



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-1451010

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

PUBLIC MEETING

RE: MORIAH COLLEGE REDEVELOPMENT

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

LOCATION: **VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE**

DATE: **9.58 AM, THURSDAY, 15 APRIL 2021**

MR DUNCAN: Good morning and welcome to the Independent Planning Commission's electronic public hearing on the State Significant Development application for the Moriah College Redevelopment, SSD 10352. My name is Peter Duncan and I am the chair of this IPC panel. Joining me is my fellow Commission,

5 Adrian Pilton. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional custodians of the lands on which we variously meet and pay my respects to their elders, past, present and emerging, and to the elders from other communities who may be participating today.

10 Moriah College is located in Queens Park approximately six kilometres southeast of the Sydney CBD. Consent is sought for a concept proposal for the redevelopment of the existing senior 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 to kindergarten to year 12. I note the Department

15 of Planning, Industry and Environment, DPIE, in its assessment report has recommended approval. The Minister for Planning and Public Spaces has asked the commission to determine this application within eight weeks of receiving the final whole-of-government assessment report from DPIE.

20 In line with regulations introduced in response to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, we are moving this public meeting online with registered speakers provided the opportunity to present to the panel via telephone and video conference. In the interests of openness and transparency, we are livestreaming proceedings on the Commission's website. A full transcript of the public meeting will also be published

25 on the Commission's website in the next few days. In terms of the Commission's role in this determination, the Commission was established by the New South Wales Government on 1 March 2018 as a standalone statutory body operating independently of DPIE and other agencies. The Commission plays an important role in strengthening transparency and independence in the decision-making process of

30 major development and land use planning in New South Wales.

The key functions of the Commission include determining State Significant Development applications, conducting public hearings and public meetings for development applications and other matters, and providing independent expert

35 advice on any other planning and development matter when requested by the Minister for Planning or the Planning Security. The Commission is the consent authority for this State Significant Development application due to an objection by Waverley Council and because 50 or more unique public objections were received.

40 It is important to note that the Commission is not involved in DPIEs assessment of SSD applications nor in the preparation of its assessment reports. Commissions make an annual declaration of interest identifying potential conflicts with their appointed realm. For the record, no actual conflicts of interest have been identified in relation to our determination of this development application. I have declared,

45 however, a perceived conflict of interest which has been published on the Commission's website. The chair of the Commission has considered the perceived

conflict and determined that my nomination to the panel may proceed. You can find additional information and the way we manage potential conflicts on our website.

5 This public meeting forms one part of the Commission's process. We have also undertaken a site inspection and met with DPIE, the applicant, and Waverley Council. Transcripts of all meetings and site inspection notes have been published on the Commission's website. After the public meeting we may convene with relevant stakeholders if clarification or additional information is required on matters raised. Following the public meeting we will endeavour to determine the
10 development application as soon as possible noting that there may be a delay if we find the need for additional information.

Further written submissions on this matter will be accepted by the Commission up to 5 pm on Thursday 22 April 2021. You can make a submission using the Have Your
15 Say portal on the website or by email and post. We invite interested individuals and groups to make any submission they consider appropriate during the meeting. However, the Commission is particularly assisted by submissions that are responsive to DPIEs assessment report and recommended conditions of consent. All submissions made to DPIE during exhibition of the environment impact statement
20 have been made available to the Commission. As such, today's speakers are encouraged to avoid repeating or restating submissions they previously have made to the application.

The Commission must emphasise that certain matters by law, it is not permitted
25 to take into account when making its determination and, therefore, submissions on matters cannot be – except on these matters, cannot be accepted. These factors include reputation of the applicant and any past planning law breaches by the applicant. Before we get underway I would like to outline how today's public meeting will run. We will first hear from DPIE on the findings of the whole-of-
30 government assessment report of the application currently before the Commission. We will hear from the applicant second and then we will proceed to hear from registered speakers.

We will endeavour to stick to our published schedule. This will be dependent on
35 registered speakers being ready to present at the allocated time. I will introduce each speaker when it's their turn to present to the panel. Everyone has been advised in advance how long they have to speak. A bell will sound when a speaker has one minute remaining. A second bell will sound when the speaker's time has expired. To ensure everybody receives their fair share of time I will enforce timekeeping
40 rules. I do reserve the right, however, to allow additional times as required to hear new information.

If you have a copy of your speaking notes, or any additional material to support your presentation, it would be appreciated if you could provide a copy to the Commission.
45 Please note: any information given to us may be made public. The Commission's privacy statement governs our approach to managing your information. Our privacy statement is also available on our website. Thank you. It's now time to call our first

speaker: Karen Harragon and Brent Devine from the Department. Please proceed, Karen.

5 MS K. HARRAGON: Good morning, Commissioners. My name is Karen
Harragon and I'm the director of the social infrastructure assessment team at the
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment. I'm here with my colleague,
Brent Devine, today from the school infrastructure assessment team. We have a
short presentation to provide you today which will outline the Department's
10 approach to what was taken into its assessment of the State Significant Development
application for the Moriah College Redevelopment in Queens Park. The application
is for a concept proposal and the first stage of that development including seeking
approval for 290 additional students.

15 The application has been referred to the IPC for determination as Waverley Council
objected to the application and more than 50 submissions in objection were received.
I'm just going to start sharing my screen. The issues that we're going to focus on
today include the key matters of concern that were raised in the submissions
including traffic and parking, built form, visual impacts and biodiversity. If the
Commissions would prefer me to have full screen, I can also do that. I will now ask
20 Brent to speak and provide view of the site and the proposed development and he
will outline the key issues considered in the Department's assessment.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks, Karen.

25 MS HARRAGON: Thank you, Brent.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks, Karen. Can you put it on full screen, please. Thank you.

30 MR B. DEVINE: Okay. Thank you, Karen. And good morning, everybody. My
name is Brent Devine. I'm a principal planner in the school's infrastructure
assessments team and was involved in the assessment of this application. I just
apologise in advance for the croaky voice but I'm just battling a head cold today but
we're going to power on. I will start with a brief overview of the site and the
application before touching on the key issues and how each of these are addressed.

35 So Moriah College is located in Queens Park which is approximately six kilometres
southeast of the Sydney CBD. The site is adjacent to public open space areas
including Queens Park, which is located to the east, and Centennial Park to the south
and west. The residential areas of Queens Park and Randwick are located to the
40 north and south of the site respectively. This slide shows the general layout of the
school campus which includes a primary school, senior school, and an early learning
centre. The primary school is located on Lot 1 at the north-western extent of the site,
the senior school is located on Lot 3 and comprises the eastern half of the site, and
the early learning centre is located centrally on Lot 22.

45 This slide also shows Lot 23 which is to the southwest of the school campus. This
land comprises around one hectare of Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub which is a

critically endangered ecological community under the New South Wales Biodiversity Conservation Act. This is land that is owned and managed by the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust. At the time this application was lodged the school had a population of 1535 students and an approved maximum capacity of 1680 students.

5 So this slide sets out the key components of the concept proposal which I will quickly touch on. We have demolition tree removal and earthworks, a building envelope for a new STEAM and ILC building, which is to be constructed in stage 1, and STEAM stands for Science, Technology, Engineering, Art and Mathematics, and ILC is an Independent Learning Centre, which is essentially the school library.

10

We also have a building envelope for a new early learning centre that will replace the existing one as part of stage 2. Enhanced vehicle and pedestrian access arrangements, car parking and intersection upgrades, onsite drop-off and pick-up for the senior school and the ELC. Enhanced school recreation facilities: our landscape masterplan and a vegetation management plan and we also have a combined total of 290 additional students. In terms of the stage 1 development, the key components include the stage and construction of the four-storey STEAM and ILC building in Baronga Avenue.

15

20

There's also 93 car parking spaces which include both basement and car parking, alterations to the vehicle access arrangements of gate 4, creation of internal drop-off and pick-up area for the senior school and ELC, intersection upgrades, signage, landscaping and the implementation of the vegetation management plan. Stage 1 also proposes to increase the student population by an additional 160 students. So this slide shows the extent of all demolition proposed across the site. Demolition will be carried out in stages and would involve the removal of five school buildings, two demountable structures and the partial demolition of Building E, the removal of 84 existing car parking spaces, removal of the outdoor sports courts and infill of the outdoor amphitheatre, as well as tree removal and earthworks.

25

30

The demolition plan also shows the established of a buffer area to Lot 23 to protect the adjoining Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub. In establishing the buffer the application involves the removal of existing school infrastructure and this includes the partial demolition of a timber deck that's connected to the ELC building, the relocation of an existing shade structure and removal of artificial sports turf. So the development of stage 1 is proposed to be completed in two phases of construction which are referred to in the application of stages 1A and 1B. This slide shows the stage 1A development at completion of which the key component here is the initial construction phase of the four-storey STEAM and ILC building.

