

SUBMISSIONS ON MP 07_0167 NIELD AVENUE GREENWICH FROM THE PUBLIC AND AGENCIES

PART A – PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS

1

PART B – AGENCY SUBMISSIONS

14

Part A – Public submissions

No.	Date recd	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issue Summary
1	21 Nov 08 & 19 Dec 08	Council Resident	Objection	- Appendix 23 of EA states a 1800 number, email address and website will be set up, non of which exist yet - Development is far too large for the site - Development will overshadow properties in Bellevue Avenue, particularly in winter - Site slopes significantly down, but building doesn't - Height and FSR do not comply with existing or draft LEP - Inevitable that insufficient car parking will be available for residents in surrounding streets	- Communication Plan - Bulk & Scale - Overshadowing - Topography - Building Design - Height - FSR - Car Parking
2	25 Nov 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Support location and use – close to bus and rail public transport, RNSH - Concern for stormwater runoff from Pacific Highway ridge to the Gore Creek outlet to the Lane Cover river - Rainwater should be retained on site for reuse due to large roof area and substantial number of bathrooms - Close proximity of building mass to existing houses e.g. 17G Bellevue Avenue	- Stormwater - WSUD - Bulk & Scale - Setbacks
3	26 Nov 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Too large in mass and scale - Directly opposite RNSH that is already dealing with shortages in doctors and nurses - No market for this facility, existing 'Waterbrook Greenwich' retirement apartments having difficulty selling	- Bulk & Scale - Land use - Demand
4	26 Nov 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Traffic generation and safety implications along Innes Road, between the Pacific Highway and Ronald / Wisdom Road. All traffic exiting Nield Avenue heading to the city will have to exit to the north then down Innes Road which is already at capacity with parked vehicles - No value in another medical facility given proximity to North Shore Private, RNSH and Greenwich Hospice - Development will become an exclusive hospice for Waterbrook retirees	- Traffic - Demand - Validity of Land use
5	28 Nov 08	Local Resident	Objection	- EA documentation lacks perspective views to enable assessment of relationships between proposed development and existing buildings on Pacific Highway - Height will block views from western outlook of units and create a limited, dim space between the buildings - Buildings on Pacific Highway are on ridgeline, land downhill should not be built out to such an extent	- EA Information - View Analysis - Height - Views
6	28 Nov 08 & 18 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Storms during construction will bring mud flooding through the valley below the site - Building is a high rise monolith which will overshadow and reduce views of the sky and trees - Area and infrastructure cannot support the proposed density - Will set precedent for large scale non residential development in residential area - During construction of Waterbrook Stage 1 access to Morven Gardens laneway was restricted for 2 years, the road surface was destroyed and is yet to be repaired, mud run off flooded onto adjoining properties, illegal parking, noise and dust impacts occurred and the developer was unsympathetic to concerned neighbours - Height does not comply with current LEP	- Flooding - Bulk & Scale - Infrastructure - Density - Neighbourhood Character - Previous Approvals - Restricted Access - Noise - Dust - Height

				3-4 storey limit may be acceptable if current footprint is not increased - Development will stretch parking resources, cause traffic chaos and lead to illegal parking in surrounding streets - Facility is an aged care facility not a hospital - House values will fall and adjoining properties damaged	- Car Parking - Traffic - Validity of Land Use - Property Values - Construction Impacts
7	11 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Inaccurate and outdated public display material was used (aerial photo from 5 years ago, zoning, surrounding site data) - Built form would adversely affect surrounding neighbours and utility of development itself - Independent control and monitoring of site preparation and construction is required for safety of neighbours - Insufficient parking for staff and visitors, which given nature of facility will have frequent use – 30 more car parks should be provided - Site does not facilitate off-site parking and surrounding streets are densely parked - Inadequate and difficult access for emergency vehicles – only one access point, narrow street with tight turning circle - Design should improve Nield Ave ingress/egress and provide adequate turning for large ladder trucks and other emergency vehicles - No information is provided on dealing with asbestos from houses to be demolished and safety aspects - How will noise be contained to stipulated construction times? What penalties will apply? - How will it be ensured that vibration damage to adjacent properties will be avoided and rectified?	- EA Information - Built form - Site Preparation - Construction Management - Car Parking - Access - Safety - Noise - Construction Impacts
8	11 Dec 08	Local Landowner	Objection	- Size of proposed development will obscure views and property value will decrease - Hospital (non-residential use) should not be in residential area, residential zoning should be honoured - Size and height of facility does not comply with Council's controls - Extent of vegetation removal equates to destruction - Traffic congestion from staff and visitor parking in residential area	- Bulk & Scale - Views - Property Values - Zoning - Height - Vegetation - Traffic
9	15 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Surrounding area is mainly residential homes and a few small low rise apartments - Height contravenes existing and draft LEP, it should maintain a maximum height of 12 m (4 storeys) particularly at western end - Setbacks are not sufficient to minimise the impact on the surrounding properties - Central courtyard design should be removed to allow for same total building floor area with greater setbacks (min of 20 m from south boundary) and greater opportunities for privacy screen planting - Maintenance of several additional existing mature trees and further plantings should be provided - No balconies should be included on south side of facility to protect current privacy of surrounding residents - Overshadowing is to occur but remedies above will rectify this - Construction noise and disturbance will be significant, developer should install double glazing to affected properties and limit all works to weekdays only	- Neighbourhood Character - Height - Setbacks - Building Design - Vegetation - Privacy - Overshadowing - Noise - Construction Impacts
10	15 Dec 08	Council Resident	Objection	- Developments should comply with zoning and planning regulations - Development has unsuitable bulk, scale and height - Height does not comply with current LEP which envisages buildings to 3 storeys - Development does not comply with height controls and does not 'ensure the existing amenity of residences in the neighbourhood' under the draft LEP - Neighbourhood suggests nothing more than 5 storeys - FSR is unacceptable and does not comply with the draft LEP - Will decrease value of surrounding properties - Loss of amenity through loss of views, existing residential views will be substituted for rooftop terrace/café views - Noise from elevated rooftop terrace/café will disrupt surrounding neighbours	- Zoning - Bulk & Scale - Height - FSR - Property Value - Views - Noise - Topography - Building Design - EA Information - Car Parking - Construction Impacts - Vegetation

