this proposal be rejected. Thank you.

40

MR PILTON: Thanks, Victoria. Could I encourage you, please, to send your notes in to the Commission - - -

MS WENSLEY: Most certainly.

45

MR PILTON: - - - and any further information you have about the local wildlife.

MS WENSLEY: I'm sorry. What was that about the local – you - - -

MR PILTON: If you have any further information about the local wildlife, perhaps you could - - -

5

MS WENSLEY: I do, indeed. And I can include some details for the environmental officer as well who may be able to speak to you about any further inquiries you might have. He has a lot of statistics and resources that I didn't have time to include.

10

MR PILTON: That's okay. Thank you very much.

MS WENSLEY: Thank you. Thank you.

15 MR DEIGHTON: Thanks, Victoria. Up next is Suzanne Shields. Ms Shields.

MS S. SHIELDS: Yes.

MR DEIGHTON: Good afternoon.

20

MS SHIELDS: Hi. Hello. Good afternoon. Yes. My name is Suzanne. I live in Osborn Road. My main issue with the Loreto redevelopment relates to traffic, which according to table 13 in the report 94 per cent of the submissions received were also concerned about. So that's an overwhelming proportion of submissions that I don't believe the report has satisfactorily addressed. Already there's a significant problem with traffic congestion, and there's nothing in the report that gives me confidence the problem will be fixed. In fact, reading through the report, to be honest, I feel only despair, and I'm hearing despair coming through from a lot of the speakers as well.

25

30 So we've heard talk of the Green Transport Plan – or the Green Travel Plan, the aim to reduce traffic congestion, and they set out a variety of measures they call key. These include periodic reminders to provide information of public transport options, encouraging staff carpooling, provision of bicycle parking to encourage active transport. Honestly, I'm laughing as I read them. They're so ridiculous. This plan is an ineffectual joke, as these key measures indicate. The idea of the Loreto community tootling along Pennant Hills Road on bikes is laughable.

35

Also, I wonder what constitutes periodic reminders in relation to information on public transport. A note, email to parents on the odd occasion? What about encouraging staff carpooling? Mentioning it at a staff meeting every now and again? To be honest, I think it's pitiful and shows a complete lack of commitment to solving the traffic problem. Where are the well-defined goals in relation to the reduction of traffic mess on local streets? Goals should be specific and measurable, and these key measures are worthless and empty. I think this Green Travel Plan is just greenwashing. In fact, I know it is.

45

So the report that I read indicates the Department considers this plan to be an effective tool. I'm not sure how that conclusion was reached. I certainly don't agree, and I can tell from all my fellow speakers that most local residents are right behind me there. They don't agree that it's going to be an effective tool either. The report gives vague, unclear statements regarding traffic management, the aspirational things that we've heard about, but they're essentially meaningless. I have no confidence in how the current traffic congestion is managed, let alone the future traffic mess that we all know will happen.

So Loreto has clearly spent a lot of money getting a blizzard of documentation produced in an attempt to support their redevelopment. I would have liked to have seen a serious study undertaken on how to reduce traffic on local streets. Why wasn't that done? The answer seems to be that Loreto doesn't care about inflicting their traffic mess onto local streets. Loreto already has a bus fleet in operation, picking up students, and this program can be expanded to make it the main, if not the only way students arrive and depart. And also people should be arriving and departing from Pennant Hills Road, not Osborn Road, not Mount Pleasant Avenue. Let those expensive heritage gates do the work they're supposed to rather than only be used on ceremonial occasions.

I would have liked to have also read in the report perhaps how Loreto was committed to reducing school traffic by, you know, for example, 75 per cent by the end of next year. Again, a specific and measurable goal would have been fantastic. That would have shown commitment to the local community and been a great show of faith. But all we've been inflicted with are weasel words, I'm afraid. Creative thinking needs to be employed with regard to the traffic, and I couldn't see any creative thinking in that vast amount of documentation that has been produced. This redevelopment is not in the public interest and will only exacerbate current traffic problems. I think we all know that. So Loreto's planned redevelopment will come at the expense of the local community. Thank you all very much.

