

**THE PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS MET IN COMMITTEE ROOM 2, PARLIAMENT HOUSE, HOBART, ON FRIDAY 25 SEPTEMBER 2009.**

---

**CONSTRUCTION OF: NEW HILTON RISE PRIMARY SCHOOL; NEW CLAREMONT PARK PRIMARY SCHOOL; AND NEW GLENORCHY HIGH SCHOOL.**

**Mr BRENDAN KELLY**, GENERAL MANAGER, LEARNING SERVICES (SOUTH), DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; **Mr GRAHAM SPEIGHT**, CO-PRINCIPAL, ROSETTA HIGH SCHOOL; **Mr PATRICK YEUNG**, BYA ARCHITECTS; **Mr ANDREW FINCH**, DIRECTOR, FINANCE, FACILITIES AND BUSINESS SUPPORT, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION; **Mr PHILLIP ANTHONY BUTLER**, SCHOOL ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT; AND **Mr JAMES MORRISON**, MORRISON AND BREYTENBACH ARCHITECTS PROPRIETARY LIMITED WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

**CHAIR** (Mr Harriss) - Thank you all very much for coming along. As always, we appreciate the opportunity for the site visits; They are always instructive. We particularly appreciated the hospitality of your school, Graham, and the welcome by the students who were most useful when we arrived. Brendan, are you going to make the introductory comments about the project?

**Mr KELLY** - Thank you, Mr Chair. My role is General Manager of Learning Services (South) and I have the responsibility for leading and supporting education and business improvement in schools and colleges in that geographic region. With the agreement of the Chair and committee, I would like to respectfully suggest that in the first instance we commence our discussion and questions with the newly-proposed high school, Montrose Bay High School, to be followed by discussion and questions on the two proposed new primary schools, Windermere Primary School and Austins Ferry Primary School. That being the committee's direction, I will preface my comments and introduction to provide a platform to both the proposed new high school and the two new primary schools.

It is an exciting time for education for the Glenorchy region. Schools in the Glenorchy area have taken up the challenge and have been involved in discussions with school communities about working better together, this in part being driven by past discussions of school principals and recent opportunities presented by the Federal Government's Building the Education Revolution. The focus and driver for these discussions has been about every child in the Glenorchy area having a better start and access to better schools that offer better curriculum choices. Some schools have agreed to amalgamate or relocate to provide new enhanced facilities and better subject choices. Under the project Brent Street Primary School will amalgamate with Glenorchy Primary School at the Glenorchy Primary School site, while Springfield Gardens Primary School will amalgamate its current two campuses into one on the existing site, with other schools in the greater Glenorchy area being involved in exciting individual Building the Education Revolution projects.

The focus of our discussion today, however, is that a group of four primary schools which will close - Claremont Primary, Abbotsfield Primary, Mount Faulkner Primary and Roseneath Primary - with two new schools to be built in the Claremont-Austins Ferry area. Claremont High School will amalgamate with Rosetta High School on the Rosetta High School site. It is envisaged that the new schools will go to tender this year. Glenorchy is really leading the way here.

It is important to note that the northern suburbs schools agreed to formalise proposed mergers following a number of committee meetings early in March. Parents, staff and the community were briefed on funding packages and additional funding options available to schools and given an outline of predicted demographic changes in the northern suburbs. Memorandums of understanding from the school association chairs of the schools signing onto the Glenorchy schools project were received, with a formal MOU formalising each school's commitment to amalgamate to both the State Government and the wider community. The work and spirit of the cited MOUs is supported and guided by a steering committee as appointed by the minister. This committee is chaired by myself and has a membership comprising of community, school principals, department officers and the chairperson of the Learning Services (South) School Improvement Board.

While this is a very exciting time for education in the northern suburbs, it is the end of an era and a time of reflection for some school communities. For the school communities of Brent Street, Claremont, Abbotsfield, Mount Faulkner and Roseneath primary schools and Claremont High School, the next few months will be a time to celebrate, honour the past and look to the future.

With the Chair's consent, I want to acknowledge the key members of the northern suburbs community and schools who are leading this significant education project, and particularly the school principals and school association chairs for their leadership and commitment to education in the broader Glenorchy area. These people have a wide range of backgrounds and experiences and I have every confidence that they have and will provide the leadership and commitment to deliver the best possible outcomes for the students, staff and the wider community in the Glenorchy region. Their schools communities have a real depth of understanding of the complexity of the issues involved and a determination to provide the best possible education for their children. I am very happy to say that I believe the design of the new facilities reflects a broad range of views and opinions.

With the agreement of the Chair and committee, I would now like to hand over to the Principal of Rosetta High School, Mr Graham Speight, who will guide us through on behalf of the Rosetta and Claremont High School communities, the design aspect of the proposed new Montrose Bay High School.

**Mr SPEIGHT** - I would like to acknowledge that Angela Bird from Claremont High School is in the audience so if we have any discussion around that I am sure she would be more than happy to be sworn in.

This project had its genesis in December 2007 when we met with the then minister who is now the Premier, and that group was all the principals of all the Glenorchy schools. Basically what we put to him was that we could see that many of our schools were either

run-down or in a state whereby they were not fit for purpose, and the nature of our demographic situation was changing so significantly that we needed to address things. At that meeting the minister committed to employing some external consultants to work with the school community basically to map a new future for provision in the Glenorchy area. That process was to be enacted in early 2009 but events surrounding the Building the Education Revolution overtook us and we found ourselves in Launceston at a meeting of all school chairs and principals where, in essence, Andrew and others addressed the meeting and basically put it to people, 'There are some opportunities here, come to us with your proposals'.

Flowing from that meeting, we had a number of discussions at the principal and school association levels and there were a number of public meetings. All sorts of different proposals and scenarios were put forward but out of it came a proposal to merge Claremont High School and Rosetta High School. Basically, that was premised on, in essence, aspiration and the aim that we improve things. The main drivers really were - and you have seen them this morning, so you know - that both schools were built in the 1960s, and look it. They have been well looked after but basically they are pretty run-down and in many aspects, in relation to curriculum, they're out of date and not fit for purpose. Also there was a need for some additional facilities, particularly in the area of performing arts. But more pressing was the demographics of the northern suburbs insofar as both of those high schools, at one stage, had more than 1 000 students and we would not now have 1 000 between the two of us. So there has been significant movement and if you add to that the decline of Cosgrove from something like 700 to 240, you can see there is a pattern there.

In our early discussions the option of a new high school on a greenfield site was canvassed but we were quickly brought back to reality in that financially we were probably outside the ballpark. So the decision to renovate and add to the Rosetta site was, to a large extent, determined by the fact Patrick Yeung and Associates had put together a design brief for work at Rosetta where we had a pretty good idea as to what work needed to be done and how it would be costed.

This committee was quoted with the design elements of new developments, because we went for a bit a stroll. The performing arts centre will be available to the wider community and this will be a boom for the Glenorchy community and the partnerships with Tilford Zebras Soccer Club and the Tasmanian Cricket Association and futsal will also see enhanced use by the wider community of the school facilities.

The desire for school communities to work with the Big Picture Education Australia to develop a Big Picture school is an important component of the work. The rationale for that is provided in your packages, and James Morrison has been working with us on that project. Big Picture is really around personalisation and designing curriculum options that are, in essence, one student at a time, and it is a recognition that schools need to work with the community because education is a bigger thing than just what schools can provide. The Big Picture ethos really, in essence, is about working outside of the school as well as in the school and the students negotiate their programs.

When the merger between Goodwood Primary and Moonah Primary was mooted, we had designs on recycling the heritage buildings at Moonah for use as Big Picture school but that merger did not proceed. A similar concept with heritage buildings at Glenorchy

Primary predicated on a Glenorchy-Goodwood merger was also considered, but this also failed to materialise, and then we looked at the multicampus arrangement at Goodwood which we are now really happy with. When you see the designs you will see that it will not only give that area a lift but it will be fit for purpose and designed around the needs of those students.

The developments at the East Derwent schools out at Bridgewater are also significant to this conversation because they are about to build a new school, a 9-12 site is currently being progressed. The new arrangements around years 5-8 also have an impact on enrolments coming to both Claremont and Rosetta.

In the basic merger discussions, the community made it very clear to us that they wanted two high schools in the Glenorchy region. With Cosgrove being maintained and the new Montrose Bay High School, therefore there will be two schools.

We had a number of consultative meetings and all members of the school community - parents, students, members of the general community, teachers - were involved in those discussions. We had ballots at both schools and there was overwhelming support for the merger and for the plans to redevelop. Since then an advisory group, which includes students, parents and staff from both school communities, has been informed of all decision-making. We have engaged BYA Architects, with Patrick as the consulting architect to the Rosetta High site, and Morrison & Breytenbach, with James as consulting architect for the Big Picture school and related developments.

The preliminary costings of the work have been broken down into two stages because once we got the first QS back we were clearly outside of the available moneys, but that is a reasonable approach. Subject to tenders received, it is anticipated that the administration block currently proposed for Rosetta will be excluded from stage 1. The issue around that is that we have no guarantee of what the tender price will be. If the tender price is the right price then the admin block will be in the build; if not then it will be outside the build. It is a costing thing.