				- Design fails to step down steep sloping site - Both wings should be a maximum of 3-4 stories rather than 6-7 to reduce overshadowing - Spacious U-shape design adversely impacts adjoining properties - Advantages for those IN the development give insufficient consideration to the community OUTSIDE - Before and After photo montages should not show vegetation which can be misleading - Access and parking likely to be problem during construction - Rigorous Construction Management Plan dealing with access and parking issues needs to be in place to ensure difficulties from the Waterbrook Stage 1 construction process are not experienced, particularly as parking is already under heavy pressure from TAFE, commuters and residents 91 car parks is insufficient - Removal of 89 trees will ensure current green residential area is dominated by out of scale development - Facility appears likely for permanent residence, there will be no surgical procedures, hard to distinguish development from a nursing home/hostel	Validity of Land Use
11	15 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Construction of a building of this scale will have significant impacts on local residents - Developer ignored most DA conditions during construction of Waterbrook Stage 1 (issues of concern were construction, noise, dust, vibration, traffic and parking), developer should not be able to repeat this - Community day information included false, doctored and misleading photos and drawings which minimise impact on the community - Proposal contravenes local planning controls - Building is too high, overshadows surrounding properties and is not sufficiently setback to minimise impacts on surrounding properties - Impact on community would be reduced if building design was more compact, lower in height and with greater setbacks - Development will destroy property values and views - Likely developer will build structure under guise of "hospital" claim it unviable and turn building into an aged care facility - Development inconsistent with existing and draft LEP in terms of scale and density - FSR too high - Experience from Waterbrook Stage 1 is that all existing vegetation will be destroyed during construction and will be years before it is reinstated if at all	- Bulk & Scale - Developer History - EA Information - Height - Overshadowing - Setbacks - Property Values - Validity of Land Use - Density - FSR - Vegetation
12	16 Dec 08	Member of Public	Objection	- Concept of hospital/nursing home sensible for the site, however number of negative issues - Bulk and scale should be in keeping with area, it does not allow for slope nor reduce impact on neighbours - Café/restaurant while necessary would have long opening hours and noise should be contained - Removal of 89 mature trees is unnecessary, design should incorporate some of these - There is no evidence of a hospital bed licence - Unclear how parking for staff, trades people and visitors will be managed, given existing restrictions in area any development should contain all parking onsite - The applicant has a history of difficulty in sticking to rules, clear, appropriate and enforceable rules for management of construction are required	- Land Use - Bulk & Scale - Topography - Noise - Vegetation - Licensing - Parking - Developer History - Construction Management
13	17 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Height and FSR does not comply with draft LEP - Loss of amenity through loss of privacy, overshadowing and loss of views - Roof top café will cause noise - U-shape design and failure of building to step down slope exacerbates impacts adjoining properties - Loss of 89 trees will change the nature of the neighbourhood - No application has been made for a private hospital licence - Nield Ave is narrow and apartments on either side rely on it for access and egress, estimate of truck movements during construction is low. Maximum number of movements was exceeded for Waterbrook	- Height - FSR - Privacy - Overshadowing - Views - Noise - Building Design - Topography - Licensing - Traffic

				- Stage 1 and Innes Road is still waiting repairs - Narrow nature of Nield Ave may result in serious accidents during construction phase - Limited parking is available surrounding the site, it is proposed that construction workers will park on site, this never happened for Stage 1 - Unrealistic that construction workers will travel by public transport or pay for expensive public parking 89 or 91 (variously stated) car parks is inadequate for size of facility and in comparison to other hospitals - Emergency evacuation to the pathway along Morven Gardens has potential for accidents - Narrow access via Nield Ave is difficult for emergency vehicles - Existence of pressurised gases and hazardous chemicals in hospital pose greater threat than residences - Site lends itself more to townhouses or limited low rise apartments	- Construction Impacts - Vegetation - Car Parking - Emergency Considerations - Hazards - Neighbourhood Character
14	17 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Development is too high - Development breaches the FSR in draft LEP which must be followed to maintain property values and amenity - Scale of development is to maximise profits - Rooms will directly face and look into existing gardens, only limited design considerations have been made to protect privacy - Deep excavations close to large trees on boundaries will jeopardise trees which take years to grow back - Noise and damage to neighbouring properties during rock excavation could be significant during and after construction - Rooftop outdoor staff amenities could bring additional noise and raucous behaviour to residential areas	- Height - FSR - Bilk & Scale - Property Values - Overlooking - Earthworks - Vegetation - Noise - Construction Impacts
15	17 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Development will impact our property value, home and quality of life - Design is too big, bulky and high for the site and surrounds, the footprint needs to be reduced - Height and FSR does not comply with existing or draft LEP - Site is a transitional area between commercial and residential areas, design must recognise this - Design has made no attempt to step down slope - Overshadowing will result in loss of winter sun - Setback of 9m will reduce privacy and overpower/dominate existing views - Deletion of internal U courtyard would provide green around the site for dual enjoyment of residents and neighbours - More mature trees should be retained, removal of 89 trees is inappropriate - Rooftop café would reduce privacy and contribute to noise - Construction works should be limited to weekdays only - Construction will have impacts on parking, Construction Management Plan needs to be strictly enforced - Design does not respect existing neighbourhood character	- Property Values - Height - Bulk & Scale - FSR - Building Design - Topography - Overshadowing - Setbacks - Privacy - Views - Building Design - Vegetation - Noise - Construction Impacts - Neighbourhood Character
16	18 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Does not comply with existing or draft LEP zoning and objectives - Proposal is not a hospital and application should be referred back to Lane Cove Council - Height does not comply with existing or draft LEP - Existing views will be substantially reduced, reducing amenity - Proponent advised they will undertake view analysis for my unit and agreed to provide opportunity for further comment - FSR does not comply with existing or draft LEP - Provision of 91 car parking spaces is inadequate and will exacerbate existing chronic shortage in the area - Increased traffic flow will increase noise particularly given existing use is dwellings not hospital, construction vehicles and excavation will also increase noise - Rooftop café will create noise - Balconies will result in overlooking and reduce privacy	- Zoning - Validity of Land Use - Height - Views - FSR - Car Parking - Traffic - Noise - Overlooking - Privacy - Geotechnical - Conditions of Approval

