



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1051826

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT

RE: ST ALOYSIUS' COLLEGE REDEVELOPMENT

PANEL: ANNEWISE TUOR
CHRIS WILSON
SOO-TEE CHEONG

ASSISTING PANEL: ALANA JELFS

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING AND
ENVIRONMENT:** KAREN HARRAGON
JASON MASLEN
ANDREW BEATTIE

LOCATION: IPC OFFICES
LEVEL 3, 201 ELIZABETH STREET
SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES

DATE: 11.08 AM, WEDNESDAY, 31 JULY 2019

MS A. TUOR: Good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet. I would also like to pay my respects to their elders past and present. Welcome to the meeting today on the proposal whereby St Aloysius' College Limited, the applicant, is seeking
5 approval for a concept proposal and detailed stage 1 works to redevelop the school, including concept proposal for the staged redevelopment of the junior, senior, main campuses, including partial demolition, refurbishment and alterations and additions to existing buildings to provide new teaching and learning spaces and new
10 multipurpose sports facilities; and detailed stage 1 works at the senior and main campuses, comprising alterations; and a ground-floor addition to the Wyalla building on the senior campus and internal refurbishment; and upgrades to the existing teaching and learning facilities; and demolition and rebuild of the north-east wing building on the main campus, construction of a new infill building on the existing quadrangle and associated refurbishment of north wing, south wing, great
15 hall and chapel. My name is Annelise Tuor, and I'm the chair of the IPC panel. Joining me are my fellow commissioners Chris Wilson and Soo-Tee Cheong. Ah, the other attendees at the meeting are – and I'll just get you to introduce yourselves.

MS K. HARRAGON: I'm Karen Harragon, director of social and infrastructure
20 assessments.

MR A. BEATTIE: I'm Andrew Beattie. I'm the team leader of the schools infrastructure assessments team.

25 MS TUOR: Thank you.

MR J. MASLEN: And I'm Jason Maslen, senior planning officer in the schools infrastructure team.

30 MS TUOR: Thank you. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded, and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the commission's website. This meeting is one of part of the commission's decision-making process. It is taking
35 place at the preliminary stage of this process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the commission will base its decision.

It is important for commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a
40 position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website. Um, and also I just request that all attendees introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for the attendees to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other, to ensure accuracy of the transcript. So we'll now begin. Um, so in relation to
45 the agenda, I think what we wanted to have is, um, for the department to briefly explain the assessment of the key issues in the assessment report of the concept

proposal and stage 1 works, in particular, the proposed additions to the Wyalla building, the quadrant infill building and the rooftop terrace. So over to you.

MS HARRAGON: Okay. I'm Karen Harragon. I'll be leading the, um,
5 presentation for the department, um, this morning, and each of the parties from the department will also assist in your presentation. So thank you for inviting the department to present on its assessment report in relation to St Aloysius' College redevelopment. As mentioned earlier, the proposal includes a staged redevelopment of three existing campuses to provide improved school facilities and includes a
10 concept proposal for the three campuses as well as stage 1 works for the senior and main campuses. Um, it's probably helpful to note from the beginning that the application before us – or which was lodged with the department does not involve an increase of student or staff numbers.

15 Given that we have so many plans covering development over the three campuses, we have provided the three packages to assist today and will be taking you to each of those packages. So package A contains the site locality plan and aerials for each of the campuses, and it's going to assist you through the whole of our presentation. The junior and senior schools are contained in packages B and C, and the main campus,
20 also known as "the middle school" in the application, is contained in package D. So, um, don't be concerned that we're going to go through every plan. We just thought it would be helpful that the majority of the significant plans are available, should there need to be clarification about a piece of work.

25 By way of explaining how we're gonna present today, it's relevant to mention our approach to discussing the key issues. The key issues addressed in the department's report and which were informed by over 80 submissions, including council's objections, are applicable to each of the campuses to varying degrees, but generally they include potential impacts to neighbouring properties in relation to
30 overshadowing, views, heritage and privacy – oh – sorry – and heritage, as well as potential operational impacts, including privacy and noise. More generally, however, there's also broad issues regarding the impacts of potential traffic and road safety impacts, both operational and construction. For this reason, we will present specific considerations of the major issues for the development proposal in each of
35 the campuses individually.

We will not cover all the issues raised in relation to each campus, as our report speaks to the majority of those. Jason's going to present first on the junior and senior campus, and they're contained on the aerial photographs at A4 and A3 respectively
40 in package A. I'm then going to present on the main campus, also known as middle school, with an additional piece of presentation relating to the general discussion around operation and construction traffic impacts, and also we'll revisit that discussion around student numbers, which came up in a number of the submissions. Andrew's also gonna speak to you regarding the general principles around
45 conditioning and, um, the references to our report around the trials. So, Jason, if you'd like to start off.

MR MASLEN: Thank you, Karen. Um, Jason Maslen. Ah, so I'll start by pointing the panel to A1, um, plan A1, er, the top in your pack which gives the locality plan which shows the three campuses within Kirribilli, ah, for general context, um, and you'll see the Bradfield Highway, um, coming through Kirribilli, Millers Point station and three campuses clearly marked. If the panel now turns to A4, you'll see an aerial of the junior campus which we'll start with.

10 So this – this site was previously, um, the Milsons Point Public School and was acquired by St Aloysius College in 1991, ah, and opened as the college's junior campus in 1993. The site contains, um, two to three storey buildings along the northern and western boundaries of the site and that includes the original 1887 Victorian Italianate school house which is locally listed and that's – that's on a northern campus at the top, ah, within the red, um, outlined site, ah, and there's a yellow, um, circle marking the original school house.

15 Ah, development surrounding the site is – is – generally includes two to three storey buildings in scale with, ah, mixed uses, ah, within the Kirribilli village centred to the west, ah, and north west of the site, um, and semi-detached, um, and terrace housing to the south, um, and the east. Ah, there are a number of locally listed, um, heritage items surrounding the site, um, although most of those do not front on to the street surrounding the campus, um, and, ah, the careening cove heritage conservation area is located to the east of the site, but, essentially, broadly is to the north east, um, along where Carabella Street is.

20 Um, we do have a, ah, a copy of the North Sydney local environmental plan heritage map for context and if the panel wishes to reference that at A5, ah, and that shows all three campuses and it just generally shows all of the listed buildings in the locality as well as the location of, um, those heritage conservation areas, ah, which are marked in the red, um, hatching with the careening cove heritage conservation area showed in the top right of the box, um, the Jeffrey Street heritage conservation area shown in the centre, the red hatched area, and the Kirribilli heritage conservation area – it's shown on the bottom right of the box, um, which – which, ah, obviously relate to the other two campuses. But we thought that we would provide that for context.

25 MS TUOR: Yes. That's good.

MR MASLEN: So the panel may – now may turn to B1 in our pack and that provides a pictorial view of the proposed development at the junior campus and the works, um, at the junior campus only seek – well, the application only seeks concept approval for building envelopes at the junior campus and that includes a single storey addition, um, the above existing school building along the western boundary of the site, ah, and you'll see that, ah, shown in blue, ah, on the left-hand side of – of the diagram of the site, ah, and a new subterranean, ah, multipurpose school, um, a sports facility in the south east corner and that's in the – the bottom half of the blue – blue shaded area, ah, of the site and that, essentially, um, replaces the existing basketball court at ground level. Ah, plans B2 and B3 show those envelopes in, um,

elevation form. So you can see those in context in the existing building and to some extent, um, the, ah, surrounding, ah, development.

5 So the key issues raised, um, in the submissions, um, are the junior campus
principally related to some tree removal and landscaping, construction impacts
including, um, relating from earthworks on the site to construct the subterranean, um,
multipurpose facility, ah, the environmental amenity impacts, so noise, privacy,
overshadowing and heritage impacts, ah, and to the – to the original school house
10 itself as well as the surrounding, um, listed, um, buildings and, ah, conservation
areas.

15 So the department considered all these issues in its assessment, ah, along with, ah,
the information provided in the – by the applicant in the environmental impact
statement and the response of submissions and concluded the – the impacts of the
proposal would be acceptable in consideration that the existing trees around the
boundaries of the site would be retained, um, and there is a copy of the landscape
plan at B5 which depicts the existing, um, trees around the boundaries of the site. So
the applicant has clearly said that all of those will be retained.

20 MS TUOR: So all the ones that have got a cross in the middle they're new and the,
um, ones that are rendered like a tree are existing. Is that what appears?

MR MASLEN: Ah, other – other way around. Um, the, ah, green - - -

25 MS TUOR: Oh, it'd be - - -

MR MASLEN: - - - circles with the, um, cross in the middle are existing trees to be
retained and alleging the top right.

30 MS TUOR: Mmm. Okay.

MR MASLEN: Um, and then the dark green smaller, um, shapes are proposed, sort
of, shrub planting, hedge planting to – to further screen the site.

35 MS TUOR: Okay. Thanks.

MR MASLEN: Um, and – and further in terms of the department's assessment,
consider that the built form would not exceed the height of existing buildings on the
campus. So if you turn back to, um, I suppose, B – B2 of the elevation form, um,
40 you can see the relationship with the proposed, um, ah, first storey, ah – or additional
level extension, um, to existing school building in relation to the existing
schoolhouse.

45 Um, so, ah, all of those structures or the proposed, um, proposed additions to the
buildings will be lower than the existing buildings on site, um. And, ah, if you turn
to – to B1 being the major pictorial view, um, again, its, um, proposed built form is –

does not exceed above its surrounding built form which, um, extends up to – to three storeys, particularly, ah, within the village, um – um, centre, ah, adjacent to the site.

5 Um, the department considered the built form would not visually dominate the existing, um, school house, ah, on the site or interrupt the existing layout of the site, um, or views, um, to and from, um, the surrounding listed buildings or conservation areas. And, finally, that there would be minimal overshadowing to adjoining residential properties, um, and, ah, the overshadowing is depicted in, um, B11 and B12 if – if the panel is interested. Um, the new shadows are shown in red, um, and, 10 ah, very – very few shadows extending onto the adjoining, um, private properties given, um, that the site is surrounded by streets on all boundaries.

