

Joslin Community Working Group Meeting Notes
Proposed Life Care development stage 2 at 251 Payneham Road Joslin

Meeting Number	1
Date/ time	Tuesday 12 September 2017 at 7:00pm
Location	Payneham South Community Centre
Attendees	Approximately 40 members of the Joslin Community, Steve Dangerfield (communicate et al), Sarah Hall (communicate et al), Glynn Jones (communicate et al), Allan Quire (Life Care), Sarah Gilmour (Holmes Dyer) <i>Mayor and elected members of the City of Norwood, Payneham and St Peters were invited by community members and attended in an observation and an unofficial capacity.</i>
Visitors	Nil
Apologies	Two residents who contacted the community engagement team prior to the meeting indicated they were unable to attend.

Note: For privacy reasons names of residents have not been included in the minutes.

1. Welcome and introduction

Steve opened the first meeting by welcoming participants and thanking them for their attendance. Steve went on to introduce the project team representatives and various house-keeping matters.

2. Protocols

Steve explained the intended structure for the meeting and presented a number of meeting protocols. Steve sought agreement from the group to amend the circulated agenda to give enough time to accommodate the extra 22 people in attendance to have an opportunity to speak if they so desired. The group agreed to both the meeting protocols and the slight change to the meeting agenda.

3. Purpose

Steve outlined the purpose of the meeting as follows:

- Community members to table issues and concerns
- Life Care to present a proposed community engagement process and seek agreement to the process
- Provide an opportunity for community participants to understand the Planning and Approval Process
- Life Care to present the current status of the plans
- Next meeting arrangements to be decided subject to the community engagement process being endorsed

4. & 5. Introductions and Collating Concerns

A key purpose of the meeting was to provide residents with the opportunity to express their views with respect to the proposed stage 2 development. Given the number of people, it was not possible to work around the room one person at a time. Rather, an open forum was provided for anyone to speak about the proposed stage 2 development.

A community participant commenced the discussion by stating that it was important that the Project Team understood the significance of this issue to the community and that the community was widely

represented. This included residents from First Ave, Second Ave, Third and Fourth Ave and the surrounding area. Elected members of Council were also in attendance and residents had formed groups to protest against the development at both Joslin, Norwood and Glen Osmond. A planner, community engagement specialist and lawyers had either been spoken to or engaged. Community participants wanted it to be known that if Life Care proceeded with the proposed seven storey development the community will galvanise together and seek professional support to fight the development and have it over turned. Community participants felt that the development as it stood was highly inappropriate for the area and was significantly out of step with the local development plan.

One resident described their experience of the ETSA building in Eastwood (Greenhill Road) being constructed and described the 'destruction of a suburban community' as a result. The resident described the loss of amenity for the Eastwood residents, loss of property value and the deleterious effects on the family unit through loss of privacy. The view presented was that high-rise has always been an issue - it was then and it is now.

Height

Community participants expressed significant concern about the height of the proposed development. Height was emphasised as the key issue, from which other issues flowed. The community participants agreed that if the height of the proposed development was reduced to what had been previously approved through the local development planning approval process (three storeys rather than the proposed seven storeys) then good dialogue could resume and a number of the key issues such as overlooking and interface with the Joslin residential historic conservation zone could be resolved.

Trust

The second key issues that emerged was trust. Participants questioned why Life Care had decided to submit an application to develop stage 2 of Joslin under the new State Government Planning provisions for aged care providers when they already had approval for a three storey development. In particular, concern was raised that Life Care had not acted in an open or transparent manner leaving the community perplexed as to why the sudden change in the Development Plans.

These two issues combined led to a cynicism about Life Care's willingness to engage. Community participants felt that Life Care had only come to the table after having been 'found out' and that any offer of engagement was token only with little, if any opportunity for the community to genuinely influence the proposal.

Community engagement opportunity

Steve stated that while the plans still proposed seven storeys at this time, Life Care were currently working through an iterative process with the Design Review Panel to address design issues (including overlooking) that had been raised. It was therefore likely that the plans would continue to change as Life Care move through this process. Given this, there was opportunity for the community views to be heard and where possible changes made to the proposed plans. Where alignment is not possible, Steve committed to preparing a report on behalf of the group that would be submitted to DPTI and ultimately the Minister as an appendices to Life Care's final submission.

Significant concern was raised about the ability of the project team to write a report on behalf of the community given they are contracted to Life Care. There was concern that the nature of the issues and concerns would be 'played down' and the report would not be a true reflection of the thoughts and feelings of the community.

Steve stated that Life Care was prepared to provide resources from Steve's team in good faith to report on the community's issues. Steve stated that while the initial draft could be written by Steve and/or his team, he would facilitate a process to ensure the group could edit the report to ensure it appropriately reflected the community's concerns. In addition, the group could sign the report as a means to ensure it was a true account of their planning and design issues. Or, members of the group could write the report with Steve's team facilitating its delivery to DPTI and the Minister. Steve

emphasised that the report would include only what the community wanted it to include and that the process could accommodate their complete ownership and control over the content.

