



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-1471346

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

ROSEVILLE COLLEGE, SPORT AND WELLBEING CENTRE PROJECT

MEETING WITH APPLICANT

COMMISSION PANEL: PETER DUNCAN AM (Chair)
ADRIAN PILTON

OFFICE OF THE IPC: JANE ANDERSON

APPLICANT: DEB MAGILL (Roseville College)
MICHELLE SCOTT (Roseville College)
STEPHEN EARP (DFP Planning)
JORDAN GRAHAM (EPM Projects)
ANDREW HJORTH (Brewster Hjorth Architects)
GRAHAM BROOKS (GBA Heritage)
DEMI SPENCER (GBA Heritage)

1.08 PM, THURSDAY, 13 MAY 2021

MR P. DUNCAN: Good afternoon and welcome. Before we begin, I'd like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their elders past, present and emerging.

5 Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Roseville College Sport and Wellbeing
Centre Project currently before the Commission for determination. The Anglican
Schools Corporation, the applicant, is seeking consent for the development of a new
sport and wellbeing centre, an expansion of the existing school campus, at Roseville
10 College which caters for students from kindergarten to year 12. The proposal for the
new sport and wellbeing centre includes a new three level building comprising an
indoor swimming pool, gym, change facilities and amenities, general learning areas,
rooftop sports courts, storage areas, basement car parking and landscaping works.

15 My name is Peter Duncan. I am the chair of this Commission Panel. I'm joined by
my fellow Commissioner Adrian Pilton. We are also joined by Jane Anderson from
the Office of Independent Planning Commission.

In the interests of openness and transparency, and to ensure the full capture of
information, today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be
20 produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is one part
of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several
sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination. It is
important for the Commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues
whenever it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and not in a
25 position to answer, please feel free to take that question on notice and provide any
additional information in writing which we will then also put on our website. I
request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the
first time and for all members to ensure that we do not speak over the top of each
other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. Thank you. We'll now begin.

30 Over to you Deb and Michelle. We have an agenda, so from the Commission's point
of view please feel free to give an opening statement if you wish or else go straight to
the agenda items and we can discuss them.

35 MS M. SCOTT: Hi. Michelle Scott here, business manager of the college. I just
want to start by saying thank you for the opportunity to meet you all on site this
morning. Most – we're happy for most of these questions on our behalf to be tabled
by Stephen Earp, who is our planner. We met after our site visit this morning, and
we discussed a few things that we would like to get a little bit more information from
40 the Commission on. So, I might now hand over to Stephen to address those three
main issues. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks, Michelle. Stephen.

45 MR S. EARP: Good afternoon. My name is Stephen Earp. I'm at DFP Planning,
planning consultants on behalf of The Anglican Schools Corporation, Roseville

College. The agenda identifies an item for discussion on the views of the report from the Department and recommended conditions.

5 Briefly in regard to the Department's report, all in the team have reviewed that report, and we have no issues with its recommendations, findings, mitigation
measures or assessment otherwise contained. It's an accurate reflection of
10 everything that we have submitted in the EIS and the RTS, and perhaps on record it was a good process to work through, particularly the RTS. You might notice in the time stamps there was quite some time between the issuing of the RTS, firstly to us
as the applicant, and the time taken to respond, and that's representation of the
amount of time taken to consider those matters, consult with neighbour, consult with
Council and provide a detailed response. So we're very confident with the
information that's been reflected therein from that submission.

15 In regard to the conditions, we have had two rounds of review of the draft conditions with the Department of Planning. The first round was the set of conditions issued to applicant and Council. The second was version 2 which represented Council's
inputs. We have not made any comments or made any requests in regard to the
additions added by Kur-ring-gai Council to those conditions.

20 The only matters that we have raised are actually just in relation to minor matters, such as the dates of plans in condition A1, a correction. There was a discussion that we raised in regard to condition A7 and a couple of subsequent conditions relating to
wording about the provision of car parking. Our request there was that the wording
25 be more reflective of once DCP compliance has been achieved as opposed to a specific number, as we're conscious that design development is coming underway, but it was not an issue with which we wanted to pursue any major change. And we note from the conditions issued by the Department to the IPC that that condition
hasn't changed, and we hold no objection to that, and so the car parking situation is
30 simply one that if it does change we will look in by way of modification later.

The only other matter that was raised in relation to the conditions was a minor one.
B14, sub-condition (e), which was just a reflection that the hours that are in the
standard Department conditions bore the exclusion of construction vehicle
35 movements did not actually reflect the peak times of Roseville College, and the hours reflected in B14(e), as they appear to you in these conditions, are reflective of the peak hours as represented in the traffic report. So that was a simple correction as well.