35

40

A temporary outdoor sports court will be established at the southern end of the building which is a future stage 1B area – and this is indicated on this slide. Stage 1A also involves reconfiguration of the senior school active recreation zone, enhanced pedestrian entry and forecourt at gate 3 from Baronga Avenue, internal pick-up and drop-off within the site, as well as car parking provisions and the establishment of that vegetated buffer to lot 23. We then move on to the stage 1B construction phase and this phase only involves the removal of the temporary

45

outdoor sports court which will establish – sorry, which will enable the STEAM and ILC building to be extended to the south – and this slide essentially shows the completion of the stage 1 development in its entirety.

5 I will now outline the proposed increase in the student population that is sought as part of this application. Under the concept proposal the school's population is proposed to increase by an additional 290 students which will be staged over a 15 year period. At the completion of stage 1 in 2023 an additional 160 students are proposed. At the completion of stage 2, which is anticipated by the year 2030, a
10 further 90 students are proposed, of which 50 would be ELC placements, and an additional 40 students are proposed by the year 2036. And this is described in the application as the ultimate stage which represents the school's maximum capacity. In addition to the 290 students proposed by 2036 the application proposes a further 26 staff of which 17 are proposed in stage 1.

15 I will now move on to talk about the key issues and the Department's recommendation on each of these. So in terms of the key issues I will start with traffic which was a matter raised by both Council and the public in response to the EIS exhibition. In determining the traffic impact of the proposal a key focus for us
20 was on the level of service of key intersections in proximity to the site which ultimately has an effect on the degree of traffic congestion on the surrounding road network. These key intersections are shown on the current slide.

It is acknowledged in the Department's assessment report that the full operation of
25 the concept proposal, that is, an additional 290 students and 26 staff, would likely increase and increase traffic congestion and a level of service impacts at the key intersections close to the site. Noting that three of the four intersections shown on this slide currently operate at or near capacity during the school's morning and afternoon peak periods. However, the applicant has proposed, as part of its
30 application, to complete intersection upgrades to two of these intersections and has committed to a 10 per cent modal shift away from private car usage to ensure that the surrounding road network could accommodate the stage 1 development on an initial basis.

35 The Department has conditioned that the road network upgrades be completed by the applicant to the satisfaction of Council prior to the commencement of stage 1 and this will include the creation of a left turn slip lane from York Road into Baronga Avenue. This is shown as intersection number 3 on the slide. And capacity improvements at the York Road and Queens Park intersection which is showed as
40 intersection number 1. Waverley Council have indicated that that they are supportive of the proposed upgrades and those specific concerns are raised by Transport for New South Wales.

45 For future development stages the applicant will need to undertake further detailed traffic assessment that would form part of a development application for that particular stage and would be subject to further consideration by the relevant consent authority. The applicant is also required to submit to the Planning Secretary the

results of an independent audit of its green travel plan to ensure that there is no increase in the school's population cap beyond stage 1 unless it has been demonstrated that the school has achieved a 10 per cent modal shift away from private car use. This requirement has been supported by Waverley Council.

5

The Department's assessment concluded that the road network upgrades in stage 1 and the recommended conditions of consent would ensure that the traffic and transport impacts are appropriately managed and mitigated while any subsequent development stages are to be subject to a further detailed assessment and consideration including further opportunity for public comment and consultation with Council and Transport for New South Wales. The Department also assessed the impacts of construction traffic on the surrounding road network which is expected to generate a maximum of 10 construction vehicle movements per hour during the peak construction phase in stage 1.

15

The Department considers that the volume of construction vehicles can be accommodated within the surrounding road network without significant impacts on existing road network conditions noting that the construction traffic routes to and from the site would avoid the use of local residential streets and this has been conditioned. The public submissions also raise concern in relation to construction workers using the available on-street car parking spaces in proximity to the site. To address this issue the Department has recommended that the applicant prepare a construction workers' transport strategy. This is to include detailed arrangements to minimise the demand for construction worker parking across the locality, including within the Queens Park residential area, and must include options to secure off-site car parking on a temporary basis, such as through a leasing arrangement, for the duration of construction.

If we just go to the next slide. Thanks, Karen. So I will now quickly touch on operational car parking. There are 103 new car parking spaces proposed as part of the concept proposal and this would replace the 84 spaces that would be demolished in stage 1. The applicant's traffic report confirm that the school's existing ratio of on-site car parking spaces, relative to the overall number of school staff, would be maintained as part of the development, which is around .56 spaces per staff member. The Department considered the number of proposed car parking spaces to be acceptable and it was considered that any further increase in on-site car parking would be at the detriment of the applicant's aspirational modal shifts which aims to reduce this reliance on private car usage.

I will now move on to talk about the built form of the development. The detailed design of the stage 1 building is proposed at a maximum height of 20.7 metres and comprises four storeys. The stage 2 building envelope would enable a future building to be constructed to a maximum height of 11.6 metres that would be subject to further detailed design as part of a future DA. The Department considered the merits of the proposal in determining whether the stage 1 built form and the stage 2 envelope are appropriate for this particular site and its surrounding context.

As outlined in the Department's report the design of the stage 1 STEAM and ILC building was refined over the course of the assessment and included a reduction to the bulk of the eastern façade, the setback of the level 4 mechanical plant, clearer separation of forms to reduce the overall scale of the building and amendments to the
5 façade treatment. On balance, the proposed built form was 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. There would be no new landscape – there would be new landscaping features including additional trees along the Baronga Avenue frontage which would shield parts of the new
10 building. It would not overshadow areas of Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub on Lot 23.

Also the available onsite open space provisions for students would be enhanced as buildings at a lesser height would generally be of greater bulk. And also on the basis
15 that the education set currently allows for buildings to be constructed to four storeys or to a maximum of 22 metres in height as complying development. The stage 1 building, which is proposed to a maximum height of 20.7 metres, is, therefore, proposed at a height that is less than the complying development provisions under the education set. The Department also notes in its report that the government
20 architect provide general support for the campus redevelopment and the built form design as originally proposed in the EIS. And there were no concerns raised by them in relation to the building's height, sitting or orientation.

I will now move on to talk briefly about the visual impact of the proposal. The EIS
25 included a visual impact assessment that considered view impacts from Queens Park, Centennial Park and surrounding residential locations. The current slide shows the visibility of the proposed development from within a one kilometre radius of the site. Only from the areas shaded in red is where the new built form on the site would be visible. You can see that the development will predominantly be visible from within
30 Queens Park and generally when looking towards the west or northwest.

The supplementary RTS included a photo montage report which included comparative imagery of the site with and without the stage 1 building. The images displayed on the current slide is just one of the photo montages provided in that
35 report which shows views to the site from within Queens Park. A matter raised by Council's Heritage Unit related to the sitting and orientation of the stage 1B component which is the southern extent of the building. It was noted that this part of the building could potentially be reorientated at an east/west alignment to reduce the building's bulk when viewed from the heritage listed areas of Queens Park and
40 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
45 building would be located at the south-eastern part of the site which, therefore, limits its visual impact to a comparatively isolated section. It was also noted that the design takes advantage of the site's existing topographical slope which would reduce its visual impact.

Overall, the Department's assessment of visual impacts found the proposal to be acceptable on the basis that it would not obstruct significant or important views, it 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, the built form would achieve a higher standard of design and architectural merit and was generally supported by the government architect and, furthermore, there were no concerns raised by the Heritage Council of New South Wales.

I will now talk briefly about the biodiversity impacts and specifically in relation to endangered vegetation which exists on Lot 23. A key component of stage 1 involves the establishment of a three metre to 10 metre wide vegetated buffer to mitigate potential indirect impacts of the development on the Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub. The buffer will be managed by the applicant as part of a vegetation management plan and this plan formed part of the application. The buffer has been proposed by the applicant to ensure that the future redevelopment of the site complies with the conditions of previous approvals that were issued by the Commonwealth Government, the New South Wales Government and Waverley Council.

The current slide with the image to the left shows a 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 the buffer area along the entire boundary to Lot 23 and this area is required to be vegetated in accordance with the vegetation management plan. The Department is satisfied that the potential impacts on the Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub would be adequately mitigated as a result of this buffer being established.

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

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Karen and Brent. Adrian, do you have any questions at this stage?

MR PILTON: I don't have any questions.

MR DUNCAN: I have no questions either. Thank you for that presentation.

MS HARRAGON: Thank you for the opportunity to present today.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks, Karen.

MR PILTON: Thanks, Karen.

MR DUNCAN: I will now call on the next speaker. The next speaker is Samantha Wilson representing Moriah War Memorial College Association, the applicant.

