

Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home – Response to Submissions

Concept Plan and Project Application (MP09_0188 and MP10_0044)

Issues Raised by Agencies	Proponent Response
NSW Department of Planning (also addressed in detail as part of Preferred Project Report document proper)	
<p>Given the proportionate departure from the building height controls provided in the Randwick LEP 1998, the Department requires further justification in relation to the height and bulk of the proposal as presented to the public domain. The Department considers that reductions in height, greater building articulation and greater setbacks should be considered along King Street and Dangar Street to reduce the visual bulk of the proposal.</p>	<p>Whilst FSR bonuses are offered under SEPP HSDP, there is no concurrent height bonus provided to cater for the additional FSR that is able to be provided for aged care developments. To meet both the bonus FSR provisions, and to fit within the height controls would unreasonably increase the site coverage of the development, leading to increased building lengths and building massing. This has the potential to generate significant design issues, particularly at the site's interface with other land uses. Significant areas of open space, landscaped area, and private open space is integral to the design of the proposal as well as the provision of a high amenity internal to and around the development.</p> <p>The proposal also seeks to modulate the built form in order to provide a completed streetscape, whilst making the most efficient and effective use of the land and the available services and infrastructure in the area.</p> <p>The proposal at the current density and height has previously been accepted by the Department of Planning as part of the earlier Site Compatibility Certificate process (subject to further consideration of an application for development) as being in context with its surroundings and an appropriate response to established need for increased provision for aged care. The proposed height is a direct result of the maintaining and meeting open space and landscaping requirements, meeting Council's setback controls, and a maximum GFA within the FSR parameters set by the Seniors Housing SEPP. The proposed GFA is a direct response to not only existing demand for places in the Home but also anticipated future demand for high care places. This is addressed in greater detail in Section 2 of the PPR document. It should also be noted that Council's submission / planning report indicates that the current proposal is the limit of development as envisaged by Council and that any additional density or height beyond that proposed would be an overdevelopment.</p> <p>The apparent massing of the development is mitigated by the design of the buildings (refer to Appendix B). The facades of Building C and proposed Building D are refined and articulated, using</p>

	<p>a range of finishes and materials to create visual interest, which break down the facade and reduce the apparent bulk of the buildings. Building E will be designed using a similar approach at detailed design stage, to emphasize a vertical bay articulation in the design, rather than a horizontal emphasis.</p> <p>Generous setbacks are also provided to reduce the visual bulk of the proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> proposed building E is setback 10m to King Street, the upper most level (Level 6) is setback a further 14m (a total setback of 24m) to minimise the appearance of height from the street; Building D is setback 10 to King Street. At the eastern end of King Street, at the public plaza, the building is setback 20m from King Street (excluding the 4m deep colonnade); and Building D is setback 10m from Dangar Street. <p>The revised Building E, has also been further setback from the site boundary to reduce the visual bulk, with an increased setback 14m (18m at Level 6) increasing the separation distance between the Centennial.</p>
<p>The height of proposed Building F at the western edge of the site is considered out of context with the neighbouring building to the west. The Department considers that a more sympathetic transitional element should be provided.</p>	<p>Building F has been deleted from the scheme. The floor space from Building F has been largely incorporated into a revised Building E to ensure a comparable level of service provision by the Home.</p> <p>The context between Envelope E and the adjacent development to the west has been significantly improved through the provision of increased setbacks and various design details to be employed within the building to improve amenity and privacy. Refer to Appendix B for Jackson Teece's revised plans, elevations, and sections.</p> <p>The previous boundary setback of 8.5m, has been increased to 14m (18m at Level 6). This represents a setback of 22.5m between Envelope / Building E and the Centennial. Whilst the height of the envelope has not changed, the additional distance between buildings provides for a greatly improved transition.</p> <p>The revised Envelope / Building E will also provide an improved outcome in terms of solar access. The elevation study of Centennial between 9am and 9:30am on the winter solstice, shows that the revised Envelope / Building E will not have any significant impacts on solar access. The elevations show, that whilst at 9am the proposal has an additional overshadowing impact on apartments at the ground floor of the Centennial, by 9:11am, the proposal will not restrict solar access into the living room windows of any apartments. As such, the proposal will not prevent apartments in the Centennial from achieving minimum solar access requirements.</p> <p>Whilst the childcare centre is now closer to the site boundary, attenuation measures will ensure that no adverse amenity impacts arise. The reduced setback is a result of changes made to Envelope / Building E to accommodate the upper level setbacks and separation distances, as well as to allow for a more efficient configuration for the childcare centre. Notwithstanding this, attenuation measures such as a landscaped buffer and green roof, as well as the reconfiguration of</p>

	<p>outdoor space so that they do not adjoin neighbouring private open spaces, will ensure visual and acoustic privacy are maintained. The reduced setback is considered a minor concession, given the overall improvement presented by the revised Envelope / Building E.</p> <p>This is addressed in greater detail in Section 2 of the PPR document.</p>
<p>In order to improve the amenity and useability of the proposed public space, the levels of Building D overhanging this space should be further setback to significantly reduce any overhang / encroachment.</p>	<p>Revised sections, demonstrating the amenity of the colonnade are provided at Appendix B. The merits of the colonnade (overhang) are set out below. The proposed colonnade with a depth of 4m will provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ ample circulation space, particularly considering users may be walking abreast of each other, supporting elderly or frail patrons; ■ adequate shade and wet weather protection; ■ increased legibility by contrasting with the adjacent ground level facade treatments and space functions; ■ a comfortable depth for a cafe table and chairs plus weather protected circulation space; ■ a generous edge to the public open space; ■ a feeling of enclosure, rather than an exposed area as would be the case with a more narrow colonnade or fixed glass awning; ■ adequate space for wheelchair or assisted access; and ■ enhanced security for the site by activating the King Street frontage. <p>The public plaza is setback an additional 10m from the required 10m King Street setback (providing a total setback of 20m). The 4m wide colonnade provides a total set back to the retail frontage of 24m. A colonnade of lesser depth would feel confined. More exposed, less functional and not facilitate multi usage. Replacement with a fixed awning would be more exposed but would negate the use of extendable awnings to increase amenity at the edge of the public space.</p> <p>This is addressed in greater detail in Section 2 of the PPR document.</p>
<p>Elevation plans should be provided that clearly show the presentation of the proposed buildings to King Street and Dangar Street.</p>	<p>Elevations prepared by Jackson Teece, demonstrating the presentation of the buildings to King and Dangar Streets are provided at Appendix B.</p>
<p>A dedicated off-street pick-up / drop-off area should be provided for the proposed childcare centre (a designated area should be provided for this in the proposed car park)</p>	<p>Halcrow has prepared a Traffic Assessment Addendum (refer to Appendix E) to address issues raised in the submissions. The existing child care centre temporary approval (80 child care places and 8 staff) relies on a total of six on-street short stay (15 minute) spaces for drop off/collection purposes, one of which is across the access to the Centre's existing car park which contains 6 spaces. The on-site parking is typically utilised by staff.</p> <p>As discussed further in the response to below, it is proposed to provide a total of 20 on-site parking spaces for the proposed 80 place child care centre. A total of 14 drop off / pick up spaces will be on site within a dedicated parking area. A total of 6 dedicated child care centre staff</p>

	parking spaces will be provided on site within the main Montefiore Home car parking area.
Randwick Council has noted that the existing childcare centre is already approved for 60 children. The submitted EA sets out that 20 places are currently provided and 50 places are proposed. Further clarification in this regard is therefore sought. Should it be the case that the childcare centre is to cater for more than 50 places, further consideration should be given to on-site parking provisions.	<p>It should also be noted that since Council submission on this Part 3A application, it has approved a s96 application for an extension of the child care use for a further 5 years as well as an increase in approved child care places from the previous 60 to 80 places.</p> <p>The Preferred Project proposes to provide a child care centre with 80 places in line with the temporary approval. In terms of parking provision, a total of 20 car parking spaces are required for a 80 place child care centre (RTA requirements). A total of 20 spaces dedicated to the use of child care centre uses have been provided (see also response to above). Therefore the Preferred Project proposal seeks to increase the total number of parking spaces provided for the existing child care centre use (in line with RTA and Council requirements) and provide these spaces on site, thereby removing the need for child care drop-off / pick-ups to occur on street. As such the Preferred Project proposal would substantially improve vehicular access and parking arrangements for the Child Care Centre. The 80-place child care centre currently provides 6 on site car parking spaces for staff with drop off and pick up of children occurring on street.</p>
The Department has concerns regarding potential amenity impacts created by the play area (in the side setback of proposed Building F) of the childcare centre to the adjoining apartment buildings to the west. The Department considers that the configuration / layout / location of this space needs to be further considered.	<p>The childcare centre play areas have been reconfigured in response to the Department's submission. This is addressed in greater detail in Section 2 of the PPR document. In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ the play area has been redesigned to minimise the amount of external play space fronting the neighbouring properties. This will reduce any visual and acoustic impacts emanating from the childcare centre; ■ provision of a 3m wide landscape buffer between the childcare centre and the Centennial Apartment to provide visual and acoustic privacy; and ■ a green roof has been provided on the childcare centre, ensuring a pleasant outlook for residents of the Centennial.
A full assessment should be provided of any view loss impacts (to the apartment buildings to the south east of the site) across the site to the north-west and beyond to the city.	A visual impact analysis is provided at Section 2.3 of the PPR and Appendix D . The analysis has found that there will be limited view loss as a result of the proposed development, with view impacts limited to one location at RL56.6 at 125 King Street. However, it is noted that view loss is limited to lower level skyline buildings, with views to iconic buildings such as the Centre Point Tower maintained.
Indicative floor plans and internal layouts of the proposed self-care apartments contained in Building F shall be provided in order to demonstrate that these units will be capable if complying with the requirements of SEPP 65 and the Residential Flat Design Code.	<p>SEPP 65 is discussed in detail at Section 2.6 of the PPR. The SEPP 65 Building Configuration objectives have been applied to achieve design excellence for the indicative layouts of the self care apartments in Envelope / Building E (refer to plans at Appendix F). Spatially, the apartments are functional and well organised, with all living rooms and the majority of bedrooms having access to recessed external balconies for private open space. The proposed balconies will be functional, spacious, well proportioned and designed to promote outdoor use. They will include privacy and climate control screens as necessary.</p> <p>Internally, the apartment layouts are designed to achieve a high standard of residential amenity. All apartments are larger than the minimum areas nominated in SEPP 65. They proposed layouts allow for a variety of furniture configurations, provide generous ceiling heights, have efficient internal circulation planning and maximise the number of habitable rooms with windows to</p>

