

Draft until ratified by community at next meeting.

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

Meeting Number	2
Date/ time	Thursday 14 September 2017 at 7:00pm – 9.30pm
Location	Clayton Wesley Uniting Church Community Hall
Attendees	14 members of the Norwood Community, Steve Dangerfield (communicate et al), Sarah Hall (communicate et al), Glynn Jones (communicate et al), Allan Quire (Life Care), Michael Rasheed (Life Care), Sarah Gilmour (Holmes Dyer)
Visitors	Nil

1. Welcome and introduction

Steve opened the second meeting by welcoming the attendees including new attendees who had not been at the first meeting.

2. Minutes from last meeting:

Minutes from the first meeting were reviewed and the following comments made:

- Participants asked for overshadowing to be added to the minutes
- Page 3 paragraph eight change spelling of irrelevant.

Steve asked participants if everyone was happy to make the minutes public. No one objected. On this basis the above corrections will be made and the minutes re-issued and made public on the Life Care Projects website.

3. Terms of Reference:

The terms of reference were reviewed and feedback received. Overall, the intent of the terms of reference were seen as positive, however, Life Care should be willing to negotiate and this should be reflected in the Terms of Reference.

In addition, while the intent of the section under media was understood, it was felt that it should be worded more positively. It was suggested that members approached by the media should identify that they are a part of a group meeting with Life Care and their comments are not on behalf of the group but rather themselves as individuals.

With respect to conflict resolution, it should also be noted that while it was accepted that alignment might not be possible on all issues, a willingness to negotiate should be articulated.

Action: Life Care to make changes to reflect these comments.

4. Meeting Purpose and Approach

Steve presented the purpose for the meeting and the structure and approach. Participants agreed to the agenda and the meeting proceeded accordingly.

5. Summary of Key Issues

Steve presented a summary of the key issues and concerns that had been raised at the previous meeting. These were listed in the power point presentation and are summarised below as follows:

*Height and Density (Bulk)

- Height (overshadowing, privacy, views, massing, visual pollution affecting the urban skyline)

Traffic

- Traffic (congestion, road safety for children, conflict with cycling boulevard on Beulah Road)
- Parking (concerns about on-street parking, and while on-site parking is desired, car parking should not be accommodated in an underground carpark)
- Beulah Road Boulevard, cycling and pedestrian access and safety – any development needs to accommodate future vision and not be contrary to this objective

Heritage and Character

- Integration with surrounding
- Respect to local conservation zone
- Use of materials, treatments, landscape

Environment

- Environment (stormwater from excavation of underground carpark and underground watercourses, noise from plant e.g. air conditioner)
- Ambiance – concern development will impact 'Norwood life style' and the reason why residents moved there, making the streets significantly busier

Future Development

- Supportive of development of site but in strict accordance with the local development plan guidelines (not supportive of proposed height and feeling that high rise does not belong in the neighbourhood)

Value

- Property values – concern that development will make houses unsalable and significantly impact property values

Lifestyle

- Quality of life – overall concern that proposed development will impact quality of life bringing traffic congestion, noise, increased population and a feeling of bulk affecting the streetscape

Steve provided a handout summary sheet listing these issues and advised the group that the handout had been presented to the last meeting of the Design Review Panel which had been established as part of the Government's Planning Approval Process.

Opportunity was provided for participants to comment on the issues list, or raise additional issues for consideration. The following questions and comments were made:

Is Life Care just applying for 4 stories to get 3 stories?

- Steve commented that it was his understanding that the development at this stage remained at four stories and that Life Care was working to reduce the bulk mass of the building by breaking up the building into four components, adding sight lines between the buildings and establishing set-backs to prevent overlooking. Life Care will need to demonstrate that their plans at four stories address the guidelines established as part of the planning and approval process to the satisfaction of the Design Review Panel established to review the plans as part of the process.

A comment was made about the new planning provisions for aged care providers and whether the Planning Minister had made these changes to suit his own agenda.

Steve commented that on a bigger picture scale, the Planning System is undergoing significant change. It would also seem that the Government has recognised that there is a growing issue with respect to the provision of modern and contemporary aged care accommodation choice for inner suburban Adelaide. The Government has put in place special planning provisions for aged care providers, along with specific guidelines that any proponent must meet. The planning approval process established by the State Government and being accessed by Life Care is a rigorous process involving careful scrutiny of Life Care's proposals by a Development Review Panel comprising architects, planners and heritage specialists.

A question was asked as to when did Life Care change their mind to submit a 4 storey proposal instead of a 3 storey proposal?

Steve advised the group that the cost to provide aged care services was an increasing challenge for not for profit aged care providers. Life Care are looking to provide accommodation choice for the ageing in our communities with care services that can enable them to live independently for longer. At the Beulah Road development, a critical mass of independent living units is required in order to be able to provide the varying levels of care that residents will need. This assessment has led to developing a proposal that will enable Life Care to provide modern, contemporary accommodation at a level of quality expected by the current generations of ageing together with the right level of care services.

A participant questioned the logic of Life Care purchasing a property in a heritage conservation zone. While the need to develop a critical mass was understood, the chosen site was considered inappropriate by the community for such a development. Residents purchased their homes on the basis that they were buying into a heritage conservation zone – indicating to them that the heritage of the area would be protected. The quality of life for those residents was now to be put at risk given the size and scale of the development, being inconsistent with the heritage conservation zone. A comment was made that the proposal was akin to an industrial sized processing plant and should not be permitted in this zone.

