



**AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED**

ACN 110 028 825

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

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

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

**TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS**

---

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

---

O/N H-933926

**INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION**

**PUBLIC MEETING**

**RE: LORETO KIRRIBILLI SCHOOL**

**PANEL:** **ILONA MILLAR**  
**SOO-TEE CHEONG**  
**JORGE VAN DEN BRANDE**

**PARTICIPANTS:** **DAVID GAINSFORD**  
**DOMINIC CRINNION**  
**ADITI COOMAR**

**LOCATION:** **IPC OFFICE**  
**LEVEL 17, 201 ELIZABETH STREET**  
**SYDNEY, NEW SOUTH WALES**

**DATE:** **9.04 AM, THURSDAY, 30 AUGUST 2018**

MS I. MILLAR: Okay, everyone. Ready to go?

MR .....: Yes.

5 MR .....: Yes.

MS .....: Yes.

10 MS MILLAR: Okay. We'll open the meeting. Great. Good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet, the Gadigal people, and pay my respects to their elders past and present. Welcome to the meeting today on development application SSD7919 in relation to the Loreto Kirribilli School from Ethos Urban Proprietary Limited, the applicant, who is seeking concept approval for the redevelopment of the  
15 site in three stages, comprising demolition and construction of current infrastructure, buildings, walkways, stairs and path, category 1 remediation works and minor landscaping works.

20 My name is Ilona Millar. I'm the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me is my fellow Commissioner Soo-Tee Cheong and Commission planning officer Jorge Van Den Brande. The other attendees at the meeting are from the Department of Planning and Environment. I will get you to introduce yourself in turn for the transcription service, but the notifications were we have David Gainsford, executive director of priority projects, Dominic Crinnion, team leader, and Aditi Coomar, principle  
25 planning officer.

In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting will be recorded and a full transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the  
30 Commission's decision-making process. It's taking place at a preliminary stage of the process and will form one of the several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its decision. During the meeting it's important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. But if you are asked a question and are not in a position to  
35 answer, please feel free to take it on notice and provide additional information in writing which we can put on our website. So we will now begin.

For the purposes of today's meeting, what we would like to do is first go through some background and history to the proposal and the response to submissions. I  
40 understand the submissions and the positions put by submitters during the exhibition process and talk about some of the key issues, assessments and conditions. So if I can hand over to you to introduce yourselves and then take us through those issues.

45 MR D. GAINSFORD: Sure, yeah. No, thank you for that. Yes. So David Gainsford. I'm the – as you mentioned, I'm the executive director of priority projects, which basically covers infrastructure projects, so both transport and social

structure within the department. And with me is Aditi Coomar and Dominic Crinnion, who have also been part of the assessment. So I'll hand over to Aditi and Dominic in a minute just to go through a bit of detail. We've brought some plans which we can take you through to give a bit more of an oversight to the development, and obviously we're prepared to talk to you about some of those sort of key issues and the – I guess, the reasons for referral, most of it issues that are – you know, that remain sort of contentious as part of the assessment.

So obviously the referral was something that I signed off on, so that report that you've received was an assessment that Aditi and the team completed. We've got a whole number of school projects which we're assessing at the moment. So there's a number of private schools, but also a number of public school projects at the moment and we've formed a team within the department to become expert in doing school project assessments because of the number of school projects that we've got at the moment. And so, you know, the assessment followed the same processes we've been following for all the school projects that we've been assessing, whether they have been public or private.

Because of the nature of this development being a private school and because of the council's objection, that's obviously meant we've had to refer it to the IPC, whereas for public schools where we receive council objection they go to the Minister for Planning in that circumstance. So yes, that's probably the background, unless you've got any questions in regard to that sort of general background. I mean, the other recent development with the conditions of approval – and I know when you speak to the applicant they're likely to raise some issues to do with some of the conditions, because we've had further discussions with the applicant where they've raised some concerns about what we've described as some of the standard conditions.

So we've developed a set of standard conditions across all the school projects that we're assessing now, and the applicant – you know, because – yeah, well – yeah, this is the only application that they've put into the department and they don't have the same history that the Department of Education do have raised some issues with some of those standard conditions. We can talk you through some of those issues that they've raised, as well. So do you sort of want to give a bit of a run through? We've got some plans that we can hand out to you - - -

MS A. COOMAR: Yes.

MR GAINSFORD: - - - to give a bit of an overview.

MS COOMAR: So the site for this development is Loreto Kirribilli School, which is located in close proximity to the Milsons Point Station. So this is the site. It's about 1.82 hectares and it's a private school with an enrolment at the moment of 1100 students.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

MS COOMAR: 1100 students. The site is quite unique, because it's very close to the public transport hub. It has got very clear views of the harbour and it is a very steep site. It's got about a 16-metre fall from the southern boundary to the northern boundary. It is located in an established residential area. The site itself is heritage listed and it adjoins the heritage conservation area. Apart from being heritage listed as the site itself, it does not have any specific building as such which is heritage listed. However, the important buildings within the site is the chapel, which is the highest building of the site. This is the Elamang, which was one of the oldest buildings on the site which was a residence converted to the school, and then this is also one of the older buildings, the J Block. The ..... block.

Apart from the chapel, the Elamang and the J Block, currently the site includes the Centenary Hall, the science building, there's a Mary Ward, and there's a music and performance art building, there's a Marian Centre, and there is a B Block, and then there is the junior school. So that's sort of the configuration of the site. Now, because the site is quite tight and steep, a number of the open spaces are actually located in the form of rooftop open spaces. So they've got play courts, tennis courts, currently existing on the rooftop. So as a part of the proposal, the applicant proposes to develop the site in a 50-year concept proposal with three stages. I will go to the concept proposal first.

So the application also includes details of the stage 1 works. So as a part of the concept proposal, what we're proposing is to develop the whole site into three stages, demolish buildings in stages – not all, but a few buildings in stages. Replace those buildings with new structures. But one of the main reasons for the redevelopment of the site is to create connectors which would then provide equitable access between the buildings within the site which currently does not exist because of the steep slope.

