



## Response to Submissions Table, prepared by Urbis

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<b>Darren Miller</b> <b>4 Cooper St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	The development is completely overscaled for heritage Paddington	Inconsistent scale with heritage Paddington	2
	Overlooking will occur into my property from the additional level along Stephen Street at Cooper Street corner	Overlooking will occur into my property	3
	Addition does not relate to existing heritage of the lower side of Cooper Street	Addition does not relate to existing heritage of the lower side of Cooper Street	15
	4 Cooper St, which is adjacent to the Cooper/Stephen St corner of the redevelopment is not indicated on any of the assessment diagrams. It is like my house does not exist. Well I do exist and it is not for their assessment because my house is a small single storey to street frontage 1800s heritage cottage which is adjacent to a proposed massive overscaled hospital wing along Stephen Street with an additional storey overlooking my backyard.	4 Cooper St, which is adjacent to the Cooper/Stephen St corner of the redevelopment is not indicated on any of the assessment diagrams	4
	I don't object to a redevelopment of the Scottish Hospital but I do object to an overscaled redevelopment that is trying to deceive NSW Planning with a report that does not show all of the facts and just leaves off small single storey dwellings from their report because clearly it does not work adjacent to an over scaled hospital wing.	object to an overscaled redevelopment that is trying to deceive NSW Planning with a report that does not show all of the facts and just leaves off small single storey dwellings from their report because clearly it does not work adjacent to an over scaled hospital wing	2, 4
	The new wing along Stephen St directly impacts our property <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The additional storey, L7 of the Stephen St wing, will cast a new shadowing across my backyard over my swimming pool at 3pm at</li> </ul>	Additional overshadowing in midwinter  Increased overlooking into private backyard and rooms from the	5, 3, 7

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>the winter solstice</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The large areas of south eastern windows and large wrap around terrace on Level 7 will overlook our backyard and into our bedroom and bathroom windows along our north western elevation.</li> <li>The creation of the service access to the top of Stephen St will create traffic noise from service trucks entering and leaving, up to our backyard, especially because of the natural amphitheatre to the top of Stephen St.</li> </ul>	<p>RACF</p> <p>New service entry will create additional noise impacts to the backyard</p>	
	<p>I have several major concerns of the development in general</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The whole justification of the massive over scaled development is the height reference to the surrounding unit towers. This reference is totally played down and in the case of my single storey street fronted cottage, completely omitted. The unit towers were an unfortunate over development of the 60s and 70s. They are a complete eye sore to the low scale heritage of the surrounding terrace buildings.</li> <li>The justification flies in the face of the significant heritage fabric of Paddington especially the original heritage component of the project. The development should respect the overall heritage scale of all of Paddington and not measure itself against a few surrounding unit towers.</li> </ul>	<p>Height reference to surrounding towers flies in the face of the significant heritage fabric of Paddington especially the original heritage component of the project</p>	10
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The siting of the development is poorly thought through. The relationship of the building to the topography is poor in both the external siting and internal outlook. There is little in the way of developed sections to show or help improve ways the development integrates into its surrounds.</li> </ul>	<p>The relationship of the building to the topography is poor in both the external siting and internal outlook.</p>	11
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new wings are pushed out to the surrounding streets in an attempt to reproduce the original landscaped terraces of the original grand home. This siting of the new wings only creates long multi-storey blocks along the surrounding residential streets with minimum setbacks. This scale of building planes of up to 5 &amp; 6 storeys high along the boundary line is something you expect to</li> </ul>	<p>This siting of the new wings only creates long multi-storey blocks along the surrounding residential streets with minimum setbacks.</p>	11

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>see along major arterial roads. But to see it along a small residential street is just crazy.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No wonder the architect's perspective along Stephen St has lots of new tall trees shown in front to 'soften' the sheer vertical plan of the building.</li> <li>Unfortunately all the original taller trees along this street will be lost during construction.</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development's relationship to the original heritage component of the Scottish Hospital is completely non-existent. The siting relationship is very poor to the eastern side of the Scottish Hospital to the new Stephen St wing. The single storey 1900 pitch roof wing abuts a two storey contemporary box with the new two storey box out scaling the original heritage wing. It should be the other way round. The single story wing of the Scottish Hospital would be enhanced by the new wing, not destroyed by it. The scale of the new Stephen Street wing should remain single storey with a pitched roof as it currently is. This would keep it in scale with the existing heritage wing of the hospital and the adjacent single story street fronted cottages of no. 4, 6na 8 along the lower side of Cooper St.</li> </ul>	The development's relationship to the original heritage component of the Scottish Hospital is completely non-existent.	15
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The form and use of materials to the new wings is completely out of character with the original heritage hospital. The new wings should make some attempt to relate to the heritage of the original building. The use of large scale expressed framed window blocks, terraced setback building planes, steel outrigger pergolas over large terraces, flat roof sand palm trees is completely out of character, not just with Cooper, Brown and Stephen St but all of Paddington. The use of some of the existing materials should be incorporated into the new design. Material such as sandstone, timber and copper should be considered</li> </ul>	The form and use of materials to the new wings is completely out of character with the original heritage hospital.	1, 15
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The creation of a service entry to the top of Stephen St is another understated major impact. Stephen St is a tiny dead street which only services the units at the end of the street. The serving of a major hospital from this little street directly adjacent to residential units and homes will create lots of noisy truck traffic. The</li> </ul>	The creation of a service entry to the top of Stephen St is another understated major impact	7

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	topography at the end of Stephen St is an amphitheatre so the noise will be amplified.		
	All our concerns and comments, both in writing and verbally to the PAC website and the consultation meetings were completely dismissed	All our concerns and comments, both in writing and verbally to the PAC website and the consultation meetings were completely dismissed	20
	I urge you to refuse the application until, at least, a full design review from the NSW Government Architect's office.	I urge you to refuse the application until, at least, a full design review from the NSW Government Architect's office.	N/A
<b>Natalie Miller</b> <b>4 Cooper St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	I completely object to the development of the Scottish Hospital. As the direct neighbour and owner of the single storey cottage adjacent to the proposed site our house is not mentioned on any of the floor or site plans, sections or elevations. We area a single storey cottage and the design of the terrace apartments is completely unacceptable. It has now been designed so that the apartments and rooms look into our backyard, pool and bedrooms. Unacceptable!!!	Our house is not mentioned on any of the floor or site plans, sections or elevations.  The proposal has been designed so that the apartments and rooms look into our backyard, pool and bedrooms	4
	The shadow diagrams (which we are not drawn on) indicate additional overshadowing in winter onto our backyard. Unacceptable!!!	The shadow diagrams (which we are not drawn on) indicate additional overshadowing in winter onto our backyard.	5
	The design is completely out of keeping with Paddington.	The design is completely out of keeping with Paddington.	1, 15
	I accept that the Scottish Hospital will need (to) be developed but do not accept the design. I do not want our currently private backyard to be completely destroyed by people overlooking into my backyard	Overlooking will reduce privacy to backyard	3

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	from their balconys and windows.		
	The scale of the overall development tis too big and not reflective of the surrounding architecture and urban space.	The scale of the overall development tis too big and not reflective of the surrounding architecture and urban space.	2
<b>Name Withheld</b> <b>1 Cooper Street</b> <b>Paddington</b>	We are fully supportive of having better Residential Aged Care Facilities and much better management of the current dilapidated Scottish Hospital grounds. However the size, scale and scope of this project are well beyond providing better facilities for the aged.	the size, scale and scope of this project are well beyond providing better facilities for the aged.	2
	Why do we need 82 ILUs (aka apartments) of which 39 are 3-bedroom units? This whole project is no different from a commercially-oriented apartment project (with a 100 bed RACF thrown in as a 'sweetner').	This whole project is no different from a commercially-oriented apartment project	30, 31
	Having a project of this scale and size will result in a large increase in congestion in an already congested area. Look at how narrow the surrounding streets area (Cooper, Brown, Stephen, Glen St etc) and how difficult it is for vehicles to manoeuvre through this area. Look at also the current shortage of parking for residents and people working in the surrounding areas.	Having a project of this scale and size will result in a large increase in congestion in an already congested area.	27
	Beyond the congestion, having multiple large buildings (some of which are up to 50% taller than the current tallest building on site) will immediately destroy the streetscape, greenery (green-lung) and	having multiple large buildings will immediately destroy the streetscape, greenery and architecture of a mainly heritage residential area.	2, 15

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	architecture of a mainly heritage residential area.		
	This project should be scaled down, especially the number of ILUs. We all have a role to play in preserving this very unique heritage area we call Paddington. This project will set a very bad precedent for how we develop our most prized heritage areas and our environment.	This project should be scaled down, especially the number of ILUs.	2,
<b>Rod Jones</b> <b>8 Cooper St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	Whilst initially very excited to hear of the redevelopment of the site, im afraid that it has been a 'consultation' process that I have become very disillusioned with. Representatives of the Church have been all but invisible to residents and I have observed the professionals hired by the Church treat the residents and their questions with impatience and even rudeness. I have found the approach taken by the Church's representatives has been cynical at best and deceptive at worst.	I have found the approach taken by the Church's representatives has been cynical at best and deceptive at worst.	20
	I primarily object to the scale (height) of the buildings.  From day one of the community consultation there has been widespread disbelief of the size and height of both major buildings. Whilst minor adjustments have been made we are still being told that there will be no reduction to the height of either building. I find this simply unacceptable and the assertions from the architects that the buildings have been designed with Paddington type architectural features is simply insulting.	I primarily object to the scale (height) of the buildings	2

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	I also totally reject the assurance that the nursing home building must be as high as it is to sustain efficient staffing levels. Cash flow spreadsheets can be adjusted to support any contention – should the building be reduced in height and increased in breadth, I'm sure the economics could have worked so that the operation is just as efficiently staffed.	The nursing home could be made wider to ensure that there are efficient staff levels, rather than being so high.	
	I object to the removal of all of the mature trees along Stephen Street that would have somewhat masked the development of the nursing home	I object to the removal of all of the mature trees along Stephen Street	12
	<p>I object to the potential increase of level of traffic that will come into Cooper Street.</p> <p>There are multiple entrances planned for the redevelopment from Cooper Street. At the last consultation one of the architects mentioned that because of these multiple entrances Cooper Street would probably be used as a taxi pick up spot by the residents of the new development. This naturally sent a shudder through all of the residents of Cooper Street that were present at this meeting as two cars cannot currently pass on the street. The planned removal of the turning bay from the old hospital is going to cause an increase in traffic problems that are already significant due to the use of the street by the supermarket delivery trucks to access the supermarket loading bay at the end of Cooper Street. Candidly passing Cooper Street off as a taxi pick up point makes me wonder how effective the traffic planning process has been to this development. It also makes me wonder of potential safety issues given tracks already jump the</p>	I object to the potential increase of level of traffic that will come into Cooper Street.	21



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	footpath to avoid reversing back down the street to allow cars to pass.		
	The architect's impression of the view impact from my property of the proposed nursing home is extremely upsetting. This massive building becomes my new sky-line view – it is not only an intrusion but will also allow many dozens of people to look across onto my property.	The nursing home building will create an intrusion in my outlook. Many people will now look directly into my property.	3, 25
	In summary, the buildings are too high.....this is Paddington.		2
<b>Matt Zander</b> <b>8 Cooper St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	Whilst supportive of the need to reinvigorate this site, and to provide additional aged care facilities for the community – there area a number of issues that I object to in the current proposal		
	Scale of the development.  Whilst the current buildings are in general contained within the centre of the site – the current proposal places a 6-7 building along the edge of Stephen Street within only a small setback (ie this has been pushed to the extremities of the site). This will have a hugely negative impact on the residents on the Eastern side of the site as this effectively presents a 6 storey 'wall' which will dominate the entire upper length of the street (approx 500m). The size and bulk of these multi-storey buildings is so far removed from the predominant	The Stephen Street building will present a 6 storey wall which will dominate the entire upper length of the street (approx 500m).  The size and bulk of these multi-storey buildings is so far removed from the predominant character of Paddington as to appear out of context with the surrounding area.	2

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	character of Paddington as to appear out of context with the surrounding area.		
	<p>Impact of the development on views.</p> <p>The development particularly along the Stephen St boundary will obscure a significant proportion (50%) of the visible skyline and outlook from our property. Of equal concern is that the orientation and configuration of the development on the eastern side of the property is comprised mostly of terraces and large windows both of which will have a very negative impact on our privacy and that of our neighbours.</p>	<p>The development particularly along the Stephen St boundary will obscure a significant proportion (50%) of the visible skyline and outlook from our property.</p> <p>The eastern side of the Stephen Street building comprises mostly terraces and large windows both of which have a negative impact on the privacy of neighbours.</p>	25
	<p>Design of the Development</p> <p>The majority of the surrounding suburb is comprised of small Victorian Terraces – existing large scale developments from the 1960s are extremely noticeable in their incongruity. The design of the current proposal exacerbates this issue through its size, bulk and design. Rather than perpetuating the mistakes of the past – I would hope that the State Government would seek to foster development which is more in keeping with the character of the area, and which is accretive to the enjoyment, and appreciation of residents and visitors to a suburb with special character.</p>	<p>Whilst Paddington does have some large scale buildings, these are noticeable in their incongruity, the proposal should be more in keeping with the character of the area and not perpetuate the mistakes of the past.</p>	1
	<p>Impact on traffic flow in Cooper Street</p> <p>The proposal to utilise Cooper St as a taxi drop off point for the development is very concerning – Cooper St is a single lane dead</p>	<p>Cooper Street currently does not accommodate its traffic demands. The proposal to utilise Cooper St as a taxi drop off point for the development is very concerning.</p>	21

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>end street which already has to cope with significant commercial traffic associated with the Thomas Dux supermarket. At peak times there are up to 4 trucks in the street at one time, and this restricts all traffic movement up and down the street.</p>		
	<p>Impact on traffic flows in Stephen Street</p> <p>The area where Stephen Street adjoins the edge of the development is also a single lane access – the development proposes to reinstate a driveway in this area for service vehicles and trust to the facility. This driveway has not been in use for at least 15 years – and will create traffic problems, noise, and disruption for all residents of buildings adjoining Stephen Street.</p>	<p>The new driveway in Stephen Street will create traffic problems, noise, and disruption for all residents of buildings adjoining Stephen Street.</p>	22
	<p>The impact of the size of the development on the area</p> <p>In addition to the Scottish Hospital redevelopment – there are 170 apartments nearing completion in the Advanx development 200m from the Scottish hospital gates – the cumulative impact of these 2 developments on the neighbourhood will be to add to almost 300 new dwellings (and 350+ residents) to an area with limited ability to expand services, access roads and facilities to cope with such an increase.</p>	<p>The cumulative impact of the Scottish Hospital and Advanx developments on the neighbourhood will be to add to almost 300 new dwellings (and 350+ residents) to an area with limited ability to expand services, access roads and facilities to cope with such an increase.</p>	27
	<p>In conclusion I do not support the development in its current form and would ask that the Director of Metropolitan Projects deny the application until such time as the overall scale and height of the project has been reduced, the design altered to ensure it is more in</p>	<p>Ask that the Director of Metropolitan Projects deny the application until such time as the overall scale and height of the project has been reduced, the design altered to ensure it is more in keeping with the special character of its surroundings, and the traffic flow of the</p>	N/A

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	keeping with the special character of its surroundings, and the traffic flow of the site has been revisited.	site has been revisited.	
<b>Dawn Muscat</b>  <b>3 Cooper St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>  (Hand written – copy not fully legible)	<p>I have lived in 3 Cooper St since 1945. The G and Scottish Hospital across the road from us ...proud Paddington was, the smalls from the kitchen, bake dinner of a Sunday, the rainforest beautiful gardens that were kept in order by a full time gardener. That all changes in the 90s. Our very *** hospital turned into a squatter, windows broken, drawings on the wall, to see it today you would not believe it is the same place. Garden, ***, nurses all gone, the houses in Cooper St sold the extension were finished in thirties as shown on the picture of Sydney Water Photo 1939. I myself *** in the turning bay at the west end of the building which they want to remove, it is opposite Bayview and Erina apartments all the children in the street played *** it was built there for the milk man. Hose and ** and ice delivery, so my question is why is it been pulled down we need it now for cars turning or to get out of the way of the 30 trucks that go to Thomas Dux in a day it is the shopping complex at the end of Cooper St, West end Cooper St is a one land traffic with a dead end at Thomas Dux the trucks then turn and come back down 30 up 30 down adds up to 60 trucks. Cooper Lane has about 40 cars in and out, the rest of the street has another 20 cars. Plus people parking these you must agree that is a lot of cars and trucks for a little street.</p> <p>They are making 3 entrances on Cooper Street for these residents I misled would not walk from Neild Ave.....when the front</p>		

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	door is in Cooper St, would you?		
	I would like the gate keepers lodge completely removed from Cooper St east end, next to the bus stop at Brown and Cooper Street.		
	There are two trees I noticed on the plan that are in great danger. No. 100 North Island pine in Cooper St and 119 lower down the block look at **** not good ***. Impact will report will at lease help once the damage is done, once the ** is down, its down.		
<b>Terence Priester</b> <b>2/19 Cooper St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	I object to the above referenced proposal on the following grounds that it negatively impacts the amenity of the block of flats at 19 Cooper St. Furthermore, this development should remove one storey from its easternmost wing in order to better fit the residential area.		
	EA report page 95  "How does the impact change the amenity of the affected property? How much sunlight, view, or privacy is lost, and how much is retained?  Sections 8.4.1, 8.4.2, 8.4.3 and 8.4.6 below demonstrate that there is no significant impact from the proposed buildings on neighbouring dwellings, in terms of overlooking, overshadowing or view loss."	View Loss  The current height of the operating theatre with its flat roof should, at minimum, be retained and all works to this section of the development being restricted to below this height.	25

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The views north from the block of flats at 19 Cooper St (at the corner of Stephen St) are unfavourably impacted by the bulk and size of the proposed top floor of the former operating theatre block with an addition of an elevator shaft and ILUs on the top floor. The current height of the operating theatre with its flat roof should, at minimum, be retained and all works to this section of the development being restricted to below this height.</li> </ul>		
	<p>EA report page 84</p> <p>“To Stephen street the height of any new development would be generally equivalent to the height of the existing operating theatre block stepping down to the north”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At issue here is the height of the building from the corner of Cooper and Stephen St where it is presently 1 storey from Cooper St level. Page 83 of the EA report proposes a ‘maximum 2 storeys above Cooper and 6 storeys above Stephen St.. The building replacing the current operating theatre block should be limited to 1 storey on Cooper St as it is presently, and 5 storeys on Stephen St.</li> </ul>	<p>The building replacing the current operating theatre block should be limited to 1 storey on Cooper St as it is presently, and 5 storeys on Stephen St.</p>	2
	<p>“How vulnerable to the impact is the property receiving the impact? Would it require the loss of reasonable development potential to avoid the impact?</p> <p>Whilst it is not considered that there are significant impacts resulting to neighbouring properties, the reduction in floor space available would hinder the provision of much needed affordable accommodation for seniors within the community.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Removing one storey of the proposed development from the operating theatre block would have minimal impact on provided needed affordable accommodation for seniors within the community. Furthermore, the proposed ILUs to be located atop this</li> </ul>	<p>Removing one storey of the proposed development from the operating theatre block would have minimal impact on provision of needed affordable accommodation for seniors within the community. Furthermore, the proposed ILUs to be located atop this building will not likely be classified as affordable housing.</p>	2

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	building will not likely be classified as affordable housing.		
	<p>“Does the impact arise out of poor design? Could the same amount of floor space and amenity be achieved for the proponent while reducing the impact on neighbours?</p> <p>It is considered that the design of the proposal is well considered and achieves high quality built form. The buildings have regard to the client requirements as well as the various constraints pertaining to the site. Reorganisation of floor space on the site would compromise the heritage and landscape values of the site and would result in a design that is not as appropriate to its context.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ How does increasing the height of the operating theatre block accommodate the heritage and landscape value of the site? On the contrary, insisting on a ‘maximum of 2 storeys above Cooper St and 6 storeys above Stephen St’ is not an appropriate design for this context.</li> </ul>	How does increasing the height of the operating theatre block accommodate the heritage and landscape value of the site?	15
	<p>EA report page 98</p> <p>A number of views are also identified as being of heritage significance to and from the site. These are identified in “the Conservation Plan” prepared by David Semple Kerr and ranked with the Conservation Management Plan prepared for this site in June 2006 and updated November 2010. The ranking of these views was undertaken to assist future decision making for conservation and development of the site.</p> <p>These identified views and vistas include:</p> <p>Exceptional significance – view to the Scottish Hospital from the</p>	This development should take into account the amount of green space being removed from the northern views of Cooper St (near Stephen St) and reduce its height by one storey to accommodate the visual amenities of current residents.	25

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>northern grassed terrace</p> <p>High significance – partial views to and from the Scottish Hospital from the lower north grassed area</p> <p>Moderate significance – views to the roof of the Scottish Hospital from Cooper and Brown St</p> <p>Little Significance – view to the eastern wings of the Scottish Hospital.</p> <p>The design and location of the proposed new building forms retain these identified views which help to maintain the heritage value of the Scottish hospital building, its setting and its relationship with the wider context of the site.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The views to the eastern wings of the Scottish Hospital are of Moderate to High significance encompassing harbour views, lush landscape and district views. This development should take into account the amount of green space being removed from the northern views of Cooper St (near Stephen St) and reduce its height by one storey to accommodate the visual amenities of current residents.</li> </ul>		
	<p>EA report page 114</p> <p>“When viewed from Cooper St the proposed RACF building is shown as being responsive to the scale of the lower portion of the heritage building. In some instances outlooks across the site are widened as a result of the positioning and design of the new buildings.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposed development is using the roof pitch of the adjacent</li> </ul>	<p>Given residents of Cooper Street have had to excavate in order to increase floor space, why should the hospital not meet the same obligations as residents and protect the sightlines and sense of open space already existing by excavating to fit the additional storey added by the ILUs on the current operating theatre block?</p>	<p>1, 2</p>



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>building (to the west) as the height guidelines for the RACF/ILUs replacing the operating theatre block. This, in effect, unduly increases the visible size and scale of the development. Given residents of Cooper Street have had to excavate in order to increase floor space, why should the hospital not meet the same obligations as residents and protect the sightlines and sense of open space already existing by excavating to fit the additional storey added by the ILUs on the current operating theatre block?</p>		
	<p>EA report page 94</p> <p>“From Cooper Street, the overall massing of the Stephen St RACF is sympathetic to the scale and proportioning of the heritage building. When viewed from Stephen St the uppermost floor is set back from the main building façade so as to appear recessive in scale. The building has been designed to step down the hill from the south to the north reflecting the topography of the site and the scale of buildings around this portion of the site. The articulation of the building breaks the corm up into four portions which are reflective of the proportioning of terrace dwellings further to the north along Stephen Street”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We are requesting this development be scaled back to the extent of removing the uppermost floor referenced above.</li> </ul>	<p>We are requesting this development be scaled back to the extent of removing the uppermost floor referenced above.</p>	<p>1, 2</p>
	<p>EA report page 95</p> <p>“The subject site is an anomaly within the context of the subdivision of Paddington. It is a large site, set within a highly fragmented subdivision pattern. The dimensions of the site, along with the topographical characteristics do not readily avail themselves to redevelopment for terrace form development, nor is this suitable to</p>	<p>We would like to see evidence of attempts at designing this development with a view to terrace style and form</p>	<p>1, 2</p>


AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>the type of development proposed. In this regard, it is considered that the planning controls applicable to the site are not likely to be able to maintain the terrace character of the broader Paddington area for this site"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We would like to see evidence of attempts at designing this development with a view to terrace style and form. Furthermore, we as community would expect to be presented with choices or options of a terrace form development. As such, there appears to be no regard for the style and character of heritage homes next door to the proposed development and Paddington in general. Instead the Cooper Stephen Street façade (operating theatre) as presented exhibits no identifiable style, and retains an industrial look and feel.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Ian Moate</b></p> <p><b>Flat 4/19 Cooper St</b></p> <p><b>Paddington</b></p>	<p><u>Height from Cooper Street</u></p> <p>The redevelopment of the former operating theatre at the Eastern section of Cooper St adversely impacts the residents. The proposed new building raises the height of the structure in the South east corner beyond the existing flat rood and includes another storey. This height increase is detrimental to the north facing view of Cooper St residents. I request that no more than the current height of the existing operating theatre should be allowed for the new building. Furthermore the redevelopment should delete the penthouse accommodation level which adds to the overall height and bulk of the new building.</p>	<p>The height increase from the former operating theatre building is detrimental to the north facing view of Cooper St residents.</p> <p>Furthermore the redevelopment should delete the penthouse accommodation level which adds to the overall height and bulk of the new building.</p>	<p>25</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p><u>Views and Green Aspect from Cooper St</u></p> <p>Our street and many of the buildings in it have invested significantly in refurbishment after researching and gathering information from Council about the status and development plans of the Scottish Hospital. We consulted a planner to peruse the previously approved 2001 DA (and revised DA 481/2006/1) on this old Scottish Hospital site. We were advised in 2006 that the 2001 DA would not change the outlook over the existing flat roof height in the south east corner of the site on Cooper St. The plans from the architects NBRS&amp;P were provided. This confirmed the retention of the outlook and also noted an improvement to the aspect over the facility by removing the utility box on the flat roof. Their final statement was that there was to be no change to the site on Cooper St. The key points made during the process was that the Presbyterian care redevelopment on Stephen St would also be discrete and sit beneath the height of the current flat rood of the existing operating theatre. The 2010 aged care hosing proposal now contradicts this information. The result is that our northern aspect views which are of high significance are being compromised. The views to the eastern wings of the Scottish hospital encompass harbour views, lush landscape and also a very pleasant district outlook. This new development proposal needs to take into account the amount of green space being removed from Cooper St (near Stephen st) northern views and the protection of this aspect.</p>	<p>A review was undertaken of the potential impact of the previous 2001 DA.</p> <p>The key points made during the process was that the Presbyterian care redevelopment on Stephen St would also be discrete and sit beneath the height of the current flat roof of the existing operating theatre.</p> <p>The 2010 aged care hosing proposal now contradicts this information.</p>	<p><b>28</b></p>
	<p><u>Green Roof – Roof Apartment Penthouse</u></p>	<p>The development in the south east corner needs to reduce its height</p>	<p>2</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>The new proposal increases the height of the structure in the south east corner above the present flat roof structure which affects sight lines. The result is an unfavourable view over a significantly larger, bulky building which is dominated by a grey roof and apartment. This is a grave change from the present green leafy northern views to the harbour.</p> <p>The development in the south east corner needs to reduce its height. I object to the extra residential penthouse apartment that has been included on this south east building which will deteriorate the resident's aspect and views. The bulk of the new planned lift well is another point of contention. The proposal communicated a flat planted roof (without reference to the extra height from the self contained apartment) I would like to request the removal of this extra private accommodation level in order to retain the height of the existing flat roof structure. I would further request to have the lower revised flat roof structure completely planted with low cover vegetation to assist with the green aspect and alleviate the bulk and scale of the proposed building. The visual amenity of current residents needs to be protected.</p>	<p>and remove the penthouse apartments.</p> <p>I would further request to have the lower revised flat roof structure completely planted with low cover vegetation to assist with the green aspect and alleviate the bulk and scale of the proposed building. The visual amenity of current residents needs to be protected.</p>	
	<p><u>Traffic Cooper St</u></p> <p>The proposed development has introduced several pedestrian access points from Cooper St. These access points will bring a lot more traffic to this street which is very narrow and only allows one car to pass at a time via a single lane carriageway. The contingency plans to deal with this development have been underground parking,</p>	<p>The proposed development has introduced several pedestrian access points from Cooper St. These access points will bring a lot more traffic to this street which is very narrow and only allows one car to pass at a time via a single lane carriageway.</p>	21

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>however the pedestrian access points in Cooper St have not been accounted for. Cooper St will present an attractive pick up and drop off point for family, friends, visitors and taxis. Cooper St is already unnecessarily burdened by trucks and is tricky to navigate, cars often having to reverse to allow traffic to pass. Having seen other facilities like this, there is likely to be a greater use of taxis that will now frequent these premises. It will be important on this narrow road to have a street bay opposite the entrance that accommodated taxis picking up and dropping off pedestrians (ie opposite 11 Cooper St). This will be paramount to prevent the street being blocked. There will also need to be allowance for extra car spaces on the street as visitors will use the existing resident parking places which are already too few for the residents in the neighbourhood. Any spaces forgone for the taxi pick up drop off point will need to be given back to the street elsewhere.</p>	<p>It will be important on this narrow road to have a street bay opposite the entrance that accommodated taxis picking up and dropping off pedestrians (ie opposite 11 Cooper St).</p>	
	<p><u>Trees Cooper St</u></p> <p>There are a number of trees that are being removed from the Scottish Hospital premises in this development, which compromise the green outlook over this site. The planning has neglected to account for a mature variegated Robina on Cooper St and a Jacaranda on Cooper St which are both located around the ambulance bay at the old operating theatre access point. I would also like to request the preservation of these trees.</p>	<p>There are a number of trees that are being removed from the Scottish Hospital premises in this development, which compromise the green outlook over this site. The planning has neglected to account for a mature variegated Robina on Cooper St and a Jacaranda on Cooper St which are both located around the ambulance bay at the old operating theatre access point. I would also like to request the preservation of these trees.</p>	<p>13</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>Not only should these trees be maintained, but new ones should be inserted both on the old Scottish Hospital site, and the remainder of Cooper Street nature strip,. The nature strip should continue the theme of the street planting with the ornamental pear trees that are presently on the south eastern end of Cooper St. This planting should be continued down the complete western end of Cooper St nature strip in front of the hospital building.</p>		
	<p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>In effect, the scale of this project should be revised and modified to better accommodate the height and view amenity of Cooper and Stephen St residents with an eye towards alleviating traffic congestion on Cooper Street and preserving, at minimum, the precious greenery that already exists for the street's residents. The proposed roof apartment in the south east corner should be removed and low vegetation should be placed on the flat roof surface. I therefore strongly object tot eh proposed development until these issues are adequately addressed.</p>	<p>This project should be revised and modified to better accommodate the height and view amenity of Cooper and Stephen St residents with an eye towards alleviating traffic congestion on Cooper Street and preserving, at minimum, the precious greenery that already exists for the street's residents.</p>	<p>25, 21, 13</p>
<p><b>Paul Irving and Alexandra Baker</b></p> <p><b>4/1 Bates Ave</b></p> <p><b>Paddington</b></p>	<p>The size of the project is too large for the residential area. The current proposal for 195 self care dwellings/beds and 185 parking spots will increase the traffic and noise in the area.</p>	<p>Proposal will increase the traffic and noise in the area.</p>	<p>24</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>The potential loss of light and alteration to the views from our backyard looking west towards Stephen Street Paddington. The Scottish Hospital redevelopment projects includes the construction of a new building running along Stephen St, and removal of some existing trees.</p>	<p>The potential loss of light and alteration to the views from our backyard looking west towards Stephen Street Paddington.</p>	<p>18</p>
	 <p>View from rear of 1 Bates Ave looking towards Scottish hospital site</p>		
<p><b>Cindy Wilkinson</b> <b>15 Neild Ave</b> <b>Paddington</b></p>	<p>As a resident I am appalled that buildings of such height are proposed in what is a heritage suburb of predominantly 2 storey 19<sup>th</sup> century terraces.</p> <p>The proposed building on Brown Street will be 15m higher than the existing structure, closer to the street frontage, more intrusive, much greater in bulk and out of character with the surrounding area.</p>	<p>The proposed building on Brown Street will be 15m higher than the existing structure, closer to the street frontage, more intrusive, much greater in bulk and out of character with the surrounding area.</p>	<p>1, 2</p>
	<p>The scale 'model' presented at the recent community consultation was grossly misleading with thick tree and underbrush completely</p>	<p>The scale 'model' presented at the recent community consultation was grossly misleading with thick tree and underbrush completely</p>	<p>29</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	hiding the building from visibility on Brown Street.	hiding the building from visibility on Brown Street.	
	<p>While all residents support the provision of aged care it is alarming that most of the new buildings will be to provide 2 and 3 bedroom units with car parking got two cars.</p> <p>Only 21 of the new provision will be beds for high care dementia patients.</p>	<p>While all residents support the provision of aged care it is alarming that most of the new buildings will be to provide 2 and 3 bedroom units with car parking got two cars.</p>	30
	This does not seem to be a genuine effort to provide aged care.	This does not seem to be a genuine effort to provide aged care.	30, 31, 32
<b>James Lette</b> <b>48 Brown St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	The impact of the proposal is inappropriate in the local context	The impact of the proposal is inappropriate in the local context	1
	It is an over development of the site	It is an over development of the site	1, 2
	The building form fronting Brown St is too high and intrusive, being of substantial bulk, It is out of sale with the local character and will dominate and overpower the local heritage streetscape.	The building form fronting Brown St is too high and intrusive, being of substantial bulk, It is out of sale with the local character and will dominate and overpower the local heritage streetscape.	1, 2
	The design has made no effort to respond to the Paddington heritage and local context, with an appearance which is generic to apartment buildings throughout Sydney. It presents large expanses of glass, metal cladding and 'Thredbo grey' sandstone. These are	The design has made no effort to respond to the Paddington heritage and local context, with an appearance which is generic to apartment buildings throughout Sydney.	1, 2



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	clearly inappropriate.		
	This is difficult issue for the community to accurately judge, as the photo montages provided with the application are of no use, even potentially misleading, relying on tree cover to hide the building, cover which would take many years to mature to that height and may not eventuate.	The photo montages provided with the application are of no use, even potentially misleading, relying on tree cover to hide the building, cover which would take many years to mature to that height and may not eventuate.	29
	I request that the department refer the application to the Government Architects office for independent review.	I request that the department refer the application to the Government Architects office for independent review.	N/A
	<p>Justification for bulk and scale</p> <p>As the stated basis for imposing an inappropriate development the proponent should be required to substantiate its claim “that the financial viability of the scheme relies on funding from the independent living units to offset 45% of the aged care beds as concessional beds”</p> <p>I request that documentation of this claim should be independently verified. In respect to commercial confidentiality, the information does not need to be publicly released, just an independent opinion on the validity of the claim.</p>	the proponent should be required to substantiate its claim “that the financial viability of the scheme relies on funding from the independent living units to offset 45% of the aged care beds as concessional beds”	31
	<p>Proposed Dwelling Mix</p> <p>The application states that “The size and apartment mix was dictated by the market demand analysis undertaken”</p>	the ‘demand analysis’ is a marketing study and does not utilise accepted methodologies, such as that of NSW Housing’s Centre for Housing Affordability.	30, 32

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>It is my opinion that the 'demand analysis' is a marketing study and does not constitute a housing demand study. It does not utilise accepted methodologies, such as that of NSW Housing's Centre for Housing Affordability. Surprisingly, it makes no reference to the federal benchmarks for the planning of aged care delivery, benchmarks which incorporate ILU provision and upon which their funding allocations are based.</p> <p>Critically, it provides no data on what the makeup or composition of seniors living within the LGA (eg, their ages – simply providing one figure for people over 65, ignoring that people 55 and over could enter the facility, and that people over 70 don't move into ILUs – their living arrangements and family structure, their incomes, where they live etc).</p> <p>Without such information and understanding an assessment of the demand side of the housing market cannot possibly be undertaken. It provides no planning basis to conclude that</p> <p>"the mix of apartments will be critical to both the initial success of the development and the long term operation. One bedroom apartments should be restricted to 5% to 10% of the total apartment numbers. The remainder should be a mix of 2 bedroom apartments (30% to 40%) with 2.5 and 3 bedroom places comprising the remainder. The critical 2, 2.5 and 3 bedroom apartments should comprise an overall area in the range of 95 to 140 m2, all with 2 bathrooms"</p>		

