



**AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED**

ACN 110 028 825

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

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

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

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

---

O/N H-1580455

**INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION**

**MEETING WITH APPLICANT**

**RE: WEIGALL SPORTS COMPLEX, SYDNEY GRAMMAR SCHOOL (SSD-10421)**

**PANEL:** **PETER DUNCAN, AM**  
**PROF RICHARD MACKAY, AM**

**OFFICE OF THE IPC:** **LINDSEY BLECHER**  
**JANE ANDERSON**  
**PHOEBE JARVIS**

**APPLICANT:** **DR RICHARD MALPASS**  
**SANDRA ROBINSON**  
**TINA TANG**  
**JANE LLOYD**  
**MICHAEL HEENAN**  
**LEE COLLARD**  
**ANTHONY DI CRISTO**  
**KATE LUCKRAFT**  
**JANE MAZE-RILEY**  
**ANDREW MORSE**  
**PAUL DAVIES**

**DATE:** **2.31 PM, FRIDAY, 15 OCTOBER 2021**

MR P. DUNCAN: We will start the recording now formally, and I will make a statement. Good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their Elders past, present, and emerging. Welcome to the  
5 meeting today to discuss the Weigall Sports Complex, Sydney Grammar School project SSD-10421 currently before the Commission for determination. Sydney Grammar School, the applicant, is seeking approval for the new Weigall Sports Complex comprising demolition of existing sports facilities and car parking areas, bulk excavations, and construction of a new three-storey sports complex and  
10 basement, and a single-storey split-level car park.

My name is Peter Duncan. I am the chair of this commission panel. I am joined by my fellow commissioner, Professor Richard Mackay. We are joined by Lindsey Blecher, Jane Anderson and Phoebe Jarvis from the Office of the Independent  
15 Planning Commission. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be reproduced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission bases its  
20 determination.

It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide  
25 any additional information in writing, which we will then put on our website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of our transcript. We will now begin. However, Sandra, I note that Dr Malpass is here as well. Would you like – would the two of you like to  
30 introduce your group before we start?

MS S. ROBINSON: Yes. Thank you, Mr Chair. Good afternoon, Mr Chair, Professor Mackay, and officers of the IPC. We have a wider group with us today. Dr Malpass will give you a short introduction on Sydney Grammar's need for the  
35 project, and Michael Heenan is going to give you a longer presentation, and he will attempt to answer the questions that you gave us notice on. But we do have a wider team here that are ready to answer any more detailed questions. We've got the wider architectural team. We've got Kate Luckraft from Aspect Studios; Jane Maze-Riley, who is our view impact expert; Andrew Morse, traffic consultant; and Paul Davies,  
40 heritage consultant; and we have Jane Lloyd and Tina Tang, who are the development managers. So, Dr Malpass, I might hand over to you, and then Michael will provide the longer presentation.

MR DUNCAN: Just before we start, we do have some questions as well, so I know  
45 your advice that you will probably use a bit more than the 20 minutes, but if we could keep it to around 30 if possible so that we have time for discussion.

MS ROBINSON: Absolutely. We will probably be more like 25.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thank you.

5 MS ROBINSON: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Please proceed, Dr Malpass.

10 DR R. MALPASS: Well, thank you very much. Can I just confirm that you can hear me?

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Yes, we can, quite clearly.

15 DR MALPASS: Thank you very much. Well, thank you, Chair and Professor Mackay. Thank you very much for your time this afternoon. In presenting this building to you, I would like to stress, as someone who has been in the business of educating young people for about two decades, I believe deeply in the importance of sport, exercise and physical wellbeing as fundamental components of the education of young people. I would like to suggest that it has been a key suggestion of my own  
20 vision for education in my time as headmaster of the school.

Second, though, I would note that the sports that many of our young people play today have shifted from the traditional sports of a few decades ago. Court-based sports such as basketball and volleyball as well as pool-based sports now rival  
25 traditional sports such as rugby or cricket. Further, hereto relatively minor sports such as fencing and taekwondo, etcetera, have gathered popularity. That said, the school, and, I would say, the inner city more broadly, has a relative paucity of court and pool-based facilities to meet this education and indeed ongoing sporting demand, whilst those minor sports are largely without appropriate facilities around the city.  
30

In order to participate in these rising popularity sports, students often have to travel to quite disparate locations, which does present them with ..... potentially safety risks, trouble, etcetera. Our intention with this facility is to congregate as many of those sporting activities as possible in the same location on school grounds. Therefore, a  
35 number of years ago, the school tasked the team that you see before you to devise a development which would provide Grammar and the broader community with an impressive, suitable, yet respectful facility to ensure that our young people will be able to thrive in these sports and their broader educational development for decades to come. An aspect of the broader community benefit of the project is our  
40 commitment to share the sports complex with local groups, and we've already reached out to schools such as Glenmore Park Public up the road, Darlinghurst just up the road over there, and other sports groups with the intentions such as are detailed in the operational management plan, which will be embedded into the consent. With that, I might pause with my time and hand over now to Michael  
45 Heenan for a more detailed presentation of the design, siting and impacts of the project. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Doctor.

MR M. HEENAN: Thank you very much, Dr Malpass. Everyone can hear me quite clearly?

5

MR DUNCAN: Yes, Michael. We can.

MR HEENAN: The brief will become quite clear as we go through, but vital to it was three indoor – three indoor multi-purpose full-size courts and four other multi-purpose courts. This is the site. It spans from New South Head Road up to the tail of Vialoux and Alma Street in the south. And our position A, where we took you on the walk last Thursday the 7<sup>th</sup>, the first site was from here, and that forms the shape of the building in the distance. And if we zoom in a little bit more, the eight-storey apartment building on the right, which is 2 to 8 Neild Avenue, the proposed Building 1 directly south, the new harbour-clad single-storey car park slightly to the left of that, and then the proposed Maccabi new facility on the left where they have – they have approval – first-stage approval. So moving on, I will just confirm – .....

So this is a close-up of the proposed building with the headmaster's house right in the middle of that. We have a number of great opportunities on this site, and site analysis reinforces the opening of the valley floor and the maintaining of the mature trees and the deep soil to the south and quite a number of other great opportunities. There are site constraints: arterial roads to the north and to the west, access to the site, mature trees, overlooking from the north, south, east and west by residential apartments, and, of course, quite a serious flooding issue which we described in some detail when we were going on the site walk.

The other constraint, and really the reason we're down there, is the use of the fields. And they vary from winter to summer. In winter, there's rugby, football, athletics, cross-country, and a growing demand for volleyball as well as other sports. And in summer there is cricket, tennis, basketball, water polo, swimming, plus the AAFC, the cadets have a parade ground which is a strict military size. Edgecliff Prep have PDHPE and general play. And so when we overlay all of those, we found we had very little scope for movement without really harming one of those sports. And most of the ovals down there don't comply with international standards, but you can play schoolboy football on them. We also have a 400-metre running track and the ground.

