

Emanuel School Community Consultation Committee

Meeting No: 2

Date: Monday 9th August 2021, 6pm to 8pm

Venue: Zoom

Attendees	
<p>Community Members Tara Roach Nicole Birbas NFP Justine Hughes</p>	<p>Emanuel School Andrew Watt - Principal Andrew Delany – Security Manager Derek Pal – Parent</p> <p>Sandrick Construction Warrick Smith – Project Manager Jonathan Lau Ben Liddell (Traffic engineer – guest speaker)</p> <p>Independent Chair Professor Roberta Ryan</p> <p>Minute Taker Sophie Alais</p>
<p>Apologies No apologies</p>	

Item	Description	Action
1	Welcome	
	RR welcomes everyone	
2	Apologies	
	No apologies	
3	Minutes and matters arising	
3.1	RR asks two members to endorse the minutes from the previous meeting. AD and DP agree to endorse the previous meeting's minutes.	
3.2	NFP's questions	
	<p>NFP raises a number of issues from last meeting.</p> <p>NFP asks RR to clarify her statement regarding not talking about the contents of the meeting to the public.</p> <p>RR says that it is useful that members do not report on what an individual says e.g. 'so and so said this' other than what is reported in the minutes to assist with freeing up conversation but rather to speak on behalf of the whole group discussion.</p>	

	<p>RR says that the minutes will quote people. RR says that the minutes are sent to members before they are released publicly, so the members can correct how they have been cited if they need to do so.</p> <p>NFP asks if WS can table the 128 conditions attached to the DA. WS says he can do so.</p> <p>NFP asks why the school did not invite a member of council to join the CCC.</p> <p>RR says that it is not the school’s prerogative to invite and choose members. RR says that as independent chair, she decides who constitutes the CCC. In RR’s view, it is not helpful for council to be involved in the CCC at present because the CCC is discussing the OTMP and the Green Travel Plan which will be submitted to council for approval. Given that council is the approval body for these documents, RR believes that it would be inappropriate for council to be present or to input into the discussion.</p> <p>Furthermore, RR says the CCC will discuss their views and suggestions, the school will decide what they do forward in the submissions, and then council will view the submitted OTMP and the Green Travel Plan (GTP). RR says council will be invited to join the CCC before the Construction Certificate is issued.</p> <p>NFP asks has the OTMP already been submitted, so why cannot Council join now?</p> <p>RR says the OTMP submitted is a draft, and this will be discussed in the agenda. This meeting and very likely the next meeting will involve detailed discussion about the OTMP and GTP.</p> <p>NFP asks if JL can table the surveys mentioned in last meeting (pre and post covid, plus the parking survey).</p> <p>NFP asks about the status of the OTMP, given that the OTMP was submitted to council.</p> <p>RR says it is a draft OTMP.</p> <p>NFP asks if the CCC can get a copy of the traffic results.</p> <p>RR says the CCC should hear details about them tonight.</p>	<p>WS to table DA conditions</p> <p>JL to table pre and post covid surveys, plus parking surveys.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>NFP raises several other issues.</p> <p>NFP said that in the last meeting WS referred to recommendations from the community which assist the surveyors with advice like this road is busy, put a liquorice strip down here, etc..</p> <p>On this matter, NFP asks –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Would the school clarify why the surveyors did not put down liquorice strips at the traffic hot spots directly adjacent to the school that were raised in community responses to the DA and sent to TRAFFIX by Randwick Council?2. Would the school clarify why the surveys excluded known school traffic hot spots adjacent to the school, while two intersections over 200 metres from the school were surveyed?3. Would the school clarify how valid the results of the surveys are, given that traffic hot spots known to the school have not been identified in the OTMP?4. Would WS clarify when the surveys will be done again and whether well-known traffic hot spots will be included? <p>Regarding the traffic surveys, NFP asks –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Would WS further clarify his statement about surveys during a school week and a holiday week?2. Would the school clarify how the date of the OTMP Traffix traffic survey was selected?3. Would the school clarify how valid the results of the survey are, given that Year 12 students were not in attendance on the date the school selected for the survey? <p>NFP adds that the OTMP refers on page 12 to traffic surveys undertaken on 23 September 2019. This date occurred during a school week but was not a typical school day.</p> <p>23 September was in the last week of the school term and some students were already on school holidays.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Year 12 students were not in attendance at Emanuel School on 23 September 2019.</p> <p>Year 12 students had already completed face-to-face classes for 2019 and were on study break prior to sitting HSC exams.</p> <p>Year 12 students contribute substantially to school traffic safety issues in the local area, observed removing P Plates and parking illegally.</p> <p>NFP also says that the diagrams submitted showing traffic flow and pick-up areas are misleading. The Kornmehl pre-school car park, not shown on the diagrams, is used by students and staff as a pedestrian exit with the result that school traffic outside the pre-school poses safety issues for pedestrians and drivers.</p> <p>The statement that “all students are required to enter and leave the school through these points only and are not permitted to exit via the music block/Kornmehl car park due to pedestrian/car conflicts” is inaccurate.</p> <p>The statement implies that the school actively prohibits pedestrian access via the Kornmehl car park. The reality is that pedestrian access via the car park is not prohibited.</p> <p>There are no signs prohibiting pedestrian entrance via the car park. Furthermore, students and staff are permitted to freely enter and exit the Kornmehl car park and parents are permitted to actively encourage by waiting by the car park.</p> <p>NFP is also concerned about the mismatch between the reality of the traffic congestion and the diagrams.</p> <p>RR thanks NFP for her contribution.</p> <p>RR adds road safety to the list.</p> <p>RR asks for any other matters arising before we go through agenda.</p> <p>No members have any other matters to raise with the CCC.</p>	
--	--	--