The total building budget for the work completed at the Rosetta High School site in stage 1 is \$10 million and funding for the Big Picture school development is \$2.45 million. The new school will accommodate approximately 820 students, 700 of whom will be accommodated at the Rosetta site and 120 at the Big Picture campus. Subject to the approval of the committee, it is anticipated that work will commence on both projects in November this year. We anticipate that work on the Big Picture campus will be completed by February 2010 and work on the Rosetta campus will be completed by February 2011.

**Mrs NAPIER** - You mentioned there are quite a few schools involved in it and there is a history associated with any school. It is a small issue, in a sense, but what steps are being taken to ensure that some of that history is not lost, that it is owned and transferred to the new entities?

**Mr KELLY** - That is a very important. As you saw today the schools have honour boards and are very proud of their traditions. Parents and grandparents of children have been to some of these schools. With the project advisory groups that are working at each level at each of the new builds, a special part of their brief is to ensure that there are celebrations and recognition as schools move through this transitional stage and that honour boards

and school histories are also carried forward into the new entities. So that is a very important part of the transitional stage.

**Mrs NAPIER** - That has actually been incorporated into the plan, to get ownership by the communities?

**Mr KELLY** - That is correct. The current school associations will be providing advice around that to the project advisory groups that are overseeing each of the projects. It is very important. The actual transition and movement through the bricks and mortar is hugely important but I would say that the most important part, even outside of that, are the people, being respectful of the past and making sure it is embodied in the move forward.

**Mrs NAPIER** - There is the question of the nearby associated redevelopment of Bridgewater with the 5-8 and 9-12. Associated with that is the ongoing issue of the number of students that bypass Bridgewater and indicate that they will continue to bypass Bridgewater for a variety of reasons. How many students currently are sourced from the Brighton area by Rosetta?

**Mr SPEIGHT** - If you include Brighton and the Midlands, it would be in the region of 200, but if you are talking about Bridgewater alone, it would be about 70. There would be another 40 or 50 in Claremont. So it is significant but a part of our discussions with the people out there is that we are anticipating, with the new school, that they will get a lift. More significantly, because they have gone to a middle-school model, the transition is not grade 6 to grade 7 now; it is grade 8 to grade 9. In essence, we have already seen that in this year's numbers. More students will be drawn into that process by parents choosing not to make that transition because, if you like, they are already enrolled in that middle school.

**Mrs NAPIER** - You can already see it in your numbers?

**Mr SPEIGHT** - I can already see it in what we have coming through. When we were thinking about this, that was informing the discussions, but as always with these things you are at the mercy of parent choice because they make their own choices. We will have an intake of 200 next year but there is plenty of capacity at Geilston Bay, Cosgrove and Bridgewater.

**Mrs NAPIER** - You don't pick up the Brighton school in your area?

**Mr KELLY** - No, we only service the south-east.

**Mrs NAPIER** - I take it that both service areas are comfortable with the concept that there will be that bypass, rather than looking at adopting a district or high school model for Brighton?

**Mr KELLY** - Yes, we are, but the discussions between both learning services are very round. For the aspects that you are raising and what Graham has covered, yes, but obviously we would like parents to support the local schools. Sometimes parent choice becomes a variable and it can provide a challenge for us as well. There are ongoing

discussions and we try as best we can to map that and facilitate parent choice where we can.

**Mrs NAPIER** - I am not as familiar with the Big Picture 9-10 campus that is being envisaged for Goodwood. Is that using the now not used campus on that site or is it going to be a greenfield?

**Mr SPEIGHT** - It is a combination of a new build, some terrapins and an existing building - what they call the heritage building at Goodwood. So it will become a multi-campus site with a primary special school and with the big picture in the same space, sharing some facilities. We anticipate that will give a real lift to that community because it has been in a bit of a decline. Thus far we have a good partnership that I think is going to be very mutually beneficial. Once we talk through the design I think we will find that, whilst it is low road and low cost, it is a very funky teenage style, very much centred on thinking about the students and their learning.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Claremont High already operates a Big Picture, though I am not sure what percentage of their students adopt it.

**Mr SPEIGHT** - All of 9 and 10 are in a Big-Picture-inspired environment at Claremont and we have 107 at Rosetta.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Yours is about a third of that population?

**Mr SPEIGHT** - Yes, a third of that 9-10 population.

**Mrs NAPIER** - When you look at the figure of 120, would that be just by parent and student choice or would certain criteria be used?

**Mr SPEIGHT** - Yes, exactly that.

**Mrs NAPIER** - What if you find it is a particularly popular choice?

**Mr SPEIGHT** - Well, we're hoping it is. There are two things.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Lead me through how you're going to manage that.

**Mr SPEIGHT** - Currently it's still at the design stage but notionally it would work like this: the design size for Big Picture is 120, and that is by design around a manageable number and relationships and the kind of ethos we are talking about. Because we already have 107 students in that program at the existing site there is the potential for us to continue with the Make It Big program at the Rosetta site, so in real terms the capacity there could be stretched out significantly. If there is overwhelming demand, there are a number of things we could do. Because it's going to be driven by student and parent choice to some extent, we are looking for that.

We have a number of contingencies. If the numbers aren't as great as they are, it doesn't matter; we'll proceed because we think we'll build it up. I think it will be overwhelming, but we have a fall-back in terms of Big Picture at the Rosetta site. In 2010 we will still be on the Claremont site. We have pretty good capacity in the first 12 months and

thereafter, hopefully we'll have a better picture of what the story might be. My personal opinion is that I think we will have several Big Picture schools around the southern traps within a few years because students and parents are clearly embracing it as a concept and are very pleased in terms of satisfaction levels around what's happening in those spaces.

For the present I think we have a pretty good range of options around it, but again, it needs to be managed. We already have significant interest from students from other schools but in essence this current model is only centred on Claremont High School and Rosetta High School.

**Mrs NAPIER** - So preference will be given to local students?

**Mr SPEIGHT** - Only local at the moment.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Do the local students include those who up until now have been coming from Brighton and Bridgewater?

**Mr SPEIGHT** - It includes anybody who is enrolled.

**Mrs NAPIER** - And families, presumably?

**Mr SPEIGHT** - Yes. There is an enrolment policy already in place that is essentially what you have said, but then once you move outside, people who have access because it is their preferred school will obviously take their chances and from here on out basically they'll be going to other schools.

**Mrs NAPIER** - I asked you about this on campus, but will ask again for the record. I think there's still evidence that, for whatever reason, some year 11 and 12 students are not succeeding probably in the previous model, let alone the new model, of post-year 10 education options that are being provided. Is it possible to provide an option for year 11 and 12 students to be part of that Big Picture school or would you see that as compromising the intent of that program?

**Mr SPEIGHT** - At Bridgewater there is a years 9-12 option being looked at in terms of Big Picture, so clearly there is the opportunity to do it. Referring back to your earlier question, I think in the short term our capacity really won't be there. I think we'll be oversubscribed in the context of years 9 and 10, so to open it open in a broader realm I think would give us issues that we don't really need because we'll have enough issues managing years 9 and 10. I don't see that that is a closed door; down the track I can see that there would be all sorts. In essence what Big Picture does is accelerate the learning so the students move forward, and you don't stop it because they go to year 11; they carry on. For example, there is a student currently at Rosetta who's doing certificate 3; she can't get credit yet but when she goes to Claremont College it will be recognised as prior learning and she'll be fine. Those arrangements work that way but I don't know about the other way.

**Mr GREEN** - I would like to first congratulate all the parent groups for being able to see the big picture with respect to the change in the schools and the utilisation of the sites. I only have one question about the sites, and obviously we will talk about the technical aspects of the design of the building going forward, but it seems to me that you are

doubling the size of the school as it exists at the moment, which means that there is going to be a lot more transport and there are obviously issues with the intersection, getting to and from the school. Can you allow the committee to understand what the plans are for people moving on and off the site?

**Mr SPEIGHT** - Sure. We have had an advisory project team of people from DIER, road transport, Metro and the council, and we have met now on three occasions. There are some difficulties around some of the proposals but they're mainly to do with pre-existing conditions and discussions that are happening with council and DIER in non-related areas. So in a sense we are a bit caught up in that story. DIER has proposed a set of traffic lights, for example, at Foreshore Road, which is the road in. The consequential work around that is really tied up with a lot to do with what the council does there. Patrick's people have done a road traffic design but there is a better road traffic management solution coming from council.

The timing of that is going to be the important thing and, in a sense, we have sort of drawn back from that process because, in a way, we were chewing up a lot of time on conversations that we could not influence. But Minister Sturges is very alive to this conversation and has really been driving that, aside from the DIER end of the detail. Obviously we have to go through a planning approval.

In real terms, next year we are probably only adding 35 students; it might be 38. There are already 615 at the Rosetta site, and the total there will be 700, so we are only adding marginally really, and then 120 down at the Goodwood site. Given that Rosetta once had in excess of 1 000 students, and even in my time in Glenorchy, Goodwood has had over 700 students, that total campus next year would not be more than 200, so it is manageable. The issues are there anyway - that's really what I'm saying - and obviously we are looking for improvements and have been, but we are clearly caught up in a much bigger design process about what happens to Elwick Road lights, for example.

So it's all on the table and being discussed, but I don't have the answers at the moment because, if you like, I am a part of that bigger process. But we are certainly at the table. It is a pretty well documented process and, as I said, DIER has given a solution but council does not have its consequential planning into shape. If the Elwick Bay development goes ahead we would not need to do any work because part of that is a new roundabout, parking area, turning circle, to do with Elwick. That is the council's number-one priority so I am anticipating that it will happen but I don't have a time line. That is as clear as I can be, I think.