And when we looked at that, the only scope we had was to take Weigall 3, which is the second field, and just rotate it about five degrees, just that tiny rotation there, which took away a little bit of a triangle where the parents gathered and the other coach stood, but what that meant was there was one point where the second football, second cricket, the 400-metre running track, the 306 parade ground, all coincided with that point and became an immovable point and actually set the northernmost point we could pull the building, and the westernmost point as well. So that was – that set the form for the proposal which we're showing you today, which is Building 1 on the left and Building 2 on the right, with that red line I just described.

Now, that was the end of a very comprehensive options analysis, and really we can go through this, but 2 to 5 did not achieve the desired principles to a level to proceed. And we went into a lot of detail and I assume you've had a look at those in the details, but some of them had threshold issues which simply couldn't proceed. And  
5 one of those was option 4, putting the building down on Weigall 4. This was the one that came up most of the time in the consultation, "Why don't you put it on Weigall 4?" And the constraints of flooding and the need to shelter in place because of flooding, the high-voltage power lines that access Sydney Trains cross directly underneath it, maintenance; the cost we worked out to come out at something around  
10 about two to four times the cost because of this sheltering in place and the need to stay fully compliant. It was impossible, essentially.

So this became the structure plan of our proposal, with the existing buildings being there, in the future being upgraded, restored and so forth. On Weigall 4, the one that  
15 I said was flooding, we will have to do an all-purpose finish on that field so it withstands water at some stage. But Building 1 and Building 2 became settled in these positions. We did – that was our first proposal, to tuck the building hard into the corner with a three-storey car park on that southern, southwestern wing. And we took that to public consultation, I felt an exemplary public consultation.

20 For instance, we went to a thousand letter boxes three times. 387 interactions. We were standing in this room because of COVID all day, every day for three days with 20-minute intervals of people coming through, and we got everyone. Paddington Society, the councillors, the mayor, the local residents, very comprehensive  
25 consultation. And we reacted to it. We reacted fairly substantially. We actually rotated the building clockwise, moving it away from the southern neighbours, and we also stepped the back of the building quite substantially, and we took out the three-storey car park that looked back to the neighbours and moved it across to site 2, a fairly dramatic improvement, we thought, and the basis of the discussion we had with  
30 the neighbours during the consultation.

So I will go for a quick walk around outside, then inside, and then talk to some of the issues. Walking up Neild Avenue, you don't really see the building. In this drawing further up from that first view, I've actually taken the understorey off graphically so  
35 you can see the building. And then once you're inside the field on Weigall 3, the second football pitch, you start to see the building and how well-activated the façade is, especially on a big game day with parents and coaches and people all over the face of the building. You can see the form of the building. And I will talk about what's in it in a moment. Major stairs coming up the front. And then how it fits in  
40 with the general form of buildings in Neild Avenue and in the area, surrounded by mature trees.

When we walk around the other side where you visited independently, looking from here, the building sits behind this row of trees. It has been twisted away from  
45 Vialoux, opening number 8 Vialoux up to the view, and you have that view in on it. So here's the view of the building, and as you come in from Neild Avenue the main pool and veranda will be – the main pool is below the veranda by half a level, the

entry veranda. Above that are the multi-purpose sports halls, the tall ones that require three of those. And then on the other side, the program pool. Above that, multi-purpose hall 2, multi-purpose hall 3, and then in the middle, in a very efficient area – efficient building entry and wet change, then dry change to the halls. Hall 3, which is another function hall, and then plant room tucked into the roof above.

So you get really the idea of the set-out of the building. And you can see the dotted line to the left that's coming up there. That's the front edge or the eastern edge of 8 Vialoux, so that you can see those tripartite windows that Professor Mackay talked about last time. You can see three of the apartments, 1, 5 and 9, from the field. And up on the right you can see numbers 12 to 14 and 16 and 18, up in this area here. We do view analysis from those, looking directly 90 degrees, and it's hard to see from those complying L&E vision that they have this view back to where I am with the camera as well when that happens.

So just to understand the building, I've put a section through the main part of the building, and you can see the field level and then the tennis court level, and the raised level of 29 to 33 behind that. If you remember the ridge height at 22.6, it will come up again. And the rear of the building was simply set by our solar analysis. That was our starting point we modelled, and I will go through that in a moment. A section through the multi-purpose sports halls 2 and 3, which we will talk about in a minute in more detail as well, shows that again we set parameters for the amount of solar and the amount of outlook from those departments on day 1 of the project and stuck pretty well with that.

Now, the section looking to the north, just to remind you of what's happening in those buildings, you can see that multi-purpose sports halls 2 and 3 don't require the same height as sports hall number 1. Tell me if I'm going too fast on any of this, because now I'm going to go on a virtual walk around the building using some of the images. So the arrow will come up on the plan, and then we will go to that point and look at it. So the boys have been dropped off on Neild Avenue. They look across and see the entry. That is the entry between the trees, which we will talk about. It will have an effect. But that's the entry straight on to that veranda and the pool half a level below on the right.

As we move along that veranda, you're starting to see from half a level up the – because of that battered bank we talked about last week, start to see the ovals and the stair up. So sliding in to the main swimming pool – that's it there. Where we were in that last one was out here on that walkway through there. And then in the program pool – the program pool is a different temperature at a different humidity than another pool used for different reasons. And then as we walk up the stairs and look back out over the oval, and then arrive at the top and turn left and go into the multi-purpose sports hall, it's specifically designed for the sports that are happening in there, but on day 1 of these we also get an acoustic engineer in, and it has been designed to reduce light spill, to improve acoustics and visual privacy, and I will show you how we're doing that.

We've also added to that with an acoustic fence across the back of the property with discussions with DPIE. So from the back of that hall – it's looking north – there's quite good activity to the street. You can actually see what's happening through these lower windows. But there's good privacy for the people across the road, and  
5 light spills as well. So you can see this is quite a fine hall. It opens out to the north, but enclosed to the south for acoustic and visual quiet. And this is one we finished recently. It has been recognised worldwide. But you can see the amount of acoustic absorption in these things to get the reverberation right and to stop light spill.

10 And then we go over to the multi-purpose sports halls. These are sized for specific things that happen in there, so taekwondo has a field of play and spectators, fencing, gym, cardio, PDHPE classroom, specific sizes that – we don't have much tolerance in the size of these multi-purpose – really multi-purpose rooms rather than sports  
15 halls, because of the height. And then there's a very comprehensive environmental overlay on this with photovoltaics over the whole roof, and the reflectivity of those have been taken into account in some detail.