	<p>facilitate natural ventilation and daylight access.</p> <p>The indicative layouts have also been used to assess the self-care apartments against the SEPP 65 Building Design guidelines. In summary, the indicative design is able to achieve compliance with the requirements for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ balconies; ▪ ceiling heights; ▪ internal circulation; and ▪ storage. <p>The self-care apartments are also able to meet building amenity criteria with regards to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ acoustic privacy; ▪ daylight access; and ▪ natural ventilation. <p>However, it is noted that these outcomes are based on indicative floor plans and layouts, and will be subject to design refinement at Development Application (DA) stage. Any future applications would be subject to a review of SEPP 65 at detailed design stage.</p>
Randwick City Council	
The Director City Planning Report CP85/10 forms Council's main submission. The following issues have been raised:	
Council would point out that the breaches in density and height proposed under the current proposal are at the upper limit that the subject site can tolerate relative to the existing and future character of surrounding development under the established Residential 2C and Residential 2A zoning.	Council acknowledges that the development, whilst at the upper limit of what the site can tolerate, is not excessive in its detailed consideration of the proposal. As detailed in Section 2.1 of the PPR, utilising the bonuses available to the proposal under SEPP HSDP, the development does not exceed the FSR for the 2C zone, and only exceeds the FSR for the 2B zone by 0.1:1. This equates to an exceedence of 1,711m ² across the site.
<p>The proposed new heights represent a significant increase when compared to the heights approved under the previous amended Master Plan 2002.</p> <p>In view of the overall increase in height proposed under the current Part 3A proposal, it is considered appropriate that the proposed development provides a high degree of design and planning at the interface of the proposed development along King Street and appropriate amendments may be necessary to achieve the following:</p>	<p>The 2002 Master Plan has now lapsed. Master Plans have a five year life prior to lapsing so that the development response to a site can be adapted as needs change. The proposal represents a new opportunity to review the design of the facility in-line with the social and operational needs.</p> <p>It is noted that the proposed heights exceed the controls, primarily because there are no height bonuses to correlate with the FSR bonus control when applied in tandem with other numeric controls governing site coverage or landscaping or provision of other public domain. However, through good urban design, and by appropriately treating the public edge of the site, the impact of the increased height can be mitigated:</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> King Street shall be reinforced with appropriate public domain and landscape treatment that interfaces with the development in an interactive and positive way; increased facade treatment to Buildings C, D and E that not only breaks the visual bulk and scale of these buildings but also provides high quality finishes that will respect the existing and future residential character of the King and Dangar Street streetscapes; the provision of more well defined landscaped view corridors through the site to soften any intrusive built wall-effect along the King Street and Dangar Street fronts and to break the perception of visual bulk and scale; the provision of increased pedestrian permeability through the subject site to soften the perception of a wall / gated effect along King and Dangar Street given the long linear massing on these streets; and the provision of a more integrated typology of open space in the subject site that addresses the principal function (e.g. entry forecourt, circulation corridors, walking, sitting, buffer etc) and landscape character (e.g. dense vegetation buffer area, open lawn, informal gardens etc). Additionally, the application has not addressed clearly the pedestrian circulation and linkages between various open areas which should be demonstrated in a schematic form. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. The proposal will activate the King Street frontage, providing greater interaction between the street and the Montefiore development. The development provides an opportunity to provide a domestic edge to the northern face of King Street, including appropriate upper level setbacks, and significant street edge planting in the 10-metre setback from King and Dangar Streets; The facade treatment of Envelope E will be subject to detailed design at DA stage. The facades of Buildings C and D have been designed to create a refined and articulated outcome, generating visual interest and reducing the bulk of the built form. With this in mind, the previous elevation has been revised to include a centre balcony section flanked by two screened sections, further breaking up the horizontality of the Dangar Street façade. Envelope E will be based on the same design principles and palette of materials. This is highlighted in Jackson Teece's revised drawing set at Appendix B; Suggestions that the buildings should be broken down into defined separate buildings or segments to provide view corridors through the site are unachievable due to the desire and necessity to provide optimal operational requirements of the aged care facility, such as shorter travel distances, consistent and unbroken grades and floors laterally through the development. The removal of FSR to create view corridors would also require additional height in order to maintain the proposed GFA across the site. The quality of views that could be achieved is also questionable, with any view corridors created simply opening views to within the Montefiore site, rather than significant views across and beyond the site from the south; The site is, and presently operates as a, secure private site, and is not intended to change nor is it intended beyond the public square that the site be used as a public thoroughfare. The existing and proposed fences are required for security reasons, as well as to prevent residents suffering from dementia from leaving the site unattended; and The different open space areas are identified on the landscape plans. The public spaces provided are considered appropriate given the use of the site. The internal courtyards are intended for passive recreation, with the planting around the perimeter of the site designed to screen the development from the street, whilst providing spaces for residents to enjoy the outdoors. Circulation paths and ramps within the outdoor spaces are shown on the previously provided and revised landscape plans.
<p>In relation to the public square:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> has progressively reduced in size when compared with the previous Master Plan; 	<p>The proposed public square / space is considered to be appropriately proportioned relative to the required retail space, the square's user catchment, and its proposed form and function. The previous design for the southwest corner of the site had a 400-seat synagogue. The synagogue has been removed from the scheme and been replaced with aged care accommodation and a small</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ has a linear configuration that does not appear to function ideally as a place for passive recreation or spontaneous activities but rather merely as a generous setback to the proposed Building D to justify its breach in height; ▪ consideration should be given to increasing the depth of the plaza, improving the geometric configuration and creating a terminating vista of higher quality to Church Street; and ▪ The function, form and performance of the proposed public square should be in the context of the existing Montefiore facility. 	<p>retail area, and the size of the urban plaza has been reduced accordingly. This reduction in area was discussed on site with representatives of Randwick Council in July of 2009. Plans of various other urban spaces in Sydney were tabled, showing our assessment of the appropriateness of the size and proportions of the space being put forward for the context, its catchment, and the proposed uses.</p> <p>The size of the space means it will be an 'active' space, activating the King Street frontage and providing a forecourt to both the Montefiore development and the retail use(s) on the corner of King and Church Streets. If the space were larger, it could appear empty or have 'dead' corners of space, and would not as effectively address and resolve relevant CPTED principles. The additional height sought is not in trade for the urban plaza; it is a consequence of the application of the bonus FSR and balancing this with a good urban design outcome.</p> <p>The proportions of the space are appropriate to the proposed uses, which are primarily al fresco dining and pedestrian circulation. The dimensions are 54m by 20m (or 24m if including the area under the colonnade), which cannot be accurately described as linear. Furthermore, the Council's requirement that retail be incorporated into this corner on the Montefiore side of Dangar Street was intended to 'connect to' the existing retail on the south side of Dangar Street. The deeper the plaza, the more tenuous this connection. The proportions proposed balance this connection with a comfortably-sized outdoor space suitable for al fresco dining and passive recreation.</p> <p>The space will provide a focal point, and a sense of activity. The landscaped plaza is considered to be of high quality, and this, in combination with the high quality of the design and materials of the façade of Building D, will create a pleasant terminating vista down Church Street.</p> <p>We are of the view that the proposed size and dimensions of the square are entirely in context with the Montefiore facility and its wider catchment.</p>
<p>The proposal does not appear to adequately address the degree of intensification of the existing use and the impact on surrounding residential uses including the increased number of staff and the attendant increases in the changes to work-shifts. The increase of 89 additional staff would further exacerbate these effects.</p>	<p>As detailed in the exhibited EAR, it is noted that the Home will continue to operate in the same manner with respect to the number of shifts, shift times, and changeover arrangements. The figures used in the Traffic Assessment take into account the proposed increases in staff numbers, and the "peak" times for the number of staff on-site at any one time which occurs during the changeover of shifts. The Halcrow response to issues included in this package addresses the intensification of use from a traffic, transport and parking perspective.</p>
<p>In relation to car parking and traffic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The existing child care is approved for 60 children and licensed for 80 children. The car parking and traffic analysis provided with respect to existing and future needs of the child care centre should be reviewed to ensure that the demand for car parking. Traffic and drop off / pick up are based on the higher number of children; 	<p>This was an error and it has been corrected. This issue has been addressed in the response to the Department's submission above. Following a review by Halcrow (refer to Appendix E) the exhibited childcare centre parking provisions are considered satisfactory, and will vastly improve the existing situation. Further information relating to the status of the various approvals is addressed at Section 2.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ An appropriate commitment should be made by the proponent to apply more stringent management initiatives to ensure that all staff driving to work park their cars on site; 	<p>As stated at Section 2.7.3 of Halcrow's exhibited Transport and Traffic Report, the management of the Montefiore Home has implemented measures to improve access to the on-site car parks, namely a greater distribution of swipe cards to employees and volunteers. In addition, less frequent visiting volunteers are buzzed through at reception with security being advised in advance of their scheduled (rostered) arrival. Current Council on-street parking regulations local to the site allow all users, including staff and visitor to the Home, to use the on-street parking. It is not the responsibility of the Home to impose regulations on on-street parking, as it has no jurisdiction over these spaces. However, the Home has and will continue to encourage staff to park on site as it is understood to be a concern for its neighbours. We note that this is a district-wide problem. A number of different uses compete for these spaces on any given day, including the TAFE, UNSW, Randwick Racecourse, Montefiore, and the neighbouring residents, most of whose homes are of a vintage which does not have off-street parking.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The parking assessment should assess the adequacy of the parking facilities in catering for overlapping staff shifts; 	<p>Halcrow's exhibited Transport and Traffic report notes that there is currently a transition of staff between shifts, particularly between the Day and Evening shift, generally occurring over a 1-hour period.</p> <p>This overlapping of staff shifts is beneficial for a number of reasons, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ arrival and departure trips occur over a broad period; and ■ demand for staff parking is gradual throughout the changeover period and can be managed by the gradual departure of staff. ■ in addition, the parking layout has been designed to allow for easy access entering and leaving the site so that this flow occurs smoothly. Staff can enter either via King or Dangar, and exit via King Street.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ The report should outline the proposed allocation of parking spaces between staff members, residents, family visitors and external services, including medical consultants, tradesmen and the like; 	<p>In order to maximise the utilisation of proposed on-site parking, allocation of particular parking spaces to individual uses is not proposed. The exceptions would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ child care centre staff parking; ■ child care centre drop off / pick up parking ■ loading and service vehicle areas; and ■ mini bus parking areas.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ the implications of any weekend peak traffic when family members are likely to pay visit and whether vehicles would queue and park on public roads as a result of the intensified operation; 	<p>Generally, weekend traffic does not peak significantly like weekday traffic. Weekend traffic including family visitors tends to be spread throughout the day. Conversely, weekday traffic including visits from family tend to accord with general morning and evening peak traffic periods. Therefore, with a view to assessing peak conditions on the local road network as a whole, weekend traffic would not present the busiest traffic conditions.</p> <p>With regard to queuing on street, the busiest forecast weekday period for arrivals is the morning peak hour, during which 79 vehicles would access the site, via the entry-only Dangar Street access and the two-way King Street access. On average this equates to 40 vehicles per hour or</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> existing parking restrictions relating to kerb side spaces in the vicinity to the site; and details of any short-term parking spaces within the site, including those adjacent to the main reception area. 	<p>one vehicle every 1.5mins. On this basis, any further investigation of the entry accesses and the potential for queuing is unwarranted.</p> <p>The proposal does not physically impact upon available on-street parking (ie. no changes to existing parking controls are proposed) and the proposals aim to reduce the likelihood of Home related traffic from parking on-street.</p> <p>There are four spaces on site at the main reception entrance for taxi drop-off and pick-up.</p>
<p>In relation to transport and accessibility, the following details should be addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> details on the direction of traffic and on-way / two-way movements of all internal roads; details on the drop-off and pick-up zones for both the aged care facility and the child care centre; access routes for service vehicles; access facilities for people with disabilities; details of on-street pedestrian safety related facilities such as pedestrian refuges. 	<p>A plan showing these details has been prepared by Jackson Teece and is provided at Appendix B.</p>
<p>In relation to drainage:</p> <p>It is recommended that detailed drainage related conditions of consent be referred to the Department of Planning for the Department's assessment and consideration.</p>	<p>Noted. No detailed conditions relating to drainage have been provided by Council.</p>
<p>In relation to landscaping:</p> <p>It is recommended that detailed landscape related conditions of consent be referred to the Department of Planning for the Department's assessment and consideration.</p>	<p>Noted. No detailed conditions relating to landscaping have been provided by Council.</p>
<p>Council also raised comments about the proposal's relationship with the Randwick City Plan and the Financial Impact Statement.</p>	<p>Noted. These comments address how the proposal fits Council policy. No response is required.</p>
<p>In addition to the issues raised in CP85/10, a number of other broad / general issues have been raised in Council's covering letter to the report:</p>	
<p>The impacts of a large number of aged care beds on hospital emergency services in the event on an evacuation have not been adequately considered.</p>	<p>The impact of any potential evacuation on hospital emergency services is an operational matter, and is not a relevant planning consideration.</p> <p>It is anticipated that the provision of an aged care facility (particularly the fact that the facility already exists in this locality) in proximity to a health hub and hospital services as is the case at</p>

	Randwick, would be an advantageous and rational action as opposed to providing the facility in a remote location away from health services.
The lack of consultation with emergency services.	As above, the impact of the development on the emergency services is an operational matter and is not a matter of relevance to the assessment of the proposal. In addition, the site can accommodate emergency services vehicles including ambulances and fire engines.
There are no emergency plans in place.	This is a matter for the operation of the facility, and is not a matter for consideration as part of the Concept Plan or Project Application.
There is a large number of child care spaces proposed.	In October 2010, Council approved the expansion of the child care centre from 60 to 80 children, whilst the Concept Plan and Project Application were on public exhibition. Council's approval provides for more spaces / places than that initially proposed under the Concept Plan.
The impact of 89 extra staff and how the number of extra shifts required.	As detailed in the exhibited EAR, it is noted that the Home will continue to operate in the same manner with respect to the number of shifts, shift times, and changeover arrangements. The figures used in the Traffic Assessment take into account the "peak" number of staff on-site at any one time.
The insufficient parking provided	As detailed in the exhibited Concept Plan and Project Application, the 217 parking spaces proposed under the Concept Plan exceeds the number of parking spaces required for the development under Council's Parking DCP (174 spaces). Similarly, based on the existing travel patterns of staff, the provision of 217 spaces exceeds the 207 spaces required. If more on-site parking were to be provided, it may discourage the use of public transport, which is contrary to State and local planning objectives and the recommendation for a "minimal approach to car parking".
Consideration should be given to late night transportation for female workers.	The area is not considered a high-crime area, with no issues raised relating to the safety of female workers leaving Montefiore late at night. The proposed development, in addition to existing surrounding residences, will provide additional passive surveillance for staff walking to their cars at night. Given the nature of shift work, the car spaces provided for the night shift are ample to allow for suitable late night transportation or car sharing.
Impacts of light spill on to adjoining properties.	Noted. This issue has been raised previously and is being addressed by Montefiore. An external lighting audit was undertaken, which has identified some areas of light spill. Some of these areas will be addressed with shades to be affixed to specific lamps; others are a function of the Building Management System (BMS) which is undergoing a system-wide upgrade, which should address the remaining areas.
View loss to adjoining properties.	A visual impact analysis is provided at Section 2.3 of the PPR and Appendix D . The analysis has found that there will be limited view loss as a result of the proposed development, with view impacts limited to one location at RL56.6 at 125 King Street. However, it is noted that view loss is limited to lower level skyline buildings, with views to iconic buildings such as the Centre Point Tower maintained.

