



Amy Watson - Objection: MP09_0188 and MP10_0044 - Expansion of the existing Aged Care Facility at Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home

From: "Lilli Gladstone" <lgladstone@propelinvestments.com.au>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 20/10/2010 1:31 PM
Subject: Objection: MP09_0188 and MP10_0044 - Expansion of the existing Aged Care Facility at Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home
CC: <premier@nsw.gov.au>, <sharon.armstrong@lpma.nsw.gov.au>, <coogee@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <david.shoebridge@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <john.kaye@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <cate.faehrmann@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <brad.hazzard@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <brad.hazzard@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <LOP@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <general.manager@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <murray.matson@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <kiel.smith@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <margaret.woodsmith@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <paul.tracey@randwick.nsw.gov.au>

To whom it may concern

Name: Lilli and Dean Gladstone
 Address: 89 King Street, Randwick

We strongly object to the development project for the following reasons:

Density- the FSR (Floor Space Ratio) is substantially above that permitted, even allowing for the 0.5:1 bonus for this type of development. The FSR of 1.43:1 exceeds the 1.15:1 allowed in the 2b zone. This equates to 7276sqm over. In the Residential 2c zone, the proposal is over by 947sqm. In total this adds up to 8223sqm over which is equivalent to an excess of 164 x 1-bedroom apartments (assuming 50sqm apartments or 85 x 2-bedroom apartments).

Height- Proposed Building F, the height is 10.7m over that permitted in the 2c zone which is equivalent to 3 storeys above that allowed and 3-storeys above the roof of the Centennial apartments building (proposed RL of 58.53 compared with RL of 49.29 at Centennial Apts, a difference of 9.24m in height). This is associated with the new building to the east of the Centennial Apartments.

The bulk of the proposed Buildings D (on Dangar Street) and E (on King Street) is excessive and out of character for area.

Parking- it is evident that staff, visitors and volunteers are using the surrounding streets and that there is inadequate parking on site. The use of the onsite open grassed areas for parking confirms that there is insufficient parking on site. These real experiences should take precedence over parking surveys with assumed rates.

Covenant- given that the north-western area is used for stormwater detention and has been landscaped, it is requested that a covenant be placed upon this part of the site to avoid future development expansion. This would prevent any further development in proximity to the Govett Lane properties and the broader heritage conservation area.

Visual Impact to Centennial Apartments- at present, a substantial number of apartments have their primary and in the majority of cases, have their sole outlook to the east over open space and landscaping. This is proposed to be replaced with a 6-storey building, which sits high above the roof of these apartments. The western setback is proposed as a child play area with no opportunity for meaningful landscaping. These units will be facing an apartment block, while setback in accordance with the setback controls, exceeds the height

limit by over 10m while the degree of excess (over 8000sqm) cannot justify such an impact. The length of the 6-storey building facing Centennial Apartments is 60metres, which extends beyond two out of three apartment buildings facing east.

Child Care Centre- it is proposed to extend the size of the centre from 60 to 80 children. The applicant's report states that the existing 8 spaces for 30 children is inadequate (approx 1 per 4) yet states that the proposed 13 spaces will be satisfactory yet adopts the same rate as the existing centre which has acknowledged parking problems.

The Proposal talks about an increase from 30 to 50 child care places, in fact Moriah College has lodge an amended DA to Randwick Council requesting an increase from an already approved 60 places to 80. The credibility of the concept plan for Building F is already under question.

If the Concept Plan and Development Application are approved without substantial reductions, the precedence for high-density developments in low to medium density areas such as Randwick North will be the benchmark for any future developments.

We would like to see significant amendments as follows to ensure our beautiful suburb is not ruined:

- The public square needs to be larger and have more landscaping
- Height and bulk buildings need to be reduced
- Set backs from King Street and Dangar Street need to be greater
- More parking is required on site

Regards



Lilli Gladstone
Associate Director
Propel Investments
Level 12, 201 Kent Street
Sydney NSW 2000
Tel: 61 2 8272 5204
Mob: 61 414 336 208
Fax: 61 2 8272 5222
Web: propelinvestments.com.au

This e-mail may contain confidential and/or privileged information. If you are not the intended recipient (or have received this e-mail in error) please notify the sender immediately and destroy this e-mail. Any unauthorized copying, disclosure or distribution of the material in this e-mail is strictly forbidden.