So when we look at the building, there's a couple of points I would like to go to. The change from our original December 2019 one when we first went to our consultation  
20 was relatively significant in that swing and the addition of the car park so that the address to the south could be designed much more closely. But it's in this area here I wanted to have a closer look. You can see the number of trees we're adding. We're turning this from a tennis court abutment, really, to a delightful garden. And we felt that – we felt that this was copybook view sharing in twisting the building away,  
25 making sure that these living room windows could share the view from these living rooms. Even from the bedrooms gets a view.

And even from the apartments further back, we felt we were being copybook. And the ones then that were further in got this delightful garden that really isn't used day  
30 to day to school, so they're – so, you know, and three layers of trees. Now, that's not obvious when you look at the view diagrams, because they've got to be narrow view cone consistent with accepted L&E court principles, and I will go through them later. But just think, if you stand there and just look a couple of degrees to the right, we're sharing the view with the neighbours from the south.

35 We're also – I will talk about it in a second, but there's a quirk of this – there's a piece of R3 land we're looking on, and if it was R3, they have to comply with ADG. We don't; we're a school. But if we were complying with ADG, our responsibility is for 4.5 metres of the 9 metres habitable to non-habitable, which is the red line.  
40 We've actually decided with our solar analysis and our outlook analysis to go two times, just about, on the ground floor average, and three times what that ADG could happen, and we could build an apartment building there tomorrow. So that's relatively significant.

45 So when I look at this section here, the solar was set – our solar was set very carefully right at the start, as I said, and that distances were set. And why we even talk about ADG is that red line that comes up, to the south of that, by a quirk of

history – and I can tell you why – Housing Commission didn't build stage 3 on that site. But it is R3 and can be built on, although we don't have those controls because we're a school and SSDA on the school, we did take them into account as if it was. And how we did that, we looked at the solar.

5

Now, I've given you pages of these, and this is a sample lot, but we had – if you look at this drawing – and there's a lot to see, so I will concentrate on number 8, because the Department is quite happy with 29 to 33. But we've painted every living room red. We've painted some laundries blue. And the other windows that don't have a colour are either bedrooms or bathrooms. So if we're concentrating a little bit on – I will just pull a pen up – if we're concentrating a little bit in here, at the start – we will go over here.

10

Concentrating a little bit in there – I will just look at that for a second as it goes around, and down the bottom section here you've got when it is. So this is – each of these is a sun eye diagram. So you're the sun – and everyone understands this – but you're the sun looking down, so that means the sun is getting into any of those red windows you can see, and they have a similar outlook of the sky. And we've picked the coldest, shortest day, the middle of winter, so from this very worst case – not worst in its condition for them – it's better every day as the sun rises, as you know.

15

20

So if you look at those as we move around – just let me adjust my screen – if you look at those as we move around, and I will give you a summary of these, but you can see there five of the six there that get sun is getting the sun that – and to the right, 29 to 33, they're all unchanged, including their clotheslines, which we made very much of a point of modelling the clotheslines. So we felt we had modelled the entire building, as you see it there, by stepping it to the back, to be a fair share of solar and outlook, and felt that it was quite exemplary how it came out that number 8 Vialoux, up the top right-hand corner – now, we've done every single apartment and modelled every single one and put a square metre of sun on the floor.

25

30

The existing 6 of the 12 get complying ADG sun in winter. The proposal is 6 of the 12 still get complying, 3 of them are slightly less hours, and then, over to 29, 19 of the – 29 to 33 – 19 of the 33 get complying solar now, and the proposal is 19 of the 33 get complying and not one skerrick of sunlight is changed, so they get exactly the same sunlight as they've always had, and same with the clotheslines in the back garden. It was hard in the consultation for people to believe that. We modelled it. We had it independently checked. Nothing changes in their solar. So when we start to look at the views – in fact, we probably didn't have to do these views. They don't meet the threshold, because there's an expectation in the LEP that a residential flat building will be built on this site boundary.

35

40

So you can see the before and after views. This is nine ..... trees we're putting in as well. This is number 12/8 Vialoux, one of the back ones at the top. So if you turn right you will still see a distant view, but looking in complying views, that's how it looks. They go from trees across the other side of the tennis courts to trees this side of the tennis courts. And then if we look 29 to 33, they look through a layer of trees

45



to the tennis courts at the moment. We will be adding two more layers of trees, and then the building, something like 30 to 33 metres away.

5 And then if I move on to across the road, those ones I took to you earlier who could see me in that camera angle looking up across Neild Avenue, this is their L&E compliant narrow view across the site, and they look through the trees to the building and turn left and look out over the fields. So we were quite surprised, having felt we had done absolute copybook view sharing, outlook understanding and solar, to have the design amendment condition B1 asking us to pull multi-purpose hall 2 and 3  
10 forward – “to reduce the view loss impact” is what’s written there. And I think it means outlook, because – anyway, that’s where multi-purpose hall 2 is now, 12.8 metres back, remembering our responsibility is really six if we add in their 1.5, so doubled our responsibility.

15 The design amendment condition B asked us to move that about four metres forward, and then if I go up a level, design amendment B asked for multi-purpose sports hall 3, which is already set back for the solar, to move further north in that change there. So what that means is – this is how we set it up so that we were fairly sure solar was still exemplary to number 8. The amendment condition asks us to take that piece off  
20 the back and add it to the front, because we don’t have tolerance in space. So the result is this – and I will do a 3D.

If you look at the 3D here, this is the existing condition, so you can see this is what we had done. We had gone step, step – we had gone step, step, step, to keep those  
25 solar angles there. This is the requirement for a bit more, and then from here you can see that comes to the top of the fence there. That comes to the bottom of the fence there. There’s not a lot of change as far as the intent of the condition. However, we’re able to deal with that. Our sports buildings have been recognised by the AOC and World Architecture Festival and Institute of Architects. We can handle it as  
30 architects. We don’t feel that it’s so completely necessary. I will clear those drawings.

Then the second one that was a design amendment condition that surprised us was T32, 35 and 37 to be retained. Now, those trees are in this area here. Now, those  
35 trees are in this area here. In the top right-hand side there, we have the best landscape architects and arborists we could get in Australia, I think, on this. There’s a comprehensive approach to this. We’re taking out 20 trees for substations, for entries, for putting the building onsite, but we’re adding 42 trees, and it’s a very carefully manicured approach to increasing the tree canopy cover on this site fairly  
40 substantially. And it’s at the entry that this condition came up.

So what we were saying is we were going to – that’s about where the entry is, and we showed you this onsite. We took it up close to it. They were the four trees around the entry we were proposing to take out, those four trees. In green are the trees that  
45 we weren’t going to retain, and in orange are the trees that the Department has decided we should keep in this condition. We feel like there is the entry coming in through there, there’s the canopy of tree number 39, which is this one, which has

been crowded out by tree – tree 39 has been crowded out by tree 37 and its southern canopy hasn't been allowed to grow.

