

**MINUTES**  
**Emanuel School Community Consultative Committee**

**Meeting No: 17**

**Date:** 18 September 2023, 6 pm – 7.30 pm

**Location:** Online, Zoom

<b>Attendees</b>	
<b>Community members</b> NFP Justine Hughes (JH) Tara Roach (TR) Derek Pal (DP)	<b>Emanuel School</b> Margaret Lowe – Deputy Principal (ML) Mike Tyler – Manager Facilities and Operations (MTy)
<b>Randwick Council</b> John Flanigan (JF)	
<b>Independent chair</b> Professor Roberta Ryan (RR)	<b>Sandrick Construction</b> Jonathan Lau – Project Manager (JL) Warwick Smith (WS)
<b>Minute taker</b> Isa Crossland Stone (ICS)	
<b>Apologies</b>	

Item	Description	Action
<b>1</b>	<b>Welcome, apologies</b>	
	<p>RR welcomes the attendees to the meeting.</p> <p>DP and JH endorse the minutes from the previous meeting.</p>	
<b>2</b>	<b>Matters arising</b>	
	<p><b>1. RR to follow up on the recruitment of a new community member for the CCC. RR will be open to suggestions from the members.</b></p> <p>RR says that she has not received any suggestions from the group, regarding potential new community representatives. She asks if any community members present tonight have candidates in mind.</p> <p>TR says that she has reached out to the people she mentioned at the previous meeting but has received no indication of interest.</p> <p><b>2. JF to organise daily/very regular traffic patrol of the Avoca Street 'drop-off zone'.</b></p> <p>JF says that he has spoken to the Council rangers and has confirmed that they can patrol the School area from the first week from October 10<sup>th</sup>, when the new term begins.</p> <p>TR asks if the scope of patrol will include the streets surrounding Avoca Street, including Market Street.</p> <p>JF says it will. He has included all of the surrounding streets in the scope, except Market Street, which he will request to be added to the brief.</p> <p><b>3. JF to provide an update on whether the accessible parking spot which was absorbed by the construction on Stanley Street will be returned.</b></p> <p>JF confirms that the parking spot has been returned. He believes that it is located in the same place as it was pre-construction.</p> <p>JF notes that he went past the spot today and noticed that the signage had been knocked down, so he will ensure that it is fixed.</p>	<p>JF to ensure that Market Street is included in Council's traffic patrol at the School drop-off zone.</p> <p>JF to oversee the repair of the signage at the accessible parking spot on Stanley Street.</p>

	<p><b>4. MTy (with JF's support) to follow up with the Council about moving the bins to the Kornmehl section of Avoca Street, and report back to the CCC.</b></p> <p>MTy says that he has spoken to a member of the Council named John, who has advised that he will speak to JF in more detail on this matter. JF has not been approached yet.</p> <p>John from the Council has confirmed to MTy that they will not be collecting bins before 7am, but they are not able to simply move the bins to Avoca Street.</p> <p>MTy says that his preference is for the bins to be on Chepstow Street instead, as it is easier for the School Operations team.</p> <p>TR says that she does not mind the bins being put onto Chepstow Street, as long as they are collected after 8am. TR objects to the frequency of the pickups, though. She feels that it is not reasonable to have rubbish collected 5 times per week.</p> <p>MTy asks if TR has noticed a difference in the timing of collection.</p> <p>TR says she has. It seems that they come later now due to the restricted parking between 7:30 am - 9:30 am outside the preschool gate on Chepstow Street. She says the arrangement needs to be agreed and put in the OTMP as Council could still come as early as 6am on a daily basis.</p> <p>MTy says that in a residential area, the collection must be after 7am.</p> <p>TR says that 7am every morning of the week is still unreasonable given the size of the pre-school.</p> <p>TR looks forward to hearing an update from JF from the Council on this matter.</p> <p>RR suggests that this item be followed up at the next meeting.</p>	<p>JF to share the Council's response to TR's request that the School bins be collected later in the morning.</p>
--	---	---

**5. NFP would like to discuss pedestrian safety.**

NFP begins by noting that pedestrian safety is listed as a primary objective of the OTMP.

