

Emanuel School Community Consultative Committee

Meeting No: 15

Date: 8 May 2023, 6 pm – 8 pm

Location: Online, Zoom

Attendees	
<p>Community members NFP Tara Roach (TR) Justine Hughes (JH) Derek Pal (DP)</p> <p>Randwick Council John Flanigan (JF)</p>	<p>Emanuel School Margaret Lowe – Deputy Principal (ML) Mario Torreson - (MTo) Mike Tyler – Manager Facilities and Operations (MTy)</p> <p>Sandrick Construction Jonathan Lau (JL) Warwick Smith (WS)</p> <p>Traffix Ben Liddell – Traffic Engineer (BL)</p> <p>Independent chair Professor Roberta Ryan (RR)</p> <p>Minute taker Isa Crossland Stone (ICS)</p>
<p>Apologies Asha Meller (AM)</p>	

Item	Description	Action
1	Welcome and apologies	
	<p>RR welcomes all attendees to the meeting.</p> <p>RR thanks BL for attending this meeting.</p> <p>BL introduces himself; he works at Traffix. He is the traffic engineer who prepared the updated 2023 OTMP report.</p>	
2	Matters arising	
	<p>1. JF to update the Council’s review of the table provided by ML. This will include a comparison of its numbers to the original SEE.</p> <p>JF says that following today, it seems that the school will provide more specific data relating to employment numbers. Therefore, the Council will wait for more information before providing a review.</p> <p>2. JF to follow up with his supervisor regarding traffic patrol in the afternoons on Avoca St.</p> <p>JF advises that he has spoken to his supervisor but has not received a substantial response. He will follow up again at the Council and return to the CCC with an update. This is ongoing.</p> <p>3. NFP would like to discuss pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Due to time constraints on this meeting, RR and NFP agree that this issue can be discussed at the next CCC meeting.</p>	<p>JF to update on the Council’s review of the table provided by ML. This will include a comparison of its numbers to the original SEE.</p> <p>JF to follow up with his supervisor regarding traffic patrol in the afternoons on Avoca St.</p> <p>NFP would like to discuss pedestrian safety.</p>
3	OTMP draft presentation - BL	
	<p><i>The group discusses the draft OTMP, which was circulated ahead of tonight’s meeting.</i></p> <p>TR asks BL to confirm that this OTMP is a draft has not been issued to the Council. She notes that the report appears to be signed and dated on May 10th of 2023.</p> <p>BL confirms that it is a draft. The signature and date are denoted in red text, as are all other updates and major</p>	

<p>changes for ease of reference.</p> <p>TR asks again if it was finalised on May 10. She points out that the draft was not issued to CCC members until weeks after that date on May 26.</p> <p>JL says that yes, the first draft was finalised and received that date. JL received and reviewed it, and then the draft was offered to the School for review and assessment of feasibility. The version available to the CCC since May 26 has undergone these phases.</p> <p>TR asks about Point 25 of the OTMP.</p> <p>TR would like to review the data that formed the basis of this OTMP update. She says it would be helpful to circulate this data since the report generally contains summations and conclusions rather than raw data.</p> <p>TR notes that under the CoC, they are able to view the results of the independent auditing conducted as part of the OTMP.</p> <p>JL says that the raw data which is generated partially through electronic measures. Some is machine-collected, some human-collected. That raw data is generally not presented even to JL – for the most part, he is presented with a summary either generated by electronic means or from the human parking surveyors.</p> <p>JL notes that BL’s role as an engineer is to transpose these summarised results into a summarised version for ease of reading and ease of reference.</p> <p>BL confirms this. He says that generally they do not provide raw data.</p> <p>JL asks TR what the purpose of receiving the raw data might be.</p> <p>TR says that she believes that the timeframes included in this report are truly reflective of the school flows. For example, it discusses a drop-off time which aims for students to begin at 8:45am. TR says that in reality, drop-off flow begins well prior to that period.</p> <p>TR believes that some data throughout the report does not align with the lived experience of the school’s</p>	
---	--

