

Norwood Community Reference Working Group Meeting Notes
Proposed Life Care development at 157 Beulah Road Norwood

Meeting Number	3
Date/ time	Tuesday 10 October 2017 at 7:00pm – 9.30pm
Location	Clayton Wesley Uniting Church Community Hall
Attendees	32 members of the Norwood and Joslin Community, Steve Dangerfield (communicate et al), Vicki Cirilo (communicate et al), Sarah Hill (communicate et al), Henry Rasheed (communicate et al), Sarah Gilmour (Holmes Dyer Pty Ltd), Scott Colgate (Marchese Architecture)
Apologies	Allan Quire (Life Care), Helen Dyer (Holmes Dyer Pty Ltd)
Visitors	In addition to Norwood residents a number of Joslin residents attended the meeting as well as Labor candidate for Dunstan

1. Welcome and introduction

The third meeting was opened by welcoming the attendees including new attendees who had not been at the first two meetings. A number of attendees had not pre-registered, consequently space was a little limited but the group were comfortable to proceed.

2. Minutes from last meeting:

Minutes from second meeting had been circulated to attendees via email prior to this meeting. Due to the number of additional attendees, the project team explained they would not spend time going through the previous minutes. However, those residents and stakeholders who were in attendance were welcome to provide any editorial comment either after the meeting or post the meeting via email. No issues were raised with the minutes from the floor from those who attended.

3. Meeting Purpose and Approach

The purpose of meeting was explained

- To communicate the latest plans and revisions.
- For residents to provide feedback on the latest plans.
- To answer questions that had been asked at previous meetings and at the Joslin community session held Monday 9 October 2017 where some Norwood residents had attended.

The meeting protocols were explained which those present at previous meetings had seen before. The level of emotion in the room with respect to Life Care's proposed development was acknowledged and noted that while the plans had been revised height would at this stage remain the key issue as it had not been addressed to the satisfaction of residents advocating for a two storey height limit. While he understood that this would continue to generate robust debate, the team specifically requested that participants not make personal comment to members of the project team.

Participants agreed to the agenda and the meeting protocols and the meeting proceeded accordingly.

4. Project update

Approval process:

- The process was explained the planning process and where the plans currently sit with respect to this process.

The time frames and the Design Review Panel process was also explained and that the project team felt that for Norwood, while not be definitive, the design was getting closer to being settled.

A series of questions were asked by participants and responded to by the project team a summary of which is provided below.

- **Question asked by participant: what is DRP assessing the plans against?**
Response: the DRP is appointed by the Office of Design and Architecture SA (ODASA) and the level of expertise at meetings is made up of local and interstate representation to provide advice on design matters. The plans are also assessed against a set of guidelines established by the Development Assessment Commission (publically available on website). It is a higher level of assessment that considers the principles of the local development plan.
- **Question asked by participant: why was the original plan 3 storeys and now it is higher, why is it higher?**
Response: there have been changes to aged care living and the way care packages are allocated. There has also been a policy shift to higher density in inner city living and to provide services and accommodation choice where it is needed. The cost of delivering care services is also escalating and therefore a critical population mass is needed to make these developments sustainable both socially and economically. Further research has also been undertaken in recent years identifying what ageing populations need and desire. The developments being proposed have been modelled on overseas and interstate examples of modern and contemporary accommodation and care services. Overall it was reiterated that a lot has changed since the original submission and ageing and housing is a dynamic issue.
- **Question asked by participant: Why is the proposal going to DRP? Is it beyond the approval process of local council?**
Response: the DRP provides advice on design matters. The major project declaration allows for matter of importance to the State and that address a critical need to be assessed. Council is not the planning authority for the project however, the Development Plan is one element that is looked at as part of the assessment.
- **Question asked by participant: when the Design Review Panel looks at the significance of the building – does it have a map of what people’s backyards look like, whether there is a pool or an outdoor area?**
Response: the DRP are provided with details as to what surrounds the development site; they have everything to scale in order to make informed comment. The DRP process is iterative and information is brought together across a number of meetings. It was explained that by engaging with residents early the project team don’t have all the details and plans are evolving in response to questions and issues raised at DRP.
- **Question asked by participant: The height is going to impact sun light – has this been assessed?** The participant mentioned that early engineering assessments undertaken by the participant had shown that in winter Beulah Road would have only 2 hours of sunshine. The participant stated they see this as being a precursor to what can happen anywhere in Adelaide – that developments of this description will set a precedent if allowed to continue.
Response: Shadow diagrams cast by the project team for the Beulah Road site do not indicate that sunlight is limited to 2 hours. The participant was invited to share the findings of the independent engineer’s report for discussion with Life Care.