40 MR DUNCAN: Just to clarify that, Stephen, what you're saying is that the hours that were put in don't take account of your peak times whereas the original ones do avoid conflicts with the peak hours of the school, is that right?

45 MR EARP: Yes. So, to be clear the wording of the condition is that it's the preparation of a Construction, Traffic and Pedestrian Management Sub-Plan, and sub-condition (e) is to:

Ensure that construction vehicle movements do not occur during the school drop-off (set hours) and pick up (set hours).

5 And those bracketed hours from the standard conditions just needed to be adjusted to 7.45 to 8.30, which is the school's pick-up – drop-off time, and 2.45 to 3.30, which is the school's pick-up times. So now they align with what's in the traffic report, so that's the change requested there.

10 MR DUNCAN: Yes. Thank you.

MR EARP: There was one matter that we wanted to raise with IPC that has come up. I'm going to – I just had it and I scrolled away from it for a second. Operational noise, I believe it's B21 – yes – condition B21. Just to bring the IPCs attention to there is a requirement as a mitigation measure over the acoustic report for evidence to the certifier acoustic shielding is being provided. We're satisfied with that as a condition of consent to be addressed prior to the commencement of construction, and we just wanted the – we have done a little bit of investigation. The architects have had a look in, but it's not a technically progressed item, and we thought we'd just put it there in case there was a question that came from the IPC. We don't actually have a detailed answer for that condition yet and wanted to just ask the question, if that was likely to come up should we be preparing something for you or are you also satisfied with the timing of that condition prior to construction?

25 MR A. PILTON: To be honest it's a bit early - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

30 MR PILTON: - - - because we haven't actually got to look at the conditions yet in detail.

MR EARP: Okay. Sure.

MR PILTON: So, we might come back to you.

35 MR EARP: That's fine. No problem. There are no other matters under the conditions that we wanted to raise or flag, and so that's probably okay – if that's an okay opening item for item 2 on the agenda – sorry – opening discussion for item 2 on the agenda.

40 MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MR EARP: Item 3 is the discussion around the main themes, but I just thought I'd take – this is the first IPC process for us. Is this a discussion you would like us to lead or are there questions you would like us - - -

45 MR DUNCAN: Yes. Look - - -

MR EARP: - - - or a presentation you would like us to give?

MR DUNCAN: - - - I think at that stage let's go through each point, and you can provide a summary of your view of each point, and then we can, at the end of each point, ask questions if we need to.

MR EARP: Okay. There are four points listed: built form and urban design, heritage, residential amenity and traffic and parking, and we note that they are the same key assessment issues that were discussed in the Department's report.

And on the first item of built form and urban design, I might do a brief overview of what was submitted with the original EIS, then what was submitted with the RTS, and I might then just ask Andrew Hjorth to provide a little bit more clarity there as the designer. The original proposal that was submitted with the EIS involved a – in a sense delivers the same outcomes, but it maximised or achieved equal compliance of car parking from the original 2017 car park approval. That was one of our drivers, was to make sure that we met all of the same requirements of that consent. In doing so it had – in terms of minimum dimensions and structural elements of the building, had a bit of a width play with the new space at 37, and so there was a strip of land that was part of a – I'll probably get this wrong, Andrew. Jump in if you need to. The structural component of the wall did not provide for deep soil planting for a wide space up against the boundary.

And one of the key issues that we looked at – the key issue that we looked at as part of the response to submissions package was what we called the interface zone between the new building and the boundary of number 39, and part of the key design changes that were introduced to the project at that time was a compaction of the internal layout, slight pushing into the car park area, which reduced in a slight reduction of car parking but only by a small volume, and a revised approach to that structural element on the common side of the boundary so that a very – I shouldn't say "very", but a large expanse of – a large width of deep soil planting to Council's satisfaction could be provided which allowed for trees and additional landscape planting throughout.

There were other changes to the building that also involved, say, the pushing back of the GLAs at the top floor, a slight reduction in the overall height by bringing down of floor to ceiling levels and finished floor levels. And so those overall changes essentially resulted in a slightly compacted but also reduced building which met the same client led design outcomes for tennis court space, for a pool with associated facilities, for the fitness and wellbeing centre and the like. And, Andrew, maybe just – could you just clarify was there anything that was necessarily removed from the scheme as part of the RTS or did we keep largely the same spaces as part of that? You're muted, Andrew. Sorry. Still muted.

MR A. HJORTH: Sorry. I was - - -

MR EARP: There you are.