<p>neighbours. It makes assumptions in its summary of the data which could perhaps be corrected by the community members if they have access to the data which bases these assumptions.</p> <p>RR asks TR if she could raise specific sections of the report where she has these concerns, so that BL can aim to address them specifically.</p> <p>BL agrees that if TR can share specific concerns, he will pursue some clarification.</p> <p>RR agrees with this plan for going forward in the meeting. She says that otherwise, this matter may have to be pursued more directly offline to allow for the electronic nature of the data.</p> <p>TR and BL concur.</p> <p>With regards to section 3.1 on page 6, which details 'location and site' NFP asks BL where the information regarding location in Paragraph 2 was sourced.</p> <p>Paragraph 2 describes a "Northern boundary of 67m to a neighbouring residential property and a section of Stephen St". NFP flags that neither of these details is accurate. Rather, the Northern boundary of the school is shared with Peace Park. NFP says that the OTMP should be updated to amend this error.</p> <p>TR refers to the site map included in Section 3.1. It denotes an 'enrolment boundary for 2020'. TR suspects that the enrolment boundaries are incorrect.</p> <p>BL agrees that the map does not show an enrolment boundary. He will amend this error.</p> <p>TR asks about the description of 'three-legged priority intersection', which is recurring throughout the report. Does "three-legged" refer to the number of roads involved in the intersection?</p> <p>BL clarifies that it does not relate to the number of roads involved. He says that many of the intersections involved in this report happen to be three-leg priority controlled.</p> <p>NFP refers to section 3.3.4 of the OTMP, which shows the intersection of Chepstow Street and Stephen Street.</p>	<p>BL to amend Section 3.1, Paragraph 2 of the OTMP which incorrectly locates the School's 67m Northern boundary as connected to a residential property and to Stephen Street.</p> <p>BL to amend the map in Section 3.1, which incorrectly denotes the School's 'enrolment boundaries'.</p>
---	--

<p>This section refers to as a “two-legged intersection”. She explains that where Stephen St turns into Chepstow Street, the carpark is located on the right. NFP says that this is a valuable visual, given that this section has been a topic of much discussion by the CCC.</p> <p>TR raises the Road Safety Audit (RSA) findings and remediation measures, which BL says have mostly been in the hands of the Council.</p> <p>TR speaks first to RSA 4: she says that the queue along Avoca Street remains a problem. She finds that while there is more space on Avoca Street that can be used in the queue, many parents are not utilizing the full length of the street. Use of the full length would help to alleviate the problem of traffic backing up.</p> <p>From the School perspective, MTy says that they have tried to deal with this problem. It seems to be an issue wherein parents and grandparents arrive early and loiter around the school grounds, therefore causing congestion.</p> <p>TR clarifies that this issue occurs in the morning as well as the afternoon. She asks of it is possible for wardens to drive traffic flow all the way down the street. This would be very helpful.</p> <p>MTy agrees. He will instruct the School’s traffic wardens tomorrow (May 30, 2023), and aim to implement this new direction system effective immediately.</p> <p>TR turns to RSA 7. The findings here read, “Vehicles parked and students dropped off with the existing no stopping restriction at the intersection of Stanley Street and Chepstow Street.”</p> <p>TR says that Stanley Street is still problematic. Even following the installation of the new refuge, there are still parents who do U-turns on the refuge and turn down Chepstow Street.</p> <p>Tr says that a large part of Stanley Street is a bus zone, but parents are using the bus zone as a drop-off point. TR would like some clarification on this issue.</p> <p>MTy says when the work zone on Stanley St has been removed, the School will have a warden based more permanently on Stanley Street to manage this area and</p>	<p>MTy to instruct the Emanuel School traffic wardens to direct parent traffic to flow all the way to the end of the pickup line on Avoca Street. This will begin from May 30, 2023.</p>
--	--