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>The report provides no evidence or justification to conclude a 5% limit on one bedroom dwellings. Such a conclusion is not only contrary to accepted academic research, but also an understanding of the housing needs of seniors in the Eastern suburbs. Many elderly residents have been living here for many years. Their incomes do not reflect property prices. There is a need to provide an opportunity for local asset rich, cash poor, elderly to down size, letting them remain here near their networks and services and also freeing their homes for more appropriate use by families. There is a shortage of smaller, more affordable 1 and 2 bedroom units to meet their needs.</p>	<p>The report provides no evidence or justification to conclude a 5% limit on one bedroom dwellings. Such a conclusion is not only contrary to accepted academic research, but also an understanding of the housing needs of seniors in the Eastern suburbs.</p>	30
	<p>The marketing basis of the proponents study is demonstrated by the statement that “the size of the accommodation is also commensurate with nearby accommodation”. That is, the proposal will reinforce existing issues with the housing market and does not respond to actual need.</p> <p>The proponent should be required to commission an adequate housing study which justifies the dwelling mix they propose.</p>	<p>The proponent should be required to commission an adequate housing study which justifies the dwelling mix they propose.</p>	30
	<p>Assessment of Traffic Impact</p> <p>The traffic analysis has not considered the cumulative impact of new and proposed developments in the vicinity including the Advanx Residential Site, Sydney Grammar rezoning, the Dept of Housing site in Lawson St or the potential redevelopment of White City.</p> <p>The submission documents acknowledge that this is the case, but</p>	<p>The traffic analysis has not considered the cumulative impact of new and proposed developments in the vicinity including the Advanx Residential Site, Sydney Grammar rezoning, the Dept of Housing site in Lawson St or the potential redevelopment of White City.</p>	27, 23

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>they do not provide any credible explanation as to why cumulative impacts do not matter in this case.</p> <p>The advanx site along will have around 2,760m2 of commercial/retail uses and 218 dwellings.</p> <p>It is also my view that the traffic generation rates utilised by the TA are too low. I understand that the research upon which the RTA based these rates was undertaken in 1981. There have been momentous changes in the nature and composition of seniors since this time. Their lifestyles have changed dramatically as incomes have increased and baby boomers have entered this age group. With this their use of private vehicles has also increased.</p>		
	<p>I also note that there is no requirement that occupants of the development be retired. In fact, given likely dwelling price points, and the stated target market, it is likely that many will need to be in the workforce.</p> <p>An appropriate approach would have been if the TA determined rates of traffic generation of similar developments in the locality. This has not been done and I request that it be required.</p> <p>The TA has underestimated (1) traffic levels at the time the site is occupied and (2) traffic generation rates and accordingly greatly underestimated the impact on surrounding streets and local amenity.</p> <p>This is important that the traffic surveys identify that parts of the local</p>	<p>The TA has underestimated (1) traffic levels at the time the site is occupied and (2) traffic generation rates and accordingly greatly underestimated the impact on surrounding streets and local amenity.</p>	<p>27, 23</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>road network are already operating beyond capacity.</p> <p>Also note that the TA states that “Ideally traffic flows on a local road should be below 300 vehicles per hour and on collector roads below 500 vehicles per hour”. Rather it is my understanding that the RTA guide states that for collector roads the Maximum Flow is 500 vph in the peak and that the Environmental Goal is 200 vph in the peak.</p>		
	<p>Parking</p> <p>In order to preserve local amenity, it is important that the Department condition any approval so that the future residents of the development are not eligible for off-street car parking permits. The supply of parking in the locality is inadequate.</p>	<p>In order to preserve local amenity, it is important that the Department condition any approval so that the future residents of the development are not eligible for off-street car parking permits</p>	<p>24</p> <p>This is a matter for the NSW DPI. It is not intended that residents will be eligible for parking permits, as they will have allocated resident car parking provided on site.</p>
	<p>Construction Management</p> <p>It is important that the Department condition any approval so that the proponent is required to consult the community in the formulation of a construction management plan.</p>	<p>It is important that the Department condition any approval so that the proponent is required to consult the community in the formulation of a construction management plan.</p>	<p>This is a matter for NSW DPI</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<b>Genevieve &amp; Robert Wensley</b> <b>67 Hargrave st</b> <b>Paddington</b>	We object to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the scale of development at no. 2 Cooper Street on the site of the Scottish Hospital,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the scale of development at no. 2 Cooper Street on the site of the Scottish Hospital is too big ,</li> </ul>	2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the removal of several trees in excess of 75</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>too many trees are being removed</li> </ul>	13
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the increase in the floor area on the 2002 approved DA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>there increase in floor area from the 2002 DA is excessive</li> </ul>	28
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the domination of Stephen St and the area by this large construction and unsympathetic scale and architecture on the site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stephen St and the area will be dominated by this large construction and unsympathetic scale and architecture on the site.</li> </ul>	1
<b>Charles Hunter</b> <b>5 Dillon st</b> <b>Paddington</b>	The removal of the trees is not acceptable (88 trees along with pruning). This part of Paddington is unique with beautiful old trees found nowhere else in Sydney	The removal of so many trees is not acceptable. This part of Paddington is unique with beautiful old trees found nowhere else in Sydney	13
<b>Ainslie Curran</b> <b>5 Dillon St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	The impact on the heritage is not acceptable.	The impact on the heritage is not acceptable.	15
	The pretend trade off on the play ground is unacceptable. You can not take that away from the residents	The pretend trade off on the play ground is unacceptable. You can not take that away from the residents	33
	The traffic over flow during and after has not been considered and	The traffic over flow during and after has not been considered and	24

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	the area cannot withstand that flow	the area cannot withstand that flow	
	The parking in residential areas and places has not been addressed.	The parking in residential areas and places has not been addressed.	24
	The community spirit is being ruined by this project	The community spirit is being ruined by this project	
	The park is used daily by loads of small children who can not be subject to the works and the danger	The park is used daily by loads of small children who can not be subject to the works and the danger	46
	The community consultation is being ignored which is extremely disappointing	The community consultation is being ignored which is extremely disappointing	20
	I ask as out Council to do something about this rotr.	I ask as out Council to do something about this rotr.	N/A
	Strongly object to the trade offs for the Dillon St Playground. That playground is used every day every hour by a huge community and the work proposed is not showing true and real proposals for the playground and grounds.	Strongly object to the trade offs for the Dillon St Playground.	33
<b>Carl Wyant</b> <b>1 Dillon St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	The scale of the project seems completely outsized for the neighbourhood of Paddington. The massive increase in the height of the residential buildings proposed (more than 15m in some cases and closer to Brown St than the current building) will create a disequilibrium to a neighbourhood that is dominated by Terraces. The nearly tripled footprint of buildings on the site will reduce significantly the green space in the neighbourhood, a characteristic	The massive increase in the height of the residential buildings proposed will create a disequilibrium to a neighbourhood that is dominated by Terraces.  The nearly tripled footprint of buildings on the site will reduce significantly the green space in the neighbourhood	1, 2

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	that makes Paddington a special place to live.		
	<p>The majority of the project renovation is not even in service of the goal of increasing space and availability of the current nursing facility (only some additional 12 beds will be created), but rather the development of a retirement village which curiously has 39 individual 3 bedroom units among the proposed 82 unit complex as well as a large number of 2 bedroom units, the vast majority with 2 underground parking spaces per unit.</p> <p>I say curios because I'm trying to imagine a nursing home (usually populated by a single person, occasionally by a couple) where the individual(s) are not downsizing from the residences that they'd lived in prior to their retirement, not to mention the seeming lack of need for two vehicles by these retirees.</p> <p>For most of the residents currently living in the neighbourhood the entire project seems like nothing more than a thinly veiled real estate development of high-end residential units much like the site at the former Women's Hospital and an attempt by the development arm of Scottish Hospital and the Presbyterian Church to take advantage of the windfall economic opportunities of a prime piece of Paddington property. The definition of a retirement complex being set at the age of 55 for resident, as opposed to the age of 65+ when the majority of the population can afford to retire, has given the developers the legal opening to take advantage of this prime property for massive financial gain, but lets not be fooled into thinking that the development is actually for the benefit of aged care. If this were</p>	<p>The majority of the development is not even to increase the nursing home facility.</p> <p>The entire project seems like nothing more than a thinly veiled real estate development of high-end residential units and an attempt by the development arm of the Presbyterian Church to take advantage of the windfall economic opportunities of a prime piece of Paddington property.</p>	30, 32



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	actually the case the current nursing facility would certainly be increased by more than 12 beds and this complex would be the focus of the development, rather than ancillary to the residential units.		
	Considering the number of new residents this one development will bring to an already congested neighbourhood, the increase in automotive traffic from the new residents and their visiting families in a village that is already at capacity most times of day, the increased parking needs for the same (the proposed underground spaces will not accommodate the family of visitors that would be expected to come to see their retired relatives) in an area that is already above capacity for residents and businesses, and all this coupled with the already outsized increase in traffic and parking congestion that will arrive once the Advanx complex is completed just a hundred metres or so down Nield Street, the proposal would seem completely out of step with the community and the plan that would increase traffic and parking needs without the inclusion of a single change in road infrastructure. Even to the casual observer, this project looks to be a rather foolhardy endeavour on its face.	Local traffic generation will be increased in the already over crowded street system.	24
	It should be no wonder then that a project which had its beginnings in 2000-2001 with Woollahra Council , and was defeated there, only to be revived again in 2010 as a designated Major Project by NSW, is taking a second shot with a larger government body after being rejected by more community based overseers. If a project of this nature, so thoroughly unresponsive to the needs of the local community were to be passed by the State government, one can		Note for DPI

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	only imagine the political ramifications for the current office holders who are already so on the nose of the public for their developer friendly posture in the city at large at the expense of a better environment and good governance. Paddington remains what it is as a result of the care its residents put into maintaining its heritage qualities. Lets not allow those qualities to be spoiled by greed, as they have been elsewhere in our city.		
<b>Marcelle Lawrence</b> <b>35 Dillon St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	It is unsympathetic architecture – design ignores Paddington’s built form. It is a heritage listed area	It is unsympathetic architecture – design ignores Paddington’s built form. It is a heritage listed area	1, 15
	88 trees to be removed this is a disgrace in Paddington which has lost more and more trees over the last 10 years	88 trees to be removed this is a disgrace	13
	9 storey building to Brown St is 14m higher and much wider than the existing building	9 storey building to Brown St is 14m higher and much wider than the existing building	2
	Building exceeds LEP height controls	Building exceeds LEP height controls	45
	The floor area has increased by up to 46% on the 2002 DA	The floor area has increased by up to 46% on the 2002 DA	<b>28</b>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<b>Ben &amp; Julie Goodsir Owners 40 Stephen St Paddington</b>	We are very concerned that the plan states all trees along Stephen Street are to be removed. These are a wonderful asset to the community softening the environment, providing shade and attracting native fauna. Surely their removal is against the retention order by Woollahra Council Tree Preservation Order? In this day and age the removal of healthy mature trees is abhorrent.	We are very concerned that the plan states all trees along Stephen Street are to be removed. Surely their removal is against the retention order by Woollahra Council Tree Preservation Order?	12
	We would like greater setbacks between the aged care facility and 40 Stephen Street. The proposed plan does not meet SEPP 65 recommendation of 18m.	We would like greater setbacks between the aged care facility and 40 Stephen Street.	34
	The proposed service vehicle entry for the hospital is opposite the foyer of 40 Stephen Street. There is no current service entry there at present and the narrowness of Stephen Street makes it completely unsuitable for use by service vehicles for a hospital. Also there is no turning area at the end of Stephen Street. The present service area is in Brown Street. Why can't this remain the service area entry for the whole hospital?	The narrowness of Stephen Street makes it completely unsuitable for use by service vehicles for a hospital.  The present service area is in Brown Street. Why can't this remain the service area entry for the whole hospital?	7
	We are also concerned that the air conditioning units are located opposite 40 Stephen Street. We want them relocated so that they do not impact on the residents of our block.	We want the air conditioning units relocated so that they do not impact on the residents of our block.	35
	Also we do not want commercial laundry use or kitchen ventilation in Stephen Street or garbage pick up. Residents were told in consultation sessions that there would be no garbage pick up from Stephen Street. Not only is the street narrow and unsuitable but the noise generated by vehicles turning and backing in and out of	Also we do not want commercial laundry use or kitchen ventilation in Stephen Street or garbage pick up.	7, 8

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	loading bays will have a significant effect on the quality of life of our residents.		
	We are very concerned about the whole plan and hope that the Presbyterian Aged Care authority will look favourably on the concerns of the present residents and owners. We are not against redevelopment but want the best for all parties to be achieved.	We are very concerned about the whole plan and hope that Presbyterian Aged Care will look favourably on the concerns of the present residents and owners.	The PPR addresses resident concerns
	We are concerned that the proposal as it stands will have a hugely detrimental effect on the residents of 40 Stephen Street where we are the owners of a unit. We are concerned about unnecessary removal of healthy mature trees in Stephen Street, the location of a service vehicle entry opposite our block in a very narrow unsuitable street, the location of the air conditioning plant and the use of Stephen Street for garbage and commercial laundry pick up and kitchen ventilation to Stephen Street. Surely the concerns of the present residents and owners of adjoining properties should be given great weight before the approval of a redevelopment goes ahead. Careful and considerate planning can satisfy all parties.	We are concerned that the proposal as it stands will have a hugely detrimental effect on the residents of 40 Stephen Street	12, 7, 35,
<b>Victoria Bel</b> <b>404/40 Stephen St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	As a resident and member of the Executive Committee for the above building, I want to express my strong objection to this proposed development. Our building would be very adversely affected. I bought my property almost 11 years ago. I was attracted by the quiet location and many beautiful trees which support possums and birds. It is a joy to be able to live in such a location so close to the city. If	If the proposed development goes ahead as planned, it will significantly detract from the quality of life currently enjoyed by residents of 40 Stephen St.  We will lose the mature trees opposite our building which provide a	12

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>the proposed development goes ahead as planned, it will significantly detract from the quality of life currently enjoyed by residents of our building.</p> <p>We will lose the mature trees opposite our building which provide a beautiful canopy over the street</p>	beautiful canopy over the street	
	<p>We will have a busy service entrance directly opposite our building. Not only will this increase the volume of traffic in our quiet cul-de-sac, it will also lead to loss of car parking spaces, which area at a premium. I do not own a car space so I need to park in the street. It can already be difficult to find car spaces in our street so we cannot afford to lose any of the available parking. Also the completed development will no doubt attract visitors who will also occupy car spaces currently needed by residents. In addition, the only way that vehicles can turn around in our street is to use the car park which comprises the common property of our building.</p>	the busy service entrance directly opposite our building will increase the volume of traffic in our quiet cul-de-sac, and will also lead to loss of car parking spaces, which area at a premium.	7, 22
	<p>Owners of properties facing Stephen Street will have their current view of trees and have it replaced by a very intrusive tall building with balconies.</p>	Owners of properties facing Stephen Street will have their current view of trees and have it replaced by a very intrusive tall building with balconies.	18
	<p>As a resident who will be directly affected by this development, if it goes ahead, I at least want:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the existing mature trees retained</li> <li>the entry to the Aged Care Facility to be from Brown Street, where the current entrance is located</li> <li>no service vehicles of any kind or garbage collection associated</li> </ul>	<p>As a resident who will be directly affected by this development, if it goes ahead, I at least want:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the existing mature trees retained</li> <li>the entry to the Aged Care Facility to be from Brown Street, where the current entrance is located</li> <li>no service vehicles of any kind or garbage collection associated</li> </ul>	12, 13, 7, 35, 34

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>with the development, to take place from Stephen Street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The air conditioning plant to be located away from Stephen Street as the noise will adversely affect residents whose living rooms face the street</li> <li>▪ Greater setback between the aged care facility building and Stephen Street.</li> </ul>	<p>with the development, to take place from Stephen Street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The air conditioning plant to be located away from Stephen Street as the noise will adversely affect residents whose living rooms face the street</li> <li>▪ Greater setback between the aged care facility building and Stephen Street.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Stephen Stoneham</b></p> <p><b>Owner</b></p> <p><b>804/40 Stephen St</b></p> <p><b>Paddington</b></p>	<p>I think it is inappropriate to make Stephen St a thoroughfare for service vehicles for the Scottish Hospital. Stephen St is already narrow and access can be difficult if two cars are approaching in opposite directions. I also believe that service vehicles could be leaving and entering at all times convenient to the 'service operators' rather than the residents convenience.</p> <p>There is already an entrance on the other site of the Scottish Hospital – why not enhance that?</p>	<p>The main site entrance off Neild Ave should be used as the service entry, not from Stephen St</p>	<p>22</p>
	<p>Current on-street car parking in Stephen St is limited, as it is in much of the surrounding area in Paddington. The removal of these car parks will increase significantly the difficulty of parking for friends and relatives of 38 &amp; 40 Stephen st and those residents whose units do not have on site car parking.</p> <p>Keep the street opposite 38 &amp; 40 Stephen st for residential parking.</p>	<p>Keep the street opposite 38 &amp; 40 Stephen st for residential parking.</p>	<p>36</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>The trees that already exist provide shade and give Stephen St a residential ambiance to some degree it masks the 40 Stephen St tower by their relative size. Replacing some of the trees seems to be an exercise in redundancy. Stephen St will look like high density light industry.</p> <p>Keep the large “retention value B” trees in Stephen St</p>	Keep the large “retention value B” trees in Stephen St	12
	<p>Proposed air conditioning condenser units if located on Stephen St will impact the quality of life for those units who face Stephen st and the noise will impact other units too, as none of the units have air-conditioning units and rely on open windows to help keep the units cool in summer.</p> <p>Relocate the air-conditioning units to elsewhere in the Scottish Hospital redevelopment.</p>	Relocate the air-conditioning units to elsewhere in the Scottish Hospital redevelopment.	35
<b>Clint Yabuka</b>  <b>Architect</b>  <b>401/40 Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>	<p>Whilst I support the redevelopment of the site, I do believe that the proposal for the Scottish Hospital will have significant detrimental outcomes for neighbouring residents. The proposal is both out of character with the context and also particularly unsympathetic to much of its context.</p>	I do believe that the proposal for the Scottish Hospital will have significant detrimental outcomes for neighbouring residents.	1
	<p>The impact of the proposal upon the character of the local neighbourhood (particularly Stephen St) is unacceptable and the</p>	<p>The impact of the proposal upon the character of the local neighbourhood (particularly Stephen St) is unacceptable and the</p>	2

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	application should be refused.	application should be refused.	
	<p><u>Community Consultation</u></p> <p>The proponent held a series of meetings, some of which were claimed to be voluntary, which were conducted as information sessions to inform those present of the scheme. Although in the first meeting 2 schemes were presented, these schemes were overwhelmingly versions of the same scheme, these proposals were presented as the only solution.</p>	Two versions of the same scheme were presented at the first consultation meeting.	20
	<p>The process was not intended to be consultative of the local community, instead all concerns were dismissed as erroneous irrespective of the validity of the enquiry. Only selective community concerns were recorded or published in the minutes of these meetings.</p> <p>A specific example is the proposed increase in size to the Dillon St Reserve; during a presentation of the concept master plan, an audience member questioned the audience regarding the desirability of increasing the size of th park, the audience resoundingly answered that 'there was no perceived benefit and that they did not support increasing the size of the park, certainly not as a trade for additional building bulk'. Despite this response, there was no recording of this concern and it was subsequently ignored in the design development.</p>	The process was not intended to be consultative of the local community, instead all concerns were dismissed as erroneous irrespective of the validity of the enquiry.	20
	Across the three 'community consultation sessions' the Architect	Project architect repeatedly referred to the trees along Stephen St	12



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>repeatedly referred to the trees along Stephen St as 'weed species that are recommended by the Arborist for removal'. This statement is incorrect and has been repeatedly identified to Mr Rabinowitz as such. The trees in question are mature examples that are protected under Woollahra Council's TPO. During the most recent 'community consultation session' when I questioned Mr Rabinowitz regarding his statement, he referred to the Arborist who stated that the removal of the trees from Stephen St is necessitated only because of the location of the proposed buildings and excavation works. Surely this cannot be a valid rationale for removing protected trees.</p>	<p>as 'weed species that are recommended by the Arborist for removal'. This is incorrect.</p> <p>These trees are protected by Council's TPO and should be retained.</p>	
	<p><u>Concept Masterplan</u></p> <p>The Concept Masterplan asserts that due to topography the site is able to carry more building bulk at its southernmost end and that, additionally, the heritage trees and gardens located to the west and centre of the site require preservation. This rationale was used to generate the locations of the proposed building, however there are significant flaws with this rationale:</p>	<p>There are significant flaws with the rationale of placing taller buildings to the south of the site due to the site's topography.</p>	10, 11
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed building bulk relies upon existing buildings on site to generate a maximum height, these existing buildings (the heritage buildings along Cooper St) are 2 levels above Cooper St which is the highest and steepest point on the site. Using these heritage buildings as a height datum is deceptive as the site falls quickly from this point resulting in 6 levels above Stephen St. By the time the site reaches the corner of Stephen St and Glen Sts, the surrounding context is two storey terraces and walk ups.</li> </ul>	<p>Using these heritage buildings as a height datum is deceptive as the site falls quickly from this point resulting in 6 levels above Stephen St. By the time the site reaches the corner of Stephen St and Glen Sts, the surrounding context is two storey terraces and walk ups.</p>	10
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The location of 'heritage' trees to the centre and west of the site are used as justification to locate buildings to the southern and</li> </ul>	<p>No evidence has been presented to identify why specific trees have been listed as 'heritage' trees on the site, and thereby why they have</p>	11, 13

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>eastern edges of the site. No evidence has been presented to identify why those specific trees have been listed as 'heritage' trees on the site, not to identify the origins of other significant trees such as those to Stephen St. Proposed building are thus pushed to the southern and eastern boundaries. The continuous green canopy along Stephen St is highly valued by local residents and provides a green corridor enroute to Rushcutters Bay, this has been identified as 'low retention value'. That the quiet cul-de-sac of Stephen St provides amenity to more locals than those who are resident on Stephen St has been entirely overlooked.</p>	<p>influenced building location, when the report does not identify the origins of other significant trees such as those to Stephen St.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The concept masterplan also identifies 'principles' such as using setbacks and landscape to mediate the impact of new buildings. Whilst this principle has been utilised to Brown st, it has been entirely ignored to Stephen St. To Stephen St the small setbacks, wholesale removal of significant trees and the introduction of service zones and loading docks is in sharp contrast to this 'concept master plan principle'. Stephen St is treated particularly badly by the proposal.</li> </ul>	<p>The concept masterplan identifies 'principles' such as using setbacks and landscape to mediate the impact of new buildings. This has been used to Brown St but not Stephen St.</p>	<p>10, 37</p>
	<p>The treatment of Stephen St in particular generates such suspicion in the motives of the architect and design team; the location of building services, insufficient setbacks and removal of significant trees occurs directly adjacent the surrounding dwellings with the lowest average value and highest concentration of tenants rather than owner occupiers. It is also the most densely populated segment adjacent the site's boundary further compounding the impact. It is my belief that the design team have deliberately located 'difficult' buildings and facilities on Stephen St with the expectation that the surrounding residents are unlikely to comment.</p>	<p>It is my belief that the design team have deliberately located 'difficult' buildings and facilities on Stephen St with the expectation that the surrounding residents are unlikely to comment.</p>	<p>11</p>
	<p>Of 105 residences on surrounding streets directly fronting the site, Stephen St carries 59% of the dwellings and is by far the most</p>	<p>The treatment of Stephen St needs to be consistent with that applied to other streets. The high number of residents on Stephen St is not</p>	<p>37</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	heavily impacted by the proposal. The treatment of Stephen St needs to be consistent with that applied to other streets. The high number of residents on Stephen St is not justification for reduced amenity on Stephen St, but should rather be cause to provide greater consideration and respect in the design process to protect and improve the amenity of these residents.	justification for reduced amenity on Stephen St, but should rather be cause to provide greater consideration and respect in the design process to protect and improve the amenity of these residents	
	<u>The Advertised Documents</u>		
	<p><i>Independent Living Units</i></p> <p>It is shocking that the additional scale of the proposal delivers only an additional 12 aged care beds, whilst the bulk of the proposal is the additional provision of 82 apartments. The apartments are large with an average size of 160m<sup>2</sup>. I do not believe that the loss of local amenity can be justified when such large residences are to be provided for the frail. Reducing the average apartment size would significantly reduce the bulk of the proposal allowing for a reduction in height and an increase of setbacks allowing significant trees to be retained.</p>	It is shocking that the additional scale of the proposal delivers only an additional 12 aged care beds, whilst the bulk of the proposal is the additional provision of 82 apartments.	32
	<p><i>Car Parking</i></p> <p>It appears that over 170 carparking spaces are to be provided on the site, the basement car park extends beyond the building footprints and is as little as 2m from the Stephen St boundary. The requirement of 124 bays has been exceeded by one-third generating a second basement level.</p>	<p>The requirement of 124 bays has been exceeded by one-third, generating a second basement level.</p> <p>Reducing the number of bays provided will remove the need for a second basement level and allow for greater setbacks in addition to keeping the basements beneath building footprints allowing for</p>	38

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>The depth and insufficient setback of the basement car park to Stephen St ensure that no significant re-vegetation is possible along this boundary. Note that this is the current location of the row of 'significant' established trees that are approximately 19m in height and within 1m of the boundary.</p> <p>Reducing the number of bays provided will remove the need for a second basement level and allow for greater setbacks in addition to keeping the basements beneath building footprints allowing for critical vegetation along boundaries.</p>	critical vegetation along boundaries.	
	<p><i>Site Context and Setbacks</i></p> <p>The design team have stated that the proposal responds to context to generate building heights and setbacks. The only context that has been acknowledged on Stephen St is the 1964 Seidler Apartment tower at number 40. This building is significantly out of context and would not be achievable under the Woollahra LEP, as a resident of this building I acknowledge that it is a dominant and inappropriate component of the local landscape due to height and setbacks alone.</p> <p>The comparisons of proposed building heights to neighbouring buildings are deceptive in this regard as the height of the lift overrun at 40 Stephen St is given as a building height and the parapet height of the proposal is given as the building height. The parapet height of the tower at 40 Stephen St is RL 42.6 (not RL 47.5 of the LOR).</p> <p>However it has been this building and not its immediate neighbours</p>	<p>Responding to the height of the Seidler building as a rationale for responding to context is inappropriate.</p> <p>The heights used are also inaccurate – the max height of the seidler building quoted is that of the LOR, whilst the parapet height of the new building fronting Stephen Street is used as the comparable height.</p>	10

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>of 2 and 3 level buildings to the north and south along Stephen St that has been used to define the surrounding context. By misrepresenting the context, the design team justify simply mirroring and copying the setbacks and height of the tower building along Stephen St. This gross misinterpretation of context will result in a 'pinch point' of tall buildings on Stephen St that is dramatically out of context with the overwhelming character of the neighbourhood (both terrace houses and apartment buildings alike) that is 203 storeys in height.</p>		
	<p>The proposed RACF building will dominate and overshadowing the 3 storey apartment building at 38 Stephen St and the 2 storey apartment building on the corner of Stephen and Glen Sts whilst creating a building gulley with the tower building at 40 Stephen St.</p> <p>The boundary setback for the RACF varies from as little as 3.2m up to 6.2m. Vegetation will be further reduced with egress for fire stairs is included, and if footpath widening is approved subject to a VPA with Council.</p> <p>The measured distance from 40 Stephen St living room and kitchen windows to the RACF balconies is as little as 16m. These setbacks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) do not allow for significant trees to be retained or replaced</li> <li>(b) do not meet the required SEPP 65 separation distance of 18m for buildings of this size.</li> </ul>	<p>The measured distance from 40 Stephen St living room and kitchen windows to the RACF balconies is as little as 16m. These setbacks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(c) do not allow for significant trees to be retained or replaced</li> <li>(d) do not meet the required SEPP 65 separation distance of 18m for buildings of this size.</li> </ul>	<p><b>45</b></p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p><i>Public Domain</i></p> <p>Currently a significant neighbourhood view exists down Glen St to the mature trees on Stephen St. The placement of the ILU building at the base of Glen St does not allow for retention of the Woollahra TPO protected trees. Additionally, the placement of ILU building appears part way across the intersection of Stephen and Glen Sts thereby providing a poor built form termination to Glen St.</p> <p>Page 18 of the EA report states that the trees “to Stephen St are of low quality but do provide some screening to the existing operating theatre building”. The trees are in fact significant and TPO protected. To describe these trees as ‘low quality’ is both disingenuous and entirely inaccurate. The arborist’s report lists 9 of these trees as Retention Value B, as they are significant and healthy specimens.</p> <p>Page 19 of the EA report states that “Green, heavily vegetated edges characterised the view looking down Stephens St”, this apparently contradicts the above statement but also the Concept Master plan that states that the vegetation along Stephen St is of low retention value. The trees form a continuous ‘green canopy’ along the eastern boundary of the site that provides a very significant local landscape element.</p>	<p>The placement of the ILU building at the base of Glen St does not allow for retention of the Woollahra TPO protected trees</p> <p>Trees to Stephen st should be protected as they are listed as ‘retention value B’ in the arborist report.</p>	13
	The proposed fracturing and stepping of building form designed to ‘minimise’ the impact of height creates an inappropriate architectural	The proposed fracturing and stepping of building form designed to ‘minimise’ the impact of height creates an inappropriate architectural	1, 10, 11

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>response. This is particularly apparent when nearly 90 trees are removed, exposing all this large development to public view. Proposed new plantings are actually shrubs (proposed Blueberry Ash)</p>	<p>response.</p>	
	<p><i>Overshadowing</i></p> <p>The propose bulk RACF and ILU buildings to Stephen St will begin to shade ground level apartments at 38 Stephen St by midday in mid winter and shade almost the entire building at 38 Stephen St by 2pm. Additionally the first floor apartments at 40 Stephen St are shaded by 1230pm in midwinter increasing to nearly 50% of the building in shadow by 4pm. This is absolutely unacceptable; setbacks must be increased to allow adequate daylight to dwellings at 38 and 40 Stephen St that do not achieve any other solar access.</p>	<p>The new building will create unacceptable overshadowing of 38 and 40 Stephen St.</p>	<p>6</p>
	<p><i>View Loss</i></p> <p>The EA report states that “ it is not considered that any dwelling dor which view analysis modelling was undertaken will be affected by view loss as a result of the proposal”</p> <p>The higher building forms are proposed to be located opposite 38 and 40 Stephen St. There ate 90 people living in these units – ranging from the elderly ageing in place to families with young children. To say that there will not be any impacts on neighbouring buildings is disingenuous.</p>	<p>To say that there will not be any view impacts on neighbouring buildings is disingenuous.</p>	<p>18</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p><i>Trees</i></p> <p>All trees along Stephen St are slated for removal, with the exception of two trees at the far north east corner. The arborist report classified 9 trees along the boundary of Stephen St as Retention Value B 'Could be Retained'. Most are Chinese hackberry, Camphor Laurel and Coral Trees over 10m tall, which are protected under Woollahra TPO. Elsewhere on the site these same species have been retained. There is also no justification for the removal of the trees along Stephen St. T37, T35 and T31 are of particular value to 40 Stephen St.</p> <p>Mature Trees along Stephen St, particularly the Retention Value B trees, must be retained and protected. Removal of these trees for the sole reason of allowing building form is vandalism.</p>	<p>The arborist report classified 9 trees along the boundary of Stephen St as Retention Value B 'Could be Retained'. Most are Chinese hackberry, Camphor Laurel and Coral Trees over 10m tall, which are protected under Woollahra TPO.</p> <p>There is also no justification for the removal of the trees along Stephen St. T37, T35 and T31 are of particular value to 40 Stephen St.</p>	12
	<p>The consultants report states that they will 'replace any trees assessed as Category A or B...that are proposed for removal with the same species...or with similar species to maintain landscape character'. However the landscape plans show shrubs such as <i>Elaeocarpus reticulatus</i> (Blueberry Ash). These shrubs will grow, at best, 8-9m tall and will do little to screen the 18.3m high wall opposite 40 Stephen St.</p>	<p>The tall trees are proposed to be replaced with shrubs that grow to 8-9m, which will do little to screen the 18.3m high wall opposite 40 Stephen St.</p>	12
	<p>As stated above these trees constitute a significant local landscape component, labelling them as of 'low value' or 'weed species' is disingenuous and inaccurate. These trees should be protected as</p>	<p>These trees along Stephen St should be protected as required by Woollahra's TOP.</p>	12



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	required by Woollahra's TOP.		
	<p>EA report page 26</p> <p>"The mature plantings and significant drop within the site provides the opportunity to achieve taller buildings within the site if they are located to site within the tree canopy and contained by trees away from the street edges. This will following the existing approach to development on the site"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>this principle has been adhered to on other parts of the site but has been disregarded for Stephen St . The proposal will place 5 to 6 storey buildings along the street edge with minimal setbacks, and in doing so remove every existing tree along the streetscape and replace them with shrubs.</li> </ul>	<p>The principle of locating taller buildings within the tree canopy has been adhered to on other parts of the site but has been disregarded for Stephen St .</p>	37
	<p>EA report page 80</p> <p>"Locating the building form between the trees to enable the maximum retention of vegetation is a positive outcome as it maintains the current landscape character around the site, mitigates the visual impact of any development and continues the visual and heritage contribution of the site to the surrounding area"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>this statement is incorrect in all aspects. The built form along Stephen St will not be located between trees, it will not retain any existing vegetation, it does not maintain the current landscape character, will not mitigate the visual impact of the development and will not continue the visual and heritage contribution of the site to the surrounding area.</li> </ul>	<p>The built form along Stephen St will not be located between trees, it will not retain any existing vegetation, it does not maintain the current landscape character, will not mitigate the visual impact of the development and will not continue the visual and heritage contribution of the site to the surrounding area.</p>	12, 34
	<i>Stephen St Loading Dock</i>	No evidence has been provided to suggest that the loading dock	9, 22

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>A long-disused entry point to the Hospital has been used to justify a new service vehicle entry. The consultants reports refer to a so-called 'existing' service entry from Stephen St. During the public consultation, consultants were unable to say what the entry was used for, when it was closed nor where it was located. In addition, there is a large cluster of mature trees in the supposed location of the service entry. Looking at the existing hospital building and pavement, it is extremely unlikely that any service entry existed at this point.</p> <p>The only documentation to justify the entry is an 1882 subdivision plan showing rear access to terrace houses in the location, as there is no evidence of the lane of the terrace houses, it is disingenuous to suggest that a lane that may have existed is reason for a service dock to a single large building.</p> <p>The traffic report states the traffic generated by the loading bay "will not be numerically inconsistent with that of prevailing other uses in the area". However prevailing uses in the area are not loading bays for service and delivery vehicles. In addition, the narrow cul-de-sac cannot handle service delivery vehicles or additional traffic. Additionally as there is no turning circle at the end of the cul de sac, vehicles currently use our private car park at 40 Stephen St to turn around.</p>	<p>location was previously used as a service entry.</p> <p>Stephen St will not be able to handle the increased traffic. There is no place for vehicles to turn around, except on private property.</p>	
	<p>Due to the narrow street and the surrounding tall buildings and cliffs, the noise generated by 4 to 6 commercial vehicles per hour turning into and backing out of the loading bay will have a significant</p>	<p>the noise generated by 4 to 6 commercial vehicles per hour turning into and backing out of the loading bay will have a significant detrimental effect on the residents of 40 Stephen St. They will not</p>	7