**Amy Watson - Online Submission from lilli gladstone of RNAG (object)**

From: lilli gladstone <lgladstone@propelinvestments.com.au>
To: Amy Watson <amy.watson@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 24/09/2010 5:00 PM
Subject: Online Submission from lilli gladstone of RNAG (object)
CC: <assessments@planning.nsw.gov.au>

Building E is way too close to King Street - it needs to be set much further back from the street. Our current pleasant outlook and morning sun will be blocked by this massive 6 story building.

The increase in traffic will make this quiet, suburban, family area, busy and congested.

It will significantly decrease the value of our property.

The urban square is a concrete jungle - it requires much more greenery (trees and grass)

The building of this massive infrastructure will take a significant amount of time - the area will be consumed by builders, noise, dust and other disruptions.

Name: lilli gladstone
Organisation: RNAG

Address:
89 King St, Randwick

IP Address: c58-109-64-138.randw3.nsw.optusnet.com.au - 58.109.64.138

Submission for Job: #3603 MP09_0188 Concept Plan for Seniors Housing and Care Facility
https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_job&id=3603

Site: #2147 Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home
https://majorprojects.onhiive.com/index.pl?action=view_site&id=2147

Amy Watson

E: amy.watson@planning.nsw.gov.au

Powered by Internetix Affinity

2

From: Bernard Mills <bernard.mills@thalesgroup.com>
To: <amy.watson@planning.nsw.gov.au>, <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
CC: BATES Jane <jane.bates@thalesraytheon-fr.com>
Date: 4/10/2010 8:37 pm
Subject: RE: Exhibition of MP09-0188 and MP10-0044 - Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home

Dear Amy,

We recently received via our strata manager your notice in relation to the Environmental Assessments for the planned developments at the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home, 100-120 King Street and 30-36 Dangar Street in Randwick (MP09-0188 and MP10-0044).

We are owners of Unit 4, 1 King Street Randwick (Strata Plan 15529) and wish to make the following submission based on the material provided in your letter and on the NSW Government Major Projects website.

We do not object to the two EAs and documentation lodged in relation to this project.

However we read with interest the materials relating to parking and traffic, as these are key issues in the near neighbourhood.

On any normal day, street parking is near capacity in King Street and surrounding streets such as Dangar Street and Prince Street. On afternoons and evening when the nearby Institute of Technology has heavy class loads, or on weekends when a major meet occurs at the nearby Randwick Racecourse, this already-heavy traffic and parking load further increases and manifests in crowded streets and frequent instances of illegal parking. I note that a number of residential properties in the near area (which includes many older apartment blocks) do not have garage facilities for motor vehicles, and therefore that these influxes of external traffic directly impact on the ability of local residents to park their vehicles near their homes.

We would therefore urge NSW Planning and the Randwick City Council to be particularly exigent in terms of objective analysis of further impacts on traffic and parking caused by this development, and the requirement to include adequate on-site parking. The mix of activities envisaged in the development, which include childcare, retail areas and aged care will clearly increase numbers of staff and visitors to the site, and our assessment is that local roads do not have the capacity to bear this additional load, especially insofar as street parking is concerned.

Kind regards, and please do not hesitate to contact us if you need to discuss this submission further.

Bernard Mills and Jane Bates

--
Bernard Mills
Industry Engagement Manager - Australia/Europe
Thales International
45 rue de Villiers, 92526 Neuilly-sur-Seine Cedex, FRANCE
Ph: +33 (0)1 57 77 86 32 | Fax: +33 (0)1 57 77 88 51

Mob (Fr): +33 (0)6 49 32 86 30 | Mob (Au): +61 (0)4 14 78 89 10
bernard.mills@thalesgroup.com | www.thalesgroup.com



Amy Watson - [Fwd: Re: Exhibition of MP09-0188 and MP10-0044 - Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home]

From: Bernard Mills <bernard.mills@thalesgroup.com>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>, <amy.watson@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 6/10/2010 6:44 PM
Subject: [Fwd: Re: Exhibition of MP09-0188 and MP10-0044 - Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home]
CC: BATES Jane <jane.bates@thalesraytheon-fr.com>

Dear Amy,

In the first line of the second paragraph (bolded) of our submission I stated King Street as our address. In fact we live in Prince Street. I just wanted to correct to avoid any confusion.

Bernard Mills

Bernard Mills a écrit :

Dear Amy,

We recently received via our strata manager your notice in relation to the Environmental Assessments for the planned developments at the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home, 100-120 King Street and 30-36 Dangar Street in Randwick (MP09-0188 and MP10-0044).