<p>ensure that parents are not parking in the bus zone. Currently, the warden team is shifted around the area but there is no permanent warden in that area.</p> <p>TR notes that one of within the work zone there was a disability parking zone. She believes that this was the only accessible parking zone in that vicinity. Will this space be reverted to disability parking following construction?</p> <p>TR points out an image at the end of the report, which shows the single previous accessible parking area which has now been absorbed by the construction area. The group agrees that this question should be clarified, as this spot was historically the only accessible parking.</p> <p>ML asks JF to comment on this on behalf of council. JF says that he will follow this up with council. He is not personally aware, at present.</p> <p>TR would also like more information from the School regarding the bus zone and the school busses. She asks of it is necessary for the bus zone to be allocated from 7am-4pm on all school days.</p> <p>ML says that most schools have a bus zone operating out the front during school hours, to facilitate school activities and school trips or various lengths.</p> <p>TR agrees. She has seen this at other schools.</p> <p>TR says that she is interested in understanding whether the positioning of this bus zone is optimal. Perhaps if it were relocated, for example to Avoca St near the preschool, it would minimize the issues stated in the RSA.</p> <p>NFP notes that some of the bus routes tabulated in Figure 14 on page 26 of the report are no longer current. Since the report will be permanent, these ought to be updated.</p> <p>TR says that the section 4.3.2 should be updated. The timeframes denoted for parking restrictions are inaccurate.</p> <p>MTy says that he will look at this and discuss with BL offline.</p> <p>NFP comments on the diagram of Figure 15. She says that</p>	<p>JF to follow up at the Council about whether the accessible parking spot which has been involved in the work area on Stanley Street will be maintained.</p> <p>BL to update Figure 14 of the OTMP to reflect changes to bus routes.</p>
---	--

	<p>there is actually no staff/student entry point into the car park on the corner of Chepstow Street and Stephen Street. The green arrow which indicates such an entry should be removed.</p> <p>NFP says that, here, there is a vehicle access point which notes “no pedestrian access”.</p> <p>ML clarifies that the sign actually says “no pedestrian access before 8am”.</p> <p>ML adds that following last meeting, the usage of these gates has been changes to “preschool only”.</p> <p>TR agrees, but says that the green arrow noted by NFP is still incorrect.</p> <p>TR says that the gate is supposed only to be open from 8am for Kornmehl preschool families and staff. This should be made clear in Section 4.4.2the OTMP document.</p> <p>NFP says that Section 4.4.2 should reflect the fact that the car park and preschool drop-off, rather than the pre-school, open at 8am.</p> <p>BL will speak with the School about clarifying this point.</p> <p>NFP notes that the diagram of Figure 16 is a good reflection of the directions of traffic flow in the AM and the PM.</p> <p>TR notes that Section 4.6.2 should be updated to make clear that the school provides 3 student entry points, including the aforementioned preschool access point on Chepstow Street. It is important to update this number and to make a clear distinction between preschool and K-12 access point usage.</p> <p>BL will make this distinction.</p>	<p>MTy and BL to discuss the timeframes notes in 4.3.2, in order to ensure their accuracy.</p> <p>BL to review the diagram at Figure 15, to ensure that the demarcated entry point on the corner of Chepstow and Stephen Streets is corrected.</p> <p>BL to update Figure 15 and relevant information in Section 4.4.2 of the OTMP reflect that the gate at Chepstow and Stanley Streets is reserved only for Kornmehl Preschool staff, students and siblings of preschool students.</p> <p>BL to liaise with the School regarding a distinction between the preschool drop-off hours and school hours, as mentioned in the OTMP Section 4.4.2.</p>
--	---	---

