

Emanuel School Community Consultative Committee

Meeting No: 5

Date: Thursday 7th October 6 – 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 Warwick Smith – Project Manager Jonathan Lau</p> <p>Independent Chair Professor Roberta Ryan</p> <p>Minute Taker Sophie Alais</p>
<p>Apologies No apologies.</p>	

Item	Description	Action
1	Welcome	
	<p>RR welcomes everyone.</p> <p>TR and JH are uncomfortable with their personal emails being up on the school website.</p> <p>AW says he is happy for them to be taken down.</p> <p>RR says it is typical in CCCs for the members to have their email up on the website, though often people make a new email specifically for this purpose.</p> <p>TR suggests that they have a community email.</p> <p>RR says she is happy for people to email through her to have contact with community members.</p> <p>Community members to advise on their preferences.</p>	
2	Apologies	
	No apologies.	
3	Minutes from last meeting	

	DP and NB approve the minutes.	
4	Actions from last meeting	
	All completed.	
5	OTMP and TPP	
	<p>NB says she is disappointed that the OTMP was lodged with Council, even if it was an administrative error knowing that is has happened before. NB asks if this pattern will continue. NB says that given that the revised OTMP was only emailed to members not long before the meeting, NB has been unable to read through it to see if her concerns raised in previous meetings have been noted. If not, NB says there is no point in her coming to meetings.</p> <p>RR asks JL to respond about the administrative issues and the OTMP being sent.</p> <p>JL says that a 4.55 modification was submitted to Council to tidy up some issues. JL says they cannot submit the OTMP in the 3-month period they were given, so they are asking for a 3 month extension. JL says the incorrect 4.55 mod was submitted which had the incorrect wording on the condition. JL says the only other matter in the 4.55 was just a tidy up, JL is unsure if the CCC wants to talk about that. JL is happy to go through these items. JL says that once a contractor comes on board, there will be other 4.55 aesthetic changes to the building. JL says he can table those items or focus on community matters in this meeting.</p> <p>NB says that if the changes are related to parking etc then please raise it, but if it is within school grounds, it would be outside the community member's perspective.</p> <p>RR says to JL that the general point is that the CCC is an information exercise. There is no harm in telling people that something is happening. RR says it is good to get in the routine of letting people know.</p> <p>JH says that in the spirit of what the CCC is trying to achieve, it does not create the optimum environment when OTMP etc are submitted without the CCC knowing. It does impact the quality of the conversation in the meeting.</p> <p>TR agrees. TR says give the CCC the opportunity to decide if a change is or is not relevant. TR notes that with building design, neighbours close to the school are concerned about how the bridge will look, noting that the community cannot now change any of the approved plans.</p>	

