

Appendix A - Response to Submissions Table

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
Agency Submissions	
<p>Hornsby Shire Council</p>	<p>Council's concerns in relation to the proposal are as follows:</p> <p><u>Planning</u></p> <p>Hornsby LEP 1994 does not provide a maximum FSR in Special A zone, however Council's Community Uses DCP requires development in Special A zone not to exceed 0.4:1 adjoining low density areas.</p> <p>Council requests that the Department be satisfied the bulk, scale and intensity of development would be compatible with the surrounding low density areas.</p> <hr/> <p><u>Height</u></p> <p>Council requests the Department in its assessment of the proposal has regard to the existing streetscape character to ensure the building would not unreasonably restrict sunlight or result in loss of privacy and amenity to adjacent residential properties.</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
	<p>windows to principal internal daytime living spaces between 9am and 3pm.</p> <p>The addition of vegetation within the setback will (when mature) provide further privacy screening and softening buffering. Further, as described in Section 2.2 of the Response to Submission Report, the proposed development's envelope and scale is appropriate in relation to the width of Burdett Street. Figure 3 of the Response to Submission Report demonstrates the containment of the building wholly within the sightline of 45° when an individual is viewing the development from the opposite side of Burdett Street. The proposal is therefore not considered to be overbearing and bulky from street level and is appropriate in its context and relative to the lack of height controls governing development of the site.</p>
<p><u>Setback and Landscape</u></p> <p>The building setback to Burdett Street should be increased to enable additional landscaping within the site between the building and the property boundary along the frontage.</p> <p>There is limited articulation of the building façade and the setback should be consistent with the existing established streetscape.</p> <p>Small trees should be provided in the additional landscape area between building and property boundary.</p>	<p>The landscape setback to Burdett Street has been increased by reducing the width of the maintenance path that runs along the southern boundary of the building. This allows for additional planting between the property boundary along the Burdett Street frontage.</p> <p>There are no site-specific provisions for setbacks within Hornsby Shire Council's controls. Therefore the setback has been considered on its merits and is considered suitable for the scale of the proposed building, consistent with the existing hospital development.</p> <p>As detailed in Section 2.2 of the Response to Submission Report, the Stage 1 footprint has been located to provide for optimal functional adjacency and connectivity to the HOPE building and to minimise disruption to ongoing hospital-related activities and to provide for the best continuity of services to the community. Its location also allows for only minimal removal of vegetation and takes advantage of existing driveway crossings. Furthermore, and most importantly, the floor plate is designed to deliver optimal functional and efficient health services. There is no flexibility for the building to</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
	be moved further north, or for its footprint to be reduced in size to gain a greater setback area along Burdett Street on the southern boundary.
<p><u>Traffic & Safety</u></p> <p>Edgeworth David Ave, Palmerston Road and Myra Street are controlled as one intersection. This is a dog-leg intersection located on a tight bend. It is Council's view that the intersection modelling software used (SIDRA) is unsatisfactory as it does not accurately account for down and upstream weaving/merging manoeuvres. The dog-leg restricts the capacity of the road network at this location.</p>	<p>The current operation and performance of the intersection is based on the existing situation, and any operational issue is the result of the current operation of the intersection and its local demand and not all the vehicular movements are hospital related. The Stage 1 Redevelopment of the Hospital would only result in minor additional traffic during a peak hour period and would not alter the good level of service, (which is reported as a level of A service by TTW) to the existing operation of the street system.</p> <p>It is considered that as not all traffic will be using the same approach routes and not all vehicular traffic would be in the same direction, such impact would be insignificant on the road system and intersection operation (as shown in Traffic and Parking Report appended to the EIS).</p> <p>Further, this was not raised as a concern by the RMS.</p> <p>Please refer to the Traffic and Parking letter at Appendix C within this submission for more detail.</p>
<p>Existing traffic pattern indicates that vehicles using the route on Myra Street and Alexandria Parade access the hospital via Palmerston Road at Edgeworth David Ave intersection. Previous reviews undertaken by Council have established that peak hour traffic conditions at this location are unsatisfactory.</p> <p>Future development in the area will necessitate intersection improvements at this location possibly requiring provision of an exclusive right turn lane into Palmerston Road and two westbound through lanes. The hospital redevelopment is a trigger to provide the required intersection improvement works at this location.</p>	<p>Refer to response above.</p> <p>In addition, the Department's 'Circular D6 – Crown Development Applications and Conditions of Consent' provides exemptions that are appropriate to Crown development. One of the exemptions relates to Health projects and the upgrade of local roads, whereby works only associated with the site entrance require upgrading. Crown developments (including Health projects) are not required to offset contributions to upgrade local roads, further afield or beyond that of works at the perimeter at the site's entrance.</p> <p>Therefore, as the works are not associated with the site entrance, it is considered the proposed intersection works are</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
	unreasonable and unnecessary for a Crown development which in its own right provides substantial public benefits with minimal additional traffic generation.
