



APPENDIX 2: SUMMARY AND REVIEW OF RESIDENT SUBMISSIONS

SUBMISSION ISSUE		RESPONSE
Additional Level	I object to an additional level.	<p>The comments in relation to the 'additional level' are mistaken- there is no additional level proposed. We note there has been a re-labelling of level terminology (ie the way levels are described) between that approved Concept Plan and the detailed plans for approval in the current Section 75W for Building D. This re-labelling may have caused some confusion; however, it must be made clear that <u>no</u> additional levels have been added to the proposal.</p> <p>The approval of (what is now termed) Level 7 of Building D was approved as part of Mod 2 of the Concept Plan (MP_0188 Mod 2). In the approval of this level, the PAC imposed a condition (FEAR No. 8) which sought to reduce the apparent bulk and scale of the building when viewed at street level (ie from Dangar Street). The effect of this condition does not remove the level, but rather shifts the building mass associated with the top-most floor away from the street-front elevation.</p> <p>The reduction of the available building area caused by this condition meant that it was not operationally feasible to provide dementia care rooms and the necessary support services at this top level. However, the resultant building area was sufficient to allow plant being located within the building envelope created by the condition. The plant level is wholly contained within the approved Concept Plan.</p> <p>The nature of the condition is such that the plant level will not be readily seen from the eyeline of a pedestrian using Dangar Street. Further, the solid mass associated with the plant room is recessed within the building envelope. These characteristics, together with landscaping within the Dangar Street setback and road verge all combine in relieving the impacts associated with building mass when viewed from higher vantage points.</p>



SUBMISSION ISSUE		RESPONSE
	<p>The resultant height of this additional level is above the heights approved by the PAC after taking significant due consideration and concerns from residents regarding the heights of the Stage 1 residential aged care facility.</p>	
	<p>Objection to additional level comprising plant room</p>	
	<p>The creation an additional floor of plant rooms on the top floor are particularly offensive. We had hoped at least that the top floor would have some architectural design elements and possibly landscaping to minimise its impact.</p>	
	<p>I object to an additional level added; nothing on King Street or Dangar Street is this high. The height should remain as agreed originally.</p>	



SUBMISSION ISSUE		RESPONSE
	<p>We strongly object to your proposal to build an additional level comprising plant room.</p> <p>We currently look directly into the current top floor of the Montefiore Home from our second storey. We strongly disagree with the proposed heights of the new structure, as it will tower over us and all the properties in our area by 2-3 storeys.</p>	
Traffic and Parking	<p>Reducing car spaces.</p> <p>Reduction of car spaces and removal of temporary car park- I object to this as this would greatly increase traffic and reduce parking availability in our streets which are already busy enough with bus traffic and park use as well as staff and visitor parking from the current MACC facility.</p> <p>One of the reasons given for the original approval was the availability of onsite parking. With the reduction and removal of parking proposed in this</p>	<p>Matters in relation to traffic and parking have been separately addressed in a Review prepared by Traffix, included within Appendix 3 of this submission.</p> <p>This review has concluded (in relation to the matters that relate to Building D) that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sufficient on-site parking is provided to Building D in accordance with the Seniors SEPP. Furthermore, sufficient on-street parking is provided for the development of the overall site (ie Buildings D, E and F) irrespective of the staging regime. • It is common practice for construction workers to have tools and equipment to be delivered to the site while they arrive by public transport. Notwithstanding, there temporary parking areas available on the site. • The perceived impacts on on-street parking arising from the subject proposal are acceptable.



SUBMISSION ISSUE		RESPONSE
<p>modification the impact to the local area needs a completely new assessment. As a resident, I do not wish to have parking restrictions imposed in our street due to a development which does not even meet Council regulations. Already our street is badly impacted during the day due to the existing facility which is highlighted by the comparative ease of parking here in evening hours.</p> <p>Loss of on-site parking spaces, which has a further impact on residents' street parking concerns already raised regarding the previous submissions.</p> <p>In addition, there is already insufficient parking for visitors.</p> <p>Car park on King Street and Dangar Street is limited for residents at present. Reduction of car spaces at Montefiore will impact the community once again. I object to reduction of car spots. Visitors, staff and loved ones</p>	<p>Ultimately, the Traffic Review concluded that:</p> <p><i>The proposed Concept Plan Mod 3 and Block D Mod 2 proposals will have no detrimental change on the previously approved traffic and parking arrangements, instead providing an improvement over the current approvals in both traffic generation and parking provisions for the site.</i></p>	