**Mr GREEN** - Thank you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, Graham.

**Mr YEUNG** - Mr Chairman, thank you for inviting me to guide you through some of the design that is in front of you in the report. Our office was invited to participate in the redevelopment of Rosetta High School some five years ago when the first lot of redevelopment took place. You would probably gather that the original building was designed in the late 1950s and early 1960s when the Brooker Highway was the main access road in Hobart. The school was designed fronting the Brooker Highway and of course there were a lot double-loaded corridors, spaces where you can see that, over the

period of time that we were involved, that we are gradually rationalising into more consolidated and better organised spaces. In between time we also were involved with doing the master planning for the school going forward, so we have a very clear vision of where we are heading and this latest project has been accelerated but our basic design philosophy is still there, where we gradually absorb all the corridors into musical space and then identify student movements and pathways. I think that the school was very supportive in supporting those ideas, the structural spines are all there now and we are reaping the benefit of that, in designing all the student activity spaces and courtyards and larger spaces for the shelter area and the tuckshop et cetera.

Now we are moving into the next phase in development which is in the master plan where the library resource is one of the major additions to the college, and by inspecting today you can see the temporary nature of the library that we have at present. By locating the library in the space we allocated we actually make best use of the space available to us at the present time, which is a very useful and friendly space. So with that and our master plan in place, the larger addition which was badly needed was a performing arts centre, or PAC, which will be located in the area we indicated on the foreshore site. In conjunction with the new administration block this will give the new combined school a new frontage, a new beginning and a new presence, so to speak. By doing so we also are creating another badly-needed landscape courtyard for facilities to be shared by the community as well because the PAC area will be well used by the local community, together with the gymnasium.

The BER money that is coming through will help us by putting the science language centre that we have funding through. That has come in good time to make sure that it is forming part of the first days of the development. As to our total plans for the amalgamated school with Claremont, at the moment we cannot afford the overall project so we have split it into two sections which I think Mr Speight mentioned. Hopefully we can go ahead with the administration block but if not it will be delayed to stage 2 with the balance of the classroom block, which is block A and B, upper level, at a later time.

I mentioned the car parking and the traffic but I will not go into that. With the new location of the administration and the PAC block we have our own car parking area just in front of the gymnasium. The foreshore area will be developed in the future with the expectation of the new combined school in the future.

Another major issue we have is that we have inherited an old school; it is basically good brick and mortar in front of us but we have to make use of it to satisfy the pedagogy of the new educational process. We are taking those design briefs to use the existing fabric as much as we can. We are saving a lot of energy by not building new buildings in this particular phase and it is much more challenging to try to absorb some of the existing structures.

It is not a green-star building because of the fact that we could not afford the luxury of the extra costs involved, but we will endeavour to make the best use of the latest technology that we can afford. We have gone ahead with the rainwater recycling and we will also have benefit of the Federal solar panel grant. We would encourage high-level ventilation as much as possible for the classrooms. As I mentioned before, maximum building life will be with us because we are using existing fabrics. One of our major design issues with our creative courtyard was mentioned on the site visit. It will

encapsulate an exciting creative courtyard so that the school can participate in sharing those views of the design. The PAC, which is the performing arts building, will be well utilised by the school and will be a state-of-the-art building.

**Mrs NAPIER** - We certainly had an opportunity to look at most of those design issues, including performing arts, the science and technology areas and the library. It seemed to me a good investment in trying to upgrade an existing facility and expand certain areas.

**CHAIR** - In terms of the administration block and the risk of not being able to deliver that in the first stage, what is the likelihood of not being able to get that? It seemed pretty fundamental to the functioning of the whole new campus to have that new facility.

**MR YEUNG** - The market conditions, the pricing conditions. We would love to build it because that would be the front of the new school. It is the funding arrangements.

**CHAIR** - So within the \$10 million that we are talking about, there is a real risk that that part will not get done?

**Mr FINCH** - There is a risk but we need to reserve our judgment. That is like most projects in the State. We scope them up and we get quantity surveyor estimates and so on but you can never really test it until you take it to the market and get hard bids, based on the documentation, from contractors that are available at the time to do the job. But as soon as we get those bids we sit down and analyse them and work out how they compare to our estimates. Do we have the capacity, are there other scope changes that we can make, can we find other funds within the overall budget?

**Mr GREEN** - So if it is say \$500 000 shy or something like that -

**Mr FINCH** - That is right. We might be able to find other money to do that, or stretch our asset sales commitment where we have estimated proceeds and things from other schools.

**Mrs NAPIER** - What is your building index inflation factor that you are currently dealing with?

**Mr FINCH** - That is always hard to estimate. It varies on each tender process and each project.

**Mrs NAPIER** - As an average. For example, Health yesterday were saying that they are dealing with about 10-15 per cent.

**Mr FINCH** - It depends on which point you take. We have been tendering rigorously in the last two to three months over the Building the Education Revolution projects and we have been fortunate through that process in the way we have chosen to undertake the procurement and continue to get very competitive pricing. We are still getting up to six bids for each project. In some isolated areas it is different and you might only get the one bid. Then it is about whether they can send people around to the east coast and so on. So there is variation but the pricing is still very competitive. We had a meeting with one of the major contractors earlier in the week and they are still saying that they have capacity in the north and north-west. They have been assisted very much by what is

going on but they are still a little bit underdone up in that part of the State. The south is different. It is hard to give just one figure and talk about a statewide process when there are different aspects right around the State.

**Mrs NAPIER** - So for the greater Hobart area, what building index inflation factor are you dealing with?

**Mr FINCH** - Again, I do not have a figure that I can quote. The figure that you have been given yesterday is probably as good as anything.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Twelve months ago we were told that figures were floating around of about 30 per cent.

**Mr FINCH** - We come up against this with school communities from time to time and a lot of it is anecdotal. 'I built something three years ago and I built for this amount' but sometimes there are different factors at play and different materials. We have moved into an environment where we are now pushing for high energy ratings and sustainability principles in jobs.

**Mrs NAPIER** - You will not get much more money out of the Treasurer if you give him answers like that.

**Mr FINCH** - It probably costs about 10 per cent more to get those principles in-built in jobs. So it is hard to compare, sometimes like comparing apples with oranges. One project has these aspects to it and another project has those aspects. We have an example here. We are building the same school but it is more costly at one of the sites given the nature of the site. One is very flat and one has a bit of a slope in it. So to erect buildings on those sites might cost us \$800 000 more, given the site difficulties, though they are exactly the same fabric.

**Mrs NAPIER** - But that would be built into your costing estimates?

**Mr FINCH** - Yes. I am just giving an indication that it is difficult to compare one project to another because of all the different aspects of a project.

**Mr YEUNG** - As Andrew was saying, it fluctuated with markets. Before the financial crisis the steel price was escalating at a rate of knots. We had a project in Melbourne which had been allowing for it and we were very delighted by the time we received our tender because we were much better off. That was 12 months ago now. The climate is different now and with the BER pushing the projects coming through, they tend to be a little bit inflationary in the availability of materials and labour. So they fluctuate. Recently at a private school we were quite satisfied that it had come in well on budget, where in other projects we are allowing for inflation of 10 per cent. Until you have a tender close, it would more likely go up than come down. Ten per cent would be a ballpark figure, without our quoting.

**CHAIR** - There clearly is a lot of work intended for this part of the whole concept in the northern suburbs. After a very cursory assessment, you would have to think that the admin component of the project is at real risk. That \$10 million does not get a lot of work done in the current market.

**Mr YEUNG** - That is true, bearing in mind that we are inheriting an old building. There are a lot of surprises in there and we cannot have X-ray eyes on them.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Is that the tunnel that you are talking about?

**Mr YEUNG** - We have tunnel vision on those. We have to rewire a lot of things and get rid of all the old skylights and so on. It is probably money well spent now to fix up all the issues that we had before. We can only do as much as we can to allow for that situation. But for latent conditions, we really have the expense of what we find. So we should be fairly careful how we allow in the budget for some unknown things.

**CHAIR** - In terms of the school association side of things, I saw you nodding, Phil, while we were going through that process of investigating the risk of all of that. That must be a real concern to the parent community?

**Mr BUTLER** - Obviously the new administration building underpins a whole range of other things that we were hoping for. Obviously we have to be practical. We can only do things with the money we have. I'm still hopeful that the QS has been good; I am still hopeful that the tender will come in and allow us to do it. I would rather be positive at this stage than otherwise. We would much prefer that administration building to be built.

**Mr KELLY** - My answer to Mrs Napier with regard to the Big Picture is that in essence the Big Picture space used to be the old administration block, so if there isn't a new administration block we move into a tighter scenario around those options, but we are used to tight scenarios.

**Mr BUTLER** - There are so many other positives there as well; we can't just dwell on the one fact. There are so many positives with this new build.

**Mr GREEN** - What does the admin block represent as a percentage of the construction?

**Mr FINCH** - Some 11 per cent of the total project.

**Mrs NAPIER** - In that discussion we're having about the possibility that the admin block wouldn't go ahead, I presume that we're still regarding the dance/drama area as being a must. If the pricing gets really out of control then we may not be able to proceed with the admin component on the eastern side.