<p>Jubilee Street is also a primary access route to the hospital. A Council review has established that there are a number of motor vehicle accidents happening at the intersection of Edgeworth David Ave and Jubilee Street and the proposal and cumulative traffic from later stages is likely to increase the number of accidents at this location.</p> <p>The proponent should be requested to consider mitigation measures in accordance with Issue 3.4 outlined in the DGRs.</p>	<p>The road network surrounding the Hospital also carries local traffic to residential and other land uses within the area. Therefore, any traffic management measures would be the responsibility of the Council as the level of additional vehicular movements from Stage 1 Redevelopment of the Hospital is small and would not be significant to contribute to any substantial impact on the road network.</p> <p>Further, this was not raised as a concern by the RMS.</p>
<p><u>Parking</u></p> <p>Surrounding streets are extensively used by hospital visitors and employees. An analysis of the data from the parking surveys undertaken by Council has established that on-street parking experiences a utilisation rate of over 95% during most hours of the day. This implies that the current provision for hospital visitors and employees is not adequate.</p> <p>The traffic report has indicated that there is the potential to create a net gain of up to 400 parking spaces by construction of a multi storey car park as part of Stage 2 development. In order to improve the amenity of local residents, this initiative is supported and should be a commitment to be included as one of the conditions of consent for the development.</p>	<p>A parking strategy for the site has been put forward as part of the Traffic and Parking Report and the EIS.</p> <p>Stage 1 will provide a surplus of parking on the Campus site for the parking generated by the development (being 9 spaces over the required 100 spaces). In addition, there is adequate parking on-site and immediately around the perimeter of the Hospital's four boundaries.</p> <p>The additional car spaces will not meet the planned capacity until 2022. The slow increase in demand will be evenly distributed across the day as the planned admission process is very regimented and structured.</p> <p>It is reiterated that the Stage 1 Redevelopment is mainly an asset replacement project.</p> <p>Any future on-site multi storey car park would need to be substantiated in planning and be dependent upon funding.</p>
<p><u>Construction Traffic Impacts</u></p> <p>A comprehensive Construction Management Plan should be prepared prior to the commencement of work. Construction access routes shall be in line with current road restrictions and</p>	<p>Noted. A Construction Traffic Management Plan for the site will be prepared prior to commencement of works. This has been included as a mitigation measure.</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
<p>requirements. Council's Traffic and Road Safety Branch should be consulted during preparing of the Construction Management Plan.</p>	
<p><u>Recommended Conditions of Consent</u></p> <p>General</p> <p>1. Erosion and Sediment Control</p> <p>Erosion and sediment control measures must be provided and maintained throughout the construction period in accordance with the manual <i>'Soils and Construction 2004 (Bluebook)'</i>, the approved plans, Council specifications and to the satisfaction of the principal certifying authority. The erosion and sediment control devices must remain in place until the site has been stabilised and revegetated.</p>	<p>Noted. We understand that the Department will consider Council's recommended conditions and determine their reasonableness and appropriateness. Comments are provided to the proposed conditions where relevant and HI will review the Department's draft conditions and provide a formal response.</p>
<p><u>3. Demolition</u></p> <p>All demolition work must be carried out in accordance with Australia Standard 2601-2001 – The Demolition of Structures and the following requirements:</p> <p>a) Demolition material is to be disposed of to an authorised recycling and/or waste disposal site and/or in accordance with an approved waste management plan.</p> <p>b) Demolition works, where asbestos material is being removed, must be undertaken by a contractor that holds an appropriate licence issued by WorkCover NSW in accordance with Chapter 10 of the Occupational Health Safety Regulation 2001 and Clause 29 of the <i>Protection of the Environment Operations (Waste) Regulation 2005</i>.</p> <p>On construction sites where buildings contain asbestos material, a standard commercially manufactured sign containing the words 'DANGER ASBESTOS REMOVAL IN PROGRESS' measuring not less than 400mm x 300mm must be erected in a prominent position visible from the street.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
<p><u>4. Works near Trees</u></p> <p>All required tree protection measures are to be maintained in good condition for the duration of the construction period.</p> <p>Note: The applicant is to ensure that no excavation, filling or stockpiling of building materials, parking of vehicles or plant, disposal of cement slurry, waste water or other contaminants is to occur within 4 metres of any tree to be retained.</p>	Noted.
<p><u>5. Sydney Water- s73 Certificate</u></p> <p>A S73 Certificate must be obtained by Sydney Water</p>	Noted. This process is already underway.
<p><u>6. External Lighting</u></p> <p>All external lighting must be designed and installed in accordance with Australian Standard AS 4282 – Control of the Obtrusive Effects of Outdoor Lighting. Certification of compliance with the Standard must be obtained from a suitably qualified person.</p>	Noted.
<p><u>Traffic</u></p> <p>7. The intersection of Edgeworth David Avenue / Myra Street / Palmerston Road be redesigned/ reconstructed with a view to improve its alignment (removing the dog leg) and provision of an exclusive right turn lane into Palmerston Road and two westbound through lanes.</p> <p>8. Construction of a median at the intersection of Edgeworth David Avenue / Jubilee Street to improve traffic safety by restricting movements contributing to right turning crashes.</p> <p>9. The Multi-level car park to accommodate the demand for</p>	<p>HI considers proposed conditions 7 and 8 unreasonable and excessive, as the current operation and performance of the intersections are based on existing situations and the current operation of the intersection, noting that the traffic generated by the proposed Stage 1 Redevelopment is minimal.</p> <p>In addition to the above, the Department's 'Circular D6 – Crown Development Applications and Conditions of Consent' provides exemptions that are appropriate to Crown developments. One of the exemptions relates to Health projects and the upgrade of</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
<p>car parking be constructed prior to occupation Stage 1 hospital redevelopment.</p> <p>10. A comprehensive Construction Management Plan should be prepared prior to commencement of works. Construction access routes shall be in line with current road restrictions and requirements. Council's Traffic and Road Safety Branch should be consulted during preparing of the Construction Management Plan.</p> <p>11. A Transport Management Strategy for the Hospital should be developed to promote active and public transport particularly among staff which would result in reduction of care use and car parking provision.</p>	<p>local roads, whereby works only associated with the site entrance require upgrading. Crown developments (including Health projects) are not required to offset contributions to upgrade local roads, further afield or beyond that of works at the perimeter at the site's entrance.</p> <p>Therefore as the works are not associated with the site entrance, it is considered the proposed intersection works are unreasonable and unnecessary for a Crown development as a result of minimal traffic generation. In addition, it should be noted that the RMS has not raised these intersections as an issue.</p> <p>Parking for the Stage 1 Redevelopment is completely contained on the campus. A multi-storey car park is not required as part of this application. Accordingly, requested Condition 9 is unreasonable and unnecessary.</p> <p>The planning principles applied to the Stage 1 project is to de-clutter the site and build vertically. The rationalisation of the site will provide opportunities for additional on-grade car parking.</p> <p>Future developments will be required to undertake a planning review to ascertain the likely level of demand for a parking, and in particular for any form of multi-storey car park.</p> <p>Consideration of a possible multi-storey car park would depend on demand and planning requirements of Stage 2. Whilst the Campus's Master Plan has identified a location for a multi-deck car parking station, its viability would need to be substantiated in planning and dependent upon funding. At this stage HI cannot commit to any multi-storey car park and requests that any draft condition seeking to confirm the potential future development of a multi-storey car park be excluded or removed.</p> <p>A Comprehensive Construction Management Plan will be prepared by the contractor prior the commencement of works. This will include Construction access routes.</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
	A Transport Management Strategy for the Hospital has been detailed as part of the Traffic and Parking Report appended to the EIS including the required actions and measures.
