

**Emanuel School Community Consultative Committee**

**Meeting No:** 6

**Date:** Thursday 25<sup>th</sup> November 6 – 8pm

**Venue:** Zoom

<b>Attendees</b>	
<p><b>Community Members</b> NFP Tara Roach</p>	<p><b>Emanuel School</b> Andrew Watt - Principal Andrew Delany – Security Manager Derek Pal – Parent</p> <p><b>Sandrick Construction</b> Warwick Smith – Project Manager Jonathan Lau</p> <p><b>Grindley Construction</b> Asha Meller Michael Packman</p> <p><b>Randwick Council</b> John Flanigan</p> <p><b>Traffix</b> Ben Liddle</p> <p><b>Independent Chair</b> Professor Roberta Ryan</p> <p><b>Minute Taker</b> Sophie Alais</p>
<p><b>Apologies</b> Nicole Birbas Justine Hughes</p>	

<b>Item</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Action</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome</b>	
	RR welcomes everyone to the meeting. RR notes there are several extra attendees today: JF from Randwick Council; AM and MP from Grindley Construction; and BL is joining again from Traffix.	
<b>2</b>	<b>Apologies</b>	
	NB and JH are apologies.	
<b>3</b>	<b>Minutes from last meeting</b>	
	AD and WS approve last meeting’s minutes.	

	<p>NFP has a comment which RR treats as a matter arising.</p> <p>NFP notes that she is not sure in which minutes it was included but a previous minutes noted that the Year 12 students will be parking 500m away from the campus. NFP asks when the OTMP will be updated to reflect this restriction.</p>	
<b>4</b>	<b>Actions from last meeting</b>	
	No actions.	
<b>5</b>	<p><b>Introduce Construction Point of Contact &amp; Discuss Construction Management Plan</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Work Zones</b></li> <li>○ <b>Construction Traffic Plan</b></li> <li>○ <b>Contractor Parking</b></li> <li>○ <b>Noise &amp; Vibration</b></li> <li>○ <b>High level programme</b></li> <li>○ <b>Communication</b></li> </ul>	
	<p>JL welcomes the team from Grindley Construction who have been appointed the principal contractors for the building works.</p> <p>AM is the General Manager of Grindley and MP is the Project Manager and will be the CCC member for Grindley.</p> <p>AM thanks everyone. AM notes that Grindley is aware that traffic and parking is of great concern to everyone involved. AM says that MP has put together a presentation to share to talk the CCC step by step through the plan for construction in 2022.</p> <p>WS asks AM to explain the company story behind Grindley and how the conditions of consent are at the forefront of the relationship between Grindley and the school.</p> <p>AM says that Grindley has been operating for 33 years. Allan Carson began Grindley and is still the owner. Annual turnover is 200 million. Grindley specialises in the education and aged care sectors, so Grindley are education specialists and are well experienced in these types of projects e.g., live occupied sites in residential areas. Grindley is the parent company and Grindley Interiors is a fully owned subsidiary company. Grindley's projects are usually worth up to \$15 million, this project is \$8 – 9 million. Grindley has 120 staff and 40% of the staff have been with the company for over 10 years.</p> <p>MP shares his screen to show PowerPoint presentation (see Appendix A).</p>	

