

2 October 2025

Our Ref: R/2025/16  
File No: 2025/553139  
Your Ref: SSD-75493483

Najeeb Kobeissi  
Senior Planning Officer, Social and Diverse Housing Assessments  
Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure

Via Major Projects Portal

Dear Najeeb

**Advice on EIS – Forest Lodge Integrated Seniors Living – SSD-75493483**

Thank you for your correspondence dated 8 September 2025 inviting the City of Sydney Council (the City) to comment on SSD-75493483 for the alterations of the former hat factory and the construction of a 6-storey building to accommodate 71 independent living units, a 12-bed residential care facility, and associated amenity and parking, and the delivery of public open spaces and 2 through-site links.

The City has reviewed the EIS and supporting documents, including the public benefit offer (PBO).

The City is generally supportive of the PBO. The City encourages the applicant to liaise directly with the City's Planning Agreements team to amend the PBO to address the comments included in this correspondence and to prepare a draft Voluntary Planning Agreement prior to the determination of the SSD.

The City also provides the following advice for your consideration, to improve the heritage, landscape, and built form outcome of the proposed development:

**1 Public Benefit Offer**

The public benefits offered are generally aligned with the LEP and DCP in terms of provision of publicly accessible open spaces and through-site links, including the necessary embellishment.

To ensure the PBO can be accepted by the City, the PBO needs to be amended to address the following comments:

- Any conflicting comments regarding potential offsets against section 7.11 development contribution must be clarified. No offsets of development contribution would be accepted.
- The publicly accessible through-site link on land identified as "B" on the PBO plan needs to provide equitable access between Junction Street and Larkin Street reserve, with a minimum width of 6m.

- The design of the Larkin Street reserve extension must be amended to be in accordance with the City's Parks Design Code 2024, and in consultation with the City's Public Domain team.
- The cost estimates must also be updated to reflect the modified design.
- Detailed cost estimates prepared by a suitably qualified quantity surveyor must be provided to establish the embellishment (works-in-kind) for the land identified as "A" and "B" on the PBO plan.

*Note: A Bank Guarantee will be needed as security that the obligations associated with delivering the works-in-kind are met.*

The applicant should liaise directly with the City's Planning Agreements team to prepare an amended PBO and then a draft Voluntary Planning Agreement.

The City requests that an amended PBO (signed by all parties with the authority to enter into the planning agreement, including the landowner) be received and formally accepted by the City prior to the determination of the SSD.

The City also requests that any subsequent issue of a development consent includes a deferred commencement condition requiring the Voluntary Planning Agreement to be executed and be registered on the title of the land.

## **2 Building and Landscape Design**

The northwestern through-site link (Area F) must achieve a minimum width of 3m to provide sufficient space for pedestrian access path and mature screen planting along the entire length of the through-site link as required by section 6.3.12.5(7) of the Sydney SDCP 2012. The grades of the through-site link are to comply with AS1428.

A direct connection between the northwestern through-site link and the existing footpath to Orphan School Creek should also be considered to serve the desire line for people travelling to/from Orphan School Creek.

The proposed sewer location within the structural root zone of Trees 2, 3, 6 and 7 should be relocated outside of these areas and have an encroachment into their tree protection zone for no more than 10%. Priority must be given to retaining and protecting Trees 6 and 7.

Retention of the existing tree plantings within the garden bed adjacent to the SW boundary within Larkin St reserve to be retained where possible. Removals will only be considered as a last resort with replacement plantings to occur within the reserve and indicated within updated landscape plans. Any replacement trees are to be provided with sufficient canopy species.

The landscape design needs to provide appropriate and taller shrubs along the northwestern side of the building (Area E) to better screen the above-ground parking areas. The current planting mainly includes a mix of ferns and grasses up to only 1m tall.

The landscape design also needs to provide a clear delineation along the future boundary between the development site (Area E) and the area to be dedicated to the City (Area A) to land ownership, maintenance responsibilities, liabilities are clearly differentiated. Similarly, the building design needs to include appropriate access control to separate the undercroft area from Larkin Street Reserve.