<p><u>Engineering</u></p> <p>12. An on-site stormwater detention (OSD) system must be designed by a chartered civil engineer and constructed in accordance with the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The OSD system shall be designed for a 50 year ARI storm with maximum permissible discharge rate limited to the of 5 year SRI discharged prior to the development ▪ Have a surcharge/inspection grate located directly above the outlet <p>Connected directly to council's stormwater drainage system</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A suitably designed and sized tank will be provided as part of the HKH redevelopment works. The volume required to satisfy 5 year ARI post development for the 50 year ARI is 250m³.</p> <p>The tank will have several inspection grates, one will be located above the outlet.</p> <p>The OSD tank will connect directly to Council's stormwater pit (Hornsby Council's pit number 10706). This connection replaces an existing OSD pipe connection from within the Hospital Campus.</p>
<p><u>Internal Driveway/ Vehicular Areas</u></p> <p>13. the driveway and parking areas in site must be designed in accordance to the Australian Standards 2890., 2890.2 3727 and following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Design levels at the front boundary be obtained from Council ▪ The driveway grade must not exceed 25 percent and changes in grade must not exceed 8 percent <p>Conduit for utility services including electricity, water, gas and telephone be provided.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Internal roadways and parking areas will be designed as per relevant Australian Standards.</p> <p>The intention is to match existing levels. Where this is not possible, levels from Council will be sought.</p>
<p><u>Footpath</u></p> <p>14. A concrete footpath must be constructed along the full frontage if the subject sire in accordance Council's Civil Works Design and Construction Specification 2005 and the following</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>A new footpath will be constructed along the frontage of the</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
<p>requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The existing paved footpath must be removed and reconstructed fronting the proposed development ▪ Construction of Pram ramps at road and intersection. ▪ The land adjoining the footpath to be fully turfed. <p>Any public utility adjustments to be carried out at the cost of the applicant and to the requirements of the relevant public authority.</p>	<p>HKH Stage 1 SSD redevelopment site.</p> <p>The existing path along the frontage will be removed.</p> <p>The pram ramps at the intersection of Derby and Burdett Street will be reconstructed to suit the new path.</p>
<p><u>Vehicular Crossing</u></p> <p>15. A separate application under the Local Government Act, 1993 and the Roads Act, 1993 must be submitted to Council for the installation of a new vehicular crossing and the removal of redundant crossing. The vehicular crossing must be constructed in accordance with Council's Civil Works design, 2005 and the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Any redundant crossings to be replaced with integral kerb and gutter ▪ The footway area to be restored by turfing ▪ Approval obtained from all relevant utility providers that all necessary conduits be provided and protected under the crossing <p>16. All car parking must be constructed and operated in accordance with Australian Standard AS/NZS 2890.1:2004- Off street car parking and Australian Standard AS 2890.2:2002- Off street commercial vehicle facilities'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All parking areas and driveways are to be sealed to an all weather standard, line marked and signposted ▪ Car parking, loading and manoeuvring areas to be used solely for nominated purposes; ▪ Vehicles awaiting loading, unloading or servicing shall 	<p>Noted. No new driveways will be provided as part of the HKH Stage 1 SSD redevelopment works.</p> <p>There will be redundant driveways. These driveways will be removed and replaced with kerb and gutter.</p> <p>All parking areas will be designed as per relevant Australian Standards including AS2890.6 for accessible parking spaces.</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
<p>be parked on site and not adjacent or nearby public roads;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All vehicular entry on to the site and agress from the site shall be made in a forward direction <p>17. Accessible parking spaces are to be in accordance with AS/NZS 2890.6:2009</p>	
<p>18. Creation of Easements</p> <p>The following matter(s) must be nominated on the plan of subdivision under s88B of the Conveyancing Act 1919:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The creating of an appropriate 'Positive Covenant' and 'Restrictions as to user' of the construction on site detention/retention systems and outlet works, within the lots in favour of council in accordance with Council's prescribed wording. The position of the onsite detention system is to be clearly indicated on the title <p>To register the OSD easement, the restriction on the use of land 'work as executed' details of the onsite detention system must be submitted verifying that the required storage and discharge rates have been constructed in accordance with design requirements. The details must show the invert levels if the site system together with pipe sizes and grades. Any variations to the approved plans must be shown in red on the "works-as-executed" plan and supported by calculations.</p>	<p>The outlet from the HKH Stage 1 redevelopment OSD tank is replacing an existing outlet to Derby Street. If no easement exists, registration of an easement will be submitted.</p>
<p>Traffic Control Plan</p> <p>19. A Traffic Control Plan (TCP) must be prepared by a qualified traffic controller in accordance with Roads & Traffic Authority's Control at Worksites Manual 1998 and Australia Standard 1742.3 for all work on public roads. The TCP must detail the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Arrangements for public notifications of works 	<p>Noted. This will be prepared as part of Construction Traffic Management Plan.</p>

	Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Temporary construction of signage ▪ Permanent post construction signage ▪ Vehicle movement plans ▪ Traffic management plans ▪ Pedestrian and cyclist Access/ Safety 	
	<p>Damage to Council Asset</p> <p>20. any damage caused by Council's Asset as a result of construction of development must be rectified in accordance with Council's Written requirements at the sole cost of the applicant</p>	<p>Noted. A Dilapidation Report will be prepared prior to construction.</p>