	<p>TR asks if the OTMP will be reviewed in time for the proposed mid-December start because the Construction Certificate would need to be approved by mid-December.</p> <p>JL says that in short, they are hoping to have it approved by Council by this point.</p> <p>TR asks approved or reviewed?</p> <p>JL says that work will not commence if the Construction Certificate has not been issued.</p> <p>TR asks if they are planning to revise it.</p> <p>JL says they have to wait until Council comes back to us.</p> <p>WS says to be clear, no works requiring the Construction Certificate will commence before it has been received. Grindley can be onsite and be doing some work e.g., constructing site sheds plus the school needs to do electric and pipe works before construction.</p> <p>TR says that coming into Stanley St there are some “no go” streets that are narrow. TR says there has been incidents in the past with trucks going up those narrow streets.</p> <p>MP says they are currently developing a work zone and that plan has to be approved by council.</p> <p>TR asks if the contractors will know this work zone plan?</p> <p>AM says yes, all contractors will be issued with strict instructions on what streets they can use to enter the site.</p> <p>MP says it will be a map with clear routes.</p> <p>TR asks if AM and MP know what the dilapidation reports will cover? TR says this is of interest to the residents on the top of Chepstow St.</p> <p>AM says they do not know at this stage, they are still reviewing with a structural engineer.</p> <p>TR asks if information on the dilapidation reports can be communicated with this group.</p> <p>AM says yes, it can.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>RR asks for any other questions or comments from the CCC members. RR says this is just an introduction. RR says that the CCC will have a lot to do with AM, MP and the team over the next few months.</p> <p>TR asks if there will be building work on Saturdays.</p> <p>MP says yes the DA allows work from 7am-5pm on weekdays, and then from 8am-6pm on Saturdays.</p> <p>NFP thanks MP and AM for the update.</p> <p>WS says that this time in the project timeline is a good time to inform the CC how the construction works with the community. WS says it is important for the community to understand that construction is different from the school. Once control of the site is given to the building contractors, then authority is taken away from the school, even though the school owns the site. Therefore, even the school would need to ask permission to enter the site. WS says that there needs to be only 'one captain' for safety reasons. This goes with things like insurance, vaccinations and other requirements. In the CCC, there will issues for the school like the GWTF and issues for Grindley to do with the site.</p> <p>RR asks if MP is the direct contact for the site.</p> <p>MP says he is not the onsite manager, he is the project manager. MP says he will be the initial contact but the onsite manager may develop a better relationship with the community as time goes on so they may become the main contact.</p> <p>RR says when the time is right, then it may be good for the site manager to join the CCC meetings.</p> <p>MP agrees.</p> <p>TR asks if there any other measures for the contractors to reduce traffic congestion and parking issues.</p> <p>MP says there is carpooling, a lot of the similar trades carpool together.</p> <p>TR says the two suggestions is just carpooling and public transport.</p>	
--	---	--

	AM and MP say yes.	
<b>6</b>	<b>Current status of the approvals</b>	
<b>7</b>	<b>Observations on the current traffic management arrangements</b>	
	<p>JF is joining the meeting to express views on the OTMP (Operational Transport Management Plan) as part of the assessment process.</p> <p>JF introduces himself. He is the development engineer coordinator. JF says he was invited to tonight's meeting and has perused the previous minutes to update himself. JF says he has been busy with court matters and regional planning panels.</p> <p>JF says he has been reviewing the OTMP, the version he has was lodged 27<sup>th</sup> October. Council is keen to see the processing of the 4.55s, there are still two to go. He is not sure if they will need to go to panel. This will influence the Green Travel Plan (GTP) and the OTMP. JF is keen to hear the CCC's views on the issue. After this, council will do a review and it will go to Tony Leihman, manager of integrated transport. He chairs the Randwick Traffic Committee. After this, there may be changes or it may be adopted.</p> <p>RR asks for an update on the planning panel.</p> <p>JF says he was there for the briefing. Then it was a public meeting. Then the panel adjourned, and then afterwards there was a determination will be finalised. Then there is a short period of time before the findings are sent out. JF says he hopes the process will be quick. JF was not present in the final section but Angel a senior planner was but JF has not spoken to her since the meeting.</p> <p>RR says the findings will come out formally but it is usually a fairly rapid process so it will be over the next few days.</p> <p>RR asks for a update from TR who attended the Regional Planning Panel public meeting on behalf of the community.</p> <p>TR says she told the Panel that the CCC had come a long way on pickups and drop offs but it has not been long enough to see if there has been cultural change. TR says she acknowledged to the Panel that the CCC has done a lot work. TR noted though that nothing had moved on the parking front. TR says that council has said its not illegal and therefore it is easier to retain</p>	

