

RANDWICK PRECINCT COMMITTEE

PO Box 1331
Randwick 2031
October 18, 2010
Ph: 9398 2290

Mr Ray Brownlee
General Manager
30 Frances Street
Randwick

Dear Mr Brownlee

The development application numbered CP/85/10 October 19, 2010 Business Paper for the Montefiore Nursing Home corner King & Dangar Streets was considered at the Randwick Precinct meeting on 13 October December 2010 and a motion was passed unanimously to lodge the following submission:

Randwick Precinct objects to the concept plan (MP 09_0188) for the Montefiore site and the development application (MP 10_0044) for Building D on the corner of King and Dangar Streets on the basis of:

1. Height exceeding the guidelines for the area being 12 metres for zone 2C and 9.5 metres for zone 2B, noting that the surrounding residential buildings are much lower than the heights proposed,
2. Excess density, a total floor space ratio exceeding the standards for the area even after including the 0.5 to 1 bonus for aged care, and
3. Insufficient on-site parking, given that only an extra 65 car parking spaces are proposed despite a more than doubling of residential capacity and noting that the expert report on traffic lodged with this application details an existing 90% utilization of the current car park during peak periods.
4. Privacy and view loss and overshadowing of Centennial Building and reduction in solar access and also to,
5. Insist on Dilapidation Reports for neighbouring residences.

Accordingly, Randwick Precinct requests a reduction in scale of the proposal.

ALSO complaints were made about inadequate notification of this proposal to many neighbouring residents and previous objectors.

Yours sincerely

Kathy Neilson
(Acting Precinct Chair)

David Ongkill

From: oliver harvey [olmharvey@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, 18 October 2010 7:50 PM
To: Robert Belleli; Charles Matthews; Alan White; Office of the Mayor;
bruce@notleysmith.com; Tony Bowen; Bradley Hughes; Scott Nash; John Procopiadis;
Anthony Andrews; Geoff Stevenson; Ted Seng
Subject: TRIM: Fw: Opposition to Montefiore Development

> Dear Sir/Madam

- >
- > I am writing to express deep concern about and opposition to the
> planned Montefiore Nursing Home expansion: MP09_0188 and
> MP10_0044 -
> Expansion of the existing Aged Care Facility at Sir Moses Montefiore
> Jewish Home, 100-120 King St and 30-36 Dangar St, Randwick.
>
- > I am a resident at 13 Dangar St, Randwick.
>
- > There are 4 key reasons I oppose the development in its present form.
> - 1 Bulk/Density: I understand the proposal to be over permitted Floor
> Space Ratio by more than 8000 m2, or more than 40% over the allowed
> limit (including the generous bonus FSR of 0.5)
>
- > - 2. Height: In the EA paper that is part of the proposal states that
> the proposed height is 10.7m over in zone 2B (allowed max
> 9.5m) and
> 8.5m (allowed max 12m). The proposed plans omit some important
> existing building heights making it difficult to give a comparison.
> However, it is clear that some residents in the Centennial Apartments
> will be greatly affected by loss of amenity (privacy, solar access,
> noise (childcare playground proposed between Centennial and Building
> F). And the bulk of the proposed Buildings D and E is excessive and out
> of character for our area.
>
- > - 3. Carparking: It is clear that staff, visitors and volunteers are
> using our surrounding streets at present 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. We prefer to
> refer to these real experiences than to rely on parking surveys with
> assumed rates. We understand the proposal includes a mere
> 57
> additional onsite carapaces bringing the total number to 212. Bearing
> in mind the existing bed numbers are 276, proposed bed numbers 276,
> bringing the total number to 552, a doubling in size - with few
> additional car spaces.
>
- > - 4. Childcare: the considerable increase in capacity of the child
> care centre will compound the congestion and parking issues. We
> understand the childcare car park already to be inadequate.
>
- > - 5. Congestion/traffic: this part of Randwick North is a family area,
> with many local families and also visitors using the Govett Reserve
> and surrounding streets for family activities. Vehicular traffic is
> already heavy for an area with such foot-traffic and especially that
> of families and children crossing Dangar St to go to the park. The
> density of the proposed development, and the implication of increased
> traffic in Dangar Street, is a serious concern given this context. The
> speeds at which vehicles travel on Dangar St makes it only a matter of

> time before a child is hit and severely injured or killed, and
> increased vehicular traffic proposed by Montefiore significantly
> compounds this risk.
>
> Finally, if the concept plan and development application are approved
> without substantial reductions, the precedence for high-density
> development in low to medium density areas such as Randwick North will
> be the benchmark for future developments.
>
> Yours sincerely
>
> Oliver Harvey
>

64

David Ongkili

From: Priscilla Liu [psliu888@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, 18 October 2010 6:32 PM
To: Bradley Hughes
Cc: Alan White; Office of the Mayor; bruce@notleymsmith.com; Tony Bowen; Scott Nash; John Procopiadis; Anthony Andrews; Geoff Stevenson; Ted Seng
Subject: TRIM: Part 3A Major Project Application for the Montefiore Aged-care Home at 100-120 King Street and 30-36 Dangar Street, Randwick

Dear Mr Mayor, Mr Hughes, Mr, White, Mr Bruce, Mr Bowen, Mr. Nash, Mr Procopiadis, Mr. Andrews, Mr Stevenson and Mr Seng

Like the other residents of Centennial apartment, especially those lived in Block 2 + 3, we are very very concerned about the overdevelopment of Montefiore

Besides the negative impact on all those who lived near MonteFiore, I wonder what it is like for the current and future residents of Montefiore to lose their lovely space and garden, to live in a large institution with hundreds of residents. looking into each other's rooms and blocks of building.

Montefiore Development seems to be focusing on the number of people they will be housing, have they forgotten about the importance of space and homely environment which is essential to the physical and mental wellbeing of everyone, especially the young, the frail, and the elderly.

Please support the Residents of Randwick in opposing the Montefiore development proposal

Yours Sincerely

Priscilla Liu

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

65

David Ongkili

From: Lu Dunford [ldunford@georgeinstitute.org.au]
Sent: Thursday, 25 November 2010 4:10 PM
To: Office of the Mayor
Subject: Montefiore DA Development Plans

Dear Mayor

The planning development proposed by the Montefiore complex is far from satisfactory to residents. The Randwick Council's Town Planners need to reassess it and the outrageous proposals need to be seen in the true light that they are presented and not be presented in a swirl of smokescreen.

I would like to point out the incorrect FSR calculations on page 53, table 8 and on page 55 first paragraph and again in second last paragraph.

It mentions that the FSR variance is 0.9:1, where in fact it should be 0.09:1 in zone 2C. The allowed FSR is 1.4:1, proposed 1.49:1, correct variance 0.09:1. If approved with the FSR variance of 0.9:1, this would allow Montefiore to build with a Floor Space Ratio of 2.3:1. Compare this with a FSR of 0.9:1 that is allowed for normal homes in zone 2C, an FSR of 2.3:1 would be 250% over that limit.

Overall the proposed structure and changes are far too ambitious and need to be modified substantially.

L Dunford 85a Darley Rd Randwick 2031

Lu Dunford
Receptionist, Administration

The George Institute for Global Health | AUSTRALIA
Level 10, King George V Building, 83-117 Missenden Rd | Camperdown NSW 2050 Australia
Postal Address: PO Box M201 | Missenden Rd | NSW 2050 Australia
T +61 2 9993 4500 | F +61 2 9993 4501
E ldunford@georgeinstitute.org.au | W www.georgeinstitute.org.au

The George Institute is affiliated with the University of Sydney
Legal: www.georgeinstitute.org/disclaimer



Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.