



## 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-1580454

### INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

### MEETING WITH COUNCIL

**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**

**COUNCIL:** **COUNCILLOR HARRIET PRICE**  
**COUNCILLOR MEGAN McEWIN**  
**NICK ECONOMOU**  
**GEORGE FOTIS**  
**AURELIO LINDAYA**  
**EMILIO ANDARI**  
**DAVID GREY**  
**ROBERT LAM**  
**PETER FAILES**  
**SHONA LINDSAY**

**DATE:** **11.03 AM, FRIDAY, 15 OCTOBER 2021**

MR P. DUNCAN: Good morning. Before I begin I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the lands on which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their elders, past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Weigall Sports Complex, Sydney Grammar School project, SSD-10421,  
5 currently before the Commission for determination. Sydney Grammar School, the applicant, is seeking approval for the new Weigall Sports Complex comprising demolition of the existing sports facilities and carparking areas, bulk excavations and construction of a new three-storey sports complex with basement and a single-storey, split-level carpark. My name is Peter Duncan. I am the chair of the Commission  
10 Panel.

Today I am joined by my fellow commissioner Professor Richard Mackay. We're also joined by Lindsey Blecher, Jane Anderson and Phoebe Jarvis from the office of the Independent Planning Commission. In the interests of openness and transparency  
15 and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination. It is important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees to  
20 clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and you're not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will also post 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  
25 each other to ensure the accuracy of the recording and the transcript.

We will now begin and I will, in a moment, provide an opportunity for councillors and Council officers to introduce yourselves, but there is an agenda that I assume everybody has and as it's laid out we're going to have some opening remarks from  
30 Council then opening remarks from Council also about 10 minutes each if we can and then provide some questions in line generally with the agenda. But I will say we've just met with the Department and asked a number of questions about the proposal, some of which include the facade issue that Council has mentioned on the western frontage, traffic access – particularly trucks and truck giving – and adjoining  
35 properties and potential for their community use of facilities should something go ahead in this location. But, at this stage, that's where we're up to. I will now hand over to you, Nick, if you wish to make some introductions from Council's point of view.

40 MR N. ECONOMOU: Thank you, chair. My name is Nick Economou. I'm the Manager of the Development Control Department. So primarily the planning submission that was prepared by staff has come through George Fotis and my team. In essence, we do have the technical specialists here with us. But I think I did read the report that has been prepared by the Department's planners and I think the key  
45 issues that were put forward in the Council's submission in terms of view affectation, solar access, traffic and the like, have been addressed in the report and I think – and I

do take heart that one of the key issues is in relation to the view affectation. And I think reading the report it talks about there are to be design amendments made to the principal building – I think it's Building 1 – in order to ensure the views – I think it's from – is it Lawson or Vialoux? Or one of the adjoining properties there has to be  
5 redesigned to protect that. Now, I don't know what level of redesign is required to achieve that, and I couldn't see a condition to that effect or what the extent of the design modifications would be to make it acceptable, but I think the Department has turned its mind to that issue.

10 Another key issue from the Council staff's perspective is in relation to traffic. That is a key area there. We do have White City, the school. So this we feel is an opportunity where, with what has been approved at White City and together with Sydney Grammar, is a mechanism to try and address the traffic situation there. So we think that there should be an improvement to the traffic situation.

15 Another aspect to deal with traffic, and it was a key issue that was raised in relation to the White City development, was one where that if consent is granted we really need a very strong and robust construction management plan, and we'd like to see those routes, you know, to and from the site, the period when it will be done so it has  
20 the least disruption on the adjoining properties.

The third aspect that is critical to the Council, and I have read the report, it's in relation to the Paddington Greenway and I know that there is a state initiative and also a Council initiative to progress moving forward with the Paddington Greenway  
25 and, in the Council's submission, there was a condition that we thought should be imposed which seems to have been omitted from the draft conditions is my understanding, and the report does state that the site of the building is – I think it's over 120 metres away from the Paddington Greenway, but we would just like the Commission to acknowledge the importance of this project and that this consent does  
30 not derail or impose or hinder that development potentially moving forward.

