

## Emanuel School Community Consultation Committee

**Meeting No:** 3

**Date:** Monday 30<sup>th</sup> August 2021, 6pm to 8pm

**Venue:** Zoom

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

Item	Description	Action
<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome</b>	
	RR welcomes everyone to the meeting.	
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies</b>	
	No apologies.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Minutes from last meeting</b>	
	RR asks for any final comments on the previous minutes.	
	AW asks if anyone has seen the community page on the school's website and if people have any feedback.	
	Members have not seen the new page. Please provide any comments when you have a chance to review. <a href="https://www.emanuelschool.nsw.edu.au/community/community-consultation/">https://www.emanuelschool.nsw.edu.au/community/community-consultation/</a>	
	AD and JH endorse the last meeting's minutes.	
<b>4</b>	<b>Actions from last meeting</b>	
	All matters arising have been dealt with as agenda items or via email.	

**Staff numbers**

AW confirms the staff numbers as 148 FTE. AW says that there is a reporting disparity between reports to NESAs and other organisations because the Jewish life staff are not included in staff numbers. AW also says that with many part-time staff employed, it can be difficult to assume staff numbers on any given day. So AW says the larger number mentioned in the last meeting is accurate.

TR says that the Council's cap for staff at Emanuel is 138 FTE. So currently there are 10 more staff, which is more than the 7 car spaces saved from the Green Travel Plan (GTP).

AW says that if the school had investigated staff numbers when the student cap was raised then the staff cap may have risen as well because more students mean more staff. AW says he and the school are committed to reducing the parking numbers with the GTP and the OTMP. AW says it will be good to encourage public transport, shared rides, cycling in partnership with building and travel consultants.

AW says the school shares the same aims as the community. Number of staff required with 920 students will not increase. AW says buying the property on Avoca St and getting 4 more cars off the road will help with parking issues. AW says he welcomes suggestions.

TR says that it is frustrating that the caps are agreed to but then with extra staff it means that there are more staff parking than there will be savings with the new plans. TR asks how a reduction will be achieved and how this will be monitored.

AW says that one area is if they cannot legally enforce Year 12s not to drive to school, the Year 12 drivers will be restricted to parking away - not on neighbouring streets. AW says the draft OTMP has a map of streets and says these are the ones that Year 12s will not be allowed to park on.

TR says that is a good step but only meets existing issues. Just addressing Year 12 conditions does not address an increase in teachers parking around the school. Year 12 issue is separate to the excess number of staff.

<p>NFP is concerned about bracket creep. Given that 148 FTE is 10 full time staff over the limit, it could actually mean there are more than 10 excess staff.</p> <p>AW says that his assurance is that the student numbers will not rise with him as principal. AW says they thoroughly investigated the numbers over the past few days. AW says Emanuel does not need more teachers because student numbers will not increase. There is a difference between the EFT (equivalent full time) and actual number of people.</p> <p>The conditions count EFT – the number of people will be more depending on the number of part time staff.</p> <p>NFP says this is historical because the caps have always existed and the cap has been exceeded, so the figures keep jumping around.</p> <p>AW thanks NFP and says that he has only been principal for 3 – 3.5 years so some of these issues are historical.</p> <p>RR says that the meeting will be focused on the OTMP but RR says it is important to go over the other conditions so that the CCC can anticipate what will be of the most interest.</p> <p><b>Conditions of Consent</b></p> <p>WS says the action was to issue the 128 conditions. The conditions are broken down into pre, during and post construction. WS suggests that the CCC focuses on the pre-construction conditions then move to during-construction conditions once the group understands the conditions and the during-construction conditions become relevant.</p> <p>RR asks WS if there are conditions in the pre-construction list that will be of interest?</p> <p>WS says that he is happy to go through any conditions. Maybe by next meeting once people have read through the conditions, they will know what they want to tackle.</p> <p>RR asks the group if they have any views on these issues.</p> <p>TR asks for the status of the conditions so that the CCC knows where each condition is at.</p> <p>WS says he and JL can status the pre-construction conditions so that people know where they condition are at in the process.</p>	<p>WS and JL to report on status of the pre-construction conditions.</p>
--	--