<p>Roads and Maritime Service</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Balmoral Street should be included in the traffic modelling assessment as traffic signals are proposed at the intersection of Balmoral St/Edgeworth David Ave intersection under the blackspot programme. 	<p>The current operation and performance of the intersection is based on the existing situation, and any operational issue is the result of the current operation of the intersection and its local demand. It should be noted that not all the existing vehicular movements are hospital related. The Stage 1 Redevelopment of the Hospital would only result in a minor additional traffic generation to intersections during peak hour. Considering that not all traffic will be using the same approach routes and not all vehicular traffic would be in the same direction, such impact would be insignificant on the road system and intersection operation. (This was previously shown in Traffic and Parking Report appended to the EIS).</p> <p>Please refer to the Traffic and Parking letter by TTW at Appendix C of this Response to Submission Report.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Burdett Street and Sherbrook Road intersection modelling and impact have not been included in the report. 	<p>See response above.</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sidra Modelling has modelled Edgeworth David Avenue and Palmerston Road as a T-intersection, Edgeworth David Avenue/ Palmerston Road/ Myra Street are controlled by one signal and should be re-modelled to include movements from all these roads including Myra Street.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Could further information be provided on the full project which includes all stages and works to be undertaken for the Hornsby Ku-ring-gai Hospital. This would help RMS assess the impact of the redevelopment once it has been fully completed.
	<p>See response above.</p>
	<p>Each development phase at the hospital will be considered relative to its individual impacts and external background traffic growth at the time of that development. To attempt to predetermine future background traffic growth and any future traffic control scenarios would be un-instructive and a futile exercise at this point in this project's context.</p> <p>It is therefore considered unreasonable and unnecessary at this stage to provide all stages of works and development to assist the RMS to understand the full impact of the entire long-term redevelopment of the Campus. In addition, the timing of funding and the delivery of future development proposals and the unknown details of the implementation of the Master Plan would therefore make it difficult to implement the full impact of traffic generation.</p> <p>Further to the above matters, it is important to note that the RMS has not raised any concern regarding parking issues at, or around, the hospital.</p>
The Office of Environment and Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Office of Environment and Heritage has no interest in reviewing or commenting on the EIS for the Hornsby Ku-ring-gai Hospital Redevelopment Stage 1. Please note that the Heritage Branch may provide comment separately.
	<p>Noted. We note the Heritage Branch did not provide any further comment.</p>
EPA	<p>Any development consent is to ensure the proponent adequately addresses predicted environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures associated with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Detailed assessment of potential site contamination
	<p>Noted. It is acknowledged that additional contamination testing will need to be undertaken following demolition of the existing buildings. However it should be noted that the Preliminary Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment Report prepared by Aargus</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
<p>following demolition of existing building, including information about groundwater and the de-commissioned underground storage tank.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The EPA recommends a condition of consent. 	<p>Engineering (Appendix K of the EIS) concludes that the potential for significant contamination of soil and groundwater within the site is low.</p> <p>As a Crown development, HI will review the draft conditions of consent by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure and determine whether the contamination condition is reasonable in this context.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Details on handling, transport and disposal of any asbestos waste. <p>The EPA recommends a condition of consent.</p>	<p>Noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Construction related noise and vibration (including recommended standard construction hours and respite periods for high noise impact work), dust control and management, and erosion sediment control. ▪ The EPA recommends a condition of consent. 	<p>NDY has advised that information required to conduct a construction and noise vibration assessment is not available at this stage. However a construction noise and vibration management plan will be prepared prior to the start of demolition and construction. This plan will be prepared in accordance with the EPA's Guidelines.</p> <p>An erosion and sediment control plan was prepared by TTW Engineering and appended to the EIS (See Appendix G of the EIS). These measures will be enforced during the construction period.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proper assessment of background noise levels and the potential noise and vibration impacts arising from operational activities such as waste collection, loading dock activities, mechanical services (especially air conditioning plant) operation and standby generator testing and operation. 	<p>The acoustic assessment is based on existing background noise levels which have been measured in accordance with the NSW Industrial Noise Policy. The relevant methodology has been discussed within the Acoustic Report appended to the EIS. A revised report is provided at Appendix E to the Response to Submission Report.</p> <p>Due to the distance from the operational vibration sources to the nearest affected receivers, vibration impacts are considered negligible.</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
Sydney Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The developer should engage a Water Servicing Coordinator (WSC) to get a Section 73 Certificate.
	<p>Noted. A Section 73 Certificate application is already underway.</p> <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The site is traversed by a 150mm wastewater main, which will become redundant upon construction of replacement mains. The proponent should ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lot 23 DP 814181, Lot B DP 363790, Lot 2,3&4 DP 14774 and Lot 1 DP232290 are consolidated prior to main becoming redundant. - All maintenance holes have unrestricted access, a 1m clearance from the outer edge and a 2.4m headroom clearance above the maintenance hole surface level. - The disused wastewater main is to be either cut up under the supervision of a Sydney Water Developer Works Inspector or be sand filled - Detail designs are submitted to Sydney Water through the WSC for approval and all wastewater design plans comply with Sewerage Code WSA-02
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the event that trade wastewater is generated, the property owner is required to submit an application for permission to discharge trade wastewater to the sewerage system before business activities commence.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sydney Water will further assess the impact of any subsequent development when the developer applies for a Section 73 Certificate.

	Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
Transport for NSW	TfNSW does not have any comment on the proposal.	Noted.
Public Submissions		
Barbara Rawlingson (Resident of 32 Jubilee Street Wahroonga)	<p>The main concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Pleased to hear that the hospital is finally being upgraded as it is required in the ever increasing population. 	The Stage 1 Redevelopment is a response to overwhelming community demand as the current hospital services need improvement to clinical functionality to serve the needs of the broader community.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased parking and traffic flow problems on Jubilee Street. 	<p>The project is Stage 1 of the redevelopment program which seeks to replace major existing assets and infrastructure on the Hospital site that are in need of repair. The design development and planning of the building has been carefully considered to provide clinical and functional adjacency to surrounding hospital buildings. The design and the resulting footprint provides for clinical and operational efficiencies, without diminishing existing levels of services and without affecting existing buildings which are needed to continue to provide key services. The development in itself provides for only a minimal addition to existing clinic services and will largely act as a replacement facility for aged and out-of-date infrastructure. To this end, the development does not substantially create additional Hospital-related activity on the site.</p> <p>Therefore, the level of additional traffic and parking activities associated with the proposal are minor and would have minimal impact on traffic and parking conditions along the street system including Jubilee Street.</p> <p>The RMS did not raise concerns with regard to Jubilee Street.</p>

	Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like to know what can be done to ensure that traffic conditions in Jubilee Street do not worsen as a result of this development and future developments at Hornsby Hospital. 	Please see above.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would like to see Jubilee Street closed at the intersection of Burdett Street to stop passing through traffic. 	<p>This is a matter for Council's Traffic Committee and is not directly tied to, or attributable, to the project.</p> <p>The RMS did not raise concerns with regard to Jubilee Street.</p>
<p>Leone Coward (Resident of 90 Burdett Street)</p>	<p>The main concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Building setback is too close to Burdett Street. Consideration should be given to the residential areas and no amount of landscaping will hide the building that large. 	<p>As previously discussed, the building floor plate cannot be changed or modified due to the functional and spatial requirements of the hospital building, and the links to the existing hospital facilities. For these reasons, the building footprint cannot be reduced. Additionally, the building footprint cannot move any further to the north as it will impede the existing services of the Hospital, please refer to Figure 2 of the Response to Submissions Report.</p> <p>Further, as discussed in Section 2.2 of the Response to Submissions Report, the building sits comfortably within the 45° angle when viewed from the opposite side of Burdett Street, which demonstrates that the building in fact does not sit too close to Burdett Street and is of an appropriate scale and size in the context of the street.</p> <p>However, to provide a softened interface of the building, the maintenance path has been reduced to allow for a greater landscape setback to Burdett Street. Trees will be planted which (when mature) will provide a visual relief to the building façade.</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The building should be built on Palmerston Road alongside the HOPE building. This will have less impact on residents and be close to essential services 	<p>The building has been selected for this location due to the physical site characteristics including gentle slope and minimal vegetation removal. In addition, the site allows for minimal removal of existing buildings as well as minimising the disruption to the existing Hospital services. It presents the Hospital with the best location which concurrently allows for maintenance of clinical and allied services and for future options on the hospital site.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The traffic in the area is excessive during morning and afternoon periods. A more realistic traffic review should be done. 	<p>It should be noted that not all the vehicular traffic movements are associated with the Hospital. Any Hospital-related vehicular traffic is within the capacity and characteristics of the road system as detailed in Traffic and Parking Report appended to the EIS. The traffic study concluded that intersections around the hospital all presently operate at a satisfactory level of service.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No-one will want to buy a house in an industrial looking area. What consideration has been given to compensating the residences affected by this development? 	<p>The design of the building has been carefully considered relative to its functional need and its residential context. The choice materials, colours, and vegetated treatments seeks to blend the development into its residential neighbours and avoid being solely a "clinic building" response. The facade seeks to provide visual relief rather than present as a bland form. As stated elsewhere within this response document and at Section 2.2 of the Response to Submission Report, the design of the building is appropriate in its context.</p>
<p>Elwyn Muller (Resident of 18 Derby Road)</p>	<p>The main concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Car parking is a problem on the Hospital site. <p>The Stage 1 Redevelopment has provided for surplus parking relative to the amount the proposed development generates (109 spaces to a demand for 100). It should be noted that the Stage 1 works do not result in a large incremental growth across the Hospital Campus, rather it provides a consolidation of facilities being decanted into the one convenient and comprehensive location.</p> <p>Parking supply has been provided in accordance with the demand associated with the number of staff, outpatients and visitors.</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stage 1 area. Site should be developed last and should be the new car park area on site. 	<p>The project is Stage 1 of the redevelopment program which seeks to replace major existing assets and infrastructure on the Hospital site that are in need of repair. The design development and planning of the building has been carefully considered to provide clinical and functional adjacency to surrounding hospital buildings. The design and the resulting footprint provides for clinical and operational efficiencies, without diminishing existing levels of services and without affecting existing buildings which are needed to continue to provide key services. The development in itself provides for only a minimal addition to existing clinic services and will largely act as a replacement facility for aged and out-of-date infrastructure. To this end, the development does not substantially create additional Hospital-related activity on the site.</p> <p>In addition, the proposed Stage 1 site requires only minimal removal of vegetation and modification to the land form and utilises existing driveway access points for traffic. Overall, in consideration of the benefits of the scheme and the design of the redevelopment, its minimal impact (and complementary nature) on continuity of hospital services, and as well as minimal impact upon its neighbours on and off the Campus, this provides the Government and the community with the best value-for-money option.