MR HJORTH: - - - on mute button because I move things around. I was trying to be good and not have background noise. So, no, they were the main things that we changed. So, we really looked at how we could increase the zone between – if you like, the buffer zone between the property at number 39 and the development. So
5 there was a number of things that were done with that. So the only other one I'd add is that we originally had an awning over the eastern side of the – adjacent to the courts for some sun protection for the children using that court. With consultation with the next-door neighbour, he had some concerns about that because it impacted on his views of the sky. The college reviewed that and agreed to withdraw that and
10 remove that from their design.

MR DUNCAN: Can we just ask the question while we're on that boundary. We talked about it on site. Where the fence is for the courts, you're showing a framed structure and some planting there. Do you have any more detail of that? And, well,
15 what height would that be in your mind from the court level?

MR HJORTH: Okay. Look, again, no – look, there is a drawing in the submission I –drawing number 12 in the DA which has notional sections through that. Look, at the moment we haven't worked out exactly what height that would be. The notion
20 was rather than having just the fence that we actually could have some softening of that fence by utilising some planting in that location as well. It indicates planting there at the moment of around – I'm just looking at – must be about 1200 high but, look, we would certainly work on the technical side of that and the details of exactly what plants we were putting in there and how we did that. You might be able to
25 select some plants that didn't need the frame, or it could be a mix of climbing plants that could also climb on the – obviously with the right choice of plant, on the wire mesh if there was a wire mesh fence. So, no, we haven't done it, and there's no more detail at this point of time than what's shown on drawing 12 unless you require further detail.
30

MR DUNCAN: Andrew, I assume what you're saying is that can be further developed, and probably the key issue would be, you know, people from the court sort of looking straight into the neighbour's property.

35 MR HJORTH: Well, that would - - -

MR DUNCAN: So, some sort - - -

MR HJORTH: Yes, yes. That - - -
40

MR DUNCAN: Some sort of - - -

MR HJORTH: The reasons – yes – sorry.

45 MR DUNCAN: Yes. Some sort of effective screen that I'd imagine at least 1.8 or
- - -

MR HJORTH: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: - - - two metres high from the court's surface to do that, and it looks like it's possible on the drawing you've shown.

5

MR HJORTH: Correct. So we – from the court's surface there there's 400 – the sides of that planter box, if you like, come up 400 to get enough depth for the planting in there. Certainly, yes, we'd be very open to work to a height. The whole idea of that is to the users of the court from the adjacent neighbour.

10

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR HJORTH: Not to make it – you know, we were very conscious of – from our discussions in consulting with the neighbour, we were very aware that he didn't want things that were too high there as well, because he didn't want to feel that that element was too high. So - - -

15

MR DUNCAN: I see.

MR HJORTH: - - - we were happy to find a balance and work with them to what height that planting should be to do both those activities.

20

MR DUNCAN: Yes, yes. So it's a balance of screening and overshadowing, isn't it? So - - -

25

MR HJORTH: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: - - - is it correct to quote that area could have more resolution that could improve the situation? I'm not talking about more setbacks, but some more landscape resolution there to resolve that issue of screening?

30

MR HJORTH: Correct. And, look, we have on the lower side of the – adjacent to the fence, for example, we've had both and that deep soil planting that sits in the first three metres from the fence to the building. Council made representation of what plans they would like to see in there, and the next-door neighbour also made some suggestions as well. They didn't fully align at the time, so I believe that the landscape architect has chosen plants and a range of plants in there that would be amenable to both parties but, again, exactly the same, that planting at the top of that on the court level, we could – you know, as a part of this process we can look at the plants selected and what heights and the like to do. The nice thing about it if you have some sort of trellis is it becomes a framework that you can actually use to say, well, this is the height of the plants that we're intending to be always there and that they should be trimmed to that height as well.

35

40

MR DUNCAN: Sure. And I think that's the key issue, something that can be effective and serve that purpose. That's fine. Do you have anything more?

45

MR PILTON: Yes. Could I just ask a question? On the plans – I’m just looking at plan 4 at the moment – on the eastern side of the tennis courts there’s a sort of strip along the edge. What’s the purpose of that? I’m not quite sure where the fence goes there and - - -

5

MR HJORTH: You’re meaning between – west of grid 5, is that what you’re saying?

MR PILTON: Where’s grid 5? Yes. West of grid – no, no. It’s sort of more - - -

10

MR DUNCAN: East.

MS D. MAGILL: South east.

15 MR PILTON: Near section 2, just to the east of that. You see the tennis court is there - - -

MR HJORTH: Yes.

20 MR PILTON: - - - and then there’s a double line coming down. I’m not sure what that is, whether it’s a concrete wall or - - -

MR HJORTH: That was where the outdoor – yes. Let me have a look at that in section. Sorry. That area there can either be planting low level – in that level it’s not. It’s just the grating – there’s a grate between the two areas. It was just a milling area to be able to go on and off courts at that point of the thing. So - - -

25

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you.