NFP says that the OTMP states that 9 public road intersections were to be surveyed in 2023, to gain an understanding of the traffic movements at each one and to measure the effectiveness of the OTMP.

NFP notes that the intersection of Steven Street and Chepstow Street, which is at the entrance of the preschool, was included here at the residents' request. Chepstow Street is part of the Go with the Flow system and the school generates significant traffic movement around this corner during peak periods before and after school. Drivers tend to double-park in this area and to do U-turns at this corner. There is no pedestrian crossing near this intersection.

NFP notes that Reference 5 of the Road Safety Audit (RSA), which refers to 'Drop off and pick up zone at the preschool', notes high risk to pedestrians in Chepstow Street.

This section was responded to by the School's various remediation measures. The School has suggested that the 'go with the flow' scheme (outlined in Section 4.4 of the OTMP) minimises traffic movements on Chepstow Street. However, NFP notes that this claim is not substantiated by data in the OTMP.

NFP cites the OTMP, which notes a requirement that prior to the issuing of any occupation certificate, the traffic management strategies and travel strategies (including details of the traffic monitoring results) must be taken into account.

Therefore, NFP says that data supporting the effectiveness of the School's remediation measures should be included in the OTMP document, as this is a key issue and therefore that it has been actively and effectively minimised is a significant claim.

NFP notes that the OTMP requires the 'Green Travel Plan' to provide targets for the reduction of private car trips. However, NFP notes that the intersection traffic survey