MS S. WILSON: Thank you very much. Good morning, everybody. Thank you for your time today. I will just share my screen. I've got a quick presentation as well.

5 MR DUNCAN: Thanks, Samantha.

MS WILSON: Hopefully you can all see that now. Let me know if not.

MR DUNCAN: Yes, we can see that.

10

MS WILSON: Okay. Excellent. Okay. So thank you very much for your time today. As you mentioned, my name is Samantha Wilson, I am an associate director with Urbis and we have been running the planning approvals for Moriah College for about the last five years and have been working on this State Significant
15 Development application since early 2018. I want to say quickly just a thank you to the Department of Planning for an extremely thorough assessment report, draft conditions, and a very thorough presentation. Unfortunately, I'm probably going to repeat a lot of what Brent has just said but I think it's important anyway.

20 I'm going to just quickly touch on the site, the proposal, the community and stakeholder engagement that was undertaken over the past roughly two years, the key issues being traffic and parking, building form, visual impact, overshadowing, biodiversity and the increase in student numbers and then a quick summary at the end. Hopefully I will take up the 20 minutes allocated. So quickly, just on the site,
25 Brent did give us a very thorough briefing but I just wanted to point out again the primary school campus to the northeast of – northwest, sorry, of the site. There are no works proposed on that part of the campus. The senior school campus is really where the focus of this State Significant Development application is and, of course, the early learning centre as well, which was only recently completed in the last few
30 years.

There are four gates – access points on the site. Gate 1, gate 2 and gate 4 are all vehicle access points and gate 3 is pedestrian only. As we know, the site is bound by Queens Park Road, Baronga Avenue and York Road. We have the residential
35 community and Queens Park to the north and the site really sits in a parkland setting with Queens Park to the east and Centennial Park to the west and the south. The proposal before you is for a concept application that seeks to establish building envelopes for the redevelopment of the senior part of the campus. That includes demolition of a number of buildings, the establishment of new building envelopes,
40 car parking spaces, onsite drop-off and pick-up for the senior school and early learning centre, improved vehicle and pedestrian access arrangements within the site and also on surrounding roads, the establishment of a landscape master plan and the staged increase of students over a 15 year period.

45 The project has a capital investment value of approximately 81 million and it will result in 250 jobs over the life of the project including 26 future staff. The stage 1 application seeks consent for the demolition of buildings, the construction of a part

three storey/part four storey building to accommodate a STEAM facility – that’s Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Mathematics – and an independent learning centre. There is also the improved vehicle and pedestrian access with a new onsite drop-off and pick-up area for the senior school and early learning centre, a
5 significantly increased amount of open space and new outdoor recreation zones, signage, lighting and new security walls, intersection upgrades and 160 additional K-12 students in the first stage.

10 Stage 2 is subject to a future likely SSD application, and it’s also subject to the implementation of the Green Travel Plan which we will go into further detail on. The intention is that that future building envelope will use – will be used for an early learning centre to replace the existing structure onsite, and for teaching facilities. It will be a three storey building with additional car parking spaces and an additional
15 130 students.

So there were eight objectives for this project that were set at the very early stages and that have remained throughout. That was to replace dated and inefficient buildings on the site. So the buildings on that plan there in yellow are in poor condition at the moment. The red is a rammed earth wall that is deteriorating and
20 needs to be removed. And the brown buildings are in average condition.

The second objective was obviously to provide the STEAM facilities. Obviously, as the Commission would know, a lot of independent and public schools are moving to this new form of education, and certainly STEAM facilities is the number one thing
25 on everyone’s list at the moment. And obviously the independent learning centre, being the library for the school – the current library has well and truly met the school’s needs so far and is in desperate need for upgrade. So they – that was the main objective for this project.

30 The idea was to then also provide the future growth for the early learning centre. The school currently operates a number of early learning centres offsite, and the idea is to bring those students onto campus so that they can have a whole of life experience from age two all the way through to year 12 on the one campus. We needed to – one of the main objectives was to reorient the high school main entrance
35 away from the residential areas of Queens Park and to create a front door for the campus, so that everybody – students, visitors, the public – would know where the front door of the campus is. At the moment it is really lacking a sense of address. So that new front door will be on Baronga Avenue.

40 To improve the traffic management system we obviously have the onsite drop-off and pick-up loop road for the high school students that will follow the same process that the junior school runs at the moment. There are intersection upgrades and travel demand management measures. The school currently has a limited supply of onsite open space and the main objective in locating the buildings to the south of the site
45 was to significantly increase the amount of open space available for students. So we go from 34 per cent of the site being available for open space to 51 per cent of the site.

And as we have heard, we need to meet the future needs of a growing population, obviously, as all schools do, and the application seeks to allow for the staged increase of approximately 290 students over a 15 year period, with 160 students in the first stage. We also wanted to make sure that we minimise impacts on nearby properties, most importantly the residential community of Queens Park to the north. That's why the new buildings are situated as far away from the residential area as possible on the very south-east corner of the site.

So this has been a pretty lengthy process to date. There was a lot of early engagement that occurred in early 2019. That – we had face to face briefings with key stakeholders. There were letterbox drops, community information sessions, media releases, a dedicated website and phone number for feedback to be provided to the community. We submitted the environmental impact statement in November and it went on exhibition. There were 321 submissions received. 53 per cent of those were actually supporting the application, and obviously a number of those were from existing and future students and parents. There were 45 per cent of those submissions objected to the proposal, and there was an objection from Waverley Council.

The applicant did a lot of changes to the application through – from the environmental impact statement to the response to submissions. There was a reduction in height and changes to the building façade and materials, and revised internal layout to address issues that were raised during the exhibition period. The stage 2 building was also reduced to remove all overshadowing of the Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub. The driveway was relocated on York Road. An additional 52 bicycle parking spaces were provided. And that response to submissions went on exhibition for approximately 15 days, and 44 submissions were received.

A supplementary response to submissions was then prepared and further changes were made to the scheme. The vegetation buffer was introduced to the Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub. The driveway was moved again to accommodate that vegetation buffer. An amended landscape planting strategy was provided, and additional traffic modelling was undertaken. And that information was made public in December of 2020.

So I will just cover quickly the key issues, and I know that the Department have just presented on these so I'll try to be quick. On traffic and parking the key things that I want to point out here is that there will be 103 car parking spaces provided, which is an increase of 19 spaces. There will be 160 new bicycle parking spaces. That's well in excess of the Council's requirements. But it's important for us to actually be able to achieve that 10 per cent modal shift. Those bicycle parking spaces are shown on the plan here where I've circled it. They're right at the front door of the campus and they're co-located with end of trip facilities, so showers and lockers and things like that.

There is a new internal pick-up and drop-off ring road that will ensure that cars now enter the site rather than queuing on York Road. There are intersection upgrades, a

Green Travel Plan, and obviously the Traffic Transport and Parking Plan. So this slide just shows you the existing arrangement on the left-hand side of where senior school parents currently queue on York Road in the shoulder to pick up and drop off students. The proposed arrangement is that those cars will enter the site and run
5 along a loop road around the roundabout and come to the drop-off spaces and then exit the site and run along York Road again.

The intersection upgraded – upgrade, sorry. There's three key ones: there is an upgraded seagull intersection at the York Road/Queens Park Road intersection; the
10 slip lane, which is shown here at the York Road/Baronga Avenue intersection; and an upgraded pedestrian crossing on York Road. Now, these were discussed very early on with Council. They were identified in the very first traffic impact assessments, and they were – have been endorsed by Council's traffic committee. This slide just shows you that seagull intersection to the right and the new pedestrian
15 crossing to the left.

So the traffic modelling, there were four key intersections that were modelled. The modelling shows that, regardless of the additional school traffic, the key intersections will actually operate at a level of service of F by the year 2036. Those proposed
20 intersection upgrades that have been agreed with Waverley Council are absolutely critical in order to improve the overall intersection performance of these surrounding intersections. With those intersection upgrades and the 10 per cent modal shift that the school has committed to, the Queens Park/Baronga Avenue intersection, which is shown as intersection 2 on your plan, will operate at the an acceptable level of
25 service of A or B in the AM and PM peak. The intersection of York Road and Queens Park Road – that's shown as number 1, which will get that seagull intersection upgrade – will operate at a level of service A or B.

The York Road/Baronga Avenue intersection, which is shown as number 3, it will
30 actually operate at a level of service F, which is what it currently operates. However, there is actually a significant improvement to the average vehicle delay and queue length, which I will show you on the next slide in a second. And intersection 4, shown on the plan there which is the York Road/Darley Road/Avoca Street intersection, will operate at a level of service F due to background traffic alone.
35 That's without the school upgrades. However, the average delay at this intersection will only be three to four seconds longer during the peak times.