30 MR DUNCAN: Thank you. Just on a related issue, what would be the days and hours of use of the courts? What would be the planned usage?

MS SCOTT: The planned usage from the college’s perspective would be very similar to our current usage of the spaces. It would be for tennis training before school starts from about 7 am and if there’s any necessary training up to about 5 o’clock - - -

35

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

40 MS SCOTT: - - - in the afternoon, so that’s after the actual school hours. And during the day it would be for scheduled sport and PDHPE lessons to the extent that the surface and the space is convenient for it, and most of our girls do go offsite for most of our sport activity because we don’t have the amenity here.

45 MR DUNCAN: Okay. And weekend use.

MS SCOTT: Weekend use would be Saturday mornings for sporting competitions, part of the IGSSA competition. So, from 8 till 12 on Saturday mornings. And at the moment that is currently only in term 1 and term 4 because that's the terms that tennis is played.

5

MR DUNCAN: Okay. And, therefore, I guess, it's a given then it's not used Saturday afternoons and Sundays.

MS MAGILL: No. The benefit of girl's sport is that it's finished by midday.

10

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MS MAGILL: There is a note, though, that that's not just tennis courts, it is multi-court, and so there is the chance that it could be used for netball or basketball during terms 2 and 3.

15

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR PILTON: Okay.

20

MR DUNCAN: So if we talk about after hours use, is it also consistent to say there will be no use of it on a Sunday and Saturday afternoon?

MS MAGILL: Yes. As Michelle said, consistent with current use for the court space. So you'll notice that there's no lighting that's been put in, so we don't expect any sort of evening activity or outside of regular school hour operations.

25

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Good. Thank you. All right, Andrew, I think we can move on from there.

30

MR HJORTH: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

35 MR HJORTH: So have you finished, Stephen, or did you want me to - - -

MR EARP: Sorry. On built form and urban design as a topic we've generally covered the way that that came about. In terms of its design say it was never designed to be a prominent street frontage building. You can probably see that the architect's taken quite long lengths to make this building as recessive as possible. Materiality reflects that as well. So what the designer has been trying to achieve is purpose and function but also a recessive but high quality frontage. So there hasn't been a desire to amend that Bancroft Street frontage through this process. So landscaping has played an important role in this, because there's a status quo of Bancroft Street's streetscape character that is retained along this frontage and also was introduced into the discussion of that interface zone down the side.

40

45

There was a bit of conversation – if I just turn to the conversation with the neighbour for a minute. There was conversation around whether those trees would be better off being deciduous or evergreen. As you can imagine there's probably benefits and pitfalls to both. He has a pool. He also wants to have – maintain – well, both he and his wife wanted to maintain privacy throughout the year, and we were essentially led on that discussion by Council who had some very specific requirements. So what's reflected there is taking into account as much of what the neighbour would like to ask with what Council's landscape officer was willing to agree to. But we – as you can see from Council's final letter, all matters aside essentially from the heritage conservation area matters were dealt with, that includes landscaping and the retention of tree 7. So I think that's probably a sufficient coverage of built form and urban design, unless there was any questions that came up or anything anyone else wanted to contribute, happy to move onto heritage.

15 MR DUNCAN: Yes, yes.

MR EARP: Okay. Just calling upon Graham and Demi, the authors of the most recent heritage assessment you'll have in the pack. There were three in total. One was – the first was an assessment by Urbis that was submitted with the original EIS; the second was a Department commissioned independent assessment by NBR Architecture, and then further recommendations of that finding, a supplementary statement of heritage impact was prepared by Graham Brooks and Associates. I might get – throw to you, Graham, Demi, in regard to where you picked up the project with the NBR, because GBA were not from – not in the project from the beginning. They were introduced at the time after we received the NBR peer review. So from their perspective, it's probably a third set of eyes discussion we can have now, Graham, about what did you see when you were introduced by the findings of the NBR report and where did your assessment take you.

30 MR G. BROOKS: Yes. Thank you, Stephen and Panel members. It's nice to be talking now. My apologies for this morning, but I believe I've been debriefed by Demi that the morning inspection was quite thorough and hopefully you've got an understanding now of the three dimensionality and the nature of what we're looking at.

35
40
45
When we came into the project there was some degree of uncertainty, I think, where it should go forward. There was some quite strong opinions expressed around the various people who wrote the previous reports. I mean, our view, after some very thorough research by Demi, was that ultimately the subject house at 37 was not of the same quality as the houses further up, particularly as a group, and that ultimately our recommendation was that it will be better to move the whole facility onto the site of the first house knowing that it meant that it will be losing a contributory house in a conservation area, and I think we basically decided that the – an overall benefit for the community both in heritage and school terms was to be achieved by retaining and avoiding any further development on the three historic buildings at 27 to 31. So ultimately, I guess, a fresh view, more detailed understanding and research that

perhaps had come through to us, and then a consideration of the best way of getting the benefits out there. Demi, do you want to add something?