	<p>results in the OTMP do not show the number of vehicles entering the preschool, and therefore there is no benchmark from which to measure this targeted reduction.</p> <p>NFP is concerned that the OTMP will be submitted without including an established benchmark figure.</p> <p>NFP notes that Section 4.4 of the original OTMP included the statement, <i>“Students are not permitted to exit via the music block/ Kornmehl carpark due to pedestrian/car conflicts.”</i></p> <p>NFP would like this statement to be returned to the current OTMP. Pedestrian safety remains an issue around the Kornmehl preschool drop off/pick up zone. The original DA approval separated pedestrian access and vehicular access to the preschool:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Safe pedestrian access via the preschool pedestrian gate in Avoca Street.</li> <li>* Vehicular access via the vehicular driveway in Chepstow Street.</li> </ul> <p>There is therefore no pedestrian crossing near the School driveway at the bottom of Chepstow Street, and as such, driver behaviour (which includes U-turns at the intersection with Stephen Street and double-parking) endangers pedestrians.</p> <p>NFP says that to meet OTMP condition 22. (b) the OTMP needs to show how pedestrian safety is protected within the vicinity of the preschool. With no monitoring results to demonstrate minimised traffic movements in Chepstow Street, the claim below about traffic management measures having been “further refined” is difficult to substantiate.</p> <p>NFP recommends that Section 22. (b) is updated to include the following:</p> <p><i>Management of the drop off/pick up zones around the preschool be upgraded for pedestrian safety to ensure that the access points to the preschool be separated as per the original DA approval:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Safe pedestrian access via the preschool pedestrian gate in Avoca Street.</li> <li>* Vehicular access via the vehicular driveway in Chepstow Street.</li> </ul>	<p>JL to return the wording of the original OTMP, which discusses pedestrian safety and prohibits pedestrian access via the Kornhel gates, to the current OTMP.</p> <p>JL to follow up the traffic data regarding north-bound travel along Chepstow Street, which is currently (perhaps incorrectly) reported to be 0 cars.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>NFP feels that the wording of OTMP Section 4.6.2 is misleading in terms of pedestrian access and safety.</p> <p>NFP suggests that Section 4.6.2 be updated to include the following statement:</p> <p><i>All students are required to enter and leave the school through designated drop off and pick up areas that provide connections to the existing footpaths and pedestrian crossings on Stanley Street and Avoca Street.</i></p> <p><i>Access points:</i>  <i>One K-12 pedestrian access gate on Stanley Street near the intersection with Avoca Street</i>  <i>One K-12 pedestrian access gate on Avoca Street</i>  <i>One Kornmehl preschool pedestrian access gate on Avoca Street</i>  <i>Pedestrian access is not permitted through the vehicular driveway to the preschool in Chepstow Street for safety reasons.</i></p> <p>NFP also recommends amending the statement on page 82 of the OTMP that the document was 'approved' in 2022. The document has not yet been approved.</p> <p>ML says that she feels that the change to the Kornmehl gates is superseded, as the usage of the Kornmehl gates has changed this year. The only people using the gates are students of Kornmehl, and parents and siblings of Kornmehl students.</p> <p>However, ML says that she is happy to have the original statement from the original OTMP, read by NFP, included in the 2023 OTMP.</p> <p>RR asks for JL to make this addition.</p> <p>NFP acknowledges that the management of Kornmehl gate has improved greatly over the year after the School agreed to monitor its use. She thanks ML and the School for their good work.</p> <p>NFP says that the corner at Steven Street and Chepstow Street the OTMP says 0 travelling North along this street.</p> <p>NFP says that this cannot be correct – how could parents be entering the preschool carpark if they are not travelling</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>east-bound up Steven Street and north-bound along Chepstow Street?</p> <p>JL agrees that this figure of 0 should be followed up and clarified.</p> <p>NFP thanks JL. She reiterates that it is very important.</p> <p><b>6. JF to update on Randwick Council's review of the OTMP and outline the next steps.</b></p> <p><b>Previous</b></p> <p>JF says that the Council's Transport Team has been working through the OTMP.</p> <p>JF has been sending the team key items from the minutes of these CCC meetings.</p> <p>JF says that he has presented the team with a package outlining the community concerns that have been dominating some of the meetings. These include items such as the operation of the gates at Chepstow Street, the possible relocation of the bus zone from Stanley Street into Avoca Street,</p> <p>JF discussed the potential use of the lower Avoca Street gate of the Kornmehl campus, which was documented in DA/257/97, (relevant DA for the preschool), and approved as the main pedestrian access point for the preschool.</p> <p>JF believes that this gate is closed currently, but if it could be activated and parking could be provided in the surrounding area, this area could act as additional pedestrian access and ease traffic congestion. He has asked the Transport team to review this area, as it is an area that has been highlighted repeatedly in the CCC meetings.</p> <p>MTy says that the school would likely not be able to provide the necessary resources to operate this pedestrian access in this way.</p> <p>The Transport team will consult with the School on a number of these matters in the coming weeks. Particular reference will be made to potential changes to parking restrictions in Avoca Street to facilitate the opening / use of the Avoca Street gate of the Kornmehl campus.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>JF adds that he is interested in whether there is any scope to change the parking restriction on Avoca Street, depending on the School's operational hours. The Transport team will raise this with the School during their consultation.</p> <p>JF says that if the Transport Team is supportive of the items that JF has presented to them, they will present them to the Traffic Committee for a review. The Traffic Committee will take into account the outcomes of the School's consultation.</p> <p>JF notes that the Traffic Committee meets approximately on a monthly basis. Therefore, it is likely that the Traffic Committee will not conduct its review of these issues and consultations until November.</p> <p>RR asks where the Council is up to in their review of the OTMP.</p> <p>JF says that on behalf of the Transport Team, he has asked JL and WS for a track change that went from the original OTMP to the final OTMP. He has only been provided the mark-up changes between versions 3 and 4 of the OTMP.</p> <p>JL says that the provided version shows changes marked in red text and are equivalent to track changes. JL has provided the group with two versions; the first has the track changes from the original approved document, and the second shows additional changes made to this first document. Therefore, the changes from the original document to the current, most updated document are tracked across these two documents.</p> <p>JF thanks JL for this explanation. He will revisit the documents on this understanding.</p> <p>This will be valuable in considering whether the OTMP, as a living document, could contain certain changes based on issues raised by the CCC.</p> <p>DP asks, given that the OTMP is a 'living document', if it would be possible for the OTMP to be approved, with agreed changes to be taken on post-approval.</p> <p>JF says that this might need to be included as a section in the OTMP, stating what changes have been proposed and will be investigated further.</p>	<p>WS and JL to include in the OTMP a note that the document is a living document, and will be subject to updates items raised by the CCC are addressed through the appropriate review.</p>
--	--	---