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>detrimental effect on the residents of 40 Stephen St. They will not longer have quiet enjoyment of their properties.</p> <p>Furthermore the DA shows two parallel parking bays on the street will be removed for the service vehicle entry. The VPA with Council seeks to remove several parking bays, with compensation in the form of eight 90 degree parking bays outside Dillon Reserve. We question why these parking spaces would need to be removed if Stephen St were suitable for this type of traffic.</p>	<p>longer have quiet enjoyment of their properties.</p> <p>It is questioned why parking spaces would need to be removed if Stephen St was suitable for this type of traffic.</p>	
	<p><i>Building Facilities to Stephen St</i></p> <p>Residents have been told that the loading bay would only be used for laundry service and kitchen/food supplies for the RACF. All other laundry, food and garbage services for other uses would be from Brown St. However there is a large garbage room directly adjacent to the loading bay on Stephen St. We question why a large garbage room is located adjacent to the loading dock if no garbage will be picked up from this location. We also question why all services can't be located from Brown St as are currently.</p> <p>There is a commercial kitchen and large laundry room opposite 40 Stephen St. Residents are concerned about noise and exhaust air from these uses.</p> <p>Plans also show a large bank of air conditioning condenser units to be located opposite 40 Stephen St. These will be noisy and running 24 hours a day. Half burying these units will not mitigate the noise</p>	<p>We question why a large garbage room is located adjacent to the loading dock if no garbage will be picked up from this location. We also question why all services can't be located from Brown St as are currently.</p> <p>There is a commercial kitchen and large laundry room opposite 40 Stephen St. Residents are concerned about noise and exhaust air from these uses.</p> <p>The air conditioning units will generate noise which will impact residents across the road.</p>	<p>8, 35</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	impact on 38 and 40 Stephen St which have living rooms and kitchens facing these air conditioner units.		
	<p>Additionally it has been stated that there will be no pedestrian or visitor access from Stephen St, the placement of a large lobby at existing ground level between the RACF and ILU buildings suggests that access to and from Stephen St is both simple and probable. Public presentations of the scheme strongly deny that resident access via Stephen St will be provided, and that visitors will not gain access to the site from Stephen St, this appears untrue. The probable Stephen St pedestrian entry will have a significant effect on local car parking as visitors will undoubtedly use this access.</p>	Public presentations of the scheme strongly deny that resident access via Stephen St will be provided, and that visitors will not gain access to the site from Stephen St, this appears untrue.	22, 23, 24
	<p>As stated above I believe that the proposal presents unacceptable urban form outcomes that generate conflict of use, poor amenity (for existing and proposed residents) and a significant degradation of the neighbourhood character.</p> <p>The proposal is significantly inconsistent with Woollahra DCP and does not present an outcome that is in the public interest.</p> <p>I believe the proposal should be refused.</p>	<p>As stated above I believe that the proposal presents unacceptable urban form outcomes that generate conflict of use, poor amenity (for existing and proposed residents) and a significant degradation of the neighbourhood character.</p> <p>The proposal is significantly inconsistent with Woollahra DCP and does not present an outcome that is in the public interest.</p> <p>I believe the proposal should be refused.</p>	1, 2, 45
<b>John &amp; Virginia Richardson</b> <b>36 Stephen St</b>	In general we object to the scale of the proposed development, the destruction of a heritage site and the disregard for the amenity of the local community all for the addition of just 12 aged care beds.	we object to the scale of the proposed development, the destruction of a heritage site and the disregard for the amenity of the local community all for the addition of just 12 aged care beds.	2, 15,

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
Paddington			
	<p><u>Site Suitability</u></p> <p>This is not now, and never will be a good site for housing the elderly, where ease of access is a fundamental requirement. This site is situated at the bottom of the Paddington slopes, meaning access to all services, even the closest bus stop, requires a steep up-hill walk. It was amusing to read in the developers submission the rather quaint suggestion that to go to the post office or bank, one merely has to walk 290m to a bus stop, twice the distance necessary, as the path gradient to the closest stop is too great, and catch a bus to Woollahra or Bondi Junction, an excursion that could take ½ day and impossible for the infirm.</p> <p>Climate is the other problem with this site – being essentially in a gully it received very little winter sun – it is cold. Old bones need the sun! The height of the proposed buildings will only increase the problem, casting shadows over the central open space morning and afternoon, but particularly in the afternoon.</p> <p>The bats are also a problem, but they will probably disappear with the trees.</p>	<p>Access to the site and the nature of the topography is not suitable to provide aged care housing on this site.</p> <p>The site is in a gully and gets little winter sun making it unsuitable for aged care housing.</p>	45
	<p><u>The Garden and Grounds</u></p> <p>As the last remaining largely intact gentry estate, this site is of huge significance to Paddington and eastern Sydney. The garden is what it is about – the house being but part of the whole. In fact the house</p>	<p>The developer has focused on the heritage value of the house and seems not to understand the importance of the garden.</p>	15, 16

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>without the garden would be of little significance. The developer has focused on the house and seems not to understand the importance of the garden.</p> <p>Over the years the Church has allowed the garden to sink into a woeful state of disrepair, just through sheer neglect, and now seeks to almost completely destroy it. In the words of their own arborist “A significant feature of the site is the heavy wooded weed invasion and a general lack of grounds maintenance undertaken clear of the functioning buildings over recent years”.</p>		
	<p>Of the 144 assessed trees on the site, 88 are to be removed, of these, 72 are healthy trees.</p> <p>Of the original 9 heritage listed trees, 1 has going, 1 is to be removed and 4 will be under serious threat with buildings sited within the TPZ and branches to be pruned to allow for building and/or construction under their canopies.</p> <p>If buildings are sited within TPZs, it stands to reason that, construction zones will be much more invasive.</p> <p>EG T18 the port Jackson fig on the lower lawn with a tpz radius of 15m is to have a basement carpark wall w7.5m from its trunk. Excavation in sand and pile driving will undoubtedly encroach a deal further than this.</p> <p>According to the arborist report, 7 of the retained trews will have</p>	<p>There is significant intrusion in to the TPZ and SRZ of many of the trees to be retained, including heritage trees.</p> <p>These heritage trees are fundamental to the garden – if they go the garden is gone. To ensure their survival, there should be no construction work of any sort carried out within their TPZs.</p>	13, 15

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>piling or shoring within their canopy spread.</p> <p>Another listed tree, the Kauri Pint – T119, to the west of the existing nursing home building is one of these, showing building within 5m of its trunk. The arborist calls for a TPZ of 15m and a SRZ radius of 5.5m</p> <p>Similarly the Norfolk pine T100 and the Holm Oak – T81, in the south western corner of the site will be under threat with the construction of the gatekeepers lodge within the TPZ of both these trees.</p> <p>These heritage trees are fundamental to the garden – if they go the garden is gone. To ensure their survival, there should be no construction work of any sort carried out within their TPZs.</p>		
	<p>A close look at the arborist report and plan show the majority of trees to be retained are on the western side, or Brown St side of the site, with a few on the lower lawn and terraces. All others are to be removed, including every tree along Stephen St except for two at the north east corner. If you draw a line through the middle of the site from north to south the only tree remaining of any size on the eastern side is the listed Port Jackson Fig. This rather makes a mockery of the statement on p80 of the Policy Assessment:</p> <p>“Locating the built form between the trees to enable the maximum retention of vegetation is a positive outcome as it maintains the current landscape character around the site, mitigates the visual</p>	<p>A close look at the arborist report and plan show the majority of trees to be retained are on the western side, or Brown St side of the site, with a few on the lower lawn and terraces. All others are to be removed,</p> <p>The statement that built form is to be located between the trees is blatant rubbish and an insult to the intelligence.</p>	13, 12

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>impact of any development and continues the visual and heritage contribution of the site to the surrounding area”</p> <p>This statement is blatant rubbish and an insult to the intelligence. An existing wall of trees along Stephen St is to become a wall of buildings with no chance of planting a substantial screen due to the limited space left between building and boundary and the basements below ground.</p> <p>Statements that the trees will be replaced are nonsense – where the trees were there will now be buildings.</p>	<p>Statements that the trees will be replaced are nonsense – where the trees were there will now be buildings.</p>	
	<p>Another threat to the trees – the basement parking stretching across the site – will interrupt natural ground water flows – resulting inevitably in changes to the water table. This must have an adverse effect on the trees to the north of the basements, possibly also affecting trees below the site.</p> <p>The most important part of the garden is the terraces to the north of the house. We know little of these as they have been hidden from public view for many years, but the developer’s own experts agree “the terraces at the Scottish Hospital site are rare if not unique in the eastern part of Sydney” and “the...site has exceptional and high cultural landscape heritage significance...” And yet the terraces are to be demolished.</p>	<p>The basement car parking will interrupt ground water flows resulting in changes to the water table.</p> <p>The terraces are noted as being of exceptional and high heritage value, yet are to be demolished.</p>	<p>40</p> <p>15, 16</p>
	<p>The fundamental question here is, if 88 of the 144 trees are to be removed and the terraces are to be demolished, can we call what</p>	<p>The fundamental question here is, if 88 of the 144 trees are to be removed and the terraces are to be demolished, can we call what</p>	<p>13, 15, 16</p>



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	remains a garden, let along one of historical significance? What significance is left?	remains a garden, let along one of historical significance? What significance is left?	
	<u>The Buildings</u>		
	<p><i>Siting</i></p> <p>In terms of planning principles, the decision to locate the RACF building immediately adjacent to the most populous section of the surrounding neighbourhood is an extremely poor one. The positioning of the existing is perfect, set well into the site and screened by trees on the Brown St boundary where there are few overlooking neighbours, it has little or no impact on the local residents.</p>	<p>the decision to locate the RACF building immediately adjacent to the most populous section of the surrounding neighbourhood is an extremely poor one.</p> <p>The existing location should be used as it poses little if any impact on local residents.</p>	11
	<p>This is a site usage with very high impact, proposed to be located very close to the boundary across a quiet, 10m wide cul de sac from 61 apartments. So close to the boundary as to make any planting of substantial screening impossible and with commercial kitchen, laundry and garbage store with attendant loading bay directly opposite, it is the worst possible outcome for 100+ local residents. We understand the need for staging, but this is their problem and should not be one the community has to shoulder.</p>	<p>The intensive use of the RACF building is inappropriate along Stephen St.</p> <p>Staging should be the developer's problem, not one that the community has to shoulder.</p>	41
	<p>The siting of the Stephen St ILU so that it blocks the view from Dillon Reserve into the terraces and removes the view into the garden down Glen St runs counter to the initial planning principles and all requests by the community.</p>	<p>The siting of the Stephen St ILU so that it blocks the view from Dillon Reserve into the terraces and removes the view into the garden down Glen St runs counter to the initial planning principles and all requests by the community.</p>	20, 37

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p><i>Scale</i></p> <p>Next to the destruction of the garden this is the most contentious issue. The scale of the new development is such that it completely overwhelms the existing heritage building and negates the heritage significance of the garden.</p>	The scale of the new development is such that it completely overwhelms the existing heritage building and negates the heritage significance of the garden.	2, 15, 16
	Why do the developers think that they can exceed the 9.5m LEP height limit at all, let alone by as much as almost 20m in the case of the Brown St ILU building and over 10m for the RACF building on Stephen St – a wall of building replaces a wall of trees. Even the Gate Keepers Lodge exceeds the limit by 3-5m.	Why do the developers think that they can exceed the 9.5m LEP height limit	45
	They consistently cite 40 Stephen St as an example, which, along with 176 Glenmore Rd to the south and a number of nasty walk ups were built at a time when Paddington was not a heritage suburb and was ripe for redevelopment. Fortunately, this is not the case today – the predominant height of surrounding buildings is 2-3 storeys, not 6 and 9.	They consistently cite 40 Stephen St as an example for height, along with 176 Glenmore Rd. The predominant height of surrounding buildings is 2-3 storeys, not 6 and 9.	10
	The volume of the building is also excessive, floor areas exceeding that of the previously approved development by 45%.	The volume of the building is also excessive, floor areas exceeding that of the previously approved development by 45%.	<b>28</b>
	The proposed buildings do not comply with many aspects of Paddington DCP 1008, in particular 4.1.8 C3 “The height bulk and scale of infill and new development must be consistent with the predominant height, bulk form and scale of appropriate adjoining	The proposed buildings do not comply with many aspects of Paddington DCP 2008, in particular 4.1.8 C3	45, 15

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>buildings. Conformity with adjoining buildings is not appropriate in circumstances where the development site adjoining a building which is a substantially taller landmark building or a building which is considered to be intrusive due to its excessive height and incompatible design”.</p>		
	<p><i>Built Form</i></p> <p>Built form is heavy handed and ponderous, with messy detailing and the use of far too many materials on facades in attempt to reduce its visual scale. It is completely out of context.</p> <p>In general, too high, too bulky, poor architecture showing blatant disregard for both its heritage site and its neighbours. It does not comply with the Woollahra Council LEP Height Limit or the Paddington DCP 2008 clauses 4.1.8 C3 (see above) and 4.4 Infill Development, O1,2&amp;3, C2 Character, C3 Scale, C4 Form, C11 – most important “infill development must be sited to have no adverse impact on significant trees on the site”... and C12 “materials, finishes, textures and colours must be appropriate to the historic context”</p>	<p>Built form is heavy handed and ponderous, with messy detailing and the use of far too many materials on facades in attempt to reduce its visual scale. It is completely out of context.</p>	<p>1, 2</p>
	<p><u>Traffic</u></p> <p>In regard to the developers transport assessment a correction needs to be made. In the description of the local road network, Stephen St is described as relatively wide for a local street with one parking lane and one traffic lane each way between Lawson and Glen St. In fact,</p>	<p>The width and capacity of Stephen St is incorrectly described in the traffic report.</p>	<p>23</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	Stephen St narrows at about the Scottish Hospital northern boundary to become only one travel lane with parking each side up to Glen St. From there it continues to the southern end cul de sac with only parking on one side due to a narrower carriageway, wider footpath.		
	Not mentioned in the assessment is the fact that Glen St also narrows at the eastern or Goodhope end to become one travel lane and one side of parking. These are the streets that are to take service traffic for the RACF – streets that for the most part can only take traffic in one direction at a time and in which larger vehicles often have difficulty manoeuvring.	Glen St also narrows at the eastern or Goodhope end to become one travel lane and one side of parking.	23
	It is not so much the increase in traffic that is worrying, it is the fact they will all be larger vehicles and large vehicles simply do not work in these streets. The assessment compares the increase in traffic generation to that if there were 8-10 new terrace houses here – “the traffic generation of the loading dock would not be numerically inconsistent with that of prevailing other uses in the area”.  Patently nonsense, 8-10 terrace houses are not going to generate 7-8 truck visits a day.	The assessment compares the increase in traffic generation to that if there were 8-10 new terrace houses here – “the traffic generation of the loading dock would not be numerically inconsistent with that of prevailing other uses in the area”.  Patently nonsense, 8-10 terrace houses are not going to generate 7-8 truck visits a day.	23, 22
	The loss of two on street parking spaces in an area where few residents have off street parking is not acceptable.	The loss of two on street parking spaces in an area where few residents have off street parking is not acceptable.	23, 36
	Reference to a re-activation of a disused hospital loading bay on Stephen St is quite baffling – there is absolutely no evidence that	Reference to a re-activation of a disused hospital loading bay on Stephen St is quite baffling – there is absolutely no evidence that	PAC

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	such a loading bay existed.	such a loading bay existed.	
	<p><u>Impact</u></p> <p>As argued above the impact of this development on the garden and the heritage significance of the site will be devastating. Less obvious and barely touched upon by the developer is the impact it will have on the local residents, in particular those living at the southern end of Stephen St.</p> <p>The impact of the construction phase with months of noise, vibration and dust of jack hammering and pile driving for the construction of 2 levels of basement 12m deep on their doorstep and that will just be the beginning.</p>	<p>The impact on local residents have not been considered by the developer.</p> <p>The impact of the construction phase with months of noise, vibration and dust of jack hammering and pile driving for the construction of 2 levels of basement 12m deep on their doorstep and that will just be the beginning.</p>	46
	<p>When completed there will be the impact of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>loss of outlook – a view of trees will be replaced by a 20m wall of building. The developers argue that as “the site is not zoned as open space there cannot be a reasonable expectation to retain such an outlook into vegetated areas”. But as the site is a heritage garden they could, at least expect some trees might remain and considering there is a 9.5m height limit in the area they would reasonably expect any new building to be within this limit. The fact that this building with its double basement is sited as close as 2.4m from the Stephen St boundary means that no adequate planting can be accommodated to lessen its visual impact.</li> </ul>	<p>When completed there will be the impact of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>loss of outlook</li> </ul>	18
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overshadowing – significant reduction in available sunshine on winter afternoons</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overshadowing</li> </ul>	6
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of Privacy with overlooking from rooms and balconies facing the street. With 17.4m between the ACF and no. 40, when the code minimum is 18m. This is played down in the EA – these</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of Privacy</li> </ul>	18

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	rooms overlooking Stephen Street will be “occupied by frail residents”. These frail residents will probably spend most of their time in their rooms and a lot of this time looking out the window. Plus nurses, carers, visitors.		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The constant noise, fumes, odours, escaping vermin etc from the commercial kitchen laundry and garbage store with attendant ventilation and AC equipment situated only metres away from their front entrance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The constant noise, fumes, odours, escaping vermin etc</li> </ul>	7, 35
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Service truck in a narrow cul de sac and network of streets too narrow to take it</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Service truck in a narrow cul de sac and network of streets too narrow to take it</li> </ul>	22
	<p><u>Utilities</u></p> <p>An aspect barely considered is the impact of the extra volume of sewage on an already antique and groaning system. It is proposed that sewage from all proposed buildings on Cooper and Stephen Streets be directed to the existing system in Stephen St ie 140 odd residents and 26 staff, plus a commercial laundry and kitchen, and their report just assumes that “...existing sewer mains will be sufficient for connection”. A little investigation would reveal that the sewer line in Stephen St is the source of strong sewage smells on a fairly regular basis – perhaps a sign that the system is already not coping.</p>	<p>The existing sewerage system is unlikely to be able to cope with the extra demand placed on it by the development.</p>	42
	<p><u>Consultation</u></p> <p>The so-called consultation process was a farce – ‘consultations’ were merely presentations of the intended development. Any expressed objections or criticisms were either ignored – or some dealt with by a little fiddling around the edges, but not enough to</p>	<p>The so-called consultation process was a farce – ‘consultations’ were merely presentations of the intended development.</p> <p>Any expressed objections or criticisms were either ignored – or some dealt with by a little fiddling around the edges, but not enough to make any real difference.</p>	20

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>make any real difference.</p> <p>The photo montage images of views around and into the site were so obviously fudged they were insulting. Devices used were – covering buildings with non-existent trees, not using 50mm aperture (human eye) so that views were broadened, streets appear wider and buildings lower than they actually are; rendering of proposed buildings so they appear to recede into the background; views taken from positions where development appears to have less impact eg views down Glen St would have been more revealing taken from the other side of the street.</p>	<p>The photo montage images of views around and into the site were so obviously fudged they were insulting</p>	29
	<p>Views of the Brown St buildings are from either end of the site or from Glenview St, screened by trees, in the odd case real, but mostly fictitious or trees that are to be removed, not one from where the building could be seen in all its glory. This is a nine story building – and yet if you believe the spin you would not see it from anywhere. In none of their images was the real impact of these building shown.</p>	<p>Views of the Brown St buildings are from either end of the site or from Glenview St, screened by trees, in the odd case real, but mostly fictitious or trees that are to be removed, not one from where the building could be seen in all its glory.</p>	29
	<p>It would have served them better to have engaged with the community in an honest way – they have fooled no-one, just insulted.</p>	<p>It would have served them better to have engaged with the community in an honest way – they have fooled no-one, just insulted.</p>	20
	<p>They started with a lie – the fictitious estimate of \$100 million which enabled them to bypass the Council and local community – we were angry then, we are even angrier now as all hopes of the construction process improving the outcome have well and truly faded.</p>	<p>They started with a lie – the fictitious estimate of \$100 million which enabled them to bypass the Council and local community – we were angry then, we are even angrier now as all hopes of the construction process improving the outcome have well and truly faded.</p>	44

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>In conclusion we object to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The loss of 61% of the site's trees and threat to others</li> <li>▪ The destruction of a heritage site</li> <li>▪ The height and bulk and depth of the proposed buildings</li> <li>▪ The lack of setback to surrounding streets</li> <li>▪ The disregard for the amenity of local residents</li> <li>▪ The introduction of service traffic in local streets</li> <li>▪ Lack of meaningful consultation</li> <li>▪ The dishonesty</li> </ul> <p>All for the addition of just 12 aged care beds.</p>	<p>In conclusion we object to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The loss of 61% of the site's trees and threat to others</li> <li>▪ The destruction of a heritage site</li> <li>▪ The height and bulk and depth of the proposed buildings</li> <li>▪ The lack of setback to surrounding streets</li> <li>▪ The disregard for the amenity of local residents</li> <li>▪ The introduction of service traffic in local streets</li> <li>▪ Lack of meaningful consultation</li> <li>▪ The dishonesty</li> </ul> <p>All for the addition of just 12 aged care beds.</p>	13, 15, 16, 2, 34, 24, 20
<b>Briony Edwards</b>  <b>808 Henry Lawson Dr</b>  <b>Picnic Point</b>  <b>(owner, 40 Stephen St)</b>	<p>Stephen St is currently a quiet dead end street that experiences very little traffic and noise, and has a lovely streetscape. I believe the changes that are being proposed will impact this substantially and wish for them to be reviewed.</p>	<p>I believe the changes that are being proposed will impact Stephen St substantially and wish for them to be reviewed.</p>	7
	<p><u>Removal of Trees</u></p> <p>There are notes to remove all 'retention value B' trees from Stephen St. These trees are a major asset to the street, and their removal will impact the feel and look of the street substantially.</p> <p>The Woollahra Council TPO says that nine of the trees must be preserved but the application has ignored these, even calling some of them weeds when other trees of the same species are to be</p>	<p>Trees along Stephen St are a major asset to the street, and their removal will impact the feel and look of the street substantially</p>	12



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	retained in the same proposal.		
	<p><u>The aged Care Facility is to be built right on the edge of Stephen St</u></p> <p>The SEPP 65 recommendation is for 18m, but this development is proposing 16m</p>	The setback to the RACF building does not meet SEPP 65 building separation distances.	45
	<p><u>Stephen St is to be used as a service entry</u></p> <p>Stephen St is a quiet dead end street that is quite narrow. Using this as a service entry will be a major disruption to all residents, and there is not enough room to reverse or turn trucks on the road. I fear that the common driveway areas of the apartment block will have to be used to accommodate such vehicles.</p>	Using Stephen St as a service entry will be a major disruption to all residents, and there is not enough room to reverse or turn trucks on the road.	7
	<p><u>Air conditioning units located opposite 40 Stephen St</u></p> <p>These will once again have a massive impact on the residents of 40 Stephen St with the noise that will be produced.</p>	Air conditioning units will once again have a massive impact on the residents of 40 Stephen St with the noise that will be produced.	35
	Whilst consideration has been given to the residents of Brown St, with the appearance remaining mostly untouched, it appears that the same has not been afforded to the residents of Stephen St and the massive impact this development will have on their standard of living.	Whilst consideration has been given to the residents of Brown St, with the appearance remaining mostly untouched, it appears that the same has not been afforded to the residents of Stephen St and the massive impact this development will have on their standard of living.	37
	I would ask that the plans for the Scottish Hospital on Stephen St be reviewed with a more resident friendly outlook.	I would ask that the plans for the Scottish Hospital on Stephen St be reviewed with a more resident friendly outlook.	1

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<b>Executive Committee</b>  <b>40 Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>   <b>Alan McCormick</b>  <b>40 Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>	<p>In its consultation report Urbis says that “the exceptional landscape of the site...means that any development should seek to maintain as many trees as possible to maintain landscape edges to the site and screen further development, and retain the significance of the site. This will dictate the location of building footprints to avoid damage or impact on the trees’.</p> <p>It goes on to say that ‘the large trees on the site will significantly mitigate the perceived height of the envisaged buildings, which will generally sit within the established tree canopy’.</p> <p>Whilst this principle has been used on Brown St, it has been disregarded on Stephen St which is a quiet cul de sac with many residents.</p>	<p>The EA report states that ‘the large trees on the site will significantly mitigate the perceived height of the envisaged buildings, which will generally sit within the established tree canopy’.</p> <p>Whilst this principle has been used on Brown St, it has been disregarded on Stephen St which is a quiet cul de sac with many residents.</p>	37
	<p>All trees along Stephen St are slated to be removed, with the exception of two trees at the far north east corner. The arborist report classified nine trees along the boundary of Stephen St as Retention Value B ‘Could be Retained’. Most are Chinese Hackberry, Camphor Laurel and Coral Trees over 10m tall, which are protected under Council’s TPO. Elsewhere on the site these same species have been retained. There is no justification of the removal of the trees along Stephen St. T37, T35 and T31 are of particular value to our building at 40 Stephen St.</p> <p>We request that the mature trees along Stephen St and particularly</p>	<p>We request that the mature trees along Stephen St and particularly the Retention Value B trees be retained and protected.</p>	12

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	the Retention Value B trees be retained and protected.		
	<p>The consultants report states that they will “replace any trees assessed as Category A or B...that are proposed for removal with the same species...or with similar species to maintain landscape character’ (EA p.130). however the landscape plans show shrubs such as blueberry ash. These shrubs will grow, at best 8-9m tall and will do little to screen the 18.3m high wall opposite 40 Stephen St.</p> <p>We request that any trees removed along Stephen St be replaced with tall advanced tree species that will mask the RACF building not just shrubs and minor vegetation.</p>	<p>We request that any trees removed along Stephen St be replaced with tall advanced tree species that will mask the RACF building not just shrubs and minor vegetation.</p>	12
	<p>The boundary setback for the RACF varies from as little as 3.2m up to 6.2m. Vegetation will be further reduced with egress for fire stairs is included, and if footpath widening is approved subject to a VPA with Council.</p> <p>The measured distance from 40 Stephen St living room and kitchen windows to the RACF balconies is as little as 16m. These setbacks</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(e) do not allow for significant trees to be retained or replaced</li> <li>(f) do not meet the required SEPP 65 separation distance of 18m for buildings of this size.</li> </ul> <p>We request that the RACF and ILU building setbacks be increased to allow significant trees to be retained, and to meet SEPP 65 separation requirements.</p>	<p>We request that the RACF and ILU building setbacks be increased to allow significant trees to be retained, and to meet SEPP 65 separation requirements.</p>	45

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>The consultant report states that “locating the taller buildings towards the southern end of the site which can take higher building forms without the resultant impacts on neighbouring buildings” (EA page 1114). This couldn’t be further from the truth.</p> <p>40 Stephen St has 40 units of 2 and 3 bedrooms in size. Our residents range in age from babies and toddlers, students and professionals, to elderly ageing in place. Together with 38 Stephen St we estimate that there are some 90 residents living at the southern end of Stephen St. We are very concerned about the negative impact that the proposal will have on our lives.</p>	<p>The consultant report states that “locating the taller buildings towards the southern end of the site which can take higher building forms without the resultant impacts on neighbouring buildings” (EA page 1114). This couldn’t be further from the truth.</p>	10
<p><b>Sara Stace &amp; Clint Yabuka</b></p> <p><b>40 Stephen St</b></p> <p><b>Paddington</b></p> <p><b>Submission to PAC</b></p>	<p>We have some concerns about the specific impact of the proposed development on the southern end of Stephen Street. We would like to highlight these issues as we believe they are important considerations for the Board of the Presbyterian Aged Care in upholding its values and those of Jesus.</p>		
	<p>The Scottish hospital is one of the most attractive sites in the Paddington area. Birds are attracted to the dense thicket of trees, Throughout the seasons we can see birds nesting, watch the colourful rainbow lorikeets as they feed on the coral tree flowers, and listen to the warble of currawongs, cockatoos and magpies.</p>	<p>Thus the contiguous canopy of mature trees is a wonderful asset to the area</p>	13

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>Some of the trees are deciduous whilst others are flowering, providing an ever changing backdrop from season to season. Thus the contiguous canopy of mature trees is a wonderful asset to the area. It is appreciated not just by the 90 residents who live in the adjacent apartment buildings, but also by the children who walk from their nearby homes to the playground at Dillon Reserve.</p>		
	<p>The RACF is proposed on Stephen St in a lovely, quiet cul de sac location. Opposite the RACF are three multi-residential buildings what were built in the 1960s. They are not attractive buildings, however the very large trees along the edge of the Scottish Hospital site provide a leafy backdrop that softens the impact of the buildings on the streetscape.</p>	<p>The very large trees along the edge of the Scottish Hospital site provide a leafy backdrop that softens the impact of the existing unattractive residential flat buildings on the streetscape.</p>	13, 12
	<p>The public consultation process has revealed much public concern about what would happen to the mature trees long Stephen St. Following the first public consultation meetings in may 2010, a minor concession was made to reduce the height and create a small setback to a portion of the RACF building. However the proposal still intends to remove every tree along Stephen St despite nine of the trees being classified by the Arborist as Retention Value B (Could be Retained). Council does not regard them as weeds it they are over 10m tall.</p> <p>The current trees are up to 19m tall with canopies of 6 to 8 metres radius. The proposed replacement species is Blueberry Ash, a slender shrub growing wot a maximum 8 m high. There are already a couple of examples of Blueberry Ash established on the site but</p>	<p>the proposal still intends to remove every tree along Stephen St despite nine of the trees being classified by the Arborist as Retention Value B (Could be Retained). Council does not regard them as weeds it they are over 10m tall.</p> <p>This replacement vegetation is a fraction of the size of trees being replaced. Assuming they reach their full height of 8m they will be well short of the RACF building parapet at 18.3m high. The result will be very little foliage to mask the view between 40 Stephen St and</p>	12

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	because they are shrubs the arborist didn't consider them worth tagging as trees. This replacement vegetation is a fraction of the size of trees being replaced. Assuming they reach their full height of 8m they will be well short of the RACF building parapet at 18.3m high. The result will be very little foliage to mask the view between 40 Stephen St and the RACF building.	the RACF building.	
	Furthermore because the setback is as small as 3.25m there will be little room available for large canopied trees along Stephen St in the future.	Because the setback is as small as 3.25m there will be little room available for large canopied trees along Stephen St in the future.	12, 34
	We ask the board to consider:  What will the view and loss of amenity be like for residents of the new RACF?	What will the view and loss of amenity be like for residents of the new RACF?	14
	Many of your residents will look straight out onto the unattractive 1960s tower block of 40 Stephen St. Your website says the Paddington facility 'is set in a beautiful rain forest adjacent to an environmental park'. Will this still be the case for the RACF when the site is redeveloped?	Will the site still be 'a beautiful rain forest adjacent to an environmental park' when the site is redeveloped?	13
	We suggest that the board ask their consultants for a view analysis from the RACF and that the setbacks along Stephen St be reviewed to ensure that adequate space is allowed for mature large tree species to be retained along this street frontage.	We suggest that the board ask their consultants for a view analysis from the RACF and that the setbacks along Stephen St be reviewed to ensure that adequate space is allowed for mature large tree species to be retained along this street frontage.	14
	In its consultation report, Urbis says that "the exceptional landscape of the site...means that any development should seek to maintain as	Whilst the urban design principle of 'using trees to mitigate the perceived height of the buildings which sit within the established	37

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>many trees as possible to maintain landscape edges to the site and screen further development, and retain the significance of the site. This will dictate the location of building footprints to avoid damage or impact on the trees”.</p> <p>It goes on to say that “the large trees on the site will significantly mitigate the perceived height of the envisaged buildings which will generally sit within the established canopy”.</p> <p>Whist the urban design principle has been used on Brown St it has been disregarded on Stephan St which is a quiet cul de sac with a large number of residents. It will particularly affect the RACF residents of the new Scottish Hospital.</p> <p>A potential solution that will appease most of our concerns would be to identify the 9 existing trees with B ratings that are located within a metre of the site boundary, and cut out deeper setbacks in the RACF building to accommodate them.</p>	<p>canopy’ has been used on Brown St it has been disregarded on Stephan St which is a quiet cul de sac with a large number of residents. It will particularly affect the RACF residents of the new Scottish Hospital.</p>	
	<p><u>The loading bay on Stephen St</u></p> <p>The DA shows a loading bay opposite the foyer to 40 Stephen St. Your consultants have emphasised that there was once delivery access to this location when the hospital was still in operation. They have not provided evidence of this claim, and the exiting site has a cluster of mature trees in that precise location. Residents who have lived in the building for more than 20 years have said there we no deliveries here, even when the hospital was operational.</p>	<p>No evidence has been provided of the former use of a loading dock in Stephen st.</p>	<p>9</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>The southern end of the street is very narrow. There is no turnaround space. Trucks and delivery vehicles find this particularly difficult, Council's rubbish trucks use a complicated reversing procedure which generates a considerable amount of noise, much to the consternation of residents.</p> <p>The loading bay will add 203 delivery movements per hour – this equates to 4-6 movements per hour, or one movement every 10 to 15 minutes. Due to the narrow street, and the surrounding tall buildings and cliffs, the noise generated by delivery vehicles turning into and beeping to back out of the loading bay in this difficult to access location will have a significant effect on the surrounding locality.</p> <p>It will impact both the existing residents of the street and the future RACF residents.</p>	<p>The southern end of the street is very narrow with vehicular turning opportunities limited.</p> <p>Due to the narrow street, and the surrounding tall buildings and cliffs, the noise generated by delivery vehicles turning into and beeping to back out of the loading bay in this difficult to access location will have a significant effect on the surrounding locality.</p>	7
	<p>We ask the board to consider:</p> <p>What will the noise of the loading bay be like for residents of the new RACF?</p> <p>We suggest that the PAC board request their consultant to find a different location for the loading bay, to mitigate noise and traffic impact for new and existing residents along Stephen St.</p>	<p>What will the noise of the loading bay be like for residents of the new RACF?</p>	7
	<p>PAC follow the teachings of Jesus which include</p>		



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>Showing compassion and love by caring for and nurturing the whole person – physical, social, emotional and spiritual</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provision of aged care facilities in this location in Paddington benefits from a beautiful location with a generous leafy outlook and the sound of birds. It has all the physical features to support a dignified and peaceful home for the aged. The mature trees provide much of this benefit, and it would detract significantly from the physical beauty and harmony of the place if they were removed.</li> </ul>	<p>The mature trees provide much of the site's beauty, and it would detract significantly from the physical beauty and harmony of the place if they were removed.</p>	13
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In your newsletter dated April 2010 you said “Jesus teachings and actions showed that holistic care of older people is essential if we are to care for the elderly in a biblical manner. We can't afford to ignore either the medical or spiritual aspect of care if we are aiming to please our Lord. It is the focus on holistic care that sets PAC apart from other secular or non-religious aged care providers.</li> <li>However, the report prepared by Urbis states on p110 that the RACF will be “occupied by frail residents. Whilst the residents will occupy their rooms which are oriented towards Stephen St, it is considered that the nature of the use will not result in adverse overlooking impacts to residents across Stephen St”. This is hardly in keeping with PAC's vision of honouring the whole person regardless of their age.</li> </ul>	<p>The point of this submission is not clear, but appears to relate to overlooking of Stephen Street residences.</p>	14
	<p>Supporting community life, where people can live together in harmony, safety and security:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In this location there is a wide representation of the community. There are some 90 residents living at 38 and 40 Stephen St. The units in these buildings vary in size from studios up to 3 bedroom units and accommodate residents at all sages of lifecycle. They include elderly people aging in place, who regularly sit at our bench in the sunshine and share news of the day. There are also families with very young children. The laughter of children walking to and</li> </ul>	<p>With the redevelopment of the Scottish hospital site we would like to think that the existing residents along Stephen St and the future residents of the aged care facility can enjoy the view of trees and the sound of birds outside their window for many years to come.</p>	18

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>from the nearby playground is a true pleasure to hear.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With the redevelopment of the Scottish hospital site we would like to think that the existing residents along Stephen St and the future residents of the aged care facility can enjoy the view of trees and the sound of birds outside their window for many years to come.</li> </ul>		
	<p>You said in your newsletter of April 2010 that “the task now is to look more closely at what would be appropriate for the site, and how we can keep delivering our services for different socio-economic seniors in a manner that respects the site’s unique historic and environmental integrity....As far as we are concerned this change will only work if the site’s unique beauty is maintained – and that’s exactly what we intend to do”.</p>		
	<p>Re suggest that the Board of PAC ask their consultants to:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase setbacks to the southern portion of Stephen St (south of Glen St) to ensure that adequate space is allowed for mature large tree species to be retained and new trees can grow in the future.</li> <li>Retain the existing trees along the boundary, removing only those which have been classified as Retention Value C or D. The proposed removal of all trees and replacement with blueberry ash or similar height trees will not provide the beautiful leafy backdrop for RACF residents that larger trees would provide. Retaining the existing trees would maintain the existing leafy character of the street that makes it such a wonderful asset, and we wouldn’t have to wait for trees to mature.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increase setbacks to the southern portion of Stephen St (south of Glen St) to ensure that adequate space is allowed for mature large tree species to be retained and new trees can grow in the future.</li> <li>Retain the existing trees along the boundary, removing only those which have been classified as Retention Value C or D.</li> </ul>	34, 12
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents have been told that the arborist recommended removal of all trees along Stephen st because they are weeds. However there are several instances elsewhere in this proposal where the same species will be retained. Furthermore most of the specimens along Stephen St are subject to Woollahra Council’s TPA because they are now over 10m in height.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Trees identified for removal along Stephen St should be retained as they are covered by Council’s TPO.</li> </ul>	12