**Mr YEUNG** - The department has instructed us to prepare documents on the whole project, including an administration block, and then just ask for pricing to be separated perhaps in view of how it comes in and funding available and all that sort of thing.

**Mrs NAPIER** - And what you can get for the price of the Claremont oval.

**Mr KELLY** - The reason for targeting admin was that that has the least disruption to student learning and amenity. The changes that will definitely be made are around the pedagogy and the learning. That's the thinking behind it.

**Mrs NAPIER** - It used to be that in education if you sold off excess land and so on then the school associated would get a percentage of that money to use for investment. Is that the current arrangement and how is this going to apply to closing down some of the old schools and selling the sites and opening up the new sites? In this one it's about \$10 million, and a fairly big percentage in the high school one is State funding, as I understand it. How does the funding structure work on this and what is the potential for the group of schools to access a percentage of the funds that are returned from the sale of the land and buildings?

**Mr FINCH** - Through that work of the Demographic Advisory Council that has been under way with the Government, we have made an arrangement and it adds to the incentive process of identifying surplus land and so on. We get back to the department 100 per cent of any asset sales associated with any school structure or amalgamation-type changes. The usual Treasury arrangement is that the department gets back 75 per cent and Treasury keeps 25 per cent to fund the capital investment program on an ongoing basis. Given the importance of these projects, we have a guarantee that we will get 100 per cent of the asset sale proceeds, after allowing for costs associated with selling, subdividing and so on. To get these projects to fruition we have made estimates of what we think the sites will sell for. We've had official valuations from valuers and those values are factored into these budgets, based on 100 per cent of the proceeds that will return.

**Mrs NAPIER** - So they're already in the budget?

**Mr FINCH** - Yes, they are an important part of the budget for each of the projects. Even though it will take some time for the subdivision and the sale process to unfold, that is where we get Treasury's assistance to make these projects work now and pay it back as the sales come to fruition at a later time.

**Mrs NAPIER** - After the relocation and developments, what is your time frame on selling them - three years?

**Mr FINCH** - Most of them will be declared surplus around December 2010; that is when the sites will be vacated. Then we will work through a process with Treasury. We have to go through a subdivision process with the councils because, as you have seen today, there is the dual-site focus at the Claremont High School, Windermere Primary site and up at Roseneath. We do not have that issue at Mount Faulkner or Claremont Primary, but the others will have to go through the subdivision process. We will be looking to get them onto the market as quickly as possible.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Not as long as the St Michael's school - please!

**Mr FINCH** - It is definitely not a good example. There are a lot of site issues with that one, as you know, but we have tried to -

**Mrs NAPIER** - It is all a bit sad.

**Mr FINCH** - We are on a journey to get it done as quickly as possible, but importantly 100 per cent of the estimated proceeds are in these project budgets.

**Mrs NAPIER** - How much new money is in there?

**Mr FINCH** - Overall or for the high school?

**Mrs NAPIER** - You have the BER money and you have State money so I guess we have to talk about the whole thing.

**Mr FINCH** - The Glenorchy project in its entirety is about \$50 million. It is made up of about \$23.6 million in BER funding, about \$20 million of State capital investment funding and about \$6.5 million in asset sales. That is largely three sites. That is the scope of the project in its entirety. We could talk about the Rosetta or the Montrose site or the two schools together or the Glenorchy project, but obviously the three biggest elements are what we are talking about today. I think that is the best way to look at it.

**Mrs NAPIER** - The existing IT systems within Rosetta will be expanded. Is that going to be a big cost factor?

**Mr KELLY** - The short answer is yes. There is a really good spine at Rosetta, and around that creativity courtyard obviously there will be a lot of high-end stuff but we have wireless in there already. I could go into detail but we are not anticipating any issues around that and certainly it will be state of the art in terms of schools. In fact I am talking at a conference next week where we are showcasing it.

**Mr GREEN** - We talked at length on site about the courtyards and the interface of the courtyards and the school. You showed us a newer section of the school where it already opens out onto the courtyard. Would you just explain to the committee the reason you have adopted this concept, and also talk about the roof structure adjacent to the library and that courtyard and how you plan on utilising that space.

**MR YEUNG** - The creative courtyard is part of our major thrust on the circulation spines of the school. Visually we can link through and see right through the school, which is not available at the moment. We want to create a place where the whole school can get together in one instance where the school wants to have activities and then they can disperse quickly. That is the hub, so to speak, and the way we utilise the existing courtyard, as I explained on the site, is that basically we have four arms anyway. So it is very efficient for us to try to create a big space which is just very isolated columns and with an individual roof over it, so that we can build the thing quickly. By doing so, we would have clerestory windows right around on three sides, with the largest one facing the southern side near Mount Wellington, where we intend to have high-level ventilation with electronic control for adjusting the natural ventilation. We want to keep that big space available for the resources centre so that when you go in, that you have this big volume of space in front of you. All of the side walls are already there. So we are creating a glass box, so to speak.

We also intend to put in a scalene roof, which is a very cheap way of roofing the space, and we set it away from the two existing buildings so that light can come through and that infill roofing becomes a big box, which is very simple to build. So we do not have the inherent problem with this butterfly roof that we have had over a period of time. Within that central spine we would like a lot of activity happening in front of the resources centre which is fronting onto the creative courtyard and that is where things are

going to happen. We want to design it in such a way that when you are in the creative courtyard you can look around the type department - art, media and on, so that you can look up and see people interviewing people and all those things. Alternatively, you can look down as well.

Just adding another bit of interest and I am very interested in the Chinese Feng Shui arrangement which where you have the flow of energy and we already identified that particular -

**Mr GREEN** - Have your front door in line with your back door and things?

**Mr YEUNG** - We have all that sorted out.

**Mr GREEN** - Straight through, gone. Or it is that money coming into the house?

*Laughter.*

**Mr YEUNG** - We do not want it to flow out the door. We want creative energy to be there and we want the work of art to be located in this courtyard as well. We do not have enough money but \$80 000 goes a long way.

**Mr GREEN** - I was going to ask you about the art. So you were going to incorporate it in as part of process?

**Mr YEUNG** - That is right.

**Mr GREEN** - I think it is a fantastic concept. I think it will be great.

**Mr YEUNG** - Then it flows down past the staff area into the new courtyard.

**Mr KELLY** - It will give a heart to the school.

**Mr YEUNG** - It will just add onto the courtyard. Without the administration building, it is sort of missing.

**Mr GREEN** - Yes.

**Mr YEUNG** - Also, because we have the existing building, we would like to build as many new buildings as possible to decant the site. Although we are lucky with Claremont being next door, we want to start building and we want to build a maximum number in the new areas. At the moment I think it is 1 600 square metres is our new building under stage 1. We can start and give Graham a new building and they can move in and utilise it, so that we can get onto the existing building which is a major job.

**Mrs NAPIER** - You have been running a version of the Big Picture now for a couple of years. What are your academic results and retention and attendance results telling us about whether it is worth the investment?

**Mr KELLY** - The way to look at this is basically one student at a time. Basically the students have to present in terms of exhibition and I go to as many exhibitions as I can.

So, probably in the last three years I would have been to several hundred and what I can tell you is that it works like this - I was sitting at a table like this the other day and a young girl who had done her internship with the Fire Brigade was basically presenting what she had been doing, to her parents, somebody from the Fire Brigade, some other students, me and one of her tutors. She was trying to convince her parents that the things that she was doing, working with the Fire Brigade, were going to take her where she needed to go. Her parents were basically saying, 'No, you need to go to college'. The guy from the fire brigade interrupted and said, 'But we'll send her to college and, if she wants to, we'll send her to university'. So the essence of the results is like that. It happens late November - last year there were something like 4 000 people there, only 600 could get in. It's a celebration. It is not the crude results. In fact, our crude results in terms of retention don't look flash. They're something like 65 per cent, but I can tell you where they are. Those results don't include things such as going to Guildford Young College, getting an apprenticeship or being fully employed.

**Mrs NAPIER** - I think the retention results are a nonsense myself.

**Mr KELLY** - Exactly. I could answer that but what I would say is that I think that's the point, you have to deal with the student at the time - what I would say to you is that the satisfaction ratings are through the roof. Over time I would love to do a study of where those kids go because they're all networked using the social networks and you know exactly where they are, and the teachers who are involved in those programs. The kids are still texting them saying they've got a job et cetera. It's a very social enterprise now. I could probably give you two hours' worth of answering this, but I would say that the people to ask would be their parents - and I think they're delighted. I think the main thing is that in three years we've only had two students move out of the program and both of those were kids who said, 'I don't really have the self-discipline for this yet'. The kids who have moved on and done other things are great ambassadors for Rosetta and the reason I think we get so many enrolments in at the other end is that people understand that. It's the same story as being told at Claremont, that people have got this message. We would have hundreds of visitors a year from schools within the State, interstate and overseas around these programs. There are at least another dozen schools in the State that I think will be looking to do Big Picture going into next year and beyond. I am talking in Launceston the week after next to all of the high school principals about this program. It's more in terms of 'let's do it student by student'. Compared to what we used to have - when I first went to Rosetta we identified 55 students in grades 9 and 10 at risk of not completing year 10 but that program became redundant three years ago because they were all staying.