So if you look at this, there are five precincts that they've divided the site into. This is the western precinct. This is the central court, northern precinct, southern precinct, and that's the eastern precinct. As part of the stage 1 works, they're planning to demolish this building, which is the B Block here, and replace that with a seven-storey learning – seven storey, including the roof space. Then extend the gymnasium to the front towards Elamang Avenue and create outdoor terraces in front of the gymnasium. The next – the learning hub with the existing junior school building - - -

MR GAINSFORD: The orientation of that plan is the other way around.

MS COOMAR: The other way around, yes.

MS MILLAR: Yes.

MS COOMAR: This is ..... other way around to show the view from the harbour. So yes. So connect outdoor terraces with the learning hub and then create connectors so this connect ..... building connecting these two buildings and also the junior school at one level, and then do some internal refurbishments to the chapel, create some

home bases and learning studios inside and connect the St Joseph's Block with the chapel with this connector.

5 MR GAINSFORD: And when we say connectors, they're - - -

MS COOMAR: They're basically connector pod.

10 MR GAINSFORD: Yeah. They're basically lifts, aren't they? Lifts and stairs; is that - - -

MS COOMAR: Lifts and stairs, but, like, this connector pod would also have learning studios, rooftop leaning areas – it's like a learning - - -

15 MR GAINSFORD: Right.

MS COOMAR: It's a – it's a building that - - -

MR GAINSFORD: .....

20 MS COOMAR: - - - basically connects - - -

MS MILLAR: Yeah.

25 MS COOMAR: Yes. It's a small building - - -

MR S. CHEONG: ..... There's a glass - - -

MS COOMAR: Correct.

30 MR CHEONG: Enclosed by glass and – for, like, meeting room?

MR GAINSFORD: I think so - - -

35 MS COOMAR: Yes. So there would be a number of uses. Mainly learning areas.

MR CHEONG: Yeah.

MS COOMAR: Mainly learning areas and the vertical connection.

40 MR CHEONG: Yeah.

MS COOMAR: So that's the stage 1, and it will also have the landscaping proposed to the central court here, which is one of the important heritage aspects of the site.

45 MR CHEONG: What is the timeframe for stage 1?

MS COOMAR: Stage 1 they're saying they'll be done by about 2020 – 18 months is the - - -

MR CHEONG: .....

5

MS COOMAR: - - - construction timeframe – 19 months for stage 1. So they'll do it – they'll divide the stage 1 into two stages. In the first stage, they will do the site remediation which is needed in bits and pieces – clearance, excavation – and then they will construct the main building. So once that is done in the second stage then they will do all the connectors and connect the sections of the site. So the other two precincts that are proposed to be developed in the stage 2, which is this one, and stage 3, which is southern precinct, these would be developed, they are saying, in the next 50 years or so. So they're basically waiting on funding on this ..... the school, so they cannot provide us with a timeframe on when they want to redevelop those precincts.

15

MS MILLAR: And is it unusual to have a 50-year timeframe for a concept plan?

MR GAINSFORD: That is fairly unusual.

20

MS COOMAR: It is a bit unusual, yes.

MR CHEONG: The approval for DA usually is, what, five years, and you're talking about 10 times - - -

25

MS COOMAR: That's – no. So when a DA is approved then it has to be activated within the next five years.

MR CHEONG: Yes, that's my .....

30

MS COOMAR: However, once they activate the DA, then they can - - -

MR CHEONG: There's no time limit - - -

35

MS COOMAR: There's no time limit.

MR GAINSFORD: ..... stage 1 - - -

MS COOMAR: You can actually do it any time.

40

MR GAINSFORD: Yeah. Look, it is a bit unusual and I think that's right in terms of ..... Obviously it's subject to funding. So, you know, at this point in time we haven't been given any guidance on what the timeframe might be within that 50 years. They're just giving themselves a long period of time to - - -

45

MS COOMAR: Yeah. The school actually does not know. My understanding with the discussions with them is because they do not have the funds at the moment. They

just wanted to get this thing done together so that they have an idea of what they exactly wanted to do. However, it was not possible for them to provide a timeframe for stage 2 and stage 3 of the development. So this is just a general concept elevation for Elamang Avenue. This is what will be fronting the harbour. And then, just after  
5 the completion of – this is the existing elevation and these are the buildings that they would be blending in.

MR GAINSFORD: And that's the entire concept, is it?

10 MS COOMAR: That's the final planning concept when all the buildings are built. Do you want me to take you through the stage 1, because that's more - - -

MS MILLAR: Yes, please.

15 MS COOMAR: Yes. So the stage 1 works is the detailed section of the application where they're proposing to demolish an existing building and replace that with a seven-storey building, but actually six storeys with roof space. Roof space and services on top. Apart from that – this would be the main component of the stage 1 works. Apart from that, everything else has mainly connectors and, yes, this would  
20 also be a building where they're trying to recreate the façade and link the chapel with the St Joseph's ..... so that's all the 3D representation of the stage 1 works from Elamang Avenue, so that's from the other side.

MR GAINSFORD: So we've rotated it and again - - -  
25

MS COOMAR: Yes. So that's – so that's what they're planning to do is basically this would be the seven storey learning hub of which about four stories would be underground, if you look at it from a few angles, but because of the slope of the site, these areas could still be used, and then connecting these terraces to the junior school  
30 and then these proposing connectors; that's from the roof of the gymnasium.

MR CHEONG: So that's what we're looking at?

MS COOMAR: So this is you're looking at - - -  
35

MR CHEONG: From there ..... okay.

MS COOMAR: So you're looking from here.

40 MR GAINSFORD: Yes.

MS COOMAR: This is you're looking from there, and this is when you're looking from the top of the gymnasium roof.

45 MS MILLAR: So there's – is there's solar access to, effectively, all of the seven storeys?

MS COOMAR: Yes. So they have provided, in response to the submissions, provided the expert – so we asked that question. The ..... was concerned about solar access to the learning hub, to the learning areas, and the lower floors, so they provided us with a – yes. So they are getting all three hours of solar access in the morning. There is a lower-ground floor open space in this area, and all the other areas, internally, they're basically connecting to the gym, so there are like personal development space, amenities, and all these areas which would otherwise not need that much of solar access. So the main, what do you call it, PDHPE, personal development studios and learning areas on all floors would be receiving solar access.

