



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

RE: NERINGAH SENIORS HOUSING & HOSPITAL
(SSD-45121248)

DEPARTMENT MEETING

**COMMISSION
PANEL:** ADRIAN PILTON (CHAIR)
WENDY LEWIN
MICHAEL WRIGHT

OFFICE OF THE IPC GEOFF KWOK
TAHLIA SEXTON

**DEPARTMENT OF
PLANNING &
ENVIRONMENT** AMY WATSON
ELENA SLIOGERIS
CALEB BALL
ROS READ

LOCATION: IPC: SUITE 15.02 LEVEL 15
135 KING STREET, SYDNEY NSW 2000

DATE: WEDNESDAY 20TH DECEMBER 2023
9:30AM – 10:30AM

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

<THE MEETING COMMENCED>

MR PILTON: Good morning, welcome. Before we begin, I would like to
acknowledge the traditional owners of the land in which we meet, the Gadigal people
5 of the Eora nation and pay my respects to their elders, past and present. Welcome to
the meeting today to discuss the Neringah Seniors Housing and Hospital case
currently before the Commission for determination. The applicant, Hammond Care,
is seeking consent for demolition works and the construction of an integrated seniors
housing and health services facility at Neringah Hospital. The proposed development
10 includes two five storey buildings comprising residential aged care facility and
palliative care hospice beds, 57 self-contained dwellings for seniors, health care
services, outpatient care administration facilities, 130 car parking spaces,
landscaping and public domain works which includes the upgrade of Archdale Walk.
My name is Adrian Pilton. I am the chair of this commission panel. I'm joined by my
15 fellow commissioners, Wendy Lewin and Michael Wright. We're also joined by
Geoff Kwok and Talia Sexton from the office of the Independent Planning
Commission. In the interest of openness and transparency, and to ensure the full
capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript
will be produced and made available on the Commission's website. This meeting is
20 one part of the Commission's consideration on this matter and will form one of
several sources of information on which the Commission will base its determination.
It's important for the commissioners to ask questions of the attendees, and to clarify
issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you're asked a question and are not in
a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any
25 additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website. I request
that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time,
and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to
ensure accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin. So over to you to get an
agenda.

30 MS WATSON: Yeah. Thank you. My name is Amy Watson and I am the acting
director of State Significant Acceleration at the Department of Planning and
Environment. I'll just start off with a broad introduction. So thank you for inviting us
to meet with you today about the proposed seniors housing and health services
35 facility at the Neringah Hospital in Wahroonga. The site is currently operated by
Hammondcare as the Neringah Hospital. This proposal is the second and final stage
of the redevelopment of the site, following the completion of the stage one
residential care facility building in 2016. You outline the proposal, so I won't do that
again. But the application has been referred to the IPC as Council objects. Council
40 considers the proposal does not comply with the site compatibility certificate, which
applies to the site. Council also raised concerns about the lack of owner's consent for
the upgrade of Archdale Walk. The floor space ratio, building height, urban design,
amenity, landscaping and deep soil accessibility and excessive car parking. The
Department also received seven public submissions, including four objections,
45 prominently in relation to traffic, parking, noise and landscaping. In response, the
applicant has made a number of key amendments, including increasing the northern
setback, changing tree species, retention of sandstone wall, revised pedestrian and

vehicular access, relocation of a substation, and other minor changes to improve accessibility, amenity and privacy.

5 Council continues to object, however, the Department's assessment report concludes the proposal is approvable because it is permissible with consent consistent with the statutory framework and the Site Compatibility Certificate. It's consistent with the Strategic Framework, as it will provide housing and services to support an ageing population in a well-located area close to transport services and amenities. It will provide significant public benefits, including the upgrade of Archdale Walk to improve accessibility and new through site link connecting Archdale Walk to Balcombe Park, and creation of 89 construction jobs and 15 full time equivalent operational jobs. Next slide. So I'll just take you through the application of the former State Environmental Planning Policy, housing for seniors or people with a disability. This SEPP continues to apply to this application, because an application for a site compatibility certificate was made under that housing for seniors or people with disability SEPP on the 28th of June 2021, which was before the commencement of the state Environmental Planning Policy Housing 2021 on the 26th of November 2021. So the SCC was issued in June 2021 and the housing SEPP came into effect in November 2021. On the 13th of April, 2022, the SCC was issued and it was certified that the site was suitable for more intensive development.