MR PILTON: Thank you very much, Suzanne.

MR DEIGHTON: Thanks, Ms Shields. Up next is Helen Nancarrow. Ms Nancarrow, good afternoon. You might just need to unmute.

MR PILTON: You're on mute, I think, Helen?

MS H. NANCARROW: Is that right now?

MR DEIGHTON: We can hear you.

MR PILTON: That's fine.

MS NANCARROW: Okay. Thank you for this opportunity. And I'm sorry. My computing skills are very limited. And I'm wondering if you have a plan of the school in front of you, which would help. My name is Helen Nancarrow, and I've

lived at Osborn Road, Normanhurst for 55 years. The reports and submissions re the Loreto development usually refer to Osborn Road. In a couple of places, there are acknowledgements that there are feeder roads, but generally the fact that there are five roads into Osborn Road is ignored. These feeder roads are all residential and have no direct access to Pennant Hills Road. They all end in cul-de-sacs. The only exit is Osborn Road. This results in continuous traffic jams and delays already.

The problem was brought up with traffic engineers at first in subsequent public meetings. The answer has always been that, "We are providing more carparks." When we pointed out that traffic has to get to the carparks, that was just glossed over and, once again, we were told they're providing more carparks. No amount of road widening or additional carparks will alleviate this problem. There are too many cars for the local road. At least twice a day from about 7.50 to 8.20 am and 3.10 to about 3.45 pm, the traffic is such that emergency vehicle would be unable to enter Osborn Road to help if they were needed.

Now, this is where if you have a plan, it would help. If not, can you imagine a lowercase letter B. The stem is Osborn Road. The bottom point where the letter turns is gate 4. Where the curve comes back to the intersection is gate 3. The suggested traffic management plan through gate 4 is unlikely to help traffic flow. Traffic is expected to travel in a circular route, enter a car park at gate 4, collect passengers and then exit via gate 3, turning right onto Osborn Road. The traffic at gate 3 by law has to give way to traffic on Osborn Road, and there will be traffic on Osborn Road as parents come to collect students, and there will also be local traffic. Cars will not be freely able to exit at gate 3, resulting in traffic queueing in the car park and then back onto Osborn Road. At gate 3, Osborn Road narrows and parking is allowed on the western side.

When the queuing into gate 4 occurs, Osborn Road essentially becomes one lane, with unmoving cars on the eastern side, parked cars on the west and one lane for moving cars trying to go in both directions, resulting in traffic jams. The queue will extend up the hill and traffic will be stopped in a precarious position on the crest of a hill. A situation similar to this occurred on the 23rd of September 2020. Cars were trying to enter and exit gate 4 with resulting traffic jam blocking the road and through traffic being unable to proceed. I don't believe the traffic management plan will manage the traffic.

In November 2019, bushfires threatened Sydney. Loreto meets all the bushfire standards. But Loreto is surrounded by homes which are in bushfire-prone areas, which is reflected in our insurance and building codes. On November the 12th 2019, Loreto was sufficiently concerned about the danger of fire to be one of the approximately 600 schools to close when a state of catastrophic fire danger was declared. Bushfires were threatening houses in South Turramurra, about two kilometres away as the embers fly. These fires were extinguished with a dump of fire retardant from a plane, but a large number of emergency vehicles were also in attendance.

The streets around Osborn Road are at the headwaters of the Lane Cove River. One of the feeder roads is Rivertop Close. If a fire comes roaring up the Lane Cove Valley, emergency vehicles will be unable to reach us, we will be unable to drive out of the street, as the street will be filled with parents collecting students from Loreto.

5 I don't believe this scenario can be easily dismissed, as we have lived through a summer of unprecedented bushfires. Greg Mullins, former New South Wales Fire and Rescue Commissioner has said:

10 *If you thought the 2019/2020 fires were bad, wait until the next El Niño-driven mega-blaze arrives.*

Snapshot traffic surveys and drone surveys cannot cover our lived experience of the regular daily problems. I do not believe that any of the traffic plans provided can solve the problem, which is essentially that the lesser cannot contain the greater.

