



## **Transcript from Question and Answer Session**

**For the Community Information Session for PP\_2017\_LANEC\_001\_00**

Held on Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> March 2018

at the

Terrace Function Room at the Lane Cove Community Hub, 1 Pottery Lane,  
Lane Cove

Prepared by  
**Urban Concepts**

For  
**Pathways Residences**



## Disclaimer

---

Urban Concepts has taken every care to ensure that the transcript has been faithfully represented and recorded. If there are comments that have not been recorded. The text has been typed as recorded, it has not been edited or paraphrased.

---



## Transcript from Question and Answer Session

COMMENT/QUESTION	CONSULTANT RESPONSE
<p>Question to you Graeme. How much money to you propose on making out of this development? Because it's about money. It's a sales pitch from where I'm sitting. How much money is Pathways going to make out of it and don't say you don't know, you must have done the figures.</p>	<p><u>Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences</u> We have done a feasibility study but in all honesty we are choosing to do this development because we are very much engaged with what we do and what we offer to older Australian's. It's true. You can believe it or not believe it but I'm telling you I don't have to do what I'm doing, but I choose to because I love what I do. We are very proud of the programs and accommodation we provide to older Australian's. Yes it will make money.</p>
<p>How much?</p>	<p><u>Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences</u> I don't think that information is appropriate. This is a planning process. If you'd like to view our statutory accounts and you have a resident living with us I can provide you a copy but I don't quite see how whether it makes money or not is relevant. If you look at aged care across Australia the profitability in industry statistics varies between 0 and as far as I'm aware the most recent figures \$17,000 per bed per annum. So I can assure you there are much easier ways to make a dollar than running an aged care facility. It's quite challenging at times and as I said you to we're very proud of the programs we provide and the standard of accommodation we provide. I don't step back from the fact that this is a private company and we are doing this as a private development but I don't see how our profitability is relevant to a planning proposal.</p>
<p>Ok. From a planning point of view we're talking about traffic. Graham over here said there's about 41 car spaces per 40m2 of retail for 760m2 of retail, that's about 20 cars. That leaves 26 car spaces roughly to service all the staff and all the visitors. How many staff are going to be here at any one time? You know there's only 2 buses an hour?</p>	<p><u>Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences</u> At any one time about 20. We've done studies at our other facilities on the north shore about 50% of our staff come to work on public transport.</p> <p><u>Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences</u> One of the dynamics in aged care is the people who provide the direct care are not particularly well paid. It's a structural issue in the industry. Assistant nurses earn somewhere between \$23-\$27/hr depending on what shifts they're working. Most people and often they're from non-English speaking backgrounds and we have arranged programs to assist these people. Our other facilities, one is near a railway station others aren't I understand that you're concerned about traffic.</p>



Where are they going to park is more to the point?

Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences

About 50% of the staff come to work by car and some of those carpool, the rest come by public transport. The parking we are providing conforms to all the planning regulations. We as a business want to make sure the people who do want to come and park and visit us can, and studies we have done in our existing facilities show we don't have an issue with under provision of parking. Our facility at Killara for example is a little smaller than what we're proposing here and has got less parking and based on statistics and the study we've done, we don't have an issue.

One last question, you talked about building heights of 9.5 and 12m then you talk about the RL of 70.25 to the inside or internal ceiling height of the building what about equipment and plant that are going to get put on the roof how much higher are they going to be?

Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences

So the planning framework for aged care refers to ceiling height, that's the framework.

I understand that but if I'm building a house I'm allowed to go to 9m or 9.5m

Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences

I can't tell you where the plant and equipment is going to be at this point in time, that's a DA issue but what I do understand is that obviously with the sorts of things that we would provide, for example we can bury our hot water in the basement, air conditioning which we'd provide will have to be located somewhere but that will be subject to more detailed studies and the last thing I would want to see and any of us here would want to see would be an ugly air conditioning plant sitting on a building.

Some have air conditioning units on a roof?

Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences

That doesn't mean it's necessarily our building and I can invite you to drive past Sailors Bay and you won't see any air conditioning from the street or anywhere else.

Gabrielle Morrish, GMU Design & Architecture

As the architect in the room, you can actually put an air conditioning unit in the basement so long as it's properly ventilated and there is a significant available space underneath the side as it goes down because of the topographic difference so it doesn't mean you'll end up with a lot of plant on the roof.

Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences

In fact that's not something we'd want.

Graham Pindar, Traffix

Regarding the parking question, the parking controls are stipulated by council's DCP, what it