MS D. SPENCER: No. I think that covers it. Yes.

5

MR EARP: We recognise that the Department of Planning accepted the recommendations in those reports, including the mitigation measures for photographic archival recording and interpretation plan. They've made their way into conditions of consent, and that's as was intended by those reports, and they have also in their findings agreed with the betterment of demolition of 37 over – of the alternative schemes that would require probably other buildings to be removed. So overall in terms of heritage we realise this was probably one of the bigger talking points from a public interest point of view. As we've covered here today, we've probably addressed the crux of the argument, but if there's any specifics or anything you wanted to head into with that, we're happy to address any questions you might have now.

10

15

MR DUNCAN: Nothing further at this stage, so we can move on.

20

MR EARP: Okay.

MR PILTON: Yes. Thank you very much.

25

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

30

35

MR EARP: Residential amenity was broken up into primarily acoustic impact and visual privacy. Acoustic assessment was carried out on the basis of background levels. And you'll probably note just from an underlying context for the acoustic assessment is that this DA before you does not involve any change to what the school's forecast student numbers are. All of the terms of those 2017 consents, including the max number of students and the assessments that went with those consents are brought across – you know, the idea is that they will be withdrawn. There's conditions of consent to do that. So the acoustic assessment was not addressing an increase in student numbers but primarily a change in the arrangement with which the noise would be generated by the school through this building and mechanical plant and associated matter. So it's construction noise, operational noise, etcetera.

40

45

The findings of that report, as have been captured by the Department in the conditions, have essentially advised the school may not necessarily currently comply but with some mitigation measures may be capable of complying with the nearest residential receivers, and so that's reflected in the terms of the consent. From an acoustic point of view it was also influenced by the discussion around hours of use and when it would be – when the site would be used, as you've heard just before from the school, but there's largely a retention of what the school currently do.

I also meant to make – I’ll make mention of it now, that clause 35 of the Education SEPP does require a declaration of – actually I should probably get the specific clause – a declaration of whether there’s an intent for community use, and the DA submission has been informed by a statement from the school that confirms that
5 there’s no current – because it’s not built and they haven’t had input with the community, there’s no current arrangement for community use, but it hasn’t been ruled out of the future, but it’s certainly – the operational management plan does not reflect specific user groups from the community on the site at certain hours, but the school hours would be retained whatever those other uses might be. So just so that
10 we don’t muddy the discussion, it was clause 35, subclause (6), just for reference, is where the Department wanted clarification in regard to community use. So just on
- - -

MR DUNCAN: Stephen, could I clarify that. What you’re saying is that there’s
15 potential for community use but there’s no intended community use plan at this stage.

MR EARP: Correct.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. So not ruled out or in at the moment but it could happen; is
20 that what you’re saying?

MR EARP: Correct. It was difficult for – one of the reasons why it might have not been as clear for the Department at the beginning of the assessment process was it
25 was not a project designed to be a public facility. It was designed to meet all of the requirements of the school across the whole year and all of the school’s activities, but because the Education SEPP prompts every application to make a statement, the clarification was provided that there currently is no drive for that, but it is available there if it works out. Like, for example, you would have seen on Recreation Avenue
30 that the Roseville Lawn Tennis Club is next door. This is merely just a comparison, but there may be availability if there’s overflow bookings, for example. That was something that we didn’t want reflected in the application, and we didn’t want reflected in conditions of consent, because at the minute there’s no conversation occurring between those two bodies, but as an example there may be capacity for that
35 later. Deb.

MS SCOTT: Yes. Michelle here. We do have existing capacity on our site for learn-to-swim lessons, so a major component of learn-to-swim is something that we would like to continue on in this development because that provides a great service
40 to our neighbouring families with young children learning to swim. So we are really open – and, again, it was that delicate balance between what the community wanted from a consultation perspective. They were basically keen to say to us, “We don’t want any extended community use, because we don’t want the interruption to operating hours.” We are really happy to strike that delicate balance of enhanced
45 community use as and when we can, but learn-to-swim is definitely one of those components.

MR DUNCAN: And if it was – Michelle, if it was learn-to-swim, that building is – that part of the building is completely enclosed where the pool is.

MS SCOTT: Yes.

5

MR DUNCAN: And then also potentially you could use the car park connect straight across, is that right?

MS SCOTT: Yes.