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For example T37 is 9m high and 8m radius and is located directly across 40 Stephen St. It provides a significant canopy and if it were kept would help reduce the visual impact of the buildings. By way of comparison, T5 near the Brown St entry is a very similar size that is being retained because it helps create a grand entry to the hospital. Imagine if the matching tree on Stephen st were kept, maintaining the legacy of this splendid tree canopy, screening the 1960s building across the road, laving the bird nests intact and keeping the neighbouring community happy.</li> <li>T35 is 17m high and 6m in radius. It has retention Value B and is located very close to the property boundary. It is a native tree and because it has developed a tall narrow growth it would be an ideal candidate for retention.</li> </ul>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relocate the loading bay access to another location, for example Brown Street where existing vehicular access occurs. With trucks manoeuvring in or beeping to back out of the driveway every 10 - 15 minutes during peak times the proposed service vehicle loading dock will create significant noise impacts for your RACF and ILU residents.</li> </ul>	Relocate the loading bay access to another location, for example Brown Street where existing vehicular access occurs	7
<b>Name illegible</b>  <b>702/40 Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>	The proposed aged care facility on the former site of the Scottish Hospital is a shocker.	The proposed aged care facility on the former site of the Scottish Hospital is a shocker.	2
	Removal of all the trees in Stephen St, against Council's TPO, to be replaced with a monolith of Soviet proportions only 16m across from our entry foyer, a 'new' entry that has not existed for at least 30 years – how Christian and boring is this?	Objects to removal of street trees in Stephen Street  Objects to scale of the RACF  Objects to the new service entry	12, 2, 7

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	It seems your organisation is endeavouring to squeeze every last dollar out of an historically attractive site with mature trees and rolling lawns, to be replaced with concrete structures.	It seems your organisation is endeavouring to squeeze every last dollar out of an historically attractive site with mature trees and rolling lawns, to be replaced with concrete structures.	1
	The tree lined street (Stephen St) convinced us to buy in the 80s. "Progress" (?) will destroy this.  Please reconsider.	The tree lined street (Stephen St) convinced us to buy in the 80s. "Progress" (?) will destroy this.  Please reconsider.	12
<b>Tom Barraket</b> <b>601/40 Stephen St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	The core concern most residents have is that the scale of the project is too large and I do not know of one local resident that is in support of the proposed development (in its current form). I believe that approving this development would be a major failing of government policy and the intention of Part 3A. While Part 3A was intended to push through projects in the best interest of society, this application is a highly inequitable distribution of the social costs and benefits and those paying the largest cost are the residents of Stephen St and Cooper St.	the scale of the project is too large  approving this development would be a major failing of government policy and the intention of Part 3A.	2  45
	The development is far too large and will destroy much of the greenery enjoyed by the residents in the area.	The development is far too large and will destroy much of the greenery enjoyed by the residents in the area.	2, 13
	The development is too close to Stephen St and will be very intrusive for resident living at the Cooper St end of Stephen St. There should be greater setbacks between the aged care facility and Stephen St allowing residents adequate space.	The development is too close to Stephen St and will be very intrusive for resident living at the Cooper St end of Stephen St	34, 2

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>The removal of all the trees directly opposite 40 Stephen St is not required. Several of these trees are well established and I'm informed some of them should be protected under regulations by Council as they are greater than 10m in height. The Arborist advice survey has given these trees a retention Value B rating and it seems that these trees are being removed against the residents' request purely because it is more convenient for the developer. The Camphor Laurel and Brushbox trees opposite 40 Stephen St should be kept.</p>	<p>The removal of all the trees directly opposite 40 Stephen St is not required. Several of these trees are well established and I'm informed some of them should be protected under regulations by Council as they are greater than 10m in height.</p>	12
	<p>The service entry area located directly opposite 40 Stephen St will cause excessive noise and trucks will find it difficult to navigate down the street. Stephen St is very narrow, not conducive to heavy traffic flow and many larger vehicles are likely to use the 40 Stephen St private parking area for turning. This service entry should be removed from Stephen St and all residents that I have spoken with (some who have lived in the area for multiple decades) say they don't believe there has been a service entry on Stephen St in living memory.</p>	<p>The service entry area located directly opposite 40 Stephen St will cause excessive noise and trucks will find it difficult to navigate down the street.</p>	7
	<p>The air conditioning condenser units, laundry and kitchen ventilation, which will be located directly opposite 40 Stephen St will be unattractive and create noise. The condenser units should be relocated and hidden. Kitchen and laundry ventilation should not be toward Stephen St given there is such a small distance (approx 16m) between the aged care facility and 40 Stephen St.</p>	<p>The air conditioning condenser units, laundry and kitchen ventilation, which will be located directly opposite 40 Stephen St will be unattractive and create noise. The condenser units should be relocated and hidden</p>	35

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	The new trees to be planted on Stephen St are inadequate and will fail to grow to significant size for many years (if ever). There appears to be inadequate space for the trees to grow and the same species of tree have failed to grow well in the Dillon St Reserve. I believe the development drawings are very misleading and that even after 10 years of growth the trees will be approximately 50-80% smaller than the drawings and models in the development proposal suggest.	The new trees to be planted on Stephen St are inadequate and will fail to grow to significant size for many years (if ever).	12
	My home will be severely impacted by this development and greater setbacks on the Stephen St side of the development would be a very significant improvement. Residents of 40 Stephen St who now enjoy a leafy front yard will have a service entry, garbage bay, industrial laundry and kitchen and potentially noisy air conditioning condenser unit on their front door step. Reducing the scale of the facility is necessary to gain the support from the community and I believe that approving this application will result in unfair treatment of Stephen and Cooper St residents.	Residents of 40 Stephen St who now enjoy a leafy front yard will have a service entry, garbage bay, industrial laundry and kitchen and potentially noisy air conditioning condenser unit on their front door step	7, 35
<b>T.D Jay</b>  <b>29 Louisa Rd</b>  <b>Birchgrove</b>	<u>Trees</u>  40 Stephen St looks out onto a magnificent line of very mature tress which were obviously planted well before my purchase. I urge your reconsideration of the decision to totally remove all or the majority of trees along the Stephen St boundary. Two trees specifically, namely a mature Camphor Laurel T37 (if retained could substantially reduce the impact of the development) and the mature Brushwood T35. The	I urge your reconsideration of the decision to totally remove all or the majority of trees along the Stephen St boundary, especially T37 and T35.	12

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<b>Owner of 301/40 Stephen St</b>	latter is very close to the boundary and could easily be retained along with many others if the will was there to adopt this approach.		
	The opportunity also exists to save a considerable number of the trees as shown in your report as "retention Value B". Woollahra Council TPO states that these trees must be preserved. How can this be totally ignored??? To classify these mature trees as weeds is a travesty and severely understates their value to the area.	How can Council's TPO be totally ignored?	12
	<p><u>Service Entry</u></p> <p>I can confirm that during my 27 year ownership of unit 301, no vehicles have used Stephen St as an entry/exit point for this site. No access way has existed over this period of time.</p> <p>Stephen St is not in my view designed for heavy or constant traffic movement nor does it have the width to accommodate both the cars parked on both sides of the street and two way traffic movements. Car parking is very limited and the removal of any spaces in the street will have detrimental effects on the wellbeing of the local community.</p>	<p>I can confirm that during my 27 year ownership of unit 301, no vehicles have used Stephen St as an entry/exit point for this site. No access way has existed over this period of time.</p> <p>Stephen St is not in my view designed for heavy or constant traffic movement nor does it have the width to accommodate both the cars parked on both sides of the street and two way traffic movements</p>	9, 7, 22
	Insufficient space exists to accommodate vehicles turning into and from the site. I support the use of Brown St as the service point for the aged care facility. Garbage pickup, amongst other services, is designated as being serviced from Brown St. I again suggest that all services be directed to the Brown St area. Stephen St is not suitable for regular commercial traffic.	<p>Insufficient space exists to accommodate vehicles turning into and from the site.</p> <p>I suggest that all services be directed to the Brown St area.</p>	22, 7

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p><u>Setback</u></p> <p>How can consent to the current plans be given when the current planned setback of 16m does not conform to the SEPP 65 recommendation? 18m is specified as the minimum and therefore the current plans do not meet this requirements and should be rejected.</p>	<p>How can consent to the current plans be given when the current planned setback of 16m does not conform to the SEPP 65 recommendation?</p>	<p><b>45</b></p>
	<p><u>Air Conditioning</u></p> <p>Noise from the currently planned large bank of Air Conditioners is positioned directly opposite Stephen St. With 24 hour per day running, the noise will be unacceptable to residents and I request your urgent consideration to the repositioning of these.</p>	<p>Request that the air conditioning units be relocated.</p>	<p>35</p>
<p><b>Gary Lazarus</b></p> <p><b>830/40</b></p> <p><b>Stephen Street</b></p> <p><b>Paddington</b></p>	<p>The service bay proposed for Stephen St will be the cause of noisy trucks dropping off and delivering goods. It will create the likelihood of trucks using number 40s driveway to turn around all day.</p>	<p>The service bay proposed for Stephen St will be the cause of noisy trucks dropping off and delivering goods. It will create the likelihood of trucks using number 40s driveway to turn around all day.</p>	<p>7</p>
	<p>The removal of the trees from Stephen St is almost a crime, they add complete charm to the area and are well loved by the residents. I also understand that some of them are protected under the guidelines of Woollahra Council.</p>	<p>The Stephen St trees add complete charm to the area and are well loved by the residents. I also understand that some of them are protected under the guidelines of Woollahra Council.</p>	<p>12</p>



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	Air conditioning units placed opposite our building will be noisy and create a disturbance.	Air conditioning units placed opposite our building will be noisy and create a disturbance.	35
	The overall size of the proposed development is simply too big	The overall size of the proposed development is simply too big	2
	The loss of street parking is also a concern. I do not have a private car space and rely on resident street parking which is already scarce. I understand that the developers are requesting that Woollahra Council fund extra 90 degree parking spaced further down the street at the cost of losing more trees.	The loss of street parking is also a concern.	36
	There are personal balconies and roof gardens proposed to be built overlooking the living area of all the west facing units in our block. This restricts privacy to us and future residents of the ILUs. There are only 16m between us.	There are personal balconies and roof gardens proposed to be built overlooking the living area of all the west facing units in our block. This restricts privacy to us and future residents of the ILUs. There are only 16m between us.	18
	There are fire stairs in the plan right opposite no. 40 which I understand will be lit with emergency 24 hour lighting.	There are fire stairs in the plan right opposite no. 40 which I understand will be lit with emergency 24 hour lighting.	11
	A massive decrease in the bird and wildlife due to the lack of trees and undergrowth.	A massive decrease in the bird and wildlife due to the lack of trees and undergrowth.	13
	We have been involved in all the community consultation sessions (better named information sessions) as I cannot see that the community's main concerns have been addressed through the whole 'consultation' process.	I cannot see that the community's main concerns have been addressed through the whole 'consultation' process.	20
	I feel that due to the many inconsistencies fed to us by the planners, developers and PAC, it would be a good idea to have the plans	it would be a good idea to have the plans assessed by the NSW	For consideration of NSW

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	assessed by the NSW Government architect.	Government architect.	DPI
<b>Susan Bray</b> <b>203/40 Stephen St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	It requires all the big mature trees to be removed in Stephen St, to accommodate the building, replacing them with much smaller, decorative trees which won't give screening or privacy.	It requires all the big mature trees to be removed in Stephen St	12
	The scale of the proposed building will 'wall-in' the narrow street and will substantially reduce light, particularly afternoon light, by casting a large shadow, extending across our building and grounds. The view from my living area at present is of beautiful mature trees, giving changing patterns of light and shade throughout the day and absolute privacy, which is also a major concern with five floors directly facing.	The scale of the proposed building will 'wall-in' the narrow street and will substantially reduce light, particularly afternoon light, by casting a large shadow, extending across our building and grounds	2
	Goods delivery opposite will increase noise and disturbance, with truck manoeuvrings in a narrow street, in what is presently a very peaceful area, despite density.	Goods delivery opposite will increase noise and disturbance, with truck manoeuvrings in a narrow street, in what is presently a very peaceful area, despite density.	7
	The huge footprint of the proposed development in height and length is too big for the location and will have a brutal impact on those in our building and locality. A more considered and sympathetic design could reflect Harry Seidler's idea of a taller building with a smaller footprint and a smaller building alongside allowing a corridor for through views, for those living opposite and retaining some mature	The huge footprint is too big for the location  A more considered and sympathetic design could reflect Harry Seidler's idea of a taller building with a smaller footprint and a smaller building alongside allowing a corridor for through views, for	2

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	trees at our end of Stephen St.	those living opposite and retaining some mature tress at our end of Stephen St.	
<b>Frank Costigan</b>  <b>30-34 Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>	<u>Increased activity in Stephen St</u>  The southern end of Stephen St is very quiet, the fact that there is a 'No Through Road' sign at the entrance to Stephen St keeps traffic to a minimum and noise levels are incredibly low. The most significant noise is that of the birds in the trees that are located on the site. Erecting a number of new buildings along Stephen St would change this and make Stephen St a much more substantial thoroughfare.	Erecting a number of new buildings along Stephen St would change the quiet nature of Stephen St and make this a much more substantial thoroughfare.	22
	<u>Visual Impact will be Negative</u>  The new buildings and loss of trees will have a significant negative impact on the visual beauty of Stephen St. Paddington is already very crowded and the new buildings will be an eye-sore compared to the current lovely outlook that is captured by the open space and trees. I do not believe the redevelopment should include new buildings but rather be 'redevelopment' of existing buildings.	I do not believe the redevelopment should include new buildings but rather be 'redevelopment' of existing buildings.	18
	<u>Increased Traffic congestion</u>  As the plans state, "The Victorian era street system serving the densely populated suburb of Paddington is sensitive to additional traffic volumes. The envisaged development will increase traffic	Stephen St and Glen St are both narrow streets and an increase in traffic along these streets will cause significant issues for local residents. In addition, parking is at a premium and again an increase in people activity will cause issues for local access to parking.	22, 24

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>generation associated with the site"</p> <p>Stephen St and Glen St are both narrow streets and an increase in traffic along these streets will cause significant issues for local residents. In addition, parking is at a premium and again an increase in people activity will cause issues for local access to parking.</p>		
	<p><u>Loss of Natural Vegetation</u></p> <p>I am concerned about the number of trees that will be removed to make way for these new buildings. The Paddington area is already over crowded and the trees/natural space and light are rate. To remove more trees to make way for further buildings would have a significant negative impact on the local residents. I would prefer all trees along Stephen St be retained.</p>	<p>To remove more trees to make way for further buildings would have a significant negative impact on the local residents. I would prefer all trees along Stephen St be retained.</p>	<p>13, 12</p>
<p><b>Michael O'Curraoin</b></p> <p><b>803/40 Stephen St</b></p> <p><b>Paddington</b></p>	<p>I am in favour of the redevelopment of the hospital in principle but cannot agree to the proposed size, scale, character and loss of amenity, particularly as it affects the residents of Stephen St.</p>	<p>I am in favour of the redevelopment of the hospital in principle but cannot agree to the proposed size, scale, character and loss of amenity, particularly as it affects the residents of Stephen St.</p>	<p>2, 1</p>
	<p>The size and scale of the development is far too big for this corner of Paddington. The proposed buildings dwarf the Scottish Hospital heritage building and render our leafy street a narrow, unpleasant concrete corridor. In its present form this it not a suitable development for an area of such rich Australian heritage</p>	<p>The size and scale of the development is far too big for this corner of Paddington.</p>	<p>2</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	significance.		
	<p>The number of trees being removed from the site is excessive. I refer here particularly to the 9 beautiful mature trees located within a metre of the Stephen St boundary, some reaching 19m in height. These trees are being removed solely to make room for the building. This, despite the much touted design principle that “any development should seek to maintain as many trees as possible to maintain landscape edges to the site and screen further development”. It is galling to hear that these fine specimens being referred to by the developers as weeds when in fact they are subject to a Council TPO.</p>	<p>The number of trees being removed from the site is excessive.</p>	13
	<p>From the view analysis provided by the developers for our apartment the tall building on Brown St is not situated below the tree canopy as promised. It sits at least 2 storeys above the vast majority of the trees and as such should be reduced by 2 floors.</p>	<p>From the view analysis provided by the developers for our apartment the tall building on Brown St is not situated below the tree canopy as promised.</p>	37
	<p>Some of the heritage buildings on Stephen St have zero setback while the setback of the RACF building is as little as 3.25m. The RACF building is to be situated directly across the street from 40 Stephen St with only 16m between our living room windows and the proposed structure. This negatively affects our privacy and our views. This lack of setback, mirrored underground in the development's car parks and basements precludes the retention or growing of significant sized trees along Stephen St.</p>	<p>The RACF building is to be situated directly across the street from 40 Stephen St with only 16m between our living room windows and the proposed structure. This negatively affects our privacy and our views.</p> <p>This lack of setback, mirrored underground in the development's car parks and basements precludes the retention or growing of significant sized trees along Stephen St.</p>	<p>18</p> <p>12</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>The proposed service entry on Stephen St is problematic on a number of levels. Stephen St is a narrow cul de sac and is unsuitable for such purposes, particularly when the RACF building could readily be serviced from the main Brown St entrance. To locate the entrance directly opposite the entrance to 40 Stephen St seems unthoughtful at best when you consider the noise of trucks and vans arriving, turning, reversing and leaving our street. The cliffs and building in the area at present create a funnel affect which magnifies the noise at street level and passes it up to the upper floors of 40 Stephen St. How much worse would this echoed noise be if the proposed development we allowed to go ahead, given the height and lack of setback of the proposed buildings on Stephen St and the removal of all trees.</p>	<p>Stephen St is a narrow cul de sac and is unsuitable for location of a service entry, particularly when the RACF building could readily be serviced from the main Brown St entrance</p>	7
	<p>As far as I am aware there is no precedence for a service entrance on Stephen St as has been claimed by the developers. Certainly there has been no entrance there in the memory of any of the residents of 40 Stephen St, some of whom have been here since the Seidler building was first built.</p>	<p>As far as I am aware there is no precedence for a service entrance on Stephen St as has been claimed by the developers.</p>	9
	<p>To locate air conditioning units for the entire Scottish Hospital complex across from 40 Stephen St is also unacceptable, from both a noise and visual amenity point of view.</p>	<p>To locate air conditioning units for the entire Scottish Hospital complex across from 40 Stephen St is also unacceptable, from both a noise and visual amenity point of view.</p>	35

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<b>Sara Stace</b> <b>801/40 Stephen St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	On Sunday 12 December 2010, the local children who live around the Dillon St reserve interrupted their Christmas picnic with Santa to make a plea to save their local area. The young children held up signs saying "Save our Garden of Eden", "Save our Trees" and "These trees are on death row".	On Sunday 12 December 2010, the local children who live around the Dillon St reserve interrupted their Christmas picnic with Santa to make a plea to save their local area.	
	Although we welcome the idea of a larger parkland (subject to a VPA with Council) we do not want this in lieu of retaining the amenity, beauty and serenity of the local neighbourhood.	Although we welcome the idea of a larger parkland (subject to a VPA with Council) we do not want this in lieu of retaining the amenity, beauty and serenity of the local neighbourhood.	33
	<u>We request that more trees should be retained, particularly the trees along Stephen St.</u>		12
	Dillon st reserve suffered a major loss of amenity when several trees came down in a violent storm a few months ago. The adverse effect from the loss of these trees is nothing compared to the future loss of trees that will occur on the site. Some 88 trees are slated for removal, including 23 along Stephen St along.	Dillon st reserve suffered a major loss of amenity when several trees came down in a violent storm a few months ago. The adverse effect from the loss of these trees is nothing compared to the future loss of trees that will occur on the site.	13
	The EP&A Act states that the proposed development should retain, wherever reasonable, major existing trees (cl33f). The proposal does not meet this requirement, particularly along Stephen St.	The EP&A Act states that the proposed development should retain, wherever reasonable, major existing trees (cl33f).	13, 12
	All trees along Stephen St are slated for removal, with the exception of two trees in the far north east corner. The current trees are up to 19m tall with canopies of 6 to 8 m radius.	All trees along Stephen St are slated for removal, with the exception of two trees in the far north east corner.	12
	Residents have been told that the Arborist recommended removal of	The Arborist report classified nine trees located near the boundary	12

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	all trees along Stephen St because they are weed species. This is not correct. The report classified nine trees located near the boundary as Retention Value B "Could be Retained". Most are Chinese Hackberry, Caphor Laurel and Coral Trees over 10m tall. The Woollahra TPO says that any trees of these species that are over 10m in height are subject to preservation.	as Retention Value B "Could be Retained".	
	There are several examples elsewhere in this proposal where such species will be retained: Retention Value B – T69, T76, T5, T89, T108, T108  Retention Value C – T19, T74, T75, T92, T117	There are several examples elsewhere in this proposal where such species will be retained:	12
	Located directly opposite 40 Stephen St is T37. This specimen is 19m high and 8m radius. It provides a significant canopy and if it were kept would help reduce the visual impact of the RACF building. A similar tree near the Brown St entry is being retained.	T37 provides a significant canopy and if it were kept would help reduce the visual impact of the RACF building	12
	T35 is a mature brushbox 17m high and 6m in radius. It is not a weed species and would be an ideal candidate for retention.	T35 is a mature brushbox 17m high and 6m in radius. It is not a weed species and would be an ideal candidate for retention.	12
	<u>Remove the proposed Loading Dock</u>		
	The consultants reports repeatedly refer to there being an existing service entry from Stephen St for the hospital when it was in operation. There is no such entry at present.  There is a large cluster of mature trees in the supposed location of the service entry. Looking at the existing hospital building and	The proposal has provided no historical documentation about the so-called existing service entry.	9



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>pavement, it is extremely unlikely that any service entry existed at this point.</p> <p>The proposal has provided no historical documentation about the so-called existing service entry.</p>		
	<u>Glen St and Stephen St are not suitable for service vehicles</u>		
	The additional heavy commercial vehicle traffic will significantly reduce the safety and amenity of Glen St and Stephen St	The additional heavy commercial vehicle traffic will significantly reduce the safety and amenity of Glen St and Stephen St	22
	The Traffic Report says the loading bay in Stephen St would generate up to 40 visits per week, depending on supplier contracts and waste collection frequency. This would tend to be concentrated between 8am and 4pm, adding 2-3 vehicles per hour to Stephen St or 4-6 movements per hour.	The Traffic Report says the loading bay deliveries would tend to be concentrated between 8am and 4pm, adding 2-3 vehicles per hour to Stephen St or 4-6 movements per hour.	22
	Table 4.2 of the traffic report shows no increase in the number of vehicle movements per hour in Stephen St south of Glen St (19 in morning peak and 13 in evening peak remains unchanged)	Table 4.2 of the traffic report shows no increase in the number of vehicle movements per hour in Stephen St south of Glen St	22
	The traffic report says the traffic generated by the loading bay "would not be numerically different with that of prevailing other uses in the area". However, prevailing uses in the area are not loading bays for service and delivery vehicles.	The traffic report says the traffic generated by the loading bay "would not be numerically different with that of prevailing other uses in the area". However, prevailing uses in the area are not loading bays for service and delivery vehicles.	22
	The traffic report does not say how trucks will turn around on Stephen St. There is no turning circle at the end of the cul de sac, so	The traffic report does not say how trucks will turn around on Stephen St	23

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	vehicles currently use the car park of 40 Stephen St.		
	The DA shows two parallel parking bays on the street will be removed for the service vehicle entry. However the VPA with Woollahra Council shows the removal of seven parallel parking bays, and the creation of eight 90 degree parking bays outside Dillon Reserve. This would all be done at Woollahra Council's cost. This is not an equitable solution for residents or rate payers, and would result in the destruction of even more existing vegetation along Stephen St.	Realignment of car parking on Stephen St would be done at Council's expense which is an inequitable solution for residents or rate payers	36
	<u>No garbage, laundry or kitchen on Stephen St</u>		
	<p>Residents were told during the public consultation that no garbage would be picked up from Stephen St (in contradiction to the traffic report). This loading bay would only be used for laundry service and kitchen/food supplies to the RACF. All other laundry, food and garbage services for the other uses would be from Brown St.</p> <p>There is however a large garbage room directly adjacent to the loading bay on Stephen St.</p> <p>There is also a commercial kitchen and large laundry room outside 40 Stephen St. Residents are concerned about the noise and exhaust from these uses.</p>	Residents were told during the public consultation that no garbage would be picked up from Stephen St (in contradiction to the traffic report). There is however a large garbage room directly adjacent to the loading bay on Stephen St.	23
	All of these uses should be located well away from existing residents on Stephen St.	All of these uses should be located well away from existing residents on Stephen St.	7

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<u>Relocate the air conditioning units</u>		
	<p>Plans show a large bank of air conditioning condenser units to be located opposite 40 Stephen St. These will be noisy and running 24 hours a day. The section shows they will be half buried however this will not mitigate the noise impact on 38 and 40 Stephen St which have living rooms and kitchens facing these air conditioner units.</p> <p>The air conditioning condensers need to be located where they will not impact on 38 or 40 Stephen St residents.</p>	Plans show a large bank of air conditioning condenser units to be located opposite 40 Stephen St. These will be noisy and running 24 hours a day. The air conditioning condensers need to be located where they will not impact on 38 or 40 Stephen St residents.	35
<b>Sophia Wilson</b>  <b>26a Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>	We have lived in this neighbourhood for more than 40 years. We understand the need for development of the Scottish Hospital but not of this scale.	Don't understand the need for the scale of the development	2
	We would have appreciated a better and more inclusive consultation process. We have been presented with schemes which to all intensive purposes have been designed for us to approve.	We would have appreciated a better and more inclusive consultation process.	20
	We feel there should be an independent assessment of the design proposal with particular reference to the height, tree loss and effect of this development on the local area vis-à-vis traffic and parking in the adjacent streets, increased stress on Five Ways, and the adequacy of the public transport. There is only one bus service	there should be an independent assessment of the design proposal with particular reference to the height, tree loss and effect of this development on the local area vis-à-vis traffic and parking in the adjacent streets, increased stress on Five Ways, and the adequacy of the public transport	Note for NSW DPI

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	through Paddington.		
	There should also be some place in this development where the community is able to interact with the facility such as a gym, shared café etc	There should also be some place in this development where the community is able to interact with the facility such as a gym, shared café etc	47
	Of particular concern to us is the utility entrance in Stephen Street. This street is narrow and it will lose essential car parking spaces. It will be difficult for trucks to negotiate the already tight corner where Stephen Street and Glen Street meet. This is a residential neighbourhood and it is unsuitable for commercial deliveries.	Stephen Street is narrow and the addition of the utility entrance will result in a loss of essential car parking spaces.	7, 36
	The 6 storey building along the southern end of Stephen St will create a tunnel effect as it extends past the corner of Glen St and ALL the trees are destined to be removed.	The 6 storey building along the southern end of Stephen St will create a tunnel effect as it extends past the corner of Glen St and ALL the trees are destined to be removed.	34, 12
	Losing 88 trees is of particular concern. This is the last 'green lung' of Paddington. Especially as the remaining ones will have to be severely pruned in order to build the massive car parking and foundations required for these buildings which will rise above the remaining trees, the model is quite deceptive in this regard.	Losing 88 trees is of particular concern	13
		The model is deceptive in representing the height of the buildings in relation to the trees	29
	Please note that this development is 46% larger than the previous DA approved in 2002.	this development is 46% larger than the previous DA approved in 2002.	28

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	We question the need for 39 three bed units which equates to 47% of the new resident accommodation, and only 12 more aged care beds.	Why are there 39 x 3 bedroom units and only 12 more aged care beds	32
	Lastly the new buildings would completely dominate the site. From the submitted plans and elevations they appear unsympathetic to the surrounding Victorian domestic terrace housing.	new buildings would completely dominate the site. From the submitted plans and elevations they appear unsympathetic to the surrounding Victorian domestic terrace housing.	1
<b>Susanna McArdle</b>  <b>12 Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>  <b>&amp;</b>  <b>Richard McArdle</b>  <b>12 Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>	I reject strongly the development plans, most specifically the removal of all the trees along Stephen St. The Arborist report classifies nine trees located within a metre of the boundary line as retention value b 'could be retained'. Woollahra TPO says these trees must be preserved but the plans with the state govt ignore this.	The 9 trees classified as Retention Value B should be retained in accordance with Council's TPO.	12.
<b>Gemma Williams</b>  <b>14 Glen St</b>	I do not want a service vehicle entry from Stephen st. The justification is apparently an existing service entry from Stephen St when the hospital was in operation. During consultation the consultants confessed they had no historical documentation of this	I do not want a service vehicle entry from Stephen st. During consultation the consultants confessed they had no historical documentation of this so call existing service entry.	7, 9

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<b>Paddington</b>	so call existing service entry. They have no idea how regularly it was used, when it was closed or what it was used for. There is a large cluster of mature trees in the supposed location. Looking at the existing Stephen St kerbing it is extremely unlikely that any service entry existed at this point.		
	<p>The traffic report did not assess the suitability of Stephen St to handle the service delivery vehicles. There is no turning circle at the end of the cul de sac. Vehicles currently use the private car park of 40 Stephen st to turn around. This is an inappropriate use of private property.</p> <p>The traffic report estimates that at certain times of the day there will be 4-6 movements per hour, driven into or backing out of the loading dock. Dur to the narrow street, the noise generated by delivery vehicles will have a significant effect on the residents of Stephen St.</p> <p>The DA showed 2 parking bays on the street will be removed for the service vehicle entry. However the VPA with Council shows the removal of more parallel parking bays and the creation of 8 x 90 degree parking bays outside Dillon Reserve. This will all be done at Woollahra Council's cost. This is not an equitable solution for the residents or rate payers and would destroy even more vegetation along Stephen St.</p>	<p>The traffic report did not assess the suitability of Stephen St to handle the service delivery vehicles.</p> <p>Removal of car parking on Stephen St and Council having to pay for realigned spaces is not equitable to rate payers</p>	7, 22, 23
	<p>I do not support the trade-offs for the Dillon St Playground</p> <p>The current plans do not show Dillon St Reserve being expanded.</p>	I do not support the trade-offs for the Dillon St Playground	<b>33</b>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>This is subject to separate VPA with Council. In the VPA Council would not pay or receive money for the small strip of land given by the Scottish Hospital to the Dillon St Reserve. However Council would have to pay for landscaping. They would also miss out on receiving legislated s94 contributions which are supposed to pay for infrastructure and other costs incurred to the Council. This is not an equitable solution for residents or rate payers.</p> <p>In the hospital's plans there is a community garden proposed for the elderly residents to use. In the VPA this community garden would be moved into the Reserve. Who is this intended for? The neighbourhood or the aged care?</p>	<p>Council would have to pay for upgrades to the park and would not receive s94 payments for infrastructure upgrades. This is not an equitable solution for residents or rate payers.</p> <p>If the community garden is in Dillon Reserve, who is it intended to be used by?</p>	
	<p>I want to ensure that there will be no garbage picked up from Stephen St, Commercial laundry use or kitchen ventilation that will affect the residents of Stephen St.</p> <p>Residents were told no garbage would be picked up from Stephen St. The loading bay would only be used for laundry pick up and kitchen supplied for the aged care facility. All other laundry, food and garbage service for other buildings would be from Brown St. However there is a large garbage room, kitchen and laundry located near the loading bay on Stephen St.</p>	<p>I want to ensure that there will be no garbage picked up from Stephen St, Commercial laundry use or kitchen ventilation that will affect the residents of Stephen St.</p>	7, 8
	<p>Whilst Paddington residents need and want aged care on this site the following is unacceptable:</p>		

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new plans display unsympathetic architecture and ignores Paddington's built form</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new plans display unsympathetic architecture and ignores Paddington's built form</li> </ul>	1
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The floor area has increased by up to 46% from the 2006 DA approval</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The floor area has increased by up to 46% from the 2006 DA approval</li> </ul>	28
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new buildings would dominate the original Scottish Hospital building</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new buildings would dominate the original Scottish Hospital building</li> </ul>	2, 15
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The destruction of the historic terraces dating from the mid 1800s is unacceptable</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The destruction of the historic terraces dating from the mid 1800s is unacceptable</li> </ul>	16
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As mentioned above, 88 trees are to be removed, 72 are in good condition and there is to be severe pruning of other trees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As mentioned above, 88 trees are to be removed, 72 are in good condition and there is to be severe pruning of other trees</li> </ul>	13
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 9 storey building on Brown St is 14m higher and much wider than the existing – again a completely unsympathetic assimilation into the current built environment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 9 storey building on Brown St is 14m higher and much wider than the existing – again a completely unsympathetic assimilation into the current built environment.</li> </ul>	2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new 6 storey building on Stephen St would completely dominate the skyline and elevation of Stephen st</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new 6 storey building on Stephen St would completely dominate the skyline and elevation of Stephen st</li> </ul>	2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new buildings exceed LEP height controls</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The new buildings exceed LEP height controls</li> </ul>	45
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly oppose the excavation for 185 basement car parking spaces which is in stark contrast to the 73 that were approved in the 2002 DA</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly oppose the excavation for 185 basement car parking spaces which is in stark contrast to the 73 that were approved in the 2002 DA</li> </ul>	28
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No to mention the construction continuing to 2016</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No to mention the construction continuing to 2016</li> </ul>	46
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The excellent start of having extensive PR consultation with the residents in the area has diminished rapidly being as they have entirely ignored all the community concerns.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The excellent start of having extensive PR consultation with the residents in the area has diminished rapidly being as they have entirely ignored all the community concerns.</li> </ul>	20



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<b>Sean and Vid Suttor</b>  <b>603/40 Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>	<u>Impact on our property 603/40 Stephen St</u>  Issues pertaining to our property to which we consider the developer has paid inadequate or no attention include:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The visual impact that our property received from proposed plant equipment being sited on the roof top immediately adjacent to our line of vision from our unit, as well as the negative visual impact for all the residents in our building as a result of the loss of trees and extension of the new development to within 16m of our block of units.</li> </ul>	Unacceptable visual impact to our property	35
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The traffic report for our street is erroneous, as it has not been based on the quite cul-de-sac section wherein they plan to place the service entrance to their large development, opposite our building. This cul de sac section is quiet due to its narrow nature and lack of thoroughfare to other streets, and large vehicular traffic to the service entrance will increase noise pollution as well as pose a significant health and safety hazard to residents in a narrow street with limited sight-lines for such traffic</li> </ul>	Traffic report is erroneous	23
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The compromise of privacy to our property arising from the greatly reduced setbacks along the development frontage to Stephen St, together with the current intention to remove all existing mature trees and replace them with shrub like trees</li> </ul>	Our property will have compromised privacy	14
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The major acoustic impact whereby our property suffers from noise pollution emanating from the site during the construction phase and also from the permanent operational phase, wherein both the roof plant and primary service entrance will be directly opposite our building. Nowhere within the EA does it make mention of acoustic impact to adjoining properties, including the plant equipment currently planned to be located on the roof adjacent to 40 Stephen St.</li> </ul>	Our property will suffer from acoustic impact from the RACF. This is not addressed in the EA report	43

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p><u>Retention of Existing Treescape</u></p> <p>There is little to no attempt to utilise the existing tree cover to mitigate the visual impact of the development to Stephen St.</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scheme indicates all trees along Stephen St are to be removed, which we consider entirely unreasonable and an example of totally ignoring the interests of existing residents on Stephen St.</li> </ul>	Removal of all trees along Stephen St is unreasonable	12
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The report classified 9 trees within a metre of the boundary line as retention value B which would be retained and are in fact under an existing TPO, however the plans ignore this and show these trees as being removed.</li> </ul>	Trees slated for removal should be protected under Council's TPO	12, 13
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Floral items include the mature Camphor Laurel (T37) directly opposite 40 Stephen St, which if maintained would provide a reduction in the overall impact of the development whilst also potentially benefiting new occupants.</li> </ul>	Tree 37 should be retained	12
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The mature brushbox (T35) tree located adjacent the property boundary is shown as being removed which is clearly not in accordance with the DGRs.</li> </ul>	Tree 35 should be retained	12
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The consultant report states the developer intends to replace any category A or B type trees, however this appears an entirely disingenuous statement as many of the trees to be removed are shown as replaced by shrub type trees which would only reach a maximum of 8 or 9 m, in lieu of the 20m high trees to be removed.</li> </ul>	Trees are being replaced with shrubs that will only grow to 8-9m	12
	Traffic Report		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is unreasonable that the primary service entry to a \$100 million aged care facility will have no impact on this cul de sac. The traffic report pertains to the portion of Stephen St near Lawson St rather than the cul de sac location. We suggest the service entrance be moved to Neild Ave with better access from multiple other roads.</li> </ul>	It is unreasonable that the primary service entry to a \$100 million aged care facility will have no impact on this cul de sac	23