The level 1 planter bed along the northwestern side of the memory garden should achieve a width of 2m, if possible, to afford the proposed pear trees sufficient space to grow to their expected mature sizes.

The facade edge planting is currently set 600mm below the top of the balcony balustrades. This complicates ongoing maintenance access. The facade edge planters should be raised so that the top of planter beds is 1m high and forms the balustrade to balconies. This is to facilitate maintenance personnel safe access to those areas by standing in the balconies and better connect the balcony users with the landscape works.

It is noted that the residential aged care, and the residential units in Buildings A and Building B are only serviced by one lift each. Additional redundancy should be provided to improve residential amenity.

Due to their height relations, the balconies of B.401 and D.0404 may overlook the balconies of C.301 and D.404. The reduced building separation between the balconies of A.205 and B.204, and the balconies of A.305 and B.304, may result in potential privacy issues as well. These need to be balanced with the sense of enclosure and outlook afforded to each balcony. High screening would be inappropriate.

Finally, the architectural and landscape drawings need to be coordinated to provide consistent information. In particular:

- all planters in the level 1 courtyard (except the open lawn area) are to be 1m above finished floor levels.
- the screening treatment along the northwestern boundary for the full length of the through-site link.

### **3 Heritage**

Provision 6.3.12.6(4) of the SDCP 2012 and Policy 25 of the submitted Conservation Management Plan prepared by John Oultram Heritage & Design requires the existing stone retaining wall along the eastern site boundary to be substantially retained and conserved in situ. The stone retaining wall should be conserved in situ if possible. Otherwise, the submitted heritage impact statement must justify the proposed dismantlement and clearly identify how the existing stone will be reused as part of the proposed development.

The recommendations of the heritage impact statement in relation to the former hat factory should also be reflected on the architectural drawings, including:

- Where window were blocked or infilled, insets are to be provided that signal the location of the windows.
- Where possible the ground floor timber columns, headstocks, beams and floor structure are to remain exposed in common areas.
- On the first and second floors retained timber columns, headstocks and beams are where possible to remain exposed. The timber floors and ripple iron ceilings at the first floor are to be retained even if covered.

A Schedule of Conservation Works for the former hat factory is also required by provision 6.3.12.6. The schedule must be prepared by a suitably qualified heritage consultant, with the conservation works keyed to drawings. The conservation works are to be carried out concurrently with the construction of the proposed development.

Given the extent of excavation proposed for the new additions adjoining the former hat factory, a structural engineering report should be provided to outline measures necessary to ensure the structural integrity of the retained heritage building.

#### **4 Traffic and Access**

Given the location of the site and the availability of alternative transport options, the provision of car parking should be reconsidered and further reduced. The car parking rates for residential flat buildings under clause 7.5 of Sydney LEP 2012 should be adopted, including the provision for visitor parking spaces.

Car share parking spaces should also be provided as suggested by the submitted Traffic Impact Assessment to provide alternatives to private vehicle ownership.

The parking rates for aged care staff indicated by the Housing SEPP is appropriate and should be maintained.

The different types of parking spaces must be clearly identified on the architectural drawings. The applicant is also encouraged to review the car park layout to ensure compliance with AS2890.

The location of the ambulance parking should be reconsidered. The proposed location is disconnected from the residential care units and does not appear to be easily accessible in an emergency.

#### **5 Flooding**

The City identifies the site as highly affected by flooding, with risks associated with both minor and major storm events. Larkin Street, in particular, is a sag point acting as a detention basin, with flood depths exceeding 2m in more frequent 20% AEP events and up to 8m in the PMF.

The submitted Flood Impact Assessment fails to adopt the updated 2019 version of the Australian Rainfall and Runoff Guidelines.

The Department in their assessment must be satisfied that any final flood modelling and reporting has addressed the updated 2019 version of these guidelines and the NSW Flood Risk Management Manual, accompanying toolkits and NSW Shelter-in-place guidelines.