We are owners of **Unit 4, 1 King Street Randwick (Strata Plan 15529)** and wish to make the following submission based on the material provided in your letter and on the NSW Government Major Projects website.

We do not object to the two EAs and documentation lodged in relation to this project.

However we read with interest the materials relating to parking and traffic, as these are key issues in the near neighbourhood.

On any normal day, street parking is near capacity in King Street and surrounding streets such as Dangar Street and Prince Street. On afternoons and evening when the nearby Institute of Technology has heavy class loads, or on weekends when a major meet occurs at the nearby Randwick Racecourse, this already-heavy traffic and parking load further increases and manifests in crowded streets and frequent instances of illegal parking. I note that a number of residential properties in the near area (which includes many older apartment blocks) do not have garage facilities for motor vehicles, and therefore that these influxes of external traffic directly impact on the ability of local residents to park their vehicles near their homes.

We would therefore urge NSW Planning and the Randwick

City Council to be particularly exigent in terms of objective analysis of further impacts on traffic and parking caused by this development, and the requirement to include adequate on-site parking. The mix of activities envisaged in the development, which include childcare, retail areas and aged care will clearly increase numbers of staff and visitors to the site, and our assessment is that local roads do not have the capacity to bear this additional load, especially insofar as street parking is concerned.

Kind regards, and please do not hesitate to contact us if you need to discuss this submission further.

Bernard Mills and Jane Bates

Amy Watson - Notice of Objection

From: "Russell Bartlett" <drovers@smartchat.net.au>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 10/10/2010 4:05 PM
Subject: Notice of Objection
CC: <premier@nsw.gov.au>, <sharon.armstrong@lpma.nsw.gov.au>, <coogee@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <david.shoebridge@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <john.kaye@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <cate.faehrmann@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <brad.hazzard@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <LOP@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <general.manager@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <murray.matson@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <kiel.smith@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <margaret.woodsmith@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <paul.tracey@randwick.nsw.gov.au>

Re: Application number MP09_0188 and MP10_0044 - Expansion of the existing Aged Care Facility at **Sir Moses Montefiore Home** - 100 - 120 King Street and 30-36 Dangar Street Randwick.

We object to the application on grounds that the provision for on site parking is inadequate to accommodate the demands for parking generated by this development.

The surrounding streets would become congested and local residents denied **parking** space in their streets as a result of the facility staff, visitors and the like seeking off site parking of their vehicles.

In addition we are concerned the proposed **density** and **height** of the development is **excessive** and out of character with the area and should be revised.

Please note our concerns and objection.

Regards

Lee and Russell BARTLETT

34 Wentworth Street
Randwick NSW 2031

Amy Watson - Montefiore Concept Plan and DA application

From: "PL" <peter7821@optusnet.com.au>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 11/10/2010 2:06 PM
Subject: Montefiore Concept Plan and DA application
CC: <premier@nsw.gov.au>, <sharon.armstrong@lpma.nsw.gov.au>, <coogee@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <john.kaye@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <brad.hazzard@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <LOP@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <general.manager@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <murray.matson@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <kiel.smith@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <margaret.woodsmith@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <paul.tracey@randwick.nsw.gov.au>
Attachments: Proposed development objection.PDF

Dear Sir/Madam,

Application Name and Number: MP09_0188 and MP 10_0044 – Expansion of the existing Aged Care facility at Sir Noses Montefiore Jewish Home, 1-- - 12- King Street and 30 – 36 Dangar Street, Randwick

We **object** to the project as we are very concerned about the density, height, amenity, parking, traffic and visual impact of the project. For more details of our objection please refer to the attached document.

Thank you,

Peter Leau & Sophia Ling
Owners, unit 4, 89 -91 Dangar Street, Randwick 2031

Density- the FSR (Floor Space Ratio) is substantially above that permitted, even allowing for the 0.5:1 bonus for this type of development. The FSR of 1.43:1 exceeds the 1.15:1 allowed in the 2b zone. This equates to 7276sqm over.

In the Residential 2c zone, the proposal is over by 947sqm.

In total this adds up to 8223sqm over which is equivalent to an excess of 164 x 1-bedroom apartments (assuming 50sqm apartments or 85 x 2-bedroom apartments).

Height- Proposed Building F, the height is 10.7m over that permitted in the 2c zone which is equivalent to 3 storeys above that allowed and 3-storeys above the roof of the Centennial apartments building (proposed RL of 58.53 compared with RL of 49.29 at Centennial Apts, a difference of 9.24m in height). This is associated with the new building to the east of the Centennial Apartments.