	As described in the EAR, what can be seen from the Centennial Apartments cannot be described as a “view”, rather it is considered to be an “outlook”. The retention of views and outlooks is not retained as a “right”. There are no significant views from the Centennial Apartments over the Montefiore site. Given that the proposal is consistent with local and State Government planning and strategic objectives, and with the desired future character of the site, it is reasonable that the outlook from 90-98 King Street be removed by the now proposed Envelope E, in the provision of a residential aged care facility.
The gross overdevelopment of the site.	This statement is somewhat contradictory to the comments put forward in the Director City Planning Report CP85/10. Notwithstanding this, as detailed above and at Section 2.1 of the PPR, utilising the bonuses available to the proposal under SEPP HSDP, the development does not exceed the FSR for the 2C zone, and only exceeds the FSR for the 2B zone by 0.1:1. This equates to an exceedence of 1,711m ² across the site. In respect to the height of the proposal, to meet both the bonus FSR provisions, and to fit within the height controls would unreasonably increase the site coverage of the development and increase building lengths and massing. This has the potential to generate significant design issues, particularly at the site's interface with other land uses. This would also result in a highly inefficient and ineffective development that would not cater for the functional and operational needs of aged and/or disabled persons.
Sydney Water	
The 250mm drinking water main on the south side of King street has sufficient capacity to service the proposed development	Noted.
The proposed development provides a wastewater loading that exceeds the recommended maximum loading in the Sewerage Code of Australia (Sydney Water Edition WSA 02-2002)	Noted. See below.
Upsizing of the existing wastewater main from 225mm to 300mm is required from Point A to Point B shown in the diagram below.	As discussed at Section 2.8 of the PPR, Sydney Water's submission contradicts their Notice of Requirements (NOR) for the Section 73 Subdivision / Developer Compliance Certificate, dated 8 July 2010. The NOR states that the 225mm main located within the property boundary is available for connection. Discussions held between KR Stubbs and Sydney Water have confirmed that the NOR takes precedence over any subsequent submissions, or additional requirements. As such, the existing 225mm wastewater main is adequate to accommodate the proposed development. A copy of the NOR, correspondence between KR Stubbs and Sydney Water, and an explanatory statement from CP Consulting Group Pty Ltd are located at Appendix I .
Sydney Water will further assess the impact of individual developments when the proponent applies for a Section 73 Certificate	Noted.
The proponent must fund any adjustment needed to Sydney Water infrastructure as a result of any development. The proponent should engage a Water Servicing Coordinator to get a Section 73 Certificate and manage the servicing aspects of the development.	Noted. This funding / expenditure will only be relevant to sections of works as negotiated with / advised by Sydney Water, refer to Appendix I .

Transport NSW	
Transport NSW supports the positive initiatives put forward in the EIA for increased mode share to transport including the promotion of car sharing and a commitment to the provision of end of trip facilities for cyclists.	Noted.
The EA must demonstrate the provision of sufficient on-site car parking for the proposal having regard to local planning controls and RTA guidelines (Note: the Department supports reduced car parking rates in areas well-served by public transport)	<p>Halcrow's exhibited Traffic Report provided a comprehensive 'demand based' parking assessment that used site specific data (namely a July 2009 Staff Travel Questionnaire Survey) to calculate an appropriate level of parking for the development. This methodology was primarily undertaken to determine the existing demand for the various travel modes used to access the site. The survey was also used to determine the level of current use of both on site and off parking by Montefiore.</p> <p>Community consultation has highlighted the lack of available on street parking as a key issue and the perceived contribution of the existing Montefiore Home to this community issue. It has been noted that on street parking availability is affected by a number of surrounding uses, including the TAFE, UNSW, Randwick Racecourse, not just Montefiore. However, in recognition of the complexity of this particular site in terms of the demand for on-street parking, the Home undertook this additional study to confirm what a sufficient on-site provision would be based on actual demand rather than theoretical numbers.</p> <p>The Travel Survey Questionnaire collected data on the use of public transport, carpooling, and cycling as well, and determined the parking numbers in consideration of all forms of transport used by staff and visitors. A Green Travel Plan is also included in the proposal.</p> <p>It is Halcrow's opinion that the proposed 217 parking spaces achieve an appropriate balance with regard to local planning controls, RTA guidelines, and the maintenance of appropriate levels of availability of on-street parking for neighbouring properties and other uses in the area.</p>
Provide an assessment of the implications of the proposed development for non-car travel modes (including public transport, walking and cycling) potential for implementing a sustainable travel plan for staff and visitors and provision of facilities to increase non-car mode travel.	<p>As stated at Section 3.4 of Halcrow's exhibited Traffic Report, the development and implementation of a Green Travel Plan would be part of the proposed development. It is proposed that a Green Travel plan be prepared prior to the operation of any new development on the Montefiore site. The main objective of the Green Travel Plan is to implement measures which encourage and enable a reduction in the percentage of private motor vehicle trips made to and from the site in favour of public transport, walking and cycling transport modes.</p> <p>A Green Travel Plan for the site would include measures to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ increase awareness and access to public transport services, ■ promote car sharing arrangement; and ■ discourage on street parking arrangements. <p>In tandem with the Green Travel Plan, the proposed parking allocation is based on demand as discussed above, to achieve a balanced outcome for the development, the surrounding community</p>

	and broader transport planning principles.
The EA and Traffic Assessment Report does not consider the targets and initiatives of the Metropolitan Transport Plan – Connecting the City of Cities (MTP), the NSW State Plan 2010 and the draft East Subregional Strategy, as per the recommendations in the DGRs.	The proposal is consistent with the targets and initiatives of the Metropolitan Transport Plan, NSW State Plan and the draft East Subregional Strategy. This is described in detail at Section 2.4 of the PPR and at Appendix E .
TNSW recommends car parking provisions to a maximum of 174 spaces in accordance with the rates recommended in Randwick City Council's Development Control Plan – Parking (1998). Opportunities to reduce this provision should be considered in relation to the preparation of a Workplace Travel Plan (WTP)	<p>As stated above, the previously-proposed provision of 217 parking spaces was based on a comprehensive site specific demand assessment, taking into account on-site patterns of use including staff shifts and visitation, but also in consideration of concerns voiced by neighbouring residents regarding the availability of on-street parking.</p> <p>We support TNSW's minimalist approach to car parking, and have committed to preparing a Workplace (Green) Travel Plan to encourage the use of the bus options in the area.</p> <p>This overall strategy is intended to maintain or increase the current utilisation of public transport, while reducing the use of on-street parking.</p> <p>As stated above, it is Halcrow's opinion that the proposed 217 parking spaces for the revised scheme achieves the appropriate balance with regard to local planning controls, RTA guidelines, and the maintenance of appropriate levels of availability of on-street parking for neighbouring properties and other uses in the area.</p>
The proponent should justify parking rates and other measures to encourage public transport use against achieving a 28% mode share to public transport, in accordance with the State Plan target.	<p>As stated above, justification of the proposed parking rates has been provided by the comprehensive site specific demand assessment.</p> <p>The objective of the Workplace (Green) Travel Plan would be to achieve a further 8% increase of mode share to public transport by 2016 in accordance with the State Plan target.</p> <p>Measures to achieve the increase of non private vehicle modes of travel to and from the site would include. This would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ reducing on-site parking supply relative to existing demand; ■ car share / car pooling system; ■ on site bicycle facilities; ■ Travel Plan information; distribution systems; and ■ fleet cars.
TNSW requests that Travel Demand Management measures be included as part of the WTP for staff.	The development and implementation of a Green Travel Plan forms part of the proposed transport for the future development of the site.

	The overarching principles of the Green Travel Plan are discussed above. The development of the Green Travel Plan will make use of the information and guidelines available from TNSW and RTA.
TNSW supports the proponent's commitment to providing end of trip facilities for cyclists and pedestrians. TNS requests that bicycle parking for staff should be prioritised in convenient locations that are well lit, sheltered and secure. Provision should also be made for visitor bicycle parking at grade and located close to major entrances in well lit and secure locations.	The end of trip facilities for the development will be augmented within Building A where existing shower, locker and bike parking facilities are located. It is felt that a singular consolidated position of the facilities (particularly for staff) will better promote alternative travel options and allow for ease of showering and changing close to the central workplaces on the site.
RTA	
The layout of the proposed car parking areas associated with the subject development (including driveways, grades, turn paths, sight distance requirements, aisle widths, aisle lengths and parking bay dimensions) should be in accordance with AS 2890.1 – 2004	Noted. The proposed development has been designed in accordance with AS 2890.1 - 2004. The Final Statement of Commitments has been revised to adopt this.
The developer shall be responsible for all public utility adjustments / relocation works, necessitated by the above work and as required by the various public utility authorities and / or their agents.	Noted.
All works / regulatory signposting associated with the proposed development are to be at no cost to the RTA.	Noted. All works / regulatory signposting will be at the applicant's cost.
State Transit NSW	
The development should have in place suitable mitigation measures against noise and light. An appropriate guide is the Planning NSW's interim guidelines for "Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads"	As noted by State Transit in their submissions, this issue will be dealt with at the detailed design phase for Envelope E and further at its Construction Certificate stage. Additionally, there is no expected light spill issue from the bus depot into / onto the Montefiore site given the distance from the bus depot and the residential development between the two sites. Acoustic treatment of the facade of Envelope E and other potentially affected Buildings on the site will be considered at the appropriate stage of development.
The construction work should not have an impact on STA School Services and Special running buses operating past the King Street frontage. The STA will require to be contacted by the proponent to discuss the demolition and construction management plan for stages 1 to 3. This involvement is to ensure that bus services are not adversely impacted.	A Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be prepared prior to issue of relevant Construction Certificates and as appropriate, comments on the Draft CTMP will be sought from the STA. Section 5 of the Halcrow report sets out the general principles that would be incorporated in the CTMP, including how the proximity of the site to the Bus Depot would be managed.

Issues Raised by the Community / Public Submissions	Proponent Response
Traffic and Parking	
Proposed parking provisions are inadequate, given the increased scale of the development.	As detailed in the exhibited Concept Plan and Project Application, the 217 parking spaces proposed under the Concept Plan exceeds the number of parking spaces required for the development under Council's Parking DCP (174 spaces). Similarly, based on the existing travel patterns of staff, the provision of 217 spaces exceeds the 207 spaces required. If more on-site parking were to be provided, it may discourage the use of public transport, which is contrary to State and local planning objectives.
Street parking is near capacity in King Street and surrounding streets such as Dangar and Prince Streets due to visitors, staff and volunteers of Montefiore.	<p>Noted. A survey conducted by Halcrow MWT as part of the exhibited Concept Plan and Project Application confirmed that on-street parking is near, but not at, capacity in the vicinity of the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home. It was found that 80% of on-street parking spaces in King Street are occupied throughout the day. Dangar Street was 56%-73% occupied and Prince / Church Street was 70% to 98% occupied. Whilst some spaces are occupied by staff from the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home, the large majority of staff (78.2%) park on-site. A number of other land uses near the site such as the TAFE, Randwick Racecourse and commercial operations also contribute to on-street parking.</p> <p>It should be noted that a Green Transport Plan and car sharing program is also to be implemented to seek to reduce car usage as far as possible. Finally, as outlined in the exhibited Traffic and Parking Assessment, there are only 10 volunteers on site at any given time. This number is not expected to increase as a result of the proposed development.</p>
Influxes of vehicles during race meets at Randwick Racecourse, and when the TAFE and UNSW have heavy class loads reduces the ability of residents to park near their homes.	Noted.
Many existing properties do not have off-street parking, forcing residents to park a considerable distance from their homes.	Noted. Actions detailed above and in the Statement of Commitments will seek to reduce this impact.
Requirement for adequate on-site parking to ensure that staff and visitors do not seek parking off-site.	A staff travel questionnaire conducted by Halcrow MWT found that the large majority of staff (78.2%) park on-site. The provision of additional parking spaces on site will ensure that existing on-street parking figures (outlined above) are not exceeded, and may in fact be reduced. Notwithstanding this, it is acknowledged that there is capacity for additional staff to park on-site (on-site parking is at less than 80% of capacity). In order to encourage more staff to park on-site, all new staff employed on the site will be issued with swipe-cards to encourage the use of available on-site parking during the course of the day.
Local roads do not have the capacity to accommodate the additional load in terms of street parking.	Noted. The figures outlined above indicate that on-street parking is near, but not at, capacity.