	<p>that measure. TR outlined how many students there are the school. TR also emphasized that the GTP goals were too light and the terms were too long.</p> <p>RR asks JL and WS for an update on the 4.55s.</p> <p>JL says the first 4.55 is for the Year 12 parking for the road safety evaluation and the road safety audit. The second 4.55 is for architectural changes.</p> <p>JF says there is a 40200.20c included as an operation use, timing had to be done in a certain length of time.</p> <p>JL says the OTMP could not be approved until a CCC had been set up.</p> <p>JF says it had to be included as a 4.55 so it could be formalised.</p> <p>RR asks for a comment regarding the 'matter arising' raised by NFP about the Year 12 parking exclusion zone.</p> <p>AW says it a more than 500m parking exclusion zone which was agreed upon by the committee. It is in the Transport and Parking Plan (TPP) which was included as a appendix in the OTMP.</p> <p>NFP says she cannot see that reflected in the OTMP in the version sent to members. Nor is it accurately reflected in the map in the TPP.</p> <p>AW says the map is included in the most recent version which maybe NFP does not have for which he apologizes.</p> <p>JL shares his screen to show the map outlining the Year 12 parking exclusion zone.</p> <p>BL says the map on the screen is correct.</p> <p>TR asks if this map will stay in the OTMP.</p> <p>JF says that this question is part of the council's concerns.</p> <p>WS says this is all on the panel's discussions. WS can recall marking up the streets as part on the exclusion zones. WS says the exclusion zone is not a radius which is maybe what NFP's thinks.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>NFP say that AW said it was 500m.</p> <p>AW says the CCC agreed on the current map. NFP expressed concerns on the wedge of the triangle on the bottom of the map which was then expanded which was the final outcome. It began with a talk of 500m zone.</p> <p>NFP says that this implies that the students can park on the eastern side of Avoca St. NFP says since school has resumed parents have been parking illegally. Students can still park close to the school according to the map. NFP says she does not think it reflects a 500m zone. NFP says she assumed that when AW said that students would be restricted then it would be a 500m zone.</p> <p>AW says that the current map was agreed upon 4 meetings back. It was determined by the CCC as a exclusion zone.</p> <p>RR says that the map on screen is the correct one and as TR stated it was agreed upon. So it is a moot point depending on the outcome of the panel meeting. RR says the meeting needs to keep going so any point that need to be fleshed out on JF's presence need to be talked about now.</p> <p>RR asks the CCC if anyone has anything they would like to raise with JF.</p> <p>NFP says she mainly wanted to bring up the issue about the 500m zone.</p> <p>RR says that the CCC has heard that issue now. RR recalls working through the streets. RR says she does not think that the CCC can work through that issue now. RR asks if there are any other issues that need to be raised with JF.</p> <p>TR says the key issues are that there is a lot of work on the GWTF and drop off, and illegal parent parking. TR says the CCC agrees that there needs to be more council visitation to the area. It cannot be just residents communicating to the school. TR says the this week a primary school student was dropped off in a no parking zone and not on the sidewalk side of the car. TR says she and other residents would hate to have a road accident involving a child because the parents were illegally dropping off. TR says the school can communicate with parents but parents will still do the wrong thing. TR says she has lived here for 11 years but has never seen the council stopping illegal parking and</p>	
--	---	--

illegal stopping in no parking zones. If parents began to get booked by traffic rangers, it would insist in changing the culture.

Regarding parking, TR says they do not know the outcomes from the Panel but the GTP's aims are woeful. TR says currently there are over 100 plus staff parking but the GTP aims to only reduce staff parking by 7 car parks over five years. TR says this aim is too low, and too slow. Additionally, TR notes that the school is over the full-time equivalent (FTE) staff cap. TR says that not much can be done but TR wants more to be done. TR says that even with Year 12s pushed out of parking near the school, there are still staff parking. TR says her residence is near the gate in prime parking position. TR says the something far more meaningful needs to be done about the parking issues in the area.