So I have just included the results here to specifically point out where I've highlighted in yellow the average second delays. As you can see, with the future
40 growth alone, you can see, for example, at the intersection 1 here at York Road and Queens Park Road the future development, we have a 102 second delay with no upgrades. Once you start – once you introduce the road upgrades that goes down to 18 seconds, and with the modal shift that goes down to 14 seconds. And it's similar for all of the intersections in the AM peak. And then in the PM peak period a similar
45 arrangement where the intersection upgrades are providing a significant improvement to intersection performance, and with the modal shift we have a – it improves it even further.

- A Green Travel Plan was provided with the application. It is conditioned that that is prepared in consultation with Transport for New South Wales and Council and others. We did find with the surveys that we did with the school that there is a high proportion of staff and students using their cars at the moment, and a very low proportion of people walking or cycling or catching public transport. The Green Travel Plan does aim to facilitate a 10 per cent modal shift away from private car use. The school does currently stagger arrival and departure times for each year group and we are proposing to introduce ever further staggered start and end times. Some of the initiatives that are being looked at are additional shuttle bus services, incentivising car pooling particularly for staff, introducing walking groups and walking school buses, and introducing a learn to ride program and, as I mentioned, those end of trip facilities, bicycle parking and bicycle groups. With those we expect to achieve a minimum of a two per cent shift.
- In terms of building form and design, there were significant changes made to the building form between the EIS and the response to submissions, including an overall reduction in height and bulk, really introducing new façade materials and landscape setback. That can be seen on these diagrams where, with the left-hand side that was the original environmental impact statement, and on the right-hand side the response to submissions. It's also introducing a stairway between the stage 1A and 1B buildings to really break down the scale of the form. And again from Baronga Avenue here the materiality, as you can see, has been really developed to provide that breakdown in form as well.
- The landscape setback was something that was really important to reducing the visual impact on Baronga Avenue and, as you can see from this slide, there is a significant landscape setback with new tree plantings to be put within that setback, including native species to represent the Banksia scrub adjacent and also Centennial Park.
- Visual impact, we have seen this diagram already but I thought I would include it. This does show the visual catchment of where you will be able to see, particularly the stage 1 building, from Queens Park especially. The visual impact assessment did determine that there – the stage 1 building will create a new element on the skyline, however it is screened to differing degrees by existing vegetation, both within Queens Park and along Baronga Avenue. It will not obstruct any significant or important views and it will not obstruct views from the surrounding residential areas.
- So these are just a couple of views I have included, obviously from up close in Queens Park. As you can see the existing trees within Queens Park screen the building. And as we move further back in Queens Park you can see that it becomes an element on the skyline, and we can see Bondi Junction to the right-hand side.
- Overshadowing. Again between the environmental impact statement and the response to submissions, that reduction in built form meant that we now no longer have any overshadowing of the Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub on lot 23. The overshadowing to Queens Park is limited to after 2 pm. And the internal open space

now receives very good solar access year-round. Biodiversity. Again – so the Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub now has a three to 10 metre buffer zone. The area shown in green on this plan is actually Eastern Suburbs Banksia Scrub on the site, and it is going to be managed in perpetuity through a vegetation management plan.

5

I will skip through this quickly. The increase in student numbers. Obviously it's something that is very important to the school, that this can happen in a staged manner. We do note that the Department of Planning have conditioned the increase in student numbers and to – we actually need to submit an independent assessment of the Green Travel Plan to show that we have actually achieved that 10 per cent modal shift before that increase in student numbers in stage 2 can be achieved, and the school is completely happy with that draft condition and that arrangement. They are committed to making sure this modal split happens and are happy with the conditions as they are drafted. So I will just quickly summarise. Obviously the proposal will provide – sorry, do you mind if I – I have just got 10 – 30 seconds.

15

MR DUNCAN: Continue on, Samantha.

MS WILSON: Thank you very much. Yes. So in summary the proposal will provide improved teaching and learning outcomes through the development of new purpose-built and modern educational facilities that will replace existing dilapidated assets to meet contemporary and evolving education standards. The proposal will provide significant intersection and public domain upgrades for the benefit of the wider community. There will be a direct investment of approximately 81 million, which will support up to 250 jobs.

25

The applicant has consulted widely with the community, stakeholders and authorities, and has comprehensively addressed all issues raised. The site is suitable for the proposal and is in the public interest. Subject of the implementation of the recommended conditions of consent that the Department of Planning have put forward, the proposal will have an acceptable environmental impact. So we request that the Commission approve the application, subject to those recommended conditions. Thank you very much.

30

MR DUNCAN: Samantha, thank you for the presentation. We have no further questions at this point. Thank you again.

35

MS WILSON: Thank you for your time.

MR DUNCAN: I will now call on our next speaker, Peter Cohen, who is representing the Queens Park Precinct. Peter, can you hear us? I think you might be mute.

40

MR COHEN: Okay. Where was I? I thought I had.

45

MR DUNCAN: Can hear you now.

MR COHEN: Can you hear me now?

MR DUNCAN: Can you hear now, yes. Thank you.

5 MR COHEN: Just a minute. Okay. Thank you. Good morning, Commissioners. I
am Peter Cohen. I'm the co-convenor of the Queens Park Precinct Committee, and I
shall be speaking on behalf of the Queens Park Precinct set up over 30 years ago
under the auspices of Waverley Council. The committee convenes regular public
10 meetings to discuss issues of interest in the precinct. Since Moriah College was
allocated the former eastern suburbs hospital site in the mid-80s and moved from
Bellevue Hill its impact has been a major focus of residents, especially as it has
continued to move other sections of the school to the site and expand well beyond
what was originally promised.

15 A number of our residents lived here well before the school was assigned the site by
the New South Wales government, and many others moved here before the junior
school was added which vastly increased the numbers of students and staff at the
time. You will notice in your documents that the precinct committee has made
submissions objecting to Moriah's original proposal in December 2019, and also its
20 response to submissions in July 2020. In addition there were 143 submissions
objecting to the proposal and covering a range of issues. 92 per cent were from
Queens Park and others to adjoining suburbs. Of the 168 submissions in support, 94
per cent were not from Queens Park, and most provided a short single statement in
support. The Department did not provide this context in its description of the public
25 submissions. The committee is very disappointed that in the Department of
Planning's assessment report of this proposal as it does not appear to consider many
of the issues raised by the local community, especially the impact on local residential
streets and laneways.

30 I will now speak about the main issues of concern with the proposal, starting with the
proposed increase in student numbers and potential impact on the traffic, and then
the scale of the proposed buildings. Every few years since arriving, the school has
significantly increased its student and staff numbers, generating every-increasing
traffic and parking issues with associated noise and general activity. Each time the
35 residents were given assurances of no further increases to student numbers, only to
be let down time and time again. In 1984 when the school first moved to the Queens
Park site, the residents were assured that numbers would never exceed 610. In 1993
the school sought to expand by 350 students with a maximum enrolment of 960. In
October 2004 the minister approved an additional 24 classrooms and an additional
40 720 students when the college took over the adjoining site and moved its junior
school from Rose Bay.

This brought the total number of students allowed to 1680, almost three times the
limit that residents were promised when the school was located in our precinct. In
45 November 2017 Waverley Local Planning Panel approved the establishment of the
early learning centre with the condition that the total student number not exceed
1680, including no more than 80 early learning centre students. The community

believes that this latest proposal with the plan for a further 17 per cent increase in student numbers, including an increase to 130 in the early learning centre, and despite the school's previous agreement to the conditions, is totally unreasonable, especially in the light of so many promises of student numbers being limited.

5

As you are aware from your visit to the site, it's located directly on York Road which is a primary north-south route. When York Road is not moving freely a substantial portion of north-south traffic passes through our north-south oriented local streets, especially Newland Street, and also Alt Street and Denison Street, and even Cuthbert Street, and now increasingly the narrow laneways that link these streets. They are carrying much heavier volumes of traffic than local streets should or did before the volume – before the school was located here.

10

It is incomprehensible to us that the traffic analysis undertaken by the school, and even in the Bitzios peer review provided with the assessment report, barely mention these streets and laneways. Traffic assessments provided in the proposal were only undertaken on York Road, Baronga Avenue, Queens Park Road and in particular the intersections, although the peer review did look at Newland Street and Queens Park Road intersection. When the junior school moved to the site the school provided an internal drop-off and pick-up loop. Residents were sceptical about whether parents would use it. While many do, there are still many who do not. Instead they park in local streets, sometimes within no stopping zones, and sometimes double-park to drop-off and wait for students. Every time the school numbers expand, the situation worsens. While the new proposal plans to have an internal loop for senior student drop-offs, getting parents to use it is another issue.

