



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-1431100

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

DEPARTMENT MEETING

RE: MORIAH COLLEGE REDEVELOPMENT (SSD 10352)

PANEL: **PETER DUNCAN (Chair)**
ADRIAN PILTON

OFFICE OF IPC: **KATE MOORE**
REBECKA GROTH
LAUREN DONOHOE

DEPARTMENT: **KAREN HARRAGON**
BRENT DEVINE
KELLY MCNICOL

LOCATION: **VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE**

DATE: **1.02 PM, WEDNESDAY, 31 MARCH 2021**

MR P. DUNCAN: We'll get started. Good afternoon and welcome. Good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their elders, past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today for the Moriah
5 College Redevelopment Project. Moriah College is located in Queens Park approximately six kilometres south-east of the Sydney CBD. Consent is sought for a concept proposal for the redevelopment of the existing senior school campus and an increase in student numbers by 290 students staged over a 15 year period. Consent is also sought for stage 1 development works which includes an additional 160 students
10 in kindergarten to year 12.

My name is Peter Duncan. I am chair of this Commission panel. I'm joined by my fellow Commissioner Adrian Pilton. We are also joined by Kate Moore from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission and Rebecca Growth and Lauren
15 Donohoe, consultants assisting the Commission. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the
20 Commission will base its determination. It is important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate.

If you're asked a question and not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing which we'll
25 then put on our website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time and for all members to ensure they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure the accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin. Karen, just as we're beginning, there's an agenda there. There's two additional items after seeing the site last week we just would like you to cover in
30 discussions if you can. One is this – is how construction traffic and school traffic is going to be dealt with.

If you can't answer it today, but if we could get some feedback on that, we're particularly interested in tradespeople and where they park and the mix with school
35 traffic. The other one is just a little bit more on the trees to be removed if possible but happy to have it after the meeting.

MS K. HARRAGON: Okay.

40 MR DUNCAN: So over to you, Karen.

MS HARRAGON: Thank you. I acknowledge those additional questions and we'll come to those at the end of the meeting.

45 MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MS HARRAGON: So thank you for today. So good afternoon. I am Karen Harragon, director of social infrastructure assessments at the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment and I'm here today with my colleague Brent Devine from the schools infrastructure assessments team and we're assisted by Kelly
5 McNicol from SKM Planning. So I'm actually just going to share my screen as we go through our presentation. Bear with me one moment.

MR DUNCAN: We have it now.

10 MS HARRAGON: Okay.

MR DUNCAN: I might just ask if you could put it on full screen if you can the whole presentation. It makes it a little larger from this side.

15 MS HARRAGON: I might see if I can do so. Just one moment then.

MR DUNCAN: That's it. Perfect. Thank you.

20 MS HARRAGON: So I may have some issues with seeing my notes so I might just see how I can do that. So just bear with me one moment. Yes. I think I might have some trouble with sharing and seeing my notes at the same time so - - -

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Well, do it – I think for the transcript it's probably best that
25 you can refer to the notes so do it as you were going - - -

MS HARRAGON: Okay. So – so sorry for that. I will see if I can actually make it a bit larger though. So our presentation today will outline – our presentation today will outline the Department's approach to the assessment of the SSD application for
30 Moriah College Redevelopment in Queens Park. The application is for a concept proposal and for first stage of development including an increase in student numbers. We will speak to the student numbers in more detail in our presentation. The application is SSD, that is, a state significant development as it is a development for the purposes of alterations and additions to an existing school with a CIV of more
35 than 20 million.

The proposal was referred to IPC on two grounds: Waverley Council objected to the application and more than 50 public submissions were received in respect to the exhibition of the EIS. Based on the correspondence received from the council, the Department considers that many of the issues that were raised in the original
40 submission on the EIS from council have now been addressed by the applicant in the response to submissions and supplementary response to submissions to council's satisfaction. We understand that council will be presenting separately to you and we will leave that for them to speak directly to what matters they believe are outstanding. The issues that we are going to focus on today include the matters of
45 concerns that were raised in the submissions including traffic and parking, built form, visual impacts and biodiversity.

Throughout the presentation we will, however, still be speaking to landscape issues particularly in relation to those last three being built form, visual impacts and biodiversity. I'm now going to ask Brent to provide a brief overview of the site and the proposed development and he will speak to the key issues considered in the Department's assessment. Thank you, Brent.