5 Tree 33 back here forms this sort of canopy, and we feel like by un-crowding that entry the canopy joins again, and we will see that from a view from across the way. But also, in the most used and intensive part of this entry, there is a construction zone required, and we would be building the entry over the structural roots of tree 35. Tree 37 we don't understand at all; it's five metres high and it's – it's a stick. It will fall over any day. But tree 35, we can design around it, but we don't understand why  
10 it doesn't go to form this entry here with the canopy joining over the middle of 37 and 33, joining up and becoming quite a – quite a significant entry.

And then the canopy, I talked about that, that canopy is increasing in scale. Even though we're putting quite a substantial building there, the percentage canopy  
15 increases and the canopy covers that entry completely. The understorey, we're very keen to make a beautiful garden that you look out from the south, and there's a selection of the planting palette that's Indigenous-based and a very powerful garden out the back there, I think. Our materials briefed from the school, this is a pragmatic building; it has got to be beautifully designed, but the materials have got to just do  
20 their job and be smartly used, smart materials but raw materials and materials that fit, quite well articulated, a long discussion with neighbours and others on that, like the Paddington Society; John Richardson was in on that.

We have a very substantial sustainability design initiative wrapped through every  
25 decision we've made on this site, and that's in the pack, but it will be an exemplar building from that point of view. So I will finish now just by looking at the car park slightly. The car park is single-level, like ground cars and then cars one level up. It looks like that, and there's a lot of work to resolve this entry with Maccabi and make it safer, because the prep boys cross over there every day for their playtime. If you  
30 run a section through it that way, it's split-level, so there's not giant ramps in it and all of that. And it's set up like an harbour, and we've done that because – and it's also designed to stop light spill, like the main building.

There's a solid wall to the south, there's an operational overlay, as there is with the  
35 use of the hall, as far as acoustics are concerned and light spill. Closing times in the evening. Various times they don't use it. And it's also used at times when it's not in demand, because it's there for the weekend use – generated by the weekend use demands. It can be used as a covered outdoor learning area and practice area for the boys, and you can just bypass and park only upstairs. So that's our proposal, tucking  
40 in beautifully, defining the valley floor, and creating the facilities that this school has identified will be needed for the next 110 years. They've satisfied rugby and soccer for the first 110 years. The second 110 is very different, and this is very much needed. So thanks very much, Commissioner. That's our presentation

45 MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Michael. That's a really helpful presentation. I appreciate that. Well, we might start off with Commissioner Mackay. Would you like to ask some questions at this stage?

PROF R. MACKAY: Yes. Yes. Thank you, Chair. It's Richard Mackay. And good afternoon to all. I have got quite a lot of questions, so I will try and ask them quickly, and I think it will help us get through if the answers could be kind of punchy and responsive rather than narrative. Just starting with one of the positives, the  
5 application is clearly designed around ESD principles and is targeted at four star. It seems to me, given all that's being included, why would it not aspire to five star, please?

MR HEENAN: Very good question, and we could – we could target five star.  
10 It's - - -

MS T. TANG: Sorry, Michael, can I step in and help you here?

MR HEENAN: Yes, yes. Sorry. Thank you.  
15

MS TANG: I think the issue that we have with the ESD consultant is that there is no star rating per se applicable to this sort of building, so they have actually come up with a – what do you call it – a framework or a system to try and achieve as best that we can, without committing to the formal five star, which doesn't apply to a sports  
20 building. So as you can imagine, there are – you know, in terms of water usage, etcetera, there are going to be some factors, given the pools and so on, that won't necessarily comply with the standard five star framework. So we've put forward in the application a proposed framework to achieve an equivalent sort of energy rating. Or ESD rating, I should say. It's not energy; it's ESD rating.

25 PROF MACKAY: Thank you, Tina. Look, noting that – and I don't want to sort of reel off the content of the ESD components, but if that's your approach, would not five star be achievable and appropriate?

30 MR HEENAN: I was certainly hesitating on that, because we don't know what five star is for a sports building, so we're aiming as high as we feel we can.

PROF MACKAY: All right. Thank you. I guess I would like to move fairly promptly to the amenity issues for the residents in Vialoux Avenue and Lawson  
35 Street. And, look, noting all that has been said about the design process, I would like to push a little bit further on the application of the Tenacity principles and like to consider, for example, unit 4 in number 8 Vialoux, which, it seems to me, currently has the outlook across courts, across the grounds through the trees, is going to have a large built form very close. And I'm just a little bit bemused about how, when the  
40 Applicant's own visual impact assessment describes the effect as devastating, that can be asserted as meeting the test of reasonableness in step 4 of the Tenacity principles, please. Yes, that's the unit I'm asking about.

MS ROBINSON: Jane, do you want to take that one? Jane Maze-Riley?  
45

MS J. MAZE-RILEY: Yes. Hi. Thank you, Richard, for your question. Well, unit 4 obviously is a ground-floor unit, and I think, as Sandra and others have alluded and

shown in the documentation, if a complying building was put in front of those of either one – even a single-storey building, let alone a two or a three-storey building, the controls, if they were applicable in the LEP – all of those views would be lost and therefore a level of impact in view sharing of that magnitude had already been anticipated by those controls. So in some ways, any building at all will take all the views from a ground-level unit. That's one thing.

And me coming to my own conclusions and rating the views, I think because Tenacity is subjective, I have weighted quite heavily the extent of the view loss rather than the quality of it. So the quality of the composition is fairly vernacular, and I think I described it as, you know, a pleasant outlook. So that's true, it's a pleasant outlook. From a ground-level unit at that location, it really is predominantly characterised by the ground floor itself, so that's a tennis court and some vegetation. So as Michael pointed out, really, in reality, we are replacing the trees in the foreground with some built form and additional trees.

So we're changing the position, but in terms of view loss, what's lost is not highly valued in Tenacity terms. And arguably I, yes, placed too much weight on the quantity of the change rather than the quality of the change. So in quantitative terms, in step 4 or step 3, you know, other practitioners would say it reaches a severe level of view impact. I went a bit further than that, but at the end of the day, when I considered all of the relevant factors, my overall rating did say that it was reasonable and acceptable, because there are many other factors that come into play here.

PROF MACKAY: Thank you, Jane. Could I just press a little bit further on the first part of your answer. So is part of your balancing and assessment predicated on an assumption that because of the built form that would be permissible under instruments if this were not subject to the education SEPP, therefore it's assumed that there would be a built form in front of those units?