	<p>TR asks JL when the DA will be updated on the Randwick website. TR says it is not correct on the DA tracker.</p> <p>JL says he has confirmation that it has been updated.</p> <p>TR says that it has not been updated. TR will submit a complaint if it is not updated before the 11th.</p> <p>JL says he will follow up with Randwick Council.</p> <p>RR asks AW to respond to NB's second question about whether her queries were included in the updated OTMP.</p> <p>AW says the school has engaged in good faith and moved resources to that issue. He is unsure if it is the fine detail NB was expecting.</p> <p>NB asks if it responds to Market St parking.</p> <p>JH said she had time to review the documents. JH says it does not specifically call out Market St parking, but it does speak to the no parking zone for the Year 12s. JH says thank you. JH says that it focuses on the Go With The Flow (GWTF). Does not talk about families using Market St in terms of parking.</p> <p>NB says there is no point in her joining the meetings and repeating herself. NB says there is double parking on Market St with no penalties for the people doing it. NB says there is no point in coming if there is no commitment to use policy to prevent these issues.</p> <p>AD says that the Policy and Procedures is now an appendix on the OTMP. It focuses on Year 12s, response to parents, and procedures in response to the OTMP.</p> <p>NFP asks if AD can run the group through the penalties.</p> <p>RR says that the CCC will start at the top of the document. Will talk about penalties in due course.</p> <p>AW says he is happy to take the CCC through it. AW says the introduction talks about the school's aims to improve safety, efficacy and minimise impact on residents. AW says that ironically the school will be ignoring its own car-pooling policy until the pandemic is over.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>AW says they have formally introduced the second GWTF on Kornmehl. The school is looking for a new traffic warden. AW says that the document tells parents that there will be strong procedures.</p> <p>AW says in the maintaining safe traffic flow there are broad guidelines requiring parents, grandparents and Year 12s to comply with the traffic and parking rules for safety and for the residents. Such rules include no calling children over to vehicles, no dropping children on the other side, leaving children unsupervised in vehicles, no double parking, no parking in 'no stopping zones', no parking in a bus zone or driveway, no illegal u-turns, no driving while holding a phone (see TPP).</p> <p>AW says that all offending drivers will be contacted and repeat offenders will have to meet with the principal.</p> <p>AW says that the key preventative measures include the Year 12 no parking zone and collecting Year 12's rego. AW says this is a big step for the school and it has never been done before. AW says that it is now very clear what is not allowed and what the consequences are. Residents are encouraged to report incidents. The TPP includes a number for the school office plus the reception email. The school will keep complaints register. If residents report a vehicle description, then the school can follow up.</p> <p>AW says the school has never had such a specific policy in such detail to deal with traffic issues. AW says it covers new ground for the school. AW says he hopes that residents will view it as a big step in the right direction.</p> <p>RR says there is lots of detail and that it is a big step for the school.</p> <p>NFP asks about penalties.</p> <p>AW says that penalties are dependent on the offence and how often the person has offended. AW says it is enough for the CCC to know that the school is following through. The final consequence is that the enrolment contract is broken. It is enough for the CCC to know that the school has an internal process for dealing with issues. AW says the proof will be in the pudding when it improves.</p> <p>NFP says that offenders will be followed up. How?</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>AW that that the deputy principal and the Deputy Head of Primary School will call parents or grandparents and deal with issue in line with normal protocols. If the offenders repeats, then it come to AW.</p> <p>NFP asks how will the school deal with a repeat offender?</p> <p>AW says that it will depend on the offence, it will be school based and not the concern of the committee. AW says it is a new policy and the school is confronting parents like they never have before.</p> <p>NFP says she is concerned that the number provided is only a landline. NFP says it is good if residents can send a photograph.</p> <p>AD says the contact details include the admin email, can send a photo that way. Plus, AD says his mobile number is distributed in the quarterly neighbourhood letter drop. Residents can always call or text him.</p> <p>TR asks if the traffic wardens can go down problematic streets to tell cars to move on, instead of leaving residents to police these issues.</p> <p>AW says yes, it is in the plan. AW says he has to find the appropriate staff. AW has considered hiring alumni to patrol the streets. AW says that the challenge is to get registration details. Not always parents picking up, sometimes grandparents as well.</p> <p>TR says that people patrolling would help.</p> <p>AW says they will also need people looking out for year 12 drivers.</p> <p>TR says it will be good to send this information to residents to show that the school is taking action.</p> <p>AW says that AD will add it to his neighbourhood information drops.</p> <p>NFP asks why the northern side of Carter St in not highlighted in the Year 12 exclusion zone.</p> <p>AD says that under each map it say that it is 'subject to review'. AD will update the TPP when he gets the updated maps in the revised OTMP.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>NFP asks if the TPP can add another rule about rear-to-curb parking on Steven St near Chepstow St.</p> <p>AW says he is happy to add that.</p> <p>TR notes that with parking over driveways, it is legal for 2 minutes but sometimes people block driveways even when a resident needs to enter their property. TR asks if this can be noted.</p> <p>AW says he is happy to add that.</p> <p>AD says that in the TPP is asks specifically that people do not park across driveways and bus zones.</p> <p>NFP is still concerned. NFP says that some issues can be resolved by the landline or email, but others like accessing your driveway cannot. NFP says that it would helpful to have a nominated officer at Randwick council for people to contact. NFP also says there needs to be a conversation with Randwick police on how to escalate and manage issues with them. So one person from the school, the council, and the police.</p> <p>AW says he cannot speak on behalf of the council or the police, but AD is the emergency contact person for the school. AW says that AD is already very proactive. AW says he is happy and supportive for NFP to contact Randwick council and police.</p> <p>NFP also says that small errors like writing Wentworth Ave instead of Wentworth St still need to be fixed.</p> <p>AW says he is happy to consider wording suggestions.</p> <p>JL says that the TPP is an appendix to the OTMP so that the school can update and control the TPP. OTMP was issued late so there was not time to send it to the schoo in time with the updated diagrams. But AD now had the updated OTMP and will be able to add the updated diagrams to the TPP.</p> <p>TR says that there are errors on page 11 to 17, TR says she will email JL the corrections. Some of the errors include referring to the incorrect intersections e.g. referring to Stanley St when it should be Market St.</p> <p>JL says thank you.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>NFP says that Castle Lane should be listed in the OTMP, it is already in the TPP. NFP says there is no room for parking but people are parking illegally.</p> <p>NFP also asks if JL can point to a section in the OTMP on current traffic issues in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>JL says that the traffic engineer is very factual and has a binary sort of system. JL says anything subjective would be outside what he would do.</p> <p>TR says that it is maybe better placed in the TPP. TR says that people use Castle Lane because of congestion on Carter St. Tr suggests maybe including not parking on Castle Lane or as a way to exit Carter St.</p> <p>NFW says she thinks it needs to go in both. Randwick Council needs to know about the issues. NFP thinks it is important to frame it and promote it in context with Randwick council.</p> <p>AD says that TPP is an internal school policy about how the school will manage traffic issues in reflection on the OTMP. AD says that streets that can or cannot be used is in the TPP. AD says it mentions Castle Lane, it is very specific and sent to parents. The OTMP is a broad traffic management plan, so the OTMP and the TPP can be read in conjunction.</p> <p>JL says the TPP is an appendix to the OTMP. JL says Castle Lane is narrow, but you can legally park in the Lane. The traffic engineer writing the OTMP cannot say that people cannot park in Castle Lane but the school can promote that people do not park there.</p> <p>NFP asks where in the OTMP does it talk about congestion.</p> <p>JL says that the writing about traffic movements like congestion will be based on the counts that were done. The counts will be redone every year.</p> <p>NFP asks if the OTMP will talk about the illegal parking that occurs?</p> <p>NFP clarifies if that means that illegal parking will not be mentioned in the OTMP.</p> <p>JL says that the traffic engineer cannot say if something is or is not an illegal parking spot. He can suggest how to minimise</p>	
--	--	--