	<p>TR also requests that WS and JL note what conditions require approval and if approval has been issued yet.</p> <p><b>Issues for parents</b></p> <p>TR asks for a summary of the parent issues. TR says that it is critical to understand how parents view and complain about the 'go with the flow'. TR says it will be helpful for the group.</p> <p>AW says one of the key issues is the grandparents doing pick up. Grandparents are less attached to the school culture, less likely to receive the school updates and thus more likely to not follow the rules. A critical reason for this is the speed of the pick-up. There is resistance to driving around the block for a second go at pick up. The traffic wardens tell people to go around again if there is congestion, both parents and grandparents do not like this.</p> <p>AW says another issue is people siting stationary cars because people want to do sunscreen or fix hair. AW says that in his principal groups, this is a common issue across schools.</p> <p>AW says another issue is that speed and arrival are frequent issues. When you stage the timing of exits, you lose academic time. AW says there is primary and high school staging. AW says the school engaged a road safety consultant, received council approval for making the (go with the flow) GWTFGWTF' longer, and hired an additional traffic warden.</p> <p>RR notes that grandparents may have more time than busy parents.</p> <p>AD says there needs to be a change of culture. The traffic warden helps to stop early arrivals.</p> <p>TR notes that staging is not in the traffic management plan.</p> <p>AS says that staging in an internal issue and in on p2 or p3 of a document is emailed around.</p> <p>RR mentions the previous DA from 2009 and notes that JL emailed the group an update.</p> <p>JL says that no soft copy was found after searching through filing boxes. JL says they escalated the issue with the town planner who worked on the DA. The town planner will look through their records once the Covid-19 lockdown is over. There have also been staffing changes since 2009. JL says that the school has moved in</p>	<p>AD and JL to continue to search for 2009 DA – the attached OTMP.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>the right direction by posting this information online. JL says he can ask council.</p> <p>AD says he did get the council reference for that document. AD says that he did find a copy of the original DA but it didn't include the traffic plan attachment.</p> <p>NB asks how the staging the school pick up works. NB says it could be difficult for parents with kids in different age groups.</p> <p>AD says that is works well. Younger students e.g., K -2 are not released early if they have older siblings. Most high school students catch public transport. If they have younger siblings, they walk down.</p>	
<p><b>5</b></p>	<p><b>OTMP and GTP – suggested responses to assist with traffic management – routine and for construction (update on legal/council response to Year 12 driving)</b></p>	
	<p>WS says the point of the meeting's discussion is to provide context to the OTMP. Aim is to go over the structures so that people understand the document. WS notes that not everything needs to be wrapped up in the meeting.</p> <p>JL says that the OTMP is a work-in-progress document that adapts to the changing environment. JL outlines the different chapters for the group.</p> <p>TR asks if the OTMP will be updated to include other streets than originally listed.</p> <p>JL says that yes it will be, there is a section on key intersections.</p> <p>BL says yes, streets like Carter Lane, Castle Lane, and Monmouth are being added. BL say he can add Market St. BL says it is just a description of the road.</p> <p>TR asks if Stephen/Chepstow will be added. TR says they would like it to be added because it is near the entrance to the preschool.</p> <p>Key intersections for future surveys as discussed and agreed upon</p>	



NFP adds that parents/grandparents do wait for children to come through the carpark. NFP says there is still no commitment by the school if it will be a vehicle only entrance since it creates more congestion on Stephen and Chepstow waiting for children to emerge from the preschool gate. NFP says it is important to survey over many days, not just one. NFP says she thinks AW's new GWTFGWTF will work if there is a greater observation of reality. NFP notes that parents often use Castle Lane, driving both up and down. NFP says that it is great that everyone is working together.

NB asks if Market and Avoca can be added since it is different than Stanley and Avoca.

JL says yes.

WS says that when the OTMP came up, Wentworth was surveyed. WS says the CCC said why there, it is not busy. So Stanley and Wentworth would be better to bring up rather than Wentworth.

TR says that entry to Wentworth from Stanley is a very narrow road, there is only one car space. TR says that it can be dicey, even without school traffic. TR says it could be a point of suggestion.

AD says that the top Chepstow near Stanley St would be good for data. AD want to know if the traffic flow is coming up or down the street. AD wonders if Monmouth is moved to Chepstow than there would be a good radius of coverage. AD unsure if Stephen and Wentworth used.

TR says maybe tell them to use Stephen not Monmouth. That way people will be allowed to come up Monmouth. TR adds that there is lots of double parking on Chepstow.