Increased traffic will make the quiet, suburban area busy, noisy and congested.	<p>The proposed residential aged care use is considered to be a relatively low traffic generator. The exhibited Traffic and Parking Assessment found that the proposed development will lead to an additional 118 vehicular movements during both the morning and evening peak periods.</p> <p>The Assessment also reviewed the impact of the development on local roads. The report concluded that the intersection of King and Dangar Streets will continue to operate at a good level of service with average delays of 10 seconds in the morning and evening peak periods, which is consistent with the existing level of service.</p>
Impact of the child care centre (particularly during pick-up and drop-off times) on existing parking shortages and congestion.	The Traffic and Parking Assessment submitted with the exhibited EAR concluded that the parking spaces provided at the childcare centre would adequately accommodate the additional children proposed to be accommodated under the Concept Plan (consistent with the increase accepted and approved by Randwick Council). Notwithstanding this, the redevelopment of the childcare centre is part of (last) Stage 2 of the development and will be the subject of detailed design and separate approval under a Project or Development Application in the future.
Pick-up and drop-off facilities for the child care centre are inadequate, creating a safety risk and increased congestion.	As noted above, pick-up and drop-off facilities for the childcare centre are contained within the site, have been assessed as being adequate for the proposed increase in the number of children on the site, and are not expected to result in increased congestion or safety risks. The exhibited scheme provides for a safer access and drop off / pick-up model than existing. Indeed, the proposed configuration is a marked improvement upon what Council has recently approved for an 80-place centre, which is still reliant upon a management regime to monitor drop-off and pick-up off King Street.
Use of parking surveys and assumed parking rates to calculate parking requirements.	The use of parking surveys and assumed rates is the standard method adopted for assessing traffic flows, and is considered to be valid. Further, the RTA did not raise any concerns regarding the methodology adopted in the Traffic and Parking Assessment to calculate the parking requirements.
Traffic issues are exacerbated by the large number of trucks and buses (serving the residents) accessing the site.	'Heavy vehicle' traffic was considered as part of the exhibited Traffic and Parking Assessment. The Assessment found that there would be no additional heavy vehicles entering and exiting the site as a result of the proposed development under typical operational circumstances.
Additional traffic is caused by the bus terminal.	Traffic caused by the bus terminal is not a consideration for this application, as it will not be impacted by the proposed development. However, the impact of the proposed development on buses entering and exiting the bus terminal have been considered as part of the exhibited EAR. Potential impacts on the terminal will be mitigated through ongoing consultation, and the preparation of Construction Traffic Management Plans for each Project Application.
The development would lead to increased incidences of road rage, and more accidents due to double parking and people performing "U" turns.	The proposed on-site parking and traffic impacts have been assessed as being adequate. There is no evidence to suggest that the development will result in more accidents, double parking, "u" turns or increased incidences of road rage.
Increased traffic on Dangar Street will endanger pedestrians and people using Govett Reserve.	Govett Reserve is located at the intersection of Dangar Street and White Street, some 200 metres to the north of the Montefiore site. Furthermore, the proposed development is considered to be a

	relatively low traffic generator, and therefore would not have a significant impact on pedestrian safety.
Threat to the safety of children in the area due to increased traffic.	Refer to above. In addition, the Concept Plan proposes an improvement to the drop-off area for the Child Care, which will <i>reduce</i> the amount of traffic in Dangar Street.
The 35 self care units in Building F do not specify how many bedrooms there will be in each unit, and so the traffic impact cannot be accurately determined.	Building F (now amalgamated into a refined Envelope E) forms part of the final stage of the Concept Plan, and will not be realised for some 10 years. Building E now incorporates 36 self care units. Indicative floor plans prepared for the SEPP65 assessment show that 67 bedrooms can be accommodated. However, it is noted that the detailed design of this element is yet to be determined, and will be subject to a DA in the future. The traffic impact of this development, and an appropriate response to it, would be addressed in detail at that time. The traffic study has made appropriate development density assumptions assuming a worst-case scenario.
The traffic management plan does not address weekend and evening traffic flows.	The Traffic Impact Assessment takes into account traffic flows at both the morning and afternoon peak period. Whilst peak afternoon traffic flows for the site were assessed between 3:45pm and 4:45pm (which coincides with shift changeover times at the Montefiore site), traffic flows for surrounding streets have been based on an evening peak time of between 3pm and 7pm. In addition, the parking surveys conducted took into account parking levels throughout the day, between 7am and 8pm. The traffic and parking survey was conducted on weekdays only, as the demand for traffic and parking is greatest during the week. Generally, weekend traffic does not peak significantly like weekday traffic. Weekend traffic including family visitors tends to be spread throughout the day. Conversely, weekday traffic including visits from family tend to accord with general morning and evening peak traffic periods. Therefore, with a view to assessing peak conditions on the local road network as a whole, weekend traffic would not present the busiest traffic conditions.
Increased traffic will endanger cyclists who use Dangar Street to access Centennial Park.	The proposed development is considered to be a relatively low traffic generator, and therefore would not have a significant impact on cyclist safety. It should also be noted that busier roads are located between the Montefiore site and Centennial Park.
There is no parking allowances for staff who will be working in the restaurant or function hall and for visitors who will be using these facilities.	Whilst early schemes proposed a restaurant and a function hall on the Building D site, there is no restaurant or function hall in the current scheme. Staff working in the retail shops on the urban plaza have been taken into account when calculating the overall increase in staff numbers on site, and have been incorporated into the provisions for additional parking on the site.
Impact of construction vehicles on surrounding streets.	The impact of construction vehicles was considered as part of the Preliminary Construction Management Plan that was exhibited with the Concept Plan and Project Application. Stage 1 and subsequent stages of development will be the subject of individual Construction and Construction Traffic Management Plans which will contain measures to mitigate the impact of construction vehicles during each stage of development.

<p>It is proposed to extend the size of the centre from 60 to 80 children. The applicant's report states that the existing 8 parking spaces for 30 children are inadequate (approximately 1 per 4) yet states that the proposed 13 parking space 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 childcare places, in fact Moriah College has lodged 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 questions.</p>	<p>The DA for the Moriah College Child Care Centre was approved on 22 October 2010, whilst the EAR was on exhibition. The child care centre operates independently of Montefiore, and the operation of the child care centre is subject to the conditions of that approval.</p> <p>The Preferred Project proposes to provide a child care centre with 80 places in line with the temporary approval. In terms of parking provision, a total of 20 car parking spaces are required for a 80 place child care centre (RTA requirements). A total of 20 spaces dedicated to the use of child care centre uses have been provided (see also response to above). Therefore the Preferred Project proposal seeks to increase the total number of parking spaces provided for the existing child care centre use (in line with RTA and Council requirements) and provide these spaces on site, thereby removing the need for child care drop-off / pick-ups to occur on street. As such the Preferred Project proposal would substantially improve vehicular access and parking arrangements for the Child Care Centre. The 80-place child care centre currently provides 6 on site car parking spaces for staff with drop off and pick up of children occurring on street.</p>
<p>Doubling the size of the facility, and quadrupling the size of the childcare facility will create extra traffic from visitors, on-site staff and external staff, delivery and servicing trucks, impacting on the amenity and safety of families with young children and other residents.</p>	<p>As noted above, the recent DA to increase the size of the childcare centre on the site was lodged independently of the proposed Concept Plan and Project Application. Under this DA, Randwick Council granted approval to increase the capacity of child care centre from 60 to 80 children.</p> <p>Whilst the size of the aged care facility is doubling, the childcare centre currently caters for 80 children, and has done for some time. The Traffic and Parking Assessment prepared for the exhibited Concept Plan and Project Application was based on these assumptions. The report found that the proposed parking arrangements are capable of accommodating the proposed increases in the scale of the development without any negative impacts on the amenity or safety of local residents.</p>
<p>The provision of 13 car parking spaces at the child care centre is inadequate.</p>	<p>Refer to above. 20 spaces are provided which is ample for the child care centre's intended capacity / number of child care places.</p>
<p>General staff are not permitted to park on-site, forcing them to park on the surrounding streets.</p>	<p>Staff of the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home are permitted to park on the site. A staff travel questionnaire conducted by Halcrow MWT found that the large majority of staff (78.2%) park on site.</p>
<p>The retail space and open space facing King Street would not work as a public square due to the roundabout at this intersection, the constant traffic flow and the lack of parking</p>	<p>The public square in this location is a requirement of Council's site-specific DCP. The retail space will be setback from the street by the public plaza, with trees and landscaping providing a buffer between the street and the plaza / retail space. Being close to the street will provide amenity for customers (by providing an outlook and point of interest) and increased exposure for the tenant. It is anticipated that the retail space will be occupied by a kosher delicatessen / cafe for use by residents, visitors and the general public. As such, many people using the space will be on the site or residents of the area, and will not require parking to access the cafe.</p>
<p>King Street is a busy through street that is used by the public to avoid congestion on main roads. The proposed development will cause additional congestion during peak periods.</p>	<p>The use of King Street as a means of avoiding congestion on main roads is not a relevant consideration for the proposed Concept Plan and Project Application. The Traffic and Parking Assessment prepared for the exhibited EAR has concluded that the road network can accommodate the increased traffic flows arising out of the proposed development on the site.</p>

The proposed retail premises on site will exacerbate traffic and parking congestion.	The retail space is minimal (350m ²) and is consistent with Randwick LEP 1998. The proposed retail space will not cause additional traffic and parking congestion. It is anticipated that the space will be occupied by a kosher deli / cafe, for use by residents, visitors and the general public. As such, the retail use will not create or individually generate significant additional traffic volumes, or demand for parking.
It should be insisted that staff use on-site parking	The Traffic and Parking Assessment submitted with the exhibited EAR noted that staff have a lawful right to park on the street. Notwithstanding this, approximately 78.2% of staff currently park on-site, with the remainder parking in the surrounding streets. Swipe cards will be issued to all existing, and new members of staff, to ensure as many staff as possible use the on-site parking available.
The Montefiore application proposes only 57 additional cars for 19,370m ² of space. This is a car park ratio of approximately 1 / 380m ² . Commercial uses generally require 1/50m ² .	The proposed development is an aged care facility, and is not a commercial development. As detailed in the exhibited Concept Plan and Project Application, the 217 parking spaces proposed under the Concept Plan exceeds the number of parking spaces required for the development under Council's Parking DCP (174 spaces). Similarly, based on the existing travel patterns of staff, the provision of 217 spaces exceeds the 207 spaces required. If more on-site parking were to be provided, it may discourage the use of public transport, which is contrary to State and local planning objectives.
The primary driveway for Building F is proposed to be located in the setback to Centennial Apartments, which will create undue noise and pollution. This driveway should be moved elsewhere.	The driveway is required to ensure that access and egress to former Building F (now revised Building E), and the proposed child care centre, operates efficiently. Neither the RTA nor the Department of Planning raised the general location of this driveway as issue.
The other main vehicular entry on the western side of the site on King Street will reduce the availability of on-street parking. The main entry should be moved further up the street.	The driveway will reduce the availability of on-street parking irrespective of where it is located. The driveway is placed as a result of associated issues with the location of the future Envelope E.
The car parking calculations undertaken in the EA are contradictory, inaccurate and should be reconsidered before the application is allowed to progress.	The car parking calculations provided in the EAR are considered to be valid. Further, the RTA did not raise any concerns regarding the methodology adopted in the Traffic and Parking Assessment to calculate the parking requirements.
The safety of children and their parents will be negatively impacted by the increased commercial and retail traffic caused by Montefiore.	The propose development is an aged care facility, and does not constitute a commercial development. Notwithstanding this, as noted above, 'heavy vehicle' traffic was considered as part of the exhibited Traffic and Parking Assessment. The Assessment found that there would be no additional heavy vehicles entering and exiting the site as a result of the proposed development.
The proponent's "staff education and management strategies" to manage staff parking arrangements sound impressive, but they are not working.	Noted. This is an operational matter, and is not directly relevant to the assessment of this application.
As a result of increased on-street parking, the council will most likely place timed parking around all the streets that are currently free. This would impact badly on the sense of community.	How Council chooses to address on-street parking is not a matter of consideration for this proposal. If Council were to impose timed parking in the vicinity of the site, residents would be provided with parking permits, enabling them to park on the street (as priority parkers), and so minimising any impact on a sense of community.