This opportunity was debated for some time with a majority of participants remaining sceptical about the offer. The motive for the offer was questioned with no real decision or solution reached as a consequence of the discussion.

The overall engagement process was also discussed and debated. Steve advised that the process provided participants with the opportunity to present their views early in the process and prior to the public consultation period. However, given the concerns already raised about the way in which Life Care had ignored community concerns expressed about the previous three storey proposal and had now progressed to a seven storey proposal, there was little confidence in the benefit of any engagement process on offer.

Given the way participants felt they had been treated, the discussion at times was emotive with some participants expressing high levels of stress as a consequence of the proposed seven storey development. Participants wanted Life Care to understand the emotional stress caused and was continuing to cause and that the issues could be resolved with a reduction of height back to the approved three storey proposal.

Summary of matters raised

While these bigger picture issues clearly emerged from the discussion, a number of specific issues were raised by participants. The list below provides a summary of those matters raised during the open forum.

- Community participants articulated their distrust in the **South Australian planning process**. They feel as though they have had their rights to input to the process or appeal against any decision removed and view the current Life Care development proposal as non-compliant relative to the local development plan. It was stated that the basic premise of the State Government major project planning process is flawed and that all developments should have to abide by local council planning provisions.
- Community participants do not believe that the **planning provisions for aged care providers** adequately respect or protect local heritage areas or local heritage listed buildings (such as the property immediately next door to the proposed stage 2 development).
- Community participants were distrusting of the **engagement process** - considering it not to be genuine or independent.
- Community participants desired to speak directly with the Life Care CEO and members of the Board. It was felt that the **decision makers were not listening** and that speaking to them directly was the only way that some felt they could make effective progress.
- Community participants raised issues with the inability to influence members of the **design review panel**. Steve and Sarah Gilmour outlined that the planning approval process was tightly governed and that even the proponent was limited as to what they could present and how many members of the project team could attend. Steve said that he could prepare a statement of concerns that could be made known to the members of the panel but that he could not facilitate either community members attending meeting of the panel, or a member of the panel attending meetings of the community. The names of panel members were requested as was whether the members were local or from interstate and what level of experience they had in heritage related issues. Steve stated he was not in a position to forward that information (the DRP is a confidential process and members attending change at each meeting). A summary of key community concerns was agreed to be relayed to the DRP. This would take the form of a written statement to be presented by the planning team and based on a summary of issues raised at the meeting to be documented in the minutes.
- Subsequent note: The Office of Design and Architecture supports the role of the Government Architect having multi-disciplinary expertise in architecture, urban design, heritage, landscape and public policy. ODASA provides the Design Review panel members to support the Government Planning and Approval Process. Panel members are selected from a pool of

experienced professionals who have been selected by ODASA as having the right level of expertise and knowledge to review development applications.

- Community participants stated that they were concerned that if the current seven storey proposal is approved, it will open the door to other **high rise developments along Payneham Road**. Such continuous development would in the opinion of the community participants destroy the suburb making residents 'prisoners in their own homes'.
- Community participants expressed a concern that based on their observation of Life Care's behaviour to date, that they would not abide by the conditions of any approval and would end up building whatever they wanted. In this sense, there was a strong view presented from participants that **the planning system** is broken and needs to be significantly overhauled.
- **Height** was continuously emphasised as the main issue, with the following flow on effects:
 - Encroachment and the lack of adequate set backs
 - The effect of a seven storey development on privacy, especially for those with children and/or swimming pools and out-door entertaining areas
 - The risk of overlooking by Life Care workers and residents and their visitors
 - The risk of light pollution caused at night as a result of a building that size located in a quiet suburb
 - The risk of overshadowing that a 7-storey building will cause
 - The risk of noise which will be generated having that many people residing so close to standard residential properties.
- Community participants voiced concerns regarding the **mass and external treatment** of the finished building, raising glare (from glass and building treatments), over-towering and poor visual amenity.
- Community participants raised concerns about the amount of **traffic** generated from a development of this size disbelieving that 85 underground car parks will be enough to cater for the staff, residents and visitors.
- Community participants stated that they considered that a building of this **size and density** would have a significant impact on their property value making those properties in particular that will back onto the site unsaleable.
- Community participants also expressed, in the context of the loss of **property value**, that elderly residents who do not have superannuation and are seeking to sell their home to help fund their retirement will lose out due to a development supposedly (in the view of many in attendance) designed to support the ageing.
- Community participants expressed concern that Life Care would not disclose everything to do with their plans. This statement was made on the basis that many in attendance felt that this had not occurred with respect to the **stage 1** development – that the building was higher, bulkier and included plant and equipment on the roof making the actual development significantly higher than what had been approved. On this basis, there was little trust amongst community participants that the full details would be disclosed.
- Concern was raised as to the speed of the process and how a **planning and approval process** that was intended to be rigorous could facilitate an approval for such a large scale and significant development in just months, when it took much longer to seek approval for a standard house renovation. Life Care must therefore have completed plans and will be doing very little to change them. Sarah Gilmour responded by saying that the project was being undertaken by a team of full time professionals including architects, technical professionals, and planners working on the project and constantly reviewing plans in line with discussions had at meetings of the Design review Panel.