3.3	Clarification of the current student and staff numbers of the school and the proposed numbers following the project.	
	<p>AW says the school has 916 – 918 students with a cap of 920 students. AW says the school has no intention of raising the student cap. AW says Emanuel has 140 staff – full time and part time.</p> <p>RR asks for more information of staff numbers.</p> <p>AW says staff numbers will stay static given student numbers will not rise. AW says it’s a mix of full time and part time.</p> <p>JH asks about EFTS.</p> <p>AW says there are about 120 full time staff and 20 part time staff and this changes.</p> <p>AD clarifies and says there are 120 full time and 18 part time staff.</p> <p>TR says that Emanuel’s 2020 annual report says there are 149 staff members which is 11 over the cap. TR says that according to council condition 118, the approved cap is 138 FTES.</p> <p>NFP says the maximum number must not exceed 138 and that the details of staff numbers are to be made available to the CCC and the council upon request.</p> <p>RR actions that AW and AD to return to the CCC with the numbers of full time and part time staff.</p>	AW and AD to report to the CCC on staff numbers.
4	History of DA/40/2020A and lodged OTMP and GTP and details of content – main discussion point for meeting (including TMP established per condition 11 of DA/181/2009)	
	<p><i>2009 DA</i></p> <p>TR asks AW and AD for clarification on a DA submitted in 2009. The DA was for an increase in the student cap. TR says that Condition 11 to that DA was that the applicant must submit a traffic plan to council (e.g., pickups, drop offs, student and staff numbers etc). TR wants to know what was in that traffic plan because she is concerned that there were traffic conditions as part of the 2009 DA that were not routinely checked upon or perhaps are not enforced in an ongoing way. TR is concerned that the</p>	AD to find the 2009 DA which contained a OTMP

traffic management plan for the current DA is essentially a ticking the box exercise.

AW says that he has not seen the DA given here was different staff in 2009.

RR says that there is an opportunity to locate the document to see what has or has not been done since 2009.

Draft OTMP

WS explains why a draft OTMP was submitted to council. Earlier, people were concerned that it was the final OTMP, it was not. WS says the DA has a condition known as a 4.55 which is a mechanism to amend the DA. WS says it is normal and can be used to revise conditions as needed.

WS says that condition 2 is to update the DA in the case of a design change. WS says that Council will look at the impact of the design changes to understand if the design changes are substantially the same or not. If it is a minor change then the Council offers will look at it. If it is a bigger change then it will be advertised.

WS says that the school received legal advice regarding years 12s and driving to school and asked the Council to amend the wording.

WS says it is an appendix change with acknowledgement that it is a draft. WS says he hopes people understand it was not a submission of the OTPM but an application to change some wording.