<p>illegal parking, but he is not in a position to comment on illegal parks.</p> <p>NFP notes that the three intersections that were surveyed were 300m away from the school.</p> <p>AD says that on p. 68 of the OTMP, the OTMP notes he amended congestion points with blue dots that came from CCC feedback a few meetings ago. The feedback was that the congestion measurements were not broad enough so the engineers yesterday will survey additional intersections. So next year's review will include extra 'liquorice' sticks measuring traffic based on the feedback from the CCC.</p> <p>NFP asks when the next survey will be done.</p> <p>JL says that the OTMP needs to be submitted and approved before the next surveys can be done.</p> <p>TR says that the surveys will have to be done post-covid, when school traffic is back to normal.</p> <p>NFP says it is important that traffic congestion is addressed in the OTMP to be clear to the council. Otherwise, NFP agrees with NB that it is a waste of time. Important to describe the starting point.</p> <p>RR says that her sense is that there can be descriptive elements in the document, but the traffic engineer will not be doing that. It may have to go in the TPP if there is willingness. There will not be a narrative in the OTMP because a narrative is qualitative, whereas traffic engineers will only do quantitative research.</p> <p>AD says that the opening paragraph of the TPP puts out a statement of intent on what the school wants to achieve.</p> <p>RR asks if anyone has any extra comments they would like to add.</p> <p>DP also did not have a chance to review the document.</p> <p>TR says she has amendments as stated above about some errors but she will email these through to JL.</p> <p>NFP has nothing extra to add. NFP says it is good that the TPP is now an appendix to the OTMP. It gives the TPP more status and weight.</p>	
---	--

	<p>AW has nothing to add.</p> <p>RR asks JL what the next steps are.</p> <p>JL says the OTMP must go to council for endorsement in order to get the construction certificate. Construction will get a lot more done in the non-school hours, so aim is to capitalise on the December and January school holidays which would shorten the building program which is ideal for everyone. JL says that once he has received TR's and other people comments, he will send the OTMP to council. JL says the OTMP is a work in progress document.</p> <p>RR says that once council gets the document then they approve it.</p> <p>JL says he is sure there will be toing and froing that will need to be accommodated. There are 118 conditions that need to be complied with. Once the OTMP is endorsed then the annual traffic count will be activated. Currently no requirement for the school to survey traffic because the OTMP is not yet endorsed. JL says they are likely to get a contractor on board for November to prepare for a mid-December start on site.</p> <p>RR says that OTMP goes in, then there is a back and forth with Council. RR says she will talk to council about joining the group. RR asks JL if they need to wait until the OTMP is in place before they can get a contractor?</p> <p>JL says that there are a number of items like the construction certificate. JL says their aim is to get the OTMP across the line because traffic has been noted as a problem. JL says that traffic management is done by the contractor. So the contractor will have to be on board for that part.</p> <p>RR asks what is next for this group.</p> <p>JL says he is happy to receive comments and circulate by email a week turnaround time. Then JL will send the OTMP to council. Once council has it it could take 6 – 8 weeks.</p> <p>RR asks the group if they have questions.</p> <p>TR asks the school representatives if they have received feedback about the Year 12 parking, amendment 40.22a?</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>AW says they have not received feedback. AW says they moved on the assumption that what we can do is legal from the point of view that it is school policy. If council want to make it compulsory that students cannot park near the school, then council will have to deal with any legal ramifications from parents.</p> <p>TR asks about the dilapidation reports. TR reports that other residents are concerned.</p> <p>JL says that dilapidation reports will be taken of close by properties and will be conducted by an independent engineer. JL says that this project includes no rock breaking, no earthworks, and no heavy percussive work.</p> <p>RR says that once the contractor is on board, then this will be a discussion.</p> <p>TR says thank you and says that other residents are concerned.</p> <p>JL says it is an insurance policy for the contractor.</p>	
6	AOB	
	No other matters.	
7	Next meeting	
	<p>RR says she will be in touch about the next meeting date.</p> <p>RR thanks the school for their work on the TPP, RR appreciates the time investment of the school and especially the community members.</p> <p>RR thanks everyone and says that the CCC is at a good point and stage.</p>	