

Minutes to be approved by participants at next meeting**Norwood Community Reference Working Group Meeting Notes
Proposed Life Care development at 157 Beulah Road Norwood**

Meeting Number	1
Date/ time	Thursday 6 September 2017 at 7:00pm
Location	Clayton Wesley Uniting Church Community Hall
Attendees	13 members of the Norwood Community, Steve Dangerfield (communicate et al), Sarah Hall (communicate et al), Glynn Jones (communicate et al), Allan Quire (Life Care), Sarah Gilmour (Holmes Dyer)
Visitors	Nil
Apologies	1 resident who provided written comment attached at the bottom of this minute document.

1. Welcome and introduction

Steve opened the first meeting by welcoming the attendees and thanking them for their attendance, he went on to introduce the project team that were in attendance to help facilitate the meeting. The team included, Steve Dangerfield (communicate et al) Allan Quire (Life Care) Sarah Gilmour (Holmes Dyer), Sarah Hill (communicate et al) and Glynn Jones (communicate et al).

2. Protocols

Steve explained the process outlined in the presentation and asked the community to adhere the protocols outlined. Steve sought agreement from the group regarding the agenda and the protocols for how the meeting would be run. The group agreed to these arrangements.

3. Purpose

Steve outlined the purpose of the meeting as follows:

- Table issues and concerns
- Commit to an engagement process
- Understand the Planning and Approval Process and why (local v's State)
- Understand what can be influenced
- Understand current status of the plans
- Agree to next meeting – debate and decide (detail)

4. Attendees introductions**5. Collating Concerns**

All attendees were invited to introduce themselves and outline their concerns. All participants expressed views. Below is a summary of the issues and concerns raised by each participant.

Participant 1:

We accept that the development needs to happen, but we want one that is in line with the character of Norwood. Jamming as many people as you can and going as high as you can is not the answer. I'm also concerned that 900 car movements a day entering and exiting the complex will cause a huge amount of congestion.

Key issues: Height, density, underground parking and traffic congestion

Participant 2:

I'm concerned about the number of people being catered for. The infrastructure won't be able to handle it. I'm concerned that the influx of people will compromise the Norwood lifestyle, it's a residential area and our community want to preserve the lifestyle Norwood is known for. I'm concerned that if this development gets approval, it will be the catalyst to allow other major developments in our residential area.

Our quality of life will be affected. I'm concerned about our privacy and our loss of control over our lifestyle due to government interference. All the heritage aspects of Norwood are being eroded and this development will cause visual pollution.

Key issues: Height (visual pollution), overlooking, loss of heritage, impact to quality of life (traffic, erosion of privacy)

Participant 3:

I don't want the current site to become the LeCornu of Norwood, I want something to happen to the current site as I think it's an eyesore. I'm also not against the type of service being offered by Life Care in Norwood, however I simply can't accept it being 4 stories and I want someone to be able to explain to me why it has to be 4 stories high when 2 other Independent Living Unit developments have been able to be successful with 2 story buildings.

I'm also concerned about the natural flow of the watercourses that run through our area and what effects a deep excavation (such as the underground car park) will have.

Two companies have chosen to build lower level respectful projects. We're tired of nothing happening. The notion of retirement living fits with the area. My understanding is that 94 independent living units will be sold to individual buyers. Is there going to be higher medical care provided in this facility? I feel there is a shift in how the building is proposed to operate. I feel that character can be easily addressed but high rise doesn't fit into a suburb (residential back streets); it's ok to be on a main road.

Key issues: Height, density (mass), underground car-parking (stormwater), services to be offered and why.

Allan Quire (Life Care): In recent years the home care provisions have changed which enables the elderly to live in a location that suits their lifestyle whilst still being able to receive in-home care. The residents of our projects will be able to use this home care provision to gain the care they require in their own unit within our proposed Norwood site.

Steve (communicate et): This type of aged care accommodation is in response to the changing needs of elderly Australians and how we want to age. It's about providing choice to a person about how they want to receive the care they require.

Participant 4: I agree with everything covered so far.

Participant 5:

I support all the comments already made. However the main things that concern me is the size and density. This is a community we're talking about. People move into a community for the lifestyle. High-rise does not fit in suburbs. All the other points made are all still just as relevant.

We're aware that as part of the Adelaide Masterplan, Beulah road is going to be a cycle boulevard, which will decrease the traffic flow and traffic speed. Cars will have to accommodate far more bikes. The increase of cars from this project will not work with the planned bikeway.

Key issues: Height, density, integration, quality of life, ability to truly develop Beulah Rd as a cycle Boulevard.