**CHAIR** - That discussion has revolved around process, which is important to what we are considering. Can I put to James in terms of the off-campus to give us a bit of an appreciation of the architecture of the Big Picture annexe?

**Mr MORRISON** - I want to discuss three elements of the design which we have picked up as really important and which support the education model. The first one is the students-parents-community relationship, which is again quite unique. We realised that was a very important relationship and we needed to give it importance in the design so we created in the front of the school a social space so that it is a welcoming space for parents. It's a place where we are hoping that the students will hang out. We gave it a little kitchenette, it has nice views, and we envisage comfortable furniture, welcoming

notice boards, a space for displaying student work. Related to that space, the exhibition and presentation spaces, which Graham was talking about, where the students can present their projects to their parents and tutors. So that's the first thing that is unique from normal schools is that there is a place for the community and the parents and a place for the students and parents to interact.

The second aspect we concentrated on was an innovative type of education, so we wanted the teaching space to be innovative and new. In terms of the architecture, we wanted that to be quite simple. We are creating nice, large, flexible spaces and the way that we envisage students occupying them would be more like a studio than a classroom. We are just about to go through a process of designing because the furniture is going to be crucial in that. The idea is that every year the students come and create that space themselves from scratch. They move their desks around, create sub spaces within that after negotiation within each particular year. It is a sort of studio learning situation and they recreate that space every year from scratch.

They will occupy it and manipulate how they want to use it. Adjacent to those spaces are seminar spaces. It is a link to what we mentioned as being built out of relocatable classrooms, so we have relocatable classrooms with the studio spaces but to make those relocatable classrooms interesting, because they are not interesting buildings, we pulled them apart and put spaces in between them which have nice high roofs, nice views out, large spaces and those become the seminar spaces. The third aspect is the external spaces. There are two key ones in this school.

The first is a rival courtyard area and to understand that you have got to look at the multi campus aspect of the project. It is a space where the three schools come together. It is arrival space, and interesting space, a whole lot of spaces relate to it, the entrance to the Big Picture school, Timsbury Road overlooks it and Goodwood Primary will overlook it. The shared facilities from all the schools relate to that space. So we will have three schools' worth of activity in that one area.

The other external space which is important is the Big Picture school which is designed around a courtyard and all the classroom spaces open onto a courtyard which we see as an oversized teaching space, but again, concentrating the activity and creating a focus and centre for the school.

In terms of the environmental approach, the fact that it is demountables is something that we want to celebrate. We are going to upgrade the demountables because they do not meet current energy standards so we are insulating them, building up the walls, providing more insulation in the walls and the roof and the floor. Demountables come in modules and usually they are stacked together to form a very wide module. We said, 'No; it is important that we just have single module so that we have natural lighting from both sides.' Natural lighting will also give them a far more airy open feel than they have at the moment.

We are looking at a foundation system that does not use any concrete, which is a greenhouse gas emitter. Also, it is economical and very quick to install. It follows the theme of the demountables so they will be very easy to relocate these in 10 or 20 years time if you want to create another Big Picture school down the road and the existing site is going to be sold off or something is can be removed.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Are demountables cheaper than regular classrooms? I did not think they were.

**Mr MORRISON** - They certainly are. It is cheap building. We are finding that it is costing about two thirds the cost of new to take a demountable in an existing school. Most of them are coming from the Launceston area and some from Dodges Ferry. Some of them have got asbestos in them so they have to be stripped of asbestos and then to relocate and upgrade them is costing about two thirds of the cost of new. Which, on a limited budget, a good deal of money. We are certainly get lots of space for the money that we are spending.

If you can imagine, we are using spaces in between. As I mentioned, we are taking the demountables and just moving them apart and putting new seminar spaces in between. There are two existing walls there so that again helps with the costs a bit more.

**CHAIR** - In essence it's not within the purview of the committee to go down the path of the construction processes because that component of what's being considered isn't part of our consideration because it doesn't come into the threshold of the \$5 million, but I thought it was important that we get a grab of what is being intended there because it is an annexe to what's being proposed.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Where's the funding going to come from for this?

**Mr FINCH** - The funding is from a range of sources, some from our State Budget and some from the BER.

**Mrs NAPIER** - So that's in that \$50 million budget overall?

**Mr FINCH** - That is, yes.

**Mr MORRISON** - Timsbury Road and Goodwood Primary were both allocated BER money. We have taken all the three schools together and we have certain shared facilities for all of them, so they're all gaining from the process. They're all gaining a library plus a seminar space and a gym space, so it's benefiting the three schools altogether. We certainly couldn't have built the Big Picture school just with the allocation of Big Picture money. It was useful to combine the facilities of the three schools and everybody gain from it.

**CHAIR** - We will take a five-minute break and reconvene.

**Mr YEUNG AND Mr MORRISON WITHDREW.**

**Ms JENNY LEPPARD**, PRINCIPAL, MOUNT FAULKNER PRIMARY SCHOOL, AND **Mr SCOTT CURRAN** AND **Mr MICHAEL WILKINSON**, ARTAS ARCHITECTS, WERE CALLED, MADE THE STATUTORY DECLARATION AND WERE EXAMINED.

**CHAIR** (Mr Harriss) - Thank you. We will proceed as we did previously with the earlier considerations today but before we do, I would ask for a vote on a motion to accept the document which has been submitted to us, which Mr Green has moved. The motion is carried.

**Mr KELLY** - Through the Chair, I would like to introduce Mrs Jenny Leppard to begin the discussion.

**CHAIR** - That would be good, thank you.

**Ms LEPPARD** - Before I start, I would like to acknowledge my colleague, Mrs Sharyn Gill, and also the vice-chair of our school association, Ms Sandra Crack, who are here just in case I need to call on them.

**Mr KELLY** - Just before you start, Mr Ricky Midson, a parent representative from the Roseneath Primary School community, this afternoon had a work commitment, so he sends his apologies to you.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, we appreciate that.

**Ms LEPPARD** - As outlined earlier by my colleague, Mr Graham Speight, the Glenorchy principals had met over time to explore options for schooling in the greater Glenorchy area, but this has taken another direction with the introduction of the Building the Education Revolution, which threw some of our earlier plans into a different time line. One of the concepts included a proposal to work with the four primary school communities in the Claremont district - Mount Faulkner, Abbotsfield, Roseneath and Claremont - in order to build two new primary schools.

The main drivers behind the proposal were an acknowledgement that most buildings were run-down and/or not fit for purpose in terms of contemporary school organisation, management, curriculum and pedagogy; the need for facilities which better provide for key learning areas, for example, science, technology, information and literature access, the arts and food studies - and that is particularly with our discovery centres we are thinking about; the changing demographics in enrolment patterns in the northern suburbs with overall declining enrolments; and the desire to want the best contemporary learning environment possible for our students.

The principals involved believe that their community should explore the possibilities and make the final decision. Despite the tight time line, as articulated through the BER guidelines, we believed it would be negligent of us not to present such an opportunities to our families. The next step involved processes to engage our communities to provide information, ask for suggestions and ideas, consider visionary proposals and highlight our aspirations for their children.

Finally, the four school communities supported the proposal of closing their schools in order to build two new primary schools in the Claremont district. In the early stages of this project, the actual sites for the new school builds was a topic for much discussion across the school communities, with various options being carefully considered. Finally, the new school sites were decided and included a new school on the current Claremont High site and a new school on the current Roseneath Primary School site. At the same time, a working party, including school principals, departmental senior officers and their school association chairs explored design options for the new schools and visited schools both here in Tasmania and in South Australia to determine the most appropriate direction for the contemporary design for the new schools in Claremont.

The unanimous decision was made adapt the design concept of the learning pod at St Aloysius Catholic College in Huntingfield, Kingston, to an appropriate primary school development. As a newly-built school building, it encompassed the design elements required for a contemporary learning environment for the Claremont district. Some of these key design elements included the discovery room in each learning pod to enhance the teaching of science and food studies in particular; the flexibility and fluidity of movement throughout the building due to the large glass folding doors between all the learning areas; office space for teaching teams to encourage collaboration and teaming and recognise the professional status of teachers; the opportunity to provide easy access to information and literature in each pod; opportunity for inside-outside learning; the ubiquitous ICT; adaptability of functionality; a focus on creating community through the concept of a small school within a larger school, with approximately 150 students in each pod; provision for passive supervision and support through the wide use of glass; features to prevent bullying - for example, the single self-contained toilets to replace blocks of toilets; the possibility to have a school layout which cleverly connected each pod and supporting buildings to create a strong sense of community and connectivity, using that camp fire analogy; and the development of support buildings, administration and multipurpose areas which better fit contemporary demands and community needs.

A meeting was organised to allow the community a chance to view the plans and provide direct advice and feedback to the architects. Involving four school communities has presented a more complex task than merely amalgamating two schools. We are always mindful of our responsibility to allow for equitable and fair engagement across the four school communities and ways to embrace all voices in the conversations. An advisory group including the principals, school chairs, departmental senior officers and other community representatives has been responsible for ensuring community engagement with decisions around school names, uniforms and colours et cetera, and has provided an avenue to have important issues concerning their families raised, such as bus services and parking for the new schools.