15 So as the application only seeks concept approval for the junior campus, a number of matters will be assessed in – in more detail as part of a future stage 2 development application and the department has, therefore, recommended a number of conditions that require, um, a further detailed application to – to address, um, a number of matters and that includes, um, detailed route mapping to demonstrate the long-term health of the trees would not be affected by the development of the site.

20 Ah, that a detailed assessment of the environmental amenity impacts including things such as noise, privacy and overshadowing, um, ah, would need to be outlined. Ah, a detailed geotechnical assessment would need to be included setting out how the earthworks will be undertaken and how surrounding properties and infrastructure would be protected, um, from the works associated with those earthworks. And 25 finally, a traffic and transport assessment of the construction and operational impacts. So if the panel is happy, I'll turn to the senior campus unless you have any questions.

30 MS TUOR: Ah, yeah, I've got a few questions. Um, so, um, I actually find it very hard to understand the roof form and how the roof form relates to the, um – in the elevations, um, particularly, the bit that goes up to, I think it's RL44.50, um, and just why it's necessary – I – I can understand that they're probably doing the roof forms to try and relate to the, um, roof forms of the heritage item, um, but it's just the actual - - -

35 MR C. WILSON: Is it habitable?

MS TUOR: Well - - -

40 MR WILSON: Is this bit habitable, I mean?

MS TUOR: Yeah, well, we don't know because it's a concept.

MR WILSON: Yeah.

45 MS TUOR: But it does seem as if you're actually getting an overall height that may not be necessary in terms of, um, getting one extra storey of, um, floor space accommodation. Um, and – and also I suppose just whether that then competes with

the sort of tower of the heritage item and the prominence of the heritage item by having – if you look at, um, DAB201, um, the elevations – particularly, the Crescent Place elevation, it's quite a, sort of, um, the dominance of the heritage item, it seems to be challenged by the extent of those roof forms now. But I couldn't actually, just
5 from the plans actually, understand exactly how the roof form worked.

MS HARRAGON: And I'm Karen Harragon speaking. Um, and I guess part of that would be the further detail that would come in that next stage 2 application in terms of the potential use of some of the roof void. Um, the department could suggest that
10 we could potentially put a condition of future assessment requirement, that they demonstrate why the pitch and the height presented in that element of the building is necessary and, um, whether it's appropriate, having regard to, I guess, built form in terms of bulk and scale, and also for them to have regard to opportunities to reduce that. So if that assists the, um, IPC, we could actually help in drafting that as an
15 option - - -

MS TUOR: Yes. Because - - -

MS HARRAGON: - - - so that it – it would put them on notice that even though
20 we're progressing that to general conceptual approval, that we'd like them to demonstrate why that's the best outcome for the – for the next stage.

MS TUOR: So it wouldn't be an automatic thing that you can fill that envelope. It would be that that aspect of the envelope has to be reconsidered - - -
25

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

MS TUOR: - - - at this stage?

MS HARRAGON: I think it would then put it back on them to demonstrate and I think we could probably list them quite individually, you know. Is it – is this actually sympathetic, from a heritage point of view, even though it has been put forward by the consultant that it is? Is it appropriate in terms of an overall built form and also, um, the pitch – you know, the pitch and overall height?
30

MS TUOR: Yep. And then, just on that, um – the follow on from that, just the overshadowing diagrams. I found it, again, hard to understand the shadows that were being cast by the additional storey, particularly, say, the 9 o'clock one where it was sort of unclear – you know, there's a tiny bit of shadow that's illustrate as being cast but - - -
35
40

MS HARRAGON: That's – so the dark is the existing.

MS TUOR: Yeah. I know the dark is the - - -
45

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MS TUOR: And the red is the new. But if this is going up by an extra storey and there wasn't a storey there, you'd expect that there would be some additional overshadowing. It just – even the – say, the angles here, when you're looking at, say, the shadow diagram at 3 pm, it doesn't have any shadow coming off these additional roof form. You know, you would think there would be some sort of shadow here.

MS HARRAGON: So I – I believe it might be appropriate then, if we're concerned about the adequacy or the accuracy of that, that that might be something that the applicant be placed on notice to provide further details. Yes, better detail than that.

MS TUOR: Yeah. So looking at, say, the equinox in March, September, the angle is not the angle – like, the angle is going like that, there, whereas the angle of the shadow should be like that if you're basing it on the existing. So it just sort of seemed to be, to me - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MS TUOR: - - - a little bit - - -

MR WILSON: It's an extra five metres.

MS TUOR: Pardon?

MR WILSON: It's an extra five metres.

MS TUOR: Five metres. Yeah. I – I just would have expected there to be - - -

MS HARRAGON: Some differences of what they presented.

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MS TUOR: And also just that the angle of the line of the shadow would be – if that's the line of the existing shadow there, then the line of the new shadow would follow that angle - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MS TUOR: - - - whereas it's not.

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MS TUOR: It's a totally different angle.

MS HARRAGON: And in particular, the one that you were just taking us to, was that the 3 pm?

MS TUOR: Yeah. 3 pm at the equinox.

MS HARRAGON: Okay.

5 MS TUOR: I mean, I haven't – you know, obviously, it's just – you look at these things quickly - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

10 MS TUOR: - - - and go that doesn't make sense. And then that means that you sort of question it.

MS HARRAGON: Would the IPC equally like us to just revisit in addition to perhaps raising it with the, um, applicant as well?

15

MS TUOR: We will - - -

MS HARRAGON: Just for us to - - -

20 MS TUOR: I think we will ask them when they come in today - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep. Certainly.

MS TUOR: - - - to explain it - - -

25

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MS TUOR: - - - and then, you know, maybe that will resolve any concerns that we've got. But I suppose it's just then – following on from that – when you look at the elevation of the community building, I think it is, in Humphrey Place where the window is getting an increase in overshadowing, I think that's something that we would need to be very certain that – of what the uses in that community building are and that – the extent of increase in overshadowing because – particularly if it's resulting from a roof form that may not need to be as large as it is.

35

MS HARRAGON: So, um, obviously, depending on the outcome of the discussion with the applicant - - -

MS TUOR: Yep.

40

MS HARRAGON: - - - that, equally, could be put as one of those line items in that recommended condition that we can add for you so - - -

MS TUOR: Yep. Do any of you have any questions?

45

MR S. CHEONG: I have got - - -

MS TUOR: Yes, Soo-Tee.

MR CHEONG: Just a question. Do – is there any drawing showing the existing roof form at all?

5

MS HARRAGON: There's a whole series of them and we might not have actually brought that as a set, but we can actually – perhaps what I can do is that after Jason has presented all – his two, he could actually take an opportunity to look at the set that's down on the table in full and we can maybe come back to those.

10

MR WILSON: Thank you.

MS TUOR: Thank you.

15 MR CHEONG: I'm just trying to compare the new roof form to the existing roof.

MS TUOR: Yeah. I think it – I mean, in the aerial photo you can sort of get a rough understanding of what the existing roof form is, just from the aerial photo.

20 MR CHEONG: Yep.

MS TUOR: But there isn't - - -

MR CHEONG: No.

25

MS TUOR: - - - sort of one that shows it in any detail.

MR CHEONG: It looks like it's fairly broken up in the but the new roof seems to be quite, you know - - -

30

MS TUOR: Yeah. It sort of goes - - -

MR CHEONG: It's larger and – in its form.

35 MS TUOR: I think it goes to a point here now - - -

MR CHEONG: Yeah.

MS TUOR: - - - rather than it being, um - - -

40

MR CHEONG: Continued on.

MS TUOR: Where it cuts along. All right. Any questions, Chris?

45 MR WILSON: No.

MS TUOR: Thank you.

MR MASLEN: Okay. So if we turn to the senior campus, um, we can begin with A3, with the aerial photo, so your first set.

MR WILSON: Yep.

5

MR MASLEN: So the senior campus opened in 1916, um, as the senior school of St Aloysius and is located immediately north of the main campus and they are in fact, um, connected by a first storey pedestrian, um, bridge which is marked, um, on the aerial photo between the two. Um, the senior campus contains two to four storey buildings along the eastern and northern boundaries of the site, including Wyalla, which is a late 19 century Italian mansion, um, that is locally listed and that's along the, um, southern part of the eastern boundary and there's a, um, yellow circle marking it and it is – it is marked. Um, this campus caters to years 11 and 12 and includes learning and some indoor sports facilities.

15

The surrounding development comprises generally double storey terrace, um, dwellings to the west and multi-storey residential flat buildings to the north and east and which you can – you can probably tell from the aerial photo. The proposals at the senior campus are – are generally the sort of – the smaller scope of works across the three campuses and the panel may now wish to turn to C1, which has the pictorial, um, of the – the main works, um, on site. So the application includes concept proposal and stage 1 works at the senior campus, um, principally including a single storey ground level addition and some related alterations to the rear of the Wyalla building, as well as refurbishment of the existing internal space of the building.

20

25

And the pictorial view in front of you, the addition is in the lower half of the rear elevation of the Italianate mansion building. You can see that. The key issue raised in the submissions for the senior campus related to impacts on the heritage values of the Wyalla building and that included a submission for the North Shore Historical Society. Um, the environmental impact statement included a heritage impact statement prepared by heritage experts that considered the impacts of the proposal and the department considered the findings and recommendations set out in that statement, um, and the issues raised in the submissions.

30

35

Overall, the department concluded that the proposal would have acceptable impacts, given that the proposal does not affect the front primary elevation of the building, um, which is mainly visible from Kirribilli Avenue and Upper Pitt Street and – and very much contributes to the character of those streetscapes. That the proposal, um, affects the rear elevation – ground elevation of the building, which is in a sunken position adjacent to the Robertson Lane footpath, um, so would not, therefore, be overly visually prominent, um, in the surrounding, um – um, streets. That the intervention to the ground level external wall has been limited to the outer extent of two window groups.

40

45

And C15, um, shows the demolition plan, um, of that level and it shows the extent of demolition of the two window groups on that rear elevation, which should be

apparent to the panel. Overall, as a result, the proposed addition would be subservient to the main building and would be clearly read as a new addition to the building and very much incorporates a very simple design with limited set of materials, um, so as not to compete with the existing building. And, finally, the
5 heritage impact statement set out a whole range of mitigation measures to record and reuse and salvage materials where possible, um, which the department has reinforced, um, through conditions.