10

MR CHEONG: What is the main use for the top floor in this learning hub?

MS COOMAR: So I will show you the section. Okay. So if we go through the sections, then these are learning studios on all floors and, on the roof, what their proposal is, when they started, when they lodged the EIS with us, they were proposing about 30 students would congregate from the roof from time to time. There would be supervised activities and they would have a roof garden, mainly to provide visual amenity to the neighbouring property at – neighbouring property at number 11 – number 111 Carabella Street, which is the main problem with the neighbouring property. So I will go through that.

20

MR GAINSFORD: So the roof garden would be a learning space as well is what they're proposing?

MS COOMAR: What they were proposing. Though the roof garden, they were saying that was just for visual amenity, not really a learning space. So the context of the site, if we look at it, this is where the learning hub is going to go in. So there is a residential ..... building over here, which is three storeys, and it's located very close to the site. It's about two metres setback, max to max. There is a unit over here, which is unit number 9 on the uppermost floor, which would have direct visual access to the rooftop. So this is what you will be able to see from the living room of that unit – living room, kitchen of that unit. So we've got the floorplan of that area as well.

30

So in order to provide some visual amenity to the unit-owners, to the neighbours, they propose that they will be providing a roof garden and they said we will have some supervised activities on the roof and that roof of the learning hub would also act as a connector between the existing building, which is this Marian Centre and this new building that's coming up. So they were proposing accessible connection between the two buildings via the roof.

40

So the department had raised concerns about the use of the rooftop, mainly because of its proximity to the neighbouring property, because that is basically their only outlook at the moment. They do not have the views of the harbour, apart from this restricted district view and sky views. However, from the aspect of visual privacy and because this was going to be used as a circulation space, the roof in itself, the department raised concerns that they provide alternate equitable access at other

45



levels, which was also available, rather than the roof, so that the visual privacy of this neighbour is not impacted upon, and that was one of the reasons why we have recommended conditions to restrict the usage of the roof, just for maintenance and cleaning purposes.

5

Apart from that, the department has also recommended a condition that that roof garden be removed, because, at the moment, it is unclear why that roof garden is really needed. What the applicant has indicated is that the roof garden would provide amenity, visual amenity, to the neighbours, so our question then was it wouldn't be too visible from the neighbouring property anyway and they are proposing planter boxes, etcetera, to provide some relief to these walls for the neighbours. So to the department, the roof garden was sort of something that could have – that could be excluded and, if it is there, then it would probably result in more congregation of students at the rooftop.

15

MR CHEONG: Yes. So the rooftop is not the only mean of connection. It can be, if it's inclement weather, you cannot use it anyway.

MS COOMAR: True.

20

MR CHEONG: So there must be some alternate connection.

MS COOMAR: There is alternate connection at other floors.

25

MR CHEONG: Yes.

MS COOMAR: So from the Marian Centre, they can connect. It would not be as easy as the roof. The roof would have probably been the easiest way to connect, but the students can access that building.

30

MR GAINSFORD: So I think – so we were simply, because the residents, as I understand it, from that unit, have raised an objection to the proposed development and we were sympathetic to some of the concerns they had, which is part of the reason why we've recommended not giving - - -

35

MR CHEONG: Initially, yeah.

MR GAINSFORD: Not giving access to the students there and I think, with the balustrade that they propose in there as well, which we suggest it gets removed.

40

MS MILLAR: Okay.

45

MS COOMAR: And that would – my understanding, they're going to – they're not going to retain this bit of the water that they can see. The reason they can now view this water is because this existing building is about three metres below the permissible height limit. So as soon as a building, which is 12 metres high, which is the permissible height limit for that area, gets built, that section of the view would be

lost, and I've questioned the location of the mechanical plant and they have now provided quite strong justification as to why that mechanical plant has to be there and they have - - -

5 MR J. VAN DEN BRANDE: Is there – there will be, contrary to the government architects ..... like .....

MR GAINSFORD: If they moved it?

10 MR VAN DEN BRANDE: Yes. It's a .....

MS COOMAR: Yes. So the government – so with the mechanical plant planned, they have actually divided it into two components and they have moved one of the components to the ground level. So this is just the residual section of the mechanical  
15 plant which cannot be technically removed from there, and they have provided quite strong justification on that, and I've agreed to that.

MR GAINSFORD: Okay.

20 MS COOMAR: So if the roof access can be restricted, then the neighbours can, first of all, retain some of the sky views and the district views that they have at the moment and then have some visual privacy as well. As such, the location of the learning hub, the applicant has demonstrated that it is not going to have any visual impacts on any other units that were otherwise enjoying the views of the harbour, so  
25 their view impact analysis was quite comprehensive and, yes, so it did not – it would not be impacting a severe impact, I would say. So that - - -

MR GAINSFORD: So we know that the applicant hasn't accepted those changes.

30 MS COOMAR: Yes.

MR GAINSFORD: So they've raised concerns about those changes that we've recommended.

35 MS COOMAR: So the applicant has raised concerns about us restricting the use of the roof and removal of the roof garden, because they think it does form a significant part of providing visual amenity to the neighbours. So that is one aspect of the development. Apart from that, the learning hub itself has been sunk underground, as  
40 you can see, as much as possible to avoid visual bulk impacts on the neighbouring properties, and as it will stand now, it would be lower than the existing building on Carabella Street, so it really would not be visible from the Carabella Street frontage. From the harbour and Elamang Avenue, yes, it would be visible, but it would blend with the general buildings within the site and the building is quite well-separated  
45 from the chapel and Elamang and it maintains the heritage ..... of that site as well.

MS MILLAR: Just in terms of the view from Elamang Avenue, one of the issues raised was in respect of the materials selected. Do you have any comments on the  
- - -

5 MS COOMAR: Yes.

MS MILLAR: - - - the materials?