They're just some principal comments that I have to make. I note the solar access issue was not endorsed by the Department's report, but I have had a look at the shadow diagrams again. I tend to agree. Urban design is – we do have the experts  
35 here. Apart from that, Peter, I'm happy that any questions that you have either to myself or to the relevant specialists you can ask the questions and also I think it's important that you hear from both our councillors because our councillors do represent the community and I think it's their opportunity because the advice that I have given you, or the commentary, is based on our professional planning opinion.  
40

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thank you, Nick. We might have some questions about what you've raised, but Councillors Price and McEwin, would you like to make some introductory statements?

45 MS H. PRICE: Hello. Yes, I would, but am I first off the mark or is it Councillor McEwin?

MR DUNCAN: Well, you're speaking so let's start there. Councillor Price, after you.

5 MS PRICE: Thank you very much and I really welcome this opportunity. I'm obviously the Paddington ward councillor and I have strong connections to the Paddington community. I've lived here for over – nearly 20 years. I myself was educated in Paddington at the local preschool. My two young boys, who are now grown up, were educated at the local public school. And I've also had a lot of involvement with Weigall itself. I've watched many a football game down there in my youth, and now that I'm a parent I also watch a lot of sport down there as well, so I am very familiar with the site. So I suppose my observations and my commentary comes from that perspective, but also obviously my ties with my constituents. Mr Economou will know that I often don't agree with some of his views in terms of some of the draft conditions and some of them still do – I'd like to raise some of those draft conditions with – with the Panel if I may. And I think the other thing that also informs some of my opinions is I've also been very involved with the adjoining White City development which is the Hakoah Club's development, which is basically the next-door neighbour to the school. So a lot of the issues that were raised in relation to that development also arise in relation to this, and I suppose it's interesting as well that, in relation to that development, the school itself, the Applicant, was very concerned about some of the impacts that that development would have on the school, and I myself represented – I had a petition on behalf of 600 families from that school that were concerned about the construction impacts, the traffic impacts, et cetera. So I now see myself, I suppose, in some ways advocating against some of my constituents there in relation to the concerns.

So I just would like to start if I may the construction impacts and the traffic impacts. We've now been informed with all the extra information that's been provided – and I must congratulate the Department for putting together such an impressive document. There's obviously not lots of annexures and addendums and I must say I'm still not entirely on top of those, but I will be making another formal written submission in light of all those further documents. So we now understand that there's going to be 40 truck movements per day for the bulk excavation works and – that's during the initial six to eight weeks – and then during the construction phase over two years that's 10 trucks per day. So I am very concerned about the increased truck movements, and we do have to realise that there is the potential for the impacts of the adjoining White City development and their estimates are 80 truck movements a day. So we're looking at, you know, potentially just under 200 truck movements a day. So it's my view that the construction vehicle access route needs to be really looked at in a lot greater detail.

The great thing with the Applicant is that they actually have access to non-local roads in terms of their access points. So they have access to New South Head Road and also Neild Avenue which are main roads. Unfortunately, White City only has access to the local road network which is Lawson Street, so I'm really surprised that the applicant would want to use Lawson Street and Vialoux Avenue as their main access for trucks, and my submission would be that the construction vehicle access plan

needs to be amended. And, if so, that a lot of these truck movements need to take place on the site itself. I – I understand that the Applicant probably won't want vehicles accessing on Neild Avenue, on the intersection of New South Head Road and Neild Avenue, because the trucks would have to basically come along their playing fields, but, in my opinion, I think we need to try and get as many of those trucks off the local road network, and the perfect solution is to have them on the site.