10 MR WILSON: What's its function?

MR MASLEN: It's essentially, ah, to extend the learning spaces within, um, the building. If you bear with me, I'll take you to the layout.

15 MR WILSON: To provide cover, yeah?

MR CHEONG: On C5? Would that be - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah, C5 shows - - -

20 MR MASLEN: Thank you. C5. Um, as you'll see, it's - - -

MR WILSON: Okay.

25 MR MASLEN: - - - noted as two, um, new slash extensions of classrooms. So the school is essentially reconfiguring all of the spaces, um, throughout this and the other two campuses to make the spaces, ah, more efficient and more generous, um, on site. So the related works to that elevation, ah, include improving circulation – so essentially, um, covering an existing set of stairs, which is immediately to the left of, um, those two new classrooms, and just improving, um, connectivity between the
30 different elements of the building on site.

MS TUOR: All right. Any questions? I think, um, we're planning to have a site visit, so obviously it's something that we'll need to have a look at because - - -

35 MR CHEONG: Yep. That's - - -

MS TUOR: - - - I suppose even it's – though it's the rear of the building, as it originally was, it is a – um, as I understand, it's a facade that, um, hasn't been altered, and it does face the public domain, in terms of the street, so even though it's
40 the rear, it's the one that actually you can see now - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yeah. And - - -

45 MS TUOR: - - - from the street.

MS HARRAGON: And, um, from my recollection, the public pedestrian path that is to the side of it is actually at a – quite a raised height. So you’re actually looking
- - -

5 MS TUOR: Down.

MS HARRAGON: - - - down into almost a pit - - -

MR CHEONG: Yep.

10

MS HARRAGON: - - - um, because the land – obviously, this property was excavated when that original building – and then I’d say, again, the apartment building to – um, to the east of it, um, has been raised - - -

15 MS TUOR: Yeah.

MR CHEONG: Yeah. Just one - - -

MR MASLEN: From the path raised.

20

MR CHEONG: - - - comment. Looking at your – the perspective on C1 and the section AA on C10, it looks like the building is popping up at the footpath rather than being looked down. That’s probably – it’s not a good representation of what actually is happening.

25

MR MASLEN: Certainly the footpath is, um, located where that lip is - - -

MR CHEONG: That’s the – yep. Yep.

30 MR MASLEN: - - - on the left-hand side of that blue line.

MR CHEONG: Yeah. But if you - - -

MR MASLEN: Um - - -

35

MR CHEONG: If you look at the perspective, it seems like, ah, it’s almost on level with the extension.

MR MASLEN: Yes. Which is almost where the perspective has come from.

40

MR CHEONG: That’s right.

MR MASLEN: Um, and the footpath does, um, ah, slope quite steeply upward - - -

45 MS HARRAGON: Yeah. So you - - -

MR MASLEN: - - - across the site. So depending on where you're standing, you do get different - - -

MS HARRAGON: Correct.

5

MR MASLEN: - - - views to the building.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah. So you really need to look at those sectional drawings
- - -

10

MR WILSON: That's right.

MS HARRAGON: - - - to see the raising because the gradient of the footpath's quite steep, so - - -

15

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: Okay. I'm now going to talk to you about the main campus, also known as the middle school. So, um, if you'd like to go to A2 in those aerials, that's going to assist. Um, as we mentioned to you earlier, we've also got, in that A bundle, the heritage conservation areas, I think. Actually, might be your pack, the heritage - - -

20

MS TUOR: A4.

25

MR MASLEN: A5.

MS HARRAGON: In A4.

30

MS TUOR: A5.

MS HARRAGON: And, um, on A2 you can also see the yellow dots represent, um, each of the listed items in the council's LEP. So the campus at this site was occupied by the school since 1903, when it moved there from Woolloomooloo. The three-to-nine-storey 1950s building currently occupies the northern, western and southern boundaries and forms an internal quadrangle. Um, externally from the site, when viewed, it would appear that it, um, has – is, I guess, complete, and that internal quadrangle is actually quite hard to see from the public domain other from the – other than from the adjoining privately owned land. Further work was also done in the 1950s.

35

40

So what you now see from the general form and the internal layout of the college, this was what was established from 1981. This school caters for – this campus caters for the years 7 to 10 and provides a number of school facilities. The surrounding development comprises a mix of double-storey terrace buildings and – as well as multistorey residential flat buildings. There are also a number of locally listed heritage items, which I mentioned before are the yellow dots. Um, a lot of our

45

discussion, however, will relate to Craiglea, which is the immediately adjacent property at 49 Upper Pitt Street, which can be seen on the aerial photograph.

MS TUOR: So that's this one here?

5

MS HARRAGON: Yes. And it was, um, in previous years, subject to redevelopment. So that land to the east of it is actually an apartment building which is now separately titled but formed part of that original Craiglea, um, estate. The Jeffreys Street heritage conservation area is also located to the west, and Kirribilli heritage conservation area's to the south-east of the site. The application before the IPC is for the refurbishments, alterations and additions to this campus, and they're proposed over the 10 levels, and I've actually referred to 10 levels because, ah, what we have before the IPC is actually the use of the roof terrace. So that becomes an extra level as compared to the – to the storeys that were currently occupied. The, um – the resulting increase in floor space is 3107 square metres, and that's predominantly from that infill of the quadrangle area. The site is actually not subject to a floor-space ratio.

Um, in order to understand where some of those works occur from an external perspective, if you'd like to just take yourself to, um, the diagrams D1 and D2. They are probably the easiest to understand, although we do have a whole series of maps that go to each of the works on each of the 10 levels, whether that includes the, um, demolition works and the additional works, um, if there's a need to go to each of those. So I guess the dominant impacts, um, externally are from the Upper Pitt Street presentation, and, if you'd like to go to D2, that top diagram actually represents what is going to be the removal of an existing part of the building and the replacement of it with a more modern, um, and sensitive interpretation of the architecture of that site, and you can actually see by the boxed-in red cloud in that diagram they're actually lowering the existing parapet of that building, um, from where it is at the moment.

30

MS TUOR: So – sorry.

MS HARRAGON: So - - -

35

MR MASLEN: To – just to - - -

MS TUOR: Yep.

MR MASLEN: - - - clarify that point, um, that is depicting that the applicant lowered the parapet from the original submission in the Environmental Impact Assessment in response to submissions – lower the parapet to match the existing parapet of the building.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah. So the reference to lowering is actually a reference to the, um, EIS plans that were originally exhibited.

MR CHEONG: Sorry. You're saying the, ah – the new development, the parapet is matching the existing height?

MS HARRAGON: The existing one.

5

MR MASLEN: Yes.

MR CHEONG: Okay.

10 MS HARRAGON: Through the submission of the final set of plans that came in through the RTS. Although the works are significant over the 10 levels, the major redevelopment elements of the main campus has potential impacts that warrant being discussed in detail here around, I guess, um, certain areas, and what we're going to talk to you about is the development of the rooftop terrace, including the minor roof
15 works and the use of the terrace for school as well as non-school events and the infilling of the quadrangle and the resultant change setback of the school along the eastern boundary.

20 So I'd like to talk to you first about the change to the built form impacts. Um, so levels 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the proposed plans – and they're depicted on, um, plans D21 through to D23 – reflect some of the rooftop works, which predominantly are the ones that have the considerations given to it in relation to potential view loss, and, obviously, the infill of the quadrangle has resulted in a roof terrace. That piece of the building which I spoke to you about along Upper Pitt Street, um, now becomes, um –
25 it's the same height as it was previously.

30 If you'd also then like to move to D22, um, you can see some of the, um, sails which are gonna be incorporated into the roof terrace but sit below the existing height of the building as it presents to Upper Pitt Street at the moment, and we also have, on D23, a series of, um, plant enclosures and screens that will be added to the roof of the building and a small infill, which are referenced as practice rooms, which will sit behind the stair and lift rooms.

35 In addition to considering the analysis prepared by the applicant, the department also reached out to a number of submitters within numbers 48 Upper Pitt Street, 50 to 58 Upper Pitt Street and also number 49 Upper Pitt Street and visited 10 of their submitters properties to view the existing views and better understand the potential view impacts. A snapshot of the photos and observations that the department made at the time of those visits is accompanied in the department's report and is also
40 provided at D69 and D70. So I'm going to take you through – I guess an overview of some of the view analysis and D46 is helpful in understanding where each of the view analysis were taken from.

45 So – just in summary – so D46 suggested – or identified that if you're running, I guess, down the page along that right panel, there was low or negligible view impacts from the property immediately to the north of the site. In relation to the property to the northeast, there was no view loss. In relation to Craiglea, there was

also no view loss and in relation to the apartment building that sits immediately south of Craiglea, there was no existing view to the harbour to start with. But I'm now going to take you to some of those specific views as a snapshot of the – the examples of those. So if you would like to go to the series starting from D54.

5

So view 12 is from a habitable room within unit 6 of number 48 Upper Pitt Street, and as you can see, the impact will actually be two ways. There is actually a lift overrun room which has been reduced and minimised which will actually allow this particular occupant to see more of the Harbour Bridge. So if you look at the diagrams on the left, you will see that white box is now missing from the right. However, you will see that in the diagram on the right, there's actually a – a utilities area which is now screening some of the plant that's sitting on the roof. So any questions about that particular view?

10

15 MR CHEONG: So is that the screen boxes - - -

MS HARRAGON: It's plant, yeah.

MR CHEONG: The plant for the lift, is it?

20

MS HARRAGON: No, so as you could imagine, the infill of that quadrangle is going to, obviously, generate a fairly significant need for improvements of air-conditioning services. There's also a general uplift of technology provided to the building as well, so you will find there's actually two areas where there's new plant that's going on to the lift and both of those are new screened areas.

25

MR CHEONG: So on the left diagram, that white box was

MS HARRAGON: Is the lift - - -

30

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sorry; it's a stairwell.

MS HARRAGON: Yes. Sorry. It's stair – yes.