				▪ Deep excavations are proposed in close proximity to existing buildings, the recommendations of the geotechnical report should be conditions of any approval ▪ Establishment of a residents liaison group for structural integrity issues and designated representative should be conditions of any approval	
17	18 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	▪ 7 storey height will reduce amenity by blocking light, number of trees to be removed and reduction in privacy for northern part of common property ▪ Proposal reduces property values ▪ Heights and FSR do not comply with LEP ▪ Internal courtyard occupies space that could be spread around outside of building and increase setbacks – this would alleviate shadowing and privacy concerns to some extent ▪ Construction will impact adjacent residential area and should be limited to weekdays	▪ Height ▪ Overshadowing ▪ Vegetation ▪ Privacy ▪ Property Values ▪ FSR ▪ Building Design ▪ Setbacks ▪ Construction Impacts
18	18 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	▪ Developer demonstrated little or no intentions of complying with conditions for Waterbrook Stage 1 ▪ Proposed 6-7 storey building will be totally out of character for the area ▪ Community consultation meetings advised there may be some 'inter-connectivity' or 'shared services' between Waterbrook Stage 1 and this proposal, but the exhibited documentation did not have any details on this – impacts of concern include traffic on Ridgeway driveway ▪ Surrounding residential streets will be impacted by increased traffic ▪ Documentation is unclear as to how parking is to be provided	▪ Developer History ▪ Height ▪ Neighbourhood Character ▪ Shared Uses ▪ Traffic ▪ Car Parking
19	18 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	▪ Increase in traffic will create safety issues given narrow width of Nield Avenue and concealed entry off Pacific Highway ▪ Nield Avenue has no footpaths, increase in traffic and pedestrian numbers will create safety issues ▪ Building height and proximity to existing boundaries will cause overshadowing and destroy the aspect from 11/200 Pacific Highway ▪ Application is for a licenced 79 bed hospital, it should not be 79 hospital beds plus 68 self-contained apartments – an attempt to circumvent local planning laws violated by proposal	▪ Traffic ▪ Safety ▪ Height ▪ Setbacks ▪ Overshadowing ▪ Views ▪ Validity of Land Use
20	18 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	▪ Character of area will change from residential, leafy, sunny and private to commercial, shadowy and busy ▪ Height is excessive, inconsistent with existing buildings and violates the draft LEP ▪ Design does not use natural landscape and step down the slope, resulting in overlooking into adjoining properties and loss of privacy ▪ Adjoining properties will be devalued ▪ Recommended maximum height of 3 storeys stepping down the slope ▪ FSR breaches draft LEP, design should be amended to reduce internal courtyard and increase setbacks ▪ FSR more consistent with LEP controls would reduce overshadowing and privacy impacts	▪ Neighbourhood Character ▪ Height ▪ Topography ▪ Overlooking & Privacy ▪ Property Values ▪ FSR ▪ Building Design ▪ Setbacks
21	18 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	▪ Height is out of character with existing 2 or 3 storey buildings in locality ▪ Height does not comply with Draft LEP controls ▪ Size of building is excessive ▪ A detailed study has not been carried out to assess construction impacts such as noise, dust, excavation on foundations of existing buildings in the vicinity of the site ▪ Developer should provide sound and dust shields for dwellings in vicinity of site, double glazing of dwellings may also be acceptable	▪ Height ▪ Neighbourhood Character ▪ Bulk & Scale ▪ Construction Impacts
22	18 Dec 08	Local Landowner	Objection	▪ Height is inappropriate and not consistent with existing or draft LEP controls ▪ Excessive height is unacceptable in residential area and will result in loss of amenity and views ▪ Development does not comply with existing or draft LEP residential zoning ▪ Size and bulk of building does not respect neighbourhood amenity ▪ Building should be redesigned to take advantage of the slope and reduce height to 3-4 storeys (12-15m) with lower height in south and south west where slope is steep ▪ Proposed café will obtain views lost by residents and create noise impacts for adjoining residents	▪ Height ▪ Views ▪ Zoning ▪ Bulk & Scale ▪ Building Design ▪ Topography ▪ Vegetation ▪ Construction Impacts

				- Removal of 89 trees is unacceptable and will impact 'green' character of neighbourhood - On site drilling may impact foundations of adjoining buildings and extra storeys will require extra excavation - Development will add to existing congestion on Nield Avenue due to narrow width - No illegal parking or construction work outside of designated hours should be permitted, a more rigorous Construction Management Plan is required and should be adhered to - Number of car parks is inadequate and will increase pressure in area which has a shortage of car parks - Site is suitable for residential development	- Traffic - Car Parking
23	18 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Incorrect information in the EA on permitted building height for the site under the draft LEP - Conflicting information as to nature of the proposal - Limited and conflicting evidence of community benefit - Building does not meet current or proposed planning guidelines (zoning, non-residential development in residential areas, height, FSR) - Excessive building height, bulk and scale compared to surrounds - Unacceptable privacy impacts - Failure of building to follow topography of site - Inadequate setbacks to southern boundary - Rooftop café/terrace issues, should be relocated at ground level - Inadequate attention to view sharing principles - Inadequate and misleading visual impact studies - Inadequate or unspecified erosion control measures - Tree protection measures inadequately defined, particularly for trees 45 and 104 - Unrealistic assessment of traffic/parking impacts during construction, Waterbrook Stage 1 parking should be used for construction vehicle parking - Location of a 'suitable remote holding area' for trucks is not defined - No assessment of traffic impact on surrounding residential streets, likely accidents will increase - Inadequate communication and consultation with community - Inadequate access to scale model to assist community consider proposal - A number of approval conditions suggested – refer to submission for full details	- EA Information - Height - Bulk & Scale - Privacy - Topography - Setbacks - Hospital Uses - Views - Erosion - Vegetation - Traffic - Community Consultation
24	19 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Proximity to Waterbrook Stage 1 and joint ownership lead to conclusion that proposal is an extension of the existing aged care facility and not a hospital - Loss of 92 trees and limited planting opportunities will detrimentally impact existing green character and is contrary to clause 2 of the existing LEP - Landscape plan does not cater for loss of several large canopy trees and associated habitat - Development does not comply with the objectives of the residential 2(b1) zone under the existing LEP, particularly that scale of non-residential developments must be consistent with the preferred form of development being townhouses and villas - Development will be foreign, dominating and unsympathetic and will alter residential character - Building should be reduced in height and bulk and respect existing built and physical forms in locality - Narrow access, no footpaths and increased traffic will create dangerous conditions both in Nield Avenue and on Pacific Highway and result in vehicular conflicts 89 car parks is not suitable for scale of development and existing residential streets are not suitable to accommodate additional vehicles - Bicycle parking is not provided - Design of basement car park problematic given location of emergency parking and loading zone - Distances between basement car parks and lifts are excessive, require a dangerous travel route and not sympathetic to needs of hospital - Road design not adequate for emergency vehicles and evacuation	- Validity of Land Use - Vegetation - Landscaping - Zoning - Neighbourhood Character - Height - Bulk and Scale - Traffic - Car Parking - Overshadowing - Overlooking - Light Spill - Setbacks - Building Design - Property Values - Construction Impacts