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Large trucks would be difficult to accommodate in Stephen St. The proposal suggests 3 trucks per hour which would cause major congestion.</li> </ul>	Large trucks would be difficult to accommodate in Stephen St.	22
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To state that truck movements would be restricted to certain hours of the day is unrealistic. With increasing traffic throughout Sydney to assert that large trucks can definitely arrive and depart within a time scale is misleading.</li> </ul>	To state that truck movements would be restricted to certain hours of the day is unrealistic	22, 23, 7
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no mention of mitigation of impact to pedestrians and smaller children in the area</li> </ul>	There is no mention of mitigation of impact to pedestrians and smaller children in the area	23
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There are no traffic flow diagrams demonstrating the turning circles of the various larger vehicles to be used to cater to the development.</li> </ul>	There are no traffic flow diagrams demonstrating the turning circles of the various larger vehicles to be used to cater to the development.	23
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are concerned as the developer provided assurances that there would be no garbage or refuse serviced via Stephen St, and yet there is a significantly sized garbage room shown on the plan adjacent to the loading bay. This has been a deliberately misleading statement from the developer to local residents.</li> </ul>	We are concerned as the developer provided assurances that there would be no garbage or refuse serviced via Stephen St, and yet there is a significantly sized garbage room shown on the plan adjacent to the loading bay.	8
	<p><u>Appendix F Urban Design Report</u></p> <p>The urban design report submitted which expressly lists the objective of this document “to consider the urban design qualities of this proposal and its likely impact on the surrounding neighbourhood” totally ignores a number of the issues raised including:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact to privacy of existing residents by reduced setbacks to 16m between living and bedroom windows of our property and the adjacent balconies of the aged care building. Maintaining some roadside tree line and creating larger setback would greatly mitigate this impact.</li> </ul>	Protection of privacy between 40 Stephen St and the RACF is not achieved	14
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Makes no mention of potential acoustic impact to adjacent residents or any mitigation employed to remove this to existing</li> </ul>	Report makes no mention of potential acoustic impact to adjacent residents	43

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	residents.		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns regarding large vehicle/truck congestion to the development's service entrance along our narrow dead-end street, as emphasised above.</li> </ul>	Concerns regarding large vehicle/truck congestion	22
	<p><u>Points of Clarification Throughout Construction Stage</u></p> <p>We request clarification from the planning department with regards the intended restrictions to be placed on the DA for construction works through the course of the project, including but not limited to:</p>		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given the high density residential nature of surrounding area, please confirm site hour restrictions to Monday-Friday only with no weekend working</li> </ul>	Please confirm site hour restrictions to Monday-Friday only with no weekend working	46
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The developers intention to supply sufficient quality site facilities to minimise construction site personnel utilising adjacent space for non working breaks</li> </ul>	Site workers should not use adjacent land during breaks	46
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmation that wheel-washing facilities will be instituted to ensure site traffic does not spoil the surrounding roadways.</li> </ul>	Wheel-washing facilities should be used to ensure site traffic does not spoil the surrounding roadways	46
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Confirmation of operational envelope restrictions for any craneage plant operating adjacent to the site boundary. Together with the risk mitigation of any potential crane collapse affecting adjacent residential properties.</li> </ul>	Appropriate management of cranes	46
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under item 17, Statement of Commitment, there is no mention of monitoring of structural movement of our building, and or any monitoring of noise pollution at the boundary of the site, both standard practice items for any major project adjacent residential properties.</li> </ul>	Vibration and dilapidation reports must be undertaken of adjacent properties	46

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<b>Shona Gallagher</b> <b>3 Stephen St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	The development is too big for the location and surroundings in terms of bulk, height and character	The development is too big for the location and surroundings in terms of bulk, height and character	1, 2
	Proposed excavation presents unacceptable risks to heritage listed trees	Proposed excavation presents unacceptable risks to heritage listed trees	15, 13
	Stephen St is too narrow to support a service entry	Stephen St is too narrow to support a service entry	7, 22
<b>Anna Seow</b> <b>503/40 Stephen St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	My unit will be facing the aged care building, personally cut out my direct sunlight which in turn made my unit cold and dark	My apartment will be overshadowed	6
	My unit will be devalued as a result of this construction	My unit will be devalued	52
	The roads will be extremely busy, visitors and residents will have difficulty to park	The roads will be extremely busy, visitors and residents will have difficulty to park	22
<b>Helen Lochhead &amp; Gordon Hinds</b> <b>9 Stephen St</b>	The provision of Aged Care on the site of the Scottish Hospital is supported by the current Part 3A proposal before the department is not. The overall height, scale, bulk and cumulative impacts of the	The overall height, scale, bulk and cumulative impacts of the proposal as it stands is not supported and should be refused.	JPRA GMU

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<b>Paddington</b>	<p>proposal as it stands is not supported and should be refused.</p> <p>The proposal destroys the heritage significance of the last intact Gentry Estate in Paddington</p>		
	This application being 19,500 (FSR 1.32) appears to be some 45% bigger than the 2002 approved design. The characteristic FSR of the area is 0.75:1	This application appears to be some 45% bigger than the 2002 approved design.	<b>28</b>
	The only public benefits appear to be the provision of 12 new aged care beds and 0.136ha addition to Dillon Reserve	The only public benefits appear to be the provision of 12 new aged care beds and 0.136ha addition to Dillon Reserve	32
	<p><u>Project Brief</u></p> <p>We appreciate the service and challenges provided by PAC with 88 beds existing on the site however it would appear the provision of an additional 82 apartments on the site to support the new aged care is excessive.</p> <p>While it is acknowledged that increased housing is important the average area per apartment if 160m<sup>2</sup> GFA. This is excessive The scale and bulk would be very different if the average ILY was 50-100 m<sup>2</sup> GFA. The average terrace house accommodating a family ranges from 80-130m<sup>2</sup>.</p> <p>The scale of the RACF would be reduced if the heritage building became part of the nursing home, rather than being 9 apartments on average 220 mw GFA.</p>	<p>The provision of an additional 82 apartments on the site to support the new aged care is excessive.</p> <p>The size of the ILU apartments is excessive</p>	<p>32</p> <p>30</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	The proposal does not achieve the right balance between development, housing density, affordability, impact on surrounding streets and heritage preservation and should be refused.	<p>The scale of the RACF would be reduced if the heritage building became part of the nursing home,</p> <p>The proposal does not achieve the right balance between development, housing density, affordability, impact on surrounding streets and heritage preservation</p>	<p>15</p> <p>1, 2, 15</p>
	Planning and Assessment Framework		
	<p><u>DGRs</u></p> <p>We support all the Planning Principles adopted by Woollahra Council and seek assessment as if these were a requirement of the Director General</p>	Woollahra Council's Planning Principles should form part of the DGRs	45
	<p><u>Draft East Subregional Strategy</u></p> <p>We support the continuing use of the place for aged care and its consequent employment benefits</p> <p>Paddington, with some 38 dwellings /ha is already high density load. Any new dwellings should be small and affordable.</p>	Any new dwellings should be small and affordable.	30, 31

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p><u>SEPP (Major Development) 2005</u></p> <p>The proposal falls below the non-discretionary threshold of \$100 million</p> <p>The declaration assumed that the previous DA was 17,500m2 GFA. Council actually approved a DA for 13,600m2 GFA (FSR 0.9:1), being 30% smaller than claimed by the applicant. This application should really be assessed by the Council.</p>	<p>The proposal falls below the non-discretionary threshold of \$100 million</p>	<p><b>44</b></p>
	<p><u>SEPP (HSPD) 2004</u></p> <p>The proposal does not comply with clause 33 Neighbourhood Amenities and Streetscape and should be refused.</p> <p>The proposal does not 'retain, complement and sensitively harmonise' with its Conservation Area. Six storey buildings are very close to the public street frontage. A nine storey building is proposed. The surrounding controls permit FSR 0.75 and heights of 9.5m. The controls if applied would facilitate harmony with the Conservation Area. The proposal does not comply with these controls or the surrounding area.</p> <p>The analysis of the design response presented in section 8 of the EA does not describe the real impact. The real impact is actually described in Appendix Q, The Solar Access Report.</p> <p>The proposal compromises Clause 35 Solar Access and Design for Climate as the dwelling will be substantially shaded by existing</p>	<p>The proposal does not meet many requirements of SEPP HSPD 2004</p>	<p><b>45</b></p>



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	trees. The applicant may argue that the trees are not a consideration. If so they are not a consideration in any visual analysis.		
	<p><u>Seniors Living Policy – Urban Design Guidelines for Infill Development 2004</u></p> <p>The proposed building forms do not respond to the context of the site</p> <p>Heritage and landscape elements are not retained and respected.</p> <p>The built edge to Cooper St and Stephen St is not improved</p> <p>The bulk and scale will negatively impact neighbours on all surrounding streets.</p>	The proposal does not meet all requirements of the Seniors Living Policy – Urban Design Guidelines for Infill Development 2004	45
	<p><u>SEPP 65 RFDC</u></p> <p>Context – the proposal does not comply with the heritage and Conservation Area context and the new buildings will not contribute to the quality and identity of the area</p> <p>Scale – the scale is inappropriate,. The excessive height, bulk and scale does nto suite the scale of and will dominate the historic Scottish Hospital, the street and surrounding buildings. The scale of surrounding buildings is best understood by the surrounding LEP controls.</p> <p>Built form - the built form is excessive in height, bulk and scale and</p>	The proposal does not meet the criteria for SEPP 65 compliance	45

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>inappropriate in form and detail. It will dominate the Conservation Area and the Scottish Hospital and the surrounding neighbourhood.</p> <p>Density – the density is inappropriate, exceeding the surrounding density controls by over 75%</p> <p>Landscape – the landscape is inappropriate, with some 72 healthy trees being removed from the heritage listed grounds and garden</p> <p>Amenity – the amenity of the residents in the surrounding streets will be impacted by scale and bulk of the development, the increased traffic and the loss of trees</p> <p>Social Dimensions and Housing Affordability – affordability is questionable given the size of the proposed apartments.</p> <p>Aesthetics – the proposal does not exhibit design excellence and is not compatible with the Scottish Hospital or the Conservation Area. The buildings are overly complicated in massing and detail attempting to mitigate the excessive bulk and scale.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with SEPP 65.</p>		
	<p><u>Woollahra Council Planning Principles</u></p> <p>All the planning principles are supported.</p> <p>The approved DA is a benchmark for density and bulk in the view of the Council and our view as does not accept the principles created by GMU for the site. The GMU principles have delivered the</p>	<p>The Woollahra Council planning principles are supported.</p> <p>The GMU principles have delivered the inappropriate outcome.</p>	<p>45</p> <p>11</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>inappropriate outcome.</p> <p>We agree with Council that excavation should not extend beyond the footprint of proposed buildings.</p> <p>We agree with Council that landscaping is not to be used to justify additional bulk. The only true material provided by the applicant to explain the impact of the built form is found in Appendix Q Solar Access Assessment</p>		
	<u>The Proposal</u>		
	<p>Demolition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We object to the removal of 71 healthy trees from the site. These trees should be retained. We do not support the justification that these trees are of “low conservation value” or are intrusive.</li> <li>The trees and canopy contribute significantly to the local ecology as well as the overall character and amenity of the area. There are few opportunities in this built up area for large canopy trees and the trees on this site make a unique contribution that should be retained.</li> </ul>	We object to the removal of 71 healthy trees from the site.	13
	<u>Environmental Assessment</u>		
	<p>Built Form and Urban Design Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Paddington Society does not agree with the “Preferred option Diagram” for the site layout. The diagram ‘encloses’ the terraces, develops in the Glen St view corridor, does not setback sufficiently to Brown and Stephen St, proposes development on the Brown St Gully, does not retain trees on Stephen St, proposes development on the axis of Cooper Lane, proposes street widening to Stephen St and assumes trees as some sort of height datum. We support</li> </ul>	The Paddington Society does not agree with the “Preferred option Diagram” for the site layout.	11

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>none of these principles.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed heights are incompatible with the Scottish Hospital and surrounding streets.</li> <li>Brown St ILU should not exceed the 15m approved in 2002 so as not to dominate the heritage significance of the Scottish Hospital and not permit 6 floors to dominate Brown St.</li> <li>RACF should not exceed the 12m approved in 2002 so as not to dominate the heritage significance of the Scottish Hospital or Stephen St</li> <li>Stephen St ILU should not be built at all to retain uninterrupted views into the site down Glen St</li> <li>Woollahra Council have identified in their Planning Principles consequent 0.9:1 FSR as appropriate for the site</li> <li>Existing inappropriate height as exhibited at 40 Stephen St should not be used as justification for height on the site. The new rules were specifically created to prevent such things again in Paddington</li> <li>The proposed fracturing and stepping of form designed to 'minimise' the impact of height creates an inappropriate architectural response. This is particularly apparent when so many trees are removed, exposing all this large development to public view</li> <li>The proposed buildings are not compatible with the height of buildings around the site or with the Scottish hospital itself</li> </ul>	<p>Proposed heights are incompatible with the Scottish Hospital and surrounding streets.</p> <p>The buildings should not exceed the 2002 DA heights</p>	<p>1, 2</p> <p><b>28</b></p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
		Existing inappropriate height as exhibited at 40 Stephen St should not be used as justification for height on the site.	10
	<u>Heritage</u>		
	<p>Conservation Management Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The CMP fails to properly consider the heritage significance of the grounds and gardens. The CMP simply restates what fabric is in the LEP listing, and of exceptional significance, being the evidence of horticultural terraces and associated steps, paths and stone edging paths dating from 1889 or earlier and trees nominated on the Register of Significant trees held by Council. There does not appear to be a landscape CMP provided.</li> <li>▪ Justification for the removal of fabric of exceptional significance in the terrace gardens is not provided.</li> <li>▪ There is no justification provided for the removal of 88 healthy trees not appearing to be “based on their safety, relative significance, amenity value, and contribution to the landscape as a whole”</li> <li>▪ Recommendation Priority 1 of the CMP is to “carry out conservation works to the remaining sandstone retaining wall and coping stone” and “retain and conserve the original stone stair located in the garden to the north of The Scottish Hospital”.</li> </ul>	The CMP fails to properly consider the heritage significance of the grounds and gardens.	15, 16

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The CMP offers no further guidance on the policy for the grounds and gardens of the last of the Gentry Estates. We recommend that a proper study is undertaken into the cultural significance of the grounds and gardens of The Scottish Hospital before any approvals are granted for this project. There is no conservation analysis of the cultural landscape of The Scottish Hospital.</li> </ul>	<p>Justification for the removal of fabric of exceptional significance in the terrace gardens is not provided.</p> <p>No justification for the removal of the 88 healthy trees</p> <p>The CMP offers no further guidance on the policy for the grounds and gardens of the last of the Gentry Estates. We recommend that a proper study is undertaken into the cultural significance of the grounds and gardens of The Scottish Hospital before any approvals are granted for this project. There is no conservation analysis of the cultural landscape of The Scottish Hospital.</p>	<p>15, 16</p> <p>13</p> <p>15, 16</p>
	<p>Archaeological Statement and Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With regard to the terraces the archaeologist identifies that the “remains of the 19<sup>th</sup> century garden are likely to be unique within the local area and part of a rare resource generally”</li> <li>The archaeologist identifies that the “proposed development will impact on the whole area once occupied by the terrace garden.</li> </ul>		

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>Most of the remains will be removed.” Why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We need to be clear about the cultural significance of the terraces, the location of the fabric and why it may be removed. It may require substantial modification of the design. As far as we can ascertain the terraces are not even “interpreted” where they remain and a new dementia garden area is proposed in this location.</li> </ul>	<p>As far as we can ascertain the terraces are not even “interpreted” where they remain and a new dementia garden area is proposed in this location.</p>	<p>15, 16</p>
	<p>Landscape Heritage Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ With regard to the terraces the landscape HIA identifies that “the terraces at the Scottish Hospital are rare if not unique in the eastern part of Sydney” and the “site has exceptional and high landscape heritage significance”.</li> <li>▪ The assessment also states “the proposal provides for the retention and interpretation of the terraced slope to the north of the historic building”. The conclusion of the report does not appear to be backed by any evidence. “The proposed development will result in considerable changes to the landscape but these are considered to be within the limits of acceptable change.” This is not justified by another statement in the assessment. We agree that “The surviving section of terraced garden and the mature trees ...have exceptional/high histories, aesthetic and social significance for the area.” This significance is not retained if the terraces are removed.</li> <li>▪ Whilst an arboricultural study of the trees was been undertaken no heritage assessment of the trees appears to have been done. What trees relate to what phase of ownership and use in the site’s historical chronology? No thorough landscape conservation analysis has been reported.</li> <li>▪ Excavation is proposed very close to many trees. Excavation and changes to the water levels could have a serious impact. Given the large basement it is impractical to “replace any trees assessed as Category A, B, C or D” as recommended by the landscape heritage consultant. We oppose the removal of the terraces and any</li> </ul>	<p>The conclusion of the landscape heritage report does not appear to be backed by any evidence</p>	<p>15, 16</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>existing trees without a thorough understanding of the landscape significance of this place. No justification for the removal of healthy trees is provided.</p>	<p>Whilst an arboricultural study of the trees was been undertaken no heritage assessment of the trees appears to have been done.</p> <p>Excavation is proposed very close to many trees. Excavation and changes to the water levels could have a serious impact.</p>	<p>15, 13</p> <p>13</p>
	<p>Heritage Impact Statement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We disagree that the impact on the Scottish Hospital Building is negligible and oppose any new construction in the roof</li> <li>▪ We disagree that the impact on the Scottish Hospital site is acceptable for the reasons outlined above. The terraces should be retained and all healthy trees should be retained. The buildings are too high and dominant. The terrace view to the north should be “opened” not closed as proposed.</li> <li>▪ We disagree that the impact on the Paddington Conservation Area is acceptable. The buildings along Stephen St are not set back 7 m as recommended by the applicant’s heritage consultant. The setbacks are as little as 2.5m, with any excavation consequently right on the Stephen St boundary. Given the Brown St gully, buildings on Brown St should be set back at least 25m from Brown</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We disagree that the impact on the Scottish Hospital Building is negligible and oppose any new construction in the roof</li> </ul> <p>The terraces should be retained and all healthy trees should be retained</p>	<p>15</p> <p>13, 16</p>



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>St. All existing healthy trees should be retained.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact on the heritage significance is at worst unacceptable and at best unknown. The application should be refused on heritage grounds.</li> </ul>	<p>We disagree that the impact on the Paddington Conservation Area is acceptable</p>	<p>1, 15</p>
	<p><u>Public Domain</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Paddington enjoys green views of the gardens and grounds of the Scottish Hospital from Brown St, Glenview St, Neild Ave, Dillon Reserve, Stephen St and Glen St. The proposed design has a negative impact on every one of those views and the amenity of surrounding neighbourhood, with a 9 storey building highly visible to Brown and Glenview Sts, the same building visible to Dillon Reserve and down Glen St. In addition buildings up to 6 floors high</li> </ul>	<p>The cumulative impacts on the surrounding streets is unacceptable</p>	<p>1</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>align Stephen St and impact views down glen St.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The cumulative impacts on the surrounding streets is unacceptable</li> <li>▪ We do not support expanding Dillon Reserve as public domain. We would expect proper community consultation about the changes in design to Dillon Reserve.</li> </ul>	<p>We do not support expanding Dillon Reserve as public domain.</p>	<p><b>33</b></p>
	<p><u>Landscaping and Open Space</u></p> <p>The landscape design should be founded on a proper heritage assessment of the grounds and gardens. The work to date simply relies on the LEP listing by Woollahra Council. There has been no</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proper detailed analysis of the heritage significance of the existing gardens</li> <li>▪ Assessment of when the 150 trees were placed in the gardens</li> <li>▪ Assessment of the significance of the Brown St gully, and</li> <li>▪ Poor knowledge about the remnant fabric of the terraces.</li> </ul> <p>There is no conservation analysis of the cultural landscape of the Scottish Hospital.</p> <p>The aboricultural assessment does not assess the heritage significance of the trees</p> <p>The aboricultural assessment “recommends” the removal of over 70</p>	<p>The landscape design should be founded on a proper heritage assessment of the grounds and gardens. The work to date simply relies on the LEP listing by Woollahra Council.</p> <p>There has been no</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proper detailed analysis of the heritage significance of the existing gardens</li> <li>▪ Assessment of when the 150 trees were placed in the gardens</li> <li>▪ Assessment of the significance of the Brown St gully, and</li> <li>▪ Poor knowledge about the remnant fabric of the terraces.</li> </ul>	<p>15, 16</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>trees simply because they are within “construction zones”. This is no reason for removal. The trees should be retained. Most would normally be protected by Council’s TPO.</p> <p>A large no of trees in good and fair condition are proposed for removal. A total of 35 trees with Retention Value B are to be removed. They should all be retained.</p> <p>We recommend that the removal of T116 be reviewed. This tree could be saved and is probably holding up a significant section of Brown St. Excavation is perilously close to many trees proposed to be retained. Notwithstanding the “pruning analysis” for two of the trees (T18 and T81) identified in the arborist report the basement excavation will require additional branch and root pruning for these and many other trees.</p> <p>We also note that the dementia garden appears to be in the most important part of the original terraces and the upper terraces are ‘privatised’ as private courtyards.</p> <p>We strongly object to the landscape plan proposed as it neither understands or respects the cultural heritage of the place.</p>		
	<p><u>View Loss</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All the applicant’s studies and models assume vegetation. None of this vegetation is guaranteed and in many instances the material presented is misleading or simply wrong. The trees shown on the model are not correct. The best way to appreciate the impact on views into and around the site is to examine the 3D perspectives presented in Appendix Q, the Solar Access Assessment</li> <li>▪ The views prepared do not respect the aperture of the human eye. All perspectives for the LEP are required to be 50mm views for accuracy.</li> <li>▪ To suggest as does the EA that there is no loss of view is clearly incorrect</li> <li>▪ The impact on Brown St, Dillon Reserve and on Stephen St is</li> </ul>	<p>The views prepared do not respect the aperture of the human eye. All perspectives for the LEP are required to be 50mm views for accuracy</p>	29

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>unacceptable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact on views from Glenview and Glen Streets is unacceptable.</li> </ul>	<p>To suggest as does the EA that there is no loss of view is clearly incorrect</p>	<p>18, 19, 25, 26</p>
	<p><u>Parking, Transport and Accessibility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We understand that the car park is designed to accommodate 176 cars, not 124 as stated. This is a huge consequent basement excavation. The amount of car parking on the site is excessive. The site is well connected to public transport. This quantum of parking will impact on the traffic on the surrounding narrow streets, the water table, the tree root zones and will contribute to the bulk of the development. The parking provision appears to be excessive for the location and the proposed use.</li> <li>Stephen St is a narrow Paddington Street, some 10m wide. It is inappropriate for service trucks to use this narrow street, particularly if service vehicles are required to reverse into the building. Reversing trucks are dangerous and noisy. The transport assessment incorrectly assumes that Stephen St narrows at Glen St. It does not. It narrows at Dillon Reserve.</li> <li>Note that both access to Stephen St and to Glen St from Goodhope St is very narrow. Council identify Stephen St as a no through road, presumably to discourage traffic in this typical narrow Street.</li> <li>We are not aware of any 'disused' vehicle entry from Stephen St</li> <li>Stage 1 anticipates that all access to the site would be from Stephen St until Stage 2 is complete. Stephen St is not suitable for this traffic even on a temporary basis.</li> <li>We oppose any entry to the site from Stephen St</li> <li>We also note that access for the disabled requires a 290m journey along Glenview St (in part 1:12), Liverpool St and MacDonald St to</li> </ul>	<p>The amount of car parking on the site is excessive. The site is well connected to public transport</p> <p>It is inappropriate for service trucks to use Stephen street, particularly if service vehicles are required to reverse into the building.</p>	<p>38.</p> <p>7, 22</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>access the bus stop. It is very poor access for such a significant development.</p>	<p>We are not aware of any 'disused' vehicle entry from Stephen St</p> <p>Stage 1 anticipates that all access to the site would be from Stephen St until Stage 2 is complete.</p> <p>The 290m walk from the site to the bus stop is poor access for such a significant development</p>	<p>9</p> <p>46</p> <p>45</p>
	<p><u>ESD</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Paddington Society supports the achievement of high ESD standards</li> <li>▪ The scale of the development, the size of the apartments, the size of the excavation of the basement and the quantity of excavated material that will leave the site are contrary to sustainable principles.</li> <li>▪ The removal of so many trees, the construction of basement parking and the consequent impact on the water table and local ecology is contrary to sustainable principles.</li> </ul>	<p>The development is contrary to sustainability principles</p>	<p>48</p>
	<p><u>Threatened Species</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The removal of nearly 88 trees will impact on the foraging of the Grey-Headed Flying Fox and any microbats on site as well as the local possum and bird population.</li> </ul>	<p>The removal of nearly 88 trees will impact on the foraging of the Grey-Headed Flying Fox and any microbats on site as well as the local possum and bird population.</p>	<p>13, 50</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<u>Drainage and Stormwater Management</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Rushcutters Bay flood plain is developing serious issues as Paddington continues to lose deep soil for hard surface. Where will water diverted from the site actually go?</li> <li>The Scottish Hospital is an important part of the drainage system with its 'rainforest' gully along the edge of Brown St and the area of significant deep soil in an otherwise very urbanised area. Changes to the drainage system could change the existing ecology. This could lead to exacerbated stormwater impacts downstream and tree damage.</li> </ul>	<p>Changes to the drainage system could change the existing ecology. This could lead to exacerbated stormwater impacts downstream and tree damage.</p>	40
	<u>Geotechnical and Hydrogeological Analysis</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No assessment of the impact of the proposal on the hydrogeological environment of the grounds and gardens, in particular on trees on the site has been undertaken.</li> <li>No consent should be given for any proposal on this site without a thorough understanding of the impacts of hard surfaces and basements on the water environment of the existing trees.</li> </ul>	<p>No assessment of the impact of the proposal on the hydrogeological environment of the grounds and gardens, in particular on trees on the site has been undertaken.</p>	40
	<u>Utilities</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The stormwater/sewer system in Stephen St has serious problems. It regularly is blocked and overflows and requires pumping out. The streets flood on a semi-regular basis as the existing stormwater system does not have the capacity to deal with peak storm events. Increased development in the catchment will further exacerbate this without commensurate mitigation.</li> </ul>	<p>The stormwater/sewer system in Stephen St has serious problems. Increased development in the catchment will further exacerbate this without commensurate mitigation.</p>	42
	<u>Staging</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We note that the proposed construction of a new RACF and the transfer of existing residents to the new facility is a primary driver of the design and puts a very large and bulky nursing home on Stephen St.</li> <li>There are two alternative strategies that would both reduce bulk</li> </ul>	<p>Two strategies to reduce the bulk include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use the Scottish Hospital as part of the nursing home, reducing the bulk of the Stephen St building.</li> <li>relocate residents and build, as previously proposed, a new nursing home on the site of the existing nursing home.</li> </ul>	15

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>and scale of the development. One is to use the Scottish Hospital as part of the nursing home, reducing the bulk of the Stephen St building. The second is to relocate residents and build, as previously proposed, a new nursing home on the site of the existing nursing home.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is also important to avoid the use of Stephen St for access at any stage.</li> </ul>		
	<p><u>Housing Choice</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst there may be a demand for large 2 and 3 bedroom ILUs, the Scottish Hospital site is inappropriate for large dwellings. Dwelling sizes should be as small as possible to minimise the impact on the site, the grounds, the gardens, the historic villa and on Paddington.</li> </ul>	<p>the Scottish Hospital site is inappropriate for large dwellings. Dwelling sizes should be as small as possible to minimise the impact on the site, the grounds, the gardens, the historic villa and on Paddington.</p>	30
	<p><u>Contributions/ VPA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We support the dedication of 1366.1m2 of land as an addition to Dillon Reserve</li> <li>We do not support widening of Stephen St, 90 degree parking to Stephen St</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We support the dedication of 1366.1m2 of land as an addition to Dillon Reserve</li> <li>We do not support widening of Stephen St, 90 degree parking to Stephen St</li> </ul>	33 36
	<p><u>Community Consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant did not actually engage with surrounding residents to develop a mutually acceptable design solution. The applicant essentially only took questions and at the end of each consultation session without responding and adjusting the design to respond to critical issues the community and Council raised. The scale of the project never changes.</li> <li>It this is considered appropriate consultation under Part 3A, the process is seriously flawed.</li> </ul>	<p>The applicant did not actually engage with surrounding residents to develop a mutually acceptable design solution.</p>	20
	<p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>We do not support the assessment submitted to the DOP. It is unacceptable in terms of height, bulk and scale and its consequent</p>	<p>The proposal is unacceptable in terms of height, bulk and scale and its consequent cumulative impacts on the local environment and the amenity of the area is unacceptable.</p>	1, 2

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	cumulative impacts on the local environment and the amenity of the area is unacceptable.		
<b>Annette Smith</b> <b>6/38 Stephen St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	Retired people do not need 3 bedroom apartments.	Retired people do not need 3 bedroom apartments	30
	The proposed building will make the existing overshadowing of my apartment worse.	Will increase overshadowing	6
	There has never been a service entry since I moved here in 1987. Residents of 40 years have never seen one.	There has not been a service entry in Stephen street for at least 40 years	9
	There is currently not enough car parking on Stephen St. Stephen St is narrow and vehicles come onto our property and use it as a turning bay. We cannot afford to lose 8 car parking bays.	There is currently not enough car parking on Stephen St. We cannot afford to lose 8 car parking bays.	36
	Most of the development is proposed to be in the south east corner. If they were to build apartments on the northern section, the elderly could enjoy more light and sunshine.	If they were to build apartments on the northern section, the elderly could enjoy more light and sunshine.	11
<b>Amelia Cooper</b>	The size of the development is too big. The size of the buildings are inappropriate for the surrounding heritage area. The size of the development necessitates the destruction of too many trees and	The size of the development is too big, inappropriate for the surrounding heritage area and necessitates the destruction of too	1, 2



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<b>602/40 Stephen St Paddington</b>	<p>gardens. It must be possible to upgrade the site without the scale of destruction proposed.</p> <p>I do not understand why the proposal has to be more than 40% than the 2002 Council approved DA.</p>	many trees and gardens.	
	<p>The removal of all of the trees on Stephen St – some of these trees should be preserved under Council's TPO. The site contains beautiful historic gardens and it is important that they be disturbed as little as possible.</p>	some of the trees along Stephen St should be preserved under Council's TPO	<p>Urbis</p> <p>Council's tree preservation order states that development consent is required for the removal of trees covered by the TPO. Consent is being sought in this instance.</p> <p>Insert response from arborist.</p>
	The setbacks between the RACF and 40 Stephen St are inadequate under SEPP 65 and should be increased.	The setbacks between the RACF and 40 Stephen St are inadequate under SEPP 65 and should be increased.	45
	Stephen St cannot accommodate additional traffic movements, especially 'commercial' traffic movements. It would make more	Stephen St cannot accommodate additional traffic movements,	22

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	sense for service vehicles to use Brown St.	especially 'commercial' traffic movements.	
	Air conditioning plant should be relocated so that it does not adversely impact on residents of the area.	Air conditioning plant should be relocated so that it does not adversely impact on residents of the area.	35
<b>Raymond Collett</b> <b>502/40 Stephen St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	There is a breathtaking arrogance about this proposal, which from the very first, has been driven by misleading, confused, vague, selective and overly emotive language and plans from PAC	This proposal has been driven by misleading, confused, vague, selective and overly emotive language and plans from PAC	20
	No part of their development affects others more, than that lump of it which will impact the greatest number of neighbours. That's not sensitive planning. Upper Stephen St onto which 90 or so residents step each day will be transformed from a pleasant, somewhat narrow lane, into a narrow, confining, factory dead end street.	Upper Stephen St will be transformed from a pleasant, somewhat narrow lane, into a narrow, confining, factory dead end street.	34
	The geography of this area has been overlooked. It is at the base of a small valley, well sheltered from all winds from the west to the south east. When the winder 'highs' pass over, this is a sink area. One would have to seriously doubt that there would be enough air circulating in the narrow space between their proposed building and our block, to dispel the ever increasing diesel fumes generated by their service trucks.	The geography of this area has been overlooked. One would have to seriously doubt that there would be enough air circulating in the narrow space between their proposed building and our block, to dispel the ever increasing diesel fumes generated by their service trucks.	7
	In the same way, the land shape concentrates noise. Already this is a fairly high density residential area where associated noise, even	the land shape concentrates noise. This development will	7

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	an ordinary conversation, is directed to upper floors and wakes people. This development will significantly increase the noise.	significantly increase the noise.	
	I say there are large elements of this proposal which never should have been located immediately outside our front door. Redraw and make a greater use of their traditional streets, Brown and Cooper. Have their own land connecting their Brown St entrance (which ironically is wider than Stephen St) with their other entrance at the corner of Brown and Cooper. Their proposed Stephen St entrance is a sham.	make a greater use of their traditional streets, Brown and Cooper.	1, 7
	I pass through the Children's Playground Council Reserve several times a week. This beautiful little park is quite large enough. PAC should keep their land and use it to increase their setbacks.	Dillon Reserve is quite large enough.	33
	I am including a drafted answer, I don't do this lightly, I unequivocally endorse every single line of it.		Note for DPI
	I note wryly the PAC is handing the decision over to you at the most demanding time of the year.		Note for DPI
<b>Dr R.I McWilliam</b> <b>4 Glenview St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	<p>I wish to register my support for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The present site and buildings are an eyesore in urgent need of review and rebuilding</li> <li>▪ The site could be used in a much more efficient way to cater for the needs of our aged citizens</li> <li>▪ The major trees and Heritage Buildings must be preserved.</li> </ul>		Noted

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	My objections to the proposed development are as follows:		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The large scale proposal is of too much a commercial nature, with towering height on the Brown St frontage</li> </ul>	The large scale proposal is of too much a commercial nature,	2
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not enough provision appears to have been made for parking, considering the number of occupants, staff, visitors, delivery visits and visiting Medical and Nursing personnel</li> </ul>	Not enough provision appears to have been made for parking,	39.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inadequate provision of the establishment of a Retirement Village Atmosphere as there is at many "over 55s" facilities; for example an inside meeting space or spaces where group activities can take place, such as crafts, hobbies, lectures and other group functions.</li> </ul>	Inadequate provision of the establishment of a Retirement Village Atmosphere	47
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adequate space for sitting for conversation, card games and similar quiet activities is also an important inclusion if this development is to fulfil the role of a nurturing environment sponsored by the Christian Church landlord rather than by any other property owner</li> </ul>	Inadequate space for sitting for conversation, card games and similar quiet activities	47
<b>Jan Golembiewski</b> <b>1 Glenview St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	The proposed Scottish Hospital development incorporates a listed heritage building and is in a heritage protected area, yet the proposed development makes no effort to address this fact.	The proposed development makes no effort to address the heritage building on the site, nor the heritage area in which it is situated.	15
	The Royal Womens' Hospital, just a few yards up the road was a model development. It fits into Paddington like Cinderella into her slipper. Yet it is contemporary and the value of the dwellings there is consistently high. This development uses an 'empiricist' approach that has been dubbed New Urbanism from the early 1990s. When I tried to raise the issue of style in one of the so called 'community information sessions' Gabrielle Cornish replied that the developers	This development uses an 'empiricist' approach that does not fit into the heritage character.	1, 15