<p>I'm just guessing there will be a lot of parking in the streets of Longueville from staff, visitors, etc.</p>	<p>requires is one space for every two employees that are present on site at any one time so with 20 employees, it would normally require 10 spaces for staff and the reason for that is trying to drive a sustainable planning outcome where people make full use of alternate modes. Essentially it's a matter for the DA and is not something we need to deal with in this forum but indicatively, what it throws up for the development is a requirement for 40 spaces - were proposing 46 spaces so there's a bit of latitude there. The exercise for now is to demonstrate that that can be provided on the site and there's no impediment to that within a single basement and that's what we demonstrated.</p> <p><u>Graham Pindar, Traffic</u></p> <p>Certainly not from visitors. The number of visitors coming are extremely small. One or two vehicles per hour.</p>
<p>Firstly can I introduce myself. David Gleeson is my name from Longueville representing the Longueville Residents Association and just to let you know it's a group of community minded residents who are dedicated to fostering and protecting our well planned precinct of trees, water and buildings that are no higher than 2 storeys. We object vehemently to this gross development and its devastating impacts. My question is to Graham No.1, I think that last question a trifle aggressive so I'll try and behave myself. When Lane Cove Council last year unanimously and very firmly rejected your planning proposal didn't you get the message clearly enough that this community simply doesn't want your gross development and it's damaging impacts?</p>	<p><u>Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences</u></p> <p>Interesting question, the planning framework that we operate in is legislated by the State Government. The proposal we have is significantly smaller than what was previously proposed for this site and the planning panel unanimously approved the proposal to go to the next stage with two representatives of Lane Cove Council on that panel so the purpose of today is for us to get feedback from you. We're all part of the community. We've all got different opinions. There will be some people who are not in favour of this development. When we did the development at Northbridge, Pathways Sailors Bay, I have a friend who lived in Northbridge who's in the medical profession, she didn't like the idea at all. Now she looks at the development and says "gee Graeme, this is a really nice development, I'm glad you did that so it's all part of a process and I'm not here to judge any one of you. I have been doing this for a number of years, myself and my team are very invested in what we do and we are very proud of what we do and we would seek to have something approved which the community may not all be in favour but in time I think people will reflect on it and think yes, maybe it wasn't such a bad thing. That's my view and certainly you're entitled to your view.</p>
<p>Talking about Northwood and that particular area, for a long time I will agree with you it has been a rather dead area, not a very active area and not a very appealing area but your proposals have some major concerns about them. The one obvious one that nobody has ever gotten around is the traffic. Now your traffic experts study still seems to me hopeful without being able to guarantee the results.</p>	<p><u>Belinda Barnett, Urban Concepts</u></p> <p>Can we please deal with these questions for the moment.</p> <p>I'll hand over to Graeme Pindar to address the question about traffic and then we'll hear from Gabrielle.</p>



At the same time as your development another one, 266 further up the road will bring more traffic into that corner and Lane Cove generally is under increased pressure from traffic and that intersection has been a disaster. It's never been resolved. Now the main traffic at the moment is coming out of the petrol station and that's a serious liability. But it is the main traffic. The other exits that you mentioned are very rarely used. They're very small time. I still am not satisfied that what you are proposing will work and we will end up with a peculiar arrangement where anybody who does not want to go out of your property or into your property by the North/South way, they want to go in an opposite direction will be in trouble and going around the back streets. But there are other points I'd like to raise to, the original proposal that you made was 5 storeys that was knocked back and Lane Cove Council made a proposition of 3 storeys now we seem to be faced with 4 storeys, I'd like to question that. The next thing I'd like to question is the setback from the street. You're proposing trees. I'm wondering whether 3m is going to be sufficient for deep soil planting for decent trees.

Ok, I have a few more as well.

These are all the details you have given before and I have to say they still sound hopeful rather than guaranteed.

#### Graham Pindar, Traffix

The business of trying to predict what impact the development is going to have is obviously predictive by nature and therefore this results an element of uncertainty about it so in terms of guarantee, no one can give you a guarantee. However there is a lot of uncertainty. The RMS has collected a lot of data from surveys all around the metropolitan area about these types of uses and they give you trip rates which are an average across the Sydney metropolitan area and normally what you would do is apply those trip rates and have regard for the particular circumstances. There are some set up by the RMS that are more suitable and comparable for use. So we have effectively set up RMS trip rates but having said that we've also done a check, based on first principles to say that we know how many staff are going to be working there and we know what the visitation rates are so when you align those two different methodologies the outcome really is the same and we are very confident that the generation we are predicting is not guaranteed but the margin of error would be quite moderate.

I agree with you that the word guarantee can't be given in this context.

#### Belinda Barnett, Urban Concepts

Gabrielle, would you like to respond to the question about the 5 storeys and the Council wanting 3 storeys and now wanting 4 storeys.

#### Gabrielle Morrish, GMU

The first thing to understand is our client is not the same developer who came forward with the previous application so I can't answer why they said 5 storeys or what the history of that action was. This is a completely different planning proposal, completely different client looking at the site so I think the site has changed hands since that occurred.