Boom gates should be installed to cope with peak vehicular entry demand as boom gates are able to open more quickly (than the existing gates).	The existing security arrangements are considered appropriate given the nature of the development, and the need to ensure that residents do not leave the site unattended.
Since the completion of the present Montefiore development, Govett Lane has become a “rat run” for Montefiore delivery trucks, vans and employee cars seeking to avoid the congestion caused in King Street. Further, because of the wall of buildings along Govett Lane, traffic noise using this lane is amplified.	Noted. This is an operational matter, and is not a relevant to the assessment of this application.
Commercial vehicles should not use driveways adjacent to residential neighbours as their movements are numerous and early in the morning.	As noted above, there will be no increase in ‘heavy vehicle’ traffic as a result of the proposed development.
Density	
The proposed FSRs of 1.53:1 in the 2B zone and 1.49:1 in the 2C zone exceeds the controls, even allowing for the 0.5:1 bonus for this type of development.	<p>It is acknowledged that the proposed development exceeds Council’s FSR controls for both the 2B and 2C zones noting that these FSRs do not cater for concessions in the calculation of GFA under the HSDP SEPP. However, as detailed in Section 2.1 of the PPR, utilising the bonuses available to the proposal under SEPP HSDP, the development does not exceed the FSR for the 2C zone, and only exceeds the FSR for the 2B zone by 0.1:1. This equates to an exceedence of 1,711m² across the site. This variation is minimal, and is considered acceptable given the nature of the proposed use, and the absence of any adverse impacts.</p> <p>If the density of the development was reduced to strictly comply with Council’s LEP without relevant consideration of the provision of concessions available to key social infrastructure such as this under the HSDP SEPP, the ability of the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home to provide aged care accommodation would be inhibited, representing a reduction of 272 beds of hostel-type care or 272 beds of dementia care. Given the concerns associated with Australia’s ageing population, and the lack of adequate aged care in existing communities, the proposal represents an important opportunity to ensure aged care accommodation for the future, in a site and locality that is capable of ensuring a high level of ageing in place.</p>
Even allowing for the 0.5:1 bonus for this type of development, the proposed FSR of 1.43:1 exceeds the 1.15:1 allowed in the 2B zone.	<p>Refer to above. The HSDP SEPP provides greater concessions and flexibility to Seniors Housing projects than just the 0.5:1 FSR bonus. This includes the flexible calculation of GFA, which excludes floor area ordinarily included in regular residential development.</p> <p>As detailed in Section 2.1 of the PPR, utilising the bonuses available to the proposal under SEPP HSDP, the development does not exceed the FSR for the 2C zone, and only exceeds the FSR for the 2B zone by 0.1:1. This equates to an exceedence of 1,711m² across the site. This variation is minimal, and is considered acceptable given the nature of the proposed use, and the absence of any adverse impacts.</p>
The GFA of 39,000m ² is unsupportable on a site this size, this represents a breach of over 8,000m ² or 40% above the existing planning codes. The 8,000m ² breach is calculated after a bonus of 0.5:1 for Aged Care is allowed for.	It is acknowledged that the proposed FSR and GFA exceed Council’s controls. However, as detailed above and at Section 2.1 of the PPR, utilising the bonuses available to the proposal under SEPP HSDP, the development does not exceed the FSR for the 2C zone, and only exceeds the FSR for the 2B zone by 0.1:1. The various figures raised in the public submissions have not taken into

	<p>account both the GFA concessions and FSR bonus available to aged care facilities under the HSDP SEPP.</p> <p>To not apply the provisions available to a development of this type would be foregoing the opportunity for 272 Hostel-type care beds or 272 dementia beds. In the absence of adverse environmental impacts, the proposal is considered acceptable.</p>
The EAR 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 FSR of 2.3:1. Compared with a FSR of 0.9:1 that allows for normal homes in zone 2C, an FSR of 2.3:1 would be 250% over than limit.	It is acknowledged that there was a typographical error in the exhibited EAR. This has now been rectified, and the correct figures are outlined above and in Section 2.1 of the PPR, noting that a change to scheme has now also been proposed.
The excess is equivalent to 160 x 1 bedroom (50m ²) apartments or 80 x 2 bedroom (100m ²) apartments which reflects the enormity of the departure.	As detailed above, the recalculation of the FSR means that the proposal only exceeds the permissible GFA by 1,711m ² across the site. The excess is the equivalent of only 31 x 1 bedroom (50m ²) apartments or 16 x 2 bedroom (100m ²) apartments (applying a 90% efficiency rate), if this measure were to be considered relevant or be used
The density is excessive and will have a very significant and adverse effect.	<p>The density of the development is considered acceptable in that it meets the necessary controls with respect to setbacks and solar access. As noted above, the proposed density is necessary to maximise the provision of aged care accommodation on the site. Given the concerns associated with Australia's ageing population, and the lack of adequate health care in existing communities, the proposal represents an important opportunity to secure aged care accommodation for the future. As demonstrated in the exhibited EAR and the responses to the submissions made, the proposal will not have any significant adverse impacts on the surrounding locality.</p> <p>By supporting ageing in place, and by enabling improved economic use of land and cost efficiencies through the concentration of aged care facilities on a single site, the proposed bulk and scale will deliver longer term and ongoing benefits to the broader community as well as residents of the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home.</p>
The proposal is an overdevelopment of the site.	Refer to above.
The surrounding area comprises mainly single storey houses with some two and three storey walk up residential developments. The size and scale of the development is out of character with the domestic scale of the area.	There is no predominant character in the area; it has a combination of residential and non-residential land uses. Whilst the immediate surrounds are typified by low-medium density residential development, and it is acknowledged that the development is in part denser than surrounding land uses, the design of the proposal seeks to minimise any impacts on the existing character of the area by reducing the apparent scale of the development when viewed from the street. The upper setback of proposed Envelope E allows for a transition of building heights across King Street. Similarly, the proposed roof level at the Dangar Street frontage is compatible with the level of the roofs of existing medium density / townhouse developments to the east of Dangar Street. As detailed in the exhibited EAR, the proposed scale of the development does not give rise to any significant or adverse amenity impacts, particularly with respect to overshadowing and

	relevant standards for solar access.
The development will overwhelm King and Dangar Streets.	As noted above, consideration has been given to the design of the development and the gradation of heights across the site to ensure that it will not 'overwhelm' King and Dangar Streets. In addition to the above, the topography of the site enables the bulk and height of the development to be concentrated in the centre of the site, while minimising the apparent height and bulk at street frontages. The stepping back of the upper levels further minimises the apparent bulk and height at street frontages. Further, the proposed landscaping within the King Street setback will soften the appearance of the proposed Envelope E, further minimising visual impact.
If approved, the development will create a precedent for high density developments in medium density areas.	'Non-Compliance' precedents are not considered as part of a planning assessment as each proposal should be considered on its relative merits. Considering that any future DA will be assessed by the Council, it is unlikely that the approval of the proposed height and FSR (which is specific to the subject site), will set any undesirable precedent. Further, it must be remembered that as an aged care facility height and density concessions are able to be applied in this instance.
Given the extent of the breaches, the demand for aged care accommodation is not a satisfactory justification for the deviation from planning controls.	As noted above, the extent of the proposed variations is relatively minor given the scale of the development and the latitude given to aged care facilities of this type. It is entirely reasonable to apply controls especially formulated to ensure appropriate densities can be realised to provide for future demand. Providing housing for Australia's ageing population is a significant concern for planners and policy makers. The land in the locality in which the site is located has been specifically identified by the Department of Planning's draft East Subregional Strategy as suitable for the type of seniors housing proposed. The site will therefore satisfy subregional planning objectives in this regard, while also serving State Government objectives for "ageing in place" and promoting affordable housing through general increases in housing supply. The provision of aged care housing on the site will meet expected increases in demand for such housing that will result from changes in demography, as anticipated by Department of Planning demographic projections.
It appears as though the main purpose of this massive proposal is to increase commercial viability of the site.	Refer to above. The proposal is in response to the significant and real need for aged care accommodation and making best and most efficient use of land in existing and established areas where ageing in place should be promoted.
There are no satisfactory options for siting and layout of the Envelope Envelopes.	The proposal is considered the most appropriate outcome for the site given the permissible FSR and the operational requirements of the aged care facility. If the height of the proposed buildings were reduced, it would unreasonably increase the site coverage of the development and lead to increases in building lengths and massing.
The applicant has not conducted an analysis that demonstrates the impact between a compliant development and that proposed.	Refer to above.
The assessment only analyses 2 of the 6 questions contained in the Planning Principles for Height, Bulk and Scale.	Noted. An assessment of the proposed development against all 6 questions contained in the Planning Principles for Height, Bulk and Scale is provided at Section 2.2 of the PPR.

Visual Impact and View Loss	
The views from units in the Centennial Apartments building will be significantly reduced as the only windows from the majority of apartments face east.	As described in the EAR, what can be seen from the Centennial Apartments cannot be described as a “view”, rather it is considered to be an “outlook”. The retention of views and outlooks is not retained as a “right”. There are no significant views from the Centennial Apartments over the Montefiore site. Given that the proposal is consistent with local and State Government planning and strategic objectives, and with the desired future character of the site, it is reasonable that the outlook from 90-98 King Street be removed by the refined and now relocated Envelope E (which has replaced Envelope F), in the provision of a residential aged care facility. The rationale for removing this view is further enhanced by the fact that refined Envelope E now more substantially adequately preserves solar access and visual privacy to the Centennial Apartments. Detailed future design of this envelope and approval will be subject of a future DA to Council. Design detail will be resolved in the final stage of the redevelopment, some ten years from now.
The majority of apartments in the Centennial Apartments have their primary and, in the majority of cases, their sole outlook to the east over open space and landscaping. This outlook will be obstructed by a 6-storey building, which is higher than the apartment building.	Refer to above. The visual impact of refined Envelope E will be mitigated by the generous and required setback provided, as well as other privacy measures to be implemented at Project Application or DA stage including the offsetting of windows, landscaping and screening.
The western setback is proposed as a children’s play area and provides no opportunity for meaningful landscaping.	The detailed design of the childcare centre, as well as the proposed children’s play area and landscaping treatment, will be the subject of detailed design as part of the Project Application or DA for this stage of the development, some ten years from now. A qualified Landscape Architect is and will be involved in the design and landscaping of the outdoor spaces to ensure that meaningful landscaping is provided.
The length of the 6-storey building facing Centennial Apartments is 60m, which extends beyond two out of the three apartment buildings facing east. This is excessively bulky and creates a visual screen.	<p>Noted. The building is at this stage only an envelope for a future building. As outlined in the exhibited EAR, the scale and density of the development is consistent with the desired future character of the site and is appropriate given the need for aged care accommodation. As noted above, measures have been undertaken to ensure that the proposed development does not have a negative impact on the Centennial Apartments, particularly with respect to overshadowing and privacy. The setback of redesigned Envelope E exceeds Council’s required setback controls, and the SEPP 65 rules-of-thumb, and other privacy measures will be implemented at Project Application stage to further off-set any impacts including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ provision of a 3m wide planted buffer zone between the western boundary and the relocated child care centre; ■ the addition of a ‘green roof’ to the childcare centre, providing for an increased landscape screen edge to the high care and self care building above the childcare centre and reduced perception of a hard edge; ■ replacing the balconies on the high care floors to generously proportioned non-accessible planter boxes; ■ providing balustrades that are designed to limit views down, but still allow for horizontal views and light penetration for the proposed building; and

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ windows that are screened from the western sun. The screens are designed to limit perpendicular views out and facilitate the southern and northern outlook.
The proposed development will have a negative visual impact.	The proposed Envelopes appropriately respond to the surrounding built form context and take advantage of site topography that allows the provision of greater bulk and scale away from street frontages, so as to minimise visual impacts to surrounding streetscapes. In addition, as detailed in the exhibited Landscape Plans and Landscape Report, the site will be landscaped so as to soften the appearance of the development when viewed from the street.
Views across the Montefiore site towards the City and Centennial Park will be lost.	A visual impact analysis is provided at Section 2.3 of the PPR and Appendix D . The analysis has found that there will be limited view loss as a result of the proposed development, with view impacts limited to one location at RL56.6 at 125 King Street. However, it is noted that view loss is limited to lower level skyline buildings, with views to iconic buildings such as the Centre Point Tower maintained. Views towards Centennial Park will not be affected by the proposal.
The development will block views and will create visual pollution.	As noted above, there are no significant views across the Montefiore site from dwellings on King Dangar or Church Streets.
The photomontages are flawed and misleading. New photomontages should be provided that accurately reflects the height of the proposed new buildings in relation to adjoining residential dwellings.	The exhibited and revised photomontages are indicative only, and are an artists' impression of the proposed development. They are not intended to be a truly accurate reflection of the built form.
There is inadequate view analysis to and from the site. The artists' impressions / contextual studies included in the application appear inaccurate in terms of the scale of the buildings and do not show the relationship of the building to the residential buildings which dominate surrounding streets.	<p>Whilst it is noted that the photomontages are only artists' impression of the proposed development, they have been revised to improve their accuracy in terms of scale, and relationship with other buildings.</p> <p>A detailed view analysis has been prepared by Jackson Teece (refer to Section 2.3 of the PPR and Appendix C). The analysis has found that there will be limited view loss as a result of the proposed development, with view impacts limited to one location at RL56.6 at 125 King Street. However, it is noted that view loss is limited to lower level skyline buildings, with views to iconic buildings such as the Centre Point Tower maintained.</p>
There is no photomontage that shows the relationship of the proposed new 6 storey building (Building F) with the adjoining Centennial apartments.	Noted. Given the refinement of Envelope E, a new photomontage has been prepared to address the relationship and transition between The Centennial and Envelope E when viewed from King Street. This is located at Appendix B .
The proposed finishes contain many large glass and metallic surfaces. Facing federation freestanding and semi-detached homes, the structures do not compliment the surrounding areas, they clash abrasively with them.	There is no consistency in nature of surrounding developments, with a combination of heritage houses, walk-up apartment blocks and modern townhouses as well as non-residential land uses. The proposed materials and finishes are consistent with existing development on the site, and the neighbouring Centennial Apartments and Pindare Apartments.
Proposed Building D should not have a profile more obtrusive than existing Building B. A sudden doubling of Building D as against Building B would be somewhat jarring.	The difference in height between existing Building B and proposed Building D will be mitigated by the separation between the two buildings. The appearance of the development from the street will be softened by landscaping.