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>wouldn't consider bending to the heritage style of Paddington because it would be a 'pastiche'. Certainly she should go back to university and take her history and theory classes again. I teach those classes and I can set her right.</p>		
	<p>On the subject of going back to university, the designers may well have failed design studio too. The style of the proposed development is also contemporary, but it bends far too much to flim-flammery and to fashion. It shows no respect to the heritage buildings within the site or nearby or to the Paddington Heritage Control Development Plan. In fact, if you look at the view analyses the developers have prepared, you'll see that in many causes (especially 1 Glenview St and the upper Stephen St instances) the design is more like a baseball bat in the face to the heritage structure of the area.</p> <p>Highly fashionable developments are subject to going out of fashion again. This will mean major renovations in the foreseeable future, an unacceptable carbon footprint and further disturbance to the locals and residents.</p>	<p>The style of the proposed development is also contemporary, but it bends far too much to flim-flammery and to fashion. It shows no respect to the heritage buildings within the site or nearby or to the Paddington Heritage Control Development Plan</p>	15
	<p>There area a number of professional architects, solicitors, engineers and other professionals (I include myself) who live in the shadow of the proposed Scottish Hospital development (1 Cooper St Paddington). Many of us have now had a chance to look at the various submissions to the Department of Lands and to the public. Naturally none of us have had time to wade through the whole thing as we expect your team to do, but even superficially we have found</p>	<p>we have found abundant inaccuracies and misleading information in virtually every document or model we look at. It is our opinion that this is a product of a cynical attempt to mislead both the public and the department. From the very beginning, the information we have been fed through the various 'information sessions' has been inaccurate, and to put it very politely 'rose tinted'.</p>	29

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	abundant inaccuracies and misleading information in virtually every document or model we look at. It is out opinion that this is a product of a cynical attempt to mislead both the public and the department. From the very beginning, the information we have been fed through the various 'information sessions' has been inaccurate, and to put it very politely 'rose tinted'.		
	We are not simpletons and the wool isn't so easily pulled over us. We only hope that your team also balks at the quality of the DA that the developers have handed you. Please send it back to them with a full refusal, asking them to revisit every single fact; the RLs, the scope of the original DA, and the impact on just about everything that concerns the lives of the local residents.	Please send it back to them with a full refusal, asking them to revisit every single fact; the RLs, the scope of the original DA, and the impact on just about everything that concerns the lives of the local residents.	Note for DPI
<b>Bern Le Hunte</b> <b>1 Glenview St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	<p>We object to the proposed over development of an historic site – a development of a mass and scale that would never be permitted under our local Council planning guidelines – a mass and scale that is not in keeping with the surrounding heritage area we all enjoy.</p> <p>Virtually every person who was supposedly 'consulted' felt that this, our main concern, was never addressed – not intended to be addressed by the architects and others employed by the Scottish Hospital</p>	<p>We object to the proposed over development of an historic site – a development of a mass and scale that would never be permitted under our local Council planning guidelines – a mass and scale that is not in keeping with the surrounding heritage area we all enjoy.</p> <p>Virtually every person who was supposedly 'consulted' felt that this, our main concern, was never addressed – not intended to be addressed by the architects and others employed by the Scottish Hospital</p>	2, 15
	We are requesting an independent enquiry into	We are requesting an independent enquiry into	

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether it is appropriate to build a project of such enormous bulk and scale in one of the few remaining historic enclaves of Australia that attracts visitors and admirers from far and wide</li> </ul>	Whether it is appropriate to build a project of such enormous bulk and scale in one of the few remaining historic enclaves of Australia	2, 15
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether it is appropriate to build a project of disproportionate bulk and scale in the knowledge that people have died to save historic areas such as Paddington from over development. This is no longer the 70s nor is it an era of rampant upheaval and disregard of heritage issues – we have to respect the wisdom of hindsight and protect the character of this area for future citizens.</li> </ul>	Whether it is appropriate to build a project of disproportionate bulk and scale in the knowledge that people have died to save historic areas such as Paddington from over development.	2, 15
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether it is appropriate to build beyond the bulk and scale guidelines developed by the local community for the community through our local Council</li> </ul>	Whether it is appropriate to build beyond the bulk and scale guidelines developed by our local Council	45
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whether it is appropriate to allow such bulk and scale in the development of a site when even the family who gave the land to the Scottish Hospital are horrified at the intended over development of the land their forbears donated in good faith</li> </ul>	Whether it is appropriate to allow such bulk and scale in the development of a site when even the family who gave the land to the Scottish Hospital are horrified at the intended over development of the land their forbears donated in good faith	2
	These are emotional issues so they must be stated as such. I know that your decisions must be pragmatic, and that you must plan for an ageing population. Nonetheless I hope that when I age it wont be at the expense of the environment and heritage that our heirs will inherit. It must be remembered that there are other places that do not have the same historic guidelines.		Note for DPI
	The Scottish Hospital has been progressively extending its footprint over the years from what was once a quaint local vineyard. Please don't let it become a monstrous eyesore at the heart of a vey vibrant, active, informed and articulate community.	Please don't let the Scottish Hospital become a monstrous eyesore at the heart of a vey vibrant, active, informed and articulate community	Note for DPI

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	Wishing that the Solomon in all of you will see good sense and prevent this particular aged care facility from having its way and running our suburb. Please, please conduct an independent enquiry into the bulk and scale of the proposed development so that we can at least feel that SOMEONE championed our community's concerns.	Please, please conduct an independent enquiry into the bulk and scale of the proposed development so that we can at least feel that SOMEONE championed our community's concerns.	Note for DPI
<b>Demetra Tsiampelis</b>  <b>36 Glenview St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>	<u>Model</u>  On viewing the model at Woollahra Council I found it to be inaccurate. Example, at the end of Glenview Street the tree does not exceed in its overspan as shown on the model and it would not conceal the proposed building.	The physical model is inaccurate. The tree at the end of Glenview St is misrepresented. It would not conceal the proposed building.	29
	<u>Trees</u>  I would like to know why we are removing so many trees. We need trees to sustain a a healthy environment, the culling of the trees should not be allowed.	I would like to know why we are removing so many trees.	13
	<u>Context and Height</u>  The proposed building makes no attempt to integrate with the surrounding dominant architecture which are Victorian Terrace houses and the existing Scottish Hospital building. The proposed 9 storeys are far too high.	The proposed building makes no attempt to integrate with the surrounding dominant architecture which are Victorian Terrace houses and the existing Scottish Hospital building.	1, 2



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p><u>Materials and Building Design</u></p> <p>The materials seem to be insensitive to the historic surroundings as well as the overall structure, shape and form of the proposed building are not sympathetic to the local architectural styles.</p>	The materials seem to be insensitive to the historic surroundings	17
	<p><u>Density and Effect on Existing Community</u></p> <p>The development does not comply with the LEP height controls.</p> <p>The height of the 9 storey building on Brown Street is higher and wider than the existing building. This will not give privacy to the surrounding terraces especially in Glenview Street also the proposed height will take a lot of their natural light away.</p>	The development does not comply with the LEP height controls.	45
	<p><u>Conclusion</u></p> <p>The impact of this proposal on the surrounding areas, trees and grounds of the existing Terrace houses is unacceptable especially in a conservation area.</p> <p>The proposal needs to be addressed more carefully and more consultation with the community, The impact is far too great and intrusive.</p>	The impact of this proposal is unacceptable especially in a conservation area.	15

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<b>Bob &amp; Lynn Sitsky</b> <b>29 Glenview St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	We are in support of an aged care complex on this site. However the existing plan is far too large and not suitably designed for a heritage area.	We are in support of an aged care complex on this site. However the existing plan is far too large and not suitably designed for a heritage area.	2, 15
	The architecture is unsympathetic to the Paddington heritage area	The architecture is unsympathetic to the Paddington heritage area	1
	The floor area has increased by up to 46% on the 2002 DA approved plan	The floor area has increased by up to 46% on the 2002 DA approved plan	<b>28</b>
	The new buildings will dominate the original Scottish Hospital building	The new buildings will dominate the original Scottish Hospital building	15
	Destruction and poor interpretation of historic terraces dating from mid 1800s	Destruction and poor interpretation of historic terraces dating from mid 1800s	16
	88 trees to be removed, 72 of which are in good condition and server pruning of other trees	88 trees to be removed, 72 of which are in good condition and server pruning of other trees	13
	9 storey building on Brown St is 14m higher and much wider than the existing building	9 storey building on Brown St is 14m higher and much wider than the existing building	2
	6 storey building would dominate Stephen St	6 storey building would dominate Stephen St	2
	Buildings exceed LEP height controls	Buildings exceed LEP height controls	45
	Construction till 2016	Construction till 2016	46

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	The extensive PR driven consultation process has actually ignored community concerns.	The extensive PR driven consultation process has actually ignored community concerns.	20
	An increase of just 12 aged care beds from 88 to 100	An increase of just 12 aged care beds from 88 to 100	32
	82 luxury apartments for those over 55 yrs of age, 63 more than in approved 2002 DA	82 luxury apartments for those over 55 yrs of age, 63 more than in approved 2002 DA	32, 28
	0.16ha – a tiny addition to Dillon Reserve	0.16ha – a tiny addition to Dillon Reserve	<b>33</b>
<b>Jan Davies</b> <b>19 Glenview St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	It is with dismay that we view the architects drawings. There appears to be an alarming loss of trees, and a great number of buildings of multi storeys, which in our view are not in keeping with the surrounding Victorian Terrace houses and tree lined streets.	There appears to be an alarming loss of trees, and a great number of buildings of multi storeys, which in our view are not in keeping with the surrounding Victorian Terrace houses and tree lined streets.	13, 2, 1
	The development appears to be significantly large, and in fact larger than is justified by the small increase of aged care beds it will create. It appear to be simply an overdevelopment, the benefits of which are far outweighed by the disadvantages to those who have made their home in the surrounding area.	The development is larger than is justified by the small increase in aged care beds.	32
	Another concern is the increase in traffic the huge number of residential units will cause, and the loss of parking in our street and the surrounding streets. Even now we feel that parking is becoming a problem with the number of persons who work at St Vincent's Hospital using our street to park all day. It will make the situation	The proposal will result in an increase in traffic and use of the few available on street car parking spaces.	24

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	impossible if this development is allowed to go ahead in its current form.		
	In general we feel that because of the uncertainties, and potentially disastrous outcomes that surround this proposed development it is an appropriate matter to be reviewed by the NSW Government architect.	it is an appropriate matter to be reviewed by the NSW Government architect.	Note for DPI
<b>Jillian Jones</b> <b>3 Glenview St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	Although I do not object to an aged care facility on this site, I vehemently object to the enormity of the proposed development and wish to express the following reasons for my objections	I do not object to an aged care facility on this site	
	It purports to be a massive development, about 50% larger than that approved in the original 2002 DA.	It purports to be a massive development, about 50% larger than that approved in the original 2002 DA.	<b>28</b>
	The new application is misleading when it makes reference to the 2002 FSR in that it states greater m2 than was actually approved in 2002.	The new application is misleading when it makes reference to the 2002 FSR in that it states greater m2 than was actually approved in 2002.	<b>28</b>
	The Brown St development is excessive in height, with an intended height increase of 14m taller than the existing building.	The Brown St development is excessive in height, with an intended height increase of 14m taller than the existing building.	2
	The new building boundary will come within, I believe, as close to 8.2m of Brown St. I live on the other side of Brown St and would be greeted by an unattractive and overpowering nine storey concrete	The new building boundary will come as close to 8.2m of Brown St.	2

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	form whenever I opened my front door.		
	Coupled with its proximity to Brown St and its excessive height and unsympathetic bulk, what scant filtered sunlight that is presently available will be totally obliterated by this 9 storey construction.	What scant filtered sunlight that is presently available will be totally obliterated by this 9 storey construction.	2
	There are 2 proposed pedestrian access walkways from the new building on to Brown Street, creating not just greater pedestrian traffic, but a scarcity of already insufficient street car parking spaces for present residents of Glenview and surrounding streets. Staff and visitors alike will avail themselves of car parking spaces in this area, denying resident ratepayers who pay a yearly parking permit fee, any chance to park their vehicles. This very same difficulty has been and still is encountered with St Vincent's Hospital staff parking in our streets and sending their 'runners' to check types and move cars to avoid paying fines.	There are 2 proposed pedestrian access walkways from the new building on to Brown Street, creating not just greater pedestrian traffic, but a scarcity of already insufficient street car parking spaces for present residents of Glenview and surrounding streets.	49
	Neither Council nor NSW Planning is able to clarify whether or not residents of the Scottish Hospital will be issued with resident parking permits.	Neither Council nor NSW Planning is able to clarify whether or not residents of the Scottish Hospital will be issued with resident parking permits.	49
	Traffic consultants have indicated that the basement level of the proposed development could have in excess of 200 cars. The 2002 approved DA was for 73 cars.	Larger than the 2002 DA	28
	Brown St is already a rat-run between New South Head road and Glenmore Road which will be further exacerbated by the additional traffic load flowing in and out of the proposed large basement level	Brown St is already a rat-run between New South Head road and Glenmore Road which will be further exacerbated by the additional traffic load flowing in and out of the proposed large basement level	27

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	parking area.	parking area.	
	There has not been any meaningful community consultation, rather a slick spin on the development and very few community concerns have been addressed at the information sessions.	There has not been any meaningful community consultation,	20
	<p>The images do not seem accurate when viewing the same focal point with the human eye and the view analysis images that I have seen have been extremely dark, not captured in natural daylight as one would expect. I requested a view analysis but was omitted from the list.</p> <p>Neither was I, although registered, invited to attend the view analysis meeting at St George's Hall.</p>	<p>The images do not seem accurate when viewing the same focal point with the human eye</p> <p>I requested a view analysis but was omitted from the list.</p> <p>Neither was I, although registered, invited to attend the view analysis meeting at St George's Hall.</p>	29
	The model exhibited at Woollahra Council is most misleading. The building on the Brown St side is obliterated by a plethora of incorrectly placed trees. The model itself is placed so very low that it has to be viewed in a squatting position in order to see what little is visible of the actual building front. This perspective is for birds, not for people who don't fly or live in trees. In reality, the trees exhibited and cannily placed, will do nothing to conceal the 9 storey building on Brown St. it is quite evident that this model has been designed to hoodwink the public and should be replaced by an honest one with sympathetic architecture in keeping with the heritage of this area.	<p>The model exhibited at Woollahra Council is most misleading.</p> <p>it is quite evident that this model has been designed to hoodwink the public and should be replaced by an honest one with sympathetic architecture in keeping with the heritage of this area.</p>	29
	So many of the photos displayed at the community information sessions have been misleading in an attempt to mask the building.	So many of the photos displayed at the community information	29

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	Even the time of day when the images have been captured has been used to promote a more favourable view in respect to concealment of the building. I took about 2 dozen photos in daylight and at night which clearly depicted the present building so that one could see how immense it was destined to be, towering over our homes and street.	sessions have been misleading in an attempt to mask the building.	
	I asked for comments on my photographs at one of the community consultation sessions and was told that someone would get back to me. Nobody has come back to me.	I asked for comments on my photographs at one of the community consultation sessions and was told that someone would get back to me. Nobody has come back to me.	51
	The architecture of the proposed intrusive building screams at the original Scottish Hospital building.	The architecture of the proposed intrusive building screams at the original Scottish Hospital building.	15, 17
	9 storeys on Brown St is unimaginably frightening and 6 storeys on Stephen St does little to mitigate the bulk. The narrow street will neither comfortably, nor safely, accommodate reversing delivery trucks.	9 storeys on Brown St is unimaginably frightening and 6 storeys on Stephen St does little to mitigate the bulk.	2
	An inordinate number of trees are to be removed – 88 in total, 72 simply because they will inhibit construction. I recall these trees being termed “weeds” at one of the information meetings at the Vibe Hotel It is the very existence of these “weeds” that provides the present green screen to the existing building.	An inordinate number of trees are to be removed	13
	Nothing has been said about the severe pruning of the remaining trees as they will have to be cut back about 2 to 3m from the building to enable the construction of the basement. In this day and age of	Nothing has been said about the severe pruning of the remaining trees	13

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	promoting the 'greening' of our environment it is nonsensical.		
	I understand the basement excavation could be up to 16m deep which would put the few remaining trees at risk.	I understand the basement excavation could be up to 16m deep which would put the few remaining trees at risk.	13
	Construction of this goliath building will continue through to 2016.	Construction of this goliath building will continue through to 2016.	46
<b>Name withheld 2 Glenview St Paddington</b>	The 9 storey ILU on Brown St would be significantly higher and wider than the existing building. There is no justification for such a large scale luxury apartment building in the heart of this historic and environmentally important site within the Conservation Area.	There is no justification for such a large scale luxury apartment building in the heart of this historic and environmentally important site within the Conservation Area.	1, 2
	The Brown St ILU would be 6 floors above the street level when viewed from Glenview St. This would have an impact on the view from the front and rear of my residence toward the east and will significantly alter the immediate environs for the residents in Glenview and Brown Streets.	The Brown St ILU will have an impact on the view from the front and rear of my residence toward the east	19
	The design, architecture and scale of the Brown St ILU is totally unsympathetic to the heritage streetscape of Glenview and Brown St	The design of the Brown St ILU is totally unsympathetic to the heritage streetscape of Glenview and Brown St	1, 15
	The building would require destruction of the micro-rainforest ravine, made worse by an entrance bridge connection to Brown St. There is no justification for damage to this unique environment.	The building would require destruction of the micro-rainforest ravine	13
	A total of 88 trees are to be removed from the site, of which the majority are in good condition. There is severe pruning of other	A total of 88 trees are to be removed from the site, of which the	13



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	trees.	majority are in good condition	
	There will be significant impact on the views into the grounds and gardens from Glenview St and adjacent streets.	There will be significant impact on the views into the grounds and gardens from Glenview St and adjacent streets.	19
	The increased resident, staffing and visitor numbers will result in increased street car parking and increased traffic problems in Glenview and all adjacent streets	increased street car parking and increased traffic problems in Glenview and all adjacent streets	27
	There has been no genuine attempt by the proponent to take account of the views of the community and to incorporate them during the planning process. On a number of occasions, the Paddington community has clearly expressed universal opposition to the scale and height of the proposed buildings.	There has been no genuine attempt by the proponent to take account of the views of the community and to incorporate them during the planning process.	20
<b>Ian Marsh</b> <b>21 Glenview St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	The scheme is significantly larger, by 46%, than the one submitted in 2002.	The scheme is significantly larger, by 46%, than the one submitted in 2002.	<b>28</b>
	The height significantly exceeds that allowable under Council's DCP	The height significantly exceeds that allowable under Council's DCP	45
	The envelope of the building would affect negatively the streetscape that makes Glenview St such an attractive precinct.	The envelope of the building would affect negatively the streetscape	2

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	Worse is the proposed reduction of tree cover on the site - of course some must go for development – but this is tree carnage on a grand scale, made worse by the future threats to the remaining trees posed by the envisaged basement area.	this is tree carnage on a grand scale	13
	Some reasonable development of this heritage site is to be expected and a reasonable development would attract resident support – as for eg the Women's Hospital site. By contrast, this plan is an outrage with no regard for resident amenity, the heritage value of the site or reasonable scale.	this plan is an outrage with no regard for resident amenity, the heritage value of the site or reasonable scale.	15, 2, 1
<b>Don, Margaret &amp; Sophia de Silva</b>  <b>44 Glenview St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>	Lodge our formal objection on the following grounds		
	Unsympathetic architecture	Unsympathetic architecture	1, 2, 15
	Floor area increased by up to 46% from 2002 approved DA	Floor area increased by up to 46% from 2002 approved DA	<b>28</b>
	New buildings would dominate the Scottish Hospital building	New buildings would dominate the Scottish Hospital building	15
	Destruction and poor interpretation of historic terraces dating from the 1800s	Destruction and poor interpretation of historic terraces dating from the 1800s	16

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	88 trees to be removed – 72 of which are in good condition	88 trees to be removed – 72 of which are in good condition	13
	9 storey building on Brown St is 14m higher and much wider than existing.	9 storey building on Brown St is 14m higher and much wider than existing.	2
	6 storey building would dominate Stephen St	6 storey building would dominate Stephen St	2
	184 basement car parking spaces. 2002 DA allowed 73 spaces	184 basement car parking spaces. 2002 DA allowed 73 spaces	28
	Construction until 2016	Construction until 2016	46
	Community concerns have been ignored.	Community concerns have been ignored.	20
<b>Mark Adams</b> <b>6 Glen St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	The general size and extent of the redevelopment is out of keeping with the heritage context of the Paddington area. The DGRs state that the “Height, bulk and scale of the proposal within the context of the locality. It is hard to see how the Urban Design report reaches the conclusion that this requirements has been met.	The general size and extent of the redevelopment is out of keeping with the heritage context of the Paddington area.	1
	The UD report makes comparison between the new development and the existing built form in the area. The figure on Page 41 of this report is conveniently presented in terms of RL and not height. Given the sharply sloping topography in the area this mis-represents the scale/bulk of the proposed buildings down slope. The report also makes significant comparison with the existing 60s and 70s buildings on Stephen and Cooper St. Such precedent should not be	the sharply sloping topography in the area mis-represents the scale/bulk of the proposed buildings down slope.  The UD report also makes significant comparison with the existing 60s and 70s buildings on Stephen and Cooper St. Such precedent	10

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	considered in planning matters.	should not be considered in planning matters.	
	The number and size of ILUs appears high and disproportionate to the small increase in aged care beds.	The number and size of ILUs appears high and disproportionate to the small increase in aged care beds.	32
	<p>The proposed commercial entrance off Stephen St is impractical. Stephen St is very narrow approx 50m north of the Stephen/Glen st intersection. The traffic report incorrectly states that Stephen St is relatively wide between Lawson and Glen St with one parking lane and one way traffic each way. This is clearly incorrect to anyone that has visited the site.</p> <p>It is difficult driving a large car or ute through this section of road let alone commercial vehicles that will be required to service this facility.</p> <p>The traffic report states that the activation of the loading dock off Stephen St would result in the loss of 2 parallel parking spaces on the western side of Stephen St. It is considered unlikely that this is correct and unlikely that the geometry of the entrance meets design/code requirements.</p> <p>Any access for commercial vehicles from Glen St to Stephen St would not be possible given the turning circles available.</p> <p>The conclusions of the traffic report states that the loading bay will generate only low level traffic equivalent or less than that which would have occurred if that part of the site was developed with terrace housing. While this may be correct in terms of traffic volumes it does not consider traffic type/mix and access issues associated</p>	<p>The proposed commercial entrance off Stephen St is impractical.</p> <p>Loss of only 2 car parking spaces on street is considered unlikely, as it is unlikely that the geometry of the entrance meets design/code requirements.</p> <p>Any access for commercial vehicles from Glen St to Stephen St</p>	<p>7</p> <p>36</p> <p>22</p> <p>36</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>with commercial vehicles.</p> <p>Any loss of parking along the street to improve this access is completely unacceptable.</p>	<p>would not be possible given the turning circles available.</p> <p>Any loss of parking along the street to improve this access is completely unacceptable.</p>	
	<p>Whilst the images of the development show a lot of greenery, this will take time to generate. This significant loss of mature trees that will result from construction is unacceptable.</p>	<p>Whilst the images of the development show a lot of greenery, this will take time to generate.</p>	13
	<p>It would appear that the photomontages that have been put together have been altered to make the 'after' photo of the development clearer and more appealing. This mis-represents the impact of the development and is mis-leading in the planning process.</p>	<p>It would appear that the photomontages that have been put together have been altered to make the 'after' photo of the development clearer and more appealing.</p>	29
	<p>The impacts on local residents during construction will be significant and unacceptable – noise, vibration, dust, parking of workers etc.</p>	<p>The impacts on local residents during construction will be significant and unacceptable – noise, vibration, dust, parking of workers etc.</p>	46

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<b>Dr D J Higson</b> <b>260 Glenmore Rd</b> <b>Paddington</b>	The proposed development is an attempt to pack too many residents onto this site. Paddington is already one of the most densely populated areas of Australia. I understand the demand exists for aged care accommodation, however this development would increase residential density on the site by far too much.	The proposed development is an attempt to pack too many residents onto this site. This development would increase residential density on the site by far too much.	2
	It is of vital importance to maintain the open space with trees and suitable vegetation. Public access is a secondary issue. Extension of Dillon Reserve would be fine but I do not see any great pressure for additional public space at present. If the space is not built over, it will be there in the future if needed.	but I do not see any great pressure for additional public space at present	33
	Replacement buildings on Stephen St should be no higher than at present, stepping down in height as proposed in the development plans. They could extent further to the north than at present but not so far that they obstruct the view down Glen St onto the site. There should be no building on the site opposite the junction of Glen and Stephen Streets, or to the immediate north of it.	Replacement buildings on Stephen St should be no higher than at present, stepping down in height as proposed in the development plans. There should be no building on the site opposite the junction of Glen and Stephen Streets, or to the immediate north of it.	11
	Additional vehicular traffic on Stephen St is unacceptable. If there were to be access to the Scottish Hospital site from Stephen St it should be for pedestrians only. Adequate parking should be provided on site.	Additional vehicular traffic on Stephen St is unacceptable.	22
	Anything more than one extra storey would be unacceptable on the residential building closest to the entrance on Brown St.	Anything more than one extra storey would be unacceptable on the residential building closest to the entrance on Brown St.	2
	Excavation of the site should be for car parking and services only.	Excavation of the site should be for car parking and services only.	38

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	If the development goes ahead the opportunity should be taken to put underground all the power and telephone cables in adjacent streets.	If the development goes ahead the opportunity should be taken to put underground all the power and telephone cables in adjacent streets.	Note for NSW DPI
<b>M J Bleasel</b> <b>196 Glenmore Rd</b> <b>Paddington</b>	The height, bulk and scale of the proposal is not in keeping with the context of the locality of Paddington, and will significantly erode the special character of Paddington.	The height, bulk and scale of the proposal is not in keeping with the context of the locality of Paddington, and will significantly erode the special character of Paddington.	1, 2
	The development significantly detracts from the visual impact of the heritage buildings and elements on and in the vicinity of the site and the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area  The envelope/height of the proposal does not integrate with the local environment and heritage fabric. The development does not comply with the building height standard of 9.5m that applies pursuant to WLEP.	The development significantly detracts from the visual impact of the heritage buildings and elements on and in the vicinity of the site and the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area	15
	The design quality of the development, especially the facades, massing, setbacks, building articulation, colours, material and finishes as displayed are not in keeping with the heritage area, notwithstanding 'motherhood' feel good statements without any detail in paragraphs 8.1.8 and 8.1.9 of the EA.	The design quality of the development is not in keeping with the heritage area	15, 17
	The applicant whilst alleging community consultation has only had the EA (and the devil is in the detail) displayed for a bare minimum	The applicant whilst alleging community consultation has only had	This is a matter for DPI

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	of time. I went to the meeting on 25 November 2010 (The EA having been released on 17 November). At that meeting they did not have available the design plans for the development. On specific questioning they advised that the final design will be 'significantly different' to that being displayed.	the EA displayed for a bare minimum of time.  Plans were not available for viewing at the consultation meeting of 25 November 2010.	
	I agree with the statement of planning principles for the redevelopment of the Scottish Hospital site as adopted by Council on 11/10/10	I agree with the statement of planning principles for the redevelopment of the Scottish Hospital site as adopted by Council on 11/10/10	45
<b>Esther Hayter</b> <b>14 Royston St</b> <b>Paddington</b>	The scale of the project is far too great for the site and its surroundings	The scale of the project is far too great for the site and its surroundings	2
	The buildings proposed are too high, too bulky and intrusive in the context of their surroundings	The buildings proposed are too high, too bulky and intrusive in the context of their surroundings	2
	The height, bulk and scale of the development is damaging and overwhelming to the heritage listed Scottish Hospital building and its remnant landscaped terraces	The height, bulk and scale of the development is damaging and overwhelming to the heritage listed Scottish Hospital building and its remnant landscaped terraces	2, 15, 17, 16
	The significance of the site as a whole, its landscape and its place in the fabric and history of Paddington would be irretrievably damaged if the proposal were to be approved and implemented; views into	The significance of the site as a whole, its landscape and its place in the fabric and history of Paddington would be irretrievably damaged if the proposal were to be approved and implemented; views into	15



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	and over the site are obstructed	and over the site are obstructed	
	The massing, design qualities and built form of the buildings proposed are completely unsympathetic to the scale and qualities of the architecture surrounding the site and to the fine grain qualities of Paddington in General	The massing, design qualities and built form of the buildings proposed are completely unsympathetic to the scale and qualities of the architecture surrounding the site and to the fine grain qualities of Paddington in General	1, 2
	The number of ILUs and their scale appears to be overly generous in proportion to the number of aged care beds provided	The number of ILUs and their scale appears to be overly generous in proportion to the number of aged care beds provided	32
	The proposal is excessive and in contravention of the Woollahra LEP in matters of height, density and heritage controls	The proposal is excessive and in contravention of the Woollahra LEP in matters of height, density and heritage controls	45
	The proposal is in contravention of Woollahra Council's DCPs and objectives for the Heritage Conservation Area	The proposal is in contravention of Woollahra Council's DCPs and objectives for the Heritage Conservation Area	45
	<p><u>Demolition</u></p> <p>The number of trees scheduled for removal is excessive; many of these are not intrusive, as the proposal states, they are simply in the way of the siting an excessively large footprint of the development.</p> <p>The depth of the proposed excavations, consequent changes to water table and drainage and the height and proximity of the proposed buildings raises doubts as to whether some of the trees listed for retention will in fact survive – root zones and canopies will be compromised.</p>	The number of trees scheduled for removal is excessive; many of these are not intrusive, they are simply in the way of the siting an excessively large footprint of the development.	13

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p><u>Car Parking</u></p> <p>The proposal understates the number of spaces in the basement car park – an area equivalent to some 50 additional spaces is shown on the layouts but not noted in the numerical listings. This results in excessive excavation, is misleading and should be challenged in the assessment process.</p>	<p>an area equivalent to some 50 additional spaces is shown on the layouts but not noted in the numerical listings</p>	38
	<p><u>Amenity and Streetscape</u></p> <p>The proposal does not complement or harmonise with its surroundings in the Conservation Area</p> <p>The proposed buildings are intrusive, setbacks at street frontages are limited relative to the proposed heights; the proposed heights overwhelm and impact adversely on neighbouring properties and the heritage Scottish Hospital building.</p> <p>The proposed built forms are completely out of character and scale with the surrounding streetscape – they are more appropriate to Green Square or Moore Park</p> <p>The development will not contribute to the quality and identity of the area</p>	<p>The proposal does not complement or harmonise with its surroundings in the Conservation Area</p>	15
	<p><u>Bulk and Scale</u></p> <p>The density exceeds the density controls of the surrounding area (0.75:1)</p>	<p>The density exceeds the density controls of the surrounding area (0.75:1)</p>	45

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>The previously approved consent for an aged care facility on the site was based on 13,600m2 GFA, not the 17,500m2 stated in the application</p> <p>The present application is for 19,500m2, 45% larger than previously approved</p> <p>The excessive density results in what is effectively highrise development in Paddington, where normal development controls restrict development height of 3 storeys and 9.5m.</p>	<p>The excessive density results in what is effectively highrise development in Paddington, where normal development controls restrict development height of 3 storeys and 9.5m.</p>	
	<p><u>Built Form</u></p> <p>The stepped forms and articulation of elements appear to be an attempt to break up the great mass of the proposed new buildings</p> <p>They are an unsuccessful attempt to mitigate the scale and bulk of the development</p> <p>No amount of reinstated landscaping could successfully camouflage the true height and bulk of the proposal.</p>	<p>Articulation is an unsuccessful attempt to mitigate the scale and bulk of the development</p> <p>No amount of reinstated landscaping could successfully camouflage the true height and bulk of the proposal.</p>	2
	<p><u>Landscape impacts</u></p> <p>The application recognises the high landscape heritage significance</p>	<p>Changes to the terraces and grounds are excessive and destructive in nature</p>	16

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>of the terraces and grounds but notes that the development will result in considerable changes to the landscape</p> <p>These changes are excessive and destructive in nature</p> <p>The historic terraces will be destroyed during construction and in their reinstated form they will be overwhelmed and hemmed in by new construction and alienated from enjoyment by the community in the future; some areas will be available only for the enjoyment by the owners of privately owned units.</p> <p>The removal of 70+ trees will have an enormous impact on views over and into the site from all directions.</p> <p>The assessment should include analysis of the heritage significance of the gardens and grounds and query the need for such wholesale tree removals.</p>		
	<p><u>Views</u></p> <p>The views presented in the documentation (app X) are vague, lacking in detail and simplified. Far more accurate impressions of the visual appearance of the proposed buildings are to be found in the accurate 3D modelling of the following – finishes board (App. B), 3D views – photomontage (App B), Solar Access Analysis (App Q)</p> <p>The true bulk, scale and nature of proposed architectural built form are revealed in these models for what they would be if the proposal were to be approved – massive, bulky, overwhelming to the</p>	<p>The views presented in the documentation (app X) are vague, lacking in detail and simplified</p>	<p>29</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>surroundings and streetscape, and oppressive and constricting to the heritage Scottish Hospital building and terraces.</p>		
	<p><u>Community Consultation</u></p> <p>Whilst this process appears to have been in conformity with recognised procedures and is thoroughly documented, the consultation sessions were information sessions at which residents were able to express their views on two options initially presented</p> <p>The less criticised of the two options was developed, with no reduction in the bulk and scale so roundly criticised during the consultation process</p> <p>Assertions by the applicant concerning the number and size of ILUs required to support the viability of the Nursing Home bed numbers were not expanded upon during the consultation process. The information is not transparent and cannot therefore be properly challenged by objectors.</p> <p>Since the numbers and floor areas of ILUs have such a dramatic impact on the bulk and scale of the development we requires that further information be sought by NSW Planning during the assessment process of actual numbers required and the appropriate scale of such dwellings</p>	<p>the consultation sessions were information sessions at which residents were able to express their views on two options initially presented</p> <p>Since the numbers and floor areas of ILUs have such a dramatic impact on the bulk and scale of the development we requires that further information be sought by NSW Planning during the assessment process of actual numbers required and the appropriate scale of such dwellings</p>	<p>20</p> <p>2, 30</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p><u>Community Benefit</u></p> <p>The EA claims that the benefits include improved streetscape presentation, improved interface with Dillon Reserve, and creation of public views to the rear of the heritage building and garden.</p> <p>The documentation belies all of these claims.</p> <p>The actual community benefit appears to be restricted to the provision of 12 additional aged care beds and a small (0.13ha) addition to Dillon Reserve.</p> <p>Public views into and over the heritage grounds are severely constrained</p> <p>Public access to the site is restricted.</p>	<p>The EA claims that the benefits include improved streetscape presentation, improved interface with Dillon Reserve, and creation of public views to the rear of the heritage building and garden.</p> <p>The documentation belies all of these claims.</p> <p>The actual community benefit appears to be restricted to the provision of 12 additional aged care beds and a small (0.13ha) addition to Dillon Reserve.</p> <p>Public views into and over the heritage grounds are severely constrained</p> <p>Public access to the site is restricted.</p>	32, 33
<p><b>Josephine Hargroves Talbot</b></p> <p><b>No address given</b></p>	<p>Horrified to learn of the disregard to the Paddington citizens re aged care site. It is unsympathetic architecture – design ignores the Paddington built form.</p>	<p>Horrified to learn of the disregard to the Paddington citizens re aged care site. It is unsympathetic architecture – design ignores the Paddington built form.</p>	2, 1
	<p>The floor area has increased by up to 46% on the 2002 approved DA</p>	<p>The floor area has increased by up to 46% on the 2002 approved DA</p>	<b>28</b>
	<p>The new buildings will dominate the original Scottish Hospital</p>	<p>The new buildings will dominate the original Scottish Hospital</p>	2