This group has designed processes for consultation and review, knowing that the final decision-making rested with the steering group which, in turn, may make recommendations to the secretary. Each school association chair has worked with their community to provide ways for parents to put forward their ideas and suggestions about the school plan, school names, uniforms and colours for each school. Advice has come from parents, students, teachers and other community members. School names for each site have been proposed following suggestions made by each school community and a voting process - Windermere Primary School for the Claremont High School site and

Austins Ferry School for the Roseneath Primary School site. These names are pending approval from the Premier.

The advisory group has engaged the services of a graphic designer to create a school logo, colour palette and uniform design for each school community based on the suggestions provided through school community consultation. Proposals for each school will be presented at a community meeting this Monday seeking general advice and suggestions from students and parents. Implementation planning is under way to ensure the successful amalgamation of four schools into two new school communities with newly-appointed principals, myself and Sharyn Gill taking a strong leadership role in planning and provision to ensure the integrity of the new school builds and an equitable and fair community engagement in decision-making.

With the agreement of the Chair, I would now like to hand over to our architect, Mike Wilkinson, who will guide us through the design aspects of the Roseneath site.

**Mr WILKINSON** - The Roseneath site is accessed from Brodie Street on the south side of the site. There are three pods located around a level courtyard with each pod able to take a cohort of up to approximately 150 students, giving a total school population of 450. Each pod contains six GLAs and a flexible discovery space that will be used as for years 0-4 learning, and contains the two kindergarten spaces in pod 3. The key to the design of the pods is that the GLA spaces within them are very flexible and are able to be connected as one or two spaces and can be closed down to three GLAs on each side if required. This provides opportunities for team teaching, teachers working together with groups of students, and has the ability to close down the space if required for, say, working with students with special needs.

The GLAs have smaller break-out spaces between classes for taking aside small groups of students for a project or for special tuition. Resource stores are also available for each GLA. The central studio space in the pod is to be used as a library resource space in each of the three pods. Also located centrally is a staff work facility where work planning takes place and is a base for staff and their equipment. These pods are the same for both Roseneath and Claremont. At Roseneath the student services building and the GP hall are sited on the south-west side of the central courtyard and are elevated by about one metre from the courtyard and the other pods. This will provide an overview of the balance of the site. To the south-west of the student services building and the GP hall is the car park, which is benched into the site. There are 66 car parking spaces for use by teachers and as a drop-off and pick-up zone for parents. Overflow parking is also available to the west of the car park on the Hobart Water Supply easement.

Some words on universal access. Despite the site having a fall grading of approximately 5-6 metres across the site, equal access for disabled students or staff is provided from the car park to student services building and the GP hall and down to the pods via ramps. Disabled access is also provided to the playing field on the lower part of the site and two disabled car-parking bays are provided in the car park. We also have a disabled toilet in the staff building and one in each of the pods.

As to some of the ESD or environmentally sustainable design strategies that we are looking to encompass in the project, the two schools are aiming to achieve a five-star green-star rating. The key to this will be the use of the geothermal technology for

heating and cooling. Essentially, a refrigerant or medium liquid is piped 90 metres into the ground and is heated by temperature of the earth. This liquid is then pumped back up to the surface into a heat exchanger in the ceiling space, and the cooling or the warmth is transferred to the air with the heat exchanger and that is then pumped into the learning spaces of the buildings, the administration building and the hall.

The system is slightly more expensive than the standard power grid system with condensing unit fans but costs nothing to run apart from the cost of running the fans for the air-conditioning units. The payback period for this is approximately five years; however, with economies of scale in doing, say, three schools together, that would provide a more cost-effective way of doing this and hopefully there would not be too much of a site cost penalty for doing it.

The heating and cooling system is worth approximately 16 green-star points and to achieve a five-star green-star rating you need to achieve approximately 60 green-star points. We will endeavour to achieve these points with some of the other following features that I will mention in a minute.

For insulation of the ceilings and walls, thick single-glazed or double-glazed windows will be used, maximising daylight and reducing summer heat gain and heat loss in winter. We will be using energy-efficient lighting, natural ventilation, low volatile organic compounds in paints and ceilings, low emissions boards and linings in buildings, and using carpets with a high recycle content. We will also be using water-efficient fixtures and fittings with the reuse of rainwater for toilet flushing and watering gardens around the school buildings by use of a tank that will retain water and recirculate back to the landscape and around the buildings.

**Mr GREEN** - How big?

**Mr WILKINSON** - I think it is 90 000 litres. We will also be using the buildings as a teaching tool with visibly metered power and water and some explanatory diagrams throughout the school. On the green-star rating, four stars is best practice, five stars is Australian excellence and six stars is world's best practice. It is not an easy thing to do to achieve a five-star green-star rating but we will certainly be doing our very best on the projects.

Regarding the construction methodology and some of the materials that we will be using, the buildings will generally have reinforced concrete slabs and footings. Student services and the multipurpose hall buildings will have steel columns supporting timber roof framing and also some load-bearing perimeter walls on the outside. The learning pods will utilise timber truss roof framing with plantation pine wall framing and in-fill framing between the columns. The roofing will be Colorbond steel sheeting and a combination of Spandeck and clip dock profiles and will also be fully insulated with an R rating of 3.5, external walls and acoustic insulation between the internal walls.

As I've mentioned previously, glazing frames will be powder-coated aluminium. They're looking at what sort of glazing we are required to achieve - the section J classification of the BCA - so when our mechanical engineer comes back to us we'll need to adopt that as a minimum.

We will be using painted 9 mm-thick fibre cement sheet with an express joint system above the brickwork, which will be around the lower levels of the building and act as a wearing strip. The walls internally will be lined to 1 100 or 1 200 with 16 mm-thick laminated dado panels, which will act as a coloured wearing strip, and a 16 mm-thick fabric-covered display board will be used and that will provide a perimeter in the classroom above the dado. All the boards that we specify will have a low or nil emissions rating and all the paints we use will have nil or low volatile organic compounds in them.

There is also extensive use of glass within the pods to maintain visual connections between the spaces and generally floor finishes will be sheet rubber in wet areas and carpet floor tiles. We are thinking about the carpet at the moment, whether we go for floor tiles or a broadloom mix, but we don't have all our research on that yet so the decision is still pending.

**CHAIR** - Will we then flow straight into the other site for Scott to do a similar presentation?

**Mr KELLY** - If that's acceptable to the committee, yes.

**Mrs NAPIER** - The questions I have are probably site-specific. Mike, you said that the changes in elevation are basically between 5 and 6 metres.

**Mr WILKINSON** - I could tell you exactly but these figures are a bit too small for me to read.

**Mrs NAPIER** - I don't need a precise figure, I'm just thinking probably 25-30 feet.

**Mr WILKINSON** - Something like that.

**Mrs NAPIER** - And you could see down the hill anyhow. That's fine, I don't need a precise figure on that. As I understand it, your learning pods and courtyard are basically going to be built on the school oval?

**Mr WILKINSON** - That's correct.

**Mrs NAPIER** - That is a fairly flat site and will be easily accessed. I think you said that the hall and student services will be stepped up a bit.

**Mr WILKINSON** - About 1.2 metres.

**Mrs NAPIER** - That's not a huge difference either. Just to get it on the record, you'd be aware that I have some concerns - it's the old PE teacher in me. I have been there, we did some orienteering there, and it wasn't wet, but it was wet. My recollection of that terrain was that even in relatively dry conditions it is still fairly damp there. Could you give an indication for the committee as to what your plans are for ensuring that we have a good green space down there to be used and to make sure that it's able to be used in winter as well as summer, except for extreme wet conditions as we have been having recently? It seemed to me that instead of just moulding and outside drains it's probably going to need to some ag-flow pipe and some decent construction, particularly given that it's the only oval in that vicinity, as I understand it.

**Mr WILKINSON** - That's something we're looking into at the moment. As you say, on the landscape plan it shows a swale drain around the topside of the oval, which will pick up a lot of the surface water that is currently running across it, so that will channel water around the oval and down into the creek. We are also looking at re-forming some of the surface of the oval and top-dressing. We stopped short of putting in an intricate drainage system to drain the oval but we can look at that.

**Mrs NAPIER** - In terms of making sure that we have good, free, safe running and playing areas for kids to get outside as we want them to do as much as possible, I wonder if that could be looked at. I have my doubts that moulding it is going to be sufficient to make it usable most of the time.

**Mr GREEN** - Do you think the fact that the water would be going to stormwater et cetera would make a difference to the water that flows on the bottom side?

**Mr WILKINSON** - I think it will. We are picking up all the water from the uphill side of the oval, so there would be quite a drastic reduction in the amount of water running across it.

**Mrs NAPIER** - I reckon you have some spring systems down there.

**Mr WILKINSON** - There is a creek which has a 100-year flood line which just comes inside the boundary of the site.

**Mrs NAPIER** - I do not need you to cater for that.

The other aspect was your understanding of soft fall play areas. In terms of climbing and other equipment that you have around schools, and upper body development is usually one of the limits in the modern day and age, what was envisaged? Is that something that the school community would do later on or would they transfer some of the existing equipment from the other schools that they are leaving?