20
25

I now draw your attention to the proposed traffic changes. It was very disappointing to read in the assessment report that any impact on local streets could be managed through developing a local area management plan to minimise the impact on local streets. This was done in the 1980s when the school first moved to the site. The community, Council and college developed our local area management plan then. The principles underpinning the LATM were that north-south traffic on the regional road – York Road – remain the priority road and no impediments be placed on York Road that might divert cars through the local streets, and each north-south local street be subject to calming measures so that traffic is not diverted from one to another. Increases in volumes of traffic and parent and student behaviour in cars cannot be mitigated by calming measures.

30
35

Any further expansion to the college would just add to the already difficult traffic and parking situation. The suggestion to upgrade two intersections and installing a York Road pedestrian crossing as nominated in the proposal and supported in the assessment report, doesn't consider the impact that these altered conditions place on traffic through our precinct. We strongly support the need for more detailed analysis of the intersection at York Road and Queens Park Road, as proposed in an assessment report, and the Bitzios peer review. We believe that the morning queue in Queens Park Road would be easily alleviated today by removing the threshold that prevents the separate lane forming to turn left into York Road. Currently all the

40
45

traffic shares a single lane and is constrained by those trying to turn right. This was suggested to Council last year. Apart from the heavy congestion in the morning peak hour, this intersection operates safely throughout the rest of the day and night.

- 5 The precinct community is extremely disappointed that after approaching Council a number of times requesting discussions about the college's proposed traffic changes, prior to any considerations by the Waverley Traffic Committee, this did not take place even though the precinct committee has normally been included in such discussions since the 1980s.

10

- Buses are currently underutilised by the school. This was noted in section 312 of the Bitzios peer review and this issue has been discussed at Moriah Community Consultative Committee meetings over the years. It seems clear that a very good way to relieve congestion around the school would be to have an efficient set of bus services widely used by the students. The school mentions its public transport policy and does have buses available, yet at the same time provides the excuse that it cannot compel students – parents – cannot compel parents to make their children use the bus services provides. This excuse simply means that the bus strategy is inadequate and the school is providing a more convenient alternative for pick-up and drop-off for parents using their private vehicles.

20

- Interestingly, the traffic reports provided show that almost twice as many students do use the buses in the afternoon as in the morning. We would like the school to have a strategy that will actually encourage students to use buses to the extent that it makes a positive difference to the congestion issue in the morning. School generated private traffic can be measured easily enough by looking at traffic counts and velocities during the school holidays as well as during term time. The difference is the school's impact on our neighbourhood. This has not been done as far as we are aware.

25

30

- Physical size of the proposed development is also an issue. While there has been a minimal reduction in height since the initial plans that we saw, the proposed buildings, especially along Baronga Avenue, remain far too large and intrusive for the site. It's in a sensitive environment located between Queens Park and Centennial Park and adjoining the Queens Park heritage conservation area. The site was originally part of historical Centennial Park and therefore public parkland. The proposal massively exceeds the height limit of 8.5 metres and has only minimal setbacks from Bargona Avenue which is directly opposite Queens Park. This huge structure is not in the least bit compatible with its location and will be visually jarring when viewed from Queens Park and Baronga Avenue, as many photo montages confirm.

35

40

- In summary we believe that the additional student places should not be permitted and the 1680 student limit set by the – as a condition by the Waverley Local Planning Panel in 2017 be maintained; (2) while the community acknowledges that there may be a need for upgrading and replacing some classrooms, we believe that any development should be modest in scale, lower in height and set back from Baronga

45

Avenue so as not to intrude or impact on the park and the surrounding leafy environment; (3) further analysis by traffic engineers of any proposed changes to the current arrangements should be undertaken and then discussed with the community prior to any firm decisions being made for possible implementation; (4) permissions
5 for – permission for any development at all should be contingent on the school proving that it has successfully mitigated the traffic impact by whatever means it can, including increased use of buses.

10 The key metrics for such a process should be set and managed by an ongoing – on an ongoing basis by an independent and reputable authority and include biannual reports and – to and in consultation with both Council and Queens Park residents. The community has been very tolerant over the years, considering the ever-expanding school numbers that are at odds with multiples reassurances to the contrary. The community's voice is well-illustrated by the large number of submissions from local
15 residents opposing this proposal. Such a large and intrusive development in this location and an expansion in the school numbers is an unreasonable imposition on our community and also those who treasure the parklands. Thank you very much.

20 MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Peter. We note your submission and the previous submissions of the precinct as well. Thank you for that. We have no further questions. I will now call on the next speaker, Nigel Oliver.

MR OLIVER: Good morning, commissioners. I am here today as a resident of Queens Park. Firstly I should say that I support and reinforce the statements,
25 including the objection, that Peter Cohan has just made on behalf of the Queens Park Precinct Committee. Whilst the State Significant Development Application to expand the college includes for various changes to infrastructure, I want to talk today about traffic impact and effective mitigation.

30 Should the SSDA be approved, the consequential growth in staff and student numbers will generate more traffic and on-street parking demand, and it will increase student drop-offs and pick-ups, and the demand for evening event parking in our local streets. Despite the efforts of the college through its transport, traffic and parking plan, students continue to park and parents continue to drop off and pick up
35 in the limited parking facilities of the surrounding residential streets, disregarding college requirements for obligatory compliance by students, staff and parents, with students' continuing enrolment at risk in the event of a breach. Having a transport, traffic and parking plan might tick a requirement box but its effective implementation to mitigate college generated traffic impact requires, as a minimum,
40 commitment, management and budget.

Without these three things the plan is unlikely to be successful, and the ongoing problems that the plan is then unable to address will continue to strain the relationship between the college and local residents. Various consultant reports are
45 included in the SSDA, including a Traffic Impact Assessment, TIA, that has been peer reviewed by Bitzios Consulting. The outcome appears to indicate, at the very least, the need for clarification and review of various assumptions, modelling

methodology and scope. Without a clear understanding of the forecast future traffic position as a result of the development proposal, it is going to be very difficult for the college to respond with an effective traffic and parking plan.

5 A few examples of the comments from Bitzios, including queries, in response to their review of the TIA, there is no capacity for additional bus services. Would additional bus services be a solution in any event, given the low take-up by students to date? State buses already queue through no stopping restrictions on a regular basis. To achieve a person to vehicle rate of 2.6, as stated in the TIA, is understood not to be possible since it would require at least seven persons per vehicle. 265 out of 286 staff members currently drive to work. This is substantially higher than the number of existing parking spaces allocated to staff, which is 171. I understand in the original application 15 more spaces are to be allocated, and this morning I believe that has been lifted to 19, but it's still significantly short of the requirement for staff parking.

The data from the travel questionnaires estimates 52 students already drive to school and there are no onsite parking spaces for students. The TIA, via questionnaires, finds that the majority travel by car because it is convenient. The 10 per cent mode shift is considered to be optimistic and should be treated as an aspirational target. The TIA says restriction of onsite parking is one underlying measure to reduce demand. Bitzios disagrees. In summary, the expansion of the school will increase traffic congestion and increase demand for car parking in adjacent residential streets. School visitors prefer to travel by car for convenience. This will be very difficult to change. Bus travel is available but underutilised.

The significant increase in bike travel under the Green Travel Plan is unrealistic. The 10 per cent mode shift is optimistic and aspirational. On-street parking impacts have not been evaluated in the TIA. All of this needs to be clarified and understood before a college transport, traffic and parking plan is able to begin to respond and mitigate the impacts. In conclusion, I would suggest a review and update of the TIA in consultation and agreement with Bitzios and the Queens Park committee to resolve the issues raised in the peer review. And importantly, along with many other residents, I would welcome an invitation to attend regular college-led consultation meetings relating to current and future traffic management in our residential streets. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Nigel. Thank you for your presentation today. We have got no further questions. Thank you. We're now going to take a short break and recommence at 11.40. Thank you.

RECORDING SUSPENDED

[11.05 am]

45

RECORDING RESUMED

[11.28 am]

MR DUNCAN: Welcome back to the Independent Planning Commission's public meeting for the Moriah College redevelopment project. I would now like to ask our next speaker, Michael Ahrens, to present.

5 MR M. AHRENS: Thank you. Can you hear me?

MR DUNCAN: Yes, we can. Thank you, Michael.

10 MR AHRENS: Thank you, Mr Duncan. Yes. I am very pleased, and I thank you for the opportunity to speak in relation to this development application, because it is of great significance to the precinct, and I think we are truly a stakeholder in relation to it, and I will confine myself here to one aspect of great and ever-increasing concern to residents, and that is the implications of the traffic increase. That flow – flows for traffic, what the Council correctly describes as a heavily congested
15 situation, and of course, as you know, it's increasing every year and that nothing material is planned by the Council to minimise that impact. Of course, as has already been said, and as you know, it's all north-south. The only real through street is Newland Street, leading up to the heavily used and increasingly used retail Bondi Junction area, the retail area.