In terms of your question regarding 4 storeys, we feel that 4 storeys is an appropriate outcome, it is a centre you would normally expect the centre to have some scale in addition to what you'd see in the residential around it and Council's DCP does contemplate 3-4 storeys for the rest of the centre on the other side of the Northwood Road and normally you try and balance a centre so that you don't feel one sided is more impoverished than the other and that the form reinforces the fact that you've arrived



	<p>at the centre. Your other question was regarding the trees coming into the footpath. The 3m setback is from our boundary to the face of the building that's on top of the existing street verge that's there that I think about 3m that's 6m in total. Most main streets even the footpaths in the City of Sydney have less than that. They are often 4-5m so 6m is quite generous and should allow good quality trees to go in and clear air space free of the awning.</p>
<p>My name is Janis Newton, local resident, local GP, local daughter of someone in a nursing home and I go to most of the local nursing homes around Hunters Hill and Lane Cove. I am concerned and basically I don't believe your modelling. Firstly the parking, everywhere I go despite allegedly adequate parking, the streets are full of cars and I do not believe there is enough car spaces available especially if there is going to be retail. You can look at Montefiore at Hunters Hill you can look at Bayswater Gardens at Abbotsford, the parking goes up and down the street. So I don't believe your modelling on that. As far as the traffic is concerned, I am dismayed that 2 years down the track we have still got that rat-run around the back of Longueville and I really don't think that is an acceptable answer for the residents and never will be and the types of vehicles that will be coming in and out I think will be different and will be different to what's doing that run at the moment in that there are a lot of service vehicles going in and out of the facility not just cars. As far as ride sharing and public transport for the staff that is a joke around Longueville, the buses are few and far between, rare on weekends, absent on a Sunday and certainly don't continue at 10pm and 7am for shift changes so I think that is not true.</p> <p>As far as the height that 3 storey frontage I think will over balance that whole area of the park, the tennis courts, the diddy and the other area and I don't think that will be an inviting place. I know it's not inviting now but I don't believe it will be inviting then either. My question is what do you think about that?</p>	<p><u>Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences</u></p> <p>In relation to parking, as before, it's fundamentally an issue in relation to the application of Council's DCP and whether that's an appropriate control in the circumstances. As an applicant, all you can do is seek to satisfy what the DCP says you need to provide. In relation to the main element which is the retail, the road is one space per 40m<sup>2</sup>. That is not an especially high rate because a lot of retail generates a higher demand than that but you have to keep in mind that the retail that's associated with this development is in many ways ancillary to this development and it's also servicing the local community. So there will be a higher proportion of walking trips than you would get at most retail and that's why the rate of one for 40 probably is about on the right number. There are always debates about parking, I understand that lots of development's parking is insufficient. The major contributor to parking issues is residential parking and Council's rates in relation to residents themselves and they are usually driven by State Government policies to try and force people onto alternate modes of transport. That's not the case here, the applicant knows what the demand is for their staff and their visitors. The DCP gives an outcome that is consistent with what they expect and the retail as mentioned before seems to be on the right number as well.</p> <p><u>Gabrielle Morrish, GMU</u></p> <p>As an Urban Designer I would have to disagree. It's important to have the centre balanced, I think it's also important to understand there is an existing 3 storey approval on the site already and when you're looking at the current height controls in terms of development that happens on this site and north of it, there is already a 12m height control in place. On those sites, you can fit 4 storeys, certainly 3 storeys in the existing height controls that apply to the site so I think the vision of Council is to definitely have a 3 storeys street wall coming through the centre itself.</p>



<p>What we are being offered as a major building with all the staff that go with it and all the services that go with it on a major corner which is already very difficult then you're asking us to believe that the traffic flows on this major corner are going to be about the same as they are now. I think the feeling is that this is a fiction.</p>	<p><u>Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences</u></p> <p>It is a very bold statement to say that it's a fiction. To some extent traffic in general is not so much a science as an art as well, I mean, you can always argue about numbers, we do have predictive information available to us. It's used across the metropolitan area and for every type of development and the predictions we have are as good as they can be based on current best practice. So I don't believe it's fiction, it's the best that we can do and in this case quite accurate because the research is based on surveys of existing facilities and when you survey many facilities over a period of time, you start to build up a database which gives you a very clear picture of how these uses are going to operate and from my experience with dealing with quite a few of these facilities, they are a very low order traffic generation, far less than residential and than any other use you might want to contemplate.</p>
<p>I'm a local resident, I live 100m not more from this proposed development. I live in River Road West. In the morning in recent times the Council has fortunately put in parking restrictions in the peak hours in the morning they certainly need to do it in the evening as well but that's up to them. Certainly the traffic in the morning going past, any traffic coming in and out of that development, then they've got the traffic lights and I've got to say that it's quite a build up of traffic in the AM and the peak hour and I can quite understand the objection of the other locals speaking here. Firstly I'd like to say one thing, it should be a Northwood development not a Longueville development. It's in Northwood Rd nothing to do with Longueville. I've lived in the area for years, I'm 93 but that's beside the point. I've seen developments come and go and I've seen traffic come and go and it is now peaking in that area.</p> <p>My other point is the fact about the retail. Once upon a time when I was a child growing up, we had retail at Blaxlands Corner, we had a butcher a pharmacist, newsagent, green grocer I don't think there's any hope for retail, what is there now is liquor, petrol and coffee for some. These are not questions, these are comments from me as a resident. It if goes ahead so be it, I think it won't be in time for me to be an occupant so that's sad. I can see certain advantages for it. The one thing I need to know is if you live there in a unit on your own do you have joint units, do you have cooking facilities, I presume you have toilets and bathrooms. What goes into those units? Never once in any your publicity has it occurred anywhere what is in there.</p>	<p><u>Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences</u></p> <p>Here is a photo of a typical unit.</p> <p>They're not units as such. We care for older Australian's who have got care needs – we're not a retirement village and so every resident in one of our developments has their own bedroom and bathroom, some of our units have tea making facilities but all the meals are prepared on site by our chef and all the laundry is done, etc and all of those facilities are provided on site in order to minimise any traffic.</p>