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The building should be built with bricks and concrete to support a helicopter pad as James Park is be accessible. 	<p>Material selection has been carefully considered to best blend with the existing context of the area. Bricks and concrete are proposed and are included in the Woodhead design. Other light-weight materials are also part of the design and together these seek to provide a balanced and sympathetic design response to the residential edge / neighbours to the development.</p> <p>The helipad location is not subject to this DA and the possibility of the helipad will be considered at a later date of the redevelopment program. It has been considered in planning as part of the campus Master Plan.</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The colour scheme will become dated. The metal cladding is not acceptable. Colorbond is also not acceptable as it is only guaranteed for 25 yrs. 	<p>As above, the material selection and colours have been chosen to provide a light weight and modern building design that will achieve design excellence and material longevity.</p> <p>The design principles employed ensure the building is in context with neighbouring buildings.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The external loading dock will make Derby Road look like an industrial site. The Westfield has internal loading docks which should also apply to the hospital. 	<p>The development utilises the existing entry and exit points off Derby Road. This will minimise any unnecessary disruption to the current operation of the hospital. Indeed, redundant access points will be removed.</p> <p>The Westfields Shopping Centre is located within the Hornsby CBD and cannot readily be compared to the Hospital redevelopment. The Hospital has limited space and differing handling requirements to that of a shopping centre. The building takes advantage of the sloping grades in this location to provide a substantial undercroft area, which also avoids costly excavation (and the likely extended noise impacts during construction).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Catering will have to be transported over 500m under cover to new mental health building, but will only need 150m if the building was in the centre of hospital. 	<p>This is an internal Hospital management issue and not relevant to the Stage 1 Redevelopment. As discussed elsewhere, the design and location of the Stage 1 Redevelopment presents the Hospital with the optimal clinical and operational efficiencies, without diminishing existing levels of services and without affecting existing buildings.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The building can't work efficiently unless Stage 2 is built and adjoined to the north side of Stage 1. However this will cut off access to maintenance and garbage area creating a dead area where a garden grows. 	<p>As previously stated, Stage 1 will be internally linked the existing HOPE building to enhance and improve the function of the hospital. The Stage 1 development does not require the completion of Stage 2 to efficiently operate.</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal will cause traffic issues for intersections around the site. 	<p>Not all the vehicular traffic movements to nearby intersections are associated with the Hospital site. Any Hospital-related vehicular traffic is within the capacity and characteristics of the road system, as detailed in Traffic and Parking Report. The level of possible additional traffic and parking activities associated with the proposal are small and would have minimal impact on traffic and parking conditions upon the street system.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The building should be located to the middle of the campus which would resolve traffic issues. 	<p>As stated above, the building site has been selected for clinical and functional adjacency, alignment with the masterplan, the site's capability for development, as well as providing the best value-for-money option for the Government and community alike. Further, the proposal is replacing ageing infrastructure on the site and is not creating incremental growth on the hospital site. As such, and as stated within the Traffic and Parking letter at Appendix C to the Response to Submission Report, the traffic generation will not be significantly increased in the surrounding street network.</p>
<p>Heather Phillips (Resident of 1A Spurgin Street)</p>	<p>The main concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Car Parking in streets around Hospital. The Hospital should build carparking accommodation prior to commencement of new project approaching a commercial parking organisation.

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking should be restricted to one side of Spurgin Street during weekdays. 	<p>This is a matter for Council's Traffic Committee and is not directly tied to, or attributable, to the project.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic flow along Jubilee Street should be local traffic only. 	<p>Refer to response above.</p>
<p>Margaret Desgrand (Resident of 7 Ascot Avenue, Wahroonga)</p>	<p>The main concerns are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal does not fulfil DGR 3. Scale, density and massing is inappropriate to the low scale building and generous street setbacks. The development greatly exceeds that envisaged by Draft Hornsby LEP 2012. The proposal does not fulfil DGR 3 as it does not provide a 'safer by design' due to inactive uses on ground levels. Proposal should be redesigned to provide active uses on ground levels. <p>The Draft Hornsby LEP 2012 does not provide provisions associated with height, FSR or setbacks. Therefore the proposed scale of the building must be determined on its merits.</p> <p>It is considered that the proposed development is in keeping with the needs of modern hospital facilities as well as considering the scale and the bulk of the building in the context of the surrounding residential area. The development does not cause any unreasonable impact on solar access to neighbouring properties and provides landscaping treatment to soften the appearance of the building's façade.</p> <p>As described in Section 2.2 of the Response to Submission Report, the proposed development's envelope and scale is appropriate in relation to the width of Burdett Street. Figure 3 of the Response to Submission Report demonstrates the containment of the building wholly within the sightline of 45° when an individual is viewing the development from the opposite side of Burdett Street. The proposal is therefore not considered to be overbearing and bulky from street level and is appropriate in its context and relative to the lack of height controls governing development of the site.</p> <p>In terms of achieving 'safer by design' principles, activity cannot be employed along the full length of the building's edge to both Burdett Street and Derby Road due to the nature and use of the building. In seeking to provide both a softened edge and planting to minimise the apparent bulk of the building opportunities for clear sight lines have not been able to provided for the full length</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