**Mr WILKINSON** - As far as hard play surfaces go, at the moment we have two full-size netball courts on the hard courts area in the middle on the west there. To the north of it we have a soft fall play area that we are putting in. We are proposing to put in a trafficable surface so disability access is provided. There is also a soft fall play area to the right of that, nearer to the Brooker Highway at the bottom of a set of stairs that comes down between pods 1 and 3. We are going to provide play equipment in there as well and a soft fall play area. It is not shown on the site plan at the moment but near the early learning pod 2 near Brodie Street we are going to provide another soft fall play area. We have been talking to Jenny and Sharyn and we are going to bring across some of the play equipment from the existing Roseneath site and set that up, as well as some other specialised infant play equipment in the early learning area.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Okay, that answers my question but it does not actually show on the design as to what the allowance would be for the younger children's area.

**Mr WILKINSON** - It is actually on the landscape plan. This is a more recent one that has gone into the planning submission to the Glenorchy City Council. You have the hard courts there, the soft fall play areas, and then the infants' soft fall play area.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Is there some security fencing provided?

**Mr WILKINSON** - Yes. Security fencing is provided around the perimeter of the infant play area, so they are well and truly protected. We will also have some fencing around the hard court play areas. We are thinking of instigating some fencing across the entry so that the centre part of the school, the courtyard area, can be secure after hours.

**Mrs NAPIER** - The calls that I most often get to my office are usually from parents with autistic kids or something like that who have a tendency to run away and escape from the school area. If there were children with those needs who needed some security fencing of some kind, is it going to be difficult to do that? There is not currently fencing around the area.

**Mr WILKINSON** - The outside play areas are not fenced, apart from the infant one, the infant learning pod 2, but the internal part of the school certainly is.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Is that a fence line around there? On my diagram it shows up as the dotted line around there. I was wondering if that was a fence or not?

**Mr WILKINSON** - The infant fencing is around there. Then we have fencing across here to close off the internal space - the entry to the school.

**Mrs NAPIER** - So the internal area is a safe zone?

**Mr WILKINSON** - Yes, and around the hard courts and back to that. So all that area there is secure.

**Mrs NAPIER** - That is good. That would, I presume, cater for those kids.

The other question was in relation to the operation of the library facility and the way in which it is configured within the learning pods. What does that mean for role of the librarian? Some schools do have real librarians, others just have library technicians. How is it envisaged that the role of trained librarians would or would not operate within that configuration?

**Ms LEPPARD** - One of the reasons we decided to go for that model of three mini libraries rather than one large library - and our parent rep could certainly verify this - is that in the past we have had quite a few parental complaints through our school association about our current library not being accessible enough for students. One of the things we really want to say about our new school is that, as soon as parents or children walk through the door, this is about literacy and learning. That will do that because those library spaces are right inside the front door of a pod. None of our current schools do employ a teacher librarian. For example, in our school we have a teacher assistant employed for that role. Staffing decisions have not been made yet, but in preliminary discussions with her we envisage that she might operate out of one of the pods on a Monday, another one of the pods on Tuesday and another pod on Wednesday, for example. So you might timetable

your library class times during those times. Because of a lot of the grass and the passive supervision, students and parents will be able access that space all the time. At the moment we are really limited because of staffing issues and funding, not being able to employ people within certain hours, so our library is closed at certain times because we cannot supervise it, whereas in this way it will be accessible all the time because we will be able to supervise it better.

**Mrs NAPIER** - You have answered my other question, which is whether you use trained librarians or not. In terms of making that resource work, sometimes your trained librarians have fairly front-edge knowledge of the kind of materials, processes and so on that are being used. Is consideration being given to putting a trained librarian assistant into this new configuration to really make it work well?

**Ms LEPPARD** - That is something we would work through with our school associations because a lot of the time those staffing choices are made in consultation with the school associations. Certainly in the past at our school we have opted not to employ a teacher librarian because parents prefer more music, more PE or an art teacher, for example, because they see that, for the most part, a teacher assistant and classroom teachers can fulfil the role of a teacher librarian. What we really want is for all teachers to be pushing literacy and literature and encouraging it, not just when the class goes to the library for one half-hour session a week.

**Mr GREEN** - Is there an underpass for the Brooker?

**Mr WILKINSON** - Yes, there is.

**Mr GREEN** - Will that be utilised?

**Mr WILKINSON** - That will still be used. We need to do some work at the front and at the school end to try to mitigate the use of motorbikes after school hours. But yes, it is intended that it be used for access.

**Mr GREEN** - Is that a key part of access to the school?

**Mr WILKINSON** - For those families who live on the eastern side of the Brooker Highway and in that vicinity, yes, I would think so. Parents coming from further north, say around Austins Ferry, can come up that way, drop their children off and see them off under the underpass and they are right at the back door of the school.

**Mrs NAPIER** - I noticed on one of the designs that you had bike racks. What is the usage of bikes?

**Ms LEPPARD** - We have to have them. We have to have a certain number.

**Mr CURRAN** - It is a requirement of the council that we have it and we earn green star points as well by having bike racks.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Excellent. I am delighted to see it. I think it is good. The configuration of the wet areas within the pods, is that basically the same as at St Aloysius? I was just

trying to work out whether those squiggly lines are in fact the delineation between where lino would be used and carpet would be used.

**Ms LEPPARD** - It is approximately about one-third wet area and two-thirds carpet.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Have the teachers had input about where those wet areas would go?

**Ms LEPPARD** - Yes.

**CHAIR** - Anything further at this particular site before we move onto the next one?

**Mrs NAPIER** - Let me get it on the record. We had some discussions on-site about the noise impact. Given that it was a wet day and there was a fair bit of noise coming from the highway, my first reaction was to think that there would need to be a noise barrier. I suppose it can be achieved with trees or something else like that. But I wondered whether it was worth putting on the record how the design or structure of the school will try to ensure that the noise does not impact on the learning environment in particular?

**Mr WILKINSON** - The buildings are grouped around in a circle in the camp-fire mode that we have talked about. That will provide a certain diminution of noise coming in from the highway. We are also looking at providing either double glazing or much thicker than usual single glazing which will also deaden some of the noise coming from the highway. So it would be pretty quiet in the classrooms and inside the buildings, I would imagine. In the early days we did look at putting an acoustic wall down on the boundary but I just think that might end up being very high, if it was going to work. The school is generally up above the level of the highway and as it goes north it goes up the hill, so a lot of the sound would come back and over any sort of wall that we might put there. So I am not sure on how much of an impact that would have.

**Mrs NAPIER** - What is the current noise impact of the highway on the Roseneath Primary School?

**Ms LEPPARD** - I do not know.

**Mr SPEIGHT** - I would have thought it would be non-existent because it is quite a long way up the hill.

**Mrs NAPIER** - In the buildings?

**Mr SPEIGHT** - Yes.

**Mrs NAPIER** - I suppose it is whatever one gets used to?

**Mr SPEIGHT** - Yes, not at all up there.

**Mrs NAPIER** - I would certainly hope that good sound insulation is used within the classrooms. I know we get used to things but just think, in classrooms you do not want any additional noise other than good working noise. I put it on the record that I think we need the best in terms of sound insulation for that area.

**Mr SPEIGHT** - The Rosetta classrooms are closer to the road than those classrooms will be - you were up there this morning, so you would have -

**Mrs NAPIER** - I think it is a different tunnel there. I was standing on Brodie Street and I accept that there are a lot of schools that are near highways. But I was taken by the noise that that highway makes and I think it is probably because of the tunnel effect through that area. I do not know. It certainly struck me anyhow and we are going quite close to it. So I think the design needs to accommodate it first up, rather than waiting until the problem is really noticed. You want everything to be positive about the experience in the new school and the new projects. I just think that would be a good thing to have.

**Mr KELLY** - Mr Chairman, if it is appropriate for the committee, we have been talking about the St Aloysius School and my colleague, Jenny Leppard mentioned St Aloysius. The Catholic Education Office, for the record, has been extremely supportive in enabling us to go out and visit their site. We acknowledge the high levels of support, advice and cooperation from their current Principal, Mrs Elaine Doran, former Director, Dr Dan White and the current acting director, Mr Anthony Morgan, from the Catholic Education Office. This has enabled us to be able to move quickly and efficiently, with them doing a fair bit of the research for us. I would like to be able to acknowledge that, please.

**CHAIR** - Thank you.

**Mrs NAPIER** - I put on the record that I am delighted that there is good cooperation between public and private sector when we come across designs that work. It makes a lot of sense to me to share them and I am particularly pleased that the better design for toilets has been built in as a way of reducing the potential for bullying.

**CHAIR** - Scott, could you detail the site specifics related to the Claremont site?

**Mr CURRAN** - Learning pods 1, 2 and 3 are the same in design as they are for Roseneath. Once again, what we have done is adopt the camp-fire concept and that has been one of the main drivers behind the configuration of the site plan as it is at the moment. Learning pod 2 is our early learning pod that opens out on to the early learning areas. We have a capacity on learning pod 3 where we have extended the roof off the back over the top of the discovery centre to enable us to expand learning pod 3 in the future if that is required. That is our future provision for any expansion. The student services building and the multipurpose hall essentially contain the same functions as Roseneath, the only difference being with the buildings is that the site configuration enabled us to do a different design because of the orientation of the buildings and the way you enter onto the site. Those being some of the main drivers, we have adopted the existing access point off Cadbury Road where we're maintaining the existing turning circle. We're looking to refurbish that road at this stage. We've widened the existing drop-off point to enable better bus access through that area and to enable bus drop off.