15 Thank you.

MR PILTON: Thank you very much, Helen.

20 MR DEIGHTON: Up next we have David Wilkins on the phone. Mr Wilkins, good afternoon.

MR D. WILKINS: Good afternoon. Thanks for this opportunity to address the panel. I'm David Wilkins. I'm an engineer. I have lived in Osborn Road for 42 years, and one of the things I've observed in that time in more recent years are the traffic problems in Osborn Road have occurred and increased in proportion to the expansion of Loreto. I really want to talk about the driveway access into the school. Other people have spoken about other issues that are of concern also.

30 But first I would just like to reinforce Matthew Gee's concerns about the adequacy of the queuing space in the proposed extension to the pickup, drop-off area from Osborn Road. Even since the opening of Connex, I've observed the queueing of cars and buses waiting to enter the slip road at gate 02 at times banks up around the corner into Pennant Hills Road, with more vehicles also waiting in Normanhurst Road and to turn right from Pennant Hills Road. I think that is – you know, I think there is a shortage of queueing space, and it's probably due to the fact there are too many vehicles accessing it in the first place, and also there are buses that come into Osborn Road that could easily stop in Pennant Hills Road, and they come into Osborn Road and turn straight out again. It seems unnecessary.

40 The other thing. I also find the idea of a no right turn sign at Pennant Hills Road is, at best, a low cost bandaid solution. The real answer is to put traffic lights there. I know there's – I'm told RMS doesn't like traffic lights of successive streets to be so close together, but there are plenty of examples in – or there are a number of examples in Pennant Hills Road already where traffic lights are much closer together. Traffic lights are expensive but I think a fairly small cost compared to the huge infrastructure Loreto has got and in terms of traffic access and more importantly just safety.

In regard to the accessways, gates 01, 02, 03 and I think it's 04, in Osborn Road, these are all very old driveways that have been patched and upgraded a little bit, but none of them meets any standards for turning circles, for grade. For example, gate 01 is too narrow, and it's old, and it has right angle edges, so there's no turning
5 radius inside or outside the school. Gate 02 is the slip road which challenges buses. They drive on the kerb sometimes to get up there. They can't enter gate 02 because of the bad design of the slip road without transgressing the double centrelines. If you look at any Austroads standards for turning radii for buses, it doesn't come anywhere near it.

10 Gate 01 and gate 02 are so close together they cause confusion with traffic. Gate 03 also lacks any form of proper turning radius. The only way buses can exit is to use the whole width of Osborn Road, which requires no stopping signs opposite that gate. Gate 04 is actually inadequately designed also. These things could have been
15 fixed years ago. The problem has been there for many years. And they were not – they're not expensive. They're not a difficult design exercise. They just needed someone to do something. And if these things were attended to, I believe it would relieve a lot of the congestion in Osborn Road just by itself. For the record, I'm not in favour of widening Osborn Road. It's already been widened once.

20 So I guess what I would ask, because I find it, is a couple of questions. Is the upgrading of the various driveways into Loreto from Osborn Road – and I'm talking about inside and outside of the Loreto boundary – anywhere in the plans or in the conditions of consent? Because it's great to have all this patched up, inadequate
25 driveways leading to it. It's not really solving the problem. Okay. There's another thing.

MR PILTON: Could you finish up, please?

30 MR WILKINS: The corner of Osborn Road where you turn left – sorry. I can't hear you.

MR PILTON: Sorry. Just finish up, please? Thank you.

35 MR WILKINS: Yes. The turn left corner from Osborn Road – from Pennant Hills Road into Osborn Road is so tight that buses drive up on the footpath which is immediately adjacent to the road. This is definitely a safety issue with kids standing on that corner. So is there a condition of consent for anything or a plan to reshape the corner of Osborn Road and Pennant Hills Road for the turn left? And finally,
40 what is the emergency plan if Osborn Road is blocked? It is the sole access for much of Loreto, five or six streets, as our previous speaker mentioned, and also nearby bushland. I mean, all we need is one broken down car or an accident, and that all is blocked. So – yes. If you can – I'd just like to see those things addressed because I couldn't find any specific mention of them in the documents.