<p>TR raises the waste collection. One of the collection points is outside her house on Chepstow Street. TR feels it is unreasonable to have collections every weekday, given the proximity of the school to the neighboring properties.</p> <p>The bins are often left outside the preschool gate during pickups in the afternoons, and TR believes that they are a visibility hazard.</p> <p>TR asks JF to comment on these concerns.</p> <p>JF says that the frequency of collection is strange. He agrees that the bin placement is problematic, and so is the collection timing. He wonders if having the bins be collected each day is unnecessary.</p> <p>JF suggests that MTy reviews the school's waste management plan.</p> <p>MTy say that he will review this and ensure that the bins are not put out in the evening. He will aim to have the bins all placed outside together at the same time at 6am each morning, with the other bins.</p> <p>MTy will also review the waste volumes. If the bins are full, they do need to be collected daily. He will look at usage and perhaps confer with the council about getting an additional bin. Ideally, this would be free of charge.</p> <p>Referring to the travel mode surveys in Section 5, TR discusses the enrollment records. She says that the percentage numbers in this assessment are based on an FTE, which as discussed in previous meetings is perhaps not a full representation. Thus, the extrapolations/analyses drawn in this OTMP report are likely not accurate.</p> <p>ML says that despite the dynamic quality of the FTE, on average, across a week on-site the full-time staff numbers are the same. She agrees that the percentages may need to be recalculated for more accurate reflection.</p> <p>TR says that this is a complex and difficult thing to reflect.</p> <p>BL agrees that it is difficult to put a clear figure to am FTE value. There may be ways to make disclaimers on this data.</p>	<p>BL to update section 4.6.2 to clarify that there are 3 pedestrian access points, and to make a clear distinction between K-12 and preschool students.</p> <p>MTy to ensure that the preschool bin is put out in the morning, rather than in the afternoon hours.</p> <p>MTy to review the preschool waste management plan to assess waste volumes and follow up about the potential of an additional bin.</p>
---	--

	<p>BL says that he will talk this through with the school.</p> <p>ML says that perhaps the report should include information about total staff numbers, including off-site employees, alongside FTEs.</p> <p>BL says that Traffix can work with the School to more comprehensively reflect their employee spread.</p> <p>With reference to Tables 4 and 5, TR says that use of only percentages to describe student and staff number changes over time is not adequate. The report should also include a baseline of numbers.</p> <p>BL says that as he understands it, these numbers are pretty well aligned with the 2019 numbers. He can discuss this with the School.</p> <p><i>At this point in the meeting, ML makes her exit due to other School meeting commitments.</i></p> <p>TR asks BL about Table 9. Does 'carsharing' refer to having multiple children in a vehicle, including siblings who travel together?</p> <p>BL says yes, this definition captures siblings who are driven together. For the purposes of assessing student statistics here, this definition is standard.</p> <p>TR says that for future surveys, it might be better to split the preschool from the K-6. The traffic circumstances and car parks of each group are different. The preschool students are also more likely to be dropped off by parents.</p> <p>BL says that typically parent drop-off is high in the younger primary school years as well.</p> <p>BL says that for next year's surveys, they will consider splitting these groups.</p> <p>JF asks about the definition of 'CLG meetings'. Does this refer to the CCC meetings?</p> <p>BLL says yes. This name will be corrected.</p>	<p>BL to liaise with the school regarding how best to represent their employee spread. Subsequently, BL and the School to revise presentation of the percentage figures relating to the travel mode surveys.</p> <p>BL to liaise with the School about including actual staff and student numbers to reflect changes over time.</p>
--	--	---