<p>I live very close to this proposed development and I accept there will be a development there. My concern like everybody else is about the parking. 46 car spaces is totally inadequate for this type of development.</p>	
<p>I'm seeking clarification as the whole meeting this evening has been about a particular development on one side of Northwood Road, is that the full extent of this PP or does this PP actually extend into other areas not covered by this development?</p> <p>The map on the website covers areas other than this development and I just wanted clarification that there is no change in relation to those areas.</p>	<p><u>Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences</u> No, that's the full extent of the PP. Juliet, you can probably speak more technically about this.</p> <p><u>Juliet Grant, City Plan &amp; Strategy Development</u> That's absolutely correct. It's site specific, it's tied to this site. When we draft the legal instrument it will tie it specifically to this parcel of land. We are not amending the B1 Zone in general across the whole area.</p> <p><u>Juliet Grant, City Plan &amp; Strategy Development</u> The PP is absolutely site specific, not any other area.</p>
<p>The point that Graeme has been making that the submission has to address what the boundaries are for the existing development because when we make our submissions about this if there are areas where they are not in control with compliance about that we can complain about it but equally in other areas we need to make the point to Council that the problem is the control plan doesn't put the limits that it should put for parking and other things because if they're not required to provide more than 40 spots, it's hardly surprising whilst I think we need more that you write one that needs a whole lot more. I would like to pick up on the traffic stuff though. As a resident of Longueville and having been a resident previously of Northwood I know that we are talking about two peninsulas that have 3 roads coming out of them like Northwood Rd, Kenneth Rd and William Edward which is also used as a rat-run. I note that none of the stuff I've seen addresses the traffic that's going out of William Edward as the third way out of the Peninsula and I also note that some of the things we are being presented with are in my view a little 'spun' which is part of the reason I find them lacking credibility. The photo for example on your first slide Graeme that shows one of the streets on the rat-run that usually has 25 cars on it that you're trying to dodge around as you go down that street which I do quite regularly has a total of one car parked on it, you are very fortunate to take a photo that didn't show actually much more congestion than happens there. I'd also point out the comments about the adequacy of public transport, since the meeting nearly 2 years ago, the public bus transport to the city has decreased by more than half because the 254 has ceased going into the city, the 261 no longer goes to</p>	<p><u>Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences</u> The whole debate about public transport really feeds into the question of how much parking should be provided on this site and again it is an issue for Council's DCP and we are expecting to make provision about the DCP rate which does give us some flexibility and a little bit of a safety margin. The DCP has one space for two employees doesn't mean that half of them don't have access. Some people will drive, some will car pool, ride sharing is not uncommon, there may well be people who walk, people who get dropped off – there are a lot of factors involved in journey to work data and Council's DCP is what it is. As far as I recall, it's a maximum level of provision as well so if you wanted to provide more parking you would have to have a pretty solid debate with Council about how much additional parking you would be permitted. So even with the 46 spaces we have on the agenda now which is what we're saying we can fit, there is still a discussion to have with Council at DA stage as to whether you will get the additional 6. Whether you want to go beyond that to reflect that public transport services have reduced is another question but I think in the traffic impact statement we have prepared, it does say there should be some discussions to see whether there needs to be increased frequencies of buses or indeed additional services to provide this development as well as perhaps other developments. In the context of this application, the applicant really has a responsibility to look at the impacts of this development. Council and to some extent RMS has a much wider responsibility which is to look at the cumulative impact of other developments generally so this</p>



the QVB and goes to Barangaroo where most of us don't want to go, the 254 goes to McMahons Point, I would say that you're saying the shift changes are going to have half people coming by public transport, for 7am there is one bus that comes in from Riverview arriving at the nearest stop at 6.46am and two 261's before that that come in from Lane Cove, there is no bus from St Leonards, there is no bus from the train, there is no bus from McMahons Point or the city. After 10pm there is a grand total of one bus which goes to the Lane Cove centre so if someone is coming before the 7-2 shift then they're going to have a great deal of trouble getting a bus to arrive if they're on 2-10, they're going to have a great deal of difficulty finding a bus leaving and this is without the fact that the buses are non-existent at those times on a Sat and a Sun so to come and tell us that public transport is perfectly adequate, I don't believe your staff are going to be able to get there by public transport unless you change your shift times to the times when the buses arrive which obviously you're not going to do. There is no train that is locally accessible without having buses, there is one ferry at the end of Longueville that is quite a walk away which doesn't have a bus to get you from there to the centre so I think part of the reason we have so much doubt about some of the figures on the traffic is that there are some aspects of it that just don't make any sense to the people who live there. The bus service is totally inadequate, it's not going to solve your problems. If the traffic analysis manages to miss one of the three areas in the rat-run and at no point has the rat-run really even been discussed in this then the analysis that says there's a 5.9 second delay at an intersection which might be a completely accurate average from your data but if that data comprises mostly times during the day when there is no delay and sometimes when there is a delay of 5 mins, I'm not convinced that an average is a particularly accurate way of representing what's going on so I have some real doubts about the traffic things. I accept there are standard methods to use and that you're only going to address what the development control plan requires but I really think there are some issues here.