RR says it was an unhelpful surprise that we ended up in the sequence of events where people thought the final OTMP had been submitted. The CCC was not made aware at the last meeting that this had occurred. RR says it is important to think about the kinds of processes and to communicate directly with the CCC in advance or to explain why this approach is taken.

NFP asks to clarify if the OTMP and the GTP were both submitted.

WS says yes, they were submitted as drafts as attachments to the 4.55 modification. The CCC will have

ample time to input into the documents before they are submitted to Council.

Guest speaker from Traffix

RR introduces the CCC's guest speaker, BL from Traffix.

BL introduces himself and says he has worked on the project from the start.

BL says that the intersection counts were done on September 29th 2019. There were 3 intersections chosen – Avoca/Stanley, Stanley/Wentworth, and Wentworth/Steven St. BL explains that when doing traffic analysis, they look at major traffic routes adjacent to the site. It was Traffix's assessment that those were the major intersections to the North and South etc. The surveys were done on September 23rd because it was the earliest possible date that was not in the school holidays. It was the last three days of Term 3 but BL says that he did not think many kids took the last week off school. BL says they could not afford to wait till the next term.

RR says that earlier, NFP raised concerns about specific hotspots.

NFP says she understands why those intersections were chosen from a map but it does not reflect the way the parents actually navigate the area. NFP says that many of the parents live in the Queenspark/Centennial Park area so they rarely use Wentworth St as an exit. NFP says many parents use the carpark and use Castle Lane to get to Carter St.

NFP says the 'Go With The Flow' (GWTF) is contrary to how parents use it. Parents do not abide by the 'GWTF conditions. NFP says the chosen intersections in the analysis are big but the parents do not use those intersections.

NFP has asked of the school could make the parents who use the preschool carpark to turn left on Chepstow St.

RR thanks NFP for her clear explanation.

NB says that parents everyday come down off Avoca St into Market St, near where Stanley St is. The parents use

Market St as a cul de sac and double park around 3.15pm and wait for their children, students from all years. NB says there are significant numbers of children walking across the pedestrian crossing. NB says that when you drive into Market St there are double parked cars and it is very dangerous because people are trying to overtake each other.

JH says she agrees with NB. JH says that parents are coming from the Bondi Junction end of Avoca St and it is easier to turn into Market St than the GWTF. JH says if someone is coming from the south, then that's how they do that.

TR says that parents often do a u-turn on Stanley St to access the GWTF.

TR says that NFP covered Carter St. TR says that on Stephen St there are also double-parked parents where the preschool pickup line is, so it stops parents from going in. TR says you cannot tell who is double parked or if people want to access the preschool. TR says that the turn into her street at the bottom of Chepstow and Stephen St is often blocked by pre-school traffic, sometimes she must reverse with double parked cars, and it is dangerous as children are also walking around that area.

AD clarifies NFP's comment on making left-hand turns from the carpark onto Chepstow St mandatory. AD says that residents on Chepstow St requested that parent's exiting the car park do not turn left because it makes Chepstow St too tight to drive up and down on. A local resident raised the dangers because Chepstow is a narrow street and makes it difficult for residents to go and in and out of their own homes. AD says that the problematic time on Chepstow is at 8am when parents are dropping off their kids and residents are leaving for work.

TR agrees with AD on the Chepstow St left hand turn, says that the Chepstow residents do not like it.

AD says the signs do not say that but says that they can take that on.

AD clarifies that it is legal to turn left from the preschool carpark, but parents are encouraged not to.

TR says the 'go with the flow' can work but it does need a few fixes.

AD says that the bottom of Steven St is the main blockage, he has seen in consistently himself. AD says they must work out a system to improve it and give the suggestions to council.

NB also suggests that the side of Avoca St, opposite to the school where the nursing home, should be a drop off-line as well.

AD says he does not think that the school could legally manage the other side of Avoca St. AD says that when AW joined the school as Principal, with help from Heidi from council, the school extended the GWTF to the end of the campus, and since then it has worked better plus the school employed a traffic warden. AD says there have continued to be issues with Market St.

AD says it is important to get the parents out of a convenience mindset.