The bulk of the proposed Buildings D (on Dangar Street) and E (on King Street) is excessive and out of character for area.

Parking- it is evident that staff, visitors and volunteers are using the surrounding streets and that there is inadequate parking on site. The use of the onsite open grassed areas for parking confirms that there is insufficient parking on site. These real experiences should take precedence over parking surveys with assumed rates.

Covenant- given that the north-western area is used for stormwater detention and has been landscaped, it is requested that a covenant be placed upon this part of the site to avoid future development expansion. This would prevent any further development in proximity to the Govett Lane properties and the broader heritage conservation area.

Visual Impact to Centennial Apartments- at present, a substantial number of apartments have their primary and in the majority of cases, have their sole outlook to the east over open space and landscaping. This is proposed to be replaced with a 6-storey building, which sits high above the roof of these apartments. The western setback is proposed as a child play area with no opportunity for meaningful landscaping. These units will be facing an apartment block, while setback in accordance with the setback controls, exceeds the height limit by over 10m while the degree of excess (over 8000sqm) cannot justify such an impact. The length of the 6-storey building facing Centennial Apartments is 60metres, which extends beyond two out of three apartment buildings facing east.

Child Care Centre- it is proposed to extend the size of the centre from 60 to 80 children. The applicant's report states that the existing 8 spaces for 30 children is inadequate (approx 1 per 4) yet states that the proposed 13 spaces will be satisfactory yet adopts the same rate as the existing centre which has acknowledged parking problems.

The Proposal talks about an increase from 30 to 50 child care places, in fact Moriah College has lodge an amended DA to Randwick Council requesting an increase from an already approved 60 places to 80. The credibility of the concept plan for Building F is already under question.

If the Concept Plan and Development Application are approved without substantial reductions, the precedence for high-density developments in low to medium density areas such as Randwick North will be the benchmark for any future developments.

(5)

Amy Watson - Objection to MP09_0188 and MP10_0044 - Expansion of the existing AgedCare Facility at Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home, 100-120 King Street and 30-36 Dangar Street, Randwick

From: Bill Salter <bill.salter.au@gmail.com>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/10/2010 7:29 PM
Subject: Objection to MP09_0188 and MP10_0044 - Expansion of the existing AgedCare Facility at Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home, 100-120 King Street and 30-36 Dangar Street, Randwick

8 Govett Street
 Randwick 2031
 12 October 2010

Hon. Tony Kelly, NSW Minister for Planning
 Major Project Assessment,
 NSW Department of Planning
 Dear Mr Kelly

Re: MP09_0188 and MP10_0044 - Expansion of the existing Aged Care Facility at Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home, 100-120 King Street and 30-36 Dangar Street, Randwick

We are writing to inform you that we object to the above project for the following reasons:
Density- the FSR (Floor Space Ratio) is substantially above that permitted, even allowing for the 0.5:1 bonus for this type of development. The FSR of 1.43:1 exceeds the 1.15:1 allowed in the 2b zone. This equates to 7276sqm over.

In the Residential 2c zone, the proposal is over by 947sqm.

In total this adds up to 8223sqm over which is equivalent to an excess of 164 x 1-bedroom apartments (assuming 50sqm apartments or 85 x 2-bedroom apartments).

Height- Proposed Building F, the height is 10.7m over that permitted in the 2c zone which is equivalent to 3 storeys above that allowed and 3-storeys above the roof of the Centennial apartments building (proposed RL of 58.53 compared with RL of 49.29 at Centennial Apts, a difference of 9.24m in height). This is associated with the new building to the east of the Centennial Apartments.

The bulk of the proposed Buildings D (on Dangar Street) and E (on King Street) is excessive and out of character for area.

Parking- it is evident that staff, visitors and volunteers are using the surrounding streets and that there is inadequate parking on site. The use of the onsite open grassed areas for parking confirms that there is insufficient parking on site. These real experiences should take precedence over parking surveys with assumed rates.

Covenant- given that the north-western area is used for stormwater detention and has been landscaped, it is requested that a covenant be placed upon this part of the site to avoid future development expansion. This would prevent any further development in proximity to the Govett Lane properties and the broader heritage conservation area.