The development listed in the SCC was compatible with the surrounding environment, and that proposed seniors housing is compatible with the surrounding land uses. The SCC includes a number of requirements or conditions which are listed on the slide in schedule two. They are that the floor space ratio uplift must exclude parts of the site which are zoned are too low density and Wonoona House. The through site link must be publicly accessible. Council to be satisfied with the modifications to Archdale Walk and the existing footpath gradients to provide access to services. The need to consider SEPP 65 in the ADG as it relates to the independent living units. The need to consider a previously proposed encroachment into the front setback and impacts on streetscape. The need to consider bulk and scale, and the relationship with the heritage item and its curtilage. The Department has thoroughly considered the requirements of the SEC in detail in its assessment report in appendix C, and we are satisfied that the development is generally in accordance with the project description in the SEC and those requirements in schedule two. I'll now pass on to Caleb to start taking us through the key issues.

MR BALL: All right. So my name is Caleb Ball. I'm a senior planning officer in the state Significant acceleration team. And I'm going to start by talking about build form and design. So the proposal includes two five story buildings that are separated by publicly accessible green spine. The site has a maximum permissible FSR of 1.8 to 1, although the proposal is below the maximum at 1.61 to 1. The proposal included minor breaches of the 17.5m height limit. The northern building exceeds the height control by 1.42m, while the southern building exceeds the control by 2.6m. The Department's assessment report provides a detailed assessment of consideration of the applicant's request to vary the 17.5m height development standard. The Exceedances relate to non-habitable GFA areas, including balustrades, rooftop plant

stairwells and lift cores, and due to the orientation of the site, the exceedances to the building height would not overshadow or impact any neighbouring properties. The application was subject to two separate State Design Review panel sessions. The panel were overall supportive of the proposal, particularly in regards to the green spine and the extensive brickwork linking the proposal to the adjacent heritage reservoir and surrounding buildings. The built form responds to the topography of the site by stepping down the development to the north of the site. This is reflective of the form of the Sirius building to the north, which is also a five storey building.

10 The building includes a mix of brickwork, as I mentioned, to link with the existing materials of the reservoir to the south, Wonoona Cottage to the west and the existing stage one development, and therefore the Department is satisfied the built form adequately fits within the surrounding streetscape. I'll now discuss the open space, public domain, landscape and trees. So the proposal includes a number of unique open spaces across the site, with the predominant feature consisting of a green spine through the middle which connects Neringah Avenue south to Wonoona Avenue. The Department consists the proposal would provide a series of high quality open spaces for the future residents and for the local community connecting through the site. Thought would increase canopy cover from 15.5% to 26%, and the deep soil across the site would also equate to 15.7%, which exceeds the requirement as mentioned in the senior SEPP. Council were concerned with the quality of the deep soil within the front setback to Neringah Avenue South, while the Owners Corporation, from the Sirius development to the north, were concerned with the setback, particularly to their building and the adequate space for deep soil planting for tall trees. The applicant proposed a green roof, raised planter boxes and screen planting to provide a landscaped outlook for existing residents of the Sirius building to the north.

30 Compared to the existing driveway, which is at grade and open in this location. If we talk about Neringah Avenue South and the front setback, the lower basement and OSD rainwater tanks do encroach in that front setback, although sufficient deep soil zones have been provided across the site to meet the non-discretionary development standards within clause 50 of the senior SEPP. Therefore, the Department is satisfied the proposal provides sufficient front and side landscape setbacks. So now I'll talk about landscaping and trees in particular. So there are a total of 51 trees on site, with an additional 61 trees outside of the site. The proposal will retain all 14 trees that have a high retention value, including tree one and tree 32. The applicant provided exploratory trenching for tree one and tree 32 to determine the impact of the proposed works on the root system. The testing concluded the proposed works would not significantly impact tree one and tree 32. The Department has recommended conditions to require ongoing monitoring and tree protection during construction. The Department concluded the proposed works are unlikely to adversely affect the retention of trees one and tree 32, given no significant roots were encountered during the testing. I will now pass it on to Ros to discuss accessibility and Archdale walk.