MS MAZE-RILEY: Well, firstly, yes, if the LEP was applicable, then the amount of view loss that would be occasioned by this approval would be – would be felt, would appear. So, yes, there would be that level which would be anticipated by those controls. But given that the SSDA is – the LEP is not applicable, I took a very conservative view in making those statements. I'm not sure if that answers your question.

PROF MACKAY: Kind of. I'm just – I mean, I think what you were saying, if I understood you correctly, was because there is a building allowed there and because it's a single storey, the inevitable outcome of any development is that you will see a built form straight in front of that window.

MS MAZE-RILEY: Absolutely, yes. That's correct.

MS ROBINSON: Professor Mackay, Sandra Robinson. I think the critical part of the Tenacity test is the reasonableness test, and in this instance the reasonableness test – you must compare the proposal with what development might be permitted in an

R3 zone. And an R3 development on this land would have, as Michael explained, a much smaller setback, so you wouldn't have that same outlook improvement that has been proposed. And it would be that the permitted height is 10 and a half metres, and as soon as you get to 10 and a half metres, the Vialoux apartments lose their  
5 view. So in comparison, the proposal has been tilted, set back further, and has really very, very generous landscaped areas that you just wouldn't get. So it satisfies the reasonableness test of Tenacity.

10 PROF MACKAY: Okay. Thank you for that. Could I perhaps follow you in that direction. And if what I understood is correct, Michael is suggesting that, assuming for a minute that the [Apartment Design Guide] building separation were applied, in terms of the distance, it's a fifty-fifty deal. I'm just interested in that perspective, given that the building at 8 Vialoux is an existing site condition, and I would have thought that the court's decision in – I think it's called the Tuite case – says you need  
15 to assess the environment as it is now. So you can't have a putative half of the setback on the 8 Vialoux property, because the building is already there.

MR HEENAN: Yes. There is a requirement of that when an area is in transition. We were very aware of that, and we have said that our responsibility is 4.5;  
20 however, we will take the full load, and we will go to the full 9. In fact, we go to 11 in the main façade there. So we – put aside the law – we took the higher ground.

PROF MACKAY: Thank you, Michael. Could I just clarify that point as well. If my memory serves me correctly, the Department's assessment report suggests that at  
25 the south-eastern corner of the proposed building, it's actually about 1.8 metres short of that [length] – of that full, if you like, double ADG building separation.

MR HEENAN: Look, if they've taken that, they may be looking at this box there, which is only two metres high, like a fence.  
30

MS ROBINSON: And, Michael, if I could also add – Sandra Robinson – it's this uncertainty whether you call that obscure glazing habitable, because you won't actually see through it. So if you were to do it habitable to habitable, the separation becomes 12 metres, not 9. But as obscure glazing, it really functions as a non-  
35 habitable space, which gives you the nine metres that you can see on the screen now. So that could explain the difference.

PROF MACKAY: Sandra, thank you. Look, I would invite the Applicant, if you want to, to come back to us – my recollection is the Department says there's just one  
40 point where there's a 1.8 metre under. It would be useful to hear from you on that if you take a different view.

Could I ask, Woollahra Council in its submission, and my understanding is the Government Architect through the State Design Review Panel, have both expressed a  
45 view that the Neild Avenue elevation would benefit from being more articulated, be that through fenestration or other design elements, so that it creates more of a sort of statement in terms of the public interface and outlook of the proposed building. If I understand the response provided by the Applicant correctly, you kind of, I guess, declined to do that. Is there – well, could you explain

the consideration, and is there a possibility of addressing that view expressed by both the Council and the State Design Review Panel, please?

MR HEENAN: Lee, do you want to talk about the amount of work we did in  
5 articulating that western façade after those comments?

MR L. COLLARD: Sure, Michael. Can you bring up the slide that shows the detailed analysis of that façade?

10 MR HEENAN: Not in this proposal.

PROF MACKAY: Would it be helpful if we just moved on from that question and come back to it when someone has got access to that to screen share?

15 MR COLLARD: Sure.

MS ROBINSON: Sure.

MR HEENAN: Yes, that would be good. But we did do an extensive remodelling  
20 of that façade, articulating the columns, changing the amount of glazing, changing the amount of openings. There was quite a strong reaction to it.

PROF MACKAY: Okay. Well, I think it would be very helpful, I think, to the  
Commission to have that explained, please. Look, I will, if I may, come back to the  
25 effect on the residents to the south of the site. You know, a number of them have made strong submissions, and a number of other parties have made submissions on their behalf. Firstly, a relatively minor thing: the tree species – is there some assurance that the tree species selected that have an obvious important contribution to the new visual setting and outlook of these residents are actually going to grow in  
30 this space in the space that's created between the existing built form and this, you know, proposed new building?

MS K. LUCKRAFT: Hello, Commissioner. My name is Kate Luckraft. I'm the  
landscape architect from Aspect who's responsible for choosing the trees. And, yes,  
35 we carefully chose the trees. There's a mixture of lilly pillies and Elaeocarpus species that cope with a mixture of sun and shade, because you will get different, you know, light conditions in this space through the day, and they will thrive. They will be, you know, very successful trees in that situation, and in the visualisations I believe we showed them at a very moderate size. They're approximately seven to  
40 eight metres high in the visualisations, and those trees could easily grow eight, nine, 10 metres high at maturity.

PROF MACKAY: Thank you. That's very clear. Could I also take us back again –  
I mean, arising again from this impact on the residents to the south, Michael, that  
45 was – as you provided onsite, that was a very clear explanation of the rationale and the manner in which the northern edge of the development site near the main building was determined. It does rather seem, though, in terms of the constraint

analysis, that the approach has been taken that the existing ovals, particularly number 1 and the second oval, have been tilted but designed around.

5 In other words, the distance from – between the proposed building and the affected residence to the south is in part driven by the retaining, if you like, the integrity of the 400-metre running track and number 2 oval, albeit reoriented. What would be the effect, for example, of pushing the entirety of that building development forward by four metres, maybe pushing oval number 1 to the northwest by four metres, and adjusting everything else accordingly, please?

10 MR HEENAN: Yes. I think it's a really good question to ask, and we've asked ourselves that quite a number of times. When I said they're non-complying ovals, the overrun from the first oval is non-complying in that a fullback, if he backs up hard enough, will trip into the pavilion. And at the other end, we're constrained by  
15 that line. That corner there means that the oval itself nearly touches that hedge that I talked to you about, and the sidelinesman has to cut across the oval a little bit.

So we feel like – and we're not quite complying widths on all of them. If we got into the finals, we would probably say we can't play a home game, so – not a problem so far, but – except for the football, which wins the interschool sports, and they have a  
20 fully complying oval over there. So, look, we have done every sort of manipulation of this, and every time we find a way to do it, then the 306 Squadron will come into it or the 400-metre running track. Already it's too tight there, it's too tight there. So the answer is, tried as hard as we can and we can't move another inch.

