

## **APPENDIX G – SUBMISSION RESPONSES**

# SUBMISSION RESPONSES (SUPPORT AND OBJECTION) – CLOSEBOURNE RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY

ROUND 1 – 16 January 2019 to 14 February 2019 (inclusive)

## SUBMISSION DETAILS AND RESPONSE – In Support/Neutral

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Council Response</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Raises no planning issues just a personal comment.</li> </ul>	<i>Noted.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for proposal (received 14.2.2019)</li> </ul>	<i>Noted.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Petition expressing direct support for the DA.</li> <li>Proposal complementary to Morpeth and is needed for the area – provides a natural flow on extension to those senior citizens in need of residential care without requiring them to relocate away from friends and family.</li> <li>Morpeth expanding and there is substantial over 55 growth in retirement living in Closebourne Village and Morpeth Gardens.</li> <li>Provision of facility will also meet the needs of other retirees living in Morpeth, Raworth, East Maitland and Tenambit.</li> <li>Provides economic growth and employment opportunities for local people and is an ideal development allowing for protection of heritage listed Closebourne House buildings without affecting the heritage value of the Morpeth area.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Noted (attached 154 signatures) <u>received out of submission period</u> (25.2.19)</i></p> <p><i>Direct support for proposal as well as a facility that will support the existing development on site whilst protecting the heritage values of the site and providing social and economic benefits to Morpeth and the surrounding areas.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes the adaptive use of Closebourne House is acceptable but suggests the information submitted does not demonstrate that a viable 80 bed high care nursing home can be designed in the vicinity of Closebourne house without an unacceptable impact on the significance of the subject site.</li> </ul>	<p><i>The approval of the Concept Plan as part of the Masterplan for the site (DA 08-2335) indicated a high care nursing home would be part of the development on the site. It was noted at the time of that Masterplan approval that details around the nursing home would be subject to DA assessment however it is noted as discussed throughout this report that the development is generally consistent with the building footprint proposed.</i></p> <p><i>The facility has been designed taking into account the adaptive reuse of Closebourne House, the former Laundry, Gym/Chapel buildings and Arkell House (the Registry). The contemporary additions will read as new work, however will not impact the significance of the heritage buildings on the land. The</i></p>

	<p><i>development has undergone significant amendments over time to ensure the visual curtilage and landscape curtilage as well as the historic legacy of the site is protected. Any potential impacts have been demonstrated to be able to be mitigated through the development design and conditions of consent.</i></p> <p><i>The development on the site has been subject to merit considerations as part of the DA assessment, however the development has also received approval from NSW Heritage/Heritage Committee support. The NSW Heritage Committee notes the new building works are sited within the 'development footprint' under the Masterplan to ensure the development maintains its rural context to Tank Street. General Terms of Approval have been issued by NSW Heritage in regard to the proposal and are attached to this report at Appendix B.</i></p>
--	--

## SUBMISSION DETAILS AND RESPONSE – Objections

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Council Response</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes that Closebourne House was fully restored with a bicentennial grant in 1988 and is one of the Hunter Valley's most significant buildings.</li> <li>Suggests that Lendlease has let vandals remove materials from the roof (lead).</li> <li>Suggests that there has been a totally inadequate standard of conservation on their behalf.</li> <li>Objects to fin roof for one of site's most historic buildings.</li> <li>Suggests Lendlease must be required to return the roof to a shingle or slate roof in keeping with the 1830's period of its construction.</li> <li>Public access to the building should be a requirement of any development on the site.</li> <li>Questions if Lendlease obtained Council approval for the new roof.</li> <li>Conservation of trees should be required. Total tree cover should be increased not reduced. Suggests that heritage legislation must be enforced in respect of any development on the site.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Noted.</i></p> <p><i>A range of security measures was installed to deter unauthorized entry and anti-social behavior.</i></p> <p><i>Heritage items have been maintained in accordance with CMP and Heritage Agreement. Conservation works to main roof and verandah undertaken, including:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Replacement of 1980's shingle roof with corrugated galvanized roof sheeting as per the c.1900's roof finish;</i></li> <li><i>Reconstruction of the earlier c.1870's verandah with galvanized roof sheeting, and retention of the style and location of the 1980's columns.</i></li> <li><i></i></li> </ul> <p><i>These works were approved by NSW Heritage. These works were reviewed on site by NSW Heritage together with the Laundry, Gym/Chapel and Arkell House buildings. The</i></p>