10 MS COOMAR: So with the materials, there was a bit of a contradiction between what the government architect raised and what the council raised. So the council was quite happy that they were using recessive materials, which was – I've got the materials here, which - - -

15 MR VAN DEN BRANDE: The dark tone, yes.

MS COOMAR: The dark tone materials - - -

MS MILLAR: Okay.

20 MS COOMAR: - - - which suits the heritage conservation area. The government architect requested that the materials be a light-coloured materials, which would be similar – which would have less reflectivities. My understanding and my discussions with the applicant and the reading of the Heritage Impact Statement was that they are going to salvage sandstone walls from underneath these buildings, which they think  
25 are existing. So if possible, they will be re-using those sandstone walls and using additional sandstone walls, which replicate those, so that they pick up on the colours that were existing in the gymnasium building, and then use them on the lower floors. So the lower floors would have the lighter colours to blend with the existing colour, and then they would use recessive colours on the top that would then blend with the  
30 Marian Centre. So I think it was quite a good approach and a balanced approach to deal with the heritage conservation area and the existing buildings. So that was just my conclusion on that.

35 MS MILLAR: Okay.

MR CHEONG: So what colour is that?

40 MS COOMAR: So – I will just show you the elevation here. It's just a clearer elevation. Just give me a moment. I actually had that bit and – yes. So that would be the side elevation. So it'll be ..... brick and concrete in darker colours. It's exactly not this colour. It's looking much black than it actually is, which would generally match.

45 MR GAINSFORD: So, sorry, this is darker than .....

MS COOMAR: This is darker than what the actual material ..... was that they provided us.

MR GAINSFORD: Yes .....

MS COOMAR: So it'll generally match the Marian Centre, and the lower levels  
5 from the gymnasium would be matching these colours. So these are the proposed  
colours which match the Centenary Hall, science building and all these buildings that  
are existing.

MR CHEONG: Right.

10 MS MILLAR: And then I think there were metal mesh ..... sort of covers .....

MS COOMAR: There was a metal mesh. There was a metal mesh to - - -

MS MILLAR: ..... façade.

15 MS COOMAR: To avoid air-conditioning and then provide natural ventilation and  
security to the learning areas - - -

MS MILLAR: Okay.

20 MS COOMAR: - - - and also, obviously, an architectural feature.

MR CHEONG: Can you tell me, on figure 40, where is that corner in .....

25 MS COOMAR: That would be - - -

MS MILLAR: This is figure 40 of the department's report - - -

MR CHEONG: Report.

30 MS MILLAR: - - - on page 47 of the department's report.

MS COOMAR: Okay. I will have to bring out that plan, then, if you give me a bit  
35 of time ..... so this would be that – that corner, that corner of the building, when you  
compare it with the building that's here.

MR CHEONG: Right. And what is the use of that .....

MS COOMAR: They're just proposed storage areas and all these sort of areas there,  
40 and ..... the rooftop, it would be – there would be a section of the covered learning  
area, but they've got a screen.

MR CHEONG: All right. And what is this bluish colour?

45 MS COOMAR: The blue colour stands for all the learning areas.

MR CHEONG: Yes.

- MS COOMAR: So they have proposed storage areas and less active areas to adjoin the neighbouring property, to avoid privacy impacts. So those are the orange areas, which are basically their amenity and storage areas.
- 5 MR GAINSFORD: So that's supposed to .....
- MS COOMAR: That's a better plan. So they've got store ..... areas on here. So that's the building. So that's why they'll be able to see this corner.
- 10 MR CHEONG: Right. Okay. So if it is the - - -
- MS COOMAR: So this is also typical for - - -
- MR CHEONG: So if it is a concern, would – could that be reduced?
- 15 MS COOMAR: Which section?
- MR CHEONG: The corner section.
- 20 MS COOMAR: Could that be cut out or reduced?
- MR CHEONG: Yeah.
- MS COOMAR: Well, yes. That would reduce the whole building ..... have to go through all the floor plans to see if that can be .....
- 25 MR CHEONG: No. We're talking about just the top section.
- MS COOMAR: The top floor?
- 30 MR CHEONG: Yeah.
- MS COOMAR: Okay ..... this is level 1. So I'll go up to level 6 ..... level 4, level 5. Just give me a moment. There are quite a few plans. On the top – yes. I don't think there'd be too much of a problem to cut that out, actually, to step that back, because all they have to step back is their outdoor learning area and their wet area - - -
- 35 MR CHEONG: Yeah. Yeah.
- 40 MS COOMAR: - - - which they have, to some extent, done, because they've stepped the roof. So that's the roof.
- MR CHEONG: Right.
- 45 MS COOMAR: So there is a plant room. So even if they step that back, they will still have the plant room there, though. So you're just saying – step this setback – set it back more.

MR CHEONG: Yeah. I just wonder - - -

MS COOMAR: Yeah.

5 MR CHEONG: - - - what does that - - -

MS MILLAR: What does that mean in terms of access to the plant room? Yeah.

MS COOMAR: Yes. No. There is – they won't have any access to the plant room  
10 - - -

MS MILLAR: Plant room.

MS COOMAR: - - - because if you look at this from – say I'm sitting on this  
15 window, I ..... be able to just see the walls. The person that's accessing the plant  
room will be from this side - - -

MR CHEONG: Yeah.

20 MS COOMAR: - - - and there'll be planter boxes here. So they have just given you  
the massing. If you actually look at the elevation, there will be planter boxes  
proposed all along - - -

MR CHEONG: Yeah.

25 MS COOMAR: .....

MR CHEONG: So one floor down from here is – that's what they - - -

30 MS COOMAR: The wet areas.

MR CHEONG: That's what they see, is that corner.

MS COOMAR: Correct. They see a wall.

35 MR CHEONG: Yeah.

MS COOMAR: And I've given you that - - -

40 MR CHEONG: So is there a possibility that one floor can be taken off or - - -

MS COOMAR: The whole floor can be taken off?

MR CHEONG: No. No. No. No. Just that corner.

45 MS COOMAR: That recess?

MR CHEONG: Yes.