				- Shadow diagrams are inaccurate - Building will result in significant overshadowing, overlooking and light spill for 6 Morven Gardens - Building height and setback should be amended to reduce impacts including removal of central courtyard with plantings provided in the setback - Solid bamboo screens of adequate height should be erected to prevent overlooking into all adjoining properties, uninterrupted windows to dining areas and all windows facing 6 Morven Gardens should be deleted - Height is greater than existing buildings in locality and does not comply with the existing or draft LEP, building should be redesigned to take account of slope and height of existing buildings - Existing vegetation on adjoining properties should not be relied on for screening purposes - Terrace and dining areas should be relocated away from adjoining dwellings to reduce noise impacts - Large plant room will cause noise and should be relocated away from south west boundary to location which will not impact adjoining dwellings - Development of a hospital will have a detrimental impact on property values - Excavation, building works, dust and odours will impact surrounding residents	
25	19 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Leafy and private outlook will be lost - Value of unit will be reduced substantially - Loss of light and ventilation - Car parking in locality is currently inadequate - Noise from ambulances will be increased - Existing congestion of private driveways on Pacific Highway from drivers looking for Nield Avenue will be exacerbate and traffic delayed	- Neighbourhood Character - Views - Privacy - Property Values - Overshadowing - Car Parking - Noise - Traffic
26	19 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Height and size is too great for location and will result in loss of light, views and privacy - Lane Cove Council are seeking to retain the areas coherence and 'low key' atmosphere - Height should be reduced to 3-5 storeys to mirror neighbouring buildings - Construction excavations, machine rooms/air conditioning, rooftop terrace and increased traffic will create noise impacts close to existing homes - Area has limited car parking in high demand and limited car parking is being provided on site - Heavy traffic flow during development and operation will be detrimental to surrounding residents	- Height - Bulk & Scale - Overshadowing - Views - Privacy - Neighbourhood Character - Noise - Car Parking - Traffic
27	19 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Private hospital is unnecessary given site's proximity to a number of hospitals, development is not needed - Appears less than 25% of Stage 1 Waterbrook is sold and proposal is a sweetener to sell more units - Proposal requires full time professional staff which are already in short supply in the area - Funding concerns given high portion of Stage 1 Waterbrook is unsold - Objection to liquor licence for Waterbrook restaurant - Building is too high and exceeds existing LEP, will interfere with amenity, views and accessibility - Traffic and parking issues will be worse than Waterbrook Stage 1 - Noise such as waste removal and security of dementia patients will impact quiet residential area	- Demand & Staffing - Funding - Liquor Licensing - Height - Views - Traffic - Car Parking - Noise
28	19 Dec 08	Local Resident (proforma)	Objection	- Height does not comply with existing or draft LEP - FSR exceeds existing and draft LEP - Insufficient car parks are proposed and existing shortage of car parking in locality will be made worse - Noise generated by construction and operation of 147 bed hospital with rooftop café will substantially increase from existing levels - Foundations of adjoining buildings may be damaged due to close proximity of extensive excavations - Proposal should be amended to comply with LEP requirements to respect amenity of existing residences	- Height - FSR - Car Parking - Noise - Construction Impacts
29	19 Dec 08	Local Resident (proforma)	Objection	- Height does not comply with existing or draft LEP - FSR exceeds existing and draft LEP	- Height - FSR

				▪ Insufficient car parks are proposed and the existing shortage of car parking in locality will be made worse ▪ Noise generated by construction and operation of 147 bed hospital with rooftop café will substantially increase from existing levels ▪ Foundations of adjoining buildings may be damaged due to close proximity of extensive excavations ▪ Proposal should be amended to comply with LEP requirements to respect amenity of existing residences	▪ Car Parking ▪ Noise ▪ Construction Impacts ▪ LEP requirements
30	19 Dec 08	Local Resident (proforma)	Objection	▪ Height does not comply with existing or draft LEP ▪ FSR exceeds existing and draft LEP ▪ Insufficient car parks are proposed and existing shortage of car parking in locality will be made worse ▪ Noise generated by construction and operation of 147 bed hospital with rooftop café will substantially increase from existing levels ▪ Foundations of adjoining buildings may be damaged due to close proximity of extensive excavations ▪ Proposal should be amended to comply with LEP requirements to respect amenity of existing residences	▪ Height ▪ FSR ▪ Car Parking ▪ Noise ▪ Construction Impacts
31	19 Dec 08	Local Resident (proforma)	Objection	▪ Height does not comply with existing or draft LEP ▪ FSR exceeds existing and draft LEP ▪ Insufficient car parks are proposed and the existing shortage of car parking in locality will be made worse ▪ Noise generated by construction and operation of 147 bed hospital with rooftop café will substantially increase from existing levels ▪ Foundations of adjoining buildings may be damaged due to close proximity of extensive excavations ▪ Height and bulk will obliterate existing views and impact property value and amenity ▪ Proposal should be amended to comply with LEP requirements to respect amenity of existing residences	▪ Height ▪ FSR ▪ Car Parking ▪ Noise ▪ Construction Impacts ▪ Views ▪ Property Values
32	19 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	▪ Developer paid little attention to Lane Cove Council conditions of approval for Waterbrook Stage 1 ▪ Draft LEP contains realistic height and FSR controls for transitional location between flats on highway and detached dwellings ▪ Height is inappropriate and contrary to draft LEP ▪ No effort has been made to step building down slope ▪ Screening trees for surrounding residents questionable given lack of tree retention for Waterbrook Stage 1 ▪ Balustrades off rooms will impact privacy of adjoining residential properties, also unclear why balustrades required for dementia patient rooms ▪ Parking is a major local issue and number car parks does not seem enough for size of development ▪ Waterbrook Stage 1 experienced access difficulties off Pacific Highway due to traffic and have changed address to Ulonga Avenue, likely this proposal will experience same issues due to narrow access road ▪ Community presentations gave ambiguous information on number and type of beds to that in the EA ▪ Does not comply with zoning established to maintain amenity ▪ Height will impact shadowing of adjoining properties, views and privacy	▪ Developer History ▪ Height ▪ FSR ▪ Neighbourhood Character ▪ Topography ▪ Landscaping ▪ Overlooking ▪ Car Parking ▪ Traffic ▪ Hospital Land Use ▪ Zoning ▪ Overshadowing ▪ Views ▪ Privacy
33	19 Dec 08	Local Resident		▪ Building is too high and will overshadow garden and habitable rooms ▪ Loss of privacy as residents will look directly into our lounge and bedroom ▪ While DoP are considering application for hospital Waterbrook will turn it into a nursing home ▪ Building should be scaled down at least one floor and setback further ▪ Land is within a residential neighbourhood and is not a commercial site	▪ Height ▪ Overshadowing ▪ Overlooking/Privacy ▪ Validity of Land Use ▪ Setbacks ▪ Neighbourhood Character
34	19 Dec 08	Local Community Group	Objection	▪ Many alternative forms of residential development are suitable for the site ▪ Development does not comply with current zoning objectives, particularly 1(c) and (d) ▪ There are many examples of residential and non-residential development in residential zones of up to 2-3 storeys that would be more compatible ▪ Development does not comply with proposed zoning in the draft LEP, particularly height and FSR and objective 2(b) ▪ Residents of a number of buildings on Pacific Highway and surrounding allotments will lose views ▪ Development should be designed in conformity with buildings in the 'transition zone', being land to the	▪ Zoning ▪ Height ▪ FSR ▪ Views ▪ Neighbourhood Character ▪ Bulk & Scale ▪ Topography ▪ Licensing ▪ Hospital Land Use