	<p>works that form part of the development will ensure the adaptive reuse and preservation/conservation of these buildings. The maintenance and repair works under the s.60 application were approved by NSW Heritage as priority works 13 July 2018. Material selected was permitted under the schedule of Conservation Works to the Heritage Agreement, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Corrugated galavanised steel roof sheeting, eaves, gutter and downpipes, including associated flashings.</li> </ul> <p>The approval was amended on 19 November 2018 to include revised verandah detailing as a result of the foundation conditions. These works were completed in February 2019.</p> <p>Further additional assessment in regard to tree removal has been undertaken and 11 of the 12 significant trees are to be retained on the site. Extensive plantings are proposed on the site as part of the Landscaping proposed and the Carob tree which is the twelfth significant tree was found to be significantly compromised and will be replaced. The re-design of the development has enabled retention of significant trees within the front setting of Closebourne House.</p>
<p><u>First email 5 February 19</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objector suggests they have read Statement of Heritage Impact and Visual Impact Statement and request DA be withdrawn until recent alterations to roof clarified. Suggests that the brief addendum within the Statement mentions the recent alterations but suggests the documentation misleadingly presents Closebourne House in its unaltered state.</li> <li>• Suggest Council should not be exhibiting a DA in which the accuracy or legality of the supporting documentation is yet to be determined.</li> </ul> <p><u>Second email 7 February 19</u></p> <p>Requests further information about verandah approval and whether this had been included in the Section 60 Approval. Suggests that if changes had been approved and executed then the Statement of Heritage Impact and the Visual Impact</p>	<p><i>Refer to discussion in the above submission in the regard to Closebourne House roof repairs and their approval.</i></p> <p><i>It is also noted that the majority of the photos and aerial images that were referenced in the Heritage Impact Statement were to provide a historical representation of the site. Additional upgraded photographs and images have been incorporated into the Heritage Impact Statement and Visual Assessment. In addition, it is noted that lodgement of the DA occurred before the restoration works to the roof and verandah of Closebourne House.</i></p> <p><i>Revised documentation has been provided with the development application including, but not limited to:</i></p> <p><i>A Revised Heritage Impact Statement, revised Arborist report and assessment of significant trees on the site as well as updated Engineering/stormwater, Fabric Analysis, Traffic report, Archaeology reports and Visual</i></p>

<p>Statement are inaccurate and misleading in that both documents show Closebourne House as it appeared prior to the changes to the roof and verandah. Requests explanation as to why these out of date documents have been accepted and placed on display at Maitland Council and suggests that they should not have to comment on documents that are out of date - further suggests Proponent should be obligated to correct those errors and resubmit the DA.</p>	<p><i>Impact Assessment including up to date images (note the water tower has been removed by Hunter Water but this does not change the visual impact assessment).</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Submission notes Closebourne House and its surrounding curtilage is a NSW State Listed Heritage Item (SHR 000375) – forms vital part of history of NSW, the Hunter Valley, Maitland and Morpeth.</li> <li>• Suggests that the content of the Statement of Heritage Impact and Visual Impact Statement is not up to date. Notes that addendum provided in regard to roof and verandah but none of the images in the body of the report updated. Also suggests that the Visual Impact Statement also uses out of date images – suggests the information is misleading and the DA should be retracted to ensure an accurate picture can emerge and the DA be re-advertised</li> </ul>	<p><i>Noted and referral to NSW Heritage undertaken and General Terms of Approval issued.</i></p> <p><i>Refer to discussion in previous submissions.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Closebourne house will have internal original fabric modifications and the roofline changed at rear – objects strongly - urge at all costs that the retention of the original fabric and the as-built integrity and architecture of the building is required.</li> <li>• Removal of trees – Trees planted and associated within significant periods of development for the history of Closebourne and the previous owner of the Anglican Church. Recommend that a separate Heritage Impact Statement and Arborist report be produced and assessed.</li> <li>• New buildings running along ridgelines towards Tank street – objects and suggests that these buildings be constructed at the rear of Closebourne House running down the hill towards the Morpeth heritage curtilage and be sympathetically blended with</li> </ul>	<p><i>The proposal has been revised in conjunction with extensive meetings with NSW Heritage and discussions with the Chair of the Heritage Committee, the Applicant and Council. The Statement of Heritage Impact addresses the supervision, management and extent of removal of the original fabric which is primarily associated with the lift installation and door openings in Closebourne House and conditions have been included by Heritage NSW in the General Terms of Approval issued. The development has been informed by extensive assessment in regard to heritage which includes a Fabric Analysis.</i></p> <p><i>Refer to above discussions in regard to trees.</i></p> <p><i>The new works have been designed to be recessive to Closebourne House which will maintain its prominence on the site. New buildings will be sited within the development footprint and whilst there will be some changes to views into and out of the site, this is mitigated through extensive landscaping and</i></p>