Overshadowing	
The proposed development has a significant impact on overshadowing and would remove all (or close to all) direct sunlight to Level 1 of Building 2 of the Centennial Apartments, and reduce the sunlight to all other apartments in that building.	As indicated by the revised shadow diagrams at Appendix B , proposed Envelope E would only impact on Centennial Apartments between 9am and 9:11am on June 21. As a result, the Centennial Apartments will receive well above two hours, and just under three hours, of direct solar access. The level of solar access provided to these apartments meets the requirements of the Residential Flat Design Code and its rules-of-thumb.
Units in the Centennial Apartments will receive less than 3 hours of solar access per day.	As noted above, the revised shadow diagrams show that, whilst solar access would be affected between 9am and 9:11am, residents still have solar access from that time onwards, providing over 3 hours of sunlight on the June solstice.
The shadow diagrams proposed are not a true reflection of the current and proposed solar access.	The shadow diagrams have been prepared using computer modelling by a qualified and registered consultant. The use of computer modelling is ordinary practice, and is accepted as an accurate technique for modelling solar access. As such, the shadow diagrams are considered an accurate reflection of solar access for both existing and proposed development on the site.
The use of private open space along the eastern boundary of the Centennial Apartments will be inhibited by overshadowing.	As detailed above, and on the shadow diagrams, whilst the proposed Envelope E will overshadow the private open space along the eastern boundary of the Centennial Apartments at 9am on 21 June, by 12 noon, the eastern boundary of the Centennial Apartments will be overshadowed by itself, not the proposed Envelope E. Similarly, Envelope E will also overshadow the setback at 9am on the 21 December, September and March, by 12 noon it will be in full sunlight. This is not considered significant enough to impact on the use of these spaces.
Shadow diagrams provided in the EA do not consider summer and winter solstice and only include one morning drawing at 9am on the 21 st March.	<p>A full set of shadow diagrams was exhibited with the EAR demonstrating overshadowing impacts on the 21st March, 21st June and the 21st December in the morning, midday and afternoon.</p> <p>The revised shadow diagrams have been provided for the 21st March, 21st June and the 21st December in the morning, midday and afternoon, as well as the 21st September.</p>
Higher units will be impacted substantially, albeit to a lesser degree, but is estimated that there would be a net reduction of at least 50% in sunlight for at least another 15 units in the complex again resulting in substantially less than 3 hours of sunlight per day.	Refer to above, the shadow diagrams demonstrate that adequate solar access will be maintained to all units in the Centennial Apartments.
Solar access calculations were based on the assumption that the Centennial Apartments run from east to west, and achieve afternoon sunlight. Units in Building 2 of Centennial Apartments do not have solar access from the west in the afternoon as a circulation corridor flanks the building on this side.	The shadow diagrams demonstrate that irrespective of the methodology adopted, or the design of the Centennial apartments, the proposal does not preclude the eastern windows from receiving adequate. The revised Envelope E will ensure that the Centennial Apartments will receive well above two hours, and just under three hours, of direct solar access.
Sunlight to the ground and first floor units on the eastern side of the Centennial complex is achieved between 7 and 9am, yet shadow diagrams are only	The elevation study demonstrates that the proposed Envelope E would only impact on ground floor apartments of the Centennial between 9am and 9:11am on June 21. Whilst parts of the Centennial Apartments are overshadowed by itself, the proposal cannot rectify the design

provided for 9am onwards.	inefficiencies of the Centennial Apartments, and should not be inhibited by them.
Privacy	
The privacy of units in the Centennial Apartment building will be significantly reduced. The only windows to units in the building (excluding the corner units) face east, towards Building F.	<p>There is a separation of 22.5m between Envelope E and Centennial Apartments to the west. This separation distance complies with the relevant controls, and will mitigate any potential privacy impacts. A number of additional mitigation measures are proposed to eliminate privacy concerns, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ provision of a 3m wide planted buffer zone between the western boundary and the relocated child care centre; ▪ the addition of a 'green roof' to the childcare centre, providing for an increased landscape screen edge to the high care and self care building above the childcare centre and reduced perception of a hard edge; ▪ replacing the balconies on the high care floors to generously proportioned non-accessible planter boxes; ▪ providing balustrades that are designed to limit views down, but still allow for horizontal views and light penetration for the proposed building; and ▪ windows that are screened from the western sun. The screens are designed to limit perpendicular views out and facilitate the southern and northern outlook.
Building D has east facing terraces at Levels 4, 5 and 6 which overlook the private open spaces of properties on Dangar Street.	Building D has a proposed height of 13.5m, presenting as 4 storeys to Dangar Street. The separations distances provided between Building D and dwellings to the east of Dangar Street is 33m, the distance between Building D and Envelope E and residences on the southern side of King Street is 35m. It is considered that these separation distances will adequately mitigate the overlooking of private open spaces.
Height	
The height of the proposed Buildings D, E and F is excessive and out of character with the area.	<p>The surrounding locality is a low-medium density area, and whilst it is acknowledged that the development is of a greater scale than surrounding developments, it is not considered excessive.</p> <p>As detailed in the exhibited EAR report, the design of the proposed development seeks to minimise any impacts on the existing character of the area by reducing the apparent scale of the development when viewed from the street. The upper setback of proposed Envelope E allows for a transition of building heights across King Street. The proposed roof level at the Dangar Street frontage is compatible with the level of the roofs of existing medium density / townhouse developments to the east of Dangar Street. Similarly, the apparent height of refined Envelope E is reduced by the upper floor setback, presenting as a four storey building to King Street. Finally, as detailed in the EAR, the proposed scale of the development does not give rise to any adverse amenity impacts.</p>
The height of Building F is 10.7m higher than permitted in the Residential 2c	It is acknowledged that the revised Envelope E exceed Council's height controls, however, whilst

zone, and is 9.24m higher than the Centennial Apartments.	<p>FSR bonuses are offered under SEPP HSDP, there is no concurrent height bonus provided to cater for the additional FSR that is able to be provided for aged care developments. To meet both the bonus FSR provisions, and to fit within the height controls would unreasonably increase the site coverage of the development, leading to increased building lengths and building massing. This has the potential to generate significant design issues, particularly at the site's interface with other land uses.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, Council's controls are not strictly application to the proposed development. However the development is still consistent with the MUHDCP and RFDC codes with respect to setbacks, building separation, solar access, privacy and landscaping and so is considered acceptable.</p> <p>The Site Compatibility Certificate issued by the Department of Planning for the development scheme acknowledged that the development is suitable for the site given the context, and the need for aged care facilities.</p>
The setback of Building F should be increased to accommodate the height and bulk of the building.	There is a separation of 22.5m between Envelope E and Centennial Apartments to the west. This separation distance exceeds with the relevant controls, and will help reduce the apparent scale of the building. Similarly, the upper levels of Building E have been setback to reduce the apparent height of the building when viewed from ground level.
Some of the RLs are omitted, resulting in the colour coding to be inaccurate.	Noted. We believe we have provided sufficient information, particularly with new scaled large-sized plans and elevations, for the DoP to undertake their assessment of the scheme. We note that the DoP has not requested additional information in this regard.
The performance requirements of existing setbacks are not met as a result of the proposed substantial increase in height above code adjacent to the boundary setbacks.	The proposed development does not encroach upon the required setbacks along any of its boundaries, and sets Level 6, which exceeds the height limit, back so that it is not visible from the street. Therefore these requirements are met.
The application does not adequately provide height studies that show how the development relates to the existing buildings surrounding the site.	Several height maps and site sections are provided of both the proposed and existing development as part of the EAR. Sufficient graphic material has been prepared in response to the DGRs and accepted norms to allow for a satisfactory assessment to be undertaken.
Planning Process	
Montefiore knew that the local residents were objecting to the proposal, so by bypassed local council and took it to the State Government.	<p>Since the 'mediation' meeting in March 2009, Montefiore modified the proposed design and increased the level of detail of the information provided in the submission in response to the community's, and Randwick Council's concerns. In early September 2009, Montefiore was near to lodging a revised submission with Randwick Council when they advised that the changes Montefiore had made were substantial enough for Council to be unable to accept it as a revised submission. Council advised Montefiore to withdraw and resubmit a new application.</p> <p>However, changes made to the Capital Investment Value (CIV) thresholds of the Major Development SEPP in July 2009 mandated that residential, commercial or retail projects with a CIV of \$100 million or more be assessed under Part 3A of the EP&A Act. The proposed</p>

	<p>development has a CIV of almost \$137 million and so is classified as a Major Development. Under the revised thresholds, the only available option was Part 3A.</p> <p>This is a legitimate approval pathway, and was not pursued in an attempt to 'bypass' local council. The Part 3A process still provides Council, as well as the general public, with ample opportunity to comment and be engaged on the proposed development.</p>
In early 2009, Montefiore lodged a DA with Randwick Council, however due to considerable opposition from local residents, this DA was withdrawn from Council.	Refer to above.
What is proposed to be built in the near or medium term is considerably less than \$100m.	It is Departmental policy that Concept Plans (even if they will not be realised in the near future) with a CIV of \$100 million or more are assessed by the Department of Planning under Part 3A of the EP&A Act. The implementation of the overall proposal will indeed be in stages which are less than \$100 million, and thus, Randwick Council will be the consent authority for the Stage 2 Project Application.
The consultation process has been unsuccessful in that the applicant has chosen not to take on board comments made by local residents during the consultation process.	Extensive consultation has been undertaken with local residents during the design process. The concerns of stakeholders have been considered and acted upon as relevant and reasonable.
The proposed development should be re-notified.	The proposed development has already been exhibited for a period of 62 days. This document serves to address the issues raised in the submissions.
Amenity	
The development would reduce the amenity of adjoining residents of the Centennial Apartments as well as surrounding local residents.	The environmental assessment conducted as part of the exhibited Concept Plan and Project Application assessed the amenity of residents in both the Centennial Apartments and the locality generally. The EAR concluded that the proposed development will not have any adverse amenity impacts on the community, particularly with respect to solar access, privacy and built form character.
The construction of process will take a significant amount of time, and the area will be consumed by builders, noise, dust and other disruptions.	The Preliminary Construction Management Plan will be implemented, refined and expanded upon appointment of contractors. The detailed CMP will ensure no adverse impacts in terms of acoustic amenity, air quality, pedestrian access and traffic during the construction process. Conditions of approval will ensure suitable construction methods and standards.
The proposed development will have a detrimental impact on the neighbourhood.	Refer to above.
There will be increased rubbish as a result of the development.	Waste generated during both the construction and operation phases of the development will be managed in accordance with existing and proposed waste management procedures. These will ordinarily be signed-off by Council or the DoP.

<p>The proposed development will have an adverse impact, not only on the immediate and surrounding properties, but also those in surrounding streets due to parking, traffic and pedestrian safety.</p>	<p>As noted above, there are not expected to be any adverse amenity impacts as a result of the proposed development. The Traffic and Parking Assessment conducted as part of the exhibited Concept Plan and Project Application found that the impact on surrounding streets would be minimal, with surrounding intersections continuing to operate at an acceptable level of service.</p>
<p>Residents facing Montefiore in King and Dangar Streets and those living in the Centennial Apartments complex would be facing high-rise buildings, leading to a loss of privacy and sunlight.</p>	<p>As noted above, and demonstrated in the exhibited EAR, the proposed development has been designed to minimise any impacts on the existing character of the area by reducing the apparent scale of the development when viewed from the street. The upper setback of proposed Envelope E allows for a transition of building heights across King Street. The proposed roof level at the Dangar Street frontage is compatible with the level of the roofs of existing medium density / townhouse developments to the east of Dangar Street.</p> <p>The proposed scale of the development does not give rise to any adverse amenity impacts, with solar access maintained to all surrounding buildings. Similarly, the provision of adequate setbacks will not reduce privacy to adjoining dwellings.</p> <p>Revised Envelope E will improve the outlook for residents of the Centennial. Greater setbacks, combined with a green landscaped buffer, green roof and planted balconies will enhance the appearance of the building, providing a pleasant, landscaped outlook.</p>
<p>If plant equipment is proposed to be located on the roof of the buildings, it will impact on local residents.</p>	<p>In accordance with the revised Statement of Commitments at Section 4 of the PPR, the provision of any mechanical equipment on the roofs of buildings will be subject to the applicable noise standards. As a Statement of Commitment, the Department of Planning will condition and enforce adherence with the standards.</p>
<p>The issues faced by Building F will be the same as their patients will have with the Centennial Apartments.</p>	<p>The indicative design of the self care apartments provided at Appendix F indicates that the proposal is able to comply with the requirements of SEPP 65. The detailed design of these dwellings will ensure that the amenity of residents is maintained. Amenity will be ensured through a high standard of internal design, and by enforcing the requirements of SEPP 65 with respect to solar access and cross ventilation, as well as high quality areas of active/passive recreation space within the development itself.</p>
<p>Building F will accommodate aged people who are house bound and seek visual interest. The single aspect apartments in Building F confirm their lack of internal amenity in terms of solar access and ventilation.</p>	<p>Refer to above.</p>
<p>There is poor amenity within the development due to a lack of spatial separation, particularly compared with the existing layout and outlook from buildings.</p>	<p>The principles of the existing aged care facility have been maintained in the proposed development, with the corners of the buildings utilised for group functions with outlook to the surrounding environment. Similarly, solar access is provided to all areas through the use of narrow floor plates with opportunities for natural ventilation available to all rooms</p>