				north west, west and south east 17G Bellevue Avenue and 6 Morven Gardens will be worst affected by the sheer height and excessive bulk of the proposal, but numerous other dwellings on Bellevue Avenue, Wisdom Road and Morven Gardens will also be affected - Development should step down the slope more sympathetically to existing dwellings located to the south and south west, in keeping with development on adjoining sites stepping down to RL 90 in keeping with the change in ground level, with an overall maximum height of 15m and broken up into smaller buildings - There is no evidence of an application for a private hospital licence - There is no indication how the 'high-level health care' component would be managed, accept that admittance would not be as residents - There is no explanation as to how the bed type ratio will be maintained or how changes made to this ratio - Scepticism that proposed use is predominantly a hospital and will continued to be maintained as such - Documentation does not indicate how the proposal will tie in with the existing Waterbrook - Urban Design Report does not justify why height and FSR have been exceeded to the extent proposed - Photomontages use photos that make proposed development appear distant from photo point - Due to height surrounding properties will suffer loss of amenity and consequent value - Severe view impacts are exacerbated by the unbroken façade of over 60m, with 2 wings extending nearly 40m, there has been little effort to break up building and reduce overall impact - Overshadowing would be an issue, however a reduction in building height would have considerable benefit in reducing impacts - Existing treed outlook is to be replaced with a 6 storey building - U shaped design with an extensive internal garden exacerbates impacts on adjoining properties and due to orientation the garden will receive little sun, with virtually none in winter – if building stepped down slope more appropriately (wings 3-4 storeys) internal and external overshadowing would be reduced - Height non compliance of rooftop terrace/café will gain views at expense of surrounding properties losing existing views - Kitchen at east corner of building is close to the adjoining residential flat building and will have impacts of noise, hours of operation and plant machinery – there is no indication how these impacts will be minimised 24 hour lighting required for hospitals would impact adjoining neighbours - Access from Pacific Highway via Nield Avenue which is steep is not ideal for a hospital - Likely that vehicles existing Nield Avenue and heading south will use residential streets and increase traffic - Short term/pick up parking at the entrance is limited and will result in traffic hold ups - Garbage pick up area is behind 200 Pacific Highway, residents will be impacted by noise and collection times should be conditioned - Development will increase pressure on the surrounding already limited on-street parking 89 trees are to be removed and excessive height of building will dominate the currently green leafy area - Height of screen plantings are so large it could be 10-20 years before such heights are reached - Construction traffic and access will create impacts similar to Waterbrook Stage 1 (deliveries, illegal parking, outside of hours work) at which time residents concerns were not resolved quickly, a more rigorous Construction Management Plan is required with adequate methods for dealing with any non-compliance - Deep excavations will be extremely close to boundaries, strictly controlled hours are required - Is the stormwater easement sufficient to drain the entire site and ensure dwellings downstream are not affected by flooding	- Property Values - Building Design - Overshadowing - Light Spill - Traffic - Noise - Car Parking - Vegetation - Construction Impacts - Stormwater/ Flooding
35	19 Dec 08	Local Resident	Support	Support for the proposal	N/A
36	19 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Building is too large and bulky for residential location where buildings are 2-4 storeys, it will tower over adjacent residential development - Use of Part 3A process for 7 storey building with outrageous FSR is preposterous - Questionable whether building can be a hospital when only 79 suites are to be registered beds with a little	- Height - Scale & Bulk - Part 3A Process - FSR - Validity of Land Use

