

ACT | NSW | VIC | QLD | WA ABN 16 562 343 655 ACN 084 256 295

8th December 2011

Mr Peter McManus Metropolitan & Regional Projects North NSW Planning & Infrastructure GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Attention: Peter McManus

Dear Peter,

Re: S.75W – Modification Request Sydney Adventist Hospital, Clinical Services Building (MP10_0070 MOD 2)

I refer to your recent request for clarification with respect to the height of the Clinical Services Building as per our recent S75W (MOD 2) application and provide the following advice.

As advised at the time of lodgement of our application the proposed CSB building is now up to 3.5 metres higher (in parts) than originally approved. The increase in height has been necessitated by the need to accommodate additional plant and storage space within the building. Plant was originally located on a small part of Level 1, Level 6 and part of Level 11 but is now also proposed to occupy the entirety of Level 1, half of Level 6 and all of Level 12.

We were initially of the view that the new building height was consistent with the terms of the concept approval which stipulates *"maximum heights of 20.5m, 26.5m and <u>39.5m</u> (6, 8 and <u>12 storeys</u>) in close proximity to the existing hospital tower and / or <u>to take advantage of sloping topography towards the centre of the site</u>".*

We have since been informed and now accept the Department's advice that building height is set by Clause 18(1) of Part 25 of Schedule 3 of the Major Development SEPP 2005 which stipulates that the height of any building is not to exceed the maximum height shown on the Height of Building Map, being 39.5m. We also accept the Department's advice that the following definition of building height is called up by the SEPP, notwithstanding any elucidation of how height is to be measured that may be inferred in the original Director General's Environmental Assessment Report (March 2010):

building height (or height of building) means the vertical distance between ground level (existing) and the highest point of the building, including plant and lift overruns, but excluding communication devices, antennae, satellite dishes, masts, flagpoles, chimneys, flues and the like.

We note that Part 25 of Schedule 3 to SEPP (Major Development) 2005 incorporates the following provisions:

20 Exceptions to development standards-transitional Part 3A projects

(1) A development standard imposed by this or any other environmental planning instrument on development that is part of a transitional Part 3A project, and is on land within the Wahroonga Estate site, does not apply to that development if the Director-General is satisfied, and issues a certificate to the effect, that:

- (a) compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case, and
- (b) there are sufficient environmental planning grounds to justify exempting the development from that development standard.

Strategic Planning Property Advisory Economic Analysis Retail Analysis Spatial Planning Policy and Strategy Financial Analysis GIS Mapping

Suite 2 Level 1 34 Hunter Street Sydney NSW 2000 T 61 2 9221 5211 F 61 2 9221 1284 info@macroplan.com.au www.macroplan.com.au

- (2) In deciding whether to issue a certificate, the Director-General must consider:
 - (a) whether contravention of the development standard raises any matter of significance for State or regional environmental planning, and
 - (b) the public benefit of maintaining the development standard, and
 - (c) any other matters required to be taken into consideration by the Director-General.

On this basis, we now wish, as part of our S75W modification application, to seek the Department's concurrence to a minor departure from the building height development standard that relates to the CSB building. Our explanation as to how and why our proposal is a minor variation only and therefore can be considered as a consent modification follows.

The proposed new Clinical Services Building incorporates the following changes:

- The building shape has changed to a more efficient "L" shaped building to support hospital staffing and patient care.
- The new CSB building is slightly larger in terms of gross floor area than the previously approved building.
- The new building is a maximum of 3.5 metres taller than it previously was, but in parts only.

Although the 'footprint' of the building has increased to accommodate its new "L" shape, the overall addition of floor space has been limited due to the inclusion of necessary plant facilities on Level 1, half of level 6 and level 12. Plant was originally located on levels 6 and 11. The total area taken up by plant space has increased, and is now spread over three levels - levels 1, 6 and 12. The building is slightly larger in gross floor area than the original building, having increased from 18,818m² to 19,775m² (an increase of only 957m² over 12 storeys). Despite its increase in size and height the overall floor area of the proposed hospital works (i.e. the CSB and all other buildings) remains within the gfa limitations as set by the concept approval.

Further clarification with respect to this aspect is included in our original lodgement correspondence.

Specifically with respect to building height we note that:

- The proposed new height of the CSB building exceeds the 39.5m limit (as strictly applied according to the contour of the site) in a minor manner, encroaching to a small degree in the south-west corner of the building only.
- Other approved buildings in the hospital precinct are not as high as the CSB building, i.e. a
 variation of building height is sort for the CSB building only, such that the overall visual impact of
 the proposed hospital precinct works remains generally as proposed under the referenced
 assessment reports.
- The CSB building is 'internal' to the hospital site. It is not visually intrusive in its immediate neighbourhood and is viewed predominantly from afar. As such, the discrepancy is mostly unnoticeable from outside the site. Notably, the expanded CSB building cannot be seen from across the treed valley to the west of the site, as indicated in the following view analyses which provide an outline of the CSB as originally approved and as now proposed.