<p>appropriate trees and landscaping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests no provision made for archaeological research and strongly suggests a formal archaeological survey be undertaken prior to any construction occurring on site.</li> <li>• Suggest Closebourne is a rare surviving example of an early 19<sup>th</sup> century colonial building that still remains in its original as built setting. Strongly objects to any dilution of the original curtilage, view corridor and setting and suggest that any new construction be well hidden and non contaminating or visually polluting to this rare State Item.</li> <li>• The Heritage Impact Statement has used old images of the site both at ground level and aerial (notes in some cases over 30 years old). Suggests these images misrepresent the true picture of what is proposed and glosses over important heritage features and buildings associated with the Anglican Churches long history on the site. Strongly object to the current Statement of Heritage Impact and suggest a new HIS be produced before any further assessment is undertaken.</li> <li>• Anglican Church long association with site since 1840's and suggests that this is a rare example of a religious order for the purposes of training priests and general church administration and other activities. Suggests there should be a comparative analysis undertaken in HIS of other religious sites within NSW. Suggest this may well be the oldest continually operating religious training site in NSW or Australia. Suggests that a complete heritage review of the State listing be undertaken before any decisions made.</li> <li>• Notes some buildings within the current DA proposed for demolition however these have been assessed individually and not assessed for their contribution to the site as a whole (Therefore until this comparative analysis is undertaken for the whole of the Closebourne site including its buildings, trees, gardens,</li> </ul>	<p><i>use of materials, finishes and profiles.</i></p> <p><i>Archaeology assessment completed and conditions included by NSW Heritage for appropriate archaeological testing on the site.</i></p> <p><i>Minor amendments to the heritage curtilage have been supported by NSW Heritage who note – that whilst the free-standing nature of the building is affected, the connection has been designed so that the form of the building can still be read and appreciated, both externally and within the facility. The application is supported by a Visual Impact Analysis that demonstrates the development will not impact on significant views to and from Closebourne House.</i></p> <p><i>See previous submissions.</i></p> <p><i>NSW Heritage notes – the CMP recognizes that the whole site has historical and rarity value as an Anglican Theological college and conference venue. The CMP has assessed the levels of significance of individual buildings having regard to this overall significance. This assessment considers that the demolition of some buildings of moderate and little significance will not have a materially detrimental effect on the heritage significance of place and have been supported by NSW Heritage for demolition.</i></p>
--	---