I'm not going to talk about the traffic because I think that's been discussed. If this does go ahead, the construction phase, that's going to be a disaster if you use the rat-run for the construction traffic but again we'll have to wait see. Have you considered the back entrance of that place? I know its steep but that would solve all those problems. It would be probably be more expensive and a bit more difficult but get the traffic off that main road.

question of public transport I don't think can be loaded onto one application, it's a much broader question than that and it is integrally related with the DCP parking rate provision.

In terms of the rat-run, this has historically been an issue and I think that's why it's continually raised. As I've said, what we've tried to do here is engineer an outcome where there is a traffic neutral situation and that is simply possible on this occasion because this is a very low traffic generating use. This is an adequate response to your question. The big picture is a lot bigger than we are. We hear there are issues out there. Rat-running is an existing problem to a large degree and we acknowledge that it is an issue but it's not something that we're exacerbating because we do happen to have a traffic neutral outcome. I'm sure historically there have been a lot of issues of cars parking on the street – they are existing problems and we are not going to exacerbate them. We have always said that if there are particular things that can be done we will work with Council to try and improve an existing deficient situation and that still stands. To date, Council haven't raised any particular issues with us that need resolution.

Finally in relation to volumes I'll just remind you all the rat-run really only becomes an issue when you start to get either safety concerns or whether the environmental amenity of residents in terms of things like sleep deprivation is an issue and that's not the case here because traffic volumes on those residential streets is a long way below the environmental amenity threshold as described and as calculated by the RMS guideline which is what everybody uses when looking at the impacts on the residential communities generally.

Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences

In relation to construction traffic, we are only at planning stage, it's a planning proposal it's not a development application. With a development application rest assured it would be a condition on any consent and it may be that a construction traffic management plan is prepared and submitted to Council as part of a development application which would be unusual because normally it's done once you get a consent. It's normally a standard condition that requires you to undertake a detailed construction traffic management plan which looks at



	<p>pedestrian safety and obviously accessibility by larger vehicles. With a management plan you do have the ability to impose restrictions on the way that this development site is accessed and in terms of the residential streets, one of the conditions that would arise would be that no heavy vehicles use those residential streets. Then it becomes a question of how well supervised is it and most management plans have a mechanism in place whereby people can ring up and advise the builder of any issues that are arising on a regular basis and there is a mechanism there to intervene and make sure it doesn't happen as it can impact on their contractual arrangements. You can make these things as severe as you want to so construction will be dealt with, it hasn't been dealt with yet but we acknowledge that its an issue but as I said we are at an early planning stage in terms of this particular application.</p> <p>I think the other question was in relation to the access. It's Council land so I don't think from previous discussions that that has ever been available for use. It may well solve some problems and no doubt it would create others but that's a question that's probably a bit bigger than something I can address. And it's bushland as well so I'm sure there are environmental considerations. In relation to this development that's proposed, the traffic generation from it is not dissimilar to what's existing but it's a lot less than what would be permissible on this site even under the existing zonings, this planning proposal is seeking to increase building heights and so on but this particular use doesn't follow that it's going to result in increasing traffic, quite the opposite, it's a very low generating use. You might want to contrast that with a situation where under the existing zone which means that if we weren't in this room and nothing was happening it is within the realm of possibility that an applicant could lodge something under the current controls that would be a lot worse in traffic terms than what is now proposed.</p>
<p>My name is Jacqui Barker and I run a local website called The Cove and we have published several articles about this development and we have 11,000 Facebook followers and we have not had one person go 'yay' let's get this development rolling so I just thought I'd give you that little bit of feedback. I have also had a public campaign to increase public transport in this area for over 3 years and even though we got more buses and it was heralded as a great public transport step forward, we are still struggling particularly in Longueville and Riverview so if you think any of your staff are going to use public transport they won't because as this gentleman rightly said, there is so little public</p>	



transport opportunities for your staff.

The other thing is that the RMS has big issues with the 266 development and I'm sure I'm surprised to hear too Graham the traffic person say that the RMS is ok with your particular development. I also monitor that intersection quite regularly because we are told every week that there is a big accident there and we have been lobbying the RMS for black spot funding for that intersection for years and the guy who runs the Porters will tell you the screeching of brakes is there every day and you're going to put an aged care facility where you're saying to your residents, 'hey walk over to the Diddy, go to Central Park' well you're probably going to have a high turnover of rooms because I won't let my 14 year old cross the street and you are thinking that that's ok for residents. So I'm particularly concerned how dangerous that intersection is and I think its an inappropriate place for an aged care facility.

The other thing is that senior housing was specifically omitted as permitted use, I wonder why that was. I wonder why the people who put that LEP in place before thought that senior housing is not appropriate for this intersection. Could it be because it's one of the most dangerous intersections in Lane Cove.

The other thing you mentioned is there is a shift change at 2pm. 2pm is the biggest traffic area around because schools end between 2-3, so many schools around there and that would be an issue. I would particularly like to know about your visitors. Do your visitors include doctors, chiros, physios, do they sign in? Have you taken them into account when you have looked at the visitors book because I can assure you that every aged care facility that I've been to there is a lot more people than 1.8 per bed.