MR B. DEVINE: Thank you, Karen, and good afternoon, Commissioners and members of the IPC secretariat. My name is Brent Devine and as Karen mentioned, I'm a principal planner in the schools infrastructure assessments team. I'll start with a brief overview of the site and a description of the school campus. So is that presentation up because I can't view it?

MR DUNCAN: No. It's not at the moment. Got it now.

MR DEVINE: There we go. Okay. So to begin with, the Moriah College Campus is located in Queens Park in the Waverley Local Government Area and is approximately six kilometres south-east of the Sydney CBD. This site adjoins public open space areas including Queens Park to the east and Centennial Park to the south and west. The residential areas of Queens Park and Randwick are located to the north and south of the site respectively. If we just go to the next slide. Thanks, Karen. This slide shows the general layout of the school campus and the existing buildings. The campus includes a primary school, senior school and early learning centre. The primary school is located on lot 1 at the north-western part of the site there. The senior school is located on lot 3, comprising the eastern half of the site and the ELC is centrally located on lot 22.

Also shown on this slide is lot 23 to the south-west which does not form part of this application and is land that is owned and managed by the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust. This land comprises approximately one hectare of Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub and is a critically endangered ecological community under the New South Wales Biodiversity Conversation Act. Lot 23 was also a key consideration of the Department's assessment. At the time this application was lodged the school had a population of 1535 students with an approved maximum capacity of 1680. This includes 1600 students in kindergarten to year 12 and 80 early learning centre placements. And if we just move on to the next slide, Karen.

Okay. I'll now provide a brief description of what is proposed as part of the concept proposal and also the stage 1 development. The key components of the concept proposal involve demolition, tree removal and earthworks, a building envelope for a new STEAM and ILC building. STEAM stands for science, technology, engineering, art and mathematics. ILC, independent learning centre and this is proposed to be constructed in stage 1. Also as part of the concept plan there's a building envelope for a new early learning centre that would replace the existing ELC and that's proposed as part of stage 2. There's also enhanced vehicle and pedestrian access arrangements, car parking and intersection upgrade, onsite pickup and drop off for the senior school internally within the site, enhanced recreation

facilities, onsite landscaping, a vegetation management plan, an additional 290 students.

5 In stage 1 specifically the key components include the staged construction of the four
storey STEAM and ILC building with frontage to Baronga Avenue, an additional 93
car parking spaces which includes both basement car parking and at grade car
parking, alterations to vehicle access at gate 4, internal pick up and drop off,
10 intersection upgrades, signage, landscaping and the implementation of a vegetation
management plan. There's also an additional 160 students in years K to 12 proposed
in stage 1. So this slide shows the extent of all demolition that is proposed across the
site and we note that demolition will be carried out in stages and this'll involve the
removal of five existing school buildings, two demountable structures and the partial
demolition of building E.

15 It shall also involve the removal of 84 car parking spaces, the removal of outdoor
sports courts and infill of the outdoor amphitheatre. Demolition – the demolition
stage will also include tree removal and bulk earthworks and also the establishment
of a buffer to the adjoining lot 23 to protect the adjoining Eastern Suburbs Banksia
Scrub. The establishment of this buffer will also involve the removal of existing
20 school infrastructure including the partial demolition of a timber deck that's
connected to the ELC building and the relocation of existing shade structures and
artificial sports turf. So this slide shows the completion of the stage 1A
development.

25 So the majority of works that comprise stage 1 will be undertaken in stage 1A. It
will involve the reconfiguration of the active recreation zone and enhanced
pedestrian entry and forecourt at gate 3 which has frontage to Baronga Avenue. As I
mentioned earlier, it'll establish the buffer to the Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub, to
lot 23. Reconfigured onsite pickup and drop off as well as car parking and I guess
30 the key component of stage 1 is the construction of the stage 1A component of the
STEAM and ILC building. We'll then move on to stage 1B. Sorry, I should have
mentioned in the previous slide you would have seen that to the stage 1A component
there's a temporary outdoor sports court and if we move on to the stage 1B
completion, that sports court is removed and the stage 1B component of the building
35 is connected to the stage 1A.

So that's – that plan there essentially shows the completion of the stage 1
development. I'll now move on to describe the proposed increase in the student
population. So under the concept proposal the school population is proposed to
40 increase by an additional 290 students overall. The population will occur in a stage
manner and over a 15 year period. At the completion of stage 1 in 2023 an additional
160 students are proposed and this'll comprise 66 primary school students and 94
senior school students, a further 90 students are proposed in stage 2. This'll
comprise an additional 16 primary school students, 24 senior school students and 50
45 ELC additional enrolments by the year 2030 and the remaining 40 enrolments will
comprise 16 primary school students and 24 senior school students and this is

described in the application as the ultimate stage and represents the maximum student capacity at the year 2036.