SUBMISSION ISSUE		RESPONSE
	<p>should be encouraged to be using parking on the home.</p> <p>We also object to the reduction of car spaces and the removal of the temporary car park, as this would greatly increase the traffic and parking issues in our street, which are already busy enough with general traffic, as well as staff, volunteers, and visitors parking from the current Montefiore facility.</p>	
Development Creep	<p>This represents ongoing development creep by the proponent which is not in the interest of residents for the department to support and encourage.</p> <p>Represent ongoing development creep which is not in the interest of local residents.</p>	<p>The proposed modification does not represent 'development creep'. As the original project approval granted for Building D was approved concurrently with the original Concept Plan, and because that Concept Plan was amended to reflect a new seniors housing and care mix (and hence overall building layout), the previous approval in relation to Building D had to be modified to reflect the modified Concept Plan.</p> <p>Modification 2 simply implements the detailed design associated with the approved building envelope.</p>
View Loss	<p>The proposed increase in height will have a further greater negative impact on our view loss and negative value on our property, all for the benefit of housing plant and equipment. As noted in our</p>	<p>As identified in the response against the matter relating to 'the additional level' (refer above), there is no increase to the overall approved height of Building D.</p> <p>Consequently, the results of the previous view impact assessment conducted within the recent Concept Plan modification (ie MP_0188_Mod 2) remain</p>



SUBMISSION ISSUE		RESPONSE
	<p>December 2015 objections, our clients have significant and unobstructed views from their unit, across the west to the Blue Mountains. These views also incorporate the skyline of the City and Anzac Bridge. We maintain our assertions as outlined by our lawyer previously that the tenacity principal applies in respect of views.</p>	unchanged. The previous view impact assessment was supported by both the DPE and the PAC.
	<p>The addition of the plant level is also has a more significant impact across more of our view. The advertised plans show that the intention is to fill in the void between the approved plant equipment areas. This has the effect of completely blocking our views to the blue mountains instead of partial obstructions. Something like if a neighbour erects a high fence over existing approvals that blocks a view. I strongly object to this unnecessary addition as it would now be a full obstruction to our already impacted view and amenity. This is especially poignant given that</p>	



SUBMISSION ISSUE		RESPONSE
	the approved plans already exceed the local and state guidelines for this residential enclave.	
Exceeds Local Planning Controls	This is especially poignant given that the approved plans already exceed the local and state guidelines for this residential enclave.	It is acknowledged that the proposed height exceeds the local planning controls, however these matters were considered as part of the original (and subsequently modified) Concept Plan. As identified earlier, the proposal is within the overall height of the Concept Plan approval and does not further breach the local planning controls.
	We strongly object to your proposal to build an additional level comprising plant room. Current Randwick council regulations only allow for buildings in our area up to 3 levels.	
Property Values	The proposed increase in height will have a further greater negative impact on our view loss and negative value on our property.	The impact of property values as raised in the context of this submission seems to be tied to the assertion that a further increase in building height will affect property value. As identified earlier, the proposal does not involve additional height of the building that would affect views. Further, the perceived impact on property value has not been quantified and is not a relevant consideration.
	It will severely affect the value of properties in the surrounding area.	
Mass and Scale of Development	We also object to changes impacting building massing, as the mass and scale of this building is	This proposal does not involve the increase in building mass or scale over that which was approved as part of Concept Plan modification (ie MP_0188_Mod 2).



SUBMISSION ISSUE		RESPONSE
	<p>significant, and any resulting increase in massing and scale is significant especially when viewed from above and not at street level.</p> <p>This modification seeks to push the building envelope closer to Dangar St, that is having a reduced setback, and also to increase the height by approximately an extra storey.</p> <p>This proposal would greatly exceed this (the controls) and would add to the visual bulk and scale of the overall building when viewed from Dangar Street.</p>	<p>The fine detailing of the building façade together with the proposed landscaping assists in relieving the mass and scale associated with the approved concept envelopes identified within MP_0188_Mod 2.</p> <p>As identified earlier, there is no additional storey involved in the proposal.</p>
Overdevelopment	I strenuously object to the massive overdevelopment of the Montefiore Home in Randwick	The proposal is in accordance with the approved Concept Plan approval and the general acceptability of density and form has previously been considered as part of that approval.
Without proper consideration of impacts	The proposal is without proper consideration of the impact on the local roads, houses and utilities.	The proposal is in accordance with the approved Concept Plan approval and the general acceptability of density and form has previously been considered as part of that approval.
Due Process	Notification and ability to object. We received a notice from you in late February dated 17th February	These matters are procedural issues best responded to by the DPE in their assessment of the matter.



SUBMISSION ISSUE		RESPONSE
<p>2017 stating objections close on Tuesday 7 March 2017. On looking to object on line the website actually had a different date for closing of 15 February 2017.</p> <p>The date of the notice was actually after the closing date of the submissions regarding the modifications so did not allow for any objections. This process needs to be restarted with a more reasonable time for viewings of the modifications and objections to be lodged.</p>	<p>In any case, it is understood that to address these matters, the public exhibition period was further extended beyond the original published date. In addition, late submissions could be posted on the DPE website for consideration by the applicant in this response, together with consideration by the DPE in its assessment of the matter.</p> <p>As the original project approval granted for Building D was approved concurrently with the original Concept Plan, and because that Concept Plan was amended to reflect a new seniors housing and care mix (and hence overall building layout), the previous approval in relation to Building D had to be modified to reflect the modified Concept Plan.</p> <p>Modification 2 simply implements the detailed design associated with the approved building envelope.</p> <p>The concerns regarding the ‘continual approval of modifications’ is unfounded as these modifications are both legal, appropriate and also necessary to facilitate the Concept Plan approval on the site.</p>	
<p>The way this process has been run has been inadequate and if approved would need to be taken public for rigorous media and public scrutiny into the competency and legitimacy of the whole process so far and questions as to why approvals have been allowed.</p>		
<p>They keep on asking for modifications.</p>		