45

MS READ: My name is Ross Read. I'm an external consultant planner assisting the Department with the assessment of the application. Section 26 of the senior SEPP

establishes various site related access provisions which require access to shops, banks, GP's, either within 400m of the site or 400m to public transport through those services. One good chance. Train station is 350m from the site, and Wahroonga town centre is closer. Access to that has to be by way of an accessible path, with an overall gradient of, no more than one in 14, with some small sections which can be steeper. the applicant is proposing to upgrade Archdale Walk, which is a pathway leading from Neringah Avenue south to Wahroonga. and Council has requested a deferred commencement condition in order to obtain those approvals prior to any consent. The Department considers that a deferred commencement provision is unnecessary because the applicant has provided plans which demonstrate that compliance with section 26 of the SEPP can be achieved. Owner's consent from Australia Post, which is adjacent to the walk but has a tiny bit of land on it. Has been obtained from Australia Post. Council was actually unable to refuse a section 138 Roads Act application under the SSD provisions of the EPA act, and also the Department has recommended a condition of consent requiring a section 138 Roads Act application to undertake the upgrade works to the public road and shall walk. Pedestrian safety. Council raised a concern about pedestrian safety crossing Neringah Avenue South and sought a raised pedestrian crossing.

MS READ: The applicant is not actually opposed to that, but believes that it's not warranted on the basis of meeting the section 26 SEPP requirements, nor on the basis of traffic flow. the Department has acknowledged the concerns of Council regarding the safety and has therefore recommended in the conditions a road safety audit be undertaken to consider the safety aspects of crossing Neringah Avenue South, and also a condition of consent requiring that all recommendations of that road safety audit be implemented. Back to the pedestrian entries. There's two main pedestrian entries off Ngauranga Avenue South. The main entry is to the north. The original proposal included accessible access, which required crossing the carpark, driveway under the building and the Department, Council and the State Design Review Panel all raised safety concerns about that arrangement. In response, the applicant has amended the application so that there's a separate pathway to the north of the driveway and that meets the section 26 SEPP accessibility requirements. So the Department is therefore satisfied that safe entry can be obtained, because it meets the section 26 SEPP requirements. it's separated from the driveway. And also the applicant has increased the amount of glazing at the entry way for the buildings. So it's a more legible entry than it was originally. The second entry is at the Neringah Avenue South. Entry to the green spine through link that is accessed by way of a one in 20 ramp and also some stairs.

Council was concerned that, that did not meet the section 26 SEPP accessibility requirements. The Department, however, is of the view that those requirements have been met by the more northern access to the main building, and there's lifts and one in 20 ramps throughout the site, which will enable those with accessibility issues to access that green spine acceptably. So moving on to the residential amenity. so there's 57 self-contained dwellings, and they are subject to the ADG requirements. The Department undertook a detailed assessment and the found that there is overall compliance with the design criteria with minor departures, and they relate to visual

privacy, natural cross ventilation, maximum number of units off a core, and there's some minor issues with habitable room depths. 1 in 8 of them are exceed the ADG and ground level private open space for two of the units on the. Ground floor of the south building. Very minor with respect to the privacy that relates to the northern setback, which Caleb mentioned. The ADG requires a nine metre setback when you're at the above the fourth storey from the boundary. That on the northern boundary is level two for the northern building. Originally that was set at six metres. The applicant has amended that to be nine metres in response to the owner's corporation of the serious building to the north. Being concerned about privacy impacts to them. And the Department is, considers that's acceptable. It meets the ADG requirements.

There's a setback to 15 to 17 Woonona Avenue, which you'll see in the top right-hand corner. It's in the northwest. It's to the northwest. It's an R2 zone site. So under the ADG, this site being an R4 zone site, it also requires a nine metre setback. 7.7m is provided to the boundary. And the Department Council has raised a concern about privacy there. And the Department has recommended a condition requiring privacy screens on the balconies of those northwest units on level one and two to ensure privacy to the private open space. Privacy to the southern units on the. South building is the other main aspect of privacy. there's three units on level one, which is effectively the ground level. on the south building, and they're close to a pathway which runs between Woonona Cottage to the top of the page in that main picture, and then runs along to the north of the Sydney Water Reservoir and ends up in Neringah Avenue South. Council and the Department raised privacy concerns for those units because of the pathway, and the applicant has undertaken some changes. They've reduced the length of the driveway, added privacy screen treatments to the level one units, privacy screens on the south elevation to the south facing. screens. Which are these ones here? They've also added plantation screens to the west facing balconies of the south building on the southwest corner and they've also included a timber paling fence within the landscaping in that area.