I'll now move on to the talk about the Department's key issues and our
5 recommendation on each of these. So in terms of the key issues, I'll start with traffic
which was a matter raised by council and the public and particularly in response to
the exhibition of the EIS, to assist the Department in our assessment an independent
traffic consultant, Bitzios Consulting, was engaged to undertake a peer review of the
applicant's report and, importantly, to advise on the adequacy of the traffic
10 modelling that was provided as part of their application. A key recommendation
from Bitzios was for the applicant to widen the scope of their traffic model to ensure
that it include the York Road, Darley Road and Avoca Street intersection as it was
included in the model presented with the EIS. This intersection is shown at number
4 on the slide.

15 Bitzios also recommended that different scenarios be modelled where the applicant's
desired mode shift targets are not achieved. The applicant's amended traffic report
indicates that the increased student cap will generate around 196 vehicle movements
each hour in the morning drop off period and 121 vehicle movements each hour in
20 the afternoon drop off pick up period. The additional vehicle movements also
account for additional school staff which is proportionate to the increase in student
numbers. The Department acknowledge in its assessment that the full operation of
the concept proposal would likely result in increased traffic congestion and level of
service impacts at the key intersections. However, the proposed intersection
25 upgrades and the 10 per cent modal shift that has been committed to by the applicant
will ensure that the road network could accommodate the stage 1 development on an
initial basis.

The road network upgrades must be completed by the applicant to the satisfaction of
30 council prior to the commencement stage 1 and includes the provision of a left turn
slip lane from York Road into Baronga Avenue and this is shown as intersection
number 3 on the slide as well as capacity improvements at the York Road and
Queens Park Road intersection which is shown as intersection number 1 on the side.
For further development stages – future development stages, rather, where an
35 increase in the student population is sought the Department has recommended
applicant undertake further detailed traffic assessment that will form part of a future
DA. The applicant is also required to submit to the planning secretary the results of
an independent of the school's green travel plan.

40 This is a particularly stringent requirement and will ensure that the school's
population cap does not exceed more than 1840 students or an additional 160
students overall unless it is demonstrated that a 10 per cent modal shift away from
private car use has been achieved. The assessment concluded that the road
network upgrades proposed by the applicant in stage 1 and the recommended
45 conditions of consent would ensure that the impacts of that particular development
stage can be managed and mitigated while the subsequent development stages will be
subject to further detailed assessment and consideration. In relation to car parking,

there are 103 new car parking spaces proposed overall on the site and this will replace the 84 spaces that would be demolished in stage 1.

5 The applicant's traffic report confirmed that the school's existing ratio of onsite car parking spaces relative to the overall number of school staff would be maintained as part of the concept proposal, noting that this is around .56 spaces per staff member. This ratio is maintained on the basis that an additional 15 staff spaces would be provided for the 26 staff members that would be employed under the concept proposal. The Department considered the number of car parking spaces proposed including its allocation between school staff and the ELC staff to be acceptable and it was considered that any further increase in onsite car parking would be at the detriment of the applicant's aspirational modal shifts which aims to reduce reliance on private car use.

15 I'll now move on to talk about the built form and urban design. So the detailed design of the stage 1 building is proposed to a maximum height of 20.7 metres and includes four storeys. The stage 2 building envelope would enable a future building to be constructed to a maximum height of 11.6 metres and would be subject to detailed designed as part of a future DA. Both the stage 1 building and the stage 2 building envelope exceed the 8.5 metre height limit in the Waverley LEP. The Department therefore considered the merits of the proposal in determining whether the stage 1 built form and the stage 2 building envelope are appropriate for this particular site and the surrounding context.

25 The design of the stage 1 building was refined as part of the applicant's RTS and whilst the height of the building was only marginally reduced, the applicant did introduce a number of amendments to address potential impacts on the surrounding environment and on users of Queens Park. The amendments included reduced bulk of the eastern façade, set back of the level 4 mechanical plant, clearer separation of forms to reduce overall scale of the building and amendments to the façade treatment which is designed to reduce the perception of scale. On balance, the stage 1 built form and the stage 2 building envelope were supported by the Department on the basis that there would not be a significant impact on views, privacy and solar access from the surrounding residential locations.