Overall, community participants were reluctant to enter into discussions with Life Care without a commitment to seriously review the height of the proposed stage 2 development proposal.

6. & 7. The State Government Planning Process, Life Care's proposed engagement process, givens and areas of influence

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

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

- Stakeholders to express their views, concerns and issues and have these made known 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 where possible 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 outstanding that have not been addressed.

During the meeting, a number of statements were made at various times by the project team in order to provide some context as to why the development at Joslin had changed. Life Care is a non-for-profit organisation with a mission to improve the quality of life of older South Australians. The model for aged care is changing with a greater emphasises on providing older South Australians with accommodation choice and the option to remain as independent for as long as possible. Currently South Australia has two main options – retirement villages and nursing home care. There are minimal options to provide care at varying levels to support people through the ageing process.

Life Care is seeking to provide accommodation and care services to 'fill the gap'. The Joslin proposed development aims to provide 50 independent living units with access to care packages and a range of services including hydro-therapy, allied health services including physio-therapy, podiatry and massage and community facilities including library, lounge, cinema and dining spaces. Gardens will be landscaped and well maintained and include an internal courtyard and roof-top gardens for screening and 'greening' of building only.

It was stated that the provision of services need to be funded and that aged care providers are seeking to develop revenue streams to provide the right care services to support their clients. All revenue gained goes back into the provision of care services.

BREAK: 8:30pm – 8:40pm

8. Proposed development plans

Steve presented the community with the latest building designs as they stood at the time of the community meeting. He emphasised that the plans were a work in progress and what was shown was likely to continue to change prior to final submission.

Steve stated that the latest building designs were different from the initial concepts first submitted to the State Government for major project status, especially as it related to set backs. However, the plans still showed a seven storey building along the Payneham Road frontage.

Steve pointed out the new set-backs, noting that storeys 4, 5, 6 and 7 were now sitting at an average of plus 30 metres from the northern boundary.

Community participants were able to ask questions regarding the current plans. The majority of the questions focused on the set-backs and building treatments including the introduction of green walls and roof top gardens.

One question that was asked related to the number of units located on floors four to. The engagement team took the question on notice seven (**see response at end of minutes**). Steve did state that these storeys were dedicated to independent living units. He also noted that stage 1 did not include any independent living units and was totally dedicated to higher care.

9. Next meeting and actions

Steve closed the meeting by seeking agreement from the group as to the next steps.

Again, there was some debate over the engagement process and whether it was a genuine offer from Life Care to enable the community to influence the overall outcome.

Steve emphasised that the engagement process was designed to ensure the community could present their views in a structured and considered way focusing on design issues. There would be opportunity to influence the outcome especially as it related to property interface, however, Steve advised the group that wholesale changes with respect to height would be unlikely unless the Design Review Panel expressed significant concerns and felt that key issues such as overlooking could not be addressed through clever design and building treatments.

Following lengthy discussion and further debate, the following alternative three step process was put to the group by one of the community participants:

1. Representatives of the community be given the opportunity to meet with Life Care CEO and members of the Life Care Board to present their concerns.
2. Representatives of the community be given the opportunity to tour the Life Care site with the Life Care CEO and members of the Life Care board.
3. Representatives of the community be given the opportunity to speak with members of the Design Review Panel. That the outcomes of each Design Review Panel meeting (including any changes to the plans) be presented at future community group meetings to be convened following the respective Design Review Panel meetings, to enable participants to review and comment on the latest plan iterations.

It was conveyed to the meeting that if Life Care were prepared to agree to this three step process, community participants would consider engaging in the community engagement process on offer from Life Care.

Steve asked for an acceptance of these proposed three steps and no members of the community objected to the recommended position.

Steve agreed to take the recommended position back to Life Care based on the following approach:

1. Meeting minutes to be written and the recommended position be included and reviewed by those members who registered their attendance to the meeting.
2. Once the recommendation and meeting minutes were endorsed, the recommendation would be taken to Life Care for their consideration.
3. A response to the recommendation would then be provided and based on this response, next steps would be developed.

No participant spoke against this approach.

The meeting was closed at 10:15pm.

Actions

Item	Action	Who	When
1.	Prepare and circulate minutes to participants who registered for the meeting	communicate et al staff	As soon as practicable.
2.	Facilitate a response from Life Care regarding the recommended position of the meeting.	communicate et al staff	As soon as it is known
3.	Frame next steps (subject to Life Care's response)	communicate et al staff	Subject to Life Care response
4.	Find out how many independent living units will be located on floors 4 to 7 of the proposed new building.	communicate et al staff	Provide information with the minutes if possible (see below)

Response to action item 8 regarding number of units:

Level 4: 10 Serviced apartments

Level 5: 10 Serviced apartments

Level 6: 6 Independent Living Units

Level 7: 6 Independent Living Units