25 PROF MACKAY: Okay. If I may, I wish to emphasise the Panel has formed no view about whether it's headed towards an approval or a refusal of this application. We are still in an information-gathering phase. But I want to ask a question that is very direct and fairly blunt, which is, if that built form had to move four metres to the  
30 north, would that amount to a refusal because it would not be able to be done?

MR HEENAN: There's two issues there. Yes, that's correct. I would question why, when some bits of it may achieve what you're after with that, because, you know, if we're 35 metres north. And, yes, it would be a *Mison v Randwick Council*.  
35 It would be essentially a refusal.

PROF MACKAY: Yes. Okay. I mean, I think it's helpful to be – to the Panel to understand the nature of that northern boundary line and – I mean, I guess I'm covering items that you helpfully covered during the virtual site tour.

40 May I ask about the construction management plan, and particularly the trucks? We have a large number of representations that highlight the fact that this site is adjacent to a dense residential area, conservation area to the south, and there's a sort of a plea to have the truck traffic impacts borne by the applicant rather than by the  
45 surrounding community, and so suggestions that modifications should put the truck movements more onsite, coming in off Neild Avenue, truck stacks stacking during construction should be in Neild Avenue, and that trucks should not be going up and down either Vialoux or Alma. Are you in a position to comment on that, please?

MS ROBINSON: Andrew?

MR A. MORSE: Yes, I can take that one. Thank you. So the construction management plan being drawn together so far is of a – it's of a somewhat  
5 preliminary nature in the sense that when the tender is given, the contractor will work through the details of how they will operate the site. However, we have had significant consultation with a contractor on how they would approach the construction of this site, and it's – as with all these things, taking into consideration constraints around the site, around the construction of the two buildings, the trees,  
10 and road geometries, putting that together, and of course, you know, having appreciation for impacts on the local residents. We know that we've got a sensitive road network down in this ..... Paddington here.

MS TANG: Could I just - - -  
15

PROF MACKAY: Thank you. Could I just push that a little further. It was put to us this morning during our meeting with the Council that an option would be to bring the trucks actually onto number 1 field off Neild Avenue and cause the fields not to be playable during the period of construction, and to do as some other schools have  
20 done – Cranbrook, I think, was mentioned – and find alternative accommodation for the sports during the period of construction so that the impact is on the school site, not on the surrounding residential streets.

MR MORSE: Yes. I mean, the Cranbrook example – just for transparency, we are  
25 the consultants for Cranbrook as well – is a fairly different proposition in the sense that the project itself is to lift the oval and put the oval back on the lid of the pool, so in that sense it was always going to be a loss of the sporting facilities just by virtue of the type of project. So they have the luxury of that space, although even having said that, we're still relying on Rose Bay Avenue to reach the site, so we're not  
30 completely off the arterial roads. But in terms of the impacts on the field, that's probably a matter for the school to address. But certainly the view that we took with the contractor was available access points, protection of trees, protection of the activities that can still occur within the site during the construction period.

35 PROF MACKAY: Okay. Look, again, I would invite the Applicant to respond on notice, should you wish, to a fairly blunt question about, if the Panel were of a mind to approve this proposal and condition it such that the traffic impacts had to come on and off Neild Avenue through the site, is that feasible?

40 MS MAZE-RILEY: I think – can I just make one - - -

MS TANG: Sorry, can I just clarify that – sorry, Jane – can I just clarify that, Commissioner Mackay: is that – you're talking about construction traffic only?

45 PROF MACKAY: Yes, I'm talking about construction traffic. Thank you. I've got a couple more questions. I'm conscious of the time. Can I just quickly about trees – coming back to our virtual site tour, I think it was – is it correct that tree 32 the



Applicant is happy to keep, and it's the other two trees proposed by the Department that the Applicant questions the value in so doing?

MR HEENAN: That's correct.

5

PROF MACKAY: Okay. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Richard, before we proceed, just checking to see if everybody is happy if we do run over. I know we've got a lot to go through, but I – I know from  
10 our point of view we are, before our next meeting.

MS ROBINSON: I think we would be very happy to continue, Chair and Professor Mackay.

15 MR DUNCAN: Well, let's – Richard, let's stay another 10 or 15 minutes, as .....

PROF MACKAY: Thank you, Chair. I won't be long. I know you have some questions too.

20 MR HEENAN: I've brought that up, Commissioner, the trees, and very happy to keep 32. It's 35 and – 37 shouldn't be in contention anyway; it's a nothing thing. But it's only 35 which we're talking about.

PROF MACKAY: Thank you. That's very clear. Just looking at the operations,  
25 two questions. I haven't got the numbers in front of me, but when you add up all the accommodation in terms of spectator capacity in the different rooms, etcetera, it seems to exceed significantly the predictions made in the document. And then, related to that, there's a suggestion that there will be a confined number of events, but I've not been able to find what constitutes an 'event'. Is there a numeric  
30 threshold or some way in which that can be more tightly managed or expressed so that there is not a misunderstanding if the proposal were approved, please.

MS ROBINSON: Professor Mackay, there's a very detailed schedule of events that form the basis for the car parking, really. The peak event was what determined the  
35 102 car parking spaces. And I can completely understand the complexity in understanding the detail in that, because summer and winter events are quite different, but we – I'm not quite sure we can provide more certainty, but there is no intention that the facility doesn't have the – the events just wouldn't exceed that peak summer Saturday, and that peak summer Saturday only occurs 13 times a year.

40

PROF MACKAY: Right. Well, in terms – I'm just, again, without prejudice, looking at how the consent conditions have been framed, and it seems to me that the notion of a cap on the number of events – and I presume by that it means major events such as the 13 you were mentioning. Perhaps a suggestion from the Applicant  
45 about - - -

MS MAZE-RILEY: Are you talking about the nine events that we talk about in the car park utilisation? Is that what you're talking about?

PROF MACKAY: No, I'm talking about the events in the main building.

5

MS MAZE-RILEY: Right. Okay.

MS TANG: The 13 events a year are actually outlined, I thought, in the utilisation schedule, Jane. They're .....

10

MS MAZE-RILEY: It's 14 – yes, it's 14 weekends a year. 14 weekends a year.

MS TANG: 14 weekends a year where specific – a specific sporting event happens with the school. I'm sorry, Jane, you're more familiar with what the main event is, but it's a key sporting event that happens 14 times a year between Sydney Grammar and some of the other schools.

15

MS MAZE-RILEY: Correct. So we're hosting the basketball or we're hosting the – or we're swimming. That's the – I mean, they're the two main ones.