#### **6 Public Domain Levels and Gradients**

A Public Domain Levels and Gradients application is to be submitted for review and approval concurrently with the SSD. The submission is to include cross sections through driveways and building entrances from inside the building to the centreline of the road carriageway. The submission must also demonstrate that public domain levels and gradients have been considered at the interfaces between existing park and public domain and the proposed land dedication areas.

Existing and proposed boundary levels, top of kerb levels and invert of gutter levels are to be clearly shown. Longitudinal sections showing existing and proposed boundary levels, top of kerb levels and invert of gutter levels on the same longitudinal section are also required for each frontage.

The public domain levels and gradients must be in accordance with the City's Public Domain Manual or will be reconstructed. The proposed floor levels, particularly at

building entrances and driveways must take into consideration the finished public domain levels. Any level changes required to satisfy DDA and flood planning requirements are to be resolved within the property boundary.

## **7 Stormwater Management**

A Local Drainage Management Plan prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced drainage engineer is required. The LDMP must provide a comprehensive assessment of the site's drainage requirements and demonstrate compliance with Section 3.7.2 of Sydney DCP 2012.

The Local Drainage Management Plan must address the following matters:

- the site's hydrology and its relationship to the broader drainage system, the distribution of soil types and potential for onsite infiltration, expected groundwater impacts, and opportunities for onsite stormwater reuse
- how the proposal ensures public and pedestrian safety;
- document the design of both minor and major drainage systems, showing how stormwater flows will be managed for specified exceedance probability events and that connections to the downstream drainage network do not compromise existing infrastructure capacity.

## **8 Contamination**

The submitted Remediation Action Plan (Appendix 28) has not been peer reviewed by a NSW EPA Accredited Site Auditor. To satisfy clause 4.6(1) of the Resilience and Hazards SEPP, a statement by a NSW EPA Accredited Site Auditor certifying that the RAP is practical and the site will be suitable after being remediated in accordance with the requirements of the RAP is required. Alternatively, a letter of Interim Advice from an NSW EPA Accredited Site Auditor may be provided to advise that the site is capable of being made suitable for the proposed use following remediation.

Note: The Remediation Action Plan must continue to identify that all lands to be dedicated to the City will not be subjected to a long-term management plan.

## **9 Waste Management**

The provision of a waste chute for Building C should be reconsidered. Building C only accommodates 2 residents per floor and chutes require additional construction cost and ongoing maintenance efforts and costs. Chute hopper doors are also narrow and require tension to open, which poses accessibility challenges for older residents. The provision of bin cupboards with 2 x 240L bins to allow two days storage of waste on each floor should be considered as an alternative.

The waste chute in Waste Room B is significantly recessed, limiting its access. The layout of Waste Room B and the adjacent FOGO room should be reconsidered.

An updated Waste Management Plan is also required to include design details regarding the degree of deviation of chute transfer, measures to ensure operational functionality, and to provide a chute maintenance schedule.

## **10 Public Art**

The artwork typologies and precedents included in the Public Art Strategy are considered appropriate. However, an updated public art strategy is required to only

identify opportunities for public art on land to be owned and maintained by the proposed development, i.e. exclude all land to be dedicated to the City. The updated strategy also needs to provide a commitment to at least 0.5% of the total development cost as the public art budget, rather than just the construction cost.

## **11 Sustainability**

Updated NatHERS modelling and reporting would be required to support an amended proposal. The updated drawings reflecting the above requested amendments must also be affixed with the NatHERS stamps.

The same level of sustainability commitments is to be maintained, unless to improve the target star rating for clothes dryers.

The City requests the opportunity to view the recommended conditions of consent and provide further advice should the Department recommend the application for approval.

Should you wish to speak with a Council officer about the above, please contact Bryan Li, Senior Planner, on 9265 9893 or at [bli@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au](mailto:bli@cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au).

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'NR' or 'Nicola Reeve', written in a cursive style.

**NICOLA REEVE**  
Area Planning Manager