The Department has recommended conditions to delete the privacy screens on the south balcony here, because it's felt that privacy is not really an issue being so elevated. and it's also recommended that the privacy screens for the West facing balconies on level one. Be a stack and slide. type, so that it allows a greater flexibility for the occupants to control their own amenity. With respect to the left core, the ADG recommends eight. A maximum of eight units of a left core, nine are provided in the North building. Council was raised concern about that, and the applicant has added a third lift and the Departments can satisfy that. That is acceptable. The cross ADG also recommend 60% of the units have crossed natural cross ventilation. In order to achieve that, the applicant has created a notch indent in the north building on the eastern side, and that is 2.9m wide. The Council has. Raised concerns that that would not. provide an acceptable level of natural cross-ventilation. And that meant that with those four units that are affected by that notch, only 52%, not 60%, would get the natural cross ventilation. The applicants provided advice from a sustainable building engineer to demonstrate why, with differential pressure, natural cross ventilation will be acceptable. On balance, the Department is satisfied

that there will be an acceptable level of good of natural cross ventilation for the site because of the width of the notches, and also because it meets the objective of the ADG to maximise natural cross ventilation and create a comfortable indoor environment.

5

It's moving on to traffic and parking. The traffic impact assessment estimates 28 generated trips in the Am and PM peak Council and the transport for New South Wales did not raise any concerns about the traffic volumes. However, the public submissions did. They also raised concerns about the existing constraints and congestion arising from the narrowing of Neringah Avenue south towards the north. safety concerns for school children and existing on street parking demand. The applicant doesn't believe that removal of on street parks is necessary and has made no changes to that. And the Department considers, given the volume of traffic and no alteration to the carriageway, and the fact that the proposal provides adequate on street parking, that the situation with respect to traffic is acceptable. Parking. You see that 130 vehicles can be parked on site 57 for the self-contained dwellings, ten of which are accessible. So that's one car space for every self-contained dwelling, 54 for the Hammond care staff and 19 visitor spaces, with two of which are accessible. Council sought a reduction in the number of car spaces because it exceeds their DCP and it exceeds the SIPP requirements. That was really on the basis of trying to increase the deep soil front. The Department considers that the number of car spaces is acceptable because the one space for every self-contained unit, which, the Department considers is appropriate given the likely levels of car use and pressure on street parking.

25

The 19 visitor spaces also alleviates on street parking demand, and there's sufficient on street parking, sorry onsite parking for the staff during shift changes. Construction traffic, was, a further matter of concern for both. Council and the submitters. Transport for New South Wales has recommended a construction, traffic and pedestrian management plan, which has been conditioned and that includes consultation with the Abbotsleigh Junior School, which is to the northwest of the site. maybe 100, 200m away. Council raised concerns about conflicts of interest or conflicts with the school children at pick up and drop off times, and they sought a condition that all construction movements be restricted between 8 and 9:30 in the morning and 2:30 and four. Department has considered. That request, however, considers that that condition would provide would require ceasing construction traffic for three hours a day, which would. Generate a high level of interruption to construction, and also that there could be construction issues during certain stages, such as during concrete pours, if there was a cessation in traffic. also a car park loading and servicing management plan has been recommended. to manage the servicing profiles of vehicles accessing the site, including larger vehicles and safety impacts and management of acoustic impacts from the loading area, which is on the northern side of the Northfield. so I will now hand over to Elena.