Unfortunately, we couldn't do that in relation to White City because they did not have any other access points so their main access point was Alma Street, which is actually where the junior school for the applicant is and I perfectly understand why the school did not want that – the trucks going down that street. So a similar argument must, you know, must correspond in relation to this. So I would like to see some amended conditions and an alternative construction route that utilises the playing fields. And, you know, if it means that some of those playing fields have to be out of action for a certain amount of time, well, so be it. I know that Woollahra Council has entered into arrangements with the Cranbrook School that is currently undergoing extensive renovations to its site, and we – Woollahra Council is able to give them some sort of, you know, exclusive use of some of our public fields while their – their own fields are not in use. So I think this could be a perfect way to ameliorate some of those concerns.

The hours of work, I'm not – and I'm sure Mr Economou would be able to tell me here, but I don't see why the proposed work – so this is condition D8 – I think they need to be in line with Council's standard work hours. So at the moment Council says that noisy works have to cease at 4pm. However, in condition D8 it seems that they've been allowed to use the facilities until 5pm, so I think that needs to be an amendment to 4pm, and that's on page 27 of the draft conditions. As I said, I'm going to put all of this in writing.

So moving on, then, to the environmental amenity impacts. I know a lot of extra work has been done in terms of the addendums that have been provided by the Applicant in terms of the visual impact assessment reports, but I still feel that the public housing at 29 to 33 Lawson Street really requires further assessment. There appears from the Applicant's – I mean, sorry, the Department's report – that there have been further assessments done. However, I just for the life of me cannot find those documents and it may be that they can be provided to me. Page 45 of the assessment report at paragraph 6.3.13 says that addendums have been prepared for the visual impact assessment report for 29 to 33 and 12 to 16. The only extra addendums I can find are in relation to the applicant's own properties which are the ones that – the Headmaster and the caretaker's cottage – but I do not seem to be able to find a further assessment report. So I really think that the applicant should be – should be required to do this.

I notice in the draft conditions that obviously were prepared for Mr Lamb – sorry – Richard Lamb and Associates. It does mean that there was a proposed condition. This is mentioned in his letter dated 29 September. The initial – there was a draft condition that an updated visual impact assessment report be prepared, and this was

contemplated by the Department, but that doesn't seem to – to have occurred. I really think this requires further assessment. Alex Greenwich and I, the local MP – I know that you're speaking to him this afternoon – we had the very great privilege of being invited into those homes of those public housing tenants on Lawson Street.

5 The community that lives there are very proud people. Some of them have lived in those housing tenants for over 30 years. And the impact of this – of the development I think really has been underestimated, especially in relation to their open space that they have in the community garden, and Commissioner and all Panel members, I would – if you have the opportunity, I know you've had a site visit on Weigall fields,  
10 but if a site visit could be arranged to possibly attend some of these apartments and also their beautiful community garden that – that they have, I think that would really impress upon you the impact that this development is going to have.

A lot of these housing tenants, that open space where their clothesline is and where  
15 their community gardens are is often the only sort of access they have to the outside world. Many of them have got severe disabilities, both physical and mental, and this little oasis is – is really their opportunity to engage with others in – in their unit block and also is a beautiful space. And, you know, the Hills Hoist where they do their – their washing, their clothing, that's their little sort of outlet, I suppose, and I really  
20 think that those impacts to them have been underestimated. So I really would, if there is time to do that, encourage you both to do that. As I said, they're very proud people. Having access to all the apartments wasn't – wasn't available, and some of them also feel that by speaking out they may somehow lose their public, like, their tenancy, or they might be speaking against the land – the landlord. So a lot of them  
25 also feel very intimidated by the process. English is not often their first language that they speak. And, you know, dealing with all this paperwork. I mean, I'm a lawyer by profession. I find it overwhelming and, at some stages, intimidating. So for these people I think it's even magnified even more, so I really do want to impress upon you that what I've learnt from this amazing community down there.

30 MR DUNCAN: I was just going to say thanks Councillor. We might, just from a time point of view, if we can hear from Councillor McEwin and then we can come back to more, or if there's something you would like to finish up on.