	<p>of the Burdett Street frontage. Open areas and activity at the car park and site entrance to the building provide suitable passive security and activity in this location at Burdett Street. The corner treatment of Burdett Street and Derby Road at the site's boundary has been revised to allow for clear sight-lines around the corner. This is achieved through a splayed / chamfered edge to the fence and landscaping in this location. As for the Burdett Street frontage, the Derby Road frontage to the hospital (to its loading dock area) has been screened to provide a higher amenity outcome from a visual and acoustic perspective. On balance a suitable design and 'safer by design' outcome has resulted that addresses a range of planning issues.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The minimal setback will provide an inadequate amount of landscaping that might assist to ameliorate the excessive height and scale of building. 	<p>Additional landscaping has been designed by Arcadia (see Appendix D to the main Response to Submissions Report). Arcadia has specified plantings to assist in providing a softened edge to and within the Burdett Street setback zone. Refer also to Section 2.2 of the Response to Submission Report for further detail.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ground floor uses on Burdett and Derby Street comprise inactive uses such as loading docks, fire stairs maintenance rooms etc. These are at odds with residential cottages opposite the site. 	<p>The design of the building is in response to a number of contextual and functional matters. The building responds to the natural topography of the site which reduces the need for extensive and expensive excavation. Loading docks have been provided for in these areas towards the Derby Road frontage. At the same time the docks are provided for as part of the undercroft of the building and are substantially setback to improve their relationship to the nearby residential buildings from an amenity and contextual perspective.</p> <p>The Burdett Street facade cannot provide for activity associated with the front-door of the building or hospital as (as described earlier) the building cannot be further setback or realigned to provide for a forecourt, a drop-off or pick-up area, or other activities such as cafes or the like. Whilst these activities may be beneficial to providing activity and a different contextual</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
	<p>response, the functional needs of the building and the site's constraints must also be reasonably considered.</p> <p>As discussed earlier, the building's materials choice, setbacks, height, bulk and scale are all appropriate in the residential context of the perimeter of the site.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal does not fulfil DGR 4 in that it will result in overshadowing Burdett Street in winter months. 	<p>HI consulted with the community extensively prior to the lodgement of the EIS. The community expressed their overwhelming support for the long-awaited redevelopment of the Hospital.</p> <p>One of the main outcomes of the meeting was the redesign and reduction of the plant on top of the building in order to reduce the overshadowing impacts on neighbouring properties (see design development and shadow progression plan within Appendix B to this package). The scheme minimises shadow impacts to residential properties and at worst overshadows the front yard of two properties in mid-winter after 3pm. However, all nearby dwellings still achieve three (3) hours of daylight / solar access in mid-winter between 9am and 3pm and the building's proposed overshadowing will not result in any change to the rear yards of the dwellings, which are typically considered the principal areas of private open space. The proposal is considered compliant and responds to DGR 4.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The proposal does not fulfil DGR 7 in that the proposal will cause critical shortage in car parking. 	<p>The Traffic and Parking Report appended to the EIS provides a full assessment of traffic and parking requirements. The Transport Management Strategy for the Hospital has been detailed as part of the Traffic and Parking Report including the required actions and measures.</p> <p>Section 2.1 of the Response to Submissions Report details the amount of parking existing on the Hospital site and the amount that at the end of the Stage 1 Redevelopment. Table 1 and Figure 1 to the Response to Submissions Report indicate that there will indeed be a surplus of on-site parking of 109 spaces,</p>

Issues Raised		Proponent's Response
		<p>catering for the demand created of 100 spaces.</p> <p>A Construction Traffic Management Construction Works Plan will be prepared prior to commencement of works to address the development phase of the proposal.</p>
<p>Raj Nagappan (Resident of 3 Lowe Road)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The glass façade and courtyard should be relocated to the eastern boundary as it would provide morning sun for patients, reduce bulk of building along Derby Road. 	<p>As discussed elsewhere above and in the Response to Submissions Report, the design of the building has been devised for functional purposes, as well as responding to its context.</p>
<p>Resident Committee</p>	<p>Main concerns raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation was not undertaken with residents prior to deciding the location of the building. The building should be moved and located on the Palmerston Road frontage adjacent existing Lumby building for various reasons that will benefit the hospital and residents A greater setback from Burdett Street would allow for more appropriate taller tree plantings to help maintain residential privacy. 	<p>Consultation was undertaken at an appropriate time of the development and design process. Two community information days were held on the 27 March 2012 and 29 August 2012, with two sessions held per day (morning and afternoon).</p> <p>Careful consideration was given to the community's feedback and modifications were then made to the building, such as creating a greater setback from Derby Road, and reducing the amount of plant space to minimise shadow impacts. These design modifications were in direct response to the community concerns and HI took a serious approach to these concerns and delayed the development's program to ensure the design achieved better amenity outcomes for the neighbouring residents.</p> <p>Modifications have been made within the setback between the building and Burdett Street to provide capacity for further mature and buffering landscaping. This has been accommodated by narrowing the concrete maintenance path to the building edge. A landscape plan and report prepared by Arcadia has been provided at Appendix D. The plan shows the retention of the trees which currently grow in the Council verge with the addition of <i>Tristaniopsis Laurina</i> (Water Gum) within the setback to supplement the existing screening. The trees will grow to a height of approximately 6 metres (or 2 storeys) and will be planted at regular intervals of 5 metre spacing. This additional</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
	<p>planting will offer a year-round buffer to the building's built form as well as functioning as visual relief to the building façade along Burdett Street.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The building can be further setback from Derby Road with the removal of the three (3) child care facilities, which are not a core service delivery for hospital staff. 	<p>The Stage 1 footprint has been located to provide for optimal functional adjacency and connectivity to the HOPE building and to minimise disruption to ongoing hospital-related activities and to provide for the best continuity of services to the community. Its location also allows for only minimal removal of vegetation and takes advantage of existing driveway crossings. Furthermore, and most importantly, the floor plate is designed to deliver optimal functional and efficient health services. There is no flexibility for the building to be moved further north, or for its footprint to be reduced in size to gain a greater setback area along Burdett Street on the southern boundary.</p> <p>If a dysfunctional footprint size were to be implemented and if no GFA were to be lost, it would result in a taller building (albeit without its desired functional connectivity). Figure 2 in the Response to Submissions Report illustrates that if the building were to be setback 8m to align with the existing childcare centres to the west of the site, the building would obstruct the access laneway to existing hospital facilities and would abut against a number of existing functioning buildings.