				- less than half the building – 68 suites potentially being leased for accommodation - Car parking provision is inadequate with high likelihood of overflow street parking which is already inadequate for residents - Truck movements and traffic control issues are not included in the EA, given condition breeches for Waterbrook Stage 1 details of truck movements and traffic control should be made public	- Car Parking - Traffic - Construction Impacts - Developer History
37	19 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	- Possibility end use may not be a hospital, but commercial tie-in with Waterbrook Stage 1 - Existing locality offered peace and quiet to residents - No evidence suggests a valid application has been made for a private hospital - Development does not comply with current zoning or draft LEP height controls and zone objectives - Bulk, scale and traffic generation would not respect existing amenity of residences in neighbourhood - Serious shortfall in number of car parks to be provided - Narrow and restricted left turn only access to Nield Avenue presents increase in safety issues as well traffic circling the surrounding residential streets - Access to Morven Gardens laneway was restricted for 2 years during construction of Waterbrook Stage 1 even though the developer promised it wouldn't be, unlikely restricting of neighbourhood access will change for this proposal - Serious concerns about damage to foundations of existing buildings on adjoining lots due to extensive excavations close to foundations, Geotechnical Investigation Report does not make specific recommendations rather vague statements as to what 'should' occur - Height and bulk will result in loss of views, previous leafy green outlook will be dominated by tall bulky structure, landscaping can not be considered a substitute - Substantial impacts on property values and amenity	- Validity of Land Use - Neighbourhood Character - Licensing - Height - Zoning - Bulk & Scale - Traffic - Car Parking - Developer History - Construction Impacts - Geotechnical - Views - Neighbourhood Character - Property Values
38	19 Dec 08	Local Community Group	Objection	- Exhibition period coincided with traditionally hectic time which may have impacted ability of community members to make submissions - Information about the public information campaign was limited - Date of Community Information Day coincided with largest community event on Greenwich calendar (Greenwich Village Games), an unfortunate clash for which some Waterbrook representatives must have been aware given it provided a shuttle bus throughout Greenwich for the Village Games - A model and explanatory information were not placed on permanent display during the exhibition period - Need for the facility is questionable, there are several other existing facilities offering services proposed - An additional facility may impact on the funding of the Lower North Shore Area Health Service, the NSW Government public hospital funding formula includes supply of private hospitals as a key factor in determining hospital funding, an additional hospital may further reduce funds to the RNSH which is already under funded - Development is incompatible with the existing and draft LEP - Residential 2(b1) zone permits non residential developments that are of compatible scale with surrounds, the proposal falls outside of these principles - Zone R4 High Density Residential under the draft LEP requires developments to respect amenity of neighbouring residences, the development fails to meet this requirement - Need for hospital accommodation in the Lane Cove Area was not identified during preparation of draft LEP - Height and FSR do not comply with draft LEP - Height combined with slope of land will result in a visually dominant building with overlooking and overshadowing far greater than would result from a 12m high building permitted under existing LEP - U shaped design will create an internal courtyard which is overshadowed by two large wings - U shaped design has possibly forced the building closer to boundaries and amenity of adjoining residents appears to be compromised - Rooftop terrace/café may lead to noise due to elevation and loss of privacy for units at Bellevue Avenue 89 trees are to be removed from an existing leafy area, while additional plantings are proposed such undertakings are difficult to enforce and plantings can be incompatible with existing vegetation	- Exhibition Period - Community Consultation - Demand - Impacts on Existing Hospitals - Zoning - Height - FSR - Topography - Overlooking/Privacy - Overshadowing - Building Design - Setbacks - Hospital Land Uses - Noise - Vegetation

39	19 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	▪ Height and scale of development is unacceptable and will obliterate existing views ▪ Removal of visual amenity and replacement with large building will impact property values ▪ Loss of solar access and overshadowing ▪ Removal of privacy with overlooking into living and sleeping areas ▪ External night lighting will shine directly into existing dwelling ▪ Hospital development does not comply with existing residential zoning ▪ Steep slope of land can not be considered practical for hospital grounds ▪ Rooftop terrace/café will obtain views but result in loss of existing residential views and create amenity issues such as noise due to elevation ▪ Existing much needed on street car parking is to be removed with no plans or alternatives proposed ▪ Development is out of character for transitional location between highway and detached dwellings	▪ Height ▪ Bulk & Scale ▪ Views ▪ Overshadowing ▪ Overlooking/Privacy ▪ Light Spill ▪ Zoning ▪ Topography ▪ Hospital Land Uses ▪ Noise ▪ Car Parking ▪ Neighbourhood Character
40	19 Dec 08	Council Resident	Objection	▪ EA selectively quotes from Council codes for example stating there are no height limits in the LEP, however these are in the DCP ▪ Exhibition prior to Christmas was not desirable ▪ Height will have an unacceptable impact on neighbours including loss of amenity, views and reduced property values ▪ No attempt has been made to design a building that steps down the steep slope reducing the height to 3-4 storeys (12-15m) instead of 6-7 storeys ▪ Rooftop terrace/café would obtain views but result in loss of views and privacy for units in Bellevue Avenue ▪ Elevated rooftop terrace/café would create amenity issues such as noise ▪ FSR is significantly greater than surrounding developments ▪ 80 trees are to be removed and excessive height of building will dominate the currently green leafy area ▪ U shaped building design exacerbates impacts on adjoining properties ▪ Parking provision seems low and could result in increased pressure on car parks in the area which are already under pressure ▪ Construction traffic and access will create significant problems as occurred with Waterbrook Stage 1 ▪ Site is entirely suitable for residential development	▪ EA Information ▪ Public Exhibition ▪ Height ▪ Views ▪ Property Values ▪ Topography ▪ Hospital Land Uses ▪ Privacy ▪ Noise ▪ FSR ▪ Vegetation ▪ Neighbourhood Character ▪ Building Design ▪ Car Parking ▪ Construction Impacts
41	22 Dec 08	Local Resident	Objection	▪ Proximity to Waterbrook Stage 1 and joint ownership lead to conclusion that proposal is an extension of the existing aged care facility and not a hospital ▪ Loss of 92 trees and limited planting opportunities will detrimentally impact existing green character and is contrary to clause 2 of the existing LEP ▪ Landscape plan does not cater for loss of several large canopy trees and associated habitat ▪ Development does not comply with the objectives of the residential 2(b1) zone under the existing LEP, particularly the scale of non-residential developments must be consistent with the preferred form of development being townhouses and villas ▪ Building should be reduced in height and bulk and respect existing built and physical forms in locality ▪ Development will be foreign, dominating and unsympathetic and will alter residential character ▪ Narrow access, no footpaths and increased traffic will create dangerous conditions both in Nield Avenue and on Pacific Highway and result in vehicular conflicts ▪ 89 car parks is not suitable for development of this scale and existing residential streets are not suitable to accommodate additional vehicles ▪ Bicycle parking is not provided ▪ Design of basement car park problematic given location of emergency parking and loading zone ▪ Distances between basement car parks and lifts are excessive, require a dangerous travel route and not sympathetic to needs of hospital ▪ Road design not adequate for emergency vehicles and evacuation ▪ Building will dominate 17G Bellevue Avenue both in height and bulk and compromise the existing	▪ Validity of Land Use ▪ Vegetation ▪ Landscaping ▪ Zoning ▪ Neighbourhood Character ▪ Height ▪ Bulk and Scale ▪ Traffic ▪ Car Parking ▪ Setbacks ▪ Overshadowing ▪ Overlooking ▪ Topography ▪ Building Design ▪ Noise ▪ Light Spill ▪ Property Values ▪ Construction Impacts