35 MS PRICE: Gee, where does it end? The community use is also very important, Commissioner, and I'm very concerned that, at the moment, we're only looking at possible pool access. The facilities also include a multi-use court for basketball which is really needed by the community, so I'm not really sure why the community would only be able to access the pools. And one thing that I think is really  
40 staggering is that – and this is buried in the detail as well – the capacity that is looked at in terms of the usage of the site is for 386 people in summer and 320 people in winter. Now, when you drill down into the actual operational plan, the multi-purpose hall alone has seating for 215 people; the pools have seating for 260. So that's a total of 470 people just as spectators. So the fact that they say that this is  
45 going to be – this is going to be the capacity I think is severely underestimated, and it's not only – it's not until you look at these conditions, and I really think some of these conditions need to be reviewable in terms of the way that they – the hours of

operation, etcetera, because we really don't know the true impacts. But, listen, I don't want to take up Councillor McEwin's time, so I'm sorry. There's just so much to cover and I will definitely be writing a very detailed updated submission.

5 MR DUNCAN: We understand and appreciate your comments and we – as I said at the start, we have asked generally a lot of questions about the conditions with the Department which you will see on the transcripts as well. Thank you. Councillor McEwin.

10 MS M. McEWIN: Thank you. And if I go under time I would like to donate any leftover time back to Councillor Price. Look, firstly I'm going to just reiterate everything Councillor Price has said already. I concur with everything and I'm not going to waste your time by going over that again other than to say I agree with all of it. I – I want to focus on two things: a green travel plan and the community use. So  
15 the green travel plan, my issue with the school at the moment is the number of individual trips that are being done by single parents picking up single children in large vehicles – you know, high-emission vehicles essentially. Now, other private schools, as you know, provide mass transport. They have buses that meet at certain places in the city or whatever. So you get your kids to a certain point and then you  
20 get picked up. Now, this is done for primary school children as well as high-school children.

So I think that that should be a condition in this consent that they do provide some sort of mass transport, you know, solution as part of their green travel plan. It's quite  
25 vague at the moment what the green travel plan would entail, but I do think that it needs to be more specific around bussing the students, because, being someone who's witnessed the 3 o'clock queue all the way down Lawson all the way down to my house in Glenmore Road – I live near Trumper Park – it's a nightmare, and you see these befuddled people who've just suddenly found themselves trapped in the  
30 Paddington traffic jam, and you can tell which ones are the parents because they're the ones who look relaxed. So it is really quite an odd thing that is caused by the school, and I know that they're moving the cars off into their own land, but I do think we do need to try and minimise those individual trips by parents for multiple reasons including the environment but also the residents.

35 The next issue would be the capacity, usage and events condition F4. My concern is the reason for consent being given is the public benefits; namely, the community use of that site. However, if you look at the benefit – at the conditions, there is no positive condition on the school to provide community access to the land. In fact, the  
40 conditions are expressed in a way that make it very restrictive what community access can be given. In particular, it restricts community access to – the words are “organisations only.” Now, what we are lacking in this area – and I'm speaking as a mother and a councillor – we don't have a public pool in this LGA, so what parents desperately need is access to swimming lessons, gymnastics, ballet, these sort of  
45 things that really rely on these sort of large facilities. Now, I want to point to an example of a school that – a private school that provides excellent community access and that's Ascham. They allow parents to bring their children to after school

swimming and gymnastics classes. Now, that is a genuine community benefit that is provided by a private school to the community. Now, as far as I'm aware there haven't been any risks or dangers to their students by providing this access to the community and that's what's actually needed. I think by not providing that positive  
5 condition to do this, that sort of community access, and by restricting it to organisations only, you're really limiting the community access, and my concern is that the school has no track record of providing community access. In fact, they're very exclusive. I mean that literally. The fences are very – very high. They have, you know, security there.