WS asks BL to clarify what is being measured on the blue dots on the draft OTMP.

BL says that the blue dots represent intersection counts. BL says there will be a camera there for 3 – 4 hours in the morning and then again in the evening. BL says they then go back to tally up the data to add the intersection counts to the monitor software. BL says the cameras do not capture the speed, parking etc, just traffic volumes.

NFP says that the traffic coming from York onto Clovelly want to turn right immediately after Clovelly onto Carter St making it a highly dangerous situation because it blocks traffic on Avoca. Cars wanting to turn right into Carter are actually blocking traffic. NFP says this is worth looking at. NFP says it is not safe and might be worth making council make it a no right turn during school pick up hours. It may help improve GWTF.

BL says the current blue dot on the map would be sufficient and they wouldn't have to do a survey north of Clovelly Road.

NFP says the aim is make the GWTFGWTF workable, so people use it. NFP says that Carter St with the blue dot is an important intersection.

TR says she is not sure that just taking numbers will be accurate like counting right turns. TR says that congestion is the problem, just counting cars may not be accurate.

BL says the model is not that sophisticated that it can account for localised traffic.

TR says she is not sure if that is then able to assess how bad the traffic issue is.

	<p>JL says an alternative strategy is for southbound to turn into Earl St and enter GWTF and avoid GWTF Carter.</p> <p>NFP believes this option would give people the confidence with the GWTF to give it a second drive round. NFP asks if it is possible to make Carter St a one way road so there is no bottleneck when people try to drive north.</p> <p>BL says to change Carter St, you would need support from the majority of residents.</p> <p>RR thanks everyone for their suggestions and says this forum is the best way to get community feedback.</p> <p>NFP says that the new GWTFGWTF suggests that Chepstow is not used. NFP suggests making Castle Lane a 'no go' street. NFP says it needs to be acknowledge that people in the GWTFGWTF are in competition with the preschool parents. NFP says the diagram needs the preschool flow in another colour to show people how it can be harmonious.</p> <p>BL says that a diagram combining the GWTFGWTF with the preschool pickup is in the report. BL says there is a separate one with just the GWTF because the diagram looked busy.</p> <p>TR says that there is a problem with the pre-school traffic flow diagram as it has people being directed to go down Monmouth St to access the pre-school but the primary and high school diagram directs people to go up Monmouth St to access their go with the flow. This is a problem as Monmouth St is narrow and only 1 car can get through at a time so conflicting traffic flows will lead to congestion. TR suggested that the pre-school traffic be directed to use Wentworth St and Stephen St instead.</p> <p>NFP says that the intersection where Monmouth is going up to Earl St is not as accurate. It is a blind sport, so people go 'dog leg', it is a bit tighter in reality. TR's suggestion of people going up Monmouth would be better.</p> <p>AD says that in his revised drawing, he showed the 'dog leg'. AD says that if the GWTFGWTF pushes people out too far, from an operational perspective people may just ignore it. AD says he is not saying Wentworth is a bad suggestion, just he doesn't want carers doing pick up to disregard it. AD says it is like walking a line between making it feasible for parents and residents.</p>	
--	--	--



	<p>TR says that using Wentworth St and Stephen St is not that further to travel.</p> <p>AW says that near preschool Wentworth is easy but not near Avoca. AW says there are worries that people would go down Market and then be like 'stuff it'.</p> <p>TR says that then it is worthwhile approaching Carter St residents if they would be okay with a one way streets.</p> <p>AD says that they do not want to create another problem elsewhere.</p> <p>NFP suggests approaching the GWTF by Earl St on the north. Then if you are going around again then use Carter. NFP says if the GWTF is going to work, it not good to have people going down Monmouth in a northerly direction, same with Castle St. If people are to use the GWTF then NFP says it is important to encourage people to go around a second time and make it easy for them and give the person going around a second time the priority. NFP suggests encouraging people to enter via York Road to enter Earl St and then reserve Carter St for doing the second turn.</p> <p>AD says that it might be a matter of looking at the preschool flow. AD says he thinks it could be re-jigged by asking the preschool one to move.</p> <p>NFP says that is beautiful getting the preschool to enter via Earl St. NFP says it is workable.</p> <p>BL says it sounds like a reasonable suggestion but might want to double check turning restrictions because there may be parents wanting to pick up the preschool kids and then may want to go north onto Monmouth.</p> <p>NFP says that drivers can cross Clovelly Road to re-join Avoca later. NFP says that parents could be encouraged to follow Earl, cross Clovelly, and join Avoca later on.</p> <p>BL says that that they will have to think that suggestion through. There may be issues with getting people to cross Clovelly.</p> <p>RR asks what is next to be focused on from the OTMP.</p> <p>JL says that the GWTF is covered so it is good to go back to the intersection plan.</p>	
--	---	--