<p>TR comments on the Survey Intersection results. She notes that the Market St volume is stated to be 944, which is similar to the numbers for Avoca Street and Stanley Street. This supports to previous comments by JH and former CCC member Nicole Birbas (NB), about traffic issues on Avoca Street.</p> <p>BL and JL explain that the number 944 represents the total individual movements passing Market Street in a 1-hour period, wither during the AM or PM peak periods. This total includes all vehicle movements that pass through an intersection that include Market Street, for example the intersection of Avoca Street and Market Street.</p> <p>TR thanks them for their explanation.</p> <p>JH adds that she believes that the number of 34 cars does seem accurate to her. The issue is that this number of vehicle passes in a short space of time, causing congestion.</p> <p>TR says that the previous OTMP included a table which dealt with the wait times at each intersection.</p> <p>BL says that yes, the 2022 report may have included these modelling results which were captured as part of the DA report. These numbers are not captured in the annual survey.</p> <p>TR asks how often this kind of modelling would be done.</p> <p>BL says not often. Typically, modelling of intersections occurs leading up to a development.</p> <p>Particularly in the case of schools, short peak periods involve traffic flow, given the “go with the flow” scheme, which are not reflective of other intersections. Given this, modelling of intersections does not necessarily provide a measure of how the school is operating.</p> <p>TR understands this. She says that from an impact perspective she would expect that this modelling would be helpful in assessment of how the School’s traffic operation might be improved.</p> <p>BL says that this kind of assessment could reasonably</p>	<p>BL and Traffix to consider splitting the preschool and K-6 demographics in future surveys.</p> <p>BL to amend all references of “CLG” in the OTMP to ‘CCC’.</p>
---	--

<p>done by observational studies rather than modelling.</p> <p>NFP asks BL about the figures in Table 13 relating to the Stephen Street and Chepstow Street intersections. She would like clarification on what these figures are measuring.</p> <p>NFP adds that this is an L-shaped intersection, or a “two-legged” intersection. Therefore, NFP wonders how there are 8 East-bound (EB) vehicles into Stephen Street, but 47 SB vehicles entering Chepstow Street.</p> <p>BL explains that this intersection has been treated as a three-legged intersection. The surveyors have captured the number of vehicles entering Peace Park. This is why there are three measures captured.</p> <p>The EB number ‘8’ refers to the cars heading East-bound (EB) into Peace Park carpark. The ‘47’ refers to cars travelling SB along Chepstow Street, and ‘48’ refers to cars travelling WB along Stephen Street.</p> <p>NFP asks: how is it that no vehicles have been captured exiting the car park and turning NB into Chepstow Street.</p> <p>BL reiterates that these surveys simply count the number of vehicles travelling through the public intersection over a 1-hour period during the AM and PM peak periods. These calculations do not distinguish between school-associated cars and vehicles which are members of the public.</p> <p>BL says that this data does not show how cars travel in and out of the preschool carpark. It was not designed to do so.</p> <p>NFP says that she understands that, but is still unclear about how there are no figures relating to NB travel up Chepstow St.</p> <p>BL directs NFP to the data for the Chepstow/Stanley Street intersection, which records NB travel up Chepstow.</p> <p>NFP says that these would be vehicles coming from Stanley Street into Chepstow Street, but this table is not noting vehicles which travel from Stephen Street into Chepstow.</p> <p>NFP says that this area has been one of ongoing concern</p>	
--	--

<p>for the CCC, and it was requested that vehicle numbers on the corner of Stephen Street and Chepstow Street be included in the survey.</p> <p>NFP notes that there has been a request to preschool parents to travel North in Chepstow Street when exiting the preschool carpark, and therefore measuring this is important.</p> <p>BL says that these vehicles are likely represented by the 48 WB vehicles recorded in the table. The distance of Chepstow Street involved is approximately 10m long, so it is unlikely that this WB number would pertain to any other group other than those heading NB on Chepstow.</p> <p>NFP says that she is still confused. BL says that for the sake of conserving time this evening, he will have a closer look at the raw data which has informed this section of the table. He will make any necessary clarifications.</p> <p>Regarding the baseline parking surveys in Section 6, TR asks if restricted parking and school zones are included in the numbers shown. BL says that these numbers exclude 'no parking' and 'no stopping' areas, school drop-off zones and bus zones. Resident parking zones are included.</p> <p>TR asks if the document can include a statement about what zones are and are not included. BL says yes, he will arrange this.</p> <p>NFP believes that the number of legal parking spaces surrounding Stephen Street would be lower than the numbers recorded here. She says that the data here should be recording only legal parking spaces.</p> <p>WS asks: do calculations of vacant car spaces include only include lawful parking spaces? BL confirms that this is correct. Only lawful parking capacity is calculated.</p> <p>NFP thanks WS for this clarification. She asks BL to clarify</p>	<p>BL to refer to the raw data regarding vehicles travelling NB up Chepstow Street, and make any necessary revisions to Table 13 accordingly.</p> <p>BL to add to a statement to the OTMP that clarifies which parking zones are included in the baseline parking surveys.</p>
--	--