Visual Impact to Centennial Apartments- at present, a substantial number of apartments have their primary and in the majority of cases, have their sole outlook to the east over open space and landscaping. This is proposed to be replaced with a 6-storey building, which sits high above the roof of these apartments. The western setback is proposed as a child play area with no opportunity for meaningful landscaping. These units will be facing an apartment block, while setback in accordance with the setback controls, exceeds the height limit by over 10m while the degree of excess (over 8000sqm) cannot justify such an impact. The length of the 6-storey building facing Centennial Apartments is 60metres, which extends beyond two out of three apartment buildings facing east.

Child Care Centre- it is proposed to extend the size of the centre from 60 to 80 children. The applicant's report states that the existing 8 spaces for 30 children is inadequate (approx 1 per 4) yet states that the proposed 13 spaces will be satisfactory yet adopts the same rate as the existing centre which has acknowledged parking problems. The Proposal talks about an increase from 30 to 50 child care places, in fact Moriah College has lodge an amended DA to Randwick Council requesting an increase from an already approved 60 places to 80. The credibility of the concept plan for Building F is already under question.

If the Concept Plan and Development Application are approved without substantial reductions, the precedence for high-density developments in low to medium density areas such as Randwick North will be the benchmark for any future developments.

Yours sincerely

Bill and Rhonda Salter

Amy Watson - OBJECTION TO Montefiore Concept Plan and DA MP09_0188 and MP10_0044 - 100 -120 KING ST RANDWICK

From: "Brad Mulligan" <bradm@onebuild.com.au>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 11/10/2010 9:30 AM
Subject: OBJECTION TO Montefiore Concept Plan and DA MP09_0188 and MP10_0044 - 100 -120 KING ST RANDWICK
CC: <premier@nsw.gov.au>, <sharon.armstrong@lpma.nsw.gov.au>, <coogee@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <david.shoebridge@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <john.kaye@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <cate.fahrmann@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <brad.hazzard@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <LOP@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <general.manager@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <murray.matson@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <kiel.smith@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <margaret.woodsmith@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, "Paul Tracey" <Paul.Tracey@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <Lara.Mulligan@bankwest.com.au>

OBJECTION TO MP09_0188 and MP10_0044
- Expansion of the existing Aged Care Facility at Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home, 100-120 King Street and 30-36 Dangar Street, Randwick

FROM ; BRAD MULLIGAN OWNER OCCUPIER OF UNIT 2.302 # 88 -98 KING ST RANDWICK

TO ; WHOM IT MAY CONCERN AT PLANNING NSW – MAJOR PROJECT ASSESMENT

Please be advised I (as an owner occupier of a unit in the adjoining development) strongly oppose the above noted applications for the following reasons.

Excessive Density- the FSR (Floor Space Ratio) is substantially above that permitted, even allowing for the 0.5:1 bonus for this type of development. The FSR of 1.43:1 exceeds the 1.15:1 allowed in the 2b zone. This equates to 7276sqm over.

In the Residential 2c zone, the proposal is over by 947sqm.

In total this adds up to 8223sqm over which is equivalent to an excess of 164 x 1-bedroom apartments (assuming 50sqm apartments or 85 x 2-bedroom apartments).

Height- Proposed Building F, the height is 10.7m over that permitted in the 2c zone which is equivalent to 3 storeys above that allowed and 3-storeys above the roof of the Centennial apartments building (proposed RL of 58.53 compared with RL of 49.29 at Centennial Apts, a difference of 9.24m in height). This is associated with the new building to the east of the Centennial Apartments.

The bulk of the proposed Buildings D (on Dangar Street) and E (on King Street) is excessive and out of character for area.

Parking- it is evident that staff, visitors and volunteers are using the surrounding streets and that there is inadequate parking on site. The use of the onsite open grassed areas for parking confirms that there is insufficient parking on site. These real experiences should take precedence over parking surveys with assumed rates. The real experience is that there is already insufficient parking in the area and the proposed development will seriously exacerbate the current shortage and during pick up and drop off times for the proposed expanded Day Care Centre King St will be Gridlocked.

Covenant- given that the north-western area is used for storm water detention and has been landscaped, it is requested that a covenant be placed upon this part of the site to avoid future development expansion. This would prevent any further development in proximity to the Govett Lane properties and the broader heritage conservation area.