And I hope you fix my driveway because I live in Austin Street and people don't want to turn into William Edward St because there is a traffic island there so come down and turn into Austin St and they turn into my drive and so I can just see that there are two streets you haven't even looked at and I always find it fascinating that people buy these developments without a contract condition upon change of the LEP and I'm not sure whether you have, have you? So you're the title owner so you'll push this through regardless?

Thank you for listening to me but I would like to know about those visitors numbers and also I don't really understand when you talk about the DCP in

That's not the way I would frame the answer.

The DCP has a rate that you are required to apply for any development.



Council, are you saying that the Council has given you a maximum amount of parking spaces that you can put?

But you can't have more?

Does it say its maximum?

And has your traffic report looked at any accidents that have occurred on this intersection because you had on the site about safety but I find that really quite negligent.

No, that's not the point. I drive past that every day and I've never seen anyone come out of there except the petrol station.

But police don't have the correct stats because you no longer have to report an accident unless there is an injury.

Every week there are tow aways.

It's a discussion because it's a DCP it's not a statutory document but generally speaking if it says a maximum then that's what is applied.

I need to check I'll have to come back on that.

In terms of the planning proposal, we simply have offered the DCP as a suitable starting position. The debate that we'll go forward to the DA will be whether the DCP should be varied and the DCP should and indeed most these things do have provision for some flexibility in terms of if you can justify it. So if it is the case for example public transport has been pulled back, services aren't as good then yes there is an argument for additional parking and indeed we already want to take advantage of that because we do have 46 spaces in this scheme which is more than Council would normally permit which is 40.

Well the safety issues that exist now are quite significant and a lot of those would be related to the fact that along that site frontage has 5 existing driveways.

Part of the consultation requirements under the gateway determination is we have to consult with state agencies and the police is one those

So the police will come back to us with safety requirements if there are.

#### Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences

The published accident data is basically all tow away or casualty crashes and that's been the case for the last 40 years. That hasn't changed and the reason for that is they want to make sure they can monitor accidents.

What you will find is under reported is the minor accidents which aren't tow away or casualty.

If that's the case it would be reflected in the statistics.



<p>And you would be happy that you feel it's appropriate for an aged care facility?</p>	<p>The proposed actual arrangement which includes the use of that intersection has as I mentioned, been subject to a road safety audit. Off the top of my head I can't tell you whether the road safety audit has reviewed the accident data, I would be very surprised if they didn't but it's something that we can take on board and make sure it has been looked at and whether it changes the recommendations, we'll take that on board.</p>
<p>First question is to Graeme and I think Jacqui just asked you that question but I wanted to be sure I understood the answer correctly, does Pathways already own the entire site?</p> <p>The other question is probably pre-empting what Michael Mason might be informing us but nevertheless, I would like to know if the panel here we can send questions during the next 6 weeks directly to you panel and would you be responding in a public forum those questions and answers because obviously we have lots of questions and that's not going to finish in the next 5 mins so would the panel be willing to take questions and answer them in a public forum?</p> <p>My question is since the information session is not likely to answer all the questions, can we address questions to you and get the answer?</p> <p>And we would receive a response within the 6 week timeframe?</p> <p>And lastly just an observation because I think I know the answer, I think what you said and Graham too is that there is only a left turn out of the complex and you are saying that all of the traffic is going to go down River Road which means that if people want to go to the Lane Cove Plaza they will have to come out either from Kenneth St or from Northwood Rd, maybe a u-turn on Northwood Rd or perhaps go down to Pavillion(?) and to say that this will not impact the current traffic flow is perhaps again a question of credibility that escapes us. I don't want to the answer because I think I know the answer but it's an observation that contributes to everything else that's been said.</p>	<p><u>Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences</u> We do.</p> <p><u>Juliet Grant, City Plan &amp; Strategy Development</u> Usually the process is that you make your public submissions in the next 6 weeks and then Council will receive those and consider them and as the planning consultant, we would normally provide Council with responses back to those. I don't know whether the Lane Cove Council would usually then make those responses public but you could.</p> <p><u>Belinda Barnett, Urban Concepts</u> On our consultation website there is a feedback form so you can submit a question in writing and we will respond as long as it's not regarded as part of the formal public submission process that accompanies planning proposals as long as that is understood.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p><u>Juliet Grant, City Plan &amp; Strategy Development</u> Do you mean within 6 weeks like if you submit it on the last day.</p> <p><u>Belinda Barnett, Urban Concepts</u> We try to turn things around within 48 business hours.</p>



A few questions. Pathways main claim of justification that they will be providing much needed age care is emphasised in that brochure that arrived in my mailbox yesterday that this was being spoken tonight is kind of service to us ageing baby-boomers but already there are 450 aged care beds and seniors living units some already approved and the others in master plan hospital redevelopment, 266 Longueville Road and Billy Blue Palace on the corner of Greenwich Rd and River Rd and the Greenwich Hospital development which is adding 92 seniors living units and the balance of beds are 75 new aged care beds that's in addition to the current hospital so there's already 458 aged care beds going in within one mile in a line from that intersection if you start at 266 and go through to Billy Blue Greenwich Rd.