MBMO

VIEWING POINT 13 (\$75W MOD.)

Noticeable change, high visual impact expected.

Analysis demonstrates that the proposed additions to the heaptal are scenared by existing vegetation and residential buildings in the the promised of the view. Instruction of the restance of the second the second second second and the second second second and the second second



MBMO

SYDNEY ADVENTIST HOSPITAL VISUAL IMPACT ANALYSIS





VIEWING POINT 15 (\$75W MOD.)

Analysis demonstrates that the majority of the proposed additions to the hospital will be screened by existing vegetation and high trees beyond. The low quality of the view due to the existing interruption to the skyline by the hospital invoker residential rootscapes and overhead powerlines deem the visual inpact of the proposed to be limited 11. Limited change, minimal visual impact expected. (gotte - Mar E Phile La S S75W MOD

Figure 44: Viewing point 15 photomontage. Located at Leuna Avenue Wahroonga, facing towards the south-west facade of the existing hospital.

VIEWING POINT 2 (\$75W MOD.)

Analysis demonstrates that the proposed additions to the hospital are accerned by the vegetated ridge line, expanding horizontally in line with the height of the aceaing hospital tower and overhead powerlines deem the visual impact of the proposa to be moderate.

MBMO



MBMO

MBMO

VIEWING POINT 16 (\$75W MOD.)

SYDNEY ADVENTIST HOSPITAL VISUAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

Some change, moderate visual impact expected.

Given the lowquality of view based on the presence of the axisting hospital buildings and the high capacity for change, analysis demonstrates the proposed development is acceptable. The proportion of the view that is being affected as well as the proposal being partially screened by existing vegetation and existing buildings deem the visual impact of the proposal to be of a moderate degree. Upon development of Precinc B of buildings with a maximum 20 5m height, her impact of the proposal additions will receive.





Overall Site Image of Current Works within the Hospital Precinct

- The original assessment documents referenced in the concept approval initially depicted and justified a 42m high CSB building. This was the building height that was exhibited as part of the original assessment process. The building height was subsequently lowered at the determination stage to align with that of the existing Clifford Tower hospital building that is adjacent to the CSB building. The Clifford Tower building achieves a height of RL 208.48 but has been designed "to take advantage" of the sloping site; i.e. its actual height varies from 36.48m at the point of highest ground level to 40.38m at the lowest part of the site on which it is situated. The building has a flat roof design, the same as was initially proposed and is still proposed for the CSB building.
- The CSB building is also shielded from view from adjoining roads by the Shannon Building which is scheduled to be delivered as part of Stage 3 of the current construction program. The Shannon Building achieves a maximum height RL 207.6.
- The CSB building as now proposed is RL 207 at its highest point.
- By virtue of the site's slope, the CSB building only exceeds the 39.5m height limit for a small
 portion of the building only (see attachments to this letter). The area of excess is located within the
 site and is positioned such that it does not protrude at the building's edge, i.e. it is located within
 the circumference of the building's roof.
- The new CSB building remains a 12 storey structure, as referenced in the DG's assessment report and the basis of the 39.5m limit.



Overall, the new design of the CSB building is consistent with the terms and basis of its original approval. The building is to be used for its stated purpose but has been reconfigured to provide a better level of operational efficiency for the hospital. The changes proposed are consistent with what would normally be expected as a project moves from an initial concept to an actual construction phase. No additional impact of material significance is caused by the amended design.

We therefore request the Department to exhibit the proposed plans and to refer the matter to the Planning Assessment Commission for its determination.

Previously submitted drawings remain relevant to the S75W (MOD 2) proposal. We have made arrangements for hard copies of these plans to be delivered to your offices to assist with the exhibition and notification of the modification.

Please do not hesitate to contact our office should further clarification be required.

Yours sincerely,

Massach

Wayne Gersbach Director NSW MacroPlan Australia Pty Ltd



ATTACHMENTS - EAST & WEST ELEVATIONS SHOWING PORTIONS OF BUILDING ABOVE 39.5m

L

CONTRACT & ALL MONTE AL BRADE, NEL DARABELANT NET BLADARDONED OF TAXABATTER A ANT FOR OF IT A BRADE IN ANY COLUMNOL (1) INTEGEN DE BRADE RECOMPTER CLARKE PT1 (2) DIE HARMALIS

MBMO

HASSELL

[12]

Contract of Association and Associatio and Association and Association and Association and Ass

STAGE 1 REDEVELOPMENT C - CLINICAL SERVICES BUIL CSB East and West Elevations

ALL CHARLEN AND DESIGNED AT LESS AND COMMISSION OF MORE UNIT PROVIDED AND ADDRESS OF A DESIGN



ATTACHMENTS - NORTH & SOUTH ELEVATIONS SHOWING PORTIONS ABOVE 39.5m

 \square