35 MR WILSON: So, Karen, just in terms of deciding which of these units are representative of the potential view loss, did you derive that from the applicant's assessment?

MS HARRAGON: No. So we actually contacted the occupants our self.

40

MR WILSON: Right.

MS HARRAGON: And we actually went to properties that were, I guess, ones that we wanted to, I guess, measure were these view analysis correct and also we actually reached out to other people who hadn't even made submissions that – for units that we thought were ones that were probably more likely to be affected, because as you

45

could imagine, the very lower bases of these buildings, often none of them had a view, and as you went through, you started to get variations on view - - -

MR WILSON: Sure.

5

MS HARRAGON: - - - and then at the top ones, there was obviously no – yeah, no obscurity at all.

MR WILSON: Thanks.

10

MR BEATTIE: I could further ad – Andrew Beattie, team leader – so we – the department provided the occupants of those units that we visited – and correct me if I’m wrong, we sent letters out to each of the occupants of each of those units with a letter advising the department representatives would be out onsite at a particular day, a particular time, and anyone interested in taking the opportunity to present their unit and their views would contact us and that’s how we, I guess, narrowed down who and when we visited.

15

MS HARRAGON: And there were some people who actually left their keys with their fellow occupants so that we could be let into units because they weren’t able to be there, so we actually spent most of one whole afternoon out there, visiting each of those three buildings that we mentioned that had the potential view impacts. If we look at D55, which is view 14 – sorry, that’s actually view 13 – it’s from the habitable room of – okay. So view 14 is of the second floor of the same building and it’s of the living room windows of unit 7 and you can see here this is, again, generally representative of some of the views from that level of the building.

20

25

So once again, we have a new plant enclosure. On this particular diagram, you can see both of the new plant enclosures – the two new screens – and you can see the removal of the existing stairwell. So we acknowledge that there will be a less – lesser view of the existing Harbour Bridge and probably the stanchion end of the bridge but there will be more view line of the cityscape provided – sorry, more skyline and obstruction of some of the lower areas of the cityscape.

30

MS TUOR: So the location of those plants, they would be shown on - - -

35

MS HARRAGON: So what we might do is reference for you in the – because it’s one of the documents that will help you understand the use of the actual roof – just take you to probably the landscape plans. We can also take you to the detailed plans in terms of the architectural, but the – we can probably show you the elevations as well as the landscape.

40

MR MASLEN: In terms of the floor layout, if you’re looking for the location - - -

MS TUOR: Yes.

45

MR MASLEN: - - - of the plant enclosures – D22 has the lowest floor plant enclosure shown on it. Then D23 has the second one that we just saw in the visual impact assessment. And then D24 has the highest plant enclosure. So it's those three levels.

5

MS TUOR: Sorry. Again – so there's D22.

MR MASLEN: Yes. Which shows level 4.

10 MS TUOR: And D23.

MR MASLEN: Yes. And then - - -

MS TUOR: And D24.

15

MR MASLEN: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: And probably you might also make yourself aware of the D21 which picks up the rest of that roof terrace, the majority of which the impacts are related to the glass balustrading and the landscape that would be on top. So have minimal impacts in terms of the view line and don't certainly interrupt in the same way as the plant or – sorry – the screening of the plant does.

20

MS TUOR: But your understanding is that the need for this additional plant is generated by the infill building.

25

MS HARRAGON: A whole range of – so if we were take you through the work that's going to be carried out on each of the nine storeys, you'll see there's actually substantial redevelopment on each of the storeys. So there's actually a whole range of reconfiguration of rooms, and the – I guess, the servicing of those to a more modern standard would be suggestive to me of the size of that plant that's going in.

30

MS TUOR: I mean, again, it's a question we can ask the proponent, but obviously if the plant were pulled further away from the edge of the building, it potentially may have less impact on views.

35

MS HARRAGON: Other than there might obviously be a changed view from one of the adjacent apartment buildings that isn't fronting onto it.

40 MS TUOR: Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: So happy to take you to more of these view lines, again, which are representative of some of the examples from each of the buildings. Perhaps if we, say, jump to view 17 which is on D59. Okay. So this is from the living room of unit 27 which is in building number 48, and you can see from this diagram you're now getting to a unit which is on a height that's probably above that of the finished levels of the rooftop. You can see there at the moment that existing stairwell on the

45

left diagram. You can see from this particular image these plant enclosures are starting to have a lesser impact because they're obviously sitting within the position on the roof such that the east – or – sorry – the southern extent of the roof is actually capturing the view impact rather than it as a new element.

5

MS TUOR: And the existing structure on the main building – what – do we know what that contains?

10

MR MASLEN: There is certainly a lift located in that part of the building, an existing lift.

MS HARRAGON: And you can see from the new image that air-conditioning, I guess, element – that white box - - -

15

MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: - - - is now gone.

20

MS TUOR: Yep. I mean, again that's something we can ask the proponent and just in terms of if there's any spare capacity within that structure or whether that structure actually needs to be as high as it is.

25

MR MASLEN: Certainly. If you turn to D34, it's the demolition plan indicate what's existing, and it shows that level, and you can see the lift and stairwell.

MS TUOR: D.

MR MASLEN: D34.

30

MS TUOR: 34.

MR MASLEN: We can see, in fact, that they're demolishing some existing plant and equipment which indicates that they are renewing.

35

MS HARRAGON: So the series of plans around this number are just demolition works, and there's a series of plans that follow this set which then talk about the new work, to help you understand some of the elements.

40

MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: Okay.

MR CHEONG: Just - - -

45

MS HARRAGON: Sorry?

MR CHEONG: Just some questions. Is there an opportunity to relocate the plant enclosure or the plant equipment from the – from the position that's indicated to any other roof space that may lessen the view loss – effect?

5 MS HARRAGON: So we're – we're not aware of that. We raised just views generally with the applicant and we recommended a condition that sees what we believe is a minor improvement not related to that plant. But probably a response to that question that you've posed, the diagram on D60 might look at, um, I guess an apartment where potentially the relocation of that plant elsewhere on the roof might
10 end up having an impact on this view line. But obviously, I'm not discounting, um – if you're posing that question to the applicant around does it need to be on the roof, I imagine for servicing it's generally – it must be easier there.

15 Um, there's – certainly, the building occupies the entire footprint when viewed from the public roads and I guess I would be hesitant about trying to put any plant along the eastern elevation, given its proximity to the residential apartments that are near there. And that's currently accessed through a set of stairs off Upper Pitt.

20 MR MASLEN: To note, in relation to plant and equipment, the department has recommended a condition that the applicant demonstrate the minimum extents required for plant and equipment - - -

MR CHEONG: All right.

25 MR MASLEN: - - - so to minimise that as much as possible prior to commencement of works.

MS HARRAGON: So B2 in our instrument.

30 MS TUOR: Yeah. All right. So just to understand, D34, what's shaded grey is showing the extent of the – that plant room that we were talking about, with the condenser in front of it being demolished; that's your understanding?

35 MR MASLEN: Yes. And that's existing buildings with no works proposed.

MS TUOR: Yep. So it contains a stairwell, a lift and then the lift motor room around it.

40 MR MASLEN: Yep.

MS TUOR: Okay.

45 MS HARRAGON: So – while we're still on views – so at D60 is view 9. Now, we've now moved to the adjoining property and that's the building at numbers 50 to 58 and, um, this shows you, I guess, that view from another element, or another aspect and here you can again see the existing stairwell as a white box, um, which I

guess – removing that, you see more of the skyline and only a marginal additional view of the harbour bridge.

5 You can see in this particular diagram those two plant screened areas have negligible impacts from the view from this property. And if you would like to look at D61, we're looking at, again, another view so view 10 but it also gives you a very good observation of the works that are going on that rooftop area.

10 So this is one of the first views looking, I guess, from a – a unit that's actually higher than the school. And you can see, again, there's negligible impact from the works at that level. I guess – yeah – an opportunity here would be to take you to, I guess, a very small white shaded enclosure which is in that proposed view 10, which is actually the new glass lift to the roof terrace from Kirribilli Avenue.

15 MS TUOR: So is that this what you're talking about there?

MS HARRAGON: Right in that very back corner.

20 MS TUOR: Yep. That – yeah.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

MS TUOR: So that's a glass lift.

25 MS HARRAGON: Yep. And you will see that that roof edge, at the moment that's brick, is being replaced with a glass edge – glass balustrade around that roof terrace.

30 MR WILSON: What's proposed, Karen, around the untrafficable area, the closest - - -

MS TUOR: This here?

MR WILSON: Yeah.

35 MS HARRAGON: That – if you go to that Upper – the Upper Pitt Street - - -

MR WILSON: Yep.

40 MS HARRAGON: - - - so there's no access to that roof area at all. So the terrace really only starts to become a functional, accessible terrace behind that first element, basically, the quadrangle area and the bit to the southern area of that. So the areas that have been, I guess, isolated from access, primarily for privacy purposes, are landscaped areas. And we can talk to you either now or later about the condition that we've recommended regarding the rear access stairwell and, um, how are we going
45 to seek to have that improved in terms of a privacy and overlooking element of the apartment building that sits below Craiglea.

MR MASLEN: Just to clarify, in that image the roof deck is a level below that – the Upper Pitt Street north-east wing replacement building so, um – you can see that brown section between them. That’s the parapet of that upper level, level 4.

5 MR WILSON: Okay.

MR MASLEN: And the – the roof terrace is actually a little below it, behind, just to clarify what - - -

10 MS HARRAGON: Yeah. So if you’re looking at existing view 10 and you can see that existing southern rooftop. That’s the height they’re maintaining across the inter-field quadrangle. And so as Jason mentioned, it actually sits lower than that part of the building that fronts immediately to Upper Pitt.

15 MR MASLEN: And to come back to the panel’s questions in relation to, um, the – the property selected to view, um, the sequence that Karen just went through, that started from the ground floor and then went to level 10 and the applicant’s visual impact assessment, well, the department actually visited a number of levels in between, including level 2 and level 5 of that building.

20

MS HARRAGON: And those photos are at D69 of the department’s photos.

MR MASLEN: Yeah. And similarly, with number 48 Upper Pitt Street, the department visited level 4, which wasn’t included in the applicant’s assessment.