				vegetated outlook ▪ Building should be redesigned to reduce height to allow transition from residential dwellings to flat building (no greater than 2 storeys at rear); overall size should be reduced to avoid long elevations facing adjoining properties; and setback increased to allow space for additional plantings ▪ Number of beds should be reduced to reduce overall size of development and potential traffic movements ▪ Shadow diagrams are inaccurate ▪ Building will result in significant overshadowing and overlooking of 17G Bellevue Avenue ▪ Height is excessive and does not respond to the slope, should be amended to height compatible with adjoining development and to be more responsive to natural ground level ▪ Height reduction would reduce impacts such as overshadowing, overlooking and visual bulk ▪ Development does not recognise and take into account adjoining development, it simply maximises development on the site ▪ Dining and terrace areas will cause noise impacts and should be relocated away from adjoining dwellings ▪ Large plant room will cause noise and should be relocated away from south west boundary to a central location which will not impact adjoining dwellings ▪ Light from hospital use will impact 17G Bellevue Avenue, the southern ends of Ward A and B should not contain any windows to public areas such as hallways or dining areas to prevent light spill ▪ Development of a hospital will have a detrimental impact on property values ▪ Central courtyard will receive little sun which will effect viability of landscaping, the design also forces the building to have small setbacks, better to concentrate building in the centre of the site to maximise setbacks to adjoining properties ▪ Excavation, building works, dust and odours will impact surrounding residents	
42	22 Dec 08	Local Resident (proforma)	Objection	▪ Height does not comply with existing or draft LEP ▪ FSR exceeds existing and draft LEP ▪ Insufficient car parks are proposed and the existing shortage of car parking in locality will be made worse ▪ Noise generated by construction and operation of 147 bed hospital with rooftop café will substantially increase from existing levels ▪ Foundations of adjoining buildings may be damaged due to close proximity of extensive excavations ▪ Proposal should be amended to comply with LEP requirements to respect amenity of existing residences	▪ Height ▪ FSR ▪ Car Parking ▪ Noise ▪ Construction Impacts
43	22 Dec 08	Local Resident (proforma)	Objection	▪ Height does not comply with existing or draft LEP ▪ FSR exceeds existing and draft LEP ▪ Insufficient car parks are proposed and the existing shortage of car parking in locality will be made worse ▪ Noise generated by construction and operation of 147 bed hospital with rooftop café will substantially increase from existing levels ▪ Foundations of adjoining buildings may be damaged due to close proximity of extensive excavations ▪ Proposal should be amended to comply with LEP requirements to respect amenity of existing residences	▪ Height ▪ FSR ▪ Car Parking ▪ Noise ▪ Construction Impacts
44	22 Dec 08	Local Resident (proforma)	Objection	▪ Height does not comply with existing or draft LEP ▪ FSR exceeds existing and draft LEP ▪ Insufficient car parks are proposed and the existing shortage of car parking in locality will be made worse ▪ Noise generated by construction and operation of 147 bed hospital with rooftop café will substantially increase from existing levels ▪ Balconies along the front of the building will result in overlooking and reduced privacy ▪ Foundations of adjoining buildings may be damaged due to close proximity of extensive excavations ▪ Height and bulk will obliterate existing views and impact property value and amenity ▪ Removal of 89 trees including large indigenous trees will transform a previously green outlook to one dominated by a tall and bulky building ▪ Proposal should be amended to comply with LEP requirements to respect amenity of existing residences	▪ Height ▪ FSR ▪ Car Parking ▪ Noise ▪ Construction Impacts ▪ Views ▪ Vegetation

45	22 Dec 08	Local Resident (proforma)	Objection	▪ Height does not comply with existing or draft LEP ▪ FSR exceeds existing and draft LEP ▪ Insufficient car parks are proposed and the existing shortage of car parking in locality will be made worse ▪ Noise generated by construction and operation of 147 bed hospital with rooftop café will substantially increase from existing levels ▪ Balconies along the front of the building will result in overlooking and reduced privacy ▪ Foundations of adjoining buildings may be damaged due to close proximity of extensive excavations ▪ Height and bulk will obliterate existing views and impact property value and amenity ▪ Removal of 89 trees including large indigenous trees will transform a previously green outlook to one dominated by a tall and bulky building ▪ Proposal should be amended to comply with LEP requirements to respect amenity of existing residences	▪ Height ▪ FSR ▪ Car Parking ▪ Noise ▪ Construction Impacts ▪ Views ▪ Vegetation
46	23 Dec 08	Council Resident	Objection	▪ Building height and proximity to existing boundaries will impact surrounding residents in terms of outlook and overshadowing ▪ 89 car parks is insufficient for size of development and hospital land use ▪ Existing lack of car parking in locality will be exacerbated ▪ Consideration should be given to allocation of public land for a small park to compensate for negative impacts of proposed development and Waterbrook Stage 1	▪ Height ▪ Setbacks ▪ Views ▪ Overshadowing ▪ Car Parking