20 Denison Street and Bourke Street is also experiencing increasing – take a – take a fair load of the increasing burdens of through traffic. Now, as a long-term resident of the precinct, and I have also been a member – an ongoing member of the Queens Park Consultative Committee, the QPCC, which – on which the Council and the
25 college are representative. That has been an ongoing thing recognised by the Council and agreed to by Moriah, and I must say over the years that I have been involved, the attitude of Moriah has changed significantly. It used to be much more consultative, much more willing to send media representatives along to that consultation, but increasingly not. If it wasn't for Ms Goot, I don't know where it
30 would be – where it would have been the last time we met, but the – that was a real opportunity to work these things through with the – with the precinct, and it has not worked satisfactorily, in my view, over the last few years.

I can testify, however, to the clear, ongoing recognition of the problem and the high
35 significance of the increasing flow, both for the Council and for Moriah, as well as the precinct. The – many occasions over the years, we and other precinct residents have actively canvassed solutions for it, both at well-attended precinct meetings and directly with the Council. We're expressing our serious concerns, but it seems for the Council very little if anything had been done, except to oppose applications
40 which may have the effect of making it worse. I submit a key implication of this project for the expansion of Moriah College is the implication it directly poses for that north-south and other precinct traffic.

Hence, those likely implications – those likely implications should be equally vital
45 for its consideration, not simply the implications for the college. The Council objects, of course, to the current application, as it has to, on the – on the basis of the traffic effect. At certain times – as you understand, at certain times of the day,

Newland Street is totally full of slow-moving vehicles, bumper to bumper. The effect is to avoid it if possible, to avoid Newland Street, and therefore, traffic via the precinct, including by parents of Moriah students coming and going, can therefore – to avoid Newland, they will drive through any of the quiet streets and lanes in the precinct nearby.

I am certainly not alleging that this particular lane-running effect is confined to parents of Moriah students, but the difference, especially in the afternoon, in school – between school time and holidays, especially in the afternoon, is certainly noticeable. Because of the heavy traffic in certain streets, use of the precinct laneways has become very important to residents. It's clearly dangerous to have cars divert into them in a rush to get through. Children play in those laneways. A child-minding centre has been approved by the Council at the north end of Alt Lane, but you take the particular – they are straight-through roads from – from Queens Park Road right through to Birrell, and they attract traffic.

These laneways attract traffic, especially in the afternoons. Now, traffic counts. I have – I am really amazed here. I – and I think Council must have done some traffic counts to compare active school days and holidays. I have never heard one being done yet in response to this development application, as Peter Cohen has remarked. Making such a traffic count seems to me essential if the impact of the future expansion of Moriah College is to be considered. I can see no reference, however, to traffic counts in any of the submissions or reports. That's a very strange oversight, Commissioners. This must be remedied before the application goes forward.

Aspirational claims as to lack of serious future traffic events should not and cannot, in my view, be taken as evidence. I address the Commissioners to the relevant part of the valuable Bitzios consulting report, the peer review, as Mr Oliver has mentioned – and he will submit, and I – I would adopt, the written form of analysis of that Bitzios report, which we would love to submit to you, because it really points out some serious deficiencies in the traffic assessment submitted on behalf of the college. They need to be reviewed, and Mr Oliver has described exactly how that should be done. Then turning next to the – what the college described as a green travel plan, that talks about other alternatives, a range of alternatives such a bicycle training and walking to the college.

Unless they mean walking from their cars to the college, I don't understand what that really means, because I can't – I cannot imagine that they could be serious thinking that these students who come from quite a long – or a range of places within the Waverley area will be bicycling through with their heavy bags. In that fact, there's – unless there is compulsory uses of the buses provided, compulsory use of the buses, both mornings and after school by senior students, I don't see how it is going to ever have an impact on what they call a modal reduction, whatever that means. A modal reduction. I mean, it has got to be a real effect of getting the students onto those buses morning and afternoon, and providing enough buses, just even buses directly up to the Bondi Junction Station would be – make a – quite an effect.

But today, I hear the representative on behalf of the college talk about for the first time car-pooling. I was delighted. Do they – are they serious about car-pooling? If so, let demonstrate it during this trial period, because that could have quite an effect, but I – Ms Goot has referred to the importance of car-pooling and what – the college, of course, as most schools, have great difficulty getting parents to car-pool. So I think we're – we have to revert back to the buses. Unless that bus thing is dealt with – dealt with seriously and actively and demonstrated, in a way which is auditable in terms of use of – by the students, then I don't think this green travel plan means anything. I'm not suggesting that the flow of parents, students and stuff to and from the college during term times is the only cause of the severe but that extra flow must exacerbate the ever-increasing flow to and from Randwick and further south.

For example, the current expansion of the acute care facilities, the Prince of Wales Hospital and other Randwick developments are going to be very significant to this. If there's no other traffic plan, surely the very least that can be done by both the Council and the commission is to oppose major developments like this. Let me give you just quickly a brief and firsthand experience. Those living at my residence have unfortunately over the past year been forced several times to undertake urgent treatment at Prince of Wales. When we have called – we called the ambulance. The ambulance drivers were most frustrated to encounter blockages, especially at certain hours of the day, around the college, both at the eastern end of Queens Park Road and along Baronga Street. I appreciate more now how this could be dangerous – can I have one more minute, please?

MR DUNCAN: Yes, you can. Continue, Michael.

MR AHRENS: I appreciate now how that could be dangerous at peak times, being forced to backtrack from here via Queens Park Road and Bronte Road is the only escape routes through to that hospital, and it's not really feasible at certain hours. Ambulance and other emergency vehicles passage are essential safety issues for our residents and others in Waverley. That's – thank you very much for the opportunity.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Michael, and I might mention you said that you would like to submit some more information on the traffic. We're having – we're open to written submissions or submissions until 22 April, 5 pm.

MR AHRENS: Yes, I heard that. Thank you very much. Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR AHRENS: So particularly the one that's coming in about the Bitzios report that has come in.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. And also, details of the green travel plan and their traffic and parking requirements – parking plan are actually in the draft conditions the

Department prepared, so I sort of highlight those to you. If you're going to make another submission, have a look at those.

MR AHRENS: Thank you. We will certainly do that.

5

MR DUNCAN: They're on our website. Thank you. Thanks, Michael. Thank you for your presentation.

MR AHRENS: Thank you.

10

MR DUNCAN: I would now like to call on the next speaker, Russell Chenu. Russell, can you hear me?

MR R. CHENU: Hello?

15

MR DUNCAN: Yes, Russell.

MR CHENU: Yes, I can hear you. Can you hear me and see me?

20

MR DUNCAN: Yes, we – yes, we can. Loud and clear.

MR CHENU: Very good. Thank you, gentlemen, and good morning to you, and thanks very much for providing time to – to make this presentation. I have a few comments I would like to make, but in the interests of time, I will try not to repeat
25 points that have been very eloquently made by other residents of the Queens Park neighbourhood. However, some of the – some of my comments cover the same sort of subjects but maybe with a slightly different aspect, and one of them is traffic. One thing I have noticed in the relatively short time I have been resident in Queens Park compared with some of the other people who have spoken, is the increase in traffic in
30 the last few years. The light rail seems to have diverted a lot of people commuting to the city and other areas from using Ellison Road/Anzac Parade route, and now come in through York Road. So they go passed Moriah and then up to Oxford Street.

And that, we thought, as residents, would only persist while the light rail was under
35 construction, but my observation is that that is definitely not the case, because if you use Clovelly Road and other streets going east – east-west, you can actually see that those people are continuing to use these – the routes that they did during the – during the period of the construction of the light rail, and I suspect that's because the light rail has actually slowed down traffic considerably on both – on both Allison Road
40 and on Anzac Parade. And it's exacerbated by the fact that there has been significant increase in the number of residences in those coastal suburbs as a result of the number of apartments that have been constructed on sites that used to be occupied by single-family homes.

45 So there's many, many more residents on the same size land that used to have only, you know, two to four – two to four or so occupants. And something that I don't think has been taken into account in the evaluations and submissions to date is the

impact that COVID has had. We're all aware of how public transport patronage has declined in the past 12 to 15 months, and that, as the community goes back to work in other locations from – away from home, is actually leading to an increase in the traffic on the roads. You know, in all neighbourhoods, but it's very impactful in relation to – to this eastern suburbs area. So I think the point has been made by others that the traffic is a big issue and expansion of Moriah by 290 students on top of – on top of what it already generates is, in my view, going to be quite significant for the neighbourhood.