35 It would not overshadow areas of Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub located on lot 23. The available onsite open space provisions for students would be enhanced as buildings of a lesser height would probably result in buildings that are of greater bulk and also on the basis that contemporary schools in established urban environments commonly accommodate buildings that are in excess of 8.5 metres in height and further to this point, the education set provides for new buildings to be constructed to four storeys or a maximum of 22 metres as complying development. The stage 1 building, which is proposed to a maximum height of 20.7 metres, is less than the complying development provisions in respect to building height.

45 Furthermore, the government architect generally supported the campus redevelopment and the built form design as originally proposed in the EIS and did

not raise any concerns in relation to the buildings, height, sitting or orientation. I'll now move on to talk briefly about visual impacts. The EIS included a divisional impact assessment that considered view impacts from Queens Park, Centennial Park and surrounding residential locations. This current slide shows the visibility of the proposed development from within a one kilometre radius of the site and you can see that the development will predominantly be visible from within Queens Park and generally when looking towards the west and north-west.

The supplementary RTS included photo montage report which included comparative imagery of the site both with and without the stage 1 building. The images displayed in the current site is just one of the photo montages provided in the report and shows views of the site from roughly within the centre of Queens Park. The Department acknowledge in its report that the stage 1 building would obstruct distant views of the Sydney CBD skyline within Queens Park. The Department therefore considered the planning principle for impacts on public domain views which was established in the Land and Environment Court matter of Rosebay Marina v Woollahra Council. The Department concluded that the obstruction of the distant CBD skyline would be minor and that there does not appear to be any significance attached to the view of the Sydney CBD that would otherwise be altered.

A matter raised by council's heritage unit related to the sitting and orientation of the stage 1B component of the building which is the southern extent of the building. It was noted that this part of the building could potentially be reorientated in an east-west alignment to reduce the building's bulk when viewed from the heritage listed areas of Queens Park and Centennial Park. The Department referred the application to the Heritage Council of New South Wales who did not raise any concerns in response to the visual impacts of the proposal. In fact, it was acknowledged by the Heritage Council that the stage 1 building would be located at the south-eastern part of the site therefore limiting its visual impact to a comparatively isolated section. It was noted that the design takes advantage of the existing topographical slope which would also reduce its visual impact.

Overall, the Department's visual impact assessment found the proposal to be acceptable and this is on the basis that it would not obstruct any significant or important views, would not obstruct or impact on views from the surrounding residential areas, landscaping and tree plantings would partially screen the building to reduce its visual impact and if – Karen, if you just go to the next slide. When I was discussing built form the slides didn't, essentially, show the landscaping that was going to be provided but we put this slide in to show that you can see this is the Baronga Avenue frontage. There's significant landscaping that's going to be provided just along that eastern façade of the building. And, yes, just to wrap up the visual impact, the built form is considered to achieve a high standard of design and architectural merit and was generally supported by the government architect and no concerns were raised by the Heritage Council.

So our final key issue that we just wanted to touch on today is on biodiversity and specifically in relation to the endangered Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub on lot 23.

A key component of stage 1 involves the reinstatement of a three metre to 10 metre wide buffer – vegetative buffer that is – on lot 22 to mitigate indirect impacts of the development on the adjoining Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub. The buffer will be managed by the applicant as part of a vegetation management plan for the site and this VMP formed part of the application. The buffered was proposed by the applicant as part of its amended proposals submitted with its supplementary response to submissions to ensure that the development complies with previous development consents and approvals that have been issued by the Commonwealth Government, the New South Wales Government and Waverley Council.

The current slide with the image to the left shows the site layout at stage 1 completion as originally proposed in the EIS and included development right up to the boundary of lot 23. The amended site layout which is shown to the right includes the establishment of a buffer area along the entire boundary to lot 23 and this area will be required to be revegetated with Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub species. The Department is satisfied that the conditions under the previous development consents and approval are addressed in stage 1 of the amended proposal and furthermore that the establishment of the vegetation management plan and recommended conditions will ensure that potential impacts on areas Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub would be appropriately mitigated.

So this concludes our presentation on the key issues of assessment. Overall the Department concluded in its assessment report that the impacts of the development can be mitigated through the recommended conditions of consent. I'll now hand back to the panel.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Thank you, Brett. Adrian, do you have some questions at this stage?