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	building	building	
	Destruction and poor interpretation of historic terraces dating from mid 1800s	Destruction and poor interpretation of historic terraces dating from mid 1800s	16
	88 trees to be removed, 72 of which are in good condition and server pruning of other trees	88 trees to be removed, 72 of which are in good condition and server pruning of other trees	13
	9 storey building on Brown St is 14m higher and much wider than the existing building	9 storey building on Brown St is 14m higher and much wider than the existing building	2
	6 storey building would dominate Stephen St	6 storey building would dominate Stephen St	2
	Buildings exceed LEP height controls	Buildings exceed LEP height controls	45
	Excavation for up to 184 basement car parking spaces, 2002 DA – 73 car spaces	Excavation for up to 184 basement car parking spaces, 2002 DA – 73 car spaces	28
	Construction till 2016	Construction till 2016	46
	The extensive PR driven consultation process has actually ignored community concerns.	The extensive PR driven consultation process has actually ignored community concerns.	20
	What we get: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An increase of just 12 aged care beds from 88 to 100</li> <li>45% assisted/concession beds, an increase of 28</li> <li>82 luxury apartments for those over 55 yrs of age, 63 more than in</li> </ul>	What we get: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An increase of just 12 aged care beds from 88 to 100</li> <li>45% assisted/concession beds, an increase of 28</li> <li>82 luxury apartments for those over 55 yrs of age, 63 more than in</li> </ul>	32, 28, 33

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>approved 2002 DA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0.16ha – a tiny addition to Dillon Reserve</li> </ul>	<p>approved 2002 DA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0.16ha – a tiny addition to Dillon Reserve</li> </ul>	
	I thought the consultation with the local people was most insincere and this confirms it. We must have it halted and reviewed and then proceed in a less destructive manner to the Paddington environment.	I thought the consultation with the local people was most insincere and this confirms it. We must have it halted and reviewed and then proceed in a less destructive manner to the Paddington environment	20
<b>Robert Farrar</b> <b>7/30 Fairfax Rd</b> <b>Bellevue Hill</b>	It is excessive in scale and not in keeping with the heritage of the site	It is excessive in scale and not in keeping with the heritage of the site	2
	It should be possible to achieve additional aged care facilities without such insensitive development	It should be possible to achieve additional aged care facilities without such insensitive development	32
	The local community's concerns do not seem to have been taken into account	The local community's concerns do not seem to have been taken into account	20
	Please review the plans and insist on a plan that is compatible with the location	Please review the plans and insist on a plan that is compatible with the location	Note for DPI
<b>Proformas</b>	<p><u>We want to keep all "retention Value B" trees along Stephen St</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All trees along Stephen St are slated to be removed without</li> </ul>	We want to keep all "retention Value B" trees along Stephen St	13



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<p><b>Raymond Collett</b></p> <p><b>502/40 Stephen St</b></p> <p><b>Paddington</b></p> <p><b>Mr and Mrs Lemon</b></p> <p><b>303/40 Stephen St</b></p> <p><b>Paddington</b></p> <p><b>David Ruben</b></p> <p><b>7/38 Stephen St</b></p> <p><b>Paddington</b></p> <p><b>Susan Bray</b></p> <p><b>203/40 Stephen St</b></p> <p><b>Paddington</b></p>	<p>exception. They are a wonderful asset to the local area and their loss would have a significant impact for local residents and the community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The report classified 9 trees within 1 m of the boundary line as retention value B “Could be Retained”. Woollahra Council TPO says these trees must be preserved, but the plans ignore this.</li> <li>▪ We were told the arborist recommends removal of all trees along Stephen St because they are weeds – but there are several instances elsewhere in the proposal where the same tree species will be retained.</li> <li>▪ Located directly across 40 Stephen St is a mature Camphor Laurel (T37). This magnificent specimen has a beautiful canopy and, if it were kept, would help reduce the visual impact of the Aged Care building. By way of comparison, an equal size Camphor Laurel is being retained near the Brown St entry – the hospital retains its ‘entry statement’ tree but Stephen St, where the most number of nearby residents are affected, loses a tree of similar stature and beauty.</li> <li>▪ Another tree slated for removal is a mature Bushbox (T35) located very close to the property boundary. It is not a weed species and would be an ideal candidate for retention.</li> <li>▪ The consultants reports state that they will replace any trees assessed as Category A or B with the same or similar species to maintain the landscape character. In fact they are replacing them with shrubs which may only reach 8 or 9 m tall. Given the aged care building is 18.3m to the parapet, these shrubs will do little to screen the buildings from each other.</li> </ul>		

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<b>F Kartovs</b>  <b>7/40 Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>   <b>Eliza Krisman</b>  <b>103/40 Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>   <b>B Karolyi</b>  <b>G/40 Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>			
<b>John &amp; Colleen Stephenson</b>  <b>702/40 Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>	<p><u>We want greater setbacks between the aged care facility and 40 Stephen St</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plans show as little as 16m setback between the kitchen/living room windows of 40 Stephen St and the balconies of the Aged Care building. This does not meet SEPP 65 recommendation of 18m setback between such uses.</li> </ul>	<p>We want greater setbacks between the aged care facility and 40 Stephen St</p>	<p>34</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<b>CALLi Ricketson</b>  <b>804/40 Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>			
<b>Florence Wu</b>  <b>504/40 Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>  <b>Jennifer Brown</b>  <b>403/40 Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>  <b>Taranga Anuray</b>  <b>10/38 Stephen St</b>  <b>Paddington</b>  <b>Annette Smith</b>	<p><u>We want to have the service vehicle entry removed from Stephen St</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A service vehicle entry is proposed opposite the foyer to 40 Stephen St. The justification is apparently an existing service entry from Stephen St when the hospital was in operation. There is no entry at the moment and residents who have lived in the building for more than 2 decades say there has never been an entry from Stephen St in living memory.</li> <li>▪ During the public consultation the consultants confessed they had no historical documentation of this so called 'existing' service entry. They do not know how regularly it was used, when it was closed or what it was used for.</li> <li>▪ There is a large cluster of mature trees in the supposed location of the service entry. Looking at the existing hospital operation building and Stephen St kerbing, it is extremely unlikely that any service entry existed at this point.</li> <li>▪ The traffic report did not assess the suitability for Stephen St to handle service delivery vehicles. There is no turning circle at the end of the cul de sac. Vehicles currently use the private car parking for 40 Stephen St to turn around. We object to this use of our private property for the purpose of the Aged Care Facility.</li> <li>▪ Due to the narrow street, and surrounding tall buildings and cliffs, the noise generated by delivery vehicles turning into and backing out of the loading bay in this difficult-to-access location will have a significant effect on the surrounding amenity.</li> <li>▪ The DA shows 2 parking bays on the street will be removed for the service vehicle entry. However the VPA with Council shows the removal of more parallel parking bays and the creation of eight x</li> </ul>	<p>We want to have the service vehicle entry removed from Stephen St</p>	<p>7</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
<p><b>6/38 Stephen St</b></p> <p><b>Paddington</b></p> <p><b>Steven and Patricia Sadokierski</b></p> <p><b>No address given</b></p> <p><b>Lisa Conway</b></p> <p><b>10 Glen St Paddington</b></p>	<p>90 degree parking bays outside Dillon reserve. This would all be done at Woollahra Council's cost. This is not an equitable solution for residents of ratepayers, and would destroy even more existing vegetation along Stephen St.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Given other buildings will be serviced from Brown St, the aged care facility should be serviced from there as well.</li> </ul>		
	<p><u>We want the air conditioning plant moved away from 40 Stephen St</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plans show a large bank of air conditioning condenser units located opposite 40 Stephen St. These ill be noisy and running 40 hours a day, impacting 38 and 40 Stephen St, which have living rooms and kitchens facing these units.</li> <li>The air conditioning condensers need to be located where they will not impact on 38 or 40 Stephen St residents.</li> </ul>	<p>The air conditioning condensers need to be located where they will not impact on 38 or 40 Stephen St residents.</p>	<p>35</p>
	<p><u>No garbage pick up, commercial laundry use or kitchen ventilation to Stephen St</u></p>	<p>Residents were told no garbage would be picked up from Stephen St. However there is a large garbage room, kitchen and laundry</p>	<p>8</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents were told no garbage would be picked up from Stephen St. The loading bay would only be used for laundry pick up and kitchen supplies for the Aged Care Facility. All other laundry, food and garbage serves for other buildings would be from Brown St. However there is a large garbage room, kitchen and laundry located near the loading bay on Stephen St.</li> </ul>	located near the loading bay on Stephen St.	
<b>Agency Submissions</b>			
<b>National Trust</b>	The Trust welcomes the preparation of a CMP for the site. Such a plan had not been in place when the earlier development applications were considered.	The Trust welcomes the preparation of a CMP for the site.	Refer separate response to National Trust
	The Trust welcomes the preparation of an Urban Design Report to accompany this project application which should set the proposed development in the context of any relevant building types in the area.	The Trust welcomes the preparation of an Urban Design Report to accompany this project application	Refer separate response to National Trust
	The cultural landscape components of the site comprise the various layers of interventions across the landscape and the most significant of these appear to be the early (vineyard) terraces and other evidence of layout together with the oldest trees. With regard to the significance of the terraces, both the Musecape and Casey&Lowe reports are in agreement. The Statement of Heritage Significance in the Assessment of Archaeological Impact by Casey&Lowe states that the "remains of the 19 <sup>th</sup> century garden are likely to be unique within the local area and part of a rare resource generally". The Musecape Landscape Heritage Impact Assessment finds that "the	Whilst the Musecape and Casey&Lowe reports agree on the significance of the terraces, however their reports reach different conclusions of how the development will affect the terraces	Refer separate response to National Trust

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>surviving selection of terraced garden and the large mature trees on the site have exceptional/high historical, aesthetic and social significance for the area”</p> <p>These two reports then come to a very different accounts of how the development will affect these unique and rare terraces:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Musecape: “The proposal provides...for the retention and interpretation of the terraced slope to the north of the historic building” (does this mean the retention of the terraces?) and</li> <li>▪ CFasey&amp;Lowe: “The proposed development will impact on the whole area once occupied by the terraced garden. Most of the remains will be removed”.</li> </ul> <p>In the National Trust’s view, if the terraces are of such significance as to require archaeological excavation and recording, then they are sufficiently important to be conserved, intact in their entirety.</p> <p>The Musecape report conclusions do not appear to be based on any demonstrable parameters or evidence. The “considerable changes to the landscape: in the description of the development becomes “acceptable change” in the conclusions, with no indication of how “acceptable change” is measures. This conclusion appears to be subjective and explains why others with equivalent qualifications and experience have come to very different conclusions. These conclusions must be evidence-based to be relevant to the development and heritage assessment process.</p> <p>Neither the Musecape or Casey&amp;Lowe report definitively set out what gives the site its cultural significance. The fabric and layout that</p>		

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>make up the cultural significance of the site should have been clearly indicated on a plan. Both reports fail to explain how the loss of the site's "unique" feature is not a major problem.</p> <p>The Musecape report argues that the place qualifies for listing on the State Heritage Register and acknowledges that "the surviving section of terraced garden and the mature trees... have exceptional/high historical, aesthetic and social significance for the area". The report fails to demonstrate how this significance can be retained if the development, in its present form, were to proceed.</p> <p>If the assessed high level of cultural significance of this place cannot be retained, then the documentation supporting the development must acknowledge this. The most significant features should be fully retained and properly conserved, not demolished. The development proposal is intending the latter but seeking to indicate that it is doing the former.</p>		
	<p>In view of the extent and area of proposed excavations, it is difficult to understand how some of the existing trees which are proposed to be retained could remain viable eg T119, and T81. The deep excavation would almost certainly have adverse impacts on the watertable and this should manifest itself in impact on the root system of the Kauri Pine and there is likely to be resulting canopy</p>	<p>The site has not been examined and assessed to reconcile which trees relate to each phase of use/ownership – the site's historical chronology. A thorough landscape conservation analysis would have done this. Trees of historical importance don't necessarily accord with trees that are horticulturally impressive and vice versa.</p>	<p>Refer separate response to National Trust</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>dieback.</p> <p>The Tree Wise Men assessment is an acceptable arboricultural report but it is not a heritage assessment. The site has not been examined and assessed to reconcile which trees relate to each phase of use/ownership – the site’s historical chronology. A thorough landscape conservation analysis would have done this. Trees of historical importance don’t necessarily accord with trees that are horticulturally impressive and vice versa.</p> <p>It is also disturbing to find that the “Tree Protection Plan” proposes the removal of 88 of the 144 trees on site (61%). An aerial photograph made available to the Trust illustrates the impacts of the planned tree removal and the remaining tree canopy cover. It is also proposed that the trees to be retained will also be pruned back 2-3 metres from the buildings or basement construction to allow for piling equipment operation, and additional space for building construction. The level of adverse impact is, in the Trust’s view, unacceptable.</p>	<p>It is also disturbing to find that the “Tree Protection Plan” proposes the removal of 88 of the 144 trees on site (61%).</p> <p>The level of adverse impact is, in the Trust’s view, unacceptable.</p>	



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>The terraces proposed are different in number, nature and scale from those in the original estate. The new terraces will cover the original terraces and will be different in configuration. Why attempt to interpret the original terraced forms lying below with new overlays, when they already exist? Replacement of the terraces with a terraced development is totally inappropriate as an interpretation of the terraces and would result in the loss of a highly significant part of the garden.</p>	<p>Replacement of the terraces with a terraced development is totally inappropriate as an interpretation of the terraces and would result in the loss of a highly significant part of the garden.</p>	<p>Refer separate response to National Trust</p>
	<p>The Scottish Hospital site is one of the few park-like open spaces with mature 19<sup>th</sup> Century trees surviving in Paddington., the key heritage values of the site being its central terraces, gardens, mature trees, expansive grounds and open space. The Musecape report contains a comparative analysis of three extant Colonial vineyards but does not follow this up with any conclusions.</p> <p>The report does not acknowledge that the terraces at the hospital site are the remains of a colonial vineyard. There is no discussion on how this site compares with its western counterparts and no conclusion that it is also of significance. In the Trust's view, the comparative analysis does confirm that the hospital site is certainly more than just important at a local level. It is very important at a State level as evidence of the Colonial vineyards (particularly within suburban areas) which are very rare and highly significant.</p> <p>The Casey&amp;Lowe report is dated Nov 2010 while the architectural plans are dated June 010. An archaeological assessment and findings should be completed before site planning so that</p>	<p>The Musecape report contains a comparative analysis of three extant Colonial vineyards but does not follow this up with any conclusions.</p>	<p>Refer separate response to National Trust</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>significance can inform the development. In this instance development aspirations appear to be dictating the removal of landscape with consultants being place in the position of trying to deal with the consequent loss of significance.</p> <p>With this development proposal there appears to be a breakdown in the normally accepted process of cultural landscape conservation analysis. The Musecape report doesn't have a cultural landscape conservation analysis as it is a Heritage Impact Assessment. The NBRs report would not do this as it isn't concerned with cultural landscape assessment. Normally there would be a thorough analysis of archival documentation, especially photographs, but also historic surveys, plans and written accounts which would then be used to reconcile early evidence with what presently exists on the site to determine integrity. This is an important phase that seems to be missing and, had it been included, would have helped clarify cultural value and through a CMP, would have provided clear management policies.</p> <p>The Casey&amp;Lowe report indicates that the terraces are either buried (which means they still exist and could be conserved) or modified, but with no explanation as to the extent of the modification. Could the terraces be restored / reconstructed to enhance significance or is the modification so minor that it doesn't matter? From either viewpoint there is no justification for removing them. In fact, no convincing justification has been offered in either report on why the terraces (unique in the eastern suburbs and rare nationally) need to</p>	<p>In this instance development aspirations appear to be dictating the removal of landscape with consultants being place in the position of trying to deal with the consequent loss of significance.</p> <p>With this development proposal there appears to be a breakdown in the normally accepted process of cultural landscape conservation analysis.</p>	

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>be removed.</p> <p>Relocating the early pathway is not good conservation practice and is only condoned in the Burra Charter in extreme circumstances – this is not such a circumstance. The fabric and layout of high significance should not be re-organised and moved around the new development because this would not retain the cultural value of the place.</p> <p>The proposed 9 storey Brown St ILU building, the four storey Cooper St Gatekeepers Lodge ILU building, the 6 storey Stephen St RACF and the 5 storey Stephen St ILU building will greatly reduce the important cultural landscape setting of the Scottish Hospital. The grounds are important as a curtilage for the hospital and have streetscape values and local amenity value.</p>		

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
		no convincing justification has been offered in either report on why the terraces (unique in the eastern suburbs and rare nationally) need to be removed.	
	The 4 new self care buildings ranging from 4 to 9 storeys in height will dramatically reduce the visual flow and permeability between the park-like north garden and the surrounding area of Paddington, especially Dillon Reserve and Stephen St. The significance of the grounds as a remnant Gentry estate requires that the view within the site from the original villa over the terraced gardens to the north towards Rushcutters Bay remain. The sense of enclosure of the gardens with the ring of dark foliated trees to Stephen St and Brown St should also remain.	The significance of the grounds as a remnant Gentry estate requires that the view within the site from the original villa over the terraced gardens to the north towards Rushcutters Bay remain. The sense of enclosure of the gardens with the ring of dark foliated trees to Stephen St and Brown St should also remain.	Refer separate response to National Trust
	The view from Brown St will no longer be dominated by tree cover. The none storey ILU building will be only partly shielded by the new plantings. The upper storeys will be visible and even the entire building will be visible when viewed from the park at the closure of Glenview St. The Brown St apartments will be 14m taller than the existing nursing home. These buildings have a bulk, mass and style which are incompatible with the Paddington urban context.	The view from Brown St will no longer be dominated by tree cover.	Refer separate response to National Trust

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>The view lines from Stephen St clearly indicate the loss of vegetation cover involved with the construction of the 6 storey RACF building and the 5 storey Stephens St ILU building. These buildings have such a massive footprint that only small replacement trees can be planted along Stephen St. All of the trees along the Stephen St frontage from Cooper St to Glen St are proposed for removal, many of which are large mature trees. The buildings proposed are too large and too close to the streetline for effective landscaping. The 3D montage views clearly show the major impact on the landscape along the Stephen St frontage (DA604 view 4 – StephenSt.pdf, DA605 View 5 – GlenSt,.pdf, DA606 View 6 – GlenSt-Stephen.pdf). None of the major trees along the Stephen St frontage should be removed and a 10 metre setback should be established to protect these trees. The original gully line passed through this site and is the topographic feature which fosters the present luxuriant tree growth which provides ecological benefits and a corridor for fauna such as possums, bandicoots and birds in an otherwise densely populated urban area.</p>	<p>The buildings proposed are too large and too close to the streetline for effective landscaping.</p>	<p>Refer separate response to National Trust</p>
	<p>This new development proposal appears to be considerably larger than the earlier 2002 scheme (perhaps 50% larger). With the 2002 scheme, Council approved 13.600m2 (FSR 0.9:1)</p>	<p>This new development proposal appears to be considerably larger than the earlier 2002 scheme</p>	<p>Refer separate response to National Trust</p> <p><b>28</b></p>
	<p>The provision for the underground car parking to a depth of 16m is excessive. The current proposal would allow for more than 200 cars</p>	<p>The provision for the underground car parking to a depth of 16m is excessive. The current proposal would allow for more than 200 cars</p>	<p>11</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	when the 2002 proposal was only for 73 cars.	when the 2002 proposal was only for 73 cars.	
	Elements of the main hospital housing that are of greatest significance include the verandah and balcony on the northern elevation, the four main northern former reception rooms on the garden level and the four main former bedrooms with bay windows on the first floor level. Details such as original hardware on doors and windows, joinery dating from c1848, 1901 and 1936, the main entrance door and associated windows, and chimney pieces are also of significance.	Elements of the main hospital housing that are of greatest significance include the verandah and balcony on the northern elevation, the four main northern former reception rooms on the garden level and the four main former bedrooms with bay windows on the first floor level.	Refer separate response to National Trust
	In conclusion the National Trust believes that this development proposal is an overdevelopment of this site in Paddington and appears to be predicated on the basis that open space in this area is undeveloped building space. The Trust would content that the gardens and existing landscape are important features of Paddington which should be valued and respected. We do not suggest that no development is possible on this site but this proposal is excessive and should be rejected in its current form.	National Trust believes that this development proposal is an overdevelopment of this site in Paddington and appears to be predicated on the basis that open space in this area is undeveloped building space.	Refer separate response to National Trust
<b>Paddington Society</b>	<p><u>Major Project Declaration</u></p> <p>The Paddington Society recognises that the project was declared a Major Project on 9 March 2010, under clause 6 of SEPP (Major Projects) 2005.</p>	<p>The Paddington Society recognises that the project was declared a Major Project on 9 March 2010, under clause 6 of SEPP (Major Projects) 2005.</p> <p>we remain concerned that the Department may have been misled in</p>	<b>44</b>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>Whilst we appreciate that that the end of the day any application is assessed on its merits we remain concerned that the Department may have been misled in concluding the declaration</p> <p>Advice from the applicant stated (and still states) that the previous consent for Aged Care on site in 2002 was based on a probject of 17,500m2. in face, Council approved a project considerably smaller, 13,600m2 GFA (FSR 0.9:1). Consequently the department would not have been aware that the previous consent was a very different floor area and consequent bulk, height and scale.</p>	concluding the declaration	
	<p><u>Community Consultation</u></p> <p>Notwithstanding the stated objectives and a lot of meetings and recording of meetings, the applicant did not actually engage with surrounding residents to develop a design solution, engage with Council or ensure surrounding residents and integral stakeholder were provided with the opportunity to express their views through the process.</p> <p>The applicant essentially only took questions and at the end of the day took no notice of critical issues to the community and to Council.</p> <p>Almost without exception questions were referred back to the applicant's brief. The scale of the project never changed.</p>	Notwithstanding the stated objectives and a lot of meetings and recording of meetings, the applicant did not actually engage with surrounding residents to develop a design solution, engage with Council or ensure surrounding residents and integral stakeholder were provided with the opportunity to express their views through the process.	20
	<p><u>Strategic Justification for the Project</u></p> <p>The Paddington Society appreciates the service provided by PAC</p>	It would appear that the need for 82 apartments is more driven by financial motives to support the provision of a new aged care facility. We note that the end result will only be 12 additional aged care	31

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>with 88 beds existing on the site.</p> <p>We do note that the Scottish Hospital has challenges for the aged. It has heritage and access issues and the gardens present amenity and solar access challenges for residents.</p> <p>We question the view that the Scottish Hospital is a redevelopment site. It is a sensitive heritage listed place of high local significance and possibly parts of the 'terraces' are high state significant.</p> <p>It would appear that the need for 82 apartments is more driven by financial motives to support the provision of a new aged care facility. We note that the end result will only be 12 additional aged care beds.</p> <p>We note that the average area per apartment is 160m2 GFA. The scale and bulk would be very difference if the average ILU was 100m2.</p> <p>The scale of the RACF would be reduced if the heritage building became part of the nursing home, rather than being 9 apartments an average of 220 m2 GFA.</p> <p>We submit that the proposal does not achieve the right balance between development, affordability, impact on surrounding streets and heritage preservation and should be refused.</p>	<p>beds.</p>	



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<u>The proposal</u>		
	<p>Demolition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Object to the removal of 71 healthy trees, these should be retained.</li> <li>Do not support that these trees are of 'low conservation value' or are intrusive</li> </ul>	Do not support that these trees are of 'low conservation value' or are intrusive	13
	<p>Car Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The car parking stated in the application is confusing. It states 132 spaces on site</li> <li>There appear to be 176 spaces not 124. this means the basement if 30% larger in volume than a basement required for 124 cars.</li> </ul>	There appear to be 176 spaces not 124. this means the basement if 30% larger in volume than a basement required for 124 cars.	38
	<p>Staging</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We note the proposed construction of the RACF and transfer of existing residents to the new facility is the primary driver for the design</li> <li>There are alternatives. New aged care accommodation could be provided in the heritage building, reducing the consequent sale of the RACF. Residents could be moved and a new RACF constructed on the site of the existing nursing home. The existing location is more appropriate for a large RACF building, avoiding a large building on a public street frontage.</li> </ul>	There are alternatives to the proposed staging that would enable the RACF to be re constructed in its existing location and not cause so much impact to residents of Stephen St	11, 41
	<p><u>DGRs</u></p> <p>We support all the Planning Principles adopted by Woollahra Council and seek assessment as if these were a requirement of the Director General</p>	Woollahra Council's Planning Principles should form part of the DGRs	45.

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<u>Policy Assessment</u>		
	<p>Draft East Subregional Strategy</p> <p>We support the continuing use of the place for aged care and its consequent employment benefits</p> <p>Paddington, with some 38 dwellings /ha is already high density load. Any new dwellings should be small and affordable.</p>	Any new dwellings should be small and affordable.	30
	<p>SEPP (Major Development) 2005</p> <p>The proposal falls below the non-discretionary threshold of \$100 million</p> <p>The declaration assumed that the previous DA was 17,500m2 GFA. Council actually approved a DA for 13,600m2 GFA (FSR 0.9:1), being 30% smaller than claimed by the applicant. This application should really be assessed by the Council.</p>	The proposal falls below the non-discretionary threshold of \$100 million	44
	<p>SEPP (HSPD) 2004</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with clause 33 Neighbourhood Amenity and Streetscape and should be refused.</p> <p>The proposal does not 'retain, complement and sensitively harmonise' with its Conservation Area. Six storey buildings are very close to the public street frontage. A nine storey building is proposed. The surrounding controls permit FSR 0.75 and heights of</p>	The proposal does not meet many requirements of SEPP HSPD 2004	45

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>9.5m. The controls would harmonise with the Conservation Area.</p> <p>The proposal does not provide appropriate setbacks.</p> <p>The proposal does not retain 71 healthy trees.</p> <p>The analysis of the design response presented in section 8 of the EA does not describe the real impact. The real impact is actually described in Appendix Q, The Solar Access Report.</p> <p>The proposal compromises Clause 35 Solar Access and Design for Climate as the dwelling will be substantially shaded by existing trees. The applicant may argue that the trees are not a consideration. If so they are not a consideration in any visual analysis.</p>		
	<p><u>Seniors Living Policy – Urban Design Guidelines for Infill Development 2004</u></p> <p>The proposed building forms do not respond to the context of the site</p> <p>Heritage and landscape elements are not retained and respected.</p> <p>The built edge to Cooper St and Stephen St is not improved</p> <p>The bulk and scale will negatively impact neighbours who currently enjoy a garden relationship with the Scottish Hospital. To suggest otherwise is insulting.</p>	<p>The proposal does not meet all requirements of the Seniors Living Policy – Urban Design Guidelines for Infill Development 2004</p>	<p><b>45</b></p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p><u>SEPP 65 RFDC</u></p> <p>Context – the proposal does not comply with the heritage and Conservation Area context and the new buildings will not contribute to the quality and identity of the area</p> <p>Scale – the scale is inappropriate,. The excessive height, bulk and scale does nto suite the scale of and will dominate the historic Scottish Hospital, the street and surrounding buildings. The scale of surrounding buildings is best understood by the surrounding LEP controls.</p> <p>Built form - the built form is inappropriate and will dominate the Conservation Area and the Scottish Hospital.</p> <p>Density – the density is inappropriate, exceeding the surrounding density controls by over 75%</p> <p>Landscape – the landscape is inappropriate, with some 72 healthy trees being removed from the heritage listed grounds and garden</p> <p>Amenity – the amenity of the residents will be impacted by those tress that will be retained particularly the fig trees.</p> <p>Social Dimensions and Housing Affordability – affordability is questionable given the size of the proposed apartments.</p> <p>Aesthetics – the proposal does not exhibit design excellence and is not compatible with the Scottish Hospital or the Conservation Area.</p>	<p>The proposal does not meet the criteria for SEPP 65 compliance</p>	<p><b>45</b></p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>The buildings are fractured and confused, attempting to 'conceal' their inappropriate bulk and scale.</p> <p>The proposal does not comply with SEPP 65.</p>		
	<p>Woollahra LEP</p> <p>The Paddington Society gives much more weight to the LEP provisions than does the applicant</p>	The Paddington Society gives much more weight to the LEP provisions than does the applicant	45
	<p>Woollahra DCPs</p> <p>The Paddington Society gives much more weight to the DCP than does the applicant. The proposal is not consistent with the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area DCP 2009.</p>	The proposal is not consistent with the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area DCP 2009.	45
	<p><u>Woollahra Council Planning Principles</u></p> <p>The Society considered all the planning principles are appropriate to the site.</p> <p>The previous DA is a benchmark for density and bulk in the view of the Council and the Paddington Society. The Society does not accept the principle created by GMU for the site. The GMU principles have delivered the wrong outcome.</p> <p>We agree with Council that excavation should not extend beyond the footprint of proposed buildings.</p> <p>We agree with Council that landscaping is not to be used to justify</p>	<p>The Woollahra Council planning principles are supported.</p> <p>The GMU principles have delivered the inappropriate outcome.</p>	<p>45</p> <p>11</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	additional bulk. The only true material provided by the applicant to explain the impact of the built form is found in Appendix Q Solar Access Assessment		
	<u>Environmental Assessment</u>		
	<p>Built Form and Urban Design Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Paddington Society does not agree with the “Preferred option Diagram” for the site layout. The diagram ‘encloses’ the terraces, develops in the Glen St view corridor, does not setback sufficiently to Brown and Stephen St, proposes development on the Brown St Gully, does not retain trees on Stephen St, proposes development on the axis of Cooper Lane, proposes street widening to Stephen St and assumes trees as some sort of height datum. We support none of these principles.</li> <li>▪ Comparable height studies confuse and mislead. Eg the parapet of 40 Stephen St is RL 42.6.</li> <li>▪ Proposed heights dominate the Scottish Hospital and surrounding streets.</li> <li>▪ Brown St ILU should not exceed the 15m approved in 2002 so as not to dominate the heritage significance of the Scottish Hospital and not permit 6 floors to dominate Brown St.</li> <li>▪ RACF should not exceed the 12m approved in 2002 so as not to dominate the heritage significance of the Scottish Hospital or Stephen St</li> <li>▪ Stephen St ILU should not be built at all to retain uninterrupted views into the site down Glen St</li> <li>▪ Woollahra Council have identified in their Planning Principles consequent 0.9:1 FSR as appropriate for the site</li> <li>▪ Existing inappropriate height as exhibited at 40 Stephen St should not be used as justification for height on the site. The new rules were specifically created to prevent such things again in</li> </ul>	<p>The Paddington Society does not agree with the “Preferred option Diagram” for the site layout.</p> <p>Proposed heights are incompatible with the Scottish Hospital and surrounding streets.</p>	<p>11</p> <p>2</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>Paddington</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposed fracturing and stepping of form designed to 'minimise' the impact of height creates an inappropriate architectural response. This is particularly apparent when nearly 90 tress are removed, exposing all this large development to public view</li> <li>▪ The proposed buildings are not compatible with the height of buildings around the site or with the Scottish hospital itself</li> </ul>	<p>The buildings should not exceed the 2002 DA heights</p>                      Existing inappropriate height as exhibited at 40 Stephen St should not be used as justification for height on the site.	<p><b>28</b></p>                      10
	<u>Heritage</u>		
	Conservation Management Plan	The CMP fails to properly consider the heritage significance of the	16

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ The CMP fails to properly consider the heritage significance of the grounds and gardens. The CMP simply restates what fabric is in the LEP listing, and of exceptional significance, being the evidence of horticultural terraces and associated steps, paths and stone edging paths dating from 1889 or earlier and trees nominated on the Register of Significant trees held by Council. There does not appear to be a landscape CMP provided.</li><li>▪ Recommend that removal of Tree 116 should be reviewed</li><li>▪ Justification for the removal of fabric of exceptional significance in the terrace gardens is not provided.</li><li>▪ There is no justification provided for the removal of 88 healthy trees not appearing to be “based on their safety, relative significance, amenity value, and contribution to the landscape as a whole”</li><li>▪ Recommendation Priority 1 of the CMP is to “carry out conservation works to the remaining sandstone retaining wall and coping stone” and “retain and conserve the original stone stair located in the garden to the north of The Scottish Hospital”.</li><li>▪ The CMP offers no further guidance on the policy for the grounds and gardens of the last of the Gentry Estates. We recommend that a proper study is undertaken into the cultural significance of the grounds and gardens of The Scottish Hospital before any approvals are granted for this project. There is no conservation analysis of the cultural landscape of The Scottish Hospital.</li></ul>	<p>grounds and gardens.</p> <p>Justification for the removal of fabric of exceptional significance in the terrace gardens is not provided.</p> <p>No justification for the removal of the 88 healthy trees</p>	<p>15</p> <p>13</p>



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
		<p>The CMP offers no further guidance on the policy for the grounds and gardens of the last of the Gentry Estates. We recommend that a proper study is undertaken into the cultural significance of the grounds and gardens of The Scottish Hospital before any approvals are granted for this project. There is no conservation analysis of the cultural landscape of The Scottish Hospital.</p>	15
	<p>Archaeological Statement and Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With regard to the terraces the archaeologist identifies that the “remains of the 19<sup>th</sup> century garden are likely to be unique within the local area and part of a rare resource generally”</li> <li>The archaeologist identifies that the “proposed development will impact on the whole area once occupied by the terrace garden. Most of the remains will be removed.” Why?</li> <li>The Society opposes the demolition of the terraced. If the terraces are important enough to be archaeologically excavated they are important enough to retain As far as we can ascertain the terraces are not even “interpreted” where they remain and a new dementia garden area is proposed in this location.</li> <li>We need to be clear about the cultural significance of the terraces, the location of the fabric and why it may be removed. It may require substantial modification of the design.</li> </ul>	<p>As far as we can ascertain the terraces are not even “interpreted” where they remain and a new dementia garden area is proposed in this location.</p>	16
	<p>Landscape Heritage Impact</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With regard to the terraces the landscape HIA identifies that “the terraces at the Scottish Hospital are rare if not unique in the eastern part of Sydney” and the “site has exceptional and high landscape heritage significance”.</li> <li>The assessment also states “the proposal provides for the retention and interpretation of the terraced slope to the north of the</li> </ul>	<p>The conclusion of the landscape heritage report does not appear to be backed by any evidence</p>	16

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>historic building". The conclusion of the report does not appear to be backed by any evidence. "The proposed development will result in considerable changes to the landscape but these are considered to be within the limits of acceptable change." Why?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ This is not justified by another statement in the assessment. We agree that "The surviving section of terraced garden and the mature trees ...have exceptional/high histories, aesthetic and social significance for the area." This significance is not retained if the terraces are removed.</li> <li>▪ We need to understand evidence about the terraces as vineyards. The assessment refers to 3 other vineyards. Is the Scottish Hospital on this level? It may be more significant than we think if it is a colonial vineyard in a suburban home.</li> <li>▪ Whilst an arboricultural study of the trees has been undertaken no heritage assessment of the trees appears to have been done. What trees relate to what phase of ownership and use in the site's historical chronology? No thorough landscape conservation analysis has been reported. Although it has been suggested that some of the tree identifications may not be correct. Tree T105 may not be a Moreton Bay Fig and T81 may not be a Holm Oak. We recommend these species be reviewed.</li> <li>▪ Excavation is proposed very close to many trees. Excavation and changes to the water levels could have a serious impact. Eg T119 and T81 could die in the process.</li> <li>▪ We oppose the removal of the terraces and any existing trees without a thorough understanding of the landscape significance of this place. No justification for the removal of 72 healthy trees is provided.</li> <li>▪ Given the large basement it is impractical to "replace any trees assessed as Category A, B, C or D" as recommended by the landscape heritage consultant.</li> <li>▪ Without thorough understanding of the cultural significance of the landscape all the urban design analysis is worthless.</li> </ul>	<p>Whilst an arboricultural study of the trees was been undertaken no heritage assessment of the trees appears to have been done.</p>	