AW also adds that as a Jewish community, Emanuel is big on security measures. For example, there is a special gate with security and parents must collect their children that way. The other side of Avoca St would likely not work.

NFP thanks AW for being supportive around traffic concerns with his notes home to parents. NFP asks about what students get let out by the guard at the gate.

AW says that high school students may have permission to walk out while primary school children get released via the gate. AW says there are problems and they can do better.

NFP asks about locking off access between the carpark and the music block. NFP also asks about releasing children at different times.

AW says that when you release children earlier, they lose 15 minutes of academic time.

JH clarifies that it is not just high school students on Market St. JH says that parents sometimes leave their

	<p>cars there and run across to pick up their primary aged children.</p> <p>AD says that parents doing that are breaking the rules.</p> <p>JH asks how the school enforces and manages consistent rule breakers.</p> <p>AW says that repeat offenders are banned from driving and parents are given a formal warning. AW says there may be under reporting.</p> <p>NB says the double parking is a daily occurrence. NB says she has written to the school several times and every time she has been told to go to the council or the police not the school. NB asks if there is a published punishment if parents break the rules.</p> <p>AW says repeat offenders are always published. AW asks for ideas.</p> <p>NB says that Moriah is very strict with parents. NB says maybe there should be a clear process for reporting offenders. Or advise parents in advance that there are serious consequences. NB says she cannot call council every day, it is an unfair burden.</p> <p>AW says the Emanuel needs to be more present on the roads. AW says they have contacted other schools for how they manage traffic issues from parents. AW says they will work out their plan when they have heard from everyone. AW says that Emanuel has a different philosophy from Moriah. AW says they will come up with a new plan.</p> <p>TR discussing parking constraints and traffic issues at pick-up/drop off stated that she is aware that Waverley College encourage students to walk, ride or catch the bus to school. Though acknowledges students generally live in the area unlike students at Emanuel. TR sated that Emanuel has a higher teacher to student ratio than public schools but does not provide on-site parking to the same level as other schools like Waverley, Moriah and St Catherine's.</p> <p>AW says he cannot compare Emanuel to other schools without the data. AW says there are very narrow streets with not enough parking. AW says they will encourage</p>	
--	--	--

more ride sharing with the GTP. AW says that with a large school and narrow streets, we must make the community behave better. AW says Emanuel and the community have the same aims and they want to fix it as well because receiving complaints is not pleasant and we want to be good neighbours.

TR says that in the communications AW shared showing how the school communicated with parents, it said that Council was coming out to regulate but TR has only seen Council once. Plus, TR thinks it defeats the purpose if parents are warned ahead of time that there will be Council parking rangers.

AW says that the communications say Council is coming to scare parents off. AW says they have begged and rung Council many times to bring in more rangers. AW says it is not a teacher's job to monitor traffic.

NFP says the newsletters said that the school has appointed a traffic assistant. NFP suggests there should be another traffic assistant. NFP also suggests that there should be more 'no stopping' in front of the preschool and that the school should trial locking the gate between the preschool carpark.

AD says that the gate is locked at 3pm. The only other students allowed there are students with a sibling in the preschool. Other students are not there alone. Only staff are otherwise allowed.

AW also says that himself and AD have been seriously considering another traffic warden. AW says that the school is not the police and they do not have any legal jurisdiction. AW says they rely on their authority to make people comply. AW says he likes the idea of reversing the traffic or having another warden. AW says they want to change the culture and work very hard at changing bad traffic habits, so it becomes the done thing.

NFP asks what AW meant about Year 12s driving to school. NFP asks how is this to the school's benefit?

AW says they are seeking clarification from Council on what the school is legally allowed to advise regarding year 12s and driving. AW says he does worry about making students park over a 1km away in rainy weather

conditions or when they have an early morning assessment. AW says if he can get clarification from Council on what he is allowed to say, then he can encourage Year 12s to make other solutions because otherwise, AW may encourage Years 12s not to drive but they can argue back that it is legal so why shouldn't they.

NFP says she feels that making an application to Council is disempowering the school's position regarding Years 12s and driving.

AW disagrees. AW says that when he knows what he can or cannot do as Principal he can then encourage the Year 12s to do the legally right thing. AW says that some of his governing board advocate for Year 12s driving to school, so he needs to exact legal information. At the moment, AW says he does not know what he can or cannot do.