25

MS HARRAGON: So just turning our mind, I guess, to impacts from – um, on views from a heritage item, D62 is the – one of the first images of a view from the Craiglea site and although it’s a – I guess, a rooftop area above a garage, it’s probably still relevant here and will assist in understanding how this infill area works. So you can see on the existing view 2, um, the access and entry to Craiglea – the main Craiglea building. Um, at the moment, you can see into, I guess, that open quadrangle and the storeys that sit above the quadrangle. So that infill will present as a brick wall and you can see the glass balustrading and the landscape elements that will – will keep, I guess, occupants of that roof away from the very edge. The next view is actually from the building - - -

35

MS TUOR: So just understanding this, though – so it’s only one floor difference between this height of the parapet and then the roof terrace. It just looks – I know, you know, there’s the perspective but it does look like a – quite a big difference.

40

MS HARRAGON: We can give you an RL difference on that for you.

MR MASLEN: And the parapet also does extend above the – the roof - - -

45 MS HARRAGON: Top.

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MR MASLEN: - - - the level of that north-east wing as well.

MS TUOR: So it probably - - -

5 MR MASLEN: So that adds to the visual height

MS TUOR: Does it extend about 1.2 metres, does it or - - -

10 MS HARRAGON: That's probably a good diagram to go to, isn't it?

MS TUOR: So do we have an RL for the parapet?

MR MASLEN: Um, the parapet is at 43.22.

15 MS TUOR: And do you know what the RL of the parapet for the addition is? The infill building.

MR MASLEN: As it adjoins the eastern boundary, it's 39.89.

20 MS HARRAGON: So D8 provides some helpful sections, particularly in relation to the work along that eastern boundary and its relationship with the heritage listed items.

25 MS TUOR: Okay. So say that's 40. So it should be a three-metre difference between those two RLs.

MR MASLEN: Just to clarify, the roof level of that office section of the north-east wing is at 42.06. Comes to - - -

30 MS TUOR: But that's in terms of this D62, the photo montage. I've just roughly those RLs on. So that would be representing RL43.22 and that would be representing, to the top there, RL39.89.

35 MR MASLEN: Yes. The only thing to clarify is whether it's this point here or that point there in terms of – on the detailed elevations.

MS TUOR: Yep.

40 MR MASLEN: So you may wish to turn to D5 which shows that detailed elevation.

MS HARRAGON: And, certainly, presents quite a helpful image of how, ah, much lower that roof terrace is as compared to the part of the building that presents Upper Pitt Street.

45 MS TUOR: So D5, um - - -

MR MASLEN: Bottom left drawing.

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MR MASLEN: You can see the eastern wall of the north east wing, um, of the plant
5 and equipment above indicating that lower portion of – of, um, the elevation along
Upper Pitt Street.

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MR MASLEN: And then you can see the, ah, the white horizontal element being
10 the floor of the roof deck and you have the RLs coming off on the left of the
diagram.

MS TUOR: It's meant to match the existing, ah, roof, yeah.

15 MS HARRAGON: So they both - - -

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: - - - match the existing heights other than the infill quadrangle
20 which is obviously new.

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: The terrace is the same height as the existing section of roof on
25 the eastern boundary.

MR MASLEN: The replacement – north east wing is.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.
30

MR MASLEN: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: And the, um, the Upper Pitt Street - - -

35 MR MASLEN: That's right. Yeah.

MS HARRAGON: - - - is the same height.

MR MASLEN: Yeah.
40

MS HARRAGON: But it's around about the 39.89 – it's close enough.

MR MASLEN: Yes.

45 MS TUOR: If you look at that measuring there, so it's, you know, a couple of
hundred metres below to that top of that white line which would be represented by
that line there.

MR MASLEN: Yes.

MS TUOR: So that is representing roughly a change of level of three metres.

5 MR MASLEN: Which, um, in perspective reading that against the, um, acoustic screen which is 2.4 metres. Obviously, that, um, doesn't read, ah, true if you compare those different distances.

10 MS TUOR: Yeah. Just looks – that does look a lot higher than – I would have thought either that would be lower or this would be higher. Well, that's not going to be lower because that's what's there. Anyway, we can again ask the applicant.

MS HARRAGON: And – and D8, um, is also helpful in terms of understanding how it – I guess - - -
15

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: - - - this is the – the only part of the development that changes the footprint, um, whilst the – the changes to the other parts of the building from the observations made from any of the public domain areas - - -
20

MS TUOR: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: - - - it's basically, um, just a re – new skin, although it's replacing some of the – part of that building. I guess this infill one is the one that is probably one to be quite more mindful of, given that it's the first time that part of the building is actually coming closer to the - - -
25

MS TUOR: Mmm.
30

MS HARRAGON: - - - eastern boundary than where – where it is. So D8 actually shows, um, by section how it relates to Craiglea which has, what, quite a significant setback to the heritage listed item and then as you actually go eastward towards the harbour, you'll then see, um, where the sighting of that existing apartment building is which is down on that lower road and it starts to get much closer to there and you can also see the stairs which service the quadrangle at the moment which come down from Upper Pitt Street.
35

MR CHEONG: I've got a question on, ah, the height of the screened area. Why would you need to be 2400? Is it purely for acoustic of this?
40

MS HARRAGON: Are you talking about the glass balustrading screen?

MR CHEONG: Glass balustrade. Yeah.
45

MS HARRAGON: Um, so we – well, obviously, they’ve got a, um, Building Code of Australia obligation, but we understand that it’s part of – the mitigation works were part of that glass enclosure.

5 MR CHEONG: Acoustic.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah. Particularly for the proposed, um, non-school events that were going - - -

10 MR CHEONG: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: - - - to occur outside of hours.

15 MS TUOR: Mmm. So just in relation to all of the photomontages, I understand that they would, um – um, by the applicant in terms of, um, just taking the photos and then putting it into – but were – was it checked in terms of just, um, you know, with a – you know, the Land Environment Court has, um, essentially, guidelines about the preparation of photomontages - - -

20 MR MASLEN: Mmm.

MS TUOR: - - - to ensure that they’re done in relation to surveys and gridlines and things like that.

25 MR MASLEN: Mmm.

MS TUOR: So do you know were these actually checked to make sure that they were - - -

30 MR MASLEN: The – the applicant certainly made a statement within the response of submissions that the, um, photomontages were true and correct - - -

MS TUOR: Mmm.

35 MR MASLEN: - - - and, um, certified to be correct.

MS TUOR: Okay. All right. So we’ll again just check with them. All right. Thank you.

40 MS HARRAGON: I’m going to quickly just mention, obviously because we still have a bit to present about shadows. As I mentioned to you just quickly before, the only part of the awning which really is a – a new element in terms of the current envelope - - -

45 MS TUOR: Mmm.

MS HARRAGON: - - - is that quadrangle infill. So if you go to D35 and D36, you'll see a series of, um, shadow diagrams which show the currently proposed shadows. Um, in particular, we – we met and discussed some of the concerns from the occupant of the apartment building which addresses Kirribilli Avenue in terms of,
5 um, concerns regarding access to windows within one of those properties there. So probably, um, D37 I might take you to which is some elevation shadow diagrams which show that there will be increased shadowing of that apartment building windows, um, at 1 pm on the winter solstice, and, again, at 2 pm. And that's additional shadowing. Um, the information provided by the applicant suggest that
10 the solar access provided to those units, although increased in the extent to which it is currently, would still achieve the, um, apartment guideline requirement four hours of solar access. And it's that apartment building which has the, um, only change to increased overshadowing from the development at the main campus.

15 MR WILSON: Do you understand where that's from?

MS HARRAGON: Sorry? From where that, um, that amount?

MR WILSON: What causes the increase?
20

MS HARRAGON: Um, so this – this set of stairs - - -

MR MASLEN: Essentially, it's from the quadrangle, um - - -

25 MS HARRAGON: Infill.

MR MASLEN: Infill building.

MR WILSON: Okay. Thank you.
30

MS HARRAGON: And if we, again, just go back to those elevations, probably even at D37, you can see how much lower that apartment. It's actually been excavated into the site below the heritage listed Craiglea building.

35 MR CHEONG: Just a question - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah. Yeah.

MR CHEONG: - - - on the shadow cast on the, ah, Craiglea building, if you look at
40 D37, D38, the, ah, shadow onto the window cast by the extension at 1 pm and 2 pm, ah, especially in June in winter solstice, do – do you mean to say they have sunlight, ah, before that or - - -

MS HARRAGON: Well, the earlier – the earlier diagram at 1 pm shows those
45 windows are in either full sun or dappled sun from the existing tree.

MR CHEONG: Yeah. But I think the tree is not – is never counted as a - - -

MS HARRAGON: No. So well, there's no room if you took off the dappled sun. Um, the diagram would show at 1 pm that they have solar access at 1 pm.

5 MR CHEONG: 1 pm if – if we look at the, ah, diagram on D37, it shows that it been – ah – the shadow had been cast on – on the window.

MS HARRAGON: Oh, yes. So – so existing?

10 MS HARRAGON: Yes. Sorry. Yes. I – yes. I correct myself. That the shadowing starts at 1 pm on those – part of one of the windows or part of two windows - - -

MR CHEONG: Yeah.

15 MS HARRAGON: - - - and obscures all of one window from 1 pm.

MR MASLEN: So in plan form it show an area to be shaded; however, only part of a vertical structure was shaded.

20 MR CHEONG: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah. So before 1 pm there will be

MS HARRAGON: And that's shown on D36.

25 MS TUOR: I mean, again, just looking at these shadow diagrams – so in theory that's the shadow cast on to that plane there from an existing structure that's roughly – what – three metres above the proposed deck. The – if you look at the – without going back to the plan, we'd have to look at what the RLs of those structures were and then that's the extent of shadow, but I would estimate that it's like – they're one storey higher because they're just, sort of, overruns and things like that. So that's the extent of shadow cast at that time from something that's three metres high whereas
30 when – and when you look at the extent of shadow cast from – and I don't know what the ground levels are and the relative things, but from a three-story building it looks pretty much the same as that that's cast by a one-storey element. So - - -

35 MS HARRAGON: So – sorry. What's the one-storey element that you're referencing?

MS TUOR: These structures here that are existing are at the moment roughly, as I understand it, probably about one storey higher. I don't know. We'd have to check.
40 I don't know how much higher they are than the plane below it, and that's the length of the shadow at that time of today that's being cast. At the moment there's nothing in here other than a fence. In fact, there is a fence here that would cast a shadow. It just looks very short compared to that shadow, but we'd have to see what those changes and levels were.