Some easy questions. How many beds in the short stay day care facility, how many beds in the dementia ward, the 750m2 dog and cat hospital will the patients arrive on foot? Another question, are you trying to use the vertical village provisions of the Seniors Living SEPP 2004 and the last question, when you're asked to demonstrate consistency with SEPP 19 Bushland and you said that it's not zoned opened space so it's not applicable and it's sort of not open space and you said to Council that you don't have to demonstrate anything, is that an answer we can really trust given that we've been told to believe you but we don't know if we can.

I also asked about seniors living – are you trying to use the Seniors Living 2004 SEPP?

Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences

I'll let Juliet address the planning issues. What I'd say in relation to the number of beds, one of the key points of what we're saying is we are actually providing choice for potential residents in the local area. What we do is different to what's existing and it's different to the proposed developments that you refer to. I'd also make the point that we are strictly residential age care or what you'd know as a nursing home, we're not retirement or independent living as referred to by some of you. I know the project at 266 has a significant element of residential aged care and also has an element of independent living as does the project which is proposed for Greenwich Hospital. I know 2 of the 3 aged care providers operating those facilities and I can tell you that what we do is different to those and I can also say that the wellness centre is not proposed to have any beds as such for people to stay in, it's strictly a wellness centre which is primarily providing wellbeing services to our own residents with an adjunct that if someone from the local community wishes to avail themselves of those services, they are free to do so.

We provide respite care in all our facilities within the context of the number of beds we're talking about given this is a planning proposal rather than a development application so at the moment we're talking in the vicinity of 130 beds and we would envisage that we would be providing a significant number of respite bed days within that 130 beds.

Belinda Barnett, Urban Concepts

And what proportion of the 130 beds would be put aside for people with dementia?

Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences

Given that we haven't got a firm development proposal, I envisage somewhere between 30-40 beds for patients with dementia.

No, the intention for this planning proposal is to be upfront with the community about the height and FSR Controls we are seeking for this site. For those that don't know, the vertical villages provisions in the Seniors Living SEPP provide under certain circumstances, an opportunity for a floor space 0.5:1 space bonus. We have made it very clear from day 1 with this discussion that we are being open and transparent and that we wish that the envelope controls and the DCP and the height and FSR are controls in our planning proposal are the maximum that we are seeking to develop to.



<p>Under the SEPP you don't have to comply with the DCP in a vertical village.</p> <p>It said you had to have the SEPP19 Bushland covered prior to consultation on the gateway determination.</p>	<p>This is how you frame a development application but we're not talking about the DCP we're still talking about the LEP controls that would apply to this site.</p> <p>The assessment of SEPP19 Bushland is a statutory requirement at the development application stage, we will most definitely cover that, it is a threshold issue. We have to cover that before a determination can be made.</p> <p>We have provided Council with information at this point in time for the level of detail that you require for a planning proposal, and then at development application stage, it is a higher level of assessment. I will point out that we actually don't have SEPP19 Bushland on our site, that is the adjoining site, so we will most certainly be assessing potential impacts and making sure, particularly for construction phase, if that is where we end up, that we have appropriate protection measures.</p>
<p>My name is David Reinfelt, I am the president of the Lane Cove branch of the ALP. I have studied this document and I have lots of questions, but I will limit it to 2. The first question is, one of your selling points is that you have anticipated that you will create 20 jobs, how many jobs will you displace when you bulldoze the businesses that are there? Secondly, in your document on page 22 in section 4 under Proposed Amendments to LEP 2009 you state this "A consent authority must not refuse consent to a development application for the purpose of seniors housing if it complies to Clause 48D of the State Environmental Planning Policy (housing for seniors or people with a disability 2004). Now the way I read that, are you mandating and telling the Council what they should and shouldn't do?</p> <p>The fact that you have suggested in here, if I was a Councillor and this landed on my desk, this would go straight into the shredder.</p>	<p><u>Juliet Grant, City Plan &amp; Strategy Development</u> The way the documentation is structured is that we have experts of the legislation, we don't need to tell the Council what they need to do. As a planning firm we have a reputation and I have personal integrity to make sure that what I write and what we put together is an accurate representation. I'm sorry if you think it is shred worthy, but it is an accurate planning report and if you look at other planning reports, it would appear very similar for any other development sites by any other planning consultant.</p> <p><u>Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences</u> I'm not sure exactly how many people currently work on those sites, I know there is a display apartment for a developer that is building on Burns Bay Road, there is probably one person working there. The workshop is not currently operating, there is one person in the service station as far as I'm aware, there may be two. There is a small catering firm there, and there is the veterinarian. I would imagine there is a handful of staff at this point in time across the site.</p>
<p>My name is David Sutherland, I live in Woodford Street. I did come to the first consultation meeting and now the second one, and traffic is the major issue that has been raised, and I totally understand why. My question is around some of the modelling, particularly in terms of change of use. The use of the site will generate significant traffic in my view through the rat-run, through the basis that it becomes a destination for them, whether they are a visitor to residents, servicing it, staff members, or they are visiting the retail space there. I'm not actually against the development per say, I think that</p>	<p><u>Graeme Skerritt, Pathways Residences</u> It's important to understand from our point of view, we purchased this land, we've got a vision for a development there, which some people agree with and some people don't. There is no value for us in building a development, which doesn't adequately service what we are doing. We've engaged Traffix - Graham Pindar, to do the modelling, based on particular surveys in the area and publicly available information, which Graham gets from the RMS. Anecdotally from what I understand and I have some knowledge of the area, I used to live in Longueville</p>