10 And I would urge you to listen to the recording of the Finance Community and Services Committee of the Woollahra Council on 13 September starting from one hour and 16 minutes where the school presented to the Council regarding what they perceived to be their concerns around members of the public accessing their land.  
15 Now, I – I obviously have my – my impression of what that – what they were getting at with those representations. However, my concern is having listened to that and hearing how many – how much concern they have around members of the public, I'm concerned that they don't have any incentive or intention to provide true community access. So I do think you have to have a positive condition, and the  
20 condition needs to be widened to local families to use it. And there needs to be – like the green traffic or green travel plan, there needs to be a community-access plan. So there needs to be some document where they show the Commission what they are actually doing positively and who's going to access it. Is it local families? Is it the local public schools? What exactly is going to be done before you just take them at  
25 face value and say, "Sure, there's going to be all this community benefit." I can't see the community benefit, and there's nothing guaranteed in these conditions. I – that's it from me. I would like to – if there's any more time I would like to hear some more from Councillor Price.

30 MR DUNCAN: Thanks councillor. What we might do, just to reassure you, we have asked questions, as I said, in these areas as well with the Department this morning and we will be following up with meetings with the applicant. Just at this stage, Commissioner Mackay have you got any questions of Councilor the councillors?

35 MR R. MACKAY: Yes. Thank you, Chair. It's Richard Mackay speaking and good morning everybody. Just before I get to questions, noting that the Commission Panel hasn't formed a view yet on whether it's looking at an approval or refusal of this application. But, with that caveat, I just say to both councillors, if you want to  
40 communicate to us further that's very welcome. It's quite helpful if you do actually draw attention to specific conditions and propose amendments because that gives us something very direct to consider and to work with. I – I would particularly like to ask the officers, the Commission has raised with the Department and will raise with the Applicant the fact that in the response to submissions on the advertising of the  
45 application there does not appear to have been any – any attempt to look at the articulation and the public interface, particularly on the western side of the new building along Neild Avenue, and is this something which Council would like to – I



mean, Council – Council’s submission is very clear on it. Would Council like to be further consulted in the event that the Applicant does come up with some suggestion about that?

5 MS PRICE: Absolutely from my point of view. Yes, please.

MR DUNCAN: I think, Nick, you’re on mute.

10 MR ECONOMOU: Thank you, Commissioner. Commissioner Mackay, I think the answer is yes because that is a – that was a critical aspect that was raised in the council’s submission. So I think would be benefit – of benefit for the Council to at least review their revised plans. We do have a new urban design officer that is with Council, and I just think any information or – we can provide to the Department would be of benefit. But at least if Council had its opportunity to put forward its  
15 position. So the answer is yes.

MR MACKAY: Thank you for that and, given the timing that we have to address the application and, again, not yet sure where we’re heading, it’s helpful to know that. In relation to some of Councillor Price’s comments, can I just highlight by way  
20 of assisting that the addendum to the visual assessment is actually provided as part of the Applicant’s response to submissions. It’s Appendix E and some of the matters that were raised I think are addressed in that – in that visual assessment. Could I also – just looking at my notes here – I mean, the Council submission is clear and the representations from the councillors are clear. Obviously, with this proposal, a major  
25 impact if the proposal is approved occurs to the residents immediately adjacent to the south. One of the things to which the Panel is turning its mind relates to those questions of community use, and we are understanding the school’s concern about doing that in a safe and managed way, but I would invite Council officers or councillors to perhaps provide some further comment to us about the concept of an  
30 arrangement that gave those affected residents some kind of preferential community access to the facilities, if you like by a way of recognition of the amenity effects that they would endure if the proposal were to be approved.

35 MR DUNCAN: Yes. Richard, anything further?

MR MACKAY: Well, just one last question and I think it’s probably for Mr Economou, the Greenway, unless I have misunderstood the application and its consequences and effects, it does not and cannot affect the Greenway proposal, so I would just like to clarify, is there some – is there something further that Council  
40 would seek in terms of a condition or a statement of commitment from the Applicant because they’re physically disparate and my understanding is that the Head of the school has made it very clear that he and the school support the Greenway.