<p>JL notes that plan to add monitoring to the corner of Chepstow and Stephen, and Market and Avoca.</p> <p>NFP asks about Castle Lane because it feeds into Carter St.</p> <p>JL asks if there is any value in this suggestion if they are trying to encourage people not to use Castle Lane.</p> <p>WS asks BL if the camera positioned on Chepstow and Stephen can also get a look at Stephen and Castle Lane.</p> <p>BL says maybe since the cameras go on a light pole. BL will ask the contractor.</p> <p>JW says it is a terrific suggestion since much of the congestion is going up Castle Lane.</p> <p>TR says that AD suggested moving the intersection watch from the bottom on Monmouth up to Chepstow and Stanley.</p> <p>AD says yes he suggested that. AD says that moving the monitoring up from Wentworth and Stephen up to Chepstow since Chepstow St are big emailers to the school. Monmouth is covered at the bottom end so moving it up would provide better coverage.</p> <p>JL says that the intersection performance surveys will have to be done at a later stage due to lockdown because school will not be resuming until late October and HSC Students will be finished up by that stage.</p> <p>JL says the next discussion is on the parking scheme.</p> <p>TR says she is upset with how the parking scheme is written about in the OTMP. TR says there are many reasons why people vote yes or no for a parking scheme. TR said it suggested that all residents have a choice on the parking scheme. TR says it should focus on the permit parking that is available.</p> <p>BL says he was not trying to say that residents have access, but he was trying to describe how the parking operates. BL says that when it says 'Chepstow residents' that is a typo.</p> <p>TR says she is okay for it to be included but should only state what spots are available, rather than suggesting that there is permit parking available for all residents and so parking issues are no longer a problem.</p>	
--	--

NFP says the section is inaccurate. Chepstow is adjacent to the school where there is much possibility of time parking but there is not much there. Restrictions on Stanley and Avoca do not benefit the residents. NFP agrees with TR's thoughts that the way it is stated is not reflective of reality.

RR thanks everyone for their thoughts and says to leave it with BL.

NFP asks about the pedestrian side entries noted on a map. NFP asks why there is one next to the preschool parking?

AD says it is how they access the preschool.

NFP asks why they do not use the Avoca gate?

AD says the main access is from Chepstow and that Avoca is an emergency gate that is not wide enough for daily use for the students.

NFP asks why there is so much pedestrian activity in the preschool car park.

AD says it is the primary access for the preschool. No high school children are allowed there plus the music rooms are locked off from the car park. Only K – 2 kids can access that area if they have a sibling, AW blocked it off.

NFP says the school is not saying to parents to stay in the car.

AD says that they also have a lot of staff from the preschool using that gate. It is a main access point.

NFP says that it causes a lot of congestion.

AD says this issue has been discussed in the CCC. If the car park was restricted then there would be more congestion in the streets if the school restricted all pedestrian access. It is one of the main access points to the school.

NFP asks what percent of people arrive by cars and by foot?

AD says that he will not guess because he will have to ask preschool staff. Staff enter via the gate. No access for high or primary school kids..

	<p>NFP asks about using the second emergency gate that goes to Avoca St.</p> <p>AD says that operationally it would need a whole new security guard which he does not think could be justifiable. AD says he cannot see how it slows down the traffic if they are walking from a new area. If they are legally entering and parking AD does not think that it creates more traffic. AD says he is happy to chat to the head of the preschool about it.</p> <p>NFP says that she thought that people were hanging around that area and that it causes double parking.</p> <p>TR says she thinks it is also primary school students walking out and around.</p> <p>AD says that the school releases the students and sometimes they gather.</p> <p>TR says many of their carers reverse park.</p> <p>AD says that he agrees with TR and that is what the new traffic warden will look out for.</p> <p>JL says the next topic of discussion is future travel strategies.</p> <p>BL talks through the 7 new strategies.</p> <p>BL says the first one is a Transport Access Guide (TAG) that outlines nearby public transport, cycle routes, bike racks etc. This can be advertised on the school website, the office, handed out to new students etc.</p> <p>BL says the next one is staff parking and management. Discusses how the school with manage this internally and encourages alternative modes of travel.</p> <p>TR asks if this section can be updated because it says that 19 car spots are available to teachers but actually it is only 11 in the science block and 1 in the preschool. TR says in other traffic management plans it says that x spots are available for staff and y are for visitors.</p> <p>BL says the next strategy is a carpool program which would be based on the NSW health advice due to covid.</p>	
--	--	--