what you have developed at Northbridge is a great facility. My sister lives in Northbridge, and my mother went to that facility, it's a great facility. I think that 46 car parking spaces is significantly undercooked, in terms of what's there, and I certainly know from parking at Northbridge, that on a number of occasions I had trouble parking there and many people had to park in the street. It did seem that the number of spaces there for visitors were substantially reduced by the number of staff members that were parking there. My biggest concern is, in the modelling it seems that you've used data that hasn't really considered the change of use, and therefore the traffic movements that will be generated as a result of that change of use. I think also the issue around parking in those streets as well, in both Arabella and Woodford Street particularly on a Friday night and on a Saturday night, where the Diddy doesn't really have any parking, and at the end of the day people do park all the way up and down those streets, it is reduced to one lane effectively. That is something that I don't think has been taken into consideration. Ultimately if you think you can solve the traffic issue, and I know it is a difficult one to solve and I know we talked about roundabouts last consultation at the intersection that could potentially go some way to solve it, or issues around needing to buy additional property and having the space, or whether there is a solution down the back, I'm not sure. But that to me, seems to be the major issue. I think the density and the other aspects of it could be resolved in that location, but it is the traffic and the parking for me, that seems to be the major issue. My question is about the use and how that impacts on the modelling because it doesn't seem like it has been taken into consideration adequately.

I think the volume of traffic will significantly increase, even though you say they won't, maybe a peer review will resolve that.

at one stage, the streets you referred to are at particular times, an issue. What we have sought to do, by reducing the amount of retail space in our proposed scheme is to get our development to a stage where it is demonstrably either status quo, or in fact slightly reduced from what is currently there, and significantly reduced from what could be built there under the current Council planning controls. There is no value for us in building and creating a development which becomes a big issue, in terms of traffic and so on. In saying that, I am aware a number of you in Arabella and Woodford Street, from what I understand there are currently issues there, I don't know if we can solve those problems, but what I do know is that we can frame our development so that it doesn't exacerbate that and certainly from the information that I have been given we have done that.

#### Graham Pindar, Traffic

The RMS guideline is really the bible when it comes to looking at traffic generations and impacts, and we have used that, and we have used that in relation to each individual land use. So, yes we have looked at what the trip rates are, what is based on the site now for the various uses that are on the site and we have also looked at what the trip rates will be for the proposed development. So the comparison we have done, that is in the report the actual assumptions, and the way that the traffic generations have been calculated is all presented in the way that is fairly transparent and in relatively plain English. By all means, make a submission on any aspect of it that you don't agree with, but as I said before, it is from our point of view a credible analysis and it is based on information that is available that everybody uses. It also reconciles with the first principle approach, that we have applied certainly in relation to the proposed development. In terms of the existing issue, we hear loud and clear that there is an issue with rat-running. The question to what extent is the problem, I think I have talked about the fact that the volumes themselves in those streets is not a very high volume particularly for a residential street. I think what comes into play is the fact that you've got on street parking effects, which reduce it to one lane. Now, that is an existing situation and we may not be exacerbating it and it is probably unfair to be asking us to solve that problem but that's not to say that there aren't opportunities certainly at the DA stage to engage with Council to see what can be done. No doubt there will be a solution to it, it may involve some loss of parking on the street, I suppose whether your question relates to the performance of the street, in terms of the blocking effects of on street parking or whether you perceive that we are going to impact on on-street parking because of the



	<p>fact that we will accommodate our demand on site. We are always happy to be peer reviewed, it is an option that is available to Council. I'm not sure if we would offer it because we have done a lot of work and we have come a long way and we have genuinely tried to get an outcome that does not impact on traffic. As a community, you need to differentiate between what exists and is a problem and what this development is creating which would potentially make it worse. What I am saying is that it doesn't make it worse, but it doesn't solve the existing problem clearly. There may solutions to it, and as I said we are happy to work with Council to do it. We have done all the modelling that Council has asked us to do, the modelling will be made available to Council soon (which includes the new Woodford and Arabella Street modelling, as this has only just recently been completed), the RMS has had all of the modelling for some time and they have made their own decisions about that, and it is quite a process to get the RMS on side in relation to traffic signals and it isn't something they look at lightly and that was one of the reasons the road safety was done as it was a requirement of theirs, to be able to get this application across the line of how we are approaching to access the site. I hope this answers your question, by all means look at the reports submitted and make submissions on them.</p>
<p>I think my question has been answered. Woodford Street is a terrible problem now and 100% of the exiting vehicles from this development will come up Woodford Street and there will be a bank up because local residents come down and there will be a hold up half way down the street, it is such a disaster. I cannot get in and out of my driveway now and it isn't going to improve.</p>	