	<p>DP asks if this means that they can move forward with the current OTMP with an understanding that it can be modified as agreed going forward.</p> <p>WS says that they are moving from the construction phase into the operation phase. It seems therefore to be a logical time to document these issues as part of the post-construction operational phase, which can be used to inform next year's OTMP.</p> <p>NFP says that this OTMP should be the base document going forward. This document has undergone significant changes over the redrafting process. It is currently missing some key sections from the original document, such as a section on pedestrian safety. The OTMP needs to be updated to include a lot more information as a complete baseline document.</p> <p>RR acknowledges this perspective.</p> <p>RR says that it seems that the group needs to include in the current document that there is a mechanism for updates to be made to the document as needed.</p> <p>The changes and additions to be made must be identified at this point where possible, so that they can be identified in this section.</p> <p>TR says that she has major concerns with this plan. She would not be happy with the OTMP being submitted without the inclusion of key issues that have been discussed in the past few meetings.</p> <p>RR asks TR to name some of the matters that were discussed but that have not been included in the recent draft before Council.</p> <p>TR says that namely, the document does not include appropriate wording around the usage of the preschool gate. TR is concerned that the current wording is extremely vague, as it says nothing about the usage by teachers and visitors. There should be no room for misinterpretation of the wording.</p> <p>TR says that she has conducted a review of the usage of the gate and saw that a number of parents who do not have Kornmehl students have been using this entrance.</p> <p>JF says that the Council is clear on this item and understands that the issue of gate usage still stands.</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>RR thanks JF.</p> <p>RR asks WS and JL to tighten up the wording of this section, with respect to the use of the Kornmehl gates. TR's suggested wording is recorded in the minutes of the previous meeting.</p> <p>JL and WS will amend this wording following this meeting.</p> <p>RR asks JF about the alternative preschool access from Avoca Street.</p> <p>JF says that the use of this gate would require new signage. This matter will be followed up in the Council review.</p> <p>TR says that Avoca Street is highly under utilised. If the parents and visitors are primarily using the Kornmehl gate and Stanley Street gate, they end up using parking on the residential side rather than using the available parking on Avoca Street. If the Avoca Street entry could be used as per the DA, it would alleviate parking on the surrounding streets.</p> <p>JF says that Integrated Transport Team will be looking at the parking restrictions in Avoca Street. This will likely include a minor variation to the parking signage, approved by the Traffic Committee.</p> <p>MTy says that Avoca Street is often very busy in the morning, and it would not be ideal to redirect Kornmehl traffic to this street.</p> <p>TR clarifies that they are discussing pedestrian access, rather than vehicle access. The issue is that the whole of Avoca Street is not being utilised, the portion that is not being utilised is directly outside the preschool gates, and this area could be used for pedestrian access.</p> <p><b>7. ML to provide details of the Emanuel School enrolments for 2024 split between preschool, K-6 and 7-12, and confirmation that student caps per the DA conditions will not be exceeded.</b></p> <p>ML says they do not yet know the enrolment numbers for 2024.</p> <p>Currently, the School has projected 2024 enrollments to</p>	<p>JL and WS to update the OTMP to more closely reflect the suggested wording about the use of the Kornmehl pedestrian access gate. The revised wording is to be shared with the CCC members.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>be a total of 913.</p> <p>ML notes that the preschool enrolment is 60. This is always a stable number.</p> <p>They a have a goal of 920, which is their enrolment cap. ML makes it very clear that they will not breach the cap of 920 enrolled students.</p> <p>TR suggests that they have breached previously, which is documented in the last 2 DA's.</p> <p>ML is not aware of any such breach.</p> <p>TR suggests she read the DAs.</p> <p>ML repeats clearly that the School will not breach the cap.</p>	
<b>3</b>	<b>School Update - ML</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	Summary of complaints received, including parking complaints	
	<p>ML says that since the last meeting, the School has received 2 emails referencing driving and U-turns specifically, and commenting that the traffic wardens were not active at the time.</p> <p>ML says that the school has received 1 email referencing a staff member entering via the Kornemehl gates.</p> <p>ML says that there was 1 noise complaint, regarding an outdoor music lesson wherein students were playing the acoustic guitar and singing.</p> <p>ML says that across the year, they have received 7 emails in total, which have detailed 11 complaints in total.</p> <p>The main return complaint was made 3 times and was regarding unsafe driving by the parents of the school. The school is continuing to work to resolve this use. The other 8 complaints are not returning.</p> <p>RR asks TR to explain her noise complaint.</p> <p>TR says that on Tuesday morning of the previous week, there was extremely loud music playing coming from the school. This music included xylophone, guitar and singing. The music could be heard from inside of TR's house and was disruptive to the surrounding neighbours.</p>	