NFP asks AW why staff need to enter via the access point between preschool and the high school. NFP says traffic issues are exasperated by staff entering through that gate.

AW says those parking spots would be taken even if you made staff walk around and not through the gate. AW says it is difficult to get a park around the school and the staff are often carrying a lot of materials.

NFP says that staff park near the preschool parking, often illegally i.e., close to the intersections. NFP says the reason that the parking is congregated there is because it is near that preschool entrance. NFP says that parents park rear to curb when they should parallel park. NFP sees the role of the traffic assistant to walk around get the license plate numbers of the people that have illegally parked. NFP says in the past she has had to call the school to get a staff member to move an illegally parked car.

AD says that the more information the school receives then the sooner they can get back to the committee. AD also says that the parking solutions needs to be holistic because when the committee membership changes then new residents from other locations around the school may advocate for a different system that is convenient to them. So the parking solutions needs to work for the whole community.

JH asks to clarify AW's point about his governing board having a view on Year 12s driving to school. JH asks for the context about the view of the school and why they are seeking council information.

AW says that the school leadership will agree with the Council's edict.

TR asks the group how they can enact meaningful change. TR says that at the Sydney Eastern Planning Panel, the residents raised the lack of parking and then the CCC committee was formed and it is asking about parking but the school says they cannot build any parking.

RR says in other schools it is done through policy e.g., discourage Years 12s from driving, etc. Or you can make catchment parking restricted hours so students cannot park there all day. Some schools have a very firm policy. RR says that AW's and the school's point is whether this is legally enforceable.

TR says that Moriah have a blanket ban on parking on nearby streets.

AW says they do want to discourage parking in certain areas with incentives like the GTP and the OTMP to encourage people to park further away. AW says they want to discourage driving and discourage people from parking on the neighbourhood streets.

TR asks if the school is waiting for the Council response before doing the OTMP?

AW says they want an OTMP that encourages improved traffic flows.

TR ask what the timeframe is. TR says they do not want to enter the construction phase with the same traffic and parking issues as at present. TR asks if the aim to improve the situation before construction commences or is this a long-term plan?

AW says the discussions will be reflected into the OTMP as some of the school's procedures will change.

JL says that they need to undertake a road safety audit or valuation and take on community comments and changes

to the 'go with the flow' and give that information to Traffix. JL says they want a draft working document in 6 – 8 weeks.

RR says the CCC needs to identify all the issues. RR says the group needs the experts to provide advice and suggestions to address the current situation – some of it will be on a policy level, a school level, some of it will be road signs so on the Council level. Some it will be behavioural and cultural changes. RR says the CCC will need to focus the conversation on the future so look at what those suggestions might be and then have the group say whether those situations will work. This will help the school understand what needs to go into the OTMP. Then the school will know what can be done straight away etc. RR says there are good examples from other schools that the group can consider.

RR asks BL to continue the discussion around data collection, timing and adequacy.

BL explains says that the other major work was the parking survey which was on done on June 15th 2020. BL says they consider it a conservative estimate given people were still working from home. BL addresses the validity of the survey dates. BL says they did the surveys when they could because Traffix cannot control the lockdown dates. To answer TR's earlier question, BL says it is industry practice to only do one day. Mostly either Monday – Thursday because people sometimes take the Friday off for a long weekend.

TR says that in the public results the time they examined was from 3 – 6pm. TR says she does not think this is a clear timeframe.

BL says that they assessed from 7am – 9am, and then 3pm to 6pm. Then they identified the busiest peak hour within those time frames. BL explains that with data collection they do it over a longer period of time because we do not know when that peak will be. Then within that timeframe the peak was 8.15 – 9.15. It does not have to be on the hour to the hour. BL says that the network peak meets the school peak in the morning but the evening network peak does not correlate so closely with the school's peak.