45

MS SLIOGERIS: Thanks, Ros. Commissioners, my name is Elena Sliogeris. And I'm a principal planning officer within the State Significant Acceleration Team. And I'll be providing you with an overview of our assessment in relation to demolition,

construction noise impacts, and operational noise and vibration impacts. The application was accompanied with a Noise and Vibration impact assessment, which identifies the noisiest works, including the demolition, excavation and construction stages of the project, particularly where they are carried out close to the northern boundaries, have the potential to exceed the noise management level and the highly noise affected management level by up to 3 to 13dB. Concerns were raised in public submissions about noise impacts during construction. The Department, however, considers that given the surrounding residential context and proximity to neighbouring properties, some noise exceedances during construction would be unavoidable. However, given that the proposal adjoins the existing stage one development and residential development, the Department considers the following additional measures are necessary to mitigate impacts to the nearest residential properties. They include a preparation and implementation of a construction, noise and vibration management plan, incorporating additional mitigation measures to reduce noise impacts, including complaints handling, equipment selection and maintenance, materials handling, and worksite training. Limiting the construction hours to Council standard condition hours of 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday to Friday, and 8 a.m. to 12 p.m. on Saturdays. All construction vehicles only to arrive to the work site within the permitted hours of construction. All noisy works, which exceeds the highly affected noise management level, may only be undertaken in three continuous hour blocks, with one hour respite between blocks of work.

On this basis, the Department is satisfied that reasonable and feasible mitigation measures are in place to ensure construction works can be appropriately managed within the proposed construction hours, to minimise disruption to nearby amenity. In relation to the operational noise and vibration impacts. The noise and vibration impact assessment also identifies that the largest noise impacts associated with the proposal include noise from the use of the loading dock, the use of the driveway car park spaces at the northern boundary of the site, and the mechanical plant. The proposal seeks to limit noise impacts by locating the pump room, mechanical plant room and exhaust fan room. Basement level two providing a landscaped green lid above the service driveway to act as an acoustic treatment for service deliveries, and the use of an electronic roller door. Concerns were raised in public submissions about noise associated with the use of the loading dock and driveway at the site's northern boundary, impacting on residential neighbours at the Sirius building. In response to community concerns, the applicant provided an addendum acoustic report as well as supporting acoustic letter, which notes any noise output from the mechanical plant. Rooms can be resolved from a detailed acoustic review of the mechanical plant design prior to the construction certificate. This is consistent with standard industry practice and to also ensure compliance with the noise policy for industry criteria. Predicted noise levels at the Sirius building will be two decibels below the allowable noise management level, and will comply with the noise policy for industry criteria.

The proposed green lid and other mitigation measures will limit noise associated with the loading dock to a level which is marginally lower than the existing car park operations. The applicant's noise and vibration. Impact assessment and

supplementary advice also identifies the following mitigation measures to be implemented. Restricting waste collection to between 7 a.m. and 6 p.m. Monday to Saturday. 8 a.m. to 6 p.m. on Sundays. Limit the size of vehicles, medium rigid vehicles and small vans. Only one vehicle is expected to utilise the loading dock in a typical 15 minutes. Requiring trucks to switch off engines during loading and unloading within the loading dock. Speed humps provided along the driveway and within the loading dock, and specific design requirements to limit noise impacts from the operation of the roller door. The Department is satisfied that the applicant's noise and vibration impact assessment and supplementary advice has demonstrated that noise from the operation of the service driveway, loading dock and plant equipment is unlikely to affect the amenity of neighbouring residential properties as the loading dock operations are predicted to comply with the noise policy for industry criteria subject to the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures and mechanical plant will be subject to a detailed acoustic review prior to issue of a construction certificate. Handover to Ros. Next slide please.

MS READ: Heritage. There's a number of heritage items in the vicinity across Woonona Avenue. There's The Briars, which is state and locally listed, and Warriner, which is locally listed. They're both dwellings. to within the stage one site is Winona Cottage, which is also locally listed. And to the south is the Sidney Water Reservoir, which is also locally listed. The heritage impact assessment, concluded that there wouldn't be any adverse impacts to them. And as there's no works to Woonona Cottage, which is the one that's on the site, there would be no requirement to update the heritage conservation management plan in relation to that building. so the Department there is a there is an interpretation panel on the front wall of the of Neringah Avenue South, and the Department's recommended a condition to update that. So I think that's it. So then just this slide just really highlights the conditions which have been most, discussed during the course of the assessment. Tree protection is, Caleb indicated, has been an issue, and there are a number of conditions which relate to tree protection, in particular relating to trees 1 and 32, and they include the conditions which have been recommended by the h g section. Construction, pedestrian and traffic management plan that is included in the draft condition to detail potential impacts and mitigation and measures during school zone times. that is at the request of transport for New South Wales, and includes their provisions. A pedestrian safety. As I mentioned earlier, there are conditions relating to a road safety audit to inform pedestrian safety measures across Neringah Avenue South. Privacy screening changes, as I discussed, have been included. as. Changes in condition B1. Noise mitigation measures, which largely Elena has outlined, are scattered throughout in a number of different, conditions relating to various noise.