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
		<p>Excavation is proposed very close to many trees. Excavation and changes to the water levels could have a serious impact.</p>	13
	<p>Heritage Impact Statement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We disagree that the impact on the Scottish Hospital Building is negligible and oppose any new construction in the roof</li> <li>▪ We disagree that the impact on the Scottish Hospital site is acceptable for the reasons outlined above. The terraces should be retained and all healthy trees should be retained. The buildings are too high and dominant. The terrace view to the north should be “opened” not closed as proposed.</li> <li>▪ We disagree that the impact on the Paddington Conservation Area is acceptable. The buildings along Stephen St are not set back 7 m as recommended by the applicant’s heritage consultant. The setbacks are as little as 2.5m, with any excavation consequently right on the Stephen St boundary. Given the Brown St gully, buildings on Brown St should be set back at least 25m from Brown St. All existing healthy trees should be retained.</li> <li>▪ The impact on the heritage significance is at worst unacceptable and at best unknown. The application should be refused on heritage grounds.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We disagree that the impact on the Scottish Hospital Building is negligible and oppose any new construction in the roof</li> </ul> <p>The terraces should be retained and all healthy trees should be retained</p> <p>We disagree that the impact on the Paddington Conservation Area is acceptable</p>	<p>15, 17</p> <p>16</p> <p>15</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p><u>Public Domain</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Paddington enjoys green views of the gardens and grounds of the Scottish Hospital from Brown St, Glenview St, Neild Ave, Dillon Reserve, Stephen St and Glen St. The proposed design has a negative impact on every one of those views and the amenity of surrounding neighbourhood, with a 9 storey building highly visible to Brown and Glenview Sts, the same building visible to Dillon Reserve and down Glen St. In addition buildings up to 6 floors high align Stephen St and impact views down Glen St.</li> <li>▪ The Society is very concerned about the impact on the surrounding public domain of the Conservation Area and seeks refusal of this proposal We have not found any support for the proposal's impact on the public domain from the local community.</li> <li>▪ We do not support expanding Dillon Reserve as public domain. We would expect proper community consultation about the changes in design to Dillon Reserve.</li> </ul>	<p>The cumulative impacts on the surrounding streets is unacceptable</p> <p>We do not support expanding Dillon Reserve as public domain.</p>	<p>27</p> <p><b>33</b></p>
	<p><u>Environmental and Residential Amenity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ One of the great features of the Scottish Hospital is its garden and grounds. Those gardens and ground represent an amenity</li> </ul>	<p>The site itself is extensively shaded and would not be conducive to good internal residential amenity and solar access.</p>	<p>13, 11</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>challenge, limiting solar access to buildings in the grounds. The amenity of residents will be reduced on this site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ We note the aged care building has a number of rooms that literally face south into a retaining wall ad the southern end of the building. The amenity of these rooms is very poor.</li> <li>▪ It would appear that the buildings along Stephen St will take all winter sun from 42 Stephen St by 130pm and parts of 38 Stephen St</li> <li>▪ This is surely unacceptable and grounds for refusal.</li> <li>▪ This the EA identifies how access is achieved at the Scottish Hospital access to Fiveways and the amenities of Paddington itself are not simple. It would appear that access to these places would actually require a bus trip. The Scottish Hospital is steep land, not particularly accessible.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ It would appear that the buildings along Stephen St will take all winter sun from 42 Stephen St by 130pm and parts of 38 Stephen St</li> </ul> <p>Access to the site to any form of amenities would require a bus trip.</p>	49
	<p><u>Landscaping and Open Space</u></p> <p>The landscape design should be founded on a proper heritage assessment of the grounds and gardens. The work to date simply relies on the LEP listing by Woollahra Council. There has been no</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proper detailed analysis of the heritage significance of the existing gardens</li> <li>▪ Assessment of when the 150 trees were placed in the gardens</li> <li>▪ Assessment of the significance of the Brown St gully, and</li> <li>▪ Poor knowledge about the remnant fabric of the terraces.</li> </ul> <p>There is no conservation analysis of the cultural landscape of the Scottish Hospital.</p> <p>The aboricultural assessment does not assess the heritage significance of the trees</p> <p>The aboricultural assessment “recommends” the removal of over 70 trees simply because they are within “construction zones”. This is no reason for removal. The trees should be retained. Most would</p>	<p>The landscape design should be founded on a proper heritage assessment of the grounds and gardens. The work to date simply relies on the LEP listing by Woollahra Council.</p> <p>There has been no</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proper detailed analysis of the heritage significance of the existing gardens</li> <li>▪ Assessment of when the 150 trees were placed in the gardens</li> <li>▪ Assessment of the significance of the Brown St gully, and</li> <li>▪ Poor knowledge about the remnant fabric of the terraces.</li> </ul>	<p>15, 16</p> <p>15, 16</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>normally be protected by Council's TPO.</p> <p>A large no of trees in good and fair condition are proposed for removal. A total of 35 trees with Retention Value B are to be removed. They should all be retained.</p> <p>We recommend that the removal of T116 be reviewed. This tree could be saved and is probably holding up a significant section of Brown St.</p> <p>Excavation is perilously close to many trees proposed to be retained. Notwithstanding the "pruning analysis" for two of the trees (T18 and T81) identified in the arborist report the basement excavation will require additional branch and root pruning for these and many other trees.</p> <p>We also note that the dementia garden appears to be in the most important part of the original terraces and the upper terraces are 'privatised' as private courtyards.</p> <p>The vineyard terraces (if indeed so) should be retained.</p> <p>We strongly object to the landscape plan proposed as it neither understands or respects the cultural heritage of the place.</p>		
	<p><u>View Loss</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All the applicant's studies and models assume vegetation. None of this vegetation is guaranteed and in many instances the material presented is misleading or simply wrong. The trees shown on the model are not correct. The best way to appreciate the impact on views into and around the site is to examine the 3D perspectives presented in Appendix Q, the Solar Access Assessment</li> <li>▪ The views prepared do not respect the aperture of the human eye. All perspectives for the LEP are required to be 50mm views for accuracy.</li> <li>▪ To suggest as does the EA that there is no loss of view is an insult</li> <li>▪ The impact on Brown St, Dillon Reserve and on Stephen St is unacceptable</li> <li>▪ The impact on views from Glenview and Glen Streets is</li> </ul>	<p>The views prepared do not respect the aperture of the human eye.</p> <p>All perspectives for the LEP are required to be 50mm views for accuracy</p>	<p>29</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>unacceptable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To then argue for 'mitigation measures' proved the deceit.</li> </ul>	<p>To suggest as does the EA that there is no loss of view is clearly incorrect</p>	<p>18, 19, 25, 26</p>
	<p><u>Transport and Accessibility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We understand that the car park is designed to accommodate 176 cars, not 124 as stated. This is a huge consequent basement excavation.</li> <li>Stephen St is a narrow Paddington Street, some 10m wide. It is inappropriate for service trucks to use this narrow street, particularly if service vehicles are required to reverse into the building. Reversing trucks are dangerous and noisy. The transport assessment incorrectly assumes that Stephen St narrows at Glen St. It does not. It narrows at Dillon Reserve.</li> <li>Note that both access to Stephen St and to Glen St from Goodhope St is very narrow. Council identify Stephen St as a no through road, presumably to discourage traffic in this typical narrow Street.</li> <li>We are not aware of any 'disused' vehicle entry from Stephen St</li> <li>Stage 1 anticipates that all access to the site would be from Stephen St until Stage 2 is complete. Stephen St is not suitable for this traffic even on a temporary basis.</li> <li>We oppose any entry to the site from Stephen St</li> <li>We also note that access for the disabled requires a 290m journey along Glenview St (in part 1:12), Liverpool St and MacDonald St to access the bus stop. It is very poor access for such a significant development.</li> </ul>	<p>The amount of car parking on the site is excessive. The site is well connected to public transport</p> <p>It is inappropriate for service trucks to use Stephen street, particularly if service vehicles are required to reverse into the building.</p>	<p>38</p> <p>7, 22</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
		<p>We are not aware of any 'disused' vehicle entry from Stephen St</p> <p>Stage 1 anticipates that all access to the site would be from Stephen St until Stage 2 is complete.</p> <p>The 290m walk from the site to the bus stop is poor access for such a significant development</p>	<p>9</p> <p>46</p> <p>49</p>
	<p><u>ESD</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Paddington Society supports the achievement of high ESD standards</li> <li>▪ The scale of the development, the size of the apartments, the size of the excavation of the basement and the quantity of excavated material that will leave the site are contrary to sustainable principles.</li> <li>▪ The removal of nearly 90 trees from the site is contrary to sustainable principles.</li> <li>▪ The removal of the terraces is contrary to sustainable principles.</li> </ul>	<p>The development is contrary to sustainability principles</p>	<p>48</p>
	<p><u>Threatened Species</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The removal of nearly 90 trees will impact on the foraging of the Grey-Headed Flying Fox</li> <li>▪ The removal of nearly 90 trees will impact on the environment of any microbats on site</li> <li>▪ Most importantly the threatened Grey Headed Flying Foxes will</li> </ul>	<p>The removal of nearly 88 trees will impact on the foraging of the Grey-Headed Flying Fox and any microbats on site as well as the local possum and bird population.</p>	<p>13, 50</p>



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	impact the amenity of future residents. Residents and flying foxes are not compatible. As a consequence future residents will move to have the flying fox habitat removed.		
	<u>Drainage and Stormwater Management</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Rushcutters Bay flood plain is developing serious issues as Paddington continues to lose deep soil for hard surface. Where will water diverted from the site actually go?</li> <li>The Scottish Hospital is an important part of the drainage system with its 'rainforest' gully along the edge of Brown St and the area of significant deep soil in an otherwise very urbanised area. Changes to the drainage system could change the existing ecology. This could lead to tree damage.</li> <li>The society is opposed to the extent of hard surface.</li> </ul>	Changes to the drainage system could change the existing ecology. This could lead to exacerbated stormwater impacts downstream and tree damage.	42
	<u>Contamination in Geotechnical Issues</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The society supports the appropriate removal of contaminants from the site as long as the heritage fabric and remnants are respected and retained.</li> </ul>	The society supports the appropriate removal of contaminants from the site as long as the heritage fabric and remnants are respected and retained.	15
	<u>Geotechnical and Hydrogeological Analysis</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No assessment of the impact of the proposal on the hydrogeological environment of the grounds and gardens, in particular on trees on the site has been undertaken.</li> <li>No consent should be given for any proposal on this site without a thorough understanding of the impacts of hard surfaces and basements on the water environment of the existing trees.</li> </ul>	No assessment of the impact of the proposal on the hydrogeological environment of the grounds and gardens, in particular on trees on the site has been undertaken.	42
	<u>Utilities</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents have advised that the stormwater/sewer system in Stephen St has serious problems. At certain times it smells strongly in the public domain.</li> </ul>	The stormwater/sewer system in Stephen St has serious problems. Increased development in the catchment will further exacerbate this without commensurate mitigation.	42

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<u>Staging</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The bulk and scale of the development is in part generated by the staging strategy which puts a very large and bulky nursing home on Stephen St.</li> <li>There are two alternative strategies that would both reduce bulk and scale of the development. One is to use the Scottish Hospital as part of the nursing home, reducing the bulk of the Stephen St building. The second is to relocate residents and build, as previously proposed, a new nursing home on the site of the existing nursing home.</li> <li>It is also important to avoid the use of Stephen St for access at any stage.</li> </ul>	<p>Two strategies to reduce the bulk include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use the Scottish Hospital as part of the nursing home, reducing the bulk of the Stephen St building.</li> <li>relocate residents and build, as previously proposed, a new nursing home on the site of the existing nursing home.</li> </ul>	2
	<u>Housing Choice</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Whilst there may be a demand for large 2 and 3 bedroom ILUs, the Scottish Hospital site is inappropriate for large dwellings. Dwelling sizes should be as small as possible to minimise the impact on the site, the grounds, the gardens, the historic villa and on Paddington.</li> <li>The Scottish Hospital as a significant heritage item should not be considered a commercial development opportunity.</li> </ul>	<p>the Scottish Hospital site is inappropriate for large dwellings. Dwelling sizes should be as small as possible to minimise the impact on the site, the grounds, the gardens, the historic villa and on Paddington.</p>	30
	<u>Residential Facilities</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The society supports the provision of appropriate facilities for residents</li> <li>We object to any building in the Brown St gully, including the pool and spa.</li> </ul>	<p>We object to any building in the Brown St gully, including the pool and spa.</p>	2
	<u>Contributions/ VPA</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We support the dedication of 1366.1m2 of land as an addition to Dillon Reserve</li> <li>We do not support widening of Stephen St, 90 degree parking to Stephen St</li> <li>We also question the appropriateness of this site for a community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We support the dedication of 1366.1m2 of land as an addition to Dillon Reserve</li> <li>We do not support widening of Stephen St, 90 degree parking to Stephen St</li> </ul>	33

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	garden.		
	<p><u>BCA</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not clear whether the landscape plan accommodated all egress points and the consequence of this on the gardens and the public domain.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not clear whether the landscape plan accommodated all egress points and the consequence of this on the gardens and the public domain.</li> </ul>	49
	<p><u>Community Consultation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The applicant was cleverly managed with a very skilled public relations company. The notification brochures were clear and detailed as was the follow up. The briefing sessions were handled professionally.</li> <li>It was a process carried out efficiently because it was required. It was not consultation.</li> <li>Overwhelmingly the feedback from the first briefing session expressed major concerns over the height, bulk and scale of the buildings and the subsequent impact on loss of trees and views.</li> <li>At the second briefing session participants again stated that “the preferred master plan was still advancing a building form that was out of scale, too bulky and too high for the site and that it continues to represent an overdevelopment particularly given its location in a heritage area.” And that “one of the key and simplest ways to reduce bulk and scale is to reduce floor area... There’s quite a significance leap in the amount of floor area on the site which contributes to the bulk and scale, which is everyone’s concern”</li> <li>Response: “at the end of the day, quite honestly, the FSR is irrelevant...what we’re trying to do is get an economic solution...”:</li> <li>By the third and final session it was clear little had changed. Building articulation increasing bulk elsewhere and height lowered a mere 40cm.</li> <li>The refusal of the proponent to reduce the FSR, a massive 19,500m2 in the initial application questions the validity of the community consultation.</li> <li>We have been kept informed but our concerns have been ignored.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It was a process carried out efficiently because it was required. It was not consultation.</li> <li>The refusal of the proponent to reduce the FSR, a massive 19,500m2 in the initial application questions the validity of the community consultation.</li> </ul> <p>We have been kept informed but our concerns have been ignored.</p>	20

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<u>Conclusion</u>  We do not support the assessment submitted to the DOP. It is too big, too deep and too intrusive.	We do not support the assessment submitted to the DOP. It is too big, too deep and too intrusive.	2
<b>NSW Health</b>	NSW Health does not licence private nursing homes. Overall regulation of residential aged care is now a Commonwealth government responsibility under the Aged Care Act 1997.		Noted
<b>Sydney Water</b>	<u>Water</u>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing water system has capacity to service the proposed development. The developer will need to design and construct an extension to the available 150mm water main on the eastern side of Neild Ave or the 150mm main on the eastern side of Brown St.</li> <li>The extensions will need to be sized and configured according to the Water Supply Code of Australia (Sydney Water Edition WSA 03-2002). Evidence of Code compliance should be attached with the extension design.</li> </ul>	The existing water system has capacity to service the proposed development.	Noted
	<u>Wastewater</u>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The existing wastewater system has capacity to service the proposed development. The developer will need to design and construct an extension to the available 225mm wastewater main that traverses the property.</li> <li>The extension, in addition to any adjustment or deviation, will need</li> </ul>	The existing wastewater system has capacity to service the proposed development.	Noted

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	to be sized and configured according to the Sewerage Code of Australia (Sydney Water Edition WSA 02-2002) and to the Guidelines for building Over or Adjacent to Sydney Water's wastewater mains. Evidence of compliance should be attached with the extension and/or adjustment design.		
	<p><u>Stormwater</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The site is located in the mid to upper section of the Rushcutters Bay stormwater drainage catchment. The site is traversed by a 900mm stormwater conduit, which enters the site at the Stephen St boundary and exits at the Dillon St boundary.</li> <li>▪ Preliminary assessment shows there is a potential conflict between this stormwater conduit and the proposed Stephen St building. For Sydney Water to support the proposed development, we require a minimum of 1m clearance either side of the existing conduit. Detailed plans should be submitted to Sydney Water to demonstrate compliance with this requirement.</li> <li>▪ To prevent damage to Sydney Water's stormwater assets, building foundations are to be designed and certified by a structural engineer based on the following criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Buildings are to be supported on pier foundations so structural loads are not transferred to Sydney Water stormwater assets.</li> <li>▪ Buildings must be able to remain fully supported in the event of structural failure and collapse of Sydney Water stormwater assets.</li> <li>▪ Piers are to be bored not driven</li> <li>▪ Piers are to extend to at least 0.5m below the Zone of Influence of Sydney Water stormwater assets</li> </ul> </li> <li>▪ A detailed dilapidation survey of the conduit is to be submitted to Sydney Water's stormwater group before and after the completion of any works. This is to ensure the structural integrity of the stormwater conduit and is not compromised during construction. The survey is to be conducted by an accredited CCTV operator and should cover the length of the conduit within the development site.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Preliminary assessment shows there is a potential conflict between this stormwater conduit and the proposed Stephen St building. For Sydney Water to support the proposed development, we require a minimum of 1m clearance either side of the existing conduit. Detailed plans should be submitted to Sydney Water to demonstrate compliance with this requirement.</li> </ul>	Noted. Refer SoC

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As there is no proposal to connect to Sydney Water's stormwater conduit, Sydney Water's stormwater quantity and quality requirements will not apply. A new application will be required for any proposal to connect to the conduit.</li> </ul>		
	<p><u>Trade Waste</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All customers discharging trade waste into Sydney Water's wastewater system must have written permission from Sydney Water. The trade waste requirements help Sydney Water discharge or reuse wastewater while protecting the environment and meeting regulatory requirements.</li> <li>Sydney water will either issue the customer a trade waste permit or enter into a trade waste agreement. A trade waste permit must be obtained before any discharge can be made to the sewer system. The permit is also needed for site remediation purposes. Applications for a trade waste permit can be made to Sydney Water at the Section 73 Certificate application state. For further information refer to the Sydney Water website.</li> </ul>	<p>All customers discharging trade waste into Sydney Water's wastewater system must have written permission from Sydney Water.</p>	<p>Noted</p>
	<p><u>Sydney Water Servicing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sydney Water will further assess the impact of the development when the proponent applied for a Section 73 Certificate. This assessment will enable Sydney Water to specify any works required as a result of the development and to assess if amplification and/or changes to the system are applicable. The proponent must fund any adjustments needed to Sydney Water infrastructure as a result of any development.</li> <li>The proponent should engage a Water Servicing Coordinator to get a Section 73 Certificate and manage the servicing aspects of the development. The Water Servicing Coordinator will ensure submitted infrastructure designs are sized and configured according to the Water Supply Code of Australia (Sydney Water Edition WSA 03-2002) and the Sewerage Code of Australia (Sydney Water Edition WSA 02-2002).</li> <li>Sydney Water requests the Department to continue to instruct</li> </ul>	<p>Sydney Water will further assess the impact of the development when the proponent applied for a Section 73 Certificate.</p>	<p>Noted</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	proponents to obtain a Section 73 Certificate from Sydney Water.	The proponent should engage a Water Servicing Coordinator to get a Section 73 Certificate and manage the servicing aspects of the development.	
NSW Transport	TNSW considers that the DGRs have generally be satisfactorily addressed in respect of the matters raised.	TNSW considers that the DGRs have generally be satisfactorily addressed in respect of the matters raised.	Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport NSW requests the provision of</li> <li>End of trip amenities for cyclists, in accordance with Planning Guidelines for Walking and Cycling</li> <li>Travel demand management measures including completion of a location specific Workplace Travel Plan (WTP) and Transport Access Guide.</li> </ul>	Transport NSW requests the provision of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>End of trip amenities for cyclists, in accordance with Planning Guidelines for Walking and Cycling</li> <li>Travel demand management measures including completion of a location specific Workplace Travel Plan (WTP) and Transport Access Guide.</li> </ul>	49
State Transit	State Transit has no objection to the redevelopment of the Scottish Hospital site. However, would request that DOP take into account the following in regard to public transport	State Transit has no objection to the redevelopment of the Scottish Hospital site.	Noted
	<u>Bus Stop Proximity</u>  State Transit operates the 389 services along MacDonald St, Brown St and Glenmore St. The closest bus stop for residents will be 100m for city bound services and approximately 200m for the Bondi bound services. The Department should consider the proposed resident mix of the site to determine if these distances are suitable for people	The Department should consider the proposed resident mix of the site to determine if distances to the nearest bus stops are suitable for people living in an aged facility.	49

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	living in an aged facility.		
	<p><u>389 Capacity</u></p> <p>The current 389 service runs every 3 minutes in the peak, and 10 minutes off peak on weekdays and every 15 mins on weekends. This route is highly populated and at many times is nearing capacity. The department should give consideration to whether this service provides adequate transport considering the large increase in scale of the development with the addition of 82 units and 100 resident bed complex.</p>	The department should give consideration to whether the 389 bus service provides adequate transport considering the large increase in scale of the development	49
	If the development will have a construction impact on STA services, State Transit will require in due course a copy of the traffic management plans and suitable time to undertake assessments prior to approval by the RTA.	If the development will have a construction impact on STA services, State Transit will require in due course a copy of the traffic management plans and suitable time to undertake assessments prior to approval by the RTA.	46
<b>RTA</b>	<p>RTA raises no objection to the application as the site development will not result in a significant traffic impact on the classified road network.</p> <p>The RTA provides the following comments to DOP for consideration in the determination of the DA</p>	RTA raises no objection to the application as the site development will not result in a significant traffic impact on the classified road network.	Noted
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The layout of the proposed vehicle assessable areas associated with the subject development (including driveways, grades, turn paths, sight distance requirements, aisle widths, aisle lengths and parking bay dimensions) shall be in accordance with AS 2890.1-</li> </ul>	The layout of the proposed vehicle assessable areas shall be in accordance with AS 2890.1-2004 and AS 2890.2-2002 for heavy	Noted. Refer Statement of Commitments



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	2004 and AS 2890.2-2002 for heavy vehicle usage.	vehicle usage.	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The swept path of the longest vehicle (including garbage trucks) entering and exiting the subject site, as well as manoeuvrability through the site shall be in accordance with AUSTROADS. In this regard, swept path plans which illustrate compliance with this requirement shall be submitted to the DOP for approval</li> </ul>	The swept path of the longest vehicle entering and exiting the subject site, as well as manoeuvrability through the site shall be in accordance with AUSTROADS	Noted. Refer Statement of Commitments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The developer shall be responsible for all public utility adjustment/relocation works, necessitated by the above work and as required by the various public utility authorities and/or their agents.</li> </ul>	The developer shall be responsible for all public utility adjustment/relocation works, necessitated by the above work and as required by the various public utility authorities and/or their agents.	46
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All works/regulatory signposting associated with the proposed development shall be at not cost to the RTA.</li> </ul>	All works/regulatory signposting associated with the proposed development shall be at not cost to the RTA.	46
<b>Clover Moore MP</b>	I share community concern that PAC must be a good neighbour. The Scottish Hospital site is located within a heritage conservation area, and it is vital that the development contributes to and not detracts from, Paddington's special character. The church must protect amenity, heritage, and open space while meeting needs for aged care.	The church must protect amenity, heritage, and open space while meeting needs for aged care.	1, 2, 15, 16
	<p><u>Overdevelopment</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents point out that the proposed FSR is over 40% more than that approved by Council in 2002 for a previous contentious development. I understand the Woollahra LEP sets a height limit for new buildings in Paddington of 9.5m and a FSR of 0.75:1.</li> </ul>	I share residents concerns that the proposed building heights are inconsistent with Paddington's Victorian heritage, the Woollahra LEP and the Paddington Heritage DCP.	1, 2, 15

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The proposal includes a nine storey building with up to seven storeys visible above street level on Brown St and a six storey building on Stephen St. I share residents concerns that these heights are inconsistent with Paddington's Victorian heritage , the Woollahra LEP and the Paddington Heritage DCP.</li> <li>▪ The buildings involve development deep into the site, impacting on green open space and vistas across the site.</li> <li>▪ Residents are alarmed that the development would block the view corridor from Glen St and impact on views of the gardens from Brown, Glenview, Nield Dillon Reserve and Stephen St, as well as views through the site from homes and along streetscapes of Brown, Cooper and Stephen Streets. I share their concern that the bulky buildings will consume the entire outlook of what is now an urban forest.</li> <li>▪ Residents are concerned that setbacks are inadequate for the scale of the proposal, particularly on Stephen St where they are as little as 2.5m. Residents also request larger setback for the 9 storey building on Brown St.</li> </ul>	<p>I share resident concerns that the bulky buildings will consume the entire outlook of what is now an urban forest.</p>	<p>2, 18, 19, 25, 26</p>
	<p><u>Design</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Development in heritage conservation areas must demonstrate high quality design excellence that is sensitive to context. While the bulk and scale of proposed buildings will dominate the neighbourhood, the proposed design also fails to complement the special character of Paddington, and would detract from the longstanding character of the precinct.</li> <li>▪ I share community concern that there is a need for dramatic improvement in the design of the development.</li> <li>▪ PAC should review this design to ensure that development adds to this sensitive precinct rather than detracts from visual amenity.</li> </ul>	<p>While the bulk and scale of proposed buildings will dominate the neighbourhood, the proposed design also fails to complement the special character of Paddington, and would detract from the longstanding character of the precinct.</p> <p>I share community concern that there is a need for dramatic improvement in the design of the development.</p> <p>PAC should review this design to ensure that development adds to this sensitive precinct rather than detracts from visual amenity.</p>	<p>1</p> <p>1</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p><u>Landscape and Vegetation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Where trees must be removed to enable essential development, a new tree should be planted on the site to compensate. Where mature trees are removed, mature trees should be planted to protect existing canopy, microclimate and wildlife. Development should be contained within the vegetation canopy to protect amenity and heritage. This will also require sensitive management to prevent impacts on the significant wildlife dependent on this urban forest.</li> <li>Consent conditions should require no net loss of trees or tree canopy and ensure protection of habitat and wildlife.</li> <li>The landscape is a significant part of the site's heritage and I share the Paddington Society's concern that there is no landscape conservation management plan or proper assessment of the historic significance of the trees. This assessment should be provided prior to a determination on the application.</li> <li>Removal of the terrace remains is not supported – these form part of the historic value of the site and there is no justification for their removal.</li> <li>I welcome the proposed expansion to Dillon Reserve</li> </ul>	<p>Where trees must be removed to enable essential development, a new tree should be planted on the site to compensate.</p> <p>Consent conditions should require no net loss of trees or tree canopy and ensure protection of habitat and wildlife.</p> <p>I share the Paddington Society's concern that there is no landscape conservation management plan or proper assessment of the historic significance of the trees. This assessment should be provided prior to a determination on the application.</p> <p>Removal of the terrace remains is not supported</p>	<p>13</p> <p>13</p> <p>Any conditions of consent will be determined by the NSW Department of Planning.</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
		I welcome the proposed expansion to Dillon Reserve	16  <b>33</b>
	<p><u>Traffic</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The adjacent community is concerned about traffic impacts. Paddington streets are not designed for heavy through-traffic and I have worked with residents and Council to prevent through traffic impacts over the years.</li> <li>▪ The facility should not contribute to already congested streets that are unable to carry additional vehicles. Measures that limit through traffic from residential streets and encourage public transport use by staff, residents and visitors should be required.</li> <li>▪ Stephen St is a residential street and should not be widened to accommodate additional traffic.</li> <li>▪ I share the Paddington Society's concern that excavation of the site for 124 car parking spaces will result in a loss of natural landforms and impact on significant tree root systems and prevent the planting of new trees. Consent conditions need to ensure their protection.</li> </ul>	<p>The facility should not contribute to already congested streets that are unable to carry additional vehicles</p> <p>Stephen St is a residential street and should not be widened to accommodate additional traffic.</p> <p>I share the Paddington Society's concern that excavation of the site for 124 car parking spaces will result in a loss of natural landforms and impact on significant tree root systems and prevent the planting of new trees</p>	<p>24</p> <p>22</p> <p>13</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>While there is strong community support for sympathetic development of this site and the provision of additional aged care, I share the community concern that this proposal needs amendment to reduce its scale and impacts, and requires conditions to protect the important urban forest on the site.</p> <p>I ask that a refined proposal be developed to address the community concerns, protect the special character of the site and improve the quality of this development.</p>	<p>I share the community concern that this proposal needs amendment to reduce its scale and impacts, and requires conditions to protect the important urban forest on the site.</p> <p>I ask that a refined proposal be developed to address the community concerns, protect the special character of the site and improve the quality of this development.</p>	2
<b>Woollahra Council</b>  <b>Re VPA</b>	<p>As you would be aware PAC have submitted to Council a proposed VPA. It includes dedicating land at the northern end of the site to council for open space purposes ie extending the adjoining council owned public park known as Dillon St Reserve. The council recently decided to support in principle the proposed VPA and to enter into negotiations with PAC. We have had discussions with PAC representatives at which a plan prepared by Aspect Studios for remodelling works was provided to us. This plan did not form part of PAC's original proposed VPA although one of its terms was that the council would be responsible for remodelling the park.</p> <p>It shows remodelling works on the land to be dedicated and also on the existing park land. The works are integrated with the landscape</p>		33

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	<p>works shown on the EA for the Scottish Hospital site. These works are quite extensive and would require a high level of maintenance. PAC representatives have told us that the remodelling works are effectively non-negotiable as the 'extended park' would form an integral part of the proposed development's main entry. We have a meeting scheduled later this week with PAC representatives at which time we will raise the appropriateness of their remodelling design as part of the negotiation to which the Council has agreed.</p>		
	<p>We are concerned that documents submitted with and referred to in the EA eg appendix J, also refer to works on the existing land which forms the Dillon Street Reserve and include the remodelling plan prepared on behalf of PAC by Apsect Studios. This is because council has not been approached by PAC to give consent to any works on its land and it has not given any consent for these works to form part of the EA. As the EA is currently on public exhibitions the inclusion of these works could give the wrong impression as to what Council has or has not agreed to in relation to the park. At this stage, as far as Council is concerned, we are still negotiating with PAC the terms of any VPA.</p>	<p>We are concerned that documents submitted with and referred to in the EA eg Appendix J, also refer to works on the existing land which forms the Dillon Street Reserve and include the remodelling plan prepared on behalf of PAC by Apsect Studios.</p> <p>Council has not consented to any works being undertaken on this land. These images may give the wrong impression as to what Council has or has not agreed to.</p>	<p>33</p>
	<p>You are advised that any assessment of the EA should not take into account the remodelling works shown on the land prepared by Aspect Studios in so far as they relate to land which presently forms the Dillon Street Reserve and which is presently in council's ownership. As required the Department will be advised in due course of the outcome of the negotiations between Council and PAC</p>	<p>Any assessment of the EA should not take into account the remodelling works shown on the land prepared by Aspect Studios in so far as they relate to land which presently forms the Dillon Street Reserve</p>	<p>33</p>

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	with regard to the proposed VPA.		
<b>Woollahra Council</b> <b>Re proposal</b>	The density and bulk of the proposed buildings are considered to be excessive resulting in the significance of the heritage listed Scottish Hospital building and grounds and individual trees, as recognised by the NSW Heritage Inventory and the Woollahra LEP 1995, being unduly affected. In this regard, the importance of the principles under the Burra Charter as a guide to the redevelopment of the site does not appear to have appropriately influenced the proposed design outcome.	The density and bulk of the proposed buildings are considered to be excessive resulting in the significance of the Scottish Hospital building and grounds and individual trees, being unduly affected.  Burra Charter has not appropriately influenced the design outcome	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC
	The density and bulk of the proposed new buildings are considered to be excessive resulting in the significance of the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area as recognised by the Woollahra LEP 1995, being unduly affected.	The density and bulk of the proposed new buildings are considered to be excessive resulting in the significance of the Paddington Heritage Conservation Area being unduly affected.	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC
	The height and siting of the proposed building referred to as the Brown St ILU building would result in the areas referred to as traditional garden terraces, passive recreation and middle link garden to be overshadowed at all times of the year unduly affecting the desirability of these areas to be used by the future occupants of the development	the Brown St ILU building would result in the central landscaped areas being overshadowed at all times of the year	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC
	The siting of the proposed building referred to as the Stephen St ILU building will unreasonably impact on the streetscape and views from Stephen and Glen Streets. Also, this building should be set back from the Stephen St alignment a sufficient distance to retain all exiting significant trees. This may require the setback to be	the Stephen St ILU building will unreasonably impact on the streetscape and views from Stephen and Glen Streets.	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	increased.		
	The alterations to the roof level of the heritage listed Scottish Hospital building, as recognised by the NSW Heritage Inventory and the Woollahra LEP 1995, will unacceptably reduce that building's heritage significance	The alterations to the roof level of the Scottish Hospital building, will unacceptably reduce that building's heritage significance	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC
	The excessive height of the building referred to as the Brown St ILU building will cause an unreasonable impact on views from private properties on the southern side of Cooper St.	The excessive height of the Brown St ILU building will cause an unreasonable impact on views from private properties on the southern side of Cooper St.	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC
	The siting of the proposed buildings and works poses an unacceptable risk to the well being of heritage listed trees which the proposal is relying upon to mitigate against the unacceptable density and bulk of such proposed buildings. The heritage listed trees are an intrinsic part of the property's heritage significance and contribute to the landscape and scenic qualities of the site and the locality.	The siting of the buildings and works poses an unacceptable risk to the well being of heritage listed trees.	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC
	The siting of the proposed buildings and works will require the removal of existing significant trees resulting in the landscape character of the locality being detrimentally affected. Over 70 trees are to be removed simply because they are affected by the proposed construction.	The siting of the proposed buildings and works will require the removal of existing significant trees resulting in the landscape character of the locality being detrimentally affected.	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC
	The Minister cannot be satisfied that the proposal has adequate regard to neighbourhood amenity and streetscape which are considered to be a prerequisite to granting approval under SEPP (HSPD) 2004, clause 33	The Minister cannot be satisfied that the proposal has adequate regard to SEPP (HSPD) 2004, clause 33	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC



AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	The extent by which the proposal fails to meet the “can’t refuse” standards for building height and density contained within SEPP (HSPD) 2004, clauses 48(a)&(b) and 50(a)&(b) demonstrates that the height of buildings and the density of the proposal are excessive.	The extent by which the proposal fails to meet the “can’t refuse” standards within SEPP (HSPD) 2004 demonstrates that the height of buildings and the density of the proposal are excessive.	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC
	The proposed loading dock off Stephen St will require vehicles to either reverse in or reverse out. This arrangement and the use of Stephen St for service vehicles is unsatisfactory having regard to the narrow carriageway of Stephen St.	The loading dock and the use of Stephen St for service vehicles is unsatisfactory having regard to the narrow carriageway of Stephen St.	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC
	Information submitted with the project application is considered to be misleading in relation to the floor space of the proposal, the scale model (particularly in relation to the way in which existing trees are represented), the height of the existing adjacent building at 40 Stephen St and 3D images (they appear to have been prepared using an inappropriate aperture).	Information submitted with the project application is considered to be misleading in relation to <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the floor space of the proposal,</li> <li>the scale model</li> <li>the height of the existing adjacent building at 40 Stephen St and</li> <li>3D images</li> </ul>	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC
	The proposed number of car parking spaces is considered to be excessive which results in the extent of required excavation for the basement car park to also be excessive	The proposed number of car parking spaces is considered to be excessive	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC
	The heritage terraces will be privatised with the top lawn area being only accessible to the occupants of the proposed adjoining apartments. There also appears to be no proper heritage based justification for the proposed form in which the terraces are being reinterpreted.	The heritage terraces will be privatised  No proper heritage justification for the proposed form in which the terraces are being reinterpreted.	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC

AUTHOR	SUBMISSION	ISSUE SUMMARY	RESPONSE REFERENCE
	The siting of the Brown St ILU building will result in the Brown St streetscape being adversely affected by its intrusion into the existing landscaped buffer.	The siting of the Brown St ILU building will result in the Brown St streetscape being adversely affected	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC
	The proposal clearly represents an inappropriate form of development for this site. It also provides limited public benefit in terms of residential care facilities as compared to the existing accommodation ie 100 proposed beds compared to 88 existing. We are of the view that the proposal is unacceptable and should be refused by the Minister.	<p>The proposal clearly represents an inappropriate form of development for this site.</p> <p>It also provides limited public benefit</p>	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC
	You are also advised that we have received copies of numerous objections to the proposal as a consequence of the EA being made available to the public. These objections confirm that there is widespread concern in the community with this proposal. Careful consideration needs to be given to the matters raised in those objections before any decision is made on the application.	there is widespread concern in the community with this proposal	Refer specific response prepared on behalf of PAC