SUBMISSION ISSUE		RESPONSE
	<p>The Planning & Environment keep saying yes.</p> <p>I believe you should maybe change your name leave off 'the Environment'.</p> <p>I strongly object to the continuing changes that are eventuating.</p> <p>And if say yes they will keep coming.</p> <p>I hope you are strong enough to say no more.</p>	
Neighbourhood local character	The proposal will alter the total neighbourhood.	The proposal is in accordance with the approved Concept Plan approval and the general acceptability of density and form has previously been considered as part of that approval.
	Under current Randwick Council regulations buildings in our area are not permitted over 3 levels however MACC if permitted would greatly exceed this and irrevocably alter our local neighbourhood.	The fine detailing of the building façades together with the proposed landscaping assists in complementing the neighbourhood character in the context of the approved Concept Plan.
	I firmly object to this modification proposal as it will damage the local neighbourhood.	
	This is not in keeping with the residential nature of our area, and	



SUBMISSION ISSUE		RESPONSE
	<p>goes above and beyond any type of building height that any ordinary resident of the area would be approved to build to.</p> <p>We firmly object to these modification proposals as they will damage the local neighbourhood.</p>	
Sets a precedent	<p>It sets a precedent for other developments.</p> <p>It creates dangerous precedents for future developments in the area.</p>	<p>The proposal is in accordance with the approved Concept Plan approval and the general acceptability of density and form has previously been considered as part of that approval.</p> <p>Other future proposals within the area will be assessed against the relevant planning controls and their own circumstances at the relevant time.</p>
Light Pollution	<p>The light pollution is also a significant issue, and there MUST be some type of plan to mitigate the further impacts of this on residents.</p>	<p>An assessment of this matter was undertaken as part of the proposal (refer Appendix O). A specialised lighting consultant was request to review this matter.</p> <p>It was confirmed that the proposed lighting (in relation to landscaping, security and safety) will be designed and installed in accordance with the requirements of Australian standard AS4282-1997- Control of the obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting.</p>
Buildings E & F ILUs	<p>My other concern is the addition of even more luxury housing units with even fewer car spaces. It is a total fallacy to state that the residents of independent living</p>	<p>The DA currently under assessment by Council for the construction of 79 independent living units in Buildings E and F is wholly compliant with the Concept Plan Approval MP09_0188.</p>



SUBMISSION ISSUE		RESPONSE
	units will not drive they probably will...that's what independent means!	These ILUs will be provided with a total of 97 car parking spaces which is in excess of the requirements of SEPP Seniors, and represents the provision of an extra 20 spaces above and beyond what is required under the SEPP.
Landscaping	The modified landscape plan appears to have limited meaningful trees. The setback to Dangar Street would appear to require capping so once again the development relies on the deciduous street trees on Council land. This will further exacerbate the impact of the additional height now proposed.	<p>Significant landscaping is proposed within the Dangar Street setback which is complemented by landscaping within the road verge. This is provided within the submitted Landscape Plan.</p> <p>The proposed landscaping does not 'exacerbate' the height of the proposed building.</p>
Proposed conditions	In the event that the modification is approved the applicant should be required to build deep planter boxes to sustain evergreen canopy trees (10-15m in height) on the subject land in this setback area in line with the intent of the previous PAC determination. Furthermore, a condition should be imposed to ensure no other structures including, but not limited to: aerials, satellite dishes, air conditioning units etc are able to be placed on the roof. The addition of such miscellaneous	<p>The suggested condition in relation to planter boxes to sustain evergreen canopy is not required given the mix of landscaping proposed within the Dangar Street setback.</p> <p>The suggested condition in relation to the prevention of further roof-top structures is unnecessary as the current approval does not contemplate these structures or the possible 'introduction' of these structures. In any case, if such structures were contemplated, they would need to be considered as part of a formal assessment process and would be the subject of further analysis and public consultation.</p>



SUBMISSION ISSUE		RESPONSE
	structures not specified in the modification plans would further increase the visual impact of the development when viewed from the upper levels of the townhouses at 89 Dangar Street.	
Consistency with original Concept Plan	We question whether the modified development is consistent with the original approved concept plan and project.	The proposal is in accordance with the approved Concept Plan approval and the general acceptability of density and form has previously been considered as part of that approval.
Removal of Child Care	For example, it is further disappointing that the childcare centre has already been deleted through a previous modification and this worthwhile community purpose.	The removal of child care is not proposed in this modification. This issue is not relevant in this matter and has been separately a considered and approved under MP_0188_Mod 3.