Producing aspects. and so this is to mitigate the noise impacts from them. And you'll see there's quite a number of them. There is a remediation action plan, which has been conditioned, and other conditions relating to contamination to ensure that it's suitable for the proposed development. Sydney Water has requested a specialised engineering assessment for to protect the Sydney Water Reservoir, during construction works. That's quite an extensive application which the applicant will need to make. there's condition requiring the restriction of, use of the self-contained

5 dwellings to seniors and people with a disability, as required under the SEPP. There's
also a conditions requiring affordable places of 10%, which is six units in this case.
and they will be, imposed by a restriction as to use. On the site. There's two
conditions which the Department would like to add and were discussed in the report.
10 and that's something that the Department would like to forward to the commission
shortly. And that's a condition to provide for a methodology for the retention and
installation, retention of the sandstone wall along Neringah Avenue South and to
implement and ensure that. Methodology. And its incorporation into the landscape.
Approximately 50% of the existing sandstone wall is to be retained following.
15 Representations from Council, although it is to be lowered and the Department feels
that that is acceptable and improves. Visibility to the site from the street, and also a
condition for to require 24 hour access to the through site link. including lighting and
signage. And you will recall that that is a requirement under the Site compatibility
Site compatibility certificate. From. I think that's the end of the presentation.

15 MR PILTON: Thank you very. Much. It's pretty thorough presentation. If I could
just kick off with a question when you talk about affordable places and so on, what's
the arrangement? I may not have read this so far, but are they for sale? Are they
released or are they rented or the average apartment?

20 MS REID: The units are not to be, are not intended to be sold. They are. There is a
requirement under the SEPP for Hammondcare to specify which units are affordable
units. And they provided a plan which sets out all units in the ground floor and two
units in the top floor. I think in the south building. for Those affordable units. Sorry.
25 Ground floor and level one. sorry, I can't remember---

MR PILTON: That's okay. Just general principle.

30 MS REID: They. So those units will continue to be affordable. used for affordable
housing by Hammond Care. They may well have an increased number of affordable
units, but if they so desire. But it's not intended that these units will be sold. There's
no strata included in this.

35 MR BALL: I might just add a bit more detail. So they need to be owned and
managed by community housing provider. I'm unsure if HammondCare at the
moment have that, certificate or that I'm not sure if they're a provider, but they have
identified that that could be a possibility.

40 MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you.

45 MS WATSON: Is it a condition that those six units are owned and managed by a
community housing provider? So either HammondCare will have to arrange for
someone to take ownership and manage that somehow. They probably need to be
some sort of separate application to subdivide those off. But we understand that
Hammondcare intends to register as a community housing provider to address that
condition, so we're satisfied the condition can work in either way.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you. Wendy.

MS LEWIN: Not at this stage, no.

5 MR PILTON: Michael---

MR WRIGHT: Has a question about the narrowing of the road. Can we? And the operation of the loading dock and the school zone. So the school zones to the is to the north of the northern correct. And the vehicles accessing the loading dock
10 need to come to the very northern end of the northern building. Is that correct or?

MR BALL: Yeah.

MR WRIGHT: Okay. And it looks as though that carriageway is a yield carriageway with, with car parks on either side.
15

MR BULL: Yeah.

MS REID: There's car parking both sides. But if cars are parked on both sides, there's
20 only really room for one car to go through.