<p>NB asks if there is any incentive for people to follow these suggestions.</p> <p>AW says that there is an ethical imperative to make more sustainable choices and help the neighbours. No financial incentive.</p> <p>BL says the fourth one is the school student transport scheme. This is just promoting subsidised bus passes for students from the NSW Government.</p> <p>TR says that the existing school route is popular. TR asks if there is any review of where people are coming from?</p> <p>AD says that before AW's time as principal, there was a new bus added in 2016. There was a survey conducted amongst students and staff which was then given to the STA. Collaborated with another Jewish school to create a 3<sup>rd</sup> bus who has only a handful of students but the same issue. Most students coming from Vaucluse and Bondi.</p> <p>TR asks if those buses are sufficient and asks if there is more demand?</p> <p>AD says he would have to talk to the teachers on duty. No students are left behind which shows that the buses are working. AD says he would have to get feedback on it. Primarily high school students use the bus.</p> <p>BL says that points 5 and 6 tie into each other. Strategy 5 highlights nearby cycle routes while strategy 6 highlights school bicycle parking.</p> <p>NB asks how many students and staff cycle.</p> <p>AD says it depends on the season and the weather. Most kids cycle if they have a friend to go with.</p> <p>BL says strategy 7 is on street parking changes. This is to deal with potential parking changes on the intersection between Stephen and Chepstow such as the installation of no stopping restrictions on the northern side between Castle Lane and Kornmehl drive. This would extend for 17m on both sides so the 3 car lengths up to the exist driveway of the carpark.</p> <p>TR says that she agrees with the plan to restrict 3 parking spaces on the school side but that this restriction should only be in line</p>	
--	--

with the standard go with the flow times not be 'no stopping' at any time. A 'no stopping' sign in compliance with the statutory length of 10m is also needed on the other side of the street but not 17m as this would unnecessarily take away on-street parking which is already a problem for residents. Two lanes of traffic flow will open up by the school restricting parking on their side of the street which would be sufficient

BL says his understanding is that they want to free up the road.

BL says it is only a suggestion.

AD says that he thinks the suggestion was that the congestion of the vehicles between those two entrances.

TR says that the 'no stopping' should only be during school pick up and drop times.

NFP asks if people living on Stephen St would then be required to move their cars during the school pick up and drop times?

AD says that BL has just flagged possible solutions for the problem. AD says it is merely a suggestion and no one is suggesting it will work.

TR says that there should be no parking between the first entrance then all the way up to the gates to give enough freedom for people to get through. Just that corner where people park to go into the preschool, so it can be achieved without restricting residents from parking nears their homes.

AD says that they are just gathering feedback which is the point of the meeting. There is construction going on near the site at the moment and their contractors park there. Everything at this stage is merely a suggestion.

NFP says she does not agree. NFP says that corner could have 10m of 'no stopping' zone. NFP suggests that there could also be no stopping outside 3 spaces near the preschool, people do not need to park there. NFP stresses that it is not wise to have residents running out and moving their cars during school pick up and drop off times.

JL asks why not start in Castle Lane.

AD says that the congestion is there when there is cars parked on both sides and the car are driving down both ways.

NFP says the congestion occurs when people park rear to curb. NFP strongly opposes it because it is not good to have residents having to move their cars every morning or night, NFP does not agree with no stopping outside of the school. NFP does not support 'no stopping' on the northern side of Stephen St. NFP says it is a wide section of road if people park parallel like they are legally required to.

AD says the suggestion is to free up the GWTF there. The suggestion is mandatory 'no stopping' on the corner, south of the Peace Park entrance in school hours only just to have the same drop zone as in other streets to make the GWTF better.

TR says it makes it easier for people who have no where else to park.