45

MR MASLEN: It is a significant change in level and there is a – essentially a stone wall along the boundary, so – yep. That would have some effect in terms of the overall change of shadowing.

5 MS TUOR: So at the moment there would be – the fence is along the boundary - - -

MR MASLEN: Yes.

10 MS TUOR: - - - and that's the – roughly the boundary there. So there'd be the shadow caused by the fence which is presumably that shadow there. Again, it's something – we'll talk to the proponent and just try and clarify it and in the meantime maybe look at what those RLs are of those structures there.

15 MR MASLEN: Certainly, those structures you're pointing to are the shade structures over the top of the roof deck.

20 MS TUOR: So they're not – but they're showing existing shadow. I'm just trying to understand what the existing shadow is being cast by because then if I know what the existing shadow is being cast by, then you can – and if you know how high that is above the plane that it's being cast on, then you can, sort of, say, compare, do a comparison.

25 MR CHEONG: I can see your point. In the winter solstice the angle of the sun is something like 30 degrees

MS HARRAGON: So if you go to D52, it allows you to see some of, I guess, the variations in the finished heights of the existing building where some of those depths of the existing shadows are not necessarily just one storey in height.

30 MS TUOR: Yeah. Okay. So there's the big plant.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah. There's quite a lot of popups. They'll call it that.

35 MS TUOR: So the best one to look at is probably the part of the building that has the cross on it in existing view 7 because when you look at that, it looks like it's roughly, you know, one storey above the building that goes to the east, so this bit here.

40 MS HARRAGON: The being the existing terrace or the – that will extend to the proposed terrace.

MR WILSON: The canopy.

45 MS TUOR: And that would be that element here presumably be that.

MR MASLEN: Yes.

MS TUOR: Yeah.

MR MASLEN: Yes.

5 MS TUOR: And so the change in level between that and that casts a shadow that's that long. That's the extent of the shadow cast by that change in level which when you then compare it to – so that's roughly a one-storey change in level, and then this is meant to be a three-storey change in level.

10 MS HARRAGON: If you go to D57, though, you'll see there's still that popup which is sitting – is that the same diagram?

MS TUOR: No.

15 MS HARRAGON: So view 48. Yeah, that's the right one. View 15. Sorry.

MR MASLEN:

MS HARRAGON: Okay. So D57 – in the existing diagram you'll again see how
20 high that very top of building is, the highest point of the brick – the red brick - - -

MS TUOR: Yeah, yeah.

MS HARRAGON: - - - in that first image which is higher again than the façade to
25 Upper Kirribilli which is higher again than the rooftop which is facing Upper Kirribilli which we've also agreed is a whole storey higher than what the terrace will be – the new terrace. So that – I would imagine that element is one that's actually casting a significant depth of shadow.

30 MS TUOR: Yeah. All right. I think we'll just look into that a little bit further. Yes.

MS HARRAGON: Okay. So in terms of the impacts of the occupation of these
35 new parts of the building, D12 is the landscape plan which shows you this new operational part of the school that's being introduced through the infill of the quadrangle and the activation of the rooftop. It also gives you an opportunity to look at where that landscaping is and where they'll be keeping, I guess, people using that rooftop area away from the more sensitive part of the site, which is the eastern boundary, where there are currently apartment buildings and also windows which
40 we've also been given an opportunity to go into when we did a visit of the site. Down in that bottom corner you'll see a stairwell which has been raised in a number of submissions.

45 So we recommended a condition of consent that the entrance to that stairwell be relocated so that it's actually along the western element of the stairwell, so there's actually no opportunity at all for anyone to stand immediately adjacent to an edge of

building. So there are two uses proposed for the terrace area. One is the uplift of the activities that were occurring in the quadrangle.

5 And I say the word uplift because they're going to be raised from the ground level to the rooftop, and it's generally a continuation of the current activities at the school. There's a whole schedule that outlines those at D68. In addition to that, the school has sought approval for non-school events, a limited number of those each year, and they're the ones that, I guess, the community has got the more greater concern regarding and which we have addressed in our report.

10 MR CHEONG: Just correctly. When you say you entry to the stair from the north to the west, you mean to the east

15 MS HARRAGON: No. Well, we're saying that that landscape bay - - -

MR CHEONG: Yeah.

20 MS HARRAGON: - - - be continued to the wall of the stairwell and that the entrance to the stairwell come in from the western side of it.

MR CHEONG: Eastern side of the stair, western side of the roof deck.

MS HARRAGON: Um - - -

25 MS TUOR: So you basically cut it back here. See?

MS HARRAGON: Exactly that.

30 MS TUOR: And then go like that.

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MS TUOR: So that would become garden.

35 MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MS TUOR: And then you'd walk out like that - - -

40 MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

MS TUOR: - - - to keep people - - -

MR WILSON: Reduces noise and

45 MS TUOR: To keep people away from the edge.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah. There's actually a, um, external deck immediately adjacent that, which is fronting the harbour, which is the front, and the only private open-space area of the apartment buildings to the east. So we believe that it is fairly critical, um, and quite important for those occupants to be provided, um, privacy.

5 MS TUOR: Yep. And it wouldn't materially affect the use of the terrace either.

MS HARRAGON: No. The – and the applicant has raised no concerns with that modification.

10 MR CHEONG: Could the barrier be moved inside from the edge?

MS HARRAGON: Could the stairwell?

15 MR CHEONG: No. The - - -

MS TUOR: The glass barrier. The - - -

MR CHEONG: The glass barrier.

20 MS HARRAGON: Um, I would see no reason why it wouldn't be able to. I guess, moving it inside, there's either, um, a reduction in the depth of landscaping or, ultimately, the reduction in - - -

25 MR CHEONG: The landscaping is not getting – ah, is not, ah, extended to the edge anyway.

MS HARRAGON: Here?

30 MR CHEONG: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: If we were to move that whole in by a metre?

MR CHEONG: Yep.

35 MS HARRAGON: Um, there would be no reason why that couldn't be achieved.

MR CHEONG: Yeah.

40 MS HARRAGON: Um, one of the other elements that the department's considered appropriate to improve privacy, um, outcomes is the requirement that the screening of the windows of the eastern elevation of the building – the new eastern elevation of the building – be fixed louvres rather than, um, openable louvres.

45 MR WILSON: And on an angle, yeah?

MS HARRAGON: Yes. Because there is only, um, specific windows that the concerns are regarding. Ultimately, these windows actually are adjacent to this wall, but there is a particular part of the apartment building which, um, there could be observation, so they'll be fixed so that they're obscuring that direct line of vision.

5

MR MASLEN: And a private open space for that property as well.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah. So we can talk further regarding, um, the trial period, which we note's in the IPC's, um, agenda. I just wanted to quickly just touch again on the heritage matters for this particular building. So in relation to the upper main campus, we've obviously had regard to the heritage items listed, in particular, 49 Upper Pitt Street and 1 to 5 Jeffreys Street.

10

We have reviewed the heritage impact assessment, and we conclude with – concur with the conclusions in that. Um, the image on D8, which I'll take you to, again show you the relationship of this building to the nearest adjoining heritage-listed building. So that top item is actually Craiglea. So the setback's actually quite substantial to it, and that wall – there's actually a stone wall, which is that dark line, on the boundary.

15

The addition to the existing building has been minimised by its siting so that the impacts on the existing heritage items in the immediate area have been minimised. The proposed infill has been set back from the surviving stone wall, and that minimises the adverse impacts on the remnant heritage items from the site. The proposed infill building is located over part of an existing internal courtyard and not will be – will not be visible from the conservation areas, um, or from the Wyalla heritage item. The proposed screen – glass screen enclosing the south and east sides of the roof garden and the three roof canopies over the courtyard will have a minimal visual impact on views from Copes Lookout or from Craiglea.

20

The department is satisfied that the proposed scheme has been developed with consideration of Craiglea and the potential impacts on existing and original views associated with that heritage-listed house. The department also considers that the eastern elevation of the proposed addition, whilst visible, will have limited view impacts from, um, Upper Pitt Street and Craiglea. The proposed development would not dominate heritage items in the vicinity.

25

The proposed development sits within the existing building mass of St Aloysius' College – the main campus – and, as a result, views to or within the Jeffreys Street conservation area would remain unchanged. Views looking east and west from Upper Pitt Street would not be altered by the proposed development of St Aloysius' College. For these reasons, the department supports the sensitive adaption of the existing school building on the main campus. Is there any question specifically about that main campus before we move to the more general issues raised regarding operational traffic?

30

35

40

45

MS TUOR: I just had a quick question about this elevation treatment on the east, um, in the landscape concept design, where it sort of – there's a condition about the framing for that be provided. So do you understand how it's working? Is it that they're going to have some frame over the whole building and put little planter boxes; is that - - -

MR MASLEN: So the sand coloured section is a stone wall and then, above that they would have a framework, which would then – which you can see, in terms of the lattice grey structure, and then off it would be planter boxes, um, hanging off it. So the department conditioned the applicant to provide details before they commence works to show that that structure would be supported from within the site, how – how that would happen, um, and that – that landscaping would be able to be efficiently and effectively maintained from within the premises.

MS TUOR: So when you say it's the stone wall, it's what stone wall?

MS HARRAGON: On D8 - - -

MS TUOR: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: - - - That very thick hard line is actually an existing sandstone wall.

MS TUOR: Okay. So this is – the landscape treatment is going on that wall?

MR MASLEN: Essentially, a framework that would come in behind it and – and extend above it, as depicted on that elevation on D11.

MS TUOR: So it would go up like this somehow?

MR MASLEN: Yes.

MS TUOR: And then would have the – okay.

MR MASLEN: Yes.