10 In addition, I would like to make some points on parking. Yes, there's parking in the surrounding streets. Mention has been made of the number of students who are doing that, but it's – it overlooks the number of staff of the college who also park in the streets. The number of students that park is apparent because it increases during the year as they turn 17 and then the senior students get their licence and they immediately start commuting to school, or many of them immediately start commuting to school in their own vehicles. As the demand increases for parking, that spills over into Centennial Park, and I very much doubt that Centennial Park was ever intended to be a parking lot for students at any school, including Moriah College, so it's actually intended to be a recreation area for the residents of the whole of Sydney, not a parking lot for Moriah students, or the Moriah staff, for that matter, who also tend to use the park for that purpose.

I would like to also make some notes about the sensitivity of the site. The representative of Urbis representing the college made some points about how the design had been changed in response to comments. I accept that that, you know, might be the case, but I think it understates the sensitivity of the site that Moriah College occupies, given its adjacency to Queens Park and to Centennial Park Parklands. In my view, it's just maybe a personal opinion, but it's – it looks very intrusive from the images that she put up on the screen. My final comment is that I endorse and commend the comments that have been made by Peter Cohen, Nigel Oliver and Michael Ahrens. They were all very much more eloquent than I would be in relation to the issues that they have raised, but I endorse and commend those comments to the Commission. Thank you. That concludes my comments.

35 MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Russell. Thank you for your presentation today. I will now call on our next speaker, Doug Murchison. Doug, can you hear us?

MR D. MURCHISON: Yes, I can. Can you hear me?

40 MR DUNCAN: Yes, clearly. Thank you.

MR MURCHISON: Wonderful. Thank you. Yes. My name is Doug Murchison and I have been a resident of Queens Park since 1985. I would like to just say firstly to thank Peter Cohen, Nigel and also Michael for their excellent presentations, and such they have managed to shortcut my presentation, significantly so. I would like to just focus on a – my history with the Queens Park precinct and our dealings with Moriah College. I was a member of the inaugural Queens Park precinct which was

involved in the original DA86-193 for the '93 construction, and the then general manager of the college, Robert Gue made several public commitments at the college presentations to the residents, three of these that I wish to focus on, not in great detail, but just to point them out.

5

The communal use of college swimming pools and gymnasium after school hours, a guarantee that no staff of students would be using the local streets for parking and the college would not be conducting additional after-hours functions. Sadly, shortly after the approvals were received, Robert Gue was replaced and his public commitments were ignored. How can we feel confident that any further commitments will also not be ignored? And I feel that the college needs an effective watchdog to ensure that they behave as responsible and ethical corporate neighbours. And fundamentally, I would just like to put that forward, and that's really all I have to say. But yes, I have been very disappointed with their lack of corporate behaviour and particularly as neighbours for the Queens Park precinct. It hasn't been satisfactory. That's all I have to say. Thank you very much.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you for your time today, Doug. Thank you for your presentation. I would now like to call the next speaker, Tom Gellibrand. Tom, can you hear us? Tom, I think you might be on mute.

20

MR T. GELLIBRAND: Yes, I was. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Good.

25

MR GELLIBRAND: I'm also in a very remote location in a national park down the south coast, so I – hopefully Telstra won't let me down.

MR DUNCAN: We can see that, and we can hear you loud and clear. Thank you.

30

MR GELLIBRAND: Yes. Okay. Perfect. So I have made a submission. I won't go into all the points I have made. I'm sure you have been – at least seen a summary of it, but I have just got a little speech I will read through. My name is Tom Gellibrand. I'm a resident and experienced town planner and transport specialist. My first job in planning was actually at the Office of the Commissioner for Inquiry for Environment and Planning, which was a precursor to the IPC, so I very much understand and respect the role that you gentlemen are playing.

35

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

40

MR GELLIBRAND: I have got Masters qualifications in Town Planning and I have had executive planning and transport positions in local and state government. I was actually the deputy director-general of the Department of Planning from 2009 to 2012. I have served on the Heritage Council of New South Wales and have significant experience in the risking and assessment of the impacts on items of environmental heritage. I have held executive transport positions, and most recently I was the deputy CEO of Sydney Metro. Today I was just going to focus on two

45

issues, being visual impact, traffic and related parking. So in terms of visual impacts, my position is the Department has failed to address the impacts of the proposed built form on the state heritage significance of Queens Park and Centennial Park, especially Queens Park.

5

As you know, the surrounding localities one and two-storey residential development. The propose development is for buildings higher than 20 metres, which are equivalent to, you know, up to six-storey commercial building. That scale is completely at odds with the character of our locality. It will have a significant impact on the adjacent parklands, and that impact was confirmed in the Department's assessment report, and my reference is figure 49 on page 88. It quite clearly shows the impact of the proposed built form. The Department also acknowledges that the development is inconsistent with the locality and it does call for increased landscaping, and acknowledges that that would be partially successful in addressing the impact.

Waverley Council and all the local community people – I haven't had the advantage of listening to people today but I'm sure they have raised that as well. The issue is not so much one of impact on privacy or overshadowing or overlooking. It's about the inconsistent scale of development. It's a residential locality. The school exists at the moment, but this is all about not making its impacts greater than currently – than they currently are. I think given the state significance of both Centennial and Queens Park, it's a serious planning matter that requires more than a partial landscaping response. Changes need to be made to the built form of the buildings and/or their location, and it's – you know, there's some obvious opportunities to reduce the scale along the eastern edge or push those buildings back more towards the centre of the site.

In terms of traffic and parking impact, the SEARs given by the Secretary are really clear that there has to be an assessment on the road and pedestrian safety adjacent to the proposed development. Adjacent. Whereas the proponent's assessment is purely upon adjoining roads, so it has failed to address the Secretary's assessment requirements, which is a real flaw in the overall assessment. Adjoining – the adjacent roads that they need to look at are Ashton Street, Denison Street and Alt Street, none of which have been actually assessed from a traffic impact point of view. Traffic – local traffic safety hasn't been addressed. That has been acknowledged by the Department and the peer reviewer, Bitzios, but no solutions have been identified.

The Department's report says every effort should be made by the applicant to address the potential impacts generated, but obviously there needs to be more than just a statement like that. There needs to be – if there's going to be an approval, there needs to be specific conditions of approval requiring specific things to be undertaken. The Department's report goes on to say on page 73 that the local traffic matter should be investigated by Council in consultation with the community. I would say that's unacceptable. The proponent is generating the impact and the proponent must be required to mitigate prior to undertaking the works. I can see I have only got 30

seconds left, but the sorts of – the sorts of migrations required could be simple signage.

5 In Ashton Street, it's – essentially it's saying no left turn between 7 and 9 o'clock in the morning, as has been done by Council at the intersection of Denison and Birrell. So if there's consideration to be given to approving the proposed development, it must – there must first off be significant improvements undertaken to the local roads to fix the existing impacts that no doubt people have already spoken about today. The impacts on Centennial Park, it is not a parking lot for a private school. It's
10 actually a regionally significant open spaced area for everyone to enjoy, but it effectively works as a parking lot during the week. I see I'm out of time.

MR DUNCAN: You have got some time to finish, Tom, so keep going, if you wish.

15 MR GELLIBRAND: Thank you, Peter. So we have the situation at the moment, parking occurring in the – in obviously Centennial Park. I think that before – if – if the consideration is to be given to approving it, that there should be an opportunity for people like myself – and I'm more than willing to take time off work to sit down with Council and Moriah College and say, "Look, this is what's happening at the
20 moment," which they know, "What we ask for is simple solutions like signage at the entrance to some of these local roads to limit through traffic during those early hours". They're really simple matters that could be implemented, but none of those things are in the proposal at the moment, nor do they – nor do you find them as proposed conditions of approval. I think they have to be done prior to granting any
25 approval to the concept plan and that stage 1 DA, and I'm more than willing to – to be involved in that and take time out to – to meet with both the school and the Council. We have had many meetings with the Council, by the way, and they accept that there is an issue, but no one is actually stepping forward and just saying, "Well, we – this – here's some opportunities to resolve it".
30

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thank you, Tom.

MR GELLIBRAND: Thank you very much for listening to me.

35 MR DUNCAN: Thank you for your time, and under the circumstances, it was quite clear. Thank you.

MR GELLIBRAND: Okay. I appreciate it. Thanks for hearing from me. Bye,
40 guys.

MR DUNCAN: All right. The next presenter is Simon Swifte. Please proceed.

MR S. SWIFTE: Afternoon, Commissioners, and everybody. I'm a long-term
45 resident of Queens Park and I know my views echo the views of many of my neighbours. We have objections to the development on three basic points that have been covered by many of the previous speakers, traffic, parking and the visual impact looking west from Queens Park. On the traffic, many of the north-south streets are

already at capacity in peak times, and York Road is very difficult to traverse, so many of the – many of the parents who have dropped off their children come through the north-south streets of Queens Park, and I know when I have gone out at peak times, you can see the – the numbers that are displayed by parents, the numbers that

5 Moriah College parents have on their cars, so I know that a lot of our additional traffic is from the drop-off and pick-up. Now, it's commendable that the school is looking at the green travel plan and they're looking at a 10 per cent reduction, although with a 17 per cent increase in students and teachers, that still leaves a net

10 seven per cent increase in traffic in an area that is already at capacity.