10

MR DUNCAN: So it's quite a discrete use if it was something like that.

MS SCOTT: Very discrete. We're not intending on hiring out the courts as a public facility as a money-making experience. There's no plan for that. We don't plan on being a tennis centre.

15

MS MAGILL: You'll also see that reflected in where the main entry to the building is, that it's very much off campus and that's our driver. Our driver has always been with this building that it's a facility for the students at the college.

20

MR EARP: Just – sorry.

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

MR EARP: Just a note that you'll also see the traffic report provides a discussion on that learn-to-swim scenario, when learn-to-swim cars would be in the car park, when they'd be coming out and the overlap of school activities at that time. So that assessment has been included in the body of our submission.

25

MR DUNCAN: Thank you.

30

MR EARP: On residential amenity, for the purpose of privacy, we have spoken previously in this meeting about that landscape strip to the east which remains the primary residential amenity interface. The – if you've got an appreciation for the floor level, about 1.6 above those existing tennis courts – 1.6 metres above the existing tennis courts, the opportunity for a change in conditions for visual privacy over Bancroft Avenue to the north are quite remote, if at all, occurring. We didn't feel like there was a need for privacy treatment, you know, in effect of where the building was trying to go with its design. And landscaping is going to be used along that eastern boundary to good effect. As Andrew had detailed before, some of that detailed design is coming out, but we do want it to meet the expectations and requirements of the neighbour as well, because they're going to be in their backyards at the same time these courts will be in use.

35

40

So there's no – I don't believe from – I don't know all of the conditions off by heart right now, but there's no condition, I believe, that requires further visual privacy

45

treatment or screening or anything. I could be corrected on that, but that's my understanding.

MR DUNCAN: We'll go through that. Thank you.

5

MR EARP: Yes. And that satisfies the third dot point. And the last, traffic and car parking, traffic conditions were mainly looked at from a perspective not in terms of, as I mentioned, an increase in students and how that would be managed, because kiss-and-drop arrangements, together with where – who would be parking on site have been dealt with largely in the 2017 DA. As mentioned, the response to submissions package involved design changes that reduced the car park in number by a small margin, but DCP compliance has been maintained with the by DCP throughout, and the purpose was that the school would just be providing as much parking as they can in a sensible arrangement which ticks the DCP box.

15

So in terms of the car parking assessment and the traffic impacts associated with, you'll find that the assessment focuses on those uses that are now changing what conditions might have been on the site before, which is primarily the learn-to-swim from the earlier hours of the day, and then there are no changes to the end of the day scenarios except for perhaps girls will not have to leave the site for sport facilities elsewhere. They might be staying on site, so perhaps there's actually a betterment to the traffic in that case, and the parking situation for staff is improved, and then there's an opportunity for some students to be parking on site as well.

20

So overall there was – as rare as it might seem for a school development, the traffic and parking issues were not deemed to have been overwhelming or with compromise, and we believe that the project has actually achieved satisfactory outcomes in both, and that's reflected in the conditions of consent as well.

25

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

30

MR EARP: That's the key themes.

MR DUNCAN: Just a couple of questions on that. Adrian, do you have anything?

35

MR PILTON: No.

MR DUNCAN: Just note that a green travel plan, you've committed to that in the process.

40

MR EARP: Yes, yes. We understand through the State Significant Development application process that standard conditions would be included on a green travel plan, and from the beginning of the project, therefore, the – not only is it a good idea to try and move people away from the use of cars, but for Roseville College specifically there's a bit of a narrative we had to show clearly about bicycle use and who comes from the station and safe travel movements and the like, so that had to play out and is supported by a green travel plan that primarily relates to staff

45

movements, and as you will see in the Department's conditions, that calls for a preparation of and review of that green travel plan which we're okay with.

5 MR DUNCAN: And given that, I guess, the purpose of it – we talked a little about it on site – is to improve the sort of modal split between private and public, do you think that's achievable with this plan?

10 MR EARP: It's a site that certainly has the availability to do so. As you would have noticed, the presence of parking – and this is – I'm not – I wasn't involved in the 2017 DA, but my understanding of the conditions that come out of those earlier consents include a lengthening of the Bancroft Avenue kiss-and-drop area – drop-off, pick-up, I think, area, and so there were schemes already in place agreed to by Council and their traffic committee that were satisfied – satisfied themselves in regard to the number of students and when as they increase what traffic measures
15 were required. Outside of cars there was an agreement by the Department that the site is not an appropriate one to be promoting bicycle travel to and from given its proximity to major arterial roads and its proximity to a railway station where a number of the girls do come from.