MS TUOR: So it provides amenity for the school but not necessarily for the, um, adjoining property.

MR MASLEN: Well, it's seeking to provide a replacement screen planting along that boundary.

MS TUOR: Because there are trees along that boundary now that are going?

MR MASLEN: Yes.

MS TUOR: Okay. All right. But there, um – in the 4.8 metre set back there isn't any actual tree planting proposed?

5 MR MASLEN: Not at, um – if you look at D11 – D10, sorry, you will see the ground level. It's essentially a fern garden so they are proposing, um, quite tall fern planting within that.

10 MS HARRAGON: And that stair set at the top of the diagram is actually the existing stairs from Upper Pitt Street.

MS TUOR: This one? O1?

15 MS HARRAGON: Yep. Yep. And they divide the current school, um, building from the Craiglea heritage listed site.

MS TUOR: And I suppose because it doesn't get much sun in here, that's why they've got to have a fern garden.

20 MR BEATTIE: That existing tree on that boundary, that liquid amber, is quite dominating - - -

MR MASLEN: Yes.

25 MR BEATTIE: - - - on that boundary.

MS TUOR: All right. That was the only questions I had on that – understanding it. Chris, anything?

30 MR WILSON: No. I'm fine, thanks.

MS TUOR: Soo-Tee?

MR CHEONG: No. Not in this section.

35 MS TUOR: All right. Thank you.

40 MS HARRAGON: Okay. Operational traffic; parking drop off and pick up. The school is located obviously in a very highly accessible location, with all three campuses being within 400 metres of the Milsons Point railway station, various local bus routes at Jeffreys Street and Milsons Point wharves. Reflective of this is the departments observation that as – as detailed in the assessment report, there is a high proportion of students who travel to the school by public transport, with the majority of students in all years, except year 3, travelling to school by public transport. And information regarding that, um, breakdown is provided on page 63 of our assessment
45 report.

The majority of staff, however, still continue to journey to work by – by car. The school has low levels of cycling, which could be attributed to the street topography and the limited cycling infrastructure in the area and also the – the high intensity of vehicle use within that particular, um, area. The school does not contain an on-site
5 drop off, pick up facility but relies on a number of street drop off, pick up zones on Burton Street at the junior campus and on Upper Pitt Street between the senior and the main campuses. The high public transport use generally results in high pedestrian traffic between the station and the three campuses and the location of Loreto Kirribilli within the suburb also contributes to the domination of that
10 pedestrian network.

The lack of drop off and pick up facilities, parking and pedestrian congestion were issues that were raised in all of the – majority of the submissions. Um, the department notes that the proposal does not alter the existing access arrangements
15 nor does it involve an increase in student or staff numbers. The department, therefore, has agreed with the applicant’s traffic consultant’s conclusion that the improvements to the school facilities would not have a significant detrimental impact. The department, however, believes that this application provides an opportunity to better manage the operational impacts of the school. At the moment,
20 there is no operational management plan and this first approval through the department in recent times will allow us to now condition the preparation of such a document. This is including a green travel plan, um, in our set of conditions. Is there any questions regarding the operational traffic impacts?

25 MR WILSON: There’s requirements in the green travel plan to integrate that with the green travel plan of other schools, potentially?

MS HARRAGON: Um, so what we – we have included as part of that general suite is consultation with council and we will probably have to take on – on note how
30 we’ve required them to work with the other council. Certainly, we’ve – sorry, with the other schools in the area.

MR WILSON: Loreto.

35 MS HARRAGON: We certainly have regard to that accumulative impact by the time we come to the construction impacts but we can take that on note in terms of that assessment.

MS TUOR: So the school is operating under a current consent that has conditions
40 on it but not – not an operational management plan?

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

MS TUOR: And that current consent, does it have, um, limitations on school
45 numbers and - - -

MS HARRAGON: Our understanding is that there is no current consent that limits school numbers. Yeah.

MS TUOR: They - - -

5

MS HARRAGON: Student or staff.

MS TUOR: And so are things like that pick up and drop off areas and those things, they're not necessarily within that consent, that's just something that has evolved with - - -

10

MS HARRAGON: What we do know is that the – the most recent consent did not formalise that, um – yeah, that pick up or drop off area.

15

MS TUOR: And in terms of this current application, um, because it's not increasing the student numbers, there hasn't been any rationale or logic behind looking at the pick-up and drop off areas, as I understand, but do you know if they looked at it at all in terms of trying to improve the situation or is – is there an issue with pick up and drop off at the moment, as far as you know?

20

MS HARRAGON: So I guess one of the challenges for, I guess, the department and for the school is that, um, the reliance upon, I guess, the public road system for drop off and pick up. It's very much a relationship that's dependent upon the council, as the authority – the road authority. So even for us to – to intervene and direct them to set aside parts of those road systems is really dependent upon the council's agreement to that.

25

MS TUOR: But, say, with the junior school, where they are redoing, you know, quite a lot of it along one of the frontages in terms of excavation to provide the multi-purpose – do you know if they looked at any – because it's mainly the junior school that – where kids get picked up and dropped off, whether there was any investigation of whether, as part of that, there could have been some rationalisation of pick up and drop off on the school site as opposed to the street?

30

MR MASLEN: There are no details in the application that the applicant gave that sort of consideration. No. There is quite extensive parking restrictions around all of the streets, particularly in the streets around the junior campus, because they're quite narrow streets and they're – a lot of the houses have garages opening onto those streets so it very much limits the areas of parking available, given that you would need to have traffic wait down the street.

40

MS HARRAGON: This particular council has very thorough requirements around parking and I – I think, personally, they would also have a view if you were to have to remove street parking to allow entrance and exit from the site. I think they would probably have a strong opinion on that as well.

45

MS TUOR: Thank you.

MR CHEONG: Just – just so I understand existing situation with the parking, is it right that I read some of – in some of the submission there are existing 20 car parking or 15 in some cases, that – someone has actually brought it up – and there are 136 teachers and quite a large number will be bring their cars to work so is that situation existing correct?

MR MASLEN: Well, certainly, the transport study found that the majority of teachers do drive to the school. Um, certainly the applicant's response to the issue was that there are extensive parking restrictions around the area, largely throughout the day. It generally varies between one to two hours. They did do parking demand surveys and – and by examining the availability/non-availability of parking spaces, um, across the length of the day, the applicant's consultant concluded there was no evidence of, you know, teachers parking in those local streets. Um, so it was the applicant's contention that parking is generally contained within, um, the parking on the junior campus, the senior campus, um, and also off-site at the – I think it's the Star of the Sea Church that the school has an arrangement with for 17 parking spaces.

MS HARRAGON: Certainly, I guess, the whole debate around parking we would feel important is putting more parking on the site will attract more – more vehicle movements to an already heavily-congested area. So it would be something that we would probably not be supported by our transport agencies around actually provision of any additional parking, given the high level of service of public transport for this particular as well. So it's not something that would be a high driver for us.

MS TUOR: Do you know if the school has anything like buses where they pick the students up from particular areas, or people just rely on the public transport system?

MS HARRAGON: I understand from the information that was contained in the EIS that there's significant numbers of bus network already serving that site warranted them not having to have their own.

MS TUOR: Yes. That was more just in terms of the junior school, trying to discourage people - - -

MS HARRAGON: Bringing the younger.

MS TUOR: Bringing the kids to school if they could get picked up. All right.

MS HARRAGON: One of the concerns raised by council, I believe, was the open space and the use of Bradfield Park. The proposal does not include, again, an increase of student numbers but does provide additional multipurpose sports facilities in the junior campus as part of that concept proposal as well as the improved outdoor facilities on the main campus. Consequently, the proposal would not increase the use of the park and the department's opinion is that ultimately it is likely to see a reduction in the use of that Bradfield Park area. The department has also

recommended condition requiring the preparation of an open space and recreation management plan in consultation with the council and this will, again, serve as a mechanism for the school to better engage with the council on the use of the current recreational facilities in the area. Again, this is an opportunity that this particular application brings that doesn't currently exist.

MS A. JELFS: Annelise, we've just got 15 minutes before the applicant gets here.

MS TUOR: We're running very much behind time. Yes, thanks for the reminder.

MS HARRAGON: Sorry. So the only other matter I was probably going to talk to specifically is just about construction impacts, primarily around construction vehicles and traffic.

MS TUOR: Yeah, I think because we've got such limited time, maybe we need to just jump in and start asking a few of the, sort of, key questions that we've got. And I think some of those relate to the conditions, so I will quickly start. One of them is at the moment you mentioned that there would be a trial period for the use of the terrace, but we couldn't actually find the condition. So is that – is it - - -

MS HARRAGON: We confirmed that. Unfortunately it would appear that that trial which we spoke so well about and articulated in our report has not been included in that set. We've included similar trials on other areas. As you might be aware, a number of schools now are trying to provide an alternate resourcing stream and are now looking for non-school events. So we apologise for that and we would be able to put forward the condition that we had in our mind and give that to the commission shortly.

MS TUOR: Good. And why do you go for six months instead of 12 months?

MR BEATTIE: That's probably based on what we've done for other schools. It's something that we have suggested in the past for other schools, and public schools in particular, we will start with six months when we're drafting conditions. We will consult with the applicant and if they're contesting that six months is unreasonable, then we would look to extend to either nine or 12.

In this particular case, obviously that hasn't been tested, but what we would have done in hindsight is consulted on the six-month trial and, sort of, judging their reaction to that, determined whether we would continue to run with six months or 12, acknowledging, though, that one of the events would be catering for up to 1500 occupants once a year with a combined use of a couple of areas. So you would probably want the trial to include that one event, and that being New Year's Eve, so - - -

MS TUOR: Well, I think there's two events that have got the thousand. There's a whole of school event that has 1300 or something.

MR BEATTIE: Yes. Well, unless that's during school hours – because there's the one New Year's Eve event that is clearly out of hours for 1500 occupants.

MS TUOR: Yes, yes.

5

MR BEATTIE: And that would – that would be one that I guess you would want to try and incorporate into a trial, so yeah, perhaps 12 months would be - - -

MS TUOR: Well, 12 months just gets the full picture in terms of what events
10 they're likely to have and the season

MR WILSON: And meteorological conditions as well.