MS COOMAR: Yes. It is a possibility. It could be amendment to their plans. This is what it is at the moment.

5 MS MILLAR: .....

MS COOMAR: So if they take out that section, they will have to take out – yes. There will be a further step.

10 MR CHEONG: Yeah. Yes. Just a further step. Yep.

MS COOMAR: Yep. Yeah. I'm not sure how much ..... view improvement that would be, though, taking out that section, but it can be taken out. It would not have too much of an impact on the - - -

15 MR CHEONG: .....

MS COOMAR: - - - built form.

20 MR GAINSFORD: ..... certainly a question for the applicant as well.

MS COOMAR: Yes.

25 MR CHEONG: Sure. Yep. Yes. It's not only just the view but being faced with a blank wall.

MR GAINSFORD: Yeah.

30 MR CHEONG: Yeah.

MR GAINSFORD: Yeah .....

MS COOMAR: It's actually not a full blank wall. Yeah. This section will be a blank wall, actually. Right. A section of it would be a blank wall.

35 MR GAINSFORD: Would you like us to move on to the traffic issues?

MR CHEONG: Yeah .....

40 MS MILLAR: Any more questions about design and views?

MR CHEONG: No. I think that was my last question on it.

45 MS MILLAR: So ..... gardens covered, materials and ..... okay. Yeah. If we can move on to traffic, that would be great.

MR GAINSFORD: Okay. Okay.

MS MILLAR: Okay.

5 MR GAINSFORD: So maybe just as a quick introduction – so, obviously, this was  
the main part of council’s objection to the proposal, and the main issue, I guess –  
because the concept proposal was – what’s ..... number ..... 30. So it’s a very small  
increase in its user numbers. So, really, the majority of the issues that have been  
10 they’re to do with existing issues, and, you know, the concerns of council, I guess,  
are around some of the pick-up and drop-off - - -

MS MILLAR: Yeah.

15 MR GAINSFORD: - - - aspects of the area and also traffic congestions caused by  
students. So they were issues that we interrogated as part of our assessment as well.  
Council’s concern – remaining concern, even with some of the mitigations which  
we’ll talk about in a minute, are that their view is that the pick-up and drop-off  
20 facility should be on site and should not be out on the surrounding streets. The  
applicant has argued very strongly that they don’t have the capacity to provide those  
facilities on their site. It doesn’t appear to us to be an issue of parking. There seems  
to be sufficient parking that’s associated with the existing development. It’s really  
that issue of drop-off and pick-up and then traffic congestion that’s caused by that.

25 So the applicant’s offered up a scheme now, a permit sort of scheme, as part of what  
they’re proposing, which we think has got some merit to it, and we can go through  
that in detail as well. We’ve also then proposed a series of conditions to, I guess,  
audit and monitor. The success of those sorts of measures that they’ve proposed.  
The applicant’s a bit uncomfortable with some of those requirements. They feel it’s  
30 a bit of overkill, I guess, but we certainly feel that that’s necessary for what’s being  
proposed. Aditi, do you want to go through just where the issues are at the moment.

MS COOMAR: So ..... the main problem is the ongoing traffic issues with the  
school at the moment. So the school is located, obviously, in a very close proximity  
35 to such a major transport hub, to Milsons Point station and bus stops. However, if  
you look at the surveys, they are very heavily dependent on private vehicle usage,  
and it’s not just students. It’s also the staff and – which has probably led to the  
residents’ angst and the community not being generally happy with staff parking on  
the street. The drop-off zones, according to council and according to the other  
40 surveys that have been conducted by their own traffic consultant, is during the drop –  
pick-up period, not really drop-off, because drop-off is more staggered in the  
mornings.

Pick-up period, there is a queue on the northern part of Carabella Street, and, because  
45 of that queuing and the street being so narrow, traffic is blocked for a period of 15 to  
20 minutes, 20 minutes on Carabella Street. Now, these are the main reasons from  
where council’s objections obviously come, and council has then recommended that



they have an on-site pick-up/drop-off zone. Now, given there the site is – the slope of the site and the heritage buildings existing there ..... it is – the applicant has actually demonstrated that it would be impossible to have a drop-off zone within the site. Now, in order to resolve the ongoing traffic issues, the applicant did not offer us  
5 anything. However, what they did was reduce the number of students from 100 to 30, which was a big improvement to the overall – to the overall proposal. The applicant then also offered that they would be converting the whole drop-off zone for the junior school use only.

10 So the junior school has 252 students, whereas the entire school has – is going to have 1130 students. So if only a small section of the students then use the drop-off zone, that should be reducing the queuing. They have done quite a detailed workplace travel plan, which my understanding is, if it gets implemented, it would take some time, but it would generally target to reduce the usage of the private  
15 vehicles by the staff. So what we have – what the department have now recommended is, following approval of this development, if it gets approved, then within the next six months they should be preparing an operational traffic management plan where they basically show how this drop-off zone is going to work with just the 252 students.

20 They have provided us with details of a permit system, so a sticker that they will introduce in the cars of the junior school students so that only the cars with the stickers are the ones that are dropped off and picked – permitted to be dropped off or picked up from that zone. They have appointed a traffic warden already, according  
25 to the school principal, and they're also proposing a few other control measures that they can implement. So the department's understanding and the recommendation is that, if they do implement the operational traffic management plan, then there is a possibility that, with time, the traffic congestion created on Carabella Street due to the school improves.

30 This, in conjunction with the workplace travel plan implementation, would then also reduce the private vehicle usage of that school. And until they actually implement the OTMP and then monitor it and provide us with some results, that – that we do not approve the increase in the student numbers.

35 MS MILLAR: Now, with the student numbers, the – is it fixed between the junior and senior school, or is it a total number across the school?