- **Question asked by participant: How many full time or part time casual care providers are intended for the Beulah Road site?**

Response: 5 full time equivalent staff will be appointed as part of this complex on a rotational shift in addition to other professionals and part time staff, which will be part of Life Care's packaged arrangement. A number of services are being built into the facility to create a community environment where people can access services on site. Residents can ramp up support from service providers as they need it until such time as they require more intensive care. This model of care is not just a Life Care model but is being adopted across Adelaide. An example is the Southern Cross Care site on the corner of Cross Road and Portrush Road. This care model fills a gap for what is currently on offer.

- **Question asked by participant: How long have Life Care owned the Beulah Road site?**

Response: the questions was taken on notice. It was explained that the site has been dedicated to aged care site many more years before Life Care owned the site.

Action Response: Life Care has confirmed it purchased the site in 2013. The site has been aged care housing for some 69 years (65 of these years were part of the SA Baptist Homes for the Aged).

- **Question asked by participant: Did Life Care ask the government for major project approval status?**

Response: there has been a recognition for some time both across aged care providers and Government from both a policy and practice position that the ability to develop high quality aged care services and accommodation options is a growing issue for Adelaide, especially given the rapidly increase in demand for such services in recent years.

Action response: Aged care providers including Life Care, have been in discussion with Government over-time about planning processes for aged care accommodation and facilities.

- **Question asked by participant: regarding the provision of parking and minimising off street parking it was requested that information be provided as to how this might be achieved.**

Response: acknowledgement of the comment and we would get back to this, as it has been answered a number of times in previous meetings.

Other comments by participants during the discussion included:

- The major planning approval process is a reality and aged care providers have been provided an opportunity to make it increasingly financially viable. The participant stated they are not thrilled by Life Care's interpretation and feel the approval process has been handed to them on a plate.
- The process was seen to be bypassing council and ignoring the requirements of the local development plan. In addition, there are no legal rights for the community under this new planning provision.
- The development is at odds with Council's heritage area and is completely out of scale and character with the surrounding street-scape.

5. Issues raised at last meeting

During this stage of the meeting it was explained that in documentation in previous minutes the project team had tried to articulate everything heard to date from the community. Acknowledged was made that not all aspects of the design will be influenced, however it was stated that in good faith the team was doing what it could to collate comments received and provide these comments to Life Care and the Government case officer appointed to administer the Planning and Approval process.

Community development issues were summarised as (refer to slide 8 and 9):

- Height and Density (Bulk)
- Traffic
- Heritage and Character
- Environment
- Fencing and screening
- Security
- Future Development
- Value
- Lifestyle

It was noted that the community has expressed a view that they are not against development, however the community feel the proposed development is out of scale and character and that a development that complies with the local development plan would be more appropriate.

Community planning and engagement process issues raised by the community– (see slide 10):

- Should be going through local Council approval planning process and abiding by the rules of the local area – current development does not align with the conservation zone (covering part of the site)
- Disagree with major planning project status
- Engagement process is flawed – opportunity to influence height or appeal the decision is no existent
- Engagement process can't be trusted – documentation won't truly reflect community views
- Images and visuals are misleading - not to scale

It was explained that as the current plans are yet to be presented to the DRP, the plans being shown to the community are not final. It was explained that all plans being shown were to scale and would be the same plans presented to the DRP the following day.