NFP requests that the group removes the 'no stopping' on the northern end of Stephen St. NFP says she would be distraught if she had to move her car twice a day and says it is not a reasonable imposition to place on residents. NFP says there are no residents on the preschool side.

JL says they will take on the suggestions.

RR says the CCC will take these suggestions away.

JL says a potential 8<sup>th</sup> strategy would be to increase parent education on the GWTF.

AW says this is a good idea like the regular parent teacher meetings to give a gentle reminder to parents to look after residents.

NB acknowledges the school's belief that there is a lot of good will to suggest that parents will do better with gentle reminders. NB is concerned that there are no incentives to make parents behave better. NB asks if there is any appetite at all to make a policy with consequences for repeat offenders. NB does not feel that there is a consequence specific enough that can be published to deter bad behaviour.

JH agrees with NB. JH says there is nothing in the suggested strategies that will change behaviour, nothing that is enforceable because it all requires good will. JH says that the document does not address Market St concerns. JH says that all the strategies are very soft with no punch behind them. JH says it is quite frustrating

	<p>to sit in the meeting for 2hrs about what can change but there is nothing in the traffic report that suggests there will be any changes.</p> <p>AW says Emanuel does have a Code of Conduct for parents and there are consequences for bad behaviour.</p> <p>JH asks what the consequences are because they are not published anywhere.</p> <p>AW says that the school has an enrolment policy and that can be terminated if there is an issue. AW says whenever there has been a complaint and the person has been identified, there have been consequences like when the school banned certain grandparents from driving. It is followed through. AW says the school has enough provisions on enrolment and repeat offenders.</p> <p>NB says that bad behaviour during drop off and pick up happens every day and when NB has called the school she has been redirected to go to the council or the police.</p> <p>AW says that part of the problem is identification. AW says that they need more people on the streets taking licence numbers. AW says there are policies that residents do not see. AW says that is not a copout to redirect complaints to the police sometimes because it may be outside the school's jurisdiction.</p> <p>NB asks how the school links the number plate to the offender?</p> <p>AW says that the school has done so in the past and the school has the Year 12 licence plates.</p> <p>NB says that she has seen the same people in the past, repeat offenders. NB says those strategies are not enforceable. If the solution requires more people on the streets, NB wants to see enforceable strategies in the documents.</p> <p>TR asks if offenders can be identified by their GWTF number?</p> <p>AD says yes, people can be identified from their GWTF numbers but drivers do not use their GWTF numbers is they are parking. AD says that his mobile number is on the resident drop offs. AD says that is residents with complaints can get in contact with him then there can be a prompter response. If someone phones reception, by the time that they send someone out, the offender may have left. But AD can be more prompt.</p>	
--	--	--



	<p>NB says she has picture of the licence plates on her phone because she takes photos every day when there are repeat offenders. NB says that if the documents can be specific for residents about deterrents for parents, then NB would feel confident that progress was happening.</p> <p>JH says that the documents talk about the extension of traffic zones. JH asks why not commit to security and traffic wardens and have that in the documents.</p> <p>AD says that security is there for the site and for the students. AD says there is no jurisdiction for security to enforce road rules. AD says there will be a new traffic warden in Avoca St and for Kornmehl plus a separate staff member focusing on the traffic issues. AD says that every resident and street has new problems. AD says that he cannot talk about solutions tonight but happy for it to be an action item.</p> <p>RR says that the school has heard the suggestions so there will be no decision or review on this tonight. RR says to leave everything with the school to consider how these issues can be dealt with in the OTMP. RR says let's see where the school wants to go with it. RR says there is time to consider and think about ideas because there will be revisions.</p>	
<b>7</b>	<b>AOB</b>	
	<p>TR says she would like to have a conversation on timeframes like the 5 years and 10-year timeframes for improving traffic results. TR says it does not say when these time frames would start.</p> <p>AD says that adding on to TR's suggestion, some things are referenced in the GTP and some questions raised are in the GTP.</p> <p>TR says it would be good to know where the construction plan is.</p> <p>WS says whilst resolving issues and coming back with a response, the project will need to start involving Randwick traffic people. WS says they might have some feedback on traffic mechanisms etc. WS says he will get in contact.</p>	<p>WS to get in contact with Randwick Council traffic people.</p>
<b>9</b>	<b>Next meeting details</b>	
	<p>Next meeting will be held on Zoom from 6 – 8pm on Monday September 13<sup>th</sup> 2021.</p>	