40 MS COOMAR: So the total number is the – you mean the increase in the student numbers?

MS MILLAR: No, I understand the increase is the - - -

45 MS COOMAR: .....

MS MILLAR: - - - ..... senior school, but are the – is the split – you know, will the 252 remain the same or - - -

- MS COOMAR: That is what they have said.
- MS MILLAR: So it will - - -
- 5 MS COOMAR: That is what – the 252 will remain the same.
- MR CHEONG: So the junior school student number remain unchanged.
- MS COOMAR: That’s what – that is what the school have told us.
- 10 MS MILLAR: Okay. And then a further question in terms of the management of the junior school staggering of timing, that’s included as part of the management plan? The junior school drop-off and pick-up times aren’t – you know, are staggered as well?
- 15 MS COOMAR: No. There’s junior – so what they’ve said is the drop-off times according – in accordance with their surveys are generally staggered. It operates over a period of 15 minutes to half an hour. The pick-up time is the one that cannot be staggered, because that is the time when the school finishes, which is why they
- 20 wouldn’t be able to stagger the time.
- MR GAINSFORD: But maybe the question is is there an ability for junior school to finish at a different time to senior school or - - -
- 25 MS COOMAR: They have not provided that to us.
- MR GAINSFORD: Okay.
- MS COOMAR: I did not think that was an option for them. So the main difference
- 30 that the school basically said was – would make is just making the junior school use that, which would be 252 at the moment. The senior school students are using that drop-off and pick-up zone, which is why there is a huge queuing.
- MR GAINSFORD: Okay. So one of the things – I mean, with the permit system, I
- 35 guess, we – one of the concerns potentially of the permit system is that it’s just pushing, you know, the drop-off/pick-up issue for the senior school into other areas, into the surrounding streets ..... one of the reasons why we recommended that operational traffic management plan, to really interrogate what is actually happening, you know, with some of these mitigations in place. From the school’s perspective,
- 40 they’re suggesting that that permit system should encourage senior school students to be making greater use of public transport. Which, you know, if you look at the surveys, there is much – a much higher proportion of those senior school students that are using public transport compared to the junior school.
- 45 MS COOMAR: That’s correct.
- MR CHEONG: So there - - -

MS COOMAR: Yeah.

MR CHEONG: There is no problem with pick-up in Elamang Avenue?

5 MS COOMAR: So there is no pick-up in Elamang Avenue at the moment.

MR GAINSFORD: Formalised, but - - -

10 MS COOMAR: There are no formalised. So what the residents in a lot of the submissions and what council have said is people are using Elamang Avenue for drop-offs and pick-ups. But it is an ongoing security – it is an ongoing social issue that is existing because of the mix of land use and conflict of land use in that area which really is not a part of the – what they’re proposing at the moment. So what we can – what we have tried to do through the recommended conditions is improve the  
15 situation, if that can be.

MR CHEONG: So there’s – in your table, does it show any pick-up and drop-off for senior school at all – students?

20 MS COOMAR: No. They have just given us in their surveys a total number of students that get – that is – that are getting dropped off and picked up.

MR GAINSFORD: They haven’t split it up into - - -

25 MS COOMAR: No.

MR GAINSFORD: All right.

30 MS COOMAR: Because there is no formalised drop-off/pick-u on Elamang Avenue. So students shouldn’t be really picked up and dropped off there.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Any other questions about – I had a question about the Bitzios study that you commissioned. Has – did that take into account the  
35 proponent’s response to submissions and the additional material - - -

MS COOMAR: Yes.

MS MILLAR: - - - provided by McLaren? Because the date appeared to be quite  
40 close to - - -

MS COOMAR: They may have not – no, no, no, they did. Because the majority of the additional information that came in was actually requested when Bitzios was commissioned to do the report, and then they raised quite a few concerns and did a gap analysis. So in response to that the applicant then came back. So with the  
45 walking routes, the only information that was submitted after the Bitzios report came to me was the safe walking routes and the bus routes and cyclist routes, which I did not send back to Bitzios, because Bitzios wanted that to be conditioned, and now I’ve

received that information, so I just included that. So that bit of the information would probably be after the report, yes.

5 MR GAINSFORD: And as we've done historically, if you've got further questions that you feel that you need some specialist advice on, we're happy to make available ..... to help with that ..... questions.

MS COOMAR: So the applicant is – sorry?

10 MR CHEONG: In the council objection, it says that a proposal does not address the concerns raised by council regarding the adverse impact on local traffic. What are those adverse impact that they are talking about?

15 MS COOMAR: So what council – so council's main concerns were that there is queuing because of the use of the drop-off and pick-up zone. Students are getting dropped off and picked up in the surrounding streets because of which they receive resident complaints all the time and council therefore requests that an onsite drop-off-pick up zone - - -

20 MR CHEONG: .....

MS COOMAR: - - - be provided. So that's why they've come back and said that the applicant has not responded to our concerns.

25 MR CHEONG: I see.

MR GAINSFORD: So even when we went back to council and said, well, here are the sorts of mitigations and conditions that we're recommending, they maintain their objection primarily because they ..... that that pick-up and drop-off is actually  
30 happening on the school site.

MS COOMAR: So the council – this response to submissions are – sorry, council submission that I received after the response to submissions was on the 26<sup>th</sup> of March, around that time. So between March and August the applicant has submitted  
35 at least three sets of supplementary responses to submissions. I have forwarded them to council. I have not received any response back.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Now – but council has had input into the - - -

40 MS COOMAR: Conditions - - -

MS MILLAR: - - - conditions?

45 MS COOMAR: Yes.

MS MILLAR: So – and those conditions have responded to the additional information.

MS COOMAR: That's right. So when I sent the draft conditions through to council for review, we actually added one or two things to the conditions, but they were generally – the staff were generally happy. However, they reiterated that this does not constitute our support for the proposal.

5

MR GAINSFORD: Were there other issues, Aditi, that we should - - -

MS COOMAR: Just that the council – that the applicant has raised concerns about construction truck delivery times. You will find there is a construction truck delivery time that has been quite stringently restricted by us in our conditions to be till about 2 pm only. There was a construction management plan that was submitted by the applicant and Bitzios based the delivery times in their assessment based on the applicant's CMP. Their construction management plan talked about excavation phases where they were expecting more than 40 vehicles a day, and then they said that, "We will try to have three rounds of trucks between 7 am and 2 pm."