</p> <p>By moving the whole building footprint to the north it would require the demolition of substantial occupied amenities to allow construction of Stage 1. These include, environmental services (approximately 375m²) and maintenance workshop (approximately 500m²), and the three-storey Pathology/ Mortuary Building (approximately 860m²) which would impede the function of these hospital uses and require demolition.</p> <p>The removal of the childcare centres is not an option under the development scheme.</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lighter coloured plain brick finishes with a more extensive tree plantings would more closely match the existing buildings in the locality and would be less of a visual imposition on residents. 	<p>The design of the building and the proposed material palette represents a modern hospital facility. The colours and textures already aim to complement the surrounding buildings using bricks and terracotta materials. It is not reasonable to require a new Hospital facility to match or mimic dwelling materials surrounding the site. In addition, additional planting along Burdett Street will provide further softening of the building façade.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overshadowing across 2 residential yards is not minor as claimed in the EIS. 	<p>As stated within Section 6.5.1 of the EIS and as further represented in the Woodhead drawing package at Appendix B to the Response to Submissions package, the building results in acceptable overshadowing during mid-winter as few dwellings will be affected by minimal additional overshadowing. All nearby dwellings will still achieve three (3) hours of daylight in mid-winter between 9am and 3pm (as is currently experienced). In addition, the additional overshadowing will largely only affect the front yards of the affected dwellings. Front yards are typically not considered as private open space.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fear that Stage 2 will be built and continue down Derby Road at a similar building height, mass, setback which will compound the impacts. Stage 1 sets precedent. 	<p>Stage 1 has been setback considerably from Derby Road to take advantage of the natural slope of the land to provide the loading dock uses.</p> <p>The Stage 2 design is not a consideration within this DA and has not been designed as yet.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intakes and exhausts from cooling towers and plant rooms should not be directed to Burdett Street or Derby Road. 	<p>The external noise level criteria have been used for the assessment of external noise emissions, including those from cooling towers and plant rooms. These criteria have been used as the basis of the acoustic assessment submitted with the EIS and within the revised Acoustic Report provided at Appendix E.</p> <p>Acoustic treatment has been recommended in order to mitigate the potential noise impact from cooling towers and plant rooms. The acoustic measures will be employed during the design of the towers and plant rooms to ensure acoustic amenity for surrounding residents is achieved.</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Standby generator located on the corner of Derby and Burdett Street directly opposite resident housing is inappropriate in terms of minimising impacts of noise. 	<p>NDY has provided conditions to satisfy the NSW INP criteria (refer to Appendix E) which require:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -the maximum permissible aggregate sound power level for the generator enclosure should not exceed 75 dBA, and -the overall sound pressure level contribution at 10m from the generator enclosure (under free field conditions) should not exceed 47 dBA. <p>Further, any maintenance operation for the stand-by generators should comply with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -maintenance operations should only be conducted between 7am and 6pm -each maintenance operation should only be undertaken for a maximum period of 1 hour -only one maintenance operation can be conducted in any 24 hours period. <p>The above conditions have been included in the revised Mitigation Measures in Section 3.0 of this report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in the DA Acoustic Assessment Report are welcomed. In particular the recommendation regarding loading dock operations limited to 7am and 6pm should be monitored and enforced. 	<p>Noted.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration of the loading zone facility should be relocated to the undercroft of the building and the old single storey shed to the north to be removed to provide greater turning circles for trucks. Large trucks currently manage to make manoeuvres and safe deliveries via the existing Derby Road entrance to locations within the HKH campus. 	<p>As previously stated the loading dock has been positioned to take advantage of the natural slope of the land and minimises excavation and ground disturbance impacts as well as minimising impacts upon existing facilities presently in use on the campus. Moving the loading dock to another position on the site would impede existing hospital operations and potentially impede future development connectivity for Stage 2.</p> <p>Proper mitigation measures will be put in place to ensure the</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
	loading facility will not adversely impact the amenity of neighbouring residents on Derby Road.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Figures relating to car parking are inconsistent with studies undertaken by the residents committee. ▪ 508 more cars (in addition to the 300 noted in the Traffic Report) are parking on the streets surrounding the HKH at 1.30pm on a weekday. ▪ A more robust hospital parking solution should be implemented before the multi-storey car park projected for 2021. ▪ Parking during construction period will be a serious issues. ▪ Non-car transport options are to be considered such as public transport and car pooling with an incentive of providing a \$50 per week travel allowance. 	<p>The Parking strategy for the Stage 1 Redevelopment was included as part of the Traffic and Parking Plan for the site.</p> <p>Feasible parking solutions have been considered as part of the optimisation of parking conditions for the Hospital's site. However, as previously stated the parking demand for the Stage 1 Redevelopment is 100 spaces. A provision of 109 on-site spaces (a surplus of 9 spaces) is able to be provided to cater for the demand of 100 spaces. This achieves an overall car parking supply of 500 spaces on the HKH Campus at the end of the Stage 1 Redevelopment. With the addition of 300 spaces that will be used within the immediate four boundaries of the site, the overall hospital parking supply is 800 spaces, thereby resulting in an overall surplus of 30 spaces for the Hospital demand of 770 spaces.</p> <p>Parking allocations during the construction will be identified as part of the Construction Management Plan.</p> <p>The Transport Management Strategy for the site has been recommended and detailed as part of Traffic and Parking Report.</p> <p>It should be noted that any future redevelopment of the Hospital will be addressed as part of its parking strategy. The planning principles applied to the Stage 1 project is to de-clutter the site and build vertically. The rationalisation of the site will provide opportunities for additional on-grade car parking. Consideration of a possible multi-storey car park would depend on demand and planning requirements of Stage 2. Whilst the Campus's Master Plan has identified a location for a multi-deck car parking station, its viability would need to be substantiated in planning and</p>

Issues Raised	Proponent's Response
	dependent upon funding.