45 MR ECONOMOU: Yes. If I put on my – my typical planning hat on, I don’t think there is any need for a condition because I think it has to be, you know, fair and reasonable and actually relate to the development, and I think a case in our submission, we put it forward more to alert the Commission and the Department of

the importance of the Paddington Greenway, so we just didn't want that to be an issue that would be overlooked. So it may be to the disdain of certain councillors, but I think the condition is not required because I don't think it would stack up lawfully. I do accept maybe an offer that there should be a statement of  
5 commitment. Now, I don't know how – what effect that would have by law, but I think it's something that if you could ask the Applicant to do that would be beneficial. What I will also do is I will be liaising with the General Manager as well and – just to ensure that if we wish to put in a submission before the closing date for the councillors in terms of the Greenway, we would do that. So that's the only point  
10 I have to make about the Greenway. It is a very highly sensitive issue for the council. The Council is committed, and we just don't want the – any potential development eroding that. But the answer is this development will not affect the Greenway project going ahead in my opinion.

15 MR MACKAY: Thank you. And if I may, Chair, just one last question. I think this has been covered but to be clear, if the proposal were to be approved, obviously there is substantial concern about the construction impacts and including especially the trucks, it would seem to me it does make eminent sense to manage truck movements in a way that keeps them away from residential areas. The consequence of that is, of  
20 course, more traffic in Neild Avenue, possibly truck stacking in Neild Avenue, which is a principal feeder for that residential area and also affects the Woollahra community, but it seems to me that if there is to be a mechanism in the CMP that addresses the truck and traffic impacts during construction that Neild Avenue is the receiver of those impacts, and I just want to be clear whether that is the view of  
25 councillors and Council officers please, and I know – a number of people are nodding but the nodding doesn't come up on the transcript so if you could answer that would be really good.

30 MR ECONOMOU: Councillor Price I think's going to make a point.

MS PRICE: Thank you so much. I actually don't feel that Neild Avenue should have to put up with the impacts of it. My suggestion really would be that it actually needs the site, which – obviously it's the boundary to Neild Avenue, but it just takes all that congestion and traffic off the actual street. So even though Neild Avenue is  
35 not a local road, I just feel that that would be a win for everybody, especially in light of the – the potentially double impacts of the White City development, and, unfortunately, they don't have any other – we tried as much as we could but they don't have any other access points, but the beauty with the school is that they do, and, as I said, I'm sure Council would be most open to negotiating with them in  
40 terms of, you know, ..... by Rushcutters Oval, all the different public facilities that we do have, that that land could be used, and I really think that that would mitigate a lot of the impact.

45 MR DUNCAN: Okay, thank you. Other comments on that?

MS McEWIN: Yes, Councillor McEwin here. I just want to concur with what Councillor Price said. I would very much like to see the traffic removed from Lawson and Vialoux Streets. Thank you.

5 MR DUNCAN: Yes. I understand. After being on site.

MR MACKAY: Could we perhaps hear from Mr Andari on that issue?

10 MR E. ANDARI: Yes. Hello, everyone. Emilio Andari, council's traffic engineer. I concur with Councillor Price and Councillor McEwin on the matter, the – noting that the site actually is bounded by not only the local streets but also Neild Avenue and New South Head Road, access into – into the school grounds during construction will be better used on those roads to alleviate any congestion, particularly during school drop-off peak periods as well. Noting that those local roads, Lawson and  
15 Alma – and Alma Street – feed into local residents that are directly south of the site, it also, whilst works is happening to the school, I'm sure there will be still school operations to the far west – eastern side of the school campus and as well as the nearby or adjoining White City development. So, that being said, to alleviate any congestion, safety – children's safety as well – access in could potentially be  
20 accommodated on site and there could be a construction access gate temporarily installed or – or constructed via New South Head Road or – and/or Neild Avenue to accommodate this – these truck routes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Okay, Richard.  
25

MR MACKAY: Thank you, Chair. That's nothing further from me.

MR DUNCAN: Councillor Price.

30 MS PRICE: Mr Commissioner, thank you so much. The other thing too is another of the main construction routes is also via Vialoux Avenue, so that's the tiny little street off Lawson Street, and already the Department street has acknowledged that the turning circle is so tight there that's not guaranteed that the trucks will actually even be able to fit down Vialoux so, again, that would solve that problem. And  
35 Vialoux is a cul-de-sac, so it's not just a local road, it's also a cul-de-sac, so that shows you that these impacts are going to be quite extraordinary.