Participant 6:

I think Adelaide's heritage is very important. Once you ruin Adelaide's heritage you can't go back. Overlooking is a large concern. The height of the building is an issue, as it will provide the ability for many, many people to be looking into houses, and it will destroy the views and outlook from the neighbouring properties.

Key issues: Height, non-conforming development, inability to restore the suburb to what it was once the development is built

Participant 7:

All of the issues are just as important as each other. There isn't one that is more important than the other. Having something so tall and imposing is going to affect our views, and the traffic in the area. We're concerned that it starts off as one design and how it will change through the process and not knowing what those changes are. The unknown is a big problem. We want something to happen there. We're not against the purpose of the site, but the complexity and magnitude of the proposal is the concern. We don't want a huge building ruining our lifestyle.

Key issues: Height, density, certainty of development proposal

Participant 8:

I would like to see only 2 stories and no underground car park. In a suburb like Norwood, this shouldn't happen.

Key issues: Height

Participant 9:

I support all the concerns already noted. My takeaway is that Life Care is bringing a commercial property to a residential area. I'm concerned it will reduce the value of our properties. I'm concerned about the 24h plant equipment, the size and the acoustic impacts on the surrounding properties.

Key issues: Surrounding property value impact, noise, 24/7 nature of the proposed operation

Participant 10:

I have lived through other developments with noise and dust. The issue is not the construction, but with the outcome. I moved to Norwood to have a relaxed lifestyle. I want my calm, serene environment that I moved to Norwood to stay. What is proposed is an intense development. I'm concerned with the process. I'm concerned about how the government has implemented a new process that takes community out of the decision making process and I'm concerned with the speed of the process and how quickly the Life Care proposal has progressed. It has not provided enough time for residents to respond and engage in the process.

Key issues: Quality of life, planning approval process (special provisions established by Government), lack of due consideration and time.

Steve (communicate et al): I acknowledge your concerns over the speed of the process, however as this is a moving application, I decided it was necessary to move as quickly as possible and get you (the community) to the table. If we had waited any longer to begin this process, our ability to provide you the opportunity to input would be limited.

Participant 11:

I agree with everything already covered; a 4-storey building would still overlook my yard. I don't think it's fair for people who have invested in the suburb and their house. Townhouses are ok and if they are carefully engineered I think they could be ok. The project goes against the plan of fewer cars and more bikes in the area. I'm concerned that that this project will affect the safety to my young children by having increased traffic.

Key issues: Traffic congestion, Height and overlooking, personal investment into the area compromised.

Participant 12:

We're happy to have Life Care as neighbours just as long as they are good neighbours. We're are delighted the site is being developed as long as it meets Norwood's planning provisions. I accept that the local planning provision is somewhat irreverent due to this development being approved as part of the major project status. This is a non-compliant project that will ruin our suburbs forever. I think

the proposal is immoral and unethical. My main issue is with the height and density. I don't want 92 apartments overlooking my children in my backyard.

This will cause a permanent decrease in property value because of the project. My opinion is this development will cause the neighbouring homes to be unsaleable. There are no mitigating circumstances that will prevent the visual pollution caused from a 4-story building. We have engaged in this process, but we're concerned that Life Care is not listening. In 2014 Norwood Council received an unprecedented number of complaints about the 3-story development and now Life Care have come back with a proposal that is 4 stories high with a basement.

If you put forward a complying development, we will help you cut the ribbon.

Key issues: Height, density, non-compliance to local planning provisions, an ignoring of key community concerns previously expressed in 2014.

BREAK: 8:20pm – 8:26PM

6. The State Government Planning Process and Life Care's proposed engagement process

Steve outlined the key steps in the State Governments Planning and Approval Process which is available to Aged Care providers until 30 June 2018.

Steve also presented the proposed engagement process, which essentially provides for the following:

- Stakeholders to express their views, concerns and issues and have these forwarded to the Development Review Panel set up by the State Government to consider the Life Care development application
- To review the proposed plans for the site and keep up to date with any further changes that might need to be made as a consequence of discussions with the Development Review Panel
- To seek to work with Life Care and the project team to make changes to the proposal to address issues raised
- To prepare a report to be submitted to the Department of Transport, Planning and Infrastructure and ultimately the Minister documenting the engagement process, the design aspects which have been agreed and any issues, concerns and differences that remain and have not been addressed.

Steve worked through the broader issues relating to ageing and the reasons why the Government have issued these planning provisions for aged care providers. In providing context for the development, Steve presented the challenge – how to address the provision of modern, contemporary housing and care services to support the various stages of ageing while being mindful how accommodation facilities integrate with surrounding residential environments. In this sense, given the increase of Adelaide's ageing population, this issue will become an increasing challenge and problem for Adelaide.