Visual Impact to Centennial Apartments- at present, a substantial number of apartments have their primary and in the majority of cases, have their sole outlook to the east over open space and landscaping. This is proposed to be replaced with a 6-storey building, which sits high above the roof of these apartments. The western setback is proposed as a child play area with no opportunity for meaningful landscaping. These units will be facing an apartment block, while setback in accordance with the setback controls, exceeds the height limit by over 10m while the degree of excess (over 8000sqm) cannot justify such an impact. The length of the 6-storey building facing Centennial Apartments is 60metres, which extends beyond two out of three apartment buildings facing east.

Overshadowing – The proposed development as described above would seriously increase overshadowing and remove all or close to all direct sunlight to the ground floor (Level1) units in my Building (Building 2) of Centennial Apartments and significantly reduce the sunlight to all of the others in that building.

Privacy – The privacy of all units in my building will be significantly reduced. In Fact there will be no privacy whatsoever to my unit and the others in my building as the only windows to the units in my building (excluding two four corner units) directly face East to the proposed and ill conceived development.

Loss of Views – The views of all units in my building will be significantly reduced. In Fact there will be barely any views other than a Nursing Home building from my unit and the others in my building as the only windows to the units in my building (excluding two four corner units) directly face East to the proposed and ill conceived development.

Light Spillage / Pollution– There is already considerable light spillage / pollution coming from the existing development as a large proportion of the buildings floor space remains lit all night. There is also external lights for access and security. The existing buildings are a considerable distance away but still result in a significant loss of amenity to my unit. If additional buildings are built , particularly close to the boundary to Centennial Apartments this light spillage / pollution will be considerably increased and will be unbearable all night 7 days a week.

Noise Spillage / Pollution– There is already considerable noise spillage / pollution coming from the existing development from Delivery Trucks, other vehicles and plant. The existing buildings are a considerable distance away but still result in a significant loss of amenity to my unit. If additional buildings are built , particularly close to the boundary to Centennial Apartments this noise spillage / pollution will be considerably increased and will be unbearable continuously occurring 24 hours a day 7 days a week.

Loss of Open Space and Landscaping- The proposal involves the removal of the majority of open space and landscaping currently existing. This would result in a reduction of habitat for native animals and a loss of visual amenity for adjoining residents and passerby's.

Child Care Centre- it is proposed to extend the size of the centre from 60 to 80 children. The applicant's report states that the existing 8 spaces for 30 children is inadequate (approx 1 per 4) yet states that the proposed 13 spaces will be satisfactory yet adopts the same rate as the existing centre which has acknowledged parking problems.

The Proposal talks about an increase from 30 to 50 child care places, in fact Moriah College has lodge an amended DA to Randwick Council requesting an increase from an already approved 60 places to 80. The credibility of the concept plan for Building F is already under question.

Dangerous Planning Precedent Risking the Amenity of all Randwick Residents into the Future - If the Concept Plan and Development Application are approved without substantial reductions, the precedence for high-density developments in low to medium density areas such as Randwick North will be the benchmark for any future developments.

Stress to Existing Sewer and Storm water infrastructure – The proposed development would put significant additional load on existing sewer and storm water infrastructure.

Environmental Damage and Carbon Footprint – The proposed development will result in environmental damage from siltation (from material left on the road reserve as well as on site silt getting through any temporary construction controls installed) and air pollution. Significant pollution and environmental damage will result from factory made products to facilitate the construction, the actual construction itself, waste / rubbish removal from construction and ongoing pollution to maintain and power the development.

Based on the above extensive list of serious and significant reasons , I strongly oppose the above noted Development Applications / Proposals. The above noted Development Applications / Proposals will seriously and significantly reduce the amenity of adjoining residents of the Centennial Development as well as all passerby's and local residents.

The serious impacts which would result from the proposed development including but not limited to Reduced Parking, Increased Overshadowing and loss of direct sunlight, Reduction in Privacy and Views, Increased Noise and Light Spillage, loss of open space etc have long term and significant negative effects for local residents including myself which could never be rectified if the above noted Development Applications were approved.

I STRONGLY URGE ALL READERS OF THIS E MAIL TO ACT STRONGLY TO OPPOSE AND REJECT THE ABOVE NOTED DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS.