45 MR PILTON: Okay.

MR WILKINS: Thank you.

MR PILTON: Thank you very much, David.

5 MR DEIGHTON: Thanks, Mr Wilkins. And if there was anything else you wanted to add, please feel free to send us a written submission prior to the deadline next Monday. Our final speaker for this public meeting is Ms Jorgen Christensen. Mr Christensen, good afternoon.

10 MR J. CHRISTENSEN: Good afternoon. Yes. I'm a resident of Osborn Road, number 32, and I'm just placed opposite the entry point from the parking lot. And I have to live with that, but it is not a safe place. I have I don't know how many beeps from horns on the road because people are trying to get out with high speed. But that's not my point. My main point is the traffic load, and the current situation, as
15 we have already heard, is nearly impossible, because having to wait 15 to 20, sometimes 25 minutes to get out of Osborn Road is not very easy to plan there.

The other thing is that I haven't seen any data which have been used for the modelling of the future traffic load, and my experience with queuing in theory is that
20 when you come to a point like what we have at the moment, it's an exponential curve after that point. So the situation would be exponentially worse already. And I also question how the measurements were taken, if there were any, because now you will have to have new measurements because it's a different pattern because at the moment we can't measure it because of the lockdown and we are uncertain on the
25 impact from the Connex tunnel. So that's the future.

There is another thing. That is the safety and also the escape route from Osborn Road and Mount Pleasant Avenue. There are no alternative escape routes for all the [phone ringing] roads, basically the same to Osborn Road, and Mount Pleasant
30 Avenue is also a [phone ringing], sorry. I just have to switch off my phone. Sorry. Sorry for that.

MR PILTON: That's okay.

35 MR CHRISTENSEN: Yes. But – yes. And I put into my objection earlier – I put in two options or alternatives for additional escape routes, and they were not considered apparently because they haven't been mentioned, except there has been a short mention about a traffic light at Mount Pleasant Avenue, which would ease the traffic flow and the safety there would be better. And the other option which was
40 never mentioned was that several years ago, they stopped the exit, entry point from Nepean Avenue, and that could be an alternative escape route in case of emergency. But that has been closed totally, and if it was opened up maybe with traffic lights and even maybe only for a left turn, that would be a way to get out. So that was the future also, which, as I say, we need to do more than that because there is no data and
45 no models we can see.

The last point is what would be the traffic through the construction phase because we have had several construction phases just opposite where we live, and the noise and

dust has been taking a long time, and we have had to wear masks sometimes in the garden. That's not unusual nowadays, but then it was very unusual. So the main points were really that, and then I have a point on Green Plan. I don't think that's practicable because there are no roads close by which have bicycle paths. So it's not bearable. And I think that's all. I would say it seems like the focus from Loreto has been more a financial issue than an issue of getting the traffic to flow and the impact on the community. So that's all. Thank you.

MR PILTON: Thank you very much, Jorgen.

MR DEIGHTON: And, Adrian, that was our last speaker, so I will pass back to you for your closing statement.

MR PILTON: Thank you, Troy. That brings us to the end of this public meeting into the Loreto Normanhurst School Redevelopment Project, SSD8996, concept proposal and stage 1. Thank you to everyone who has participated in this important process. Commissioners Wendy Lewin, Juliet Grant and I have appreciated your input. Just a reminder that it's not too late to have your say in this application. Simply click onto the Have Your Say portal on our website or send us a submission by email or post. The deadline for written comments is 5 pm next Monday, 4th of October 2021.

In the interests of openness and transparency, we'll be making a full transcript of this public meeting available on our website in the next few days. At the time of determination, the Commission will publish its statement of reasons for decision on our website, which will outline how the panel took the community's views into consideration as part of its decision-making process. Finally, a quick thank you to my fellow Commissioners, Wendy Lewin and Juliet Grant, and thank you for watching. From all of us here at the Commission, enjoy the rest of your day. Good afternoon.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[12.50 pm]