Loss of Open Space and Environmental Degradation	
The proposal involves the removal of the majority of open space and landscaping from the site, resulting in a reduction of habitat for native animals and a loss of visual amenity for adjoining residents and passers-by.	<p>Whilst open space in the north of the site will be maintained, existing open space in the south of the site will be lost. Given that the site is located in a highly modified urban environment, the impacts of any reduction of any native habitat are considered extremely minimal.</p> <p>The site will be landscaped in accordance with the Landscape Plan and Landscape Report exhibited with the EAR to ensure the amenity of residents, the occupants of adjoining properties and passers-by. In addition to the retail plaza, the perimeter spaces of the site will be landscaped to ensure the visual amenity is maintained. The internal streets, courtyards and terraces will also be landscaped to provide amenity for residents.</p>
The development will result in environmental damage from siltation and air pollution during the construction and operation of the development.	The impact of construction on the environment was considered as part of the Preliminary Construction Management Plan that was exhibited with the Concept Plan and Project Application. Subsequent stages of development will be the subject of individual CMPs which will contain further measures to mitigate the impact of development on the environment.
The proposed urban square is a 'concrete jungle' and requires much more greenery.	As demonstrated in the Landscape Plan and Landscape Report that was publicly exhibited, the public plaza will be heavily landscaped with a variety of trees and mass plantings to providing a buffer between the street and the plaza / retail space, and a pleasant 'green' space. Furthermore, the space to be created is set in an urban context. The design response is consistent with good urban design principles with respect to context, form and function.
The development will put pressure on existing parks.	The users of the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home are not considered key users of existing parks in the area, and will most likely use open spaces provided within the site. Therefore, the increase in the number of residents is not considered to have a negative impact in terms of additional pressure on existing parks in the area.
The green area which currently softens the development will be lost. More bricks and concrete is conducive to excess heat and allows no possibility for local ecosystems.	As noted above, the site is located in highly modified urban area, with few opportunities for significant local ecosystems. However, as shown in the Landscape Plan and Landscape Report exhibited with the Concept Plan and Project Application, the perimeter of the site will be landscaped with trees and screen planting to soften the appearance of the development.
The proposed development will lead to a loss of the natural environment where residents can walk around and enjoy the outdoors.	Whilst the area of open space on the site will be reduced as a result of the development, the provision of additional aged care accommodation on the site is considered paramount. There will still be ample space for residents to enjoy the outdoors, as demonstrated in the exhibited Landscape Plan and Landscape Report.
The green buffer surrounding the buildings that was part of the original plans is being lost for more accommodation.	Whilst existing landscaped areas in the north of the site will be maintained under the proposed development, open spaces in the south of the site will be reduced as a result of the scheme. Residents make extensive use of the landscape areas to the north of the site, the garden to the west of the hydrotherapy pool, and the courtyards internal to Buildings A and B. The open areas

	<p>flanking Building C are effectively open lawn, and are not extensively used by residents in their current form.</p> <p>There is still ample open space on site for use by residents, as well as perimeter plantings to ensure the character of the area is maintained.</p>
Vegetation in the landscaped area between the Centennial Apartments and the Montefiore site will die due to lack of solar access.	As described above, and demonstrated in revised the shadow diagrams, the landscaped area will be overshadowed by the proposed Envelope F at 9am on 21 June, as well as 9am on 21 December and 21 March. However, by 12 noon on all of these dates, the landscaped area will be in full sunlight. This will ensure adequate solar access to plants in the landscaped area.
The loss of gardens along King Street is out of character with the area and an environmental desecration.	As shown in the Landscape Plan and Landscape Report exhibited with the Concept Plan and Project Application, the perimeter of the site will continue to be landscaped with trees and screen planting to maintain the character of the area. There is no uniform character along King Street, with a mix of uses, densities, setbacks and heights along the street.
The landscaping in the boundary setbacks and street fronts is minimal where the greatest protection is required.	Refer to above.
The scheme incorporates no quality public open space.	The site is a private site, and is not required to provide any public open space. However, the retail shops and plaza will be available for public use, and this is considered to be of high quality.
There is a substantial numerical deficiency of deep soil planting (no greater than 50% of the required landscaping is to be over basements / podiums). Given that 14,739m ² of landscaping is required, the amount of deep soil planting in 7,369m ² . The proposed 2,958m ² of deep soil planting is therefore deficient by 4,411m ² .	As the total site area is 29,353m ² , a minimum of 14,677m ² of landscaped area is required. Some 14,964m ² of landscaped area is provided (or 51%). As only 4,039m ² (or 27% of the landscaped area) is provided over podiums or excavated basements, a total of 10,925m ² of deep soil landscaped area is provided. At 73% of all landscaped area this satisfies, and exceeds, Council's requirement.
A significant proportion of landscaping (20%) is not deep root planting.	Refer to above.
Minimum code requirements are not met and hard surfaces and active (as opposed to passive) landscaped areas are proposed within the landscape setbacks.	As noted above, the requirements for landscaping are met (and exceeded). Aside from the public plaza, all setbacks will provide passive landscaping.
Paved areas, walkways and entryways are included in the calculation of LSR which overestimates the level of landscape amenity.	Refer to above.
Due to the excessive floor space proposed on the site, the landscaped areas have been predominantly provided within building quadrangles where there is limited opportunity for useable and pleasant landscaping with good solar access.	The proposed locations of the open spaces are appropriate given the use of the site, and the nature of residents. The landscaped areas within the quadrangles will provide residents with secure, easily accessible open spaces, particularly for those who are physically impaired. Solar access for these courtyards is very good.
The setback to the child care centre should be increased, and fully planted with deep root planting to accommodation the increased height / bulk / scale of this	As outlined in the Landscape Plan and Landscape Report, an extensive, 3m wide landscaped buffer is proposed in the setback to the child care centre.

building.	
Landscaping should be extended to shield neighbours from the extent of the commercial operations intended.	Extensive landscaping is proposed on each of the site's boundaries to ensure the amenity of neighbours is maintained. The proposed landscape treatment on the site's boundaries is considered adequate and appropriate.
Land Use	
The Montefiore development is essentially a commercial / industrial development in a residential zone.	The primary function of the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home is a residential aged care facility. In comparison to this primary use, the kitchen and retail uses on the site form very minor components of the development, and are ancillary to the operation of the aged care facility.
The production of food on site and the presence of delivery trucks disregard the zoning of the area.	The production of food on-site is ancillary to the use of the site as a residential aged care facility, and does not 'disregard' the site's residential zoning. Delivery of goods to the loading dock is a given, and if this presents amenity issues, this matter can be otherwise addressed in operational terms.
Child care and retail land uses were not part of the original plan for the site.	<p>The mix of uses proposed as part of the development is an appropriate use of the site. The Master Plan for the site has evolved significantly since it was developed in 2001. In August 2003, an amendment to the Randwick LEP 1998 was gazetted allowing the development of local shops at the intersection of King and Dangar Streets (totalling no more than 350m² GFA). The proposed retail space is consistent with the LEP amendment. The childcare centre is an existing and approved use on the site, and so it is appropriate that it continue operating on the site.</p> <p>Council has reinforced its acceptance of a child care facility on the site, by approving a modification to the original DA in October 2010 for a further 5 years as well as an increase in approved places from 60 to 80.</p>
The proposed retail space and public open space facing King Street would appear to be designed to mask the intrusiveness, bulk and scale of the new building along the King and Dangar Street frontages.	The retail space is not designed to 'mask' the new building on King and Dangar Street, rather it has been designed to enhance the amenity of the site for residents and the general public, and to activate the street frontage. It will also complement other retail uses near the site, and assist in enhancing the commercial viability of the existing shops.
There are plenty of other areas in Sydney to build new homes, so please ask Montefiore to find them.	It is widely acknowledged that there are significant land shortages in Sydney. Further, the provision of aged care in existing communities is very important, providing the aged with the opportunity to live in their existing community near established support networks. The site is the ideal location for an aged care facility. The HSDP SEPP encourages the development of new and expanded aged care facilities in urban areas where land or opportunity is scarce. The proposed development is supportive of this policy.
There is no benefit to local residents of further commercial and retail premises given the existing nearby shopping malls and nearby local retail strips.	As noted above. The retail component is a requirement under Randwick Council's LEP 1998.
The proposed retail areas are unnecessary, there is no demand for more retail	Refer to above.

space.	
The additional commercial and retail precinct would be materially out of character with the local residential area.	Refer to above.
At no time in more than 25 years, has there been any indication that a commercial development of the intensity and scale proposed by Montefiore would be approved on the site.	As noted above, the primary function of the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home is a residential aged care facility.
The kitchens should be relocated to a commercial / industrial area that can adequately provide for commercial traffic and car parking.	Refer to above.
Light Pollution	
There is already considerable light spill from the existing development as a large proportion of the building remains lit at night, in addition to external lights for access and security.	Noted. This issue has been raised previously and is being addressed by Montefiore. An external lighting audit was undertaken, which has identified some areas of light spill. Some of these areas will be addressed with shades to be affixed to specific lamps; others are a function of the Building Management System (BMS) which is undergoing a system-wide upgrade, which should address the remaining areas.
Additional light spill created by buildings close to the boundary with the Centennial Apartments will be unbearable.	The proposed setback between revised Envelope E and the Centennial Apartments will mitigate light spill. Additionally, because Envelope E will predominantly house self-care apartments rather than communal facilities or nursing home accommodation, lights will generally be turned off at night like conventional residential dwellings.
It cannot be ignored that a partially commercial operation has additional lighting requirements compared to a solely residential facility.	Whilst not a commercial development, it is acknowledged that the residential aged care facility has additional lighting requirements compared to a conventional residential facility. However, as outlined above, this issue has been raised previously and addressed by Montefiore, and we understand that the lighting issue is in the process of being resolved.
A plan to contain light spill should be a condition of approval.	This issue has been raised previously and is being addressed by Montefiore. An external lighting audit was undertaken, which has identified some areas of light spill. Some of these areas will be addressed with shades to be affixed to specific lamps; others are a function of the Building Management System (BMS) which is undergoing a system-wide upgrade, which should address the remaining areas.
Noise Pollution	
There is already considerable noise spill from the site from delivery trucks, vehicles and plant.	The delivery of goods to the loading dock is a given, and if this presents amenity issues, this matter can be otherwise addressed in operational terms.
Additional noise pollution created by buildings close to the boundary with the Centennial Apartments will be unbearable.	As outlined above, the proposed setback between revised Envelope E and the Centennial Apartments will mitigate noise spill.