Allan Quire provided some context from Life Care's perspective. Allan stated that Life Care is a faith based not-for-profit organisation with a mission to improve the quality of life of older South Australians. However, as a not-for-profit, any development needs to be self-sustaining in order to enable us to provide the right level of care services for the residents living in these developments. Allan emphasised that Life Care does not stand to profit from any of its developments and that the organisation, being not for profit, does not have shareholders. All revenue goes back to providing care for South Australians.

Life Care is a very different type of organisation to a large scale developer and is providing an engagement opportunity for local residents over and above what they are obliged to do under the new planning provisions.

Steve added to the comments made by Allan by saying that it is costly to provide the level of service that Life Care is offering to provide for residents accessing its developments. Not-for-profits have to

have a financial model that provides the ability to fund the services their community seeks. It's just another dimension to the problem that as a community we need to consider.

Participants raised the issue of needing to have four stories – and why Life Care considered a development of this size and scale was required in the back streets of Norwood. Other not-for-profits who had built in the area of late had complied with the local planning guidelines and had undertaken successful developments of only 2 storeys.

Allan Quire stated that the problem of providing adequate services and facilities for the ageing is getting worse by the day. He stated that we do not have enough accommodation to keep up with demand and we don't think we can or should limit the choice of where elderly South Australians can live and how they live. Research is telling us that people want to be able to live independently in a home like environment for as long as possible with access to care services at different levels depending upon need. They are also seeking this type of accommodation close to the communities where they live today, usually within 5kms of the family home. As a community, we have a desperate shortage of such accommodation in the inner suburbs.

Sarah Gilmour (Holmes Dyer) asked the group to express what it is that most concerns the residents about the height of the building. She asked whether it actually the height or the imposing feeling you get from what you consider a four storey building might deliver.

Participants stated that they felt it impossible to deliver a four storey building that was not imposing. The sheer scale of such a building would change the look and feel of the suburb and not integrate with the surrounding heritage feel of the area.

Participants also pointed out that while they understood it was a problem for the State (to provide housing choice for the ageing), it should not be left to 800 families in Norwood to fix. Proper planning provisions should be developed to see such developments on main corridors and not in suburban back streets.

It was also pointed out that people who make these poor planning decisions don't have to live with them – but they expect a large number of residents to do so.

7. Givens and areas of Influence

Steve made clear the givens and the areas that could be influenced as follows:

- Life Care will proceed to seek approval to development 157 Beulah Road, Norwood and follow the new provisions established by the State Government
- Life Care is looking to deliver a development that provides independent living units for residents and associated care services

Areas for discussion and influence include:

- Street interface
- Set backs
- Materials
- Access
- Architecture
- Planting

Life Care is offering the group the opportunity to seek to resolve as many issues as possible and convey directly to the Minister via a written report signed by the participants of the group those issues where agreement cannot be reached.

Steve added that he was hopeful that there will be things that we can align on and if there are things that we cannot, then the project team was prepared to write a report for the group to be edited and signed by the group that could be submitted by Life Care with its final development application to the Minister for Planning.

Steve also stated that regarding the height, Life Care we continuing to pursue a four storey development – however, whether such a development is submitted will depend upon the ability of Life Care to meet the guidelines set by the Development Assessment Commission to the satisfaction of the Design Review Panel.

Steve also committed to providing government appointed Design Review Panel with a line of sight to the key issues and concerns of the community. The Design Review Panel is focused towards design of the proposed development and has guidelines in place as to what can be presented, however the planning team will verbally present a community statement at future Design Review Panel meetings.

A participant stated their concern that this whole process was a PR exercise and that Life Care were not going to listen to the communities views and change their proposal.

Following further discussion, a participant acknowledged the offer that Steve had tabled and suggested that the group participate in the process as it provided another avenue to have the community voice heard by the decision makers. While it might waste a little time, it would be silly not to participate.

It was further noted that there was value in seeking to influence the design review panel if possible and the Minister for Planning and therefore the offer to engage should be taken up.

Steve reiterated that the offer to engage provided an opportunity for the community to have their voices heard. He stated that the engagement process by no means would negate any other possible opportunities that the group may choose to pursue outside the bounds of the process. Put simply, it provides another avenue to submit your views via a structured process and a document to the decision makers.

Steve stated that Life Care are prepared to fund communicate et al to do this work. The final report will not be a Life Care document, but one that the group can have complete control over and can, if the group decides be signed by the members of this group.