20

PROF MACKAY: Thank you. I understand that. In terms of the application before the Commission, I am presuming that it's an application which includes those 14 events, not 24 events. And so I'm asking firstly about how that cap might be conditioned, and also how those events might be defined or described so people understand what they are. So if, for example, another school wanted to hire the premises for something comparable for one of its own events, would that or would that not be allowable?

25

MS ROBINSON: The community use is only provided for when Sydney Grammar is not using the facility. So Sydney Grammar will use it right through school terms, so the community – for example, a Saturday – the community access doesn't happen until after 3pm. So the possibility of another school coming in to have an event as big as the peak Sydney Grammar event is highly unlikely, because community use only is available when Grammar doesn't need the facility.

30

35

PROF MACKAY: Thank you, Sandra. I'm really not talking about community use. I'm talking about how the intensity of the use of this site would be tightly defined in a consent so that there isn't a problem where affected residents say, "Well, hang on a minute. You said – you said 14; now you're doing 20."

40

MS ROBINSON: Thank you, Professor. The consent makes reference to the operational management plan, and it actually becomes – as Dr Malpass said, it actually gets encompassed into the consent. Having said that, to actually police it, you would have to have somebody at the entrances clicking. You know, how many people are in? You know, you've hit your capacity. It's as – I think it's as tight as a planning consent can actually make it.

45

I've done a lot of school applications, and what typically happens is the school does their, you know, pretty detailed planning on what sort of events, the overlap, the number of students, number of spectators per student, number of spectators per guest student, and taking into account carpooling. So it really is the best estimate that the school can possibly come up with, and if it becomes a problem and the school doesn't follow through with implementing their operational management plan, it is measurable. Not easy to measure, because, as I say, to actually measure it would mean counting people walking through the gates. But it is measurable.

10 PROF MACKAY: Thank you for that. Jumping in a completely different direction, can I just ask about the need for the substation at the location proposed which seems to, again, give rise to one of these questions about the interface between the development and the public domain. And I'm happy to go back to the question about the western façade if the graphics are available, please. Do we need to have the  
15 substation right on the corner of Neild Avenue and Lawson Street, rather than out of sight, out of mind, I guess is what I'm asking.

MS TANG: That – sorry, does anyone want to take that, or shall I?

20 MS MAZE-RILEY: You take it, Tina.

MS TANG: I will give it a go. The location of the substation, we did analyse where it could go, and in terms of access – you know, needing to provide access for the authorities at the drop of a hat, and in order to fit it somewhere within the site that  
25 didn't impact on the operation of the building and the turning circles, etcetera, with the car parking at the back, that actually was the best – is the best location for it, and we carefully located it – I mean, we did a very detailed analysis of tree locations and the like in that corner to site it in the best possible way, I guess.

30 PROF MACKAY: And I mean, was there an urban design input to that? You know, I mean, it's – I guess it's the prominent corner of the site in terms of the public domain interface.

MR HEENAN: We were very aware of the continuous line of trees along Neild  
35 Avenue and the understorey, and we felt from the design point of view this is the least – the least obvious place, because the traffic coming up Neild Avenue peels right, or left into Lawson, and no one – no traffic comes directly past this. And it's tucked in – it needs to be accessible from the street, you know, for the authorities, and so the further north we take it, the more it's involved with Neild Avenue itself.  
40 Where it is, it's tucked under one of the grandest fig trees in a corner that is the remote corner of the site, I think. So we thought it was the least harmful.

PROF MACKAY: Michael, thank you. That's clear. I guess this goes to the same concern that has been expressed by a number of parties on whether this building is  
45 predominantly addressing itself to the internal grounds, or how it relates to the public area to the – the outside parts of the site to the west.

MR HEENAN: Do we have those graphics?

MS ROBINSON: Yes, we have the elevation for Neild Avenue. Jane Lloyd was going to share that. If she can have access, Michael.

5

MR HEENAN: Yes, I will stop the share.

MS J. LLOYD: Is this the one you want? Can you see that?

10 PROF MACKAY: Yes, we can.

MR COLLARD: I can start off on this. Lee Collard here from Allen Jack+Cottier, Professor Mackay.

15 MS LLOYD: Sorry, Lee, do you want that one?

MR COLLARD: No, if you can start on that first section one.

MS LLOYD: Okay.

20

MR COLLARD: So, yes, you are correct. During the design process we did have interaction with the Government Architects, and they did make the comment that they would like to see some additional detail and fenestration developed as we progress the design through the process, and we feel that we have responded to that.

25 As a starting point, I will just talk a little bit about the functions that are in those spaces, being a sports hall and a swimming pool, so glare control and, as Michael has mentioned as well, acoustics are something that is quite critical. So we spent a lot of time balancing that to make sure we would get what we believe to be a positive outcome for those functions, but also to the public domain that those spaces front onto. So there was a couple of principles that we looked at. One was taking a tripartite approach in terms of the building mass, so establishing a base, a midsection and a top.

30

And if you look at the graphic there, you can fairly clearly see that that's coming across as quite legible in that elevation. Also, the way that we were dealing with the glazing in the lower levels, we felt we were breaking that down through the use of horizontal and also vertical ..... which we also expressed – and I will just talk through this, and then we can go to a flat-on elevation of it – also expressed in the structural grid. And as Michael had mentioned before, we do have passive ESD principles integrated into this, where we look at natural ventilation in the main sports hall, and that's where we see the opportunity of operable façade, to further then articulate what we're showing there. And then, Jane, if it's okay if you could just tap to the next page. And this is how that is reading, actually, as a front-on elevation to the street.

45

PROF MACKAY: Thank you. That's really clear and very helpful. Chair, that's all the questions from me. I may have a supplementary arising from the matters I think you're going to raise.

5 MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR HEENAN: I will take the screen again, Jane.

MS LLOYD: Okay.

10

MR DUNCAN: So, Sandra, I'm not quite sure who to direct this question to, but maybe if we start with you. The question I had relates to what we've discussed, I guess, in the sense potential community use and looking at the conditions, the times and things like that. I understand that from a community use point of view, we're  
15 talking about community organisations, and I was just wondering whether you could just explain that a little bit to me, and also whether there was any potential, particularly given sort of the impacts on that northern edge to those buildings in Lawson, whether that group of community can somehow be involved in access to the facilities.

20

MS ROBINSON: I might leave the second part of your question, if I could, to the school. But the first part of the question, the real issue in terms of restricting it to groups was so that Grammar can have a formal agreement with the people who access the facility so that they know the rules, and so that there's a formal contract, I  
25 guess, between the school and the people who use the facility. So that was the main reason, and also recognising that it's an education facility, so there's sort of more of an affinity with the local public schools or the local basketball group or the local, if there is such a thing, taekwondo group, and also, probably most importantly, learn to swim for the local school groups that might not have that same sort of access to such  
30 a good facility. I'm sorry to do this at such short notice, Dr Malpass, but can you comment on Lawson Street residents' access?