10  
15

We restricted the construction delivery times to be up to 2 pm to address the overall concerns raised by council and the residents and also because there was no assessment of the main roads impact with the construction delivery times. The applicant has raised concerns that this will have impact on their construction timing significantly and that this condition be basically taken out and that they be allowed, especially for concrete pouring in all these phases, they be allowed to have construction delivery between 7 am and 6 pm, just within the blanket cover of the construction hours.

20  
25

MS MILLAR: And then what about – obviously that has flow-on impacts if that coincides with pick-up, drop-off times. Would it be feasible to exclude those times from deliveries, if we were looking to conditions?

MS COOMAR: I – I think we have to deliver.

30

MS MILLAR: Yes.

MS COOMAR: I think we have to exclude those times, because there are work zones - - -

35

MR GAINSFORD: Yes.

MS COOMAR: - - - and those work zones will conflict with the drop-off, pick-up zone on Carabella Street. So I have raised that with the applicant in the meeting that we had about the conditions that, notwithstanding even if we end up extending the hours, we actually do not have an assessment of what the construction impacts would be, then, after the peak hours, because the commuter peak hours would start after that.

40  
45

MS MILLAR: So any further questions about the traffic impacts?

MR CHEONG: Not on traffic. Nothing .....

MS MILLAR: Okay. One further question just, I think, from an administrative perspective: have we got any final confirmations for transport for New South Wales  
5 about the decision on the revised proposal?

MS COOMAR: Just with the response to submissions.

MR GAINSFORD: Yes.  
10

MS COOMAR: Yes. Transport for New South Wales just said that they needed to a road safety evaluation.

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: Yes, because on your website, the ..... transport says  
15 that the issues haven't been addressed yet. So perhaps did you have any further correspondence that closes that loop?

MS COOMAR: No. What they said is the issues were not addressed, but then they give a set of conditions, which I have, like the road safety evaluation - - -  
20

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: Okay.

MS COOMAR: - - - and the construction management plan.

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: And those conditions have been put in too?  
25

MS COOMAR: Yes.

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: And they are happy with those conditions?  
30

MS COOMAR: Well, they have recommended those conditions.

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: It will be best if you have closed the loop for - - -

MS COOMAR: Okay. Yes, I can do that.  
35

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: Yes. I mean, it could be an email. If you just simply .....

MS COOMAR: Yes, I can do that from .....

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: - - - close that loop.

MS COOMAR: Yes. I can do that. I will take that on notice actually and I will  
45 contact Transport.

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: Yes.

MS COOMAR: Yes.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Soo-Tee.

5 MR CHEONG: Just one question on the ..... that – on the departmental report, page 39. Obviously, there’s an error. It - - -

MS COOMAR: Yes. So I have to clarify, the diagrams are correct, just this needs to be 12 - - -

10 MR CHEONG: Yes.

MS COOMAR: - - - and the second one needs to be nine.

15 MR CHEONG: Yes. So long as the - - -

MS COOMAR: This is all – this is all from their EIS.

MR CHEONG: Yes. So long as they reflect what was actually is the actual case.

20 MS COOMAR: Yes, they do reflect the actual case, it’s just the labelling that has been erroneous.

MR CHEONG: Yes.

25 MS COOMAR: The diagrams are correct.

MR CHEONG: So long as the ..... on that ..... were transferred into that.

30 MS COOMAR: No, no, no.

MR CHEONG: Okay.

MS COOMAR: No, no, no. Sorry about that one labelling error.

35 MS MILLAR: Okay. Can we move on to conditions.

MR GAINSFORD: Sure.

40 MS MILLAR: In terms of the process that you’ve undertaken with the applicant on the conditions, the – it appears that the applicant’s comments have come after the proposed conditions that are incorporated in the report that we’ve got. Is that - - -

MS COOMAR: No. So there has been two rounds of - - -

45 MS MILLAR: Two rounds.

MS COOMAR: Two rounds of condition discussions with the applicant. So I received an email from the applicant on 17 August which stated, after I have indicated what our position was on the conditions. The email back from the applicant was they did not have any further comments to make on the conditions, however, they had broader concerns regarding the conditions from the department.

MR GAINSFORD: Which comes back to that point that I made before about some of the standard conditions that we're now imposing on these types of developments and so there was a subsequent meeting that was held, between our team and the applicant, where they raised some issues about some of those standard conditions and we can – we can go through that.

MS COOMAR: So we explained, and we walked them through the conditions and explained the majority of the standard conditions that the department is trying to roll out for all such social developments. They are very new conditions, so the applicant is not quite well-acquainted with how to implement those conditions. A lot of them are post-approval audit reports and environment audit reports that they have to prepare and implement. So we have explained, from our end, however, they will probably be taking it up with IPC and requesting clarification.

MS MILLAR: Okay. Then just looking through the issues raised by them – and I'm putting aside the standard conditions and the secretary directions – one point was in respect of the level of description for the OTAMP.

MS COOMAR: Yes. I haven't received any - - -

MS MILLAR: Sorry, I just want to go through – that's A24. So the department have ..... sort of the elements as follows and they proposed "such as" – which .....

MS COOMAR: Which – we discussed that and he said that if IPC agrees then ..... will do that with IPC with the "such as". It would not have too much of an impact on the condition, the "such as" bit.

MS MILLAR: Then the next point is just the use of the roof garden and ..... tested, so ..... the ..... what that ..... option ..... and the blaster, which is - - -

MS COOMAR: Yes.

MS MILLAR: - - - I think - - -

MS COOMAR: The rock-breaking.

MS MILLAR: - - - the rock-breaking. So - - -

MS COOMAR: So they have requested that the times be from 8 am to 12.30 pm and then 1.30 pm to 5 pm with a one hour respite. Their noise assessment report states that breaking should be undertaken from 9 pm.



MS MILLAR: 9 am.

MS COOMAR: 9 am, sorry. So that was one of the reasons and the two hour  
5 respite period has been a standard requirement from the department for all schools in  
residential areas.

MR GAINSFORD: The original version of that condition, without those suggested  
changes by the applicant, is something we apply for all infrastructure developments  
10 basically, so that's a very standard condition, and that's not a new condition. That's  
- - -

MR VAN DEN BRANDE: So this change is just for them to have a better plan to  
construct faster?