Steve stated that it was important to unpack the concern around height. If the height issue related to massing, overlooking and lack of integration then design modifications can be made to address these things. The challenge then is to look at what can be done while maintaining a critical mass to make the development viable.

A suggestion was made as to whether the design could accommodate green energy principles. It was noted that Life Care were seeking to incorporate such thinking into the design where possible.

6. Design Review Panel (DRP):

Steve outlined the planning and approval process and advised the group that a summary of the key issues had been presented to the last meeting of the Design Review Panel (refer note in item 5 above).

7. Design – Addressing Concerns (workshop)

Steve presented the revised plans. The purpose of workshop was to provide participants with the opportunity to work with the plans and provide written comment and/or suggestions as to how they could be changed to address key issues.

Some additional questions were asked by participants including:

- What is the material to be used for the roof?
 - To be taken on notice
- What is the height of the proposal compared to the existing two story development?
 - A side profile drawing was presented comparing the proposed height of the four storey development to the existing two storey development. Essentially the fourth storey sits above the existing two storey development (refer power point presentation slide 27).
- What are the set backs that are currently being considered?
 - These were presented in the presentation (refer power point presentation slide 23)
- What environmental rating will the building be? Will they have solar etc?
 - To be taken on notice.
- How many people will be housed on the fourth floor of these developments?
 - To be taken on notice.
- How does the top height of these buildings compare to Clayton Church homes?
 - To be taken on notice.

Participants reviewed the plans and provided feedback. Comments written on the plans are provided in the attachment 1 to the minutes.

8. Traffic Management and Stormwater

Steve presented the findings of the traffic management assessment that had been undertaken by the traffic engineer. Steve stated that current assessments have approximately 5,500 daily traffic movements along Beulah Road adjacent the development site. The development would likely add another 280 traffic movements a day.

With respect to Beulah Road being developed as a cycling boulevard, it was noted that a traditional two storey town house development would likely yield approximately 35 dwellings. These dwellings would create numerous driveway cross overs onto Beulah Road, Queen Street and George Street. The proposed development at this stage only had two cross over points on Beulah Road (one way access in and out) and one cross over point on Queen Street (drive way access to the basement car park). In this sense, the proposed development is more consistent with the ability to develop a cycling boulevard along Beulah Road as it has minimal driveway cross over points when compared to a standard development.

It was also noted that:

- All rubbish collection to occur from the basement
- All parking will be on-site; no street parking
- Pedestrian linkage will be improved

With respect to stormwater, no on-site detention is needed as the surrounding stormwater system is capable of handling the stormwater that is likely to be discharged from site. There is an intention to capture rainwater and utilise it to irrigate the landscaped gardens.

Steve also noted that geotechnical investigations had determined that ground water will not be affected by the development and the proposed excavation for the basement carpark.

9. Community Report Structure:

Steve presented a possible structure for the community engagement report as follows:

1. Introduction and summary
2. The Community working group
 - Membership
 - Terms of Reference
 - Number of meetings
3. Key issues about the development
4. Key issues about the planning approval process
5. Design ideas and options
6. Key recommendations
7. Appendices
 - Meeting minutes and agendas
 - Documented plans

No-one raised any objections to the proposed report structure.

The Meeting was closed with Steve committing to another meeting with a date to be confirmed. It was agreed that the next meeting should be held prior to the meeting of the Development Review Panel but when the next iteration of the plans are available.

Meeting close 9:30pm

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	Update draft terms of reference and upload on website	communicate et al staff	Completed prior to the next meeting
3	Issue minutes and circulate to attendees	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	Next meeting
5	Plans shared at meeting to be uploaded on website	communicate et al	As soon as possible
6	Respond to questions unable to be answered in meeting	communicate et al	Next meeting

Attachment 1: Participant Response to Plans

Notes made by participants on plans



Additional comments requiring further information from Life Care	
1.	Car parking ventilation
2.	Asbestos remediation
3.	Northern Elevation Required
4.	Is this built in REVIT 3D Modelling
5.	Cooling/ heating type – heating/ chilled or condensers
6.	Proposed building materials – external
7.	No drying areas (outside) washing on balconies
8.	Two storey only as heritage listed
9.	What is the height from the ground level to roof ridges on this current proposed plan?
10.	For storeys inappropriate in heritage residential suburb! The scale overpowers nearby houses. Two storeys will fit the area much better.
11.	How many staff on site at any one time?
12.	Who/ what is going to stop overflow parking in street e.g. visitors? Traffic flow in Beulah Road is going to increase by at least three times.
13.	What about interface between development and Beulah Road bikeway, what does DPTI say? They seem to be silent.
14.	Where are the lifts in these buildings?
15.	More garden
16.	What about 2 storeys with attic (penthouse) units? Rather than 3-4. This has effect of three that looks like two.
17.	Energy efficient with solar
18.	Stormwater for garden.
19.	Cubby house – good staying?



Elevations



SEASIDE DRIVE ELEVATION



SEASIDE STREET ELEVATION

Carport Ventilation

marchesepartners lifecare

Beulah Road | Masterplanning for State Government | September 2017

7

OVERWHELMING

Interface
Spatial arrangement



Existing Conditions Interfaces



marchesepartners lifecare

Beulah Road | Masterplanning for State Government | September 2017

5

- * Northern Elevation Right
- * Is this best in BEST 3D Modelling
- * Cooling/Heating Type - Heating/Cooling or Condensate

#Hesher's Runderdarker?