DR MALPASS: Yes, certainly. Thank you. Richard Malpass here from Grammar. Most definitely. I mean, my brief response would be a general one to say I hail from  
35 a series of schools in the United Kingdom where I've worked which made these sorts of facilities very widely open to local residents. I have a mind for the local schools that I have mentioned being able to have clear timetabled use of the facilities when they're not being used by the school. There are clear windows of time for learn to swim possibilities, both on weekends, potentially, as well as in the holiday period.

40

Look, in general, I would say I think there are extensive possibilities for the use of this facility. We're a day school, and so, depending on – depending on the times that we're permitted to offer this to the local community – we're not a boarding school, so we don't have boys using this on Sundays and in the evenings, so there are distinct  
45 possibilities. I speak as a generalist here, so I don't have a full understanding of the consent limitations that we would be facing, but my spirit of this is very much driven by my experience in the UK at such schools that had these facilities.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. So in summary, if there could be a mechanism that could be found, and I think from Sandra Robinson's comments as well, it would be through some formalised group arrangement, but there's potential for this to happen.

5 MS ROBINSON: Yes. The one thing that I had neglected to also say is there's really – it's not my expertise, but there's insurance issues in terms of – the facility everybody wants access to, quite understandably, is the pool. But lifesaving and safety becomes a real issue, and that was one of the key issues with the groups, because they then have their own responsibilities in terms of the safety of their  
10 group. If you have residents coming in, you might have two residents in there. What happens if there's a health or safety issue and drowning? So the need to have a lifeguard there becomes a real issue.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Look, I understand, but I do know from experience with other  
15 schools that this has been accommodated, and I was just wondering what opportunities we could do to broaden that, particularly in that just particular circumstance. But I think Commissioner Mackay might have a question – a further question on this.

20 PROF MACKAY: Yes. I've just got a related question, if I may, please, Chair. Could I put perhaps a question on notice to the school and its advisors that on one reading, the people who are most affected if this proposal receives consent would be the residents of 8 Vialoux and of the buildings on Lawson Street immediately to the south, and recognising all that we've been told in this presentation and all that's said  
25 in the application about what has been done to address amenity and view sharing, they are still quite affected. There are also some residents in Neild Avenue whose outlook and view would be affected.

Would the school, you know, consider being responsible for setting up the necessary  
30 arrangement – I don't know what that might be, perhaps an incorporated association or whatever – so that the school's understandable and reasonable requirements about engaging with a group who can be managed and who know the rules are achieved, but not relying on a social housing resident in Lawson Street behind to somehow magically set that up for themselves? In other words, the community benefit to  
35 Grammar and the broader community working together is actually something that Grammar might put out and make available to those who would be most affected and most concerned by this proposal.

DR MALPASS: I would again respond to that by simply restating, Professor  
40 Mackay, what I said before, that in two schools that I worked at most recently in England before I came back to Grammar five years ago, that was precisely what happened, a version of what you've just described. And they were local community schools, and such provision was made, and I have a similar spirit for this.

45 PROF MACKAY: Thank you. Well, it's certainly open to the Applicant to come back to us with some more detail on that in the next couple of weeks if you have a mind to do so.

MS ROBINSON: Professor Mackay, if it was to happen – and that’s something we will take offline – it would have to be a fairly restricted time, just in terms of the school’s own calendar, but also that, you know, the Lawson Street residents aren’t going to be able to provide their own lifesaver. And so that becomes a really  
5 significant constraint.

PROF MACKAY: Thank you. Look, understood, which is why I’m suggesting it’s sensible for the school, the Applicant, to take on notice and come back and say what is possible and offered. That would assist the Commission, I think, in considering  
10 that question.

MS MAZE-RILEY: Can I just make one comment on that. We have a – we do have a consultation through construction group that we’ve discussed in the community consultation, and it may be something that we develop up through that timetable as opposed to this one. And only just as a – just as a suggestion. It’s a – I  
15 hear what you’re saying about the on notice, but, yes.

PROF MACKAY: Thank you.

20 MR DUNCAN: Just one final thing from me. Again – and this issue has come up a couple of times, and we know it’s probably not directly related to the application, this concept of a greenway through the site. I was just wondering if – is there any formal position or statement about the greenway from the school’s point of view?

25 MS TANG: Yes. Shall I start, and then, Dr Malpass, you might want to step in, or Sandra.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks. Thank you, Tina.

30 MS TANG: We have had extensive – or we are having, I should say, a discussion with the Council, Department of Planning, and other stakeholders were included, regarding the Paddington Greenway. The school’s position is they certainly support the concept, the principles of the Paddington Greenway, so the driver of wanting to connect Centennial Park through Trumper Park through to Rushcutters Park. We  
35 accept that. I think the greatest issue for the school is the concept of having essentially a public thoroughfare running through the middle of school grounds does pose quite a safety risk and – you know, to the students, and not something that – I don’t think we can think of an example where there’s a public thoroughfare that goes through – basically through the school grounds.

40 So we do – we put forward and we want to discuss further with Council one of the options they had originally tabled to us or to the wider audience, I suppose. There were three options on the table. Options A and B run along the culvert, the drainage culvert, which is shown there in light blue on this drawing. There’s an option C,  
45 which runs along the perimeter. I don’t know who has got control of the cursor, but if you could run along the trees to the right there – yes, there, and then up and across. That’s it. So that’s an option C. That’s an option that we’re looking at. That would

still impact on school land. However, we believe that that has, you know, much less impact on the school from a safety – a student safety perspective than actually running it right through the middle of the school. Dr Malpass, I don't know if you would like to add to any of that.

5

DR MALPASS: Simply to say – and I think you've covered most things there, Tina, other than to say I have personally been on the Paddington Greenway Steering Committee since the middle of last year. We've had members of Woollahra Council, and that sort of inner circle, I suppose, of that Steering Committee, visiting the school on a couple of occasions already, and we visited Council as well. So there has been a lot of discussion and negotiation to try and reach a mutually suitable solution.

10

MR DUNCAN: Thanks, Doctor. And that probably ends our discussion on a positive note. Just at this stage, is there anything finally you would like to say? I would like to thank you and the team, by the way, for persevering today and extending the time. So I might - - -

15

MS ROBINSON: The only thing – we would like to thank you for very, very carefully considered questions, and it's very clear that you've got a thorough understanding of the project, so thank you.

20

DR MALPASS: Thank you very much for your time.

25

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Thanks, everybody.

PROF MACKAY: Thank you all. That has been very informative and helpful.

MS MAZE-RILEY: Thank you.

30

MS ROBINSON: Thank you.

MR HEENAN: Thanks very much.

35

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**[3.50 pm]**