20 So as far as modal split goes there was a review of that. There was no need for us to look beyond the school site to improve connections because it was a fairly well connected, as far as public transport goes, site to the network, and so in that respect the green travel plan is not considered to be a document which will result in major changes to school operations but rather refinements of operations to improve those
25 traffic outcomes.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. And the green travel plan itself will be a requirement from Transport for New South Wales - - -

30 MR EARP: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: - - - through the process as well. Just going to the point that was raised about – I think it's Recreation Lane where you come into the car park, and that issue of pedestrian connection to the littler lane that goes down to the park, have you
35 been able to look at that to see if there's anything that can be done there to provide a better pedestrian experience and link through there?

MR EARP: We will be providing something through to IPC as an address to that. The initial conversation that we had – so between the site meeting and now we don't
40 have a document to - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Understand.

MR EARP: - - - provide, but the initial conversation we had was that we are aware
45 that the site will – sorry – the changes to that part of the site and its connection to the lane will involve a vehicle crossover that Council had as part of the 2017 DA required amendments in that zone. Without talking with Council's engineers about what could

be done in the public space there, we're wary about what we can commit ourselves to in terms of whether it's line marking, colouring of the concrete, those sorts of - - -

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

5

MR EARP: - - - issues that help separate public/private space and users. At the moment that laneway already serves as a bit of an awkward road that people drive up and have to reverse back down.

10 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR EARP: The proposal will include a driveway entry for school users to go in, but it doesn't change the public access arrangements there, so there may be an element which we were of the understanding would play out in the section 13A
15 Roads Act approval process in having that designed out, and if there was a need for us to have a condition of consent representing consultation with Council to perhaps address that or include changes in regard to Australian Standards that assist in that defining of pedestrian and car space - - -

20 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR EARP: - - - we're happy to do so. Would you need that resolved, do you believe - - -

25 MR DUNCAN: No. We'll talk to Council about this. But I guess what I was thinking, there are mechanisms – not always built mechanisms but mechanisms like shared zones and things like that where, you know, you've got speed sort of limits and they are pedestrian and vehicle friendly. So you wouldn't – I assume you
30 wouldn't be – in the design process wouldn't be against and the school wouldn't be against that type of usage of that laneway to ensure, you know, safety of pedestrians.

MR EARP: No. Based on our conversation from earlier, traffic calming was a part of what the solution may end up being - - -

35 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR EARP: - - - and what that is. So totally open to what that outcome looks like, but the school can't take ownership of that laneway, so that's why we were a bit hesitant in actually committing to something right now.

40

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Thanks, Stephen. Adrian, do you have any more questions?

MR PILTON: No more questions from me.

45 MR DUNCAN: Do you have any more, Jane?

MS J. ANDERSON: Nothing from me Peter.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Look, I think you've covered those areas well. Is there anything further – any other issues you'd like to raise with us before we wrap up?

5 MR EARP: Yes. There's probably two questions we'd just like to put you guys. I know, Jane, I grabbed you a little bit briefly on procedure, but it might be good to know for a lot of us or most – all of us – this will be our first run through with an IPC determination.

10 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR EARP: First question is whether it's possible just to have an outline of what the steps are from here through, and, you know, you mentioned mid-June or late June as a determination - - -

15 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR EARP: - - - but between here and there what might be expected of us, can you ask questions or do you need more information, should we be ready to prepare - - -

20 MR DUNCAN: Okay.

MR EARP: - - - to liaise any more with authorities - - -

25 MR DUNCAN: Happy to do that, Stephen. It's a good question as well. I think the important issue is to say why are we here to start with, and that's because we look at State significant developments where there's been 50 or more objections, a Council objection and/or political donations, those types of issues, and you're clearly here because of the Council objection. The process then comes to us after the assessment is completed by the Department for us. So we don't do the assessment. The
30 Department does that, and their assessment report is what we base a lot of our work on, as well as, you know, meetings like this, site visits and public meetings. So we have a lot of reading to do there now. This is early in the process. We've just received it. We have KPIs and timeframes to look at things, and our timeframe is at the end of June. So you can expect something by the end of June at the latest from
35 us from the point of view of determination.

The next step for us will be that we'll be talking to Council and the Department this afternoon. Then Adrian and I will be going away, and Jane, doing a lot of reading and research, and we will reserve the right to come back, but we'll most likely come
40 back through the Department if that were the case, because you have the relationship with the Department, and so that's how – if there are further questions, we reserve the right to ask those. We will put up some notes of the meeting this morning on our website. We will also do the same – this will be transcribed and put up on the website as well. So that will be up in about seven days - - -

45 MS ANDERSON: Usually they're about three days. Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Three days. So that's even better. And then we have the public meeting on the 27th, and the applicant will be invited to speak usually – and so does the Department – usually speaking up front presenting the proposal, and then the Department talks about their assessment, and then the community or whoever registers can speak from there, and generally people speak for five to 10 minutes in that process, and I think from the applicant's point of view you'll probably be given 20 to 30 minutes, and it will be Adrian and I again. It will be a studio session, so you'll come in by Zoom, or you can come in by phone as well if you wish.