The group agreed to make a clear decision as to whether they wished to continue with the process. One participant suggested a vote or a show of hands. Steve preferred not to proceed with a vote (so as not to make anyone uncomfortable) but rather asked the group whether anyone was opposed to the notion of continuing with the process as outlined. No participant spoke against the idea to proceed.

This was then accepted as agreement by all participants present to proceed with the engagement process as outlined by Steve.

A participant then thanked Steve for facilitating the engagement process on behalf of the group.

8. Proposed Development

Steve presented the former block diagram followed by the new plans (aerial view) to show how the plans were evolving. It was noted that the plans are in a state of review and refinement and this provided an opportunity for the group to express their views and look to influence the overall outcome where possible.

Steve stated that the main purpose for showing some images and current plans was to demonstrate that the plans are a work in progress and that now is the time to make suggestions and recommendations.

Participants requested more information, especially information relating to car-parking and technical details.

Steve stated that this would be the purpose of the next meeting – to roll out the plans and unpack the detail. The brief presentation was intended to start the conversation, with the next meeting being to pull apart the detail.

9. Next meeting and actions:

Given the group had agreed to proceed with the process, the engagement team would be preparing a report at the end of the process on behalf of the group. In order to give the report authority, Steve proposed that the group consider a term of reference. Steve circulated a draft term of reference which outlined the purpose of the group and provided some structure as to how the group would work together.

Steve asked all participant to review the document and provide any comments. He stated that the document was merely a suggestion and he was keen to have changes made. He stated that it would be ideal if the group could land on a terms of reference at the next meeting.

Steve said that his team had developed a website specifically for the engagement process. All minutes of these meetings and key documents and presentations would be uploaded to the website for anybody to review. Details of the site were distributed.

Steve said that minutes would be uploaded as draft and be amended as final only when ratified by the group.

Steve also advised that in order to gather the data and information to input to the revision of the plans, various professional services companies would need to visit the site over the coming weeks. In particular Steve advised that a small drilling rig would be present on site over the next few days to take soil samples.

Next Meeting: Participants tentatively agreed on the next meeting being held in the same location 7:00pm 14 September 2017. The Life Care engagement team will confirm this date and time within the next 2-3 business days.

Steve advised that he wanted to ensure that he would have the information needed to enable the group to properly review the plans by the next meeting – and therefore he would confirm the meeting date.

Steve thanked the group for their time, the way in which the conversation between the parties had been conducted and the group's trust in taking part in the process outlined.

The meeting was closed at 9:45pm.

Written Submission from resident who could not attend the meeting:

I think it is fair to say my biggest issue is that the development in Beulah Road Norwood is NON - COMPLYING in every way possible.

Would I like to see this site redeveloped? Absolutely - but in an appropriate manner that is "complying" to all of the rules and regulations that I would have to abide by.

It's density and size is far beyond what is acceptable.

Set backs, fancy high fences and pretty trees are not going to win us over - we (myself and my fellow Neighbour's) are intelligent and we are hard working families that have built our lives here - knowing that we were in a historic conservation zone which protected us from development monstrosities.

Life Care CEO Allan Candy sat in my living room 3 years ago and looked at my outlook. He said he and Life Care wanted to be good Neighbour's - we opposed the 3 storey development then so I am not sure what made him think we would want a 4 storey development with 20 more units now!!!!

I am definitely not happy as I stated before with the proposals size, density and underground (non-complying) car park.

This not only devastates my family and our home but the neighbourhood and the historic conservation zone in which live.

I believe Life Care has been sneaky, dishonest and hoped that we would not have found out about this development yet - however we are an intelligent group of people that have caught them red handed.

I do not believe Life Care would be doing these resident engagements had we not caught them out - despite them saying it was always their intention.

I am also hoping that they (Life Care) are not doing these resident engagements to calm us down and then ignore everything we have to say - just to note to the minister that they have spoken with residents and understand our needs and wants (which clearly they do not).

I look forward to being involved in further discussions.

To summarise

1. No to 4 storey or 3 storey developments on this site
2. No to 165+ under ground car park spaces
3. No to fancy fences, minimal set backs and pretty trees to calm us down

Actions

Item	Action	Who	When
1	Find out when the next Design Review Panel Meeting is taking place	communicate et al staff	As soon as it is known
2	Review draft terms of reference and supply edits to communicate et al staff	Community Group	Provide to the communicate et al staff before next meeting if possible
3	Collate current plans and as much design information as possible to enable the group to effectively review what is being proposed	communicate et al	Next meeting
4	Review minutes and supply edits to communicate et al staff – look to ratify at the next meeting	Community Group	By next meeting
5	Community concerns documented in these minutes to be provided to the planning team for verbal presentation at the Design Review Panel as soon as practicable	communicate et al	As soon as possible