Yours Faithfully

Brad Mulligan
Project Manager



One Build Pty Ltd
PO Box K1341 Haymarket NSW 1240
Level 2 63 Foveaux St Surry Hills NSW 2010
Tel. 02 9218 3200 Fax. 02 9218 3299 mob 0431 495 714
Email bradm@onebuild.com.au

Web www.onebuild.com.au



Amy Watson - MP09_0188 and MP10_0044 - Expansion of the existing Aged Care Facility at Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home, 100-120 King Street and 30-36 Dangar Street, Randwick

From: "Margie & Dennis" <margdens@bigpond.com>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 11/10/2010 4:22 PM
Subject: MP09_0188 and MP10_0044 - Expansion of the existing Aged Care Facility at Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home, 100-120 King Street and 30-36 Dangar Street, Randwick
CC: <premier@nsw.gov.au>, <sharon.armstrong@lpma.nsw.gov.au>, <coogee@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <david.shoebridge@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <john.kaye@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <cate.faehrmann@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <brad.hazzard@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <LOP@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <general.manager@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <murray.matson@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <kiel.smith@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <margaret.woodsmith@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <paul.tracey@randwick.nsw.gov.au>

As residents of Dangar Street, Randwick for the past 23 years we are worried by a number of aspects of the above development.

Whilst we appreciate the intentions of the applicant, there are several matters which cause us deep concern. Briefly these are as follows:

1. The detrimental effect on our neighbourhood
2. The bulk and height of the proposal
3. The absence of sufficient increased parking

Accordingly we would like to formally object to the proposed development on the following grounds:

Density

The FSR (Floor Space Ratio) is substantially above that permitted, even allowing for the 0.5:1 bonus for this type of development. The FSR of 1.43:1 exceeds the 1.15:1 allowed in the 2b zone. This equates to 7276sqm over. In the Residential 2x zone, the proposal is over by 947sqm.

In total this adds up to 8223sqm over, which is equivalent to an excess of 164 x 1-bedroom apartments (assuming 50sqm apartments or 85 x 2-bedroom apartments).

Height

Proposed Building F, the height is 10.7m over that permitted in the 2c zone which is equivalent to 3 storeys above that allowed and 3-storeys above the roof of the Centennial Apartments building (proposed RL of 58.53 compared with RL of 49.29 at Centennial Apts, a difference of 9.24m in height). This is associated with the new building to the east of the Centennial Apartments.

The bulk of the proposed Buildings D (on Dangar Street) and E (on King Street) is excessive and out of character for area.

Parking

It is evident that staff, visitors and volunteers are using the surrounding streets and that there is inadequate parking on site. The use of the onsite open grassed areas for parking confirms that there is insufficient parking on site. These real experiences should take precedence over parking surveys with assumed rates.

Dennis & Margaret Stocker
 39 Dangar Street
 Randwick 2031

7

Amy Watson - MP09_0188 and MP10_0044 - Expansion of the existing Aged Care Facility at Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home, 100-120 King Street and 30-36 Dangar Street, Randwick

From: "Margie & Dennis" <margdens@bigpond.com>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 11/10/2010 4:49 PM
Subject: MP09_0188 and MP10_0044 - Expansion of the existing Aged Care Facility at Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home, 100-120 King Street and 30-36 Dangar Street, Randwick
CC: <premier@nsw.gov.au>, <sharon.armstrong@lpma.nsw.gov.au>, <coogee@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <david.shoebridge@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <john.kaye@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <cate.faehrmann@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <brad.hazzard@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <LOP@parliament.nsw.gov.au>, <general.manager@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <murray.matson@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <kiel.smith@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <margaret.woodsmith@randwick.nsw.gov.au>, <paul.tracey@randwick.nsw.gov.au>

As residents of Dangar Street, Randwick for the past 23 years we are worried by a number of aspects of the above development.

Whilst we appreciate the intentions of the applicant, there are several matters which cause us deep concern. Briefly these are as follows:

1. The detrimental effect on our neighbourhood
2. The bulk and height of the proposal
3. The absence of sufficient increased parking

Accordingly we would like to formally object to the proposed development on the following grounds:

Density

The FSR (Floor Space Ratio) is substantially above that permitted, even allowing for the 0.5:1 bonus for this type of development. The FSR of 1.43:1 exceeds the 1.15:1 allowed in the 2b zone. This equates to 7276sqm over. In the Residential 2x zone, the proposal is over by 947sqm.

In total this adds up to 8223sqm over, which is equivalent to an excess of 164 x 1-bedroom apartments (assuming 50sqm apartments or 85 x 2-bedroom apartments).

Height

Proposed Building F, the height is 10.7m over that permitted in the 2c zone which is equivalent to 3 storeys above that allowed and 3-storeys above the roof of the Centennial Apartments building (proposed RL of 58.53 compared with RL of 49.29 at Centennial Apts, a difference of 9.24m in height). This is associated with the new building to the east of the Centennial Apartments.