We're looking at the moment to demolish some of the buildings of the existing Claremont High School to enable us to open up the front section of the site for security and also to increase the welcomability of that area. We've also included a parent drop-off point so that parents can drop their children at the front of the school. We have located the car park for staff members quite close to the area in which they will be working. We have adopted an overflow car park that will enable parents to drop their

children off, park their car and walk up and collect them. We have a shelter at the front to enable students to wait for collection. We also have some bike racks at the front of the school, which are a council requirement and also enable us to get some more green-star rating points.

We have a covered walkway that creates a spine that runs through the site from the shelter through to the front of the multipurpose hall which enables us to connect the front of the school with the multipurpose hall. It also creates a vista through that area to enable us see the Derwent River in the background. It also gives us an excellent opportunity to connect into the courtyard space. As I mentioned before, the design has been centred on the courtyard and the student services, the pods and the multipurpose area all relate directly back to that courtyard. That courtyard is a hard surface and has a number of large shade trees through that area for shading and to form a sense of enclosure through that area.

We have equal access to all areas of the site - to the student services building, the multipurpose hall and to each of the pods. Learning pod 3 is set up slightly higher than learning pods 2 and 1 due to the current existing site conditions. That gives us an added advantage at the moment of being able to create an amphitheatre through the courtyard, which will form an excellent point for students to have large-scale gatherings. Learning pod 3 is accessed by two accessible ramps that go up onto that level and that leads further on into the distance to a play area and a hard stand area.

We currently have a fence around the site due to the fact that we're next to the Derwent. That will serve two purposes. It will enable us to keep students in and also enable us to prevent people who ride motorbikes from accessing the site. The boundary fences are 2.1 metres high chain-wire mesh fence, but the fence that goes around learning pod 2 and goes back and connects students services and the multipurpose hall is a much friendlier 1 200. Really, what will happen is that it will prevent motorbikes from accessing the site but will not prevent other people from accessing if they want to go and use the playground equipment. The multipurpose hall is designed so that it can be operated out of hours so that the school can be closed and access is still available to the multipurpose hall.

The car park in that area has 56 spaces at the moment and provides equal or close proximity to the multipurpose hall for out-of-hours access and enables us to create some flexibility through that space. What we have really aimed for with the design of the pods, the multipurpose hall and, indeed, the site planning is to give us as much flexibility as possible so that we can accommodate not only learning as it is currently but also learning into the future. I think that one of the strengths of the pod - and also of both of the designs - is that it gives flexibility to enable teachers to adapt their teaching style to future trends. I think that is a really positive thing about developing this pod, and indeed, with the set-up that we have of the site.

On the play areas for Claremont. We have developed a number of play areas around learning pod 2. We have a number of transitional areas so that as the children get older they can transition through those play areas to eventually having open access out onto the play area where the oval is currently located.

We are looking to relocate the majority of the play equipment from Mount Faulkner at the moment. We have done a survey of the equipment: it is new and in good condition and we can relocate about 80 per cent of it. There are a couple of pieces of equipment that will need to be replaced and we are in the process of laying those out on the site plan at the moment. That concludes my summary.

**CHAIR** - Any questions?

**Mrs NAPIER** - Does the hard stand have a fence around it?

**Mr CURRAN** - No. We deliberately have not put a fence around the hard-stand area so that we can maintain some flexibility between running off the hard-stand area onto the grass and running back again.

**Mrs NAPIER** - I would have to say that wherever I see hard stands done without fencing around them I note that it does not take too long to require fencing in terms of small and large ball activities. It might look good but it is not always functional. Kids spend all their time running off and chasing the ball.

**Mr WILKINSON** - We have a number of walls in front of the multipurpose hall and also the small retaining walls in front of learning pod 2 and learning pod 1 that will enable the kids to play down ball or hit the ball up against the wall. We tried to cater for the small ball activity around through that area so that we have got smaller areas where they can get smaller groups but the larger ball activity we envisage would be on that hard-stand area.

**Mrs NAPIER** - There is not a slope is there?

**Mr WILKINSON** - No it is very flat on that section. Once you get up onto that top section it is very flat.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Has the person responsible for PE and sport had a look at it and, if so, are they happy with that?

**Ms LEPPARD** - Yes, all staff have had a look at it and they are very excited.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Do they know that there are no fences there?

**Ms LEPPARD** - Yes, they do. Our current one has fencing but it has been so badly vandalised that people come and take whole sections of the fence away. I would much prefer this.

**Mrs NAPIER** - I accept what you are saying there but I would have to say that children create the most wonderful games, whether it is small ball or large ball, using the dimensions of a netball/tennis-sized court and I just think in a practical sense and I have not seen good use made of a hard-stand area unless it has a fence.

**Mr GREEN** - I have a point with respect to the covered walkway along the front adjacent to the car park. We are talking about pods for both sides effectively and today we were

very appreciative of the fact we did have covered walkways to get between the buildings. Has there been any consideration given to some sort of link between the pods?

**Ms LEPPARD** - There is covered walkway all the way around.

**Mr GREEN** - It is all the way around?

**Ms LEPPARD** - Yes.

**Mr GREEN** - Can you explain where that is?

**Mr CURRAN** - We have two types of walkway. We have a large walkway which forms the spine and we also have a smaller, lower level that carries around and links the learning pods. That is the line of that smaller covered walkway that runs around through there.

**Mr GREEN** - And that is the same for both sites effectively?

**Mr CURRAN** - Yes.

**Mrs NAPIER** - Mike, is your hardcourt area fenced?

**Mr WILKINSON** - Partly. The section to learning pod 1 isn't fenced and back to the groundsman's shed on the south side, but it is around the other two sides just because it's such a drop off there. You'd lose a ball in the creek pretty quickly.

**Mrs NAPIER** - The school has made a decision but I ask them to have a look at that issue. I think it is a really good area for kids to play, but if you are spending all your time chasing the ball, it will be impractical.

**Mr GREEN** - We are talking about the site-specific stuff, but with respect to the pods we had a lot of discussion about them at Rosetta but we haven't really discussed them much here, other than you've been to South Australia to have a look at a school.

**Ms LEPPARD** - No, we went to several schools in South Australia.

**Mr GREEN** - Did they have similar designs?

**Ms LEPPARD** - The beauty of going to South Australia was that we didn't see anything we did like. We were really disappointed in one way because we had heard a lot about South Australia but when we went to visit the schools we really didn't see anything that said, 'Wow, we love this, we want this'. It wasn't until we got back here and saw St Aloysius. The minute we pulled up in the car and then had a look at the buildings we just loved it.

**Mr GREEN** - So that's you, how have you been able to transpose that to the community generally?

**Ms LEPPARD** - It wasn't just us, it was the parents who went with us. In the group that went to South Australia were all the chairs of the four school associations, the four principals - it was more than four because Glenorchy and Brent Street went as well. We

have had a couple of visits to St Aloysius. On one occasion parents went and another time a much larger group of parents went. That is why it was great of Brendan to acknowledge them because they've been very generous in the sharing of their time and showing us around lots of times. Then we had a public meeting where the architects shared the plans with quite a lot of parents and community members at that meeting and they were able to have input into the design.

**Mr GREEN** - So you've got the same design?

**Ms LEPPARD** - Yes.

**Mr GREEN** - Mike, where did you come up with the concept with respect to the pods?

**Mr WILKINSON** - We saw an ad in the paper to register interest with developing a new school for the St Aloysius community - Catholic community - down at Kingston. We got through the first round, through registration, and we entered the limited design competition and it was at that time that we came up with the design for the pods.

**Mr GREEN** - So you've effectively designed them?

**Mr WILKINSON** - Yes.

**Mr GREEN** - Very good. There has been a lot of interest generally, obviously?

**Mr KELLY** - Yes. The design as commissioned by the Catholic education system is true testimony to the design work of our architects. It was quite interesting in terms of accountability in regard to limited resources and sending a significant amount of people - a total of about 12-14 people - to South Australia. I was very nervous because a fair bit of research had been undertaken, to the tune of millions of dollars, by South Australia to source best designs in Australia. When our colleagues and parents came back only to hear that there was nothing to be found, I was a bit nervous, but to then be able to hold the litmus test up against something that was at our own back door and home grown, the generosity of the Catholic education - I didn't feel as nervous, I must say.

**Mr GREEN** - It's very good. I think it's terrific. Obviously the professionals are very enthusiastic about it.

**Ms LEPPARD** - The community has been, too. I personally haven't heard one single negative comment about the design. The parents are very excited about it.

**Mr GREEN** - What are you going to call the multipurpose room?

**Mr WILKINSON** - The discovery centre.

**Mr GREEN** - Sounds flash, doesn't it!

**Mr KELLY** - Just getting back to a very important thing that Mrs Napier raised, we are very respectful of the trust the community has bestowed in the educationalists and the community leaders to venture into this new way of providing schooling in the greater Glenorchy area and for people to move from where generations of families have in some

instances been at these schools. That is a huge vote of trust and we recognise that we're not there yet. We still have a lot of work to do in consultation and keeping people committed to the spirit of where we're going. I am very grateful to the leadership of people in the school, Mr Butler and the school association people. We're very excited about the opportunity but we also know that we have a lot of work ahead of us. Today is an important step and your participation and engagement in such a positive way is very much appreciated.

**CHAIR** - Thank you, and we echo those comments in respect to the presentations we have had in this formal hearing and on site today. We are grateful for your time.

**THE WITNESSES WITHDREW.**