Part B – Agency submissions

No.	Date recd	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Issues Raised
1	3 Dec 08 & 18 Dec 08	Department of Environment and Climate Change	Comment	- Project is not a scheduled activity under provisions of Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 and does not require licensing under that Act - Proponent and its contractors must ensure facilities are constructed and operated in accordance with the general environment protection provisions of the environment protection legislation - Vegetation highly modified given urban environment, however there are a number of mature Eucalypts which may be remnants of (critically) endangered ecological communities - Compensatory measures proposed (replacing 7 native trees with 2 times the number of native trees) is unlikely to improve the biodiversity values at the site unless there an attempt to reinstate a viable area of remnant Forest and actively manage it – this would involve retaining as many remnant Blue Gums and Blue Gum-Bangalay hybrids as possible and where this in not possible collecting and propagating seeds from the trees to be removed for replating on the site - Species for compensatory plantings are suitable along with other mid-storey and ground cover species which are components of STIF or BGHF (critically) endangered ecological communities - Vegetation in south west corner of the site (Area C) has most potential for rehabilitation both in terms of native species present and potential connectivity to Lane Cove Bushland Park and Gore Hill Reserve. Maintaining and improving the condition of this vegetation with active management and supplementary planting would assist in controlling runoff into the two reserves - Suggest development footprint (Ward B) should be pulled back from south west edge of the site to maintain or increase the size of the remnant in Area C, this would enhance the long term viability of the remnant and likely success of any rehabilitation works	- Environmental Protection Legislation - Vegetation - Landscaping/Replanting
2	15 Dec 08	NSW Health (NSCCAHS)	Comment	- Concerned with impacts to RNSH with a substantial increase in numbers of frail and medically unstable residents within close proximity - Even though there is a reported shortage of dementia specific nursing homes, this facility will not be available to the general population as beds will not be Commonwealth funded – only those that can afford it will be admitted - Appendix 13a report misrepresented the results in the Booz Allen Hamilton report of 2007 by concluding that “aged care facilities do not increase referrals to emergency departments” - Suggestion that RNSH could make use of facilities ignores the following: - model for care in general medical ward is outdated as most of these are now provided in patient’s home with appropriate community support - access will only be for fee paying patients and NSCCAHS would not fund them separately - no shortage for public inpatient rehabilitation in the local catchment area	- Impact to RNSH - Affordability - Exhibition Material
3	19 Dec 08	Energy Australia	Comment	- Likely development will require one or more distribution substations and associated easements and high and low voltage cabling to supply its electrical load - To determine detailed supply arrangements EnergyAustralia will need detailed maximum demand calculations - Proponent needs to ensure that siting of any substation or associated infrastructure complies with all relevant standards and legislation and does not interfere/adversely affect hospital operation, equipment, staff, patients or members of the public - Supply arrangements discussed in S4.3.9 and S5 of the EA are based on a previous proposal for a general aged care facility and are no longer valid. The need to be reassessed as stated above - Low voltage cabling provided to Morven Gardens was in no way related to the future connectivity for the development - EnergyAustralia own network assets in the portion of Nield Avenue that is to be closed/redeveloped and EnergyAustralia will require easements over, and heavy vehicle access to its assets while they are in situ. Easements are typically 7m wide - Upon permanent removal of the assets EnergyAustralia will agree to relinquish the easement(s)/right of way	- Electricity Infrastructure - Easements

				EnergyAustralia assets in Nield Avenue are required to supply electricity to properties in Nield Avenue and to provide public lighting they may only be removed after satisfying EnergyAustralia requirements	
4	19 Dec 08	Lane Cove Council	Comment	- Controls/issues which should be considered in assessment are: - Existing LEP provisions including zone objectives 1(a) – (c) - Draft LEP provisions including FSR, height limits and zone objectives - Traffic issues and adequacy of car parking - Suitability of waste/garbage removal - Impacts on substantial trees subject to Council's Tree Preservation Order - Consideration under the Crime Prevention through Environmental Design guidelines - Application of Council's S94 Contributions Plan - Issues raised by residents during notification of 2007 proposal lodged with Council and subsequently withdrawn – full summary of issues provided in submission - Suggested amendments: - Reduce height to 3 floors, not higher than neighbouring Waterbrook - Public parkland surrounding site with walking path around entirety - Onsite parking for all construction workers/tradesmen during construction process with overflow accommodated in Waterbrook underground car park - After completion all parking to be provided for all permanent and temporary staff, visiting doctors, health care professionals and visitors to residents/patients	- Existing & Draft LEPs - Height - FSR - Zoning - Traffic - Infrastructure/Contributions - Vegetation - Safety - Community Consultation - Public Access - Construction Impacts - Car Parking
5	22 Dec 08	Ministry of Transport	Comment	- Traffic and Parking Report does not justify the proposed parking rates against existing levels of public transport or the objectives of major State Government policies - Proposed workplace travel plan (WPT) should aim to achieve a journey to work mode share of 25%, consistent with Priority S6 of the State Plan – 5 travel demand management initiatives which could be considered for inclusion in the WPT are outlined in submission	- Car Parking - Workplace Travel Plan
6	16 Jan 09	Roads & Traffic Authority	Comment	- Design of car parking should be in accordance with Australian Standards for heavy vehicle usage - Access ramp to underground car parking should be in accordance with AS2890.1-2004 - Curved ramp must accommodate the largest vehicle which will use the loading facility - Car parking provision must be to the Department and Council's satisfaction - Visitor and staff car parks should be clearly marked - Sight lines to pedestrians and other vehicles around the carpark or entrances should not be compromised - Consideration should be given to bicycle parking - Consideration should be given to encouraging non-car modes of travel - Council should review parking restrictions in Nield Avenue, via the local traffic committee - No Stopping signs should be installed on both sides of Nield Avenue immediately south of access driveways servicing units fronting Pacific Highway - Hammerhead turn around at front of hospital should be designed so that cars not wishing to enter the hospital can turn easily to re-enter the Highway. No parking should be permitted on hammerhead - Clear priority to the main internal intersection should be defined through line marking and Give Way signs - Disability requirements must be accommodated on Morven Gardens laneway, without impacting current cycling arrangements - All vehicles should enter and exit site in forward direction - All demolition and construction vehicles should be accommodated on site - Development should be designed to mitigate road traffic noise from Pacific Highway - All works/signposting associated with the development are to be at no cost to the RTA	- Car Parking - Access - Bicycle Parking - Modes of Transport - Traffic Management
7	19 Jan 09	Sydney Water	Comment	- Developer must obtain a Section 73 Certificate from Sydney Water - Developer must fund any adjustments required to Sydney Water infrastructure resulting from the development	- Sydney Water Approvals - Fire Fighting - Vegetation

				▪ Discharge of trade waste into Sydney Water's wastewater systems requires written permission ▪ Assessment of fire fighting capability is the responsibility of the applicant and should be carried out separately ▪ Tree species identified by Sydney Water that can cause water pipe damage should be considered in proposed landscaping	
--	--	--	--	--	--