MR BEATTIE: Sorry?

15

MR WILSON: And meteorological conditions as well.

MR BEATTIE: Yeah, true. Yep, yep, good point.

MS HARRAGON: And what we could continue to do is to monitor the behaviours
20 on that event. So even outside of the trial, if it was to come back that the monitoring during that suggested it would be reasonable to continue it, even a scheduling of a complaints monitoring and submitting of that register to the department will allow us to continue to see that the management that they've set out for the use of this terrace
25 is actually being applied, you know. If you're getting complaints that you're still making noise at 1 o'clock, clearly there's a breakdown and I think it's a good mechanism for the applicant to be very mindful of continuing to apply the management of that management plan.

MS TUOR: So reviewable conditions can't be imposed on this sort of – type of use, can they? They're just for licensed premises and things.

MS HARRAGON: No, but we've got some clever condition sets and, ultimately,
35 particularly around auditing. So we've got to remember the department will continue to be the consent authority and the compliance authority for this particular operation now. So we also have a condition – I'm not sure if it's in this particular set – where following on the audit, the secretary can direct the applicant to undertake particular measures. So we might - - -

MR BEATTIE: We do have that.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah, we have got that.

MR BEATTIE: It's an administrative condition for part A.

45

MS TUOR: And in your standard trial period condition, you have the applicant, what, an obligation, that they have noise loggers or something when they have an

event and you have monitoring of traffic when they have an event, or what do you actually get them to do in the trial period to assess – or is it just based on whether there's complaints?

5 MR BEATTIE: The trial period is mainly to do with – yeah, acoustic impacts and use of that rooftop terrace. So I guess we wouldn't be foreseeing the monitoring of, sort of, traffic impacts associated with that event.

MS HARRAGON: No.

10

MR BEATTIE: It's more to do with sort of the amenity impacts and the acoustic impacts of those events on the rooftop terrace.

MS HARRAGON: And – and the effectiveness of their own management, um,
15 protocols that they're – they're saying they're putting in place.

MS TUOR: So you'd require that they appoint a noise expert, that you and – they and the department agree with, that would do noise, um, readings or something like that on – where there's certain events, would they, or - - -

20

MS HARRAGON: So I – I haven't had in my mind to probably go to that formal noise testing but we could certainly, um, suggest some conditions that would allow that to occur, particularly I'd say for – well, I guess that's some of the challenges of the larger one. There would be the New Year's Eve one – you know, distinguishing
25 between background and - - -

MS TUOR: Look, I think New Year's Eve is irrelevant - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yeah.

30

MS TUOR: - - - to some extent because it's just chaos.

MS HARRAGON: Crazy. Yeah.

MS TUOR: It's just – it's more the ones that, you know - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MS TUOR: - - - it's a quiet weekend and all of a sudden there's a whole lot of
40 people.

MS HARRAGON: Yeah. And I think that's why it's probably important that the period – wherever the period is that picks up, the summer season. Because us seeing how behaviours on that rooftop occur during winter, when no one really wants to be
45 outside there anyway, and you do your bit and you're all shuffling off home – so I think that's probably pretty cool for us picking up that high season.

MS TUOR: Yep. All right. I can't remember – the other query I had as a general one about the construction of the consent, is at the moment the concept plan only approves drawings that relate to the Burton Street – the junior school, whereas I would have thought that the concept approval – and it has got conditions that relate to the school as a whole, such as the cap on student numbers. But I would have thought there would be some drawings for the concept of all the three campuses that were approved, so that you actually – your site defines the three campuses, they're all part of the site, so the concept approval obviously relates to that but there actually doesn't seem to be any drawing that – just the overall concept plan for all of the three
5
10 - - -

MS HARRAGON: We will probably have to take that on note.

MS TUOR: Yep.
15

MS HARRAGON: Come back to you.

MS TUOR: Because then, in theory, the stage 1 DA hangs off that concept approval but - - -
20

MS HARRAGON: Otherwise, it's not really a true stage 1.

MS TUOR: Stage 1. Yeah. Um, and then just – and there's probably other questions about the conditions but they're more detailed so maybe we have to have a separate meeting on conditions later, if we get to that stage. And then, just in terms of your assessment report, one thing in particular that I noted was that your – the main control that relates to our assessment of this is the Education SEPP and I think your appendix F or E or B – B, where it assesses the Education SEPP, looking at the requirements of the Education SEPP, which I've got here somewhere amongst all my pieces of paper, which I can't find – so 35, um, 6(b), it requires an assessment of:
25
30

Whether the development enables the use of school facilities, including recreational facilities to be shared by the community.

35 So in schedule – annexure B, that doesn't seem to actually get mentioned at all so – there's probably information out there but it hasn't actually been demonstrated that it has been assessed. And then, in terms of 35(6)(a), the design quality principles in schedule 7, that's assessed in table B2 but, again, I think – some of the assessments say Principle 1, Principle 5 Amenity, and Principle 7 Aesthetics. When you actually
40 look at the words in that schedule there aren't words in your response that address the words in the schedule.

MS HARRAGON: To each of the points.

45 MS TUOR: Yep.

MS HARRAGON: Okay.

MS TUOR: Particularly, say, in aesthetics because aesthetics talks very much about the school:

5 *...should respond to the positive elements from the site and surrounding neighbourhood.*

So I can't see any analysis of, in particular, what the positive elements of the surrounding neighbourhood are. And then the next part is:

10 *...and have a positive impact on the quality and character of the neighbourhood.*

So it's – that's a high bar in terms of positive impact, whereas a lot of what the report that you've done seems to rely on is the existing character of the school, which I think a lot of the community would argue is a negative feature of the environment, as opposed to a positive one. So I suppose it's how does this proposal respond to those positive elements and have a positive impact on the quality and character of the neighbourhood?

20 MS HARRAGON: So the department will seek to supplement those elements of the report for you, particularly – we understand what you say in terms of that test - - -

MS TUOR: Yep.

25 MS HARRAGON: - - - that's almost imbedded - - -

MS TUOR: Yep.

30 MS HARRAGON: - - - in the SEPP.

MS TUOR: Yep. Because we obviously have to have it demonstrated that - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

35 MS TUOR: - - - those words have clearly been, um, considered. Um, I mean – yep. As I said, I've got a lot of questions about the conditions but I think may be - - -

40 MR WILSON: Just quickly, two questions. I just wondered if the department could confirm – there's activities in terms of there's a basketball hoop, ping pong facility and handball facility on the new rooftop terrace. Can you just confirm they were all included in the terms of the noise impact assessment in terms of generating the model because my understanding is basketball hoops and so forth are quite – quite significant in terms of generating noise. Secondly, just in relation to the plan – the open space plan, or the open space management plan. What's the purpose of that plan?

45 MS HARRAGON: The – the actual landscape detail?

MR WILSON: No, no. The – sorry. It’s in the agenda. The – hang on a tic. The recreation management plan – open space and recreation management plan. What
- - -

5 MS HARRAGON: So – so - - -

MR WILSON: What would be the outcome of the plan?

10 MS HARRAGON: Well, it’s in response to the concerns raised by council and I think, more broadly, by a couple of the community submissions that the school continues to rely upon these public open space areas and, you know, it’s not a good balance in terms of the competing interest for those. So it was an opportunity for us to formalise a relationship where there’s a conversation that can occur between the school and council. And I guess we’re trying to drive a solution where one is not
15 provided in this application, where the school looks to a more sensitive use of the public areas of the school. We still continue to hold the position, though, that this application presents an improvement on what currently exists. There’s – as a result of these two applications, either through the concept application, improved outcomes for the junior school, and we believe that this rooftop terrace will provide an
20 improvement on this main campus.

MR WILSON: Yep.

25 MS HARRAGON: Obviously, the burden that’s currently there on that Bradfield Park is – something that we would think inappropriate for us to condition is this consent for that to stop but this management plan allows that consultation to start between council, who are that asset owner - - -

30 MR WILSON: Okay.

MS HARRAGON: - - - and obviously the asset owner for many of the other recreation facilities in the immediate district.

35 MR WILSON: Soo-Tee?

MR CHEONG: Yep. I got a question related to the design quality. I’m just looking at the green field which, especially on level 1 and level 2, you’ve got a building that’s totally – they will only have opening on – on each side. The one on the eastern side is actually open into an internal quadrangle – old quadrangle and in the other
40 side is onto the west – to the west. But – the width of the building is something like 30 metres. Do you have any concern with the quality of the internal space being only 2.7 maximum ceiling height and 30 metre one way and almost, like, 60 metre the other way?

45 MS HARRAGON: Obviously, there’s a practice, from design for a green field site, that would not be something that you would set as a target for a building of that depth and the ceiling heights. We recognise that obviously the challenges are that

this existing building footprint in some ways already is predetermined in terms of some of the ceiling heights and also the challenges of, um, achieving that much more floor space in quite a constrained area of Sydney. Um, we believe that the architect has achieved the best outcomes that are possible, given those constraints on the site.

5

MR MASLEN: And if you look at the layout on D19, the student areas are located along the eastern side and the northern side so they're fronting on to those elevations with windows, um, with, you know, facilities such as staffroom and other sort of spaces within the core. There is also a void within the centre of the building so there is, you know, some light within the middle of the building that comes through.

10

MS HARRAGON: And I think that goes all the way – where does that void actually start? From the actual rooftop?

15

MR MASLEN: Yes. Well, roof terrace.

MS HARRAGON: Other than - - -

MR MASLEN: It sits below the canopies we talked about earlier.

20

MR CHEONG: The canopies, the grass canopies. Yep.

MR MASLEN: Yep.

25

MS HARRAGON: Yep.

MR MASLEN: So that's, like, a central circulation space. It connects all of the levels.

30

MS TUOR: All right. Well, I think we're going to have to wind it up now, unfortunately. You've been very helpful. Thank you very much for coming in and will you be at the public meeting next week?

MS HARRAGON: We would – we generally make an appearance at those. Yes.

35

MS TUOR: Yep. Okay. Well, we will see you then.

MR CHEONG: Thank you.

40

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[12.58 pm]