MR DUNCAN: Understood. Understood. Yes. Okay. So, Councillor Price, are there more things that you wish to raise that we haven't already discussed at this  
40 point?

MS PRICE: Well, Councillor McEwin's been very generous. If I could take up just a little bit of her time. This is in relation to the public views. So, as you know, Paddington is very fortunate to be in a heritage conservation zone, but, in addition to  
45 – to that, we also have some beautiful views and vistas that are particularly protected, and the one of them is down Alma Street which has the beautiful row of palm trees, and this will be where the building number 2, so the carpark, is going to be – is going

to be built. And I did find the addendum to this one where there were some further view impact assessments done but, in my view, the photograph that has been taken there, it's very misleading. So – and, again, I will put this in writing, but on page 11 of the addendum, which is dated June 2021, it's taken on a very interesting angle.

5

So it's taken from a side angle. It's not taken from the top of Alma Street looking all the way down to the valley. And I think if the photo was actually taken from an accurate position it would see that this public view is going to be severely impacted by a carpark at the end of it. The beautiful row of trees is something that needs to be protected. Obviously, they're not – the building in no way is going to impact in any of the trees coming down, but the actual view at the end of the vista I believe will be – will be impacted. Mr Economou, I don't know if we have any heritage staff online that may be able to – to provide a little bit more commentary around that, but I think that is one that hasn't really been taken into account, and the fact that there will be – even though the building site is – sorry – the carpark is going to have greenery and green walls, etcetera, I still think that that impact really hasn't been taken into account.

10

15

20

25

30

And then the final thing, just in addition about the community use, I note in the revised operational management plan that the school has prepared there are some more details about community use, but it only relates to anyone within a 1.5 kilometre radius, which I think is a very small group of people that could potentially use it, and I really – as much as I can totally concur with Councillor McEwin about the swimming use, but we also have to remember that there's a multi-use – four multi-use courts that are also being built, and the need for basketball, netball and volleyball is so in great demand within the whole of the municipality, and it would be fantastic if those – those beautiful facilities could also be shared in some way. So I really don't think that just pool use should be the ..... facilities should also be potentially shared.

35

40

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Yes. Take your point. Other comments at this stage.

MR MACKAY: Chair, it's Richard Mackay. Through you, if I may, could I just clarify the document that Councillor Price was making reference to in relation to the view down Alma Street. I gather it's from the Response to Submissions package. Well, Councillor Price, perhaps if you could take that on notice and just let us know. I mean, you mentioned the page reference. I think being able to go straight to the document and know we have the correct one would be of assistance to the Panel please.

45

MS PRICE: Yes. No, sure. That's fine. It's actually in addendum E which was the Department asked for further information. So it's not in response to the draft submissions. I can put that in writing to you.

MR MACKAY: Okay. No, I've got it. It's the – it's the ..... report, the Request for Further Information view assessment. Thank you. That's very helpful.

MS PRICE: Yes. Dated June 2021.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thank you.

5 MS PRICE: Page 11 of that document.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. All right. Other questions, comments at this stage from Council– councillors or Council officers? No? Commissioner Mackay, have you got some more questions?

10

MR MACKAY: Nothing further from me. Thank you, Chair.

MR DUNCAN: From the Office of the Commission, are there any questions at this stage?

15

MR L BLECHER: Nothing from me. Thank you, Peter.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Look, can I say that that's been a really helpful meeting and I appreciate everything that's been – everybody that's contributed to it, but also noting that we have – we actually have sent out some letters straight to the letterboxes of the adjoining public housing units and to others to let people know that they're still able to make submissions and – and they close on 28 October and we would encourage you, as Commissioner Mackay has said, please consider putting in some of those points that you've made in your submission, you know, particularly the traffic, the community access, the views, those sorts of things, because it's really helpful for us in finalising our process. So at this stage thank you again for your time today and all the best.

20  
25  
30

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**[11.47 am]**