<p>whether parked cars have also only been calculated if they are occupying lawful parking spaces.</p> <p>BL says that he will follow this up and clarify.</p> <p>NFP thanks BL.</p> <p>TR asks about the 'total numbers available' in Section 6.4 on page 55. She asks if the maximum of 378 was the maximum of the entire 4-hour survey period, or the maximum of the 8:45-9am period. TR notes that this latter timeframe does not reflect the peak period.</p> <p>BL notes that these numbers are from the 2020 surveys. BL says that Chart 3 on page 59 shows the total parking capacity from 6-10am. It shows a 15-minute peak between 8:15-8:30am.</p> <p>BL refers to Chart 5 on page 60, which shows the parking availability on each street during the 8:15-8:30am period.</p> <p>TR asks why some streets are listed twice.</p> <p>BL explains that the streets were surveyed according to the Eastern and Western sides of the streets separately.</p> <p>BL and TR discuss Table 17 on page 66, which shows staff travel modes. TR holds that the number of staff, which is based on the FTE, is almost inevitably inaccurate. She also notes that the FTE has changes from this recording of 138. She says that this table should be based on actual numbers of total staff.</p> <p>TR asks about the 5-year and 10-year targets noted in this table. When are these up? What is counted as the start-date for these timeframes?</p> <p>BL says that the start is recorded as 2022, when the OTMP was approved.</p> <p>TR says that the report needs to include a date which specifies when the 5-year and 10-year target periods end.</p> <p>TR refers to Table 21, which shows travel mode targets for students Year 7-12. She believes that the 'By Car' percentage was higher than 4.5%.</p>	<p>BL to confirm that parked vehicle numbers in the baseline parking surveys of Section 6 only include lawfully-parked cars.</p> <p>BL to include specification of the</p>
--	--

	<p>TR says that an accurate picture in the report does need to display casual staff numbers alongside the FTE.</p> <p>WS confirms that this point is clear. Total staff employed FTE, and casual employees should all be included separately in the report.</p> <p>RR thanks BL for his time, and thanks all members for their contributions.</p> <p>RR asks what timeline the group can expect for the OTMP draft to be turned around with the changes discussed this evening.</p> <p>WS says that he hopes to have the updated OTMP draft circulated within the coming week (ending June 9).</p>	<p>WS, BL, and the School to arrange for Section 10 of the OTMP to specify total employee numbers, FTE numbers and causal employee numbers distinctly.</p> <p>WS, JL and BL to circulate the updated draft OTMP approximately within the week ending June 9.</p>
--	--	--

4	AOB	
	<p>TR asks MTy to ensure that the minutes are published on the school website. She notes that recent meeting minutes have not been published.</p> <p>MTy will follow this up.</p> <p>TR notes a complaint that was made regarding a school function last week, wherein teenage students were making noise outside at 12am. She asks that in future, these events are arranged for earlier times, and asks that students remain indoors at late hours.</p> <p>MTy says that this complaint has been noted. It was an overnight event, which is why the students were present at this time. The school has dealt with this issue and will ensure that it will not happen again.</p>	<p>MP to ensure that CCC meeting minutes are published on the Emanuel School website.</p>

5	Meeting Close and Thanks	
	RR thanks all attendees for their presence at the meeting and wishes them well.	