	<p>RR says the way that you collect the data enables you to figure out the peak.</p> <p>NFP says that on the street parking surveys, she noticed that Carter St was omitted plus there was very detailed analysis on 3 – 3.15. NFP says this is not the peak time of the school. Plus, the parking survey does not break down legal v. illegal parking.</p> <p>BL explains that they engage a surveyor to count the parking. The area was surveyed from 6am – 10am then from 2pm to 6pm. This captures both the before school and after school rush. NFP mentioned the timeframe 3 – 3.15. BL explains that the was the peak 15-minute period. BL says they did not focus on it, it was what the data said was the peak period. In the report, there were a lot of streets that did not have capacity. This matches up with what BL says he has heard from the CCC in this meeting.</p> <p>NFP says that illegal parking is not counted. The survey says it is satisfactory but NFP does not agree. NFP also says the parking survey does not go with the GWTF.</p> <p>BL says they cannot do every street between Clovelly Road and the school unfortunately. BL says the results do not go with the ‘go with the flow’ but are instead local streets.</p> <p>WS says it is very useful hearing everything at the meeting. WS proposes that the construction management and associated people make a ‘mudmap’ so members can inform the next surveys. Then BL can change is approach that is used next time, based on this feedback and the local knowledge.</p> <p>RR says that having heard this then BL can put to the members the survey plan for feedback.</p> <p>RR notes several key areas should be addressed in the solutions (a) Carter St is suggested route for GWTF for primary/high school but it is very narrow and traffic comes from both directions (b) Market St, need a plan to address double parking and using this street and Stephen St rather than GWTF, (c) Need to document GWTF for Preschool & look at possible conflict with primary/highschool GWTF</p>	<p>WS + team to make ‘mudmap’ to show members to inform the next survey</p> <p>Key areas that need to be addressed.</p> <p>BL to qualify and explain traffic results.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>JH says she is not clear on the time frame. The next traffic survey could be weeks or months away due to lockdown restrictions.</p> <p>WS says that the OTMP is a document that is continually improved such as investigations regarding signage, control, where people turn out of places. WS says they will not get all this information this time as they cannot pick it all up in the first round. In the next annual survey, WS says they can pick up better data. WS explains that other schools do an annual assessment of traffic because of public transport, changes in the student population etc, and are thus able to compare measurements. Over a five-year plan, WS says the data is always changing.</p> <p>NFP is very keen that the OTMP reflects reality. NFP would be keen for BL to look at the observations and qualify them. NFP does not believe the results reflect reality. It needs to be mentioned that they were no Year 12s the day of the traffic survey etc.</p> <p>WS says another clarification they are seeking from council about the road safety audit and the road safety valuation. WS asks BL to clarify.</p> <p>BL says that condition 15 and 24b came from TfNSW which was a request for road safety evaluation. Firstly, a Road Safety Audit(RSA), undertaken by an independent auditor during the school pick up and drop off times, identify safety concerns and areas of concern. Secondly, there is a road crash investigation e.g., crash history data. Lastly, a speed zone review, review of speed signs etc. BL explains that point 2 and 3 are typically done on public road infrastructure where the school does not have authority. So, BL says they are going back to Council for clarification.</p> <p>AW apologies and says he has to leave to attend another engagement. AW leaves the zoom.</p> <p>TR says that the speed zone review may have become a requirement due to community complaints regarding people speeding excessively e.g., on Monmouth St.</p> <p>BL clarifies and says that the three conditions will be taken on the boundary of the school. The review is not whether</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>speed zones needs to be reduced to a lower speed but whether the signs etc. are up to standard.</p> <p>RR asks if there is anything that would prohibit Council from addressing speeding concerns/reviewing speed limits.</p> <p>BL says that would separate, detailed from Council.</p> <p>RR asks if there is anything that would prevent it from being a specific recommendation by this group?</p> <p>BL says that typically there is a comprehensive review to see if the speed zone needs to be amended. Once Council has done a study, then they might send the police to do a check.</p> <p>TR asks the school if they have surveyed the parents on why they do not use the 'go with the flow'.</p> <p>AD says that is a question for AW.</p> <p>DP says that in his time as a parent at the school, he has not been surveyed.</p>	
5	Next Meeting	
	<p>RR says that the next meeting will continue to look at traffic matters. RR says that there is quite a lot of work for WS, JL and BL to do before the next meeting.</p> <p>JL suggests the 30th of August. The CCC agrees to this date, subject to AWs availability.</p> <p>AD requests that people send any questions they may have a week out from the meeting so that the school and other groups can prepare their answers in time.</p>	