There will be increased noise from ambulances, delivery vehicles, visitors and staff arriving and departing.	Based on the traffic report by Halcrow, these impacts are not expected to be significant, and can be addressed as an on-going management matter post-approval.
Dwellings at 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14 and 16 Govett Street have backyards orientated to the south towards the Montefiore site which will be affected by noise issues.	It is acknowledged that these properties have rear gardens which are orientated towards the Montefiore site. Notwithstanding this, it is not anticipated that these residences would be unduly affected by noise pollution, particularly as no development is proposed along this edge.
The type and location of air-condition units, and what will be done to muffle them, is not addressed in the EAR.	The details of air conditioning equipment will be addressed as Construction Certificate stage. Measures will be implemented to ensure that noise emanating from air conditioning equipment is limited.
The existing loading dock located on the western side towards Govett Lane is busy with delivery and servicing trucks that leave engines running and some banging their garbage bins during collections. An extension of the existing facility will exacerbate the problem.	Noted. As detailed above, 'heavy vehicle' traffic was considered as part of the exhibited Traffic and Parking Assessment. The Assessment found that there would be no additional heavy vehicles entering and exiting the site as a result of the proposed development.
Child Care Centre	
Increasing the number of spaces in the childcare centre will increase traffic congestions and people double parking to drop off their children.	The Traffic Impact Assessment submitted with the exhibited Concept Plan addressed potential traffic congestion as a result of the expanded child care centre. The assessment found that the proposed parking provisions will effectively mitigate any potential traffic impact. The development of the childcare centre forms part the final stage of development, and will not be realised for some ten years. The childcare centre will be the subject of detailed design, with further consideration given to the provision of parking, as well as pick-up and drop-off arrangements. The proposed arrangements serve to improve existing access, drop-off / pick-up and parking deficiencies.
Children at the childcare centre will be adversely affected by construction noise and pollution.	The impact of construction on surrounding land uses was considered as part of the Preliminary Construction Management Plan that was exhibited with the Concept Plan and Project Application. Subsequent stages of development will be the subject of individual CMPs which will contain measures to mitigate impacts on children at the childcare centre.
The plan to have parents drive through a boom gate into and below the complex to drop off children will not work.	No boom gates are proposed as part of the child care access arrangements.
100% of all drop-offs should be made within the site for the streets to function properly.	The proposal indicates an off-street drop-off area (i.e. within the site) dedicated solely for the child care centre.
Given the excessive scale of the development, the proposed childcare facility is not considered compatible or appropriate for integration with the aged care facility. The child care is not state significant and should not attract the bonus floor space under SEPP HSPD.	The proposed child care centre is an existing use on the site, which has been approved by Randwick Council under a separate DA and recently approved for an increase in capacity / places from 60 to 80. Notwithstanding this, the child care centre forms part of the overall development on the site, and only constitutes a minor component on the site, and does not have a significant bearing on the FSR.
The child care centre should be eliminated as it is incompatible with the proposed	Refer to above.

use and is not considered state significant development and greatly impinges on the residential amenity of the area.	
The childcare centre should not be permitted and should be relocated off site when Stage 2 commences.	Refer to above.
The soil for the child care centre should be tested for contaminants considering what the site was used for prior to it being used as a pre-school.	The child care centre is an existing use on the site, which has been approved by Randwick Council under a separate DA and recently approved for an increase in capacity / places from 60 to 80.
Noise associated with the child care centre will be unbearable for those in east facing units of the Centennial Apartments, as well as the Centennial pool area.	<p>Noise associated with the child care centre will not be increased as a result of the proposal, as the centre already accommodates up to 80 children. Any concerns relating to noise are matters for the ongoing operation of the centre, and are not relevant to the assessment of the Concept Plan or Project Application.</p> <p>Any privacy issues associated with the pool area are also addressed by the revised scheme. The setting back Envelope E, as well as the provision of a landscaped buffer, planted balconies and green roof to the childcare centre effectively mitigate against privacy and overlooking.</p>
Compliance with the Previous Masterplan	
The masterplan specifically prepared for the site which included recommended heights and FSRs as well as a public corner features. The proposal has departed from each of these aspects.	The 2002 Master Plan has now lapsed. Master Plans have a five year life so that they can be adapted as needs change. The proposal represents a new opportunity to review the design of the facility in-line with the social and operational needs.
The height is over 10m greater than the Master Plan approval.	The proposed height is a response to the additional FSR offered under the SEPP HSDP (which was not in force in 2002 and recognises the need for flexibility for aged care facilities). Whilst FSR bonuses are offered under SEPP HSDP, there is no concurrent height bonus provided to cater for the additional FSR that is able to be provided for aged care developments.
The performance of setbacks in the Master Plan approval no longer function due to excessive increase in height, bulk and scale of the proposed buildings. Increasing the bulk and scale while maintaining the setback results in severe overshadowing, loss of privacy, loss of amenity and loss of views.	The setback of Envelope E exceeds Council's required setback controls and the SEPP 65 rules-of-thumb. Setbacks are enforced to maintain amenity, privacy and solar access, none of which are significantly inhibited by the proposed Envelope E.
Given that the site area is 80.37% of the Masterplan approved site area, no more than 80.37% of the floor space should be permissible on the remaining Montefiore site.	The Master Plan was developed in 2002 and is now out of date and inconsistent with the needs of modern aged care facilities. As detailed above and in Section 2.1 of the PPR, the proposed development only exceeds the FSR for the 2B zone by 0.1:1 and is within the bonus FSR for the 2C zone. This equates to an exceedence of 1,711m ² across the site. Given the need for aged care facilities, and the absence of any significant environmental impacts, the proposed development is considered reasonable.

Covenant	
It is requested that a covenant be placed on the north-western part of the site which is used for stormwater detention, to prevent further development in proximity of the Govett Lane properties and the broader heritage conservation area.	Noted.
Pressure on Infrastructure	
The development will put increased pressure on services and infrastructure including medical facilities and public transport.	<p>Randwick is a suburb well served by both public transport and medical facilities. It is not considered that the additional residents on the site would have a significant impact on services and infrastructure, particularly as a number of transport and health services are provided for residents within the Sir Moses Montefiore Jewish Home.</p> <p>In relation to additional staff on-site, currently, approximately 20% of staff travel to and from work using non-private motor vehicle modes (including walking, cycling, car share or public transport). Whilst it is hoped that the number of staff using alternative forms of transport will increase as part of the proposed development, it is not expected to detrimentally impact on public transport services. The aim is to increase non-car use to at least 28% of all travel to and from the site consistent with State policy.</p>
Impact on Sewer and Stormwater Infrastructure	
The proposed development would put significant load on existing sewer and stormwater infrastructure.	The proposed stormwater system has been designed in accordance with Council's requirements, and will not detrimentally affect existing sewer or stormwater infrastructure.
There is already a groundwater surge issue in the basement of the Centennial Apartments, raising concerns that construction of extensive basements will increase ground water levels and exacerbate the water leak.	The detailed design of proposed Envelope E will ensure that there are no impact son ground water levels that would affect the Centennial Apartments. Detailed stormwater design will take place prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate for Building E, as detailed in the final Statement of Commitment.
The site is on a waste table land where the water table is raised during winter and lowered during summer. It needs to be addressed that the building will not impact on residents.	Refer to above.
SEPP 65	
SEPP 65 provisions must be considered in assessing all high rise buildings irrespective of any special 'considerations' the Minister may give to State Significant developments under Part 3A and the need for aged care facilities.	Noted. SEPP 65 is addressed at Section 2.6 of the PPR.
The minimum design requirements for new high rise buildings under SEPP 65	As demonstrated in the assessment of the proposal against the provisions of SEPP 65 at Section

have not been met with regards to scale, density, landscaping, amenity and built form.	2.6 of the PPR, the proposal is consistent with the 10 principles of the SEPP including context, scale, density, amenity and built form.
In light of the inadequacies of the application in dealing with the minimum SEPP 65 requirements, we call upon a review of the application by a design review panel.	A review of the 10 SEPP 65 principles has been provided at Section 2.6 of the PPR. A review of the proposal by a qualified design review panel is considered inappropriate as only proposed Envelope F contains self-contained dwellings, and this building is not the subject of detailed design.
Odour Impacts	
Increased smell from the commercial kitchen	Odour impacts have not been considered as part of the exhibited EAR, and have not been a significant concern in the public submissions received. Neither the scale of the existing kitchen on the site, nor any other new smaller kitchens or serveries, are expected to raise additional odour impacts above those currently experienced.
Devaluing of Property	
The proposed development will significantly decrease property values in the area.	Any real or perceived concerns about the reduction of property values are not a valid planning consideration, and cannot be used as grounds to refuse an application.
Heritage	
There is no consideration for how the development will impact on the heritage neighbourhood.	The Heritage Assessment prepared by Clive Lucas Stapleton and Partners Pty Ltd submitted with the exhibited EAR considers the relationship of the proposed development on heritage items in the proximity of the site, including the North Randwick Heritage Conservation Area. New development proposed on the south of the site will be separated from the North Randwick Heritage Conservation Area by existing Buildings A and B, and so will have a minimal impact on the Heritage Conservation Area.
The size, proportion, setbacks, height and FSR dominates and overwhelms the low to medium density heritage conservation area of North Randwick.	Refer to above.
The facility does nothing to enhance the Heritage Conservation Area	Refer to above.
The integrity of the Heritage Report is flawed as the assessment is based on the belief that the eastern side of the Montefiore boundary does not adjoin the Heritage Conservation area. The Heritage Report should be reviewed to take into consideration that the Randwick North Heritage Conservation Area extends up to Tramway lane and reconsiders the full impact of Building D.	<p>An addendum to the Heritage Impact Statement has been prepared to take into account the full extent of the North Randwick Heritage Conservation Area (refer to Appendix I). The statement notes that the proposed buildings are located on the southern boundary of the Montefiore site, well away from the part of the site that lies adjacent to the Heritage Conservation Area. Further, the new buildings will be further away from the conservation area and significantly concealed by the existing four storey building and landscaping. As such, the new buildings will have a minimal visual impact on the heritage conservation area located to the north of the site.</p> <p>Whilst the new buildings will be visible from the portion of the conservation area located at the junction of Dangar Street and Tramway Lane, when viewed from the street, the new buildings will</p>

	not appear higher or bulkier than the existing buildings located to the north of the site. Further, because the proposed new buildings are setback from King and Dangar Streets, view lines to the conservation area from King Street, along Dangar Street, will be retained.
Alternatives Suggested	
Looking through the SMH business section on one weekend only, it is clear that from time to time suitable sites do become available making the argument that there is a lack of alternative sites within the same ring around Randwick Shops and medical hub that would enable the achievement of key strategy outcomes flawed.	Noted. However, placing this additional capacity on another site would require duplication of the kitchen and laundry facilities, which were sized to accommodate this expansion, as per the original Master Plan. It would also introduce operational inefficiencies in terms of staffing. Furthermore, Montefiore has the right to develop the site in accordance with the Objects of the EP&A Act. Under section 5 of the EP&A Act the orderly and economic use and development of land is encouraged. The proposal is reflective of this. The proposal is of an appropriate scale (as demonstrated by its general compliance with the applicable FSR controls) and does not give rise to any adverse amenity impacts.
Eliminate Building F	Envelope F has been deleted with the GFA lost largely absorbed into a refined Envelope E. Address new setbacks, building separation etc.
Increase setbacks on King and Dangar Streets	The setbacks on King and Dangar Streets are considered appropriate, providing adequate space for landscaping and screen planting to ensure the amenity of surrounding residents and passers-by is maintained.
Eliminate the child care facility	The child care facility is an existing use on the site which has been approved separately by Randwick Council.
Review all SEPP 65 by a qualified design review panel.	A review of the 10 SEPP 65 principles has been provided at Section 2.6 of the PPR. A review of the proposal by a qualified design review panel is considered inappropriate as only proposed Envelope F contains self-contained dwellings, and this building is not the subject of detailed design.
Revised photomontages that demonstrate the height of the proposed new buildings in relation to residential dwellings on King and Dangar Streets and in relation to the Centennial apartments.	The photomontages are intended as an artists' impression of the development. The revised photomontages provided adequately portray the development, and its relationship with surrounding residential dwellings.
Redesign of buildings on King and Dangar Streets and on the western boundary (Building F) to break up the bulk and scale and better integrate with existing residential buildings.	Suggestions that the buildings should be broken down to reduce the bulk and scale of the facility are unachievable due to the operational requirements of the aged care facility. This will be addressed in the façade design. As noted earlier, the materials selected and the degree of articulation will integrate well with similar recent developments adjacent to the site, namely The Centennial and Pindare Apartment developments.
Review of shadow diagrams and full analysis of impacts on adjoining residents and the pool area.	The shadow diagrams have been prepared using computer modelling by a qualified and registered consultant. The use of computer modelling is standard practice, and is accepted as an accurate technique for modelling solar access. As such, the shadow diagrams are considered an accurate reflection of solar access for both existing and proposed development on the site.

Elimination of the western driveway on King Street	Neither the RTA nor the Department of Planning raised the location of this driveway as issue.
More information relating to the impact of Building F on privacy to adjoining residents and the pool area.	<p>There is a separation of 22.5m between Envelope E and Centennial Apartments to the west. This separation distance more than complies with the relevant controls, and will mitigate any potential privacy impacts. The differences in floor levels between the proposed development and neighbouring residences will also help ensure the privacy of units. To alleviate privacy concerns, additional measures will be implemented during the detailed design of Envelope F to reduce any impacts on privacy. These measures may include, the offsetting of windows, landscaping and screening, and will form part of the future detailed design of the Building at DA stage.</p> <p>Envelope F has been deleted with the GFA lost largely absorbed into a refined Envelope E. Address new setbacks, building separation etc.</p>
Implementation of measures to ensure ground water issues do not worsen at Centennial.	Refer to above. The detailed design of proposed Envelope E will ensure that there are no impact on ground water levels that would affect the Centennial Apartments. Detailed stormwater design will take place prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate for Building E, as detailed in the final Statement of Commitment.
Implementation of measures to ensure there is no further development of the site.	The current Concept Plan proposal describes the full extent of development intended for the site and nominates the maximum development parameters sought.
Co-locating the retail component opposite existing neighbourhood shops would seem logical, but as the aspect is to the south, the use for a delicatessen / cafe would not be viable as a shaded aspect is undesirable for this type of activity. The proposed retail component should be located to the southern side of the building access road from Dangar Street	The location of the retail area is specified by Randwick Council in Schedule 2 of Randwick LEP 1998. In accordance with Schedule 2 of the LEP, the neighbourhood shops are to be located at the corner of King and Dangar Streets, and must have a combined GFA of no more than 350m ² . The proposed retail space is consistent with these controls.