

	<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>	
4	Actions from last meeting	
	No actions.	
5	<p>Introduce Construction Point of Contact & Discuss Construction Management Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Work Zones o Construction Traffic Plan o Contractor Parking o Noise & Vibration o High level programme o Communication 	

JL welcomes the team from Grindley Construction who have been appointed the principal contractors for the building works.

AM is the General Manager of Grindley and MP i 120.05 65BTnof

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.

JL says that in short,

	AM and MP say yes.	
6	Current status of the approvals	
7	Observations on the current traffic management arrangements	

JF is joining the meeting to express views on the OTMP (Operational Transport Management Plan) as part of the assessment process.

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.

JF says he has been reviewing the OTMP, the version he has lodged 27th 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.

RR asks for an update on the planning panel.

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.

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.

RR asks for a update from TR who attended the Regional Planning Panel public meeting on behalf of the community.

	<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>	
--	--	--

NFP say that AW said it was 500m.

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.

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.

AW says that the current map was agreed upon 4 meetings back. It was determined by the CCC as a exclusion zone.

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.

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 comm TR's

RR thanks JF.

JF congratulates everyone on coming together on this issue.

8