10 MR EARP: Okay.

MR DUNCAN: So it's sort of a process where, you know, you can relax and do it from your office or home or wherever.

15 MR EARP: Okay. Just on that process, sounds like we have an opening 20, 30 minute presentation - - -

MR DUNCAN: Generally you are given the opportunity for that. I mean it's not mandatory but, you know, the opportunity is there for you to present.

20

MR EARP: Yes. That's okay. I don't think we'd need all of that time, but then Council would speak. If the public's submissions are after that will you require us to be available to answer – do we have - - -

25 MR DUNCAN: No. We actually – the Commissioners ask the questions, and generally they're fairly straightforward processes, and we don't expect you to get into a debate or anything like that. It's – probably one of the differences between a public meeting is there's less chance for that type of debate to occur - - -

30 MR EARP: Okay.

MR DUNCAN: - - - in an uncontrolled way, so it's quite formal.

35 MS ANDERSON: I'll just make a correction, Peter? So at this stage, Council have been invited, but they have chosen not to present at that public meeting, however, the Department will present, so - - -

MR EARP: Yes.

40 MS ANDERSON: - - - generally the Department presents first - - -

MR EARP: Yes.

45 MS ANDERSON: - - - and then yourselves. We can liaise with you further on that regarding timeframes for speaking and how that all works.

MR EARP: Okay.

MR DUNCAN: That's correct. It's not common practice for Councils to present at the meeting or the hearing. Quite often in the – we have it in the meeting. You may sometimes get a Councillor who decide to present on their own right, but in this case we're not aware of anything, but we'll know once registrations close.

5

MR EARP: Sure. Okay.

MR DUNCAN: So that's sort of the general process. And, Stephen, Jane will contact you, I think, beforehand anyway so we can walk you through any of those procedural issues beforehand.

10

MR EARP: Okay. That's been great. Thank you very much for running through that. The other query that we had, and this may be a little bit more administrative or vanilla in topic, is how do you prefer or is there a preference in the way that the applicant is represented at that meeting, and what I mean by that is would you like us all to be in one room if we're – and if we're not available – if we're not needing to be available for comments or anything, it sounds like it's only in a matter of being present in a space, we're not actually involved in a two-way conversation much at all.

15

MR DUNCAN: Really you don't have to bring the whole team into that meeting. I mean you bring whoever you need there, but it's your opportunity to put your application forward. So you choose how you present, and that's your choice - - -

20

MR EARP: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: - - - but you've got the whole team today. That's not necessary for the public meeting if you don't wish to do that.

25

MR EARP: Understand.

MS ANDERSON: Stephen, our communications team will liaise with you as well of exactly how to arrange your presentation at the public meeting.

30

MR EARP: Okay.

MS ANDERSON: I guess just to note that the public meeting is streamed live, so the community are able to follow it, so it's an opportunity for you to present whatever you choose to, to the public.

35

MR EARP: Okay. No. That's good. And the college are committed to consultation. As you know through the RTS process, we want to make sure that the messaging is quite clear through that. We'll make sure that whatever we're talking about that day is going to resonate strongly with what everyone's already has heard about the project during that time.

40

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MR EARP: So that's fine. We can talk to you more about that with your comms team later.

5 MR DUNCAN: So likewise, and we're very keen that we are transparent so that livestreaming, people can just click on our website and watch the proceedings of the day.

MR EARP: Okay.

10 MR DUNCAN: And once we have the final submissions, you'll have a better idea of the timeframe and who's speaking. Okay.

MR EARP: Okay. I think that's answered everything that we raised in our debrief meeting after the site meeting this morning, so I don't have anything else on my list.
15 Michelle, Deb, just wanted to check to make sure you're okay.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks, Stephen, it's been thorough.

MR EARP: Yes.
20

MR DUNCAN: Michelle or Deb, is there anything that you wish to say wrapping up? You're happy. Okay.

MS MAGILL: Yes. We're all good. Thank you.
25

MR DUNCAN: All right.

MS MAGILL: Thanks for the meeting. Thanks.

30 MR DUNCAN: Well, could I then thank everybody for your – both for your time this morning those that were there, and your time today. It's been helpful. Thank you very much.

MS MAGILL: Thank you.
35

MR EARP: Thank you.

MS ANDERSON: Bye everyone.

40

MEETING CONCLUDED

[1.56 pm]