<p><i>fencing, pathways and/or any other associated activity on the Anglican Church should be fully assessed with the intent of revising the State listing for the site).</i></p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests Lendlease have allowed the site to deteriorate even though State listed and that it is demolition by neglect.</li> <li>• Concern over roof replacement and material used.</li> <li>• Suggests a lift should not be incorporated into a State Significant property – contravenes the Burra Charter (suggests that the Grossman House approach with no lift and it being open to the general public should be the approach).</li> <li>• Notes that the heritage curtilage should not change as a result of the development and that the architectural plans do not reflect this – the new buildings should be hidden.</li> <li>• The curtilage should retain trees and shrubs.</li> <li>• Notes current building configuration surrounding Closebourne has significant building layout on the eastern side – resulting in a square with an open front to the north, Closebourne House on the west, the retained Arkell House on the east and the 'Dining room' building on the south planned for demolition – notes that this should be retained, if only the front façade. Building could be used for staff facilities instead of the upper floor of Closebourne House without the lift. The top floor of Closebourne could be free for other uses where people would only visit infrequently (eg stores).</li> <li>• Rear courtyard and roof – alters heritage significance of space. If roof included it should be freestanding and not attached to Closebourne House.</li> </ul>	<p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>The general layout and rooms of Closebourne House are retained. The lift access will ensure equitable access for visitors to the Building in compliance with the required standards and legislation. Conditions have been included by NSW Heritage in regard to minimizing impacts to heritage fabric.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions. The design changes ensure that the Closebourne building is able to be read and appreciated and the revised plans will ensure the enhancement of the internal courtyard area. The reduction in changes to the upper floor of Closebourne House results in retention of this larger space. The roofline of the rear wings is retained with reduced changes to the external fabric and internal spaces. Under the CMP the 'Dining room' building is not specifically required to be retained. Demolition of this building has been supported by NSW Heritage. Archival recording of historic buildings is to occur as part of the conditions of consent imposed by NSW Heritage.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly objects to structural changes inside and out.</li> <li>• Suggests building constructed along ridgeline should be set back down the hill at the rear of Closebourne House because construction in this area greatly diminishes the original</li> </ul>	<p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p>

<p>view corridor and curtilage set by NSW State Heritage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest development is a gross overdevelopment.</li> <li>• Objects to loss of significant trees with the Closebourne historic zone.</li> <li>• Objects to loss of public use for Closebourne House.</li> <li>• Suggest the current Statement of Heritage Impact has used photographs not current in identifying the site (aerial), buildings, trees, etc., and should be resubmitted with current data.</li> </ul>	<p><i>The development generally occurs within the development footprint and the Heritage Agreement requirement to 'respect the curtilage' does not state that works cannot be undertaken within the curtilage. The use of the building can comply with the planning for the site envisioned as part of the Masterplan and Heritage Agreement. The site has existing interpretive elements (including an Interpretation walk). A condition requiring a further interpretation plan is to be submitted as part of the General Terms of Approval issued by NSW Heritage.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to roof replacement of Closebourne House;</li> <li>• Suggests replacement of the verandah façade with flat corrugated metal awning contravenes the requirements of the Heritage Act; and</li> <li>• Suggests lack of consultation through the remediation process and disregard for Heritage Agreement;</li> <li>• Suggests DA should be placed on hold until the verandah façade its restored to its former grandeur at the least.</li> <li>• Consideration should be given to restoring the roof to its original shingle form and investigation as to whether the remaining items in Schedule 3B have been complied with;</li> <li>• Closebourne House is one of the most iconic buildings in Morpeth and if not Maitland and should be afforded the best protection available to maintain links with early settlement.</li> </ul>	<p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>The s.60 application was approved by NSW Heritage and is consistent with the schedule of maintenance works annexed to the Heritage Agreement. The development application has been exhibited as part of the DA process.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Objects to use of Closebourne House for following reasons: -Notes Closebourne House important to Maitland's heritage and as a building with State Heritage listing should be preserved as a stand alone building with ease of public access; -Proposal for a nursing home means there will be modifications to the interior and to the exterior which will detract from its historical</li> </ul>	<p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p>



<p>significance;</p> <p>-Any changes to the building should be minimal and the buildings proposed to be constructed along the ridgeline to Tank street diminish the original view corridor and should be re-visited and set back down the hill to be less obtrusive;</p> <p>-installation of the elevator inside Closebourne, alterations to roofline and loss of mature trees;</p> <p>-Suggests development should not have been allowed to be advanced without input from community; and</p> <p>-Should the development be permitted without significant modification Morpeth in particular, as well as Maitland as a whole, will see one of its heritage gems diminished forever.</p>	<p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>The DA has been notified in accordance with legislative and Council requirements.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p>
--	---

## ROUND 2 SUBMISSIONS – 15 JANUARY TO 28 JANUARY 2020 (INCLUSIVE)

### SUBMISSION DETAILS AND RESPONSE – In Support/Neutral

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Council Response</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reviewed amended notification plans – no issues and in support</li> </ul>	<i>Noted.</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for proposal as expressed by signatories to original petition still stands</li> </ul>	<i>Noted.</i>