MR A. PILTON: I was wondering about the issue of the trees to be removed. It would appear from that perspective that you can see on screen now that we're going to lose all of the trees along that side of the site – the existing trees, that is.

MR DUNCAN: Is that Baronga Avenue, is it?

MR PILTON: Along Baronga Road. Yes. It seems to me from that perspective that that's what's going to happen because our drawings aren't detailed enough to show, like, a section through the – Baronga Road through the building.

MS HARRAGON: And maybe if I even go back to the previous one, although the scale's not great, I think you could correctly say that the trees that were suggested as being under the stage 1 have now been revisited as a uniform row of trees.

MR PILTON: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: So I think it's probably correct in concluding that they're to be replaced. The existing ones are to be replaced. Although I must say, there is a

couple that a probably sitting on the verge that appear to still be retained or at least one from that view of that – the diagram on the right. So perhaps the Department can take on notice more clarity around exactly what trees are being removed and the relationship between those that have been replaced in terms of not only numbers but
5 also species and outcomes in terms of heights so we can provide that quite quickly.
So - - -

MR DUNCAN: Thanks.

10 MS HARRAGON: Obviously, you're of interest in terms of that view from the pedestrian - - -

MR PILTON:

15 MS HARRAGON: - - - from the park.

MR PILTON: In effect from the and from - - -

MS HARRAGON: Yes.

20

MR PILTON: - - - Baronga Road and York Road. But that'd be good to get more detail. Thank you.

MS HARRAGON: So we'll also focus on getting clarity from the applicant if they
25 don't otherwise do in their presentation around the depth of soil that's available in that area and also it's quite clear so that you know what the width is between the building wall so that there's a – some clarity around the species. So there's a condition of consent that actually requires that that landscaping plan be I guess developed to a more appropriate standard and that includes working with the
30 Council. Brent, can you remind me, was it also including working with the ES?

MR DEVINE: That's correct.

MS HARRAGON: Yes. So it's – obviously, we've got a balance here that we need
35 to achieve. Obviously, key to those conclusions that we reached in relation to the visual impacts is the success of the mitigation contribution of that landscaping in Baronga Avenue. The other part of the balance that we have going is the need to ensure that those species that are going to be adjoining the – that offset area are appropriately managed so that they're not overshadowing it and they're consistent
40 with the community that is represented in that area and they're actually, in fact, restrictions that have been placed on the title of this land through the previous approvals as we.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks, Karen, and that whole edge of Baronga right down to York
45 Road's of interest. We did a site inspection or carried out a site inspection last Friday and there were a couple of large trees right on the corner of York Road and it would be interesting to know – I think they're marked to come out but just the whole

treatment along that edge given that's the predominant visual impact from the parklands.

5 MS HARRAGON: So we can do a reach out to the applicant to also seek clarity as to whether the options were considered with keeping some of those larger specimens so that they actually had a contribution to the street in the immediate period. So we'll take that on notice.

10 MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Thank you.

MR PILTON: Also, could I ask just about the buffer to the Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub. What's happening inside the buffer? Does the fence move all the way across?

15 MS HARRAGON: So - - -

MR DEVINE: So the buffer will – sorry, Karen.

20 MS HARRAGON: So I'll do – Brent has more information than I do but, certainly, our big issue is that there are a number of previous approvals that actually set the expectation on how that offset was to be maintained on the site and also put in the care and control and also about how that interface was operated. So in the first instance it was about revisiting what those expectations were that had already been predetermined by the Commonwealth as a shared determination issued by – I think I recall it was a local consent, Brent. It wasn't actually a state one. It was a local
25 controlled action – determination.

MR DEVINE: Yes.

30 MS HARRAGON: So, Brent, do you just want to touch base on: (1) just going back over the removal of the structures but also what the intention is to now deliver a compliant, you know, buffer – set back.

35 MR DEVINE: Sorry, Adrian, was your question what's going to remain within the buffer - - -

MR PILTON:

40 MR DEVINE: - - - once it's established?

MR PILTON: Actually what's happening. I'm assuming - - -

MR DEVINE: Okay.

45 MR PILTON: - - - that the existing was sort of two fences along at the edge of the scrub. Will that be moved sort of eastwards or

MR DEVINE: Well, there's existing fencing along the boundary at the moment.

MR PILTON: Yes.

5 MR DEVINE: So the fencing will be retained. My understanding is that there's not going to be a second sort of fence to the west.

MR PILTON: Okay.