MR WRIGHT: I'm just thinking about the operational loading dock during school zone time and whether that's not a huge increase in traffic, 20 some larger vehicles traversing that bit of the carriageway, particularly during the school zone period.
25 Whether that's going to create some conflict with parents. Has it been is that something that the safety audit will be looking at, or is that something that's being considered in some greater depth?

MS READ: The safety audit is more oriented towards. Residents crossing. So. I think
30 it's likely. Abbotsleigh being a private school. It's probably got all their children. Within their sight by 8:30 in the morning. So. That period is. Of concern is probably more limited than maybe for a primary school.

MS WATSON: We can, we can take that on notice and have determines whether, the
35 applicant thoroughly addressed that in their, studies From what I Recall That issue wasn't particularly laid out like in the loading dock exhibition, so I don't think our assessment report has talked specifically to that, but we can take that on notice and that because that is a valid point about whether there should be any further
40 restrictions on sites.

MR PILTON: Is Neringah Avenue South, the main. access point for parents dropping their kids off to Abbotsleigh.

MS WATSON: So we'll take that on notice. We'll have a good look at that. And -
45

MR PILTON: We'll have a look at it. Site visit on Friday. So -

MS READ: Abbotsleigh, junior school is on a road to the north of Neringah Avenue South, which is at right angles to Neringah Avenue South, and it Abbotsleigh is can't remember about 200m or so to the west of Neringah Avenue South.

5 MR PILTON: Okay.

MS WATSON: Same road. Have to have a look at their routes that they had in their loading dock management plan. Sure, it's in there. We just haven't, got that information to hand.

10

MR PILTON: Just ask the question about construction traffic. It's always been it seems to be an issue in these sort of sites that there's a problem with parking for the tradesmen and so on when they come. Has anyone looked at that in any depth or any concerns?

15

MS REID: I think that would be part of. The construction traffic management plan. They think that the condition sets out that that's one of the matters that needs to be covered off construction.

20 MR PILTON: Okay.

MS LEWIN: I'll just confirm that, we don't have a demolition, a proposed demolition, but, on this existing site plan, 010. The current access to a loading dock or loading area is just a double page. It's not where the current proposed loading access is. Is there's a reason why going back in time, the location of the loading access to a loading dock changed to become so close to the series apartments. Strategically, is there some history to that that we could understand?

25

MR BULL: Yeah. So I think originally the loading zone for the hospital, it's right next to the existing hospital that's there, that's proposed to be demolished. they've looked at the South and they've tried to maintain the deep soil and the existing trees where possible. they've tried to limit the amount of entrances to the site. And so you have the entrance to the basement car park, which is in a similar location to the loading zone there. I think that was too steep. Or the basement entry may not have worked for a loading zone. So they've looked at alternatives. and that's where they've looked at that existing at grade car parks to the north.

35

MS LEWIN: That's smaller. Without any plant. Mechanical plant associated with it. But---

40

MS WATSON: I think it's the it's the lowest part of the site. when you go out on site and, it is adjacent to the residential properties, which is not ideal. You'd rather have it maybe down in the reservoir or somewhere else. But, and we looked at that with the trees as well, because there's a significant tree on that corner that they have to go to great expense to investigate. because of the driveway there. Um, but I think it has to do with the level and the location, of that driveway being in that lower area, where it raises significantly up, as you head down the road.

45

MS LEWIN: And everyone's access to the building.

MR BALL: The loading bay.

5 MS SLIOGERIS: The loading bay.

MR BULL: Location.

10 MS WATSON: The ambulance bay in the loading.

MR BULL: Yeah. Which connects straight to the residential age care facility and palliative care office.

15 MR PILTON: I don't have any questions. More questions. Michael?

MR WRIGHT: No.

MS LEWIN: No, I've got enough to interrogate the plans.

20 MR PILTON: Thank you. Very much.

MS READ: Thanks a lot.

25 MR PILTON: Thank you all today. And it's horrible weather out there.

MS WATSON: Thank you.

MR PILTON: We look forward to receiving your data.

30 MS WATSON: That's right. We will. So will you request that or. Yeah. Okay. and would you like that before?

MS SEXTON: We'll send you the request before the end of the year, but we'll do probably first week back, because we aren't meeting with Council until that week.

35 MS WATSON: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

<THE MEETING CONCLUDED>