### SUBMISSION DETAILS AND RESPONSE – Objections

<u>Issue</u>	<u>Council Response</u>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests overall scope of the DA will have devastating effect on Closebourne House and heritage precinct including buildings and landscaping.</li> <li>Intrusive to curtilage of heritage site.</li> <li>Concerns re removal or alteration of original fabric/heritage council repositioning.</li> <li>Breach of Heritage Agreement.</li> <li>Suggests proposal should be rejected and refers to Heritage Council Resolution 2017-47.</li> </ul>	<p><i>See comments in Round 1 submissions. In particular, the proposal has remained respectful of the curtilage of the site. Whilst some changes to fabric will have an impact conditions have been included by NSW Heritage to ensure mitigation of impacts to the heritage fabric.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests additions overpower house</li> </ul>	<i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i>

<p>and significance is lost.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns re curtilage/recommendations should follow Heritage Office NSW recommendations regarding curtilage.</li> <li>Adjoining heritage building setbacks.</li> <li>No recognition of building as complex that reflects historical significance.</li> <li>Plans do not follow guidelines for interior as per CMP 2.4.2.</li> </ul>	<p><i>General Terms of Approval have been issued by NSW Heritage for the proposal.</i></p> <p><i>The development is sited within the development footprint and maintains its rural context and will not significantly impact existing historical significance on the site.</i></p> <p><i>NSW Heritage note that the legibility and layout of the rooms in Closebourne House will be retained.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests it is not a positive outcome for Closebourne House from a heritage perspective.</li> <li>Suggest application be rejected.</li> <li>Suggests Heritage Agreement not complied with re the parapet verandah work.</li> <li>Under misconception about delegation and approval path.</li> <li>Suggests again out of date image.</li> <li>Suggest interior of house now seriously altered.</li> <li>Suggests Closebourne loses presence in the landscape.</li> <li>Notification period did not occur over xmas.</li> <li>CMP out of date.</li> </ul>	<p><i>General Terms of Approval have been issued by NSW Heritage for the proposal.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>Approval by Hunter and Central Coast Regional Planning Panel.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>Re-notification occurred in January 2020 of revised plans to allow for the Xmas period to pass.</i></p> <p><i>CMP was approved for the site in 2005 and remains relevant. A draft CMP was prepared by the Applicant in 2017 but has <u>not</u> been endorsed by NSW Heritage due to concerns primarily with its policies which included encroachment into preserved landscape areas (south eastern end of the site).</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Suggests Carob tree to be sacrificed along with 33 other trees.</li> <li>Suggests minor intrusion into agreed heritage curtilage.</li> <li>Pleaded remaining trees to be retained.</li> <li>Suggests adaptive reuse compliant in spirit with provisions of CMP, Master plan and Heritage Agreement.</li> <li>Concern re adaptive reuse/intrusive works such as the addition of the two level lift. Intervention they suggest requires removal of original sandstone walls and may damage</li> </ul>	<p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>Noted.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>other fabric during construction.</li> <li>Building should retain original curtilage – does not meet guidelines of State Heritage Office and National Trust.</li> <li>Suggests a new CMP should be developed.</li> <li>SHI fails to recommend an interpretive scheme. Interpretative plan should be developed highlighting storied layers of Closebourne House Group including built items and fabric lost.</li> </ul>	<p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>Noted.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects as contrary to 2.4.2 of CMP.</li> <li>Concern re proposed additional buildings and proximity to Closebourne.</li> <li>Suggests latest amendments would severely effect the historical and heritage value of what is an important part of heritage and history in NSW.</li> </ul>	<p><i>General Terms of Approval have been issued by NSW Heritage for the proposal and the development has found to be consistent with the CMP requirements and the Heritage Agreement.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Additions overpower Closebourne House and curtilage impacts/setbacks.</li> <li>No recognition of complex of buildings.</li> <li>Says historical building not being respected.</li> </ul>	<p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>Full assessment of all buildings has been undertaken as part of this proposal and General Terms of Approval issued by NSW Heritage.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strongly objects to amended plans for Grade 1 Closebourne House.</li> <li>Says house needs to be set back in its own curtilage/additions overpower etc.</li> <li>Suggests proposal is deceptive and indicates the rape and destruction of Closebourne house commencing at front door.</li> <li>Suggests proposal full of half truths and deceit.</li> <li>Suggest out of date images negligent and indicates lack of integrity.</li> <li>Suggests financial implications outweigh other concerns.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Noted.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>Subjective commentary only.</i></p> <p><i>Subjective commentary only.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amended plans do little to alter points in previous submission 10.2.2019 other than inclusion of trees to address curtilage issue.</li> <li>Front verandah issue.</li> <li>Baseline Archaeology with previous 1847 picture and Lendlease changes.</li> <li>Concern re impacts.</li> <li>Personal non planning coments.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Noted.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>Noted.</i></p>