The bulk of the proposed Buildings D (on Dangar Street) and E (on King Street) is excessive and out of character for area.

Parking

It is evident that staff, visitors and volunteers are using the surrounding streets and that there is inadequate parking on site. The use of the onsite open grassed areas for parking confirms that there is insufficient parking on site. These real experiences should take

precedence over parking surveys with assumed rates.

Dennis & Margaret Stocker
39 Dangar Street
Randwick 2031

8

Amy Watson - MP09-0188 & MP10-0044 - Montefiore Home Extension

From: <mm@eastern.com.au>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>
Date: 12/10/2010 10:43 AM
Subject: MP09-0188 & MP10-0044 - Montefiore Home Extension

As a resident of a street that will be further impacted by the above proposed development, I wish to register my concern about the excessive density (well over recommended FSR's), the excessive height, the inadequate parking provisions and general negative visual impact, if the development were to proceed. There is already a significant development in place on this site and Government planners surely have a responsibility to retain standards of living in terms of amenity and visual impacts for current local residents.

MARGARET MCGREGOR Principal | **EASTERN REALTY** | 02 9326 7733 | 0405 384 353
25 King Street | Randwick NSW 2031 | FAX 02 9326 7722 | www.eastern.com.au

9

From: Brad Crowe <bcrowe@tpg.com.au>
To: <plan_comment@planning.nsw.gov.au>, Mayor Murrat Matson <murray.matson@r...
CC: Hon Kristina Keneally <premier@nsw.gov.au>, Hon Tony Kelly <sharon.armst...
Date: 12/10/2010 9:17 pm
Subject: MP09_0188 & MP10_0044 King and Dangar Streets Randwick

Major Project Assessments,
Department of Planning,
Sydney

12 October 2010

Re: Application MP_09_0188 and MP_10_0044 Expansion of the existing
Aged Care Facility at Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish home, 100-120 King
Street and 30-36 Dangar street Randwick.

Statement of Opposition
I oppose the above application.

I oppose the above application on a number of grounds.

I oppose it on to any extent that it exceeds existing building
regulations and council guidelines. This includes floor space ratio and
height, lack of proper parking space provision.

There is currently totally inadequate pick up and set down facilities
for children attending the child care centre. Parents are forced to
totally ignore road rules and stop in the middle of the road to set down
their children or double park blocking the street. King street can
become congested at times because of this. It causes very unsafe
situation in King street where traffic is forced to overtake double
parked vehicles and parents and children regularly have to cross the
street from wherever they are able to park whether it be legally parked
or otherwise. This is also a danger to children. I am terrified that
one day someone's child will run out in front of a car and be injured,
or god forbid be killed.

The existing child care facility should never have been approved without
proper and adequate off street pick and setdown facilities for the
children. Any proposed extension of child car facilities must not be
approved without addressing the existing problem and ensuring the
expansion is not jeopardising child safety. Of course people charged
with the responsibility of assessing the application should take into
account the fact the parents tend to drop off at a similar time in the
mornings so there is a "rush hour" which must be taken account of when
assessing off street drop off facilities. It would be grossly
irresponsible to approve this expansion unless current and future pick
and set down of children is taken care of.

I am also very concerned about the parking and traffic which has gotten
progressively very bad since the development was completed. It is the
regulators and council and governemtn officials duty to do the right
thing by the community. When it comes to parking you should be ensuring
that ALL development proposals include excess off street parking not as
you currently do by requiring barely minimal.

I am seriously concerned about the entire proposed expansion on the
grounds of the bulk, height, parking, traffic and amenity of this bold
and outrageous proposal. To have the audacity of proposing an expansion
so far outside the permitted regulations is breathtaking. As elected

officers and officials it is your duty to serve the local community and residents and deny the proposed development no matter how well they make their arguments.

I believe the current development if just able to "fit" into the local community. Yes there are parking and traffic problems but these are barely acceptable, however any expansion anything like the proposed scale should be totally ruled out. It is too big, visual impact it terrible, height mass etc. Increased parking generated and traffic congestion would be massive, it would leave to reduced views for many residents of the city and centennial park.

Please oppose this development on my behalf.

Yours faithfully,
Bradley Crowe
2/125 King Street
Randwick NSW 2031

=====
Email scanned by PC Tools - No viruses or spyware found.
(Email Guard: 7.0.0.18, Virus/Spyware Database: 6.16060)
<http://www.pctools.com/>
=====