10 MR DEVINE: Sorry, to the east, if you know what I mean. Yes, yes. It'll just be a single fence along the boundary of lot 23.

MR PILTON: Okay.

15 MR DEVINE: So the buffer - - -

MR PILTON:

MR DEVINE: - - - will just be a vegetated area that will have no infrastructure
20 within it.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: And I assume, Brent, species appropriate to the scrub.
25

MR DEVINE: That's right. And that's been conditioned that their landscaping includes specifics that are endemic to the Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub and that they're provided within that VMP area, that buffer area.

30 MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thanks for that. Adrian, do you want to raise the question now about construction traffic and the mix with school traffic and also probably the trade are.

MR PILTON: Yes. I'm just wondering what's going to happen. As I understand it,
35 the existing there's a sort of drop off through gate 4 down there – yes- that people can come in, go around, turn around and drop off and go out again. What's going to happen during construction? It looks pretty difficult to me to balance the two if you're having construction traffic going in there and all sorts of stuff. Will that still be operational during the construction period?
40

MR DEVINE: Yes, look, my understanding is that it will still be operational during construction. The applicant did provide a detailed construction staging plan and I think that plan will set out how the construction of the stage 1A building will be managed while students are continuing to be picked up and dropped off at the school.
45

MR PILTON: Is that on your site, that drawing? On the Department's site. Because I don't think we've got it.

MR K. McNICOL: Kelly McNicol.

MR DEVINE: I can try and locate that for you.

5 MR McNICOL: Kelly McNicol speaking now. The applicant provided a preliminary construction traffic management plan which would prioritise the arrival of deliveries and construction traffic employees outside of peak hours. So they would utilise the existing accessways. The Department considered that additional – because of the concerns raised by council and in recognition of the public
10 submissions regarding construction traffic the Department also has recommended a condition requiring a construction worker travel plan as well which would require possibly the applicant to provide additional parking at another location and have their employees bus to the site due to the lack of parking onsite and also in the area.

15 MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thanks, Kelly. Adrian?

MR PILTON: I don't have any other issues at the moment now. Thanks.

MR DEVINE: I think if I could just add to that, the school has also indicated for
20 more of the – I guess the heavy duty works if you like they're trying to schedule those during periods where there is no students – during the school holiday periods.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

25 MR PILTON: Okay.

MR DUNCAN: Understandable. Can I just ask, Kate, Rebecca or Lauren, do you have any questions at this stage? No. No questions?

30 MS MOORE: No further questions.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Karen, is there anything else you want to add at this time? I don't think we've got much more to say. We've been out to the site and we've got meetings this afternoon with council and the applicant.
35

MS HARRAGON: Probably the only thing I'd probably just revisit is obviously the success of this development is, really, I'd have to say wholly dependent upon the success of that modal split and the travel plan. You know, we have been very cautious on how we've approached the condition set. In some ways the way we've
40 conditioned the movement to the stage 2 and that is very much dependent upon the success of the modal split being achieved and without that being documented and evidence of that occurring, we would suggest that we don't believe it's open for the applicant to even move to the next level of student rates. So, you know, I'm more than happy to revisit that condition set if the IPC was of the opinion that there were
45 further requirements or quite specific outcomes that that travel plan review needs to seek.

I can't recall whether we've actually asked for transport to be consulted on its preparation in terms of that first review but there's certainly a further length that could be put to that if the IPCs of the view to, I guess, tighten the condition set around that.

5

MR DUNCAN: Thanks, Karen. We'll - - -

MS HARRAGON: And that's about not only students but also staff. You know, we recognise that the observations made by our independent traffic person around the numbers of teachers that were not going to park on the site and therefore if you correlate that with the survey that they'd done on the number of teachers that were still travelling to the site suggested there was a large number parking within the street. So, you know, it is a real and legitimate concern that I think you're likely to hear from the council and likely to hear from the community.

15

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: That – it's important for us as the – you know, in delivering a suite of conditions that that solution is achieved.

20

MR DUNCAN: We'll go through our meetings today and we'll have another look at that issue and if we need to, we'll come back to you on that one. Okay. Thanks for the offer.

25

MS HARRAGON: Thanks.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Anything more that anybody wants to add at this stage?

30

MR PILTON: No. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: I think we're finished there. So we will formally close the meeting. Thanks everybody for your time today. Really appreciate it.

35

MR DEVINE: Thank you.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Bye bye.

40

MR McNICOL: Bye.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[1.38 pm]