On the parking, any morning or afternoon, you can see the parents dropping off and picking up their children in the adjacent streets, and to be fair, if they weren't doing that, I don't know that the school's drop-off area has the capacity to take more people. You can always see at peak times there is a large queue to get into the

15 school, and I can see the motivation for parents who are dropping off or picking up to do that in adjacent streets. It does impact the residents. As mentioned earlier, a lot of these parents are double-parking or parking in no-stopping areas. The last point which has also been covered, the visual impact from Queens Park. A four-storey building is quite an impact when looking west from the park. Currently, it's a very

20 low-impact vision, with trees covering the – the low-rise buildings already in the school, and I just think it detracts from the experience of being in the park. That's all I have to put across. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, Simon. Thank you for your presentation today. I

25 would now like to ask our next speaker, Roma Gillam, to present. Roma, please proceed.

MS R. GILLAM: Yes. Thank you, Commissioners. So an awful lot of what I was going to say, of course, has been well-covered. I mean, the – the usual issues of the

30 traffic and the impact of the building, etcetera, but, you know, I want to speak on a more personal level as being one of the – a very long-term resident, having been here for 46 years and – well before the school was ever located here, and, you know, I just want to reinforce, you know, the whole thing about the student numbers. You know, we used to go to these initial community meetings with – actually with Robert Gue

35 who was mentioned before. We were assured that the numbers wouldn't exceed 610, and here we are, we have now got 1680 students, which is, from what I can see, the second largest independent school in the eastern suburbs, and if the extra numbers were permitted, it would be the largest independent school in the eastern suburbs.

I mean, there has to be a limit. The school just can't keep growing forever and ever and ever and placing more pressure on our neighbourhood. Now, the other thing that, you know, as a long-term resident, when the school did move here in the 1980s, I was actually involved with others in the community, including Doug, Waverley Council, Moriah College and the private traffic engineering company to develop a

40 local area traffic management plan to – which provided calming measures in the streets. Now, I was quite astounded to read the Planning Department's assessment report that said that any traffic issues in local streets, which they didn't even bother

45

to name, could be addressed by developing an LATM. So suggesting that they hadn't actually looked at what has been going on over the last umpteen years since we have had the LATM since the 1980s.

5 And, of course, an LATM doesn't do anything to reduce the volume of traffic. It doesn't do anything to address poor driver behaviour, which includes, you know, double-parking, stopping in no-stopping areas, you know, sitting in cars with the engines idling while you wait to either go into the, you know, internal drop-off points, or waiting for your children in the streets, as often happens. So, you know,
10 they're all the – the concerns that I have as a long-term resident, but I also have a concern about the proposed traffic changes. I don't – particularly the things like the intersection of Queens Park Road and York Road. Now, we have already pointed out that there is a queue there, a long queue in the mornings in Queens Park Road, which is a local road, and York Road, of course, is a regional road.

15 If the threshold – the garden threshold on the southern side were removed, that line would, you know, be halved immediately. But my concern is really a safety thing about the seagull, and I – you know, I – obviously the experts need to look at this in more detail. This is just sort of a thing that I'm a bit worried about, is that you're
20 going to have a very busy intersection there. You're going to have people in Queens Park Road looking to the right to see if there's any cars coming around the bend in York Road, traffic north-south. You're going to have the people lined up who are travelling north on York Road but turning right into Queens Park Road, so there are a whole lot of issues there that I think need to be looked at in terms of safety.

25 And also, the fact is that the – for most of the – for twenty-three and a half hours a day, there's no problem with that intersection. It's just that morning peak when parents drop off kids. I'm not saying they cause all – the whole lot of the queue, but a lot of parents drop off kids and then obviously head off into the city. I'm also a
30 little bit worried about the pedestrian crossing. I feel that – as Tom and I think Russell as well talked about students parking in Centennial Park. I feel that that crossing is being put there for the convenience of the students who are parking in Centennial Park, and it's just going to cause more – more action at that whole vicinity. You will have a pedestrian crossing, a right-hand turn, a seagull, and a
35 whole range of things, so I think that needs to be looked at really carefully.

And, of course, my other big thing is the impact from the huge, huge building that's going in there, particularly from Baronga and from Queens Park. We all use Queens Park. We all have done for many years, and to have this incredibly intrusive building
40 put there is just – you know, is quite unbelievable. So that – you know, I feel that even though we know that there might be new buildings and refurbishment, we feel that this scale is just totally out of proportion and should be reduced. So, you know, there should be no increase in the student numbers, the building should be – it should be modified, and the traffic issue should be looked at very carefully and discussed
45 with the residents, as they always have been in the past. So thank you for your time.

MR DUNCAN: Roma, thank you for your presentation today. Thank you. I will now call on our last speaker, David PLAISTER to speak. David, can you hear us?

MR D. PLAISTER: Good morning.

5

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MR PLAISTER: Can you hear me?

10 MR DUNCAN: Yes, we can. Thank you. Please proceed.

MR PLAISTER: Good morning, Commissioners. I support and reinforce the previous speakers' comments, particularly Peter Cohen, and their submissions this morning. I suppose from my point of view, there's a few things that I might add, and if I cover the same ground, I don't apologise. In terms of the school size, the school, in my view, is currently at tipping point, requiring a new campus to be found. The site is not suitable for a large school, and if approved, will represent a gross overdevelopment. Its size is impacting, eroding on the amenity area as it stands, and to consider a four-storey building which from the street will be more like six, certainly if you're over in Queens Park or Centennial Park, and, you know, vertical schools are not the sort of schools that we should have in a residential area, in my opinion.

Traffic. There has been a lot said about the traffic, and, of course, yes, there will be increase. They're going to remove 83-odd parking spots during the first stage, but ultimately going to have another 19, so they then add those two together and get 103, so quite don't know how that works, but losing 84 spaces when you're going to have additional staff and children of driving age is incomprehensible to me. Why they haven't considered underground car parking, playing areas above, as many eastern suburbs schools have, they have sporting facilities over car parks, and that allows for quite substantial onsite parking. You know, it's a sandy site, easy as anything to build in, and it hasn't been mentioned, as best I understand anyway.

A green travel plan. Deary me. Over the next 15 years, well, I will be gone, so let's hope something happens in that area. It's certainly not happening at the moment, and as a reinforcement of that, the school's existing traffic – sorry, transport, traffic and parking plan has never worked. I have done two surveys, one on 24 February, two – 1455 hours and 1355 – 1555 hours in the corner of Alt Street and Queens Park Road, and 19 vehicles blatantly just stop, pick up, wait, and – you know, wait for the children to come out of school. Similarly, on the occasion of the 27th of – Thursday, 27 March, I did the same thing and there were 17 cars on the corner. I observed them doing the same activity, waiting, picking up, what have you, of the afternoon.

It was interesting. During this application, there has been security wardens traversing the side streets in high vis tops, approaching the drivers who – I haven't seen their fingers that they sometimes go in – I'm sure go in a vertical approach and don't move until the warden, you know – go pick on someone else. So the existing

traffic management is not working, so what will happen in the future, who knows, but certainly they ignore their current undertakings. I have mentioned briefly the vertical school. To me, it is just unbelievable that the school will say, “We have got some old buildings, some old transportables. We need to put a new steam building up, four storeys plus, on the site, but from the street and other adjacent areas – adjacent areas, they certainly will be higher than that, and they will put landscaping in but that’s very limited. Most disappointing. I do not comment to the Commissioners that this state significant project be approved. The school is large enough and is over-sized at the current time, and I commend my comments and from previous speakers for your consideration. Thank you and good morning.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you, David. Thank you for your presentation today. I would now like to thank all of our speakers and presenters today. This brings us to the end of this electronic public meeting. Thank you to everybody who has participated in the process. Adrian and I have appreciated your input. Just a reminder, it’s not too late to have your say in this application. Simply click on the Have Your Say portal on the Commission’s website or send a submission to the Commission via email or post. The deadline for written comments is 5 pm next Thursday, 22 April 2021. In the interests of openness and transparency, a full transcript of today’s meeting will be made available on the Commission’s website in the next few days. At the time of determination, the Commission will publish its statement of reasons for its decision which will outline how the panel took the community’s views into consideration as part of the decision-making process. For now though, thank you for watching this IPC electronic public hearing on the proposed Moriah College redevelopment. From all of us here at the Commission, enjoy the rest of your day. Thank you, and good afternoon.

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[12.20 pm]