6. What has not changed since last plans shown?

What has not changed was explained as follows:

- The proposed height remains 4 storeys
- There are still 4 separate buildings however the distances between them have changed.
- Undercroft car parks provided for all staff, visitors and residents to get all parking off the street
- Minimum number of cross over points on Beulah Road. A U shaped porte cochere for drop offs and pickups and an underground car park entrance by Queen Street.
- Brick wall will be retained or if unable to be retained will be replaced like for like.

7. What has changed?

What has changed was described as:

1. Building designed so there is no plant on the roof top. Plant now located in linking roofs spaces behind screens so they can't be seen or heard.
2. Plans show the 'layered cake' approach
3. Roof pitch now 3 degrees – to minimise height
4. Space increased from 2 meters to 6 meters with green garden elements and timber decking coming into spaces between connected with glass atrium to create light penetration. Space between building made bigger and as the building gets higher the gap increases
5. Angle of drive way designed to accommodate bike boulevard user safety - minimal bikeway cross over points
6. Materials to be used are in keeping with surrounding colour schemes. Materials on facades and buildings are picked from buildings in the area
7. Fencing is in keeping in style surrounding site. This is open to community feedback about what might be best around interface
8. Safety on the street through the provision of front courtyards
9. Sustainable design to capture all rainwater on site

A number of questions and comments were made by participants. These are summarised as follows:

- While the roof pitch is three degrees, how does this compare with other roof pitches in the district
- While the brick wall will be retained, this will not resolve the outlook from those properties who back onto the site and will be looking at four storeys
- It is unreasonable to not be negotiating height as it is the elephant in the room and needs to be addressed. The push for four storeys must be to do with money.
- Life Care executives should be present
- Does any of the Design Review Panel members live in the area – how would they feel if this was to be proposed for their neighbourhood
- Height is a critical issue – it was stated by the Project Team that the purpose of the DRP is to scrutinise the development based on design from the perspective of overlooking, overbearing (building mass) and overshadowing
- A participant commented that overlooking and overshadowing is quantifiable however overbearing there is no measureable criteria and this is based on subjective judgement. This was agreed.
- All decision makers should be present or at least engage with residents to understand first-hand the issues.
- The names of those on the DRP were requested – the project team advised the group that all were local from Adelaide except for one from interstate but that all were very aware of resident concerns. The project team were not at liberty to make public the names of the panel members, this was a matter for ODASA to decide.
- Clarification was sought as to who Life Care is – the project team advised that they are the not for profit aged care provider for the Churches of Christ.

8. Answers to questions asked at previous meetings (refer to presentation slides):

Slides were presented with responses to previous questions asked by the community. The current design comprises:

- 141 car parks reduced from 165
- 93 independent living units

- Numbers per floor – 23 ground ; 28 level 1; 27 level 2; 15 level 3
 - Height at Queen Street – 12.95m roof line + lift over run 1.4m (2.5 x 2.5) –
 - Clayton Church Homes on Beulah Road is 9m
 - Footprint of building – percentage open space is higher than current build form on site
 - Artist impressions – gives an idea of where the buildings are sitting – set-backs change as building gets higher
 - single storey set back 4m
 - 3rd floor set back 20 m
- **Question asked by participant: How long is the proposed building construction time?**
Response: the expected building construction phase would be in the order of 12 – 18 months
 - **Question asked by participant: Will the hours of construction be complying?**
Yes
 - **Question asked by participant: Is Beulah Road classified as a main road – is that why you can get away with it? How does DRP take this into account?**
Response: the status of Beulah Road has been taken into account in preparing the plans.
 - **Question asked by participant: Is the DRP meeting tomorrow?**
Response: what participants see tonight will go to DRP.
It was also noted that this engagement process is in addition to the legislated process. The team is committed to presenting what we have heard from the community into the Planning and Approval process.
 - **Question asked by participant: What happens if DRP gives their endorsement of the plans?**
Response: The DRP are a referral body. They will provide advice but they are not the decision maker. If the DRP do not consider that any further substantive work needs to be done to the plans, the project team will finalise the reports and make a final submission to the Department of Transport, Planning and Infrastructure for their consideration and to be released to formal public consultation for at least a three week period.
 - **Question asked by participant: Are minutes being provided to DRP?**
Response: The DPTI is regularly updated on the feedback being received from the community. Information has been provided to the DRP reflecting the community views via the case officer.
 - **Question asked by participant: Could this process stretch beyond the next election?**
Response: This is a possibility but the intention is to submit well before Christmas.
 - **Question asked by participant: Will community see the results of tomorrow's DRP meeting? Will what they say be made public?**
Response: It was explained that regardless of the outcome of tomorrow's meeting it is not the final step. The community will see the final plans and will be given opportunity to comment during the statutory public consultation period.
 - **Question asked by participant: Can we have DRP attend a Norwood meeting before decision is made?**
Response: Such a decision is not for the project team of Life Care to make. There is a Planning and Approval process underway and this will include a formal public consultation period of at least 3 weeks.
 - **Question asked by participant: When you have enquiries made of you at the DRP meeting – e.g. what have you done about reducing mass – will you convey community responses of concern? What is the voice of the residents group and how is this being provided?**
Response: The DRP, DPTI and the Minister are very aware of the community sentiment. The community also have an opportunity to be heard as part of the formal public consultation period.

Other comments by participants during the discussion included:

- *We all want development and we get this – but going to this scale in this location is inappropriate; it will take longer to construct and will significantly impact residents.*
- *Main arterial road corridors are appropriate for this type of development, not a road of the size and scale of Beulah Road. The project team noted that there is still community debate around corridor development and what is the right scale and height that should be allowed.*
- Council has tried to negotiate with State Government where growth and high rise can be accommodated through the inner rim structure plan. As part of this process the Norwood, Payneham and St Peters Council agreed that certain forms of development were appropriate for The Parade and Kent Town. The council identified 'no go zones, slow go zones, and go go zones'. That means big arterial roads are for strategic infrastructure and no go zones are heritage areas. These were set up quite deliberately so the Council could deliver certainty to developers. Now 3 years later there are 7 storey buildings being proposed in a 3 storey zone and 4 storeys in a single and two storey zone. This is grossly unfair to have all rights taken away especially as the Council have been proactive in looking at suitable locations for high rise larger scale development.
- There is a need to consider street width ratio relative to the size of the proposed development.

9. Other

Participants were asked if anyone was recording the meeting. The team apologised for not asking this at the commencement of the meeting. There was no issue with the meeting being recorded but needed to ask as some residents may be uncomfortable with this.

No-one had recorded the meeting.

A resident stated that it was only courtesy for any participant to advise at the beginning of the meeting if they intended to record the meeting – it was important that all participants demonstrate honesty and transparency in this regard.

At this point the agenda of the meeting was complete and plans were distributed to clusters of tables around the room. A member of the project team was present at each table and recorded the conversation.

10. Design discussion

Key issues raised by participants on latest plans:

- Height should be reduced to 2 storeys
- Glass should be frosted on all windows above 1.7m height
- Balconies should have screening to avoid overlooking
- Asbestos fence needs replacing near George Street
- Concern about privacy and overlooking
- Interested in types of planting along boundary

11. Community report

Will be sent to community to edit and provide comment. Report will be communicated to the DPTI.

12. Actions

Item	Action	Who	When
1.	Issue minutes and circulate to attendees	communicate et al	18 October 2017
2.	Shadow diagrams developed by resident's engineer to be sent to Life Care	Community participant	Not available at the time of circulating the minutes
3.	Plans shared at meeting to be uploaded on website	communicate et al	Complete
4.	Respond to questions unable to be answered in meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Life Care to confirm how many years the Beulah Road site has been owned for. Did Life Care ask for major planning declaration? 	communicate et al	As reported in these minutes