

20 November 2025

Najeeb Kobeissi

Senior Planning Officer
Department of Planning, Housing & Infrastructure
4 Parramatta Square, 12 Darcy Street
PARRAMATTA NSW 2150

Dear Mr Kobeissi

Re: Forest Lodge Integrated Seniors Living (SSD-7593483) – Response to Submissions

This letter is provided to confirm comments made by the City of Sydney by letter of 2 October 2025 in response to the Department's Request for Additional Information of 8 September 2025 in relation to the Environmental Impact Statement for SSD-75493483 have been addressed by way of Revised Public Art Strategy (November 2025).

Response to the City of Sydney

The comments made by City of Sydney are italicised and in grey and the ways in which the Revised Public Art Strategy responds to same are outlined below.

10 Public Art Location	<i>Issue: The artwork typologies and precedents included in the Public Art Strategy are considered appropriate. However, an updated public art strategy is required to only identify opportunities for public art on land owned and maintained by the proposed development, ie exclude all land to be dedicated to the City.</i> Response: The Revised Public Art Strategy clearly outlines by way of site plan (at pages 20-21) the existing and proposed new boundaries and demarcates the land dedication areas. The revised locations in which opportunities for public art are proposed are now shown to be situated only with land owned and maintained by the proposed development and exclude all land to be dedicated by the City. Each opportunity is depicted on the plan and described in accompanying text (at pages 20-21). This revised approach remains aligned with the Strategy's vision, which lends itself to a series of dispersed public art opportunities of varying scale within the development and which are also public facing.
-------------------------------	--

10 Public Art Budget	<i>Issue: The updated Strategy also needs to provide a commitment to at least 0.5% of the total development cost as the public art budget, rather than just the construction cost.</i> Response: The Revised Strategy now provides (at page 28) that “[t]he anticipated public art budget will, at minimum, represent 0.5% of the Estimated Development Cost (EDC). This will be inclusive of all artist fees, gallery commission (if applicable), curatorial fees, artist’s sub-consultant fees, artwork project management, site visits, fabrication and installation, inspections, design meetings, client presentations, all design stages, all fabrication, storage (if required), transportation, installation costs, travel, disbursements and insurances.”.
3 Heritage Stone retaining wall	<i>Issue: The stone retaining wall should be conserved in situ if possible. Otherwise, the submitted heritage impact statement must justify the proposed dismantlement and clearly identify how the existing stone will be reused as part of the proposed development.</i> <i>Provision 6.3.12.6(4) of the SDCP and Policy 25 of the submitted Conservation Management Plan prepared by John Outram Heritage & Design</i> Response: With reference to the Strategy’s express intention to explore potential to conserve and repurpose heritage material from the site demolition in the artwork development process, and the Heritage Impact Statement note that “the stone retaining wall along the eastern boundary of the site... will be carefully dismantled and the stone reused in selected locations in the new buildings and in the site works” (at page 104), the Revised Strategy specifies the artwork development process will look to salvage and integrate heritage stone remaining (after its planned reuse in rebuilding the Junction Street wall) as part of the artwork (at page 23).

Sincerely,



Shannan Snowball