<p>Parts 1 and 2 of submissions received.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests not a positive outcome.</li> <li>• Concern re verandah work and Heritage Agreement.</li> <li>• Misconception about assessment path.</li> <li>• Issues again re images in reports.</li> <li>• Says adaptation should not be encouraged.</li> <li>• Concern re removal of elements and adaptive reuse.</li> <li>• Suggests Closebourne no longer a discreet element in the landscape.</li> <li>• Concern re adaptive reuse and changes to roof and verandah.</li> <li>• Impact to view of Closebourne from the north.</li> <li>• CMP out of date.</li> <li>• Suggests they have not sighted the full detail of the Heritage Agreement (suggests it is being withheld).</li> <li>• Removal of original fabric/landscape context.</li> <li>• 1980's reconstruction of 1829 verandah already commenced when Closebourne House added to SHI in 1985 – significant part of listing.</li> <li>• Comment about negligence and integrity with use of previous images.</li> <li>• Concern about alterations and positive financial outcomes for owner.</li> <li>• Issues re original appearance of Closebourne House.</li> <li>• Several personal non planning comments</li> <li>• Will adaptation of buildings destroy heritage significance.</li> <li>• Fireplaces, doors and historic fabric issues.</li> <li>• Suggests glazed windows to rear not inserted panels but tilted up windows.</li> <li>• Says rear view of house no longer visible due to proposed alterations.</li> <li>• Says development contravenes 2.4.2 of the CMP.</li> <li>• Significant trees – says there should be reassessment of landscape elements.</li> <li>• Suggests proposal breaches curtilage line in order to connect the new facility and Arkell House.</li> <li>• Proposed integration concerns.</li> </ul>	<p><i>The development provides for the adaptive reuse of Closebourne House, the Laundry, Gym/Chapel buildings and Arkell House in line with CMP requirements. The development provides for a satisfactory outcome that will ensure the significance of existing heritage items on the site and provide for a sympathetic development that will ensure the heritage significance of the site buildings and its landscape are protected.</i></p> <p><i>The development is to be determined by the Hunter &amp; Central Coast Regional Planning Panel.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>The Heritage Agreement is an agreement between the site owner and the Minister. NSW Heritage maintain ownership of this document. This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>Noted.</i></p> <p><i>No - this is discussed elsewhere in the submissions</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>Noted.</i></p> <p><i>General Terms of Approval have been issued in regard to the proposal by NSW Heritage in conjunction with the Heritage Committee.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p>
---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggests there is a lack of care and contempt for process.</li> <li>• Heritage Council resolution and issues with CMP's.</li> <li>• Suggests proposal a disaster etc.</li> </ul>	<p><i>This is subjective.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is subjective.</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Validity and compliance of plans;</li> <li>• Proposal development contrary to State Heritage Register and architectural reports.</li> <li>• Suggests water tank demolition a red flag to authenticity and validity of revised DA.</li> <li>• Roof and verandah – lack of due diligence.</li> <li>• Glazed panels not sympathetic to building?</li> <li>• Concerns re validity and compliance.</li> <li>• Size and scale will have a huge impact on manor house setting and level 1 – exceptional significance.</li> <li>• Contrary to State Heritage Register and Heritage Agreement.</li> <li>• Says development includes oval retirement.</li> </ul>	<p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>This is discussed elsewhere in the submissions.</i></p> <p><i>The oval proposal does not form part of this DA.</i></p>