	<p>TR made a complaint to the school and was told that the lesson was held outside due to a lack of available music rooms. This explanation was later advised through a follow up email by ML to be incorrect. TR says that ML replied to her with an email that was not conciliatory in tone and suggested that an airport or factory were noisy business places, not a school.</p> <p>ML disagrees that her tone was as described by TR. She says that her reference to living next to a factory was, rather, a statement that a school music lesson is very different from a noisy environment like a factory.</p> <p>ML adds that it is usual practice at the school to have small groups of students to compose and perform together outside at times.</p> <p>ML notes that the music in question was acoustic, and not amplified.</p> <p>ML says that she does not personally find music noisy. ML suggests that it is important to remain realistic about what can be expected at a school, which includes a level of noise.</p> <p>TR says that it is not typical for a School to have a music hall so closely situated to residential properties. Therefore, the School needs to be more considerate of their neighbours.</p> <p>TR comments that she asked ML to distribute her email to the CCC group but the email was not shared. TR also asked RR to share the email sent by ML but it was not shared with the CCC.</p> <p>ML asks TR what she thinks the school can do differently in managing the incidental noise of the school activities.</p> <p>TR is frustrated by this question. She says that her complaint is simply about this activity being unreasonable. If her neighbours on her other side had 20 people in their backyard singing and playing guitars she would also speak to them about such behaviour being unreasonable.</p> <p>RR thanks ML and TR for their perspectives. She suggests that they continue this conversation offline if they would like to.</p> <p>TR asks JF about how to take action with the council</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>regarding the noise complaint.</p> <p>JF says that TR could write to Council, who could explain the noise guidelines and potentially conduct noise monitoring.</p> <p>RR adds that residents can also raise noise complaints with the NSW EPA Complaints Line.</p>	
<b>4</b>	<b>Construction Update - JL</b>	
	<p>JL says that they are expecting construction activities to finalise towards the end of September.</p> <p>They are close to the final stages of construction and are completing the wall joinery, landscaping, and cleaning.</p> <p>There will be a brief influx of tradespeople in the next few weeks before the ultimate die-down.</p> <p>After the cessation of construction, JL says that the school will seek an occupation certificate so that the building can go into use.</p> <p>JL notes that it will be interesting to get traffic and parking results after the construction phase is done as the (40-50) construction workers undoubtedly would have been impacting traffic and parking congestion as well as adding to the noise.</p>	
<b>5</b>	<b>Meeting Close and Thanks</b>	
	<p>RR confirms that she will liaise with JF regarding the next steps of the OTMP process, as discussed by the group in this meeting.</p> <p>RR will consult with JF regarding the timing of Council's review and the finalising of the OTMP. This will inform the date of the next meeting.</p> <p>RR thanks the attendees for their contributions to the discussion. She wishes them well.</p> <p><b>Next Meeting Date: TBD</b></p>	