RR asks the school to respond about being over the FTE cap.

AW says as discussed in previous meetings, there is a cap of 920 students but the school has taken their 'eye off the ball' regarding the staff cap. AW says that staff numbers can fluctuate by 4-5 per year and there is an obvious need to keep a greater eye on the issue. AW notes there has been no increase in staff numbers over the last two years plus the student cap of 920 has not been reached. AW says he is meeting with executive tomorrow and they are looking at new solutions like ride sharing and incentives. AW thanks TR for saying that the school has improved traffic flow. AW says that parking is the next significant issue. AW says that if council allows the school to have the Year 12 parking exclusion zone, then that will be an immediate reduction of 20 car spaces.

JF says that TR's comment on FTE staff cap is not fleshed out. JF asks if the consent would be in trouble? JF says he was in the meeting but he is not sure where everyone is at regarding the staff numbers.

AW says the school is slightly over by a minimum of 4 staff.

JF asks what the school will do.

AW says the school cannot do anything. AW says they need those staff numbers to teach the students.

JF says that will need to reviewed by council. JF hears TR and AW on the GTP.

	<p>BL says that the aim was a 7 car reduction (regarding parking places) over 5 years. The reason for this was that St. Catherine's school demonstrated a 7% reduction in staff parking over a similar period. BL says they thought it was similar with other travel plans. BL says that is where the 5% reduction comes from.</p> <p>JF says a difference between St. Catherine's and Emanuel is the availability of staff parking. St. Catherine's has more staff parking than Emanuel.</p> <p>TR says there is 0.35 parking for staff after the current building works at St. Catherine's, while 48 staff walk or take transport. St. Catherine's starting baseline would be lower and their problems are different from Emanuel because St. Catherine's has a lower percentage of staff driving to school and more staff parking spaces.</p> <p>JF says he would have thought that this information would be relevant as well.</p> <p>RR asks for NFP's opinions on the general issues. Does NFP agree with TR on her points and the focus on parking?</p> <p>NFP says that TR's highlights the issues that the community has struggled with the school for many years like exceeding the cap. While there has been some improvement on the GWTF, there is still illegal parking. NFP thinks that culture can change. NFP is concerned about the Year 12s because they drive in small cars and parking in odd spaces. NFP supports what TR has said. NFP also thanks TR for representing the community at the panel meeting.</p> <p>AW says he wants to add that it is worth looking at the TPP because it is the first time in the school's history that there is a comprehensive parking policy which is a genuine attempt to change the parent culture regarding traffic and parking issues. AW says it has been a team effort with the CCC to move parking away from restricted streets and to identify poorly congested streets. AW say that there is still a way to go. AW is not sure how to get around staff parking and next year will be difficult with construction.</p> <p>RR says that residents are always looking at enforcement issues.</p> <p>JF says he can talk to the traffic enforcement people. JF notes that Waverly Council is very active around St. Catherine's.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>RR thanks JF.</p> <p>JF congratulates everyone on coming together on this issue.</p>	
<b>8</b>	<b>Feedback from the Regional Planning panel</b>	
	No feedback from the Regional Planning Panel was available at the time of this meeting.	
<b>10</b>	<b>Next meeting</b>	
	<p>RR says the next meeting should be on construction methodologies.</p> <p>JL was thinking that there should be another meeting prior to the end of the year.</p> <p>TR would like council to come back to the meeting with the feedback.</p> <p>RR says that JF is the person who is involved with the OTMP assessment. RR says she has written to council on who would be the best person to join the CCC meetings.</p> <p>TR says it would be good to have JF back.</p> <p>RR says she can invite him.</p> <p>WS asks when does school break up?</p> <p>AW says school breaks up on December 9<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>Majority of the group has limited or clashing availabilities from the third week of December so the CCC agrees that the next meeting will be Wednesday December 8th from 6-8pm. AW will be unable to attend but AD will represent him.</p>	