15 MR GAINSFORD: Yes, that's right.

MS COOMAR: Yes. So it is all – if they have two hours of respite period every  
day, they're saying that their construction delivery time is going to increase.

20 MR VAN DEN BRANDE: Yes, it will be a ..... yes, okay.

MS MILLAR: Okay. And in terms of impacted neighbours, there they seem to be  
asserting that, you know, they're the only affected, or the primarily affected - - -

25 MS COOMAR: Neighbour number 9. Unit number 9.

MS MILLAR: Unit 9, of course.

MR GAINSFORD: Are you talking about visual or - - -

30 MS MILLAR: Yes. No, no, no, from a noise, acoustic - - -

MR GAINSFORD: The noise.

35 MS COOMAR: Well, we have received concerns from residents of this unit,  
obviously, with regard to noise, vibration and - - -

MS MILLAR: Yes.

40 MS COOMAR: - - - just during construction times, but their noise and vibration  
report was quite comprehensive. It did – it did have noise goals, noise management  
levels, how the vibration would be controlled, and we have recommended conditions  
that they prepare a final construction noise and vibration management plan, and my  
45 understanding is, yes, there would be a bit of a disruption for some for a short period  
of time, but with the recommended conditions, that can be managed.

MS MILLAR: Okay.

MS COOMAR: And that's why we have the post-approval conditions as well with audits and all these other things.

5 MS MILLAR: And then the final area for conditions appears to be in respect of event notification. So that's the – is that a council issue or a - - -

MR GAINSFORD: No, it's sort of - - -

10 MS MILLAR: It's part of the school's approach.

MR GAINSFORD: Yes, it is. So one of the things – and again this is sort of a standard that we're trying to apply across all school projects now, is schools, we're seeing, increasingly are being used out of hours, you know, for various other functions, and we're quite supportive of that approach, particularly we're seeing  
15 some Department of Education facilities now being – having, you know, halls and various things being used outside of school hours and being used by the community, which is great, but it comes with it, obviously, some impacts and often those schools are not able to comprehensively tell us exactly what events are going to be used. They can tell us about the topology of events that are likely to be used.

20 So we've spent – we're spending a bit of time in our assessments now trying to understand what the impacts of those events are going to be. One of them, to us, is about being transparent with the community around those schools and making sure that those communities are aware of, you know, whether it be on a fortnightly basis or get – receive some sort of notification about the types of events that are happening  
25 at those school sites.

In this case, the applicants raise concerns with that, that notification process, primarily, as we understand it, from a security point of view. So, you know, I will let  
30 the applicants talk you through that, but they've talked about their concerns and Kirribilli House is an issue and to do with providing those notifications. I'm not sure I'm convinced about that issue, but, you know, that's something that they've raised in terms of an objection to that condition.

35 MS MILLAR: Okay.

MR CHEONG: If we've got - - -

40 MS MILLAR: Yes, go.

MR CHEONG: Can I go back to just the rock-breaking. Say possibly you're putting a condition that they use less noisier – like rock-sawing. Nowadays, you - - -

45 MS COOMAR: We have, in the construction noise and vibration management plan, they have techniques of using less noisy equipment and less of jackhammering and all these sort of things.

MR CHEONG: Yes.

MR GAINSFORD: Yes. So like city – you know, what do they call them – city standard sort of jackhammers.

5 MS COOMAR: City-standard jackhammers.

MR GAINSFORD: I know rock-sawing sometimes you need a certain amount of space to be able to do the rock-sawing efficiently - - -

10 MR CHEONG: Yes.

MR GAINSFORD: - - - rather than the jackhammering, so, yes, I'm not quite sure of the details of - - -

15 MS COOMAR: They have provided details of what they can do, what are the – what are the measures that they can take to reduce the noise, but there would still be noise.

20 MR GAINSFORD: Yes.

MR CHEONG: Yes.

MS COOMAR: And it would be over the 75 dBA; that's the required – and the ICNG does not specify how much respite hours are required exactly; whether it's one hour or two hours.

25 MR GAINSFORD: Hard to go anywhere in Sydney at the moment without hearing jackhammers, isn't it?

30 MR VAN DEN BRANDE: I have one right next door.

MS MILLAR: Soo-Tee, any further - - -

35 MR CHEONG: No more.

MS MILLAR: - - - questions?

MR CHEONG: No more questions from me.

40 MS MILLAR: Okay. I think that's it from our side. Thank you very much for that; that's been very, very helpful.

MR GAINSFORD: A pleasure.

45 MS COOMAR: Thank you.

- MS MILLAR: And if there's an additional material or information we need from you - - -
- MR GAINSFORD: Yes, please.
- 5 MS MILLAR: - - - we will be in touch.
- MS COOMAR: Yes.
- 10 MR GAINSFORD: Yes. And the other thing I was going to offer is obviously if you need to, you know, get across a lot of the detail, having been the assessment officer for the project, if, when you're planning to visit the site, I think you might even be doing that today.
- 15 MR CHEONG: .....
- MR GAINSFORD: You know, I'm perfectly happy to make myself available or if you would like us to make any other sort of briefings, happy – happy to .....
- 20 MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you very much for that. I think, from here, we will be meeting with council, inspecting the site, and meeting with the applicant - - -
- MR GAINSFORD: Yes.
- 25 MS MILLAR: - - - as we sort of go through the process of assessing all of the information. Yes.
- MR GAINSFORD: Okay.
- 30 MS COOMAR: Of course ..... the department, we have met with the majority of the residents of number 111 Carabella Street and we had access to quite a few of the residents, so we have had a look at what views they have at the moment and what would be the impact.
- 35 MS MILLAR: Okay. Thank you very much.
- MR CHEONG: Thank you.
- MS MILLAR: I ..... the meeting closed.
- 40 MR GAINSFORD: Thank you.
- MS COOMAR: Thank you.
- 45 MR VAN DEN BRANDE: Thanks.

**RECORDING CONCLUDED**

**[10.03 am]**