

The logo for URBIS, featuring the word "URBIS" in a bold, sans-serif font. The letters are contained within a square frame that is open on the right side. A thick black horizontal line extends from the right side of the square frame across the top of the page. A thick black vertical line extends from the top of the page down to the top of the square frame.

**URBIS**

# **SUBMISSIONS REPORT**

SSDA-9838218

Griffith Base Hospital Redevelopment

Prepared for

**HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE**

25 August 2021

**URBIS STAFF RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS REPORT WERE:**

Director	Peter Strudwick
Consultant	Georgia McKenzie
Project Code	P0014571
Report Number	Final

**Urbis acknowledges the important contribution that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people make in creating a strong and vibrant Australian society.**

**We acknowledge, in each of our offices, the Traditional Owners on whose land we stand.**

All information supplied to Urbis in order to conduct this research has been treated in the strictest confidence. It shall only be used in this context and shall not be made available to third parties without client authorisation. Confidential information has been stored securely and data provided by respondents, as well as their identity, has been treated in the strictest confidence and all assurance given to respondents have been and shall be fulfilled.

© Urbis Pty Ltd  
50 105 256 228

All Rights Reserved. No material may be reproduced without prior permission.

You must read the important disclaimer appearing within the body of this report.

**[urbis.com.au](http://urbis.com.au)**

# CONTENTS

1.	Introduction .....	4
2.	Analysis of Submissions.....	6
3.	Actions Taken Since Exhibition.....	7
4.	Response to Submissions .....	8
5.	Updated Evaluation and Conclusion.....	20
	Disclaimer.....	21

Appendix A	Submissions Register
Appendix B	Updated Mitigation Measures
Appendix C	Amended Architectural Plans
Appendix D	Traffic and Parking Study
Appendix E	Amended BDAR Report
Appendix F	Stamped REF Plans
Appendix G	Acoustic Statement
Appendix H	Consultation with Griffith Clty Council

## TABLES

Table 1	Summary of actions taken since exhibition .....	7
Table 2	Response to Submissions Table .....	8

# 1. INTRODUCTION

This Submissions Report has been prepared by Urbis on behalf of Health Infrastructure (the **Proponent**) in respect of the State significant Development (**SSD**) application (**SSD- 9838218**) for the Griffith Base Hospital Redevelopment.

This report addresses the matters raised by public agencies during the public exhibition of the Environmental Impact Statement (**EIS**) for the Griffith Base Hospital Redevelopment (SSD- 9838218). The EIS was on public exhibition between 30 April 2021 – 27 May 2021. During this period, seven (7) submissions were received from public agencies and Griffith City Council. These included submissions from:

- Heritage Council of NSW
- Environment Protection Authority
- Biodiversity and Conservation Division
- Heritage NSW – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage
- Transport for NSW
- Roads and Maritime Services Division
- Griffith City Council.

During exhibition, no public submissions were received.

This Submissions Report has been prepared with reference to clause 82(2) of Division 6 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulations 2000 (EP&A Regulations)* which states as follows:

*(1) The Planning Secretary is to provide to an applicant for State significant development the submissions, or a summary of the submissions, received in relation to the application during the submission period.*

*(2) The Planning Secretary may, by notice in writing, require the applicant to provide a written response to such issues raised in those submissions as the Planning Secretary considers necessary.*

During the preparation of this Submissions Report, guidance has been taken from the ‘*Preparing a Submissions Report*’ Draft Guideline prepared by the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (**DPIE**) and exhibited in 2020. Accordingly, this Submissions Report provides:

- **Section 2** – An analysis of submission received.
- **Section 3** – Identification of the actions taken since the public exhibition period, including any amendments made to the project.
- **Section 4** – A comprehensive response to the issues raised in the submissions.
- **Section 5** – An updated project evaluation and conclusion.

The proposed amendments and justification for the proposal is outlined in the specialist documentation provided as follows:

- Submissions Register prepared by Urbis (**Appendix A**)
- Updated Mitigation Measures prepared by Urbis (**Appendix B**)
- Amended Architectural Plans prepared by DJRD (**Appendix C**)
- Addendum Traffic and Parking Study prepared by PTC (**Appendix D**)
- Amended BDAR Report (**Appendix E**)
- Stamped REF Plans (**Appendix F**).

The specialist consultants have assessed the design and recommended mitigation measures to ensure the proposal will have no unreasonable or significant traffic, transport, archaeological and environmental impacts

on adjoining or surrounding properties or the public domain. This documentation confirms that there are no significant adverse impacts associated with the project.

Accordingly, the content contained in this Submissions Report and the original EIS demonstrates that the proposal balances environmental impact with community benefit and should be approved subject to appropriate conditions.

## 2. ANALYSIS OF SUBMISSIONS

The EIS was placed on public exhibition between 30 April 2021 – 27 May 2021. During this period, government agencies, Council, key infrastructure stakeholders and the community were invited to make written submissions on the project to NSW DPIE.

As outlined in the summary below, a total of seven (7) submissions were received from agencies and Council during the public exhibition of the proposal. Of these, six neither supported nor objected the proposal, and one supported the proposal.

There were no objections to the proposal, and no submissions from members of the public.

The following were the issues identified within the submissions:

- Architectural plans and considerations
- Traffic, parking and vehicular access.
- Acoustic impacts.
- Biodiversity impacts.
- Sustainable transport measures, including the submitted Green Travel Plan.
- Aboriginal cultural heritage.

These submissions related to the project, and the economic, environmental and social impacts of the project. For each submission that has been received, **Section 4** provides a description of the matters raised in the submission, a summary of the response, and a reference to where these issues have been addressed in the detailed documentation as required. The identified issues have been discussed further in **Section 5**, which provides additional justification where warranted.

### 3. ACTIONS TAKEN SINCE EXHIBITION

An overview of the actions taken since the public exhibition of the project is outlined in **Table 1** below.

Table 1 Summary of actions taken since exhibition

Action	Description
Additional Assessment	<p><b><u>Acoustic</u></b></p> <p>EMM have undertaken additional Acoustic Impact Assessment in response to commentary received from DPIE. Refer to <b>Table 2</b> and <b>Appendix G</b> for further discussion of these results.</p>
	<p><b><u>Traffic and Parking Assessment</u></b></p> <p>PTC Consultants have provided additional commentary regarding the service access at Animoo Avenue. Refer to the Parking and Access Statement at <b>Appendix E</b> and <b>Table 2</b> for further discussion of these results.</p>

## 4. RESPONSE TO SUBMISSIONS

Table 2 provides a summary of all submissions received and provides a respective response.

Table 2 Response to Submissions Table

Issue	Referral Comment	Response to Submission	Reference to information
<b>Department of Planning, Industry and Environment</b>			
<b>Acoustic</b>	1. Address the potential noise impact to nearby sensitive receivers from logistics vehicle movements and activities associated with the Non-Clinical Services Building.	<p>1. EMM have prepared an additional commentary relating to the activities associated with the Non-Clinical Services Building (<b>Appendix G</b>).</p> <p>The non-clinical services (NCS) building is located in the north corner of the development, adjacent St Vincent's Private Hospital and across Warrambool Street from St Patrick's Catholic Primary School.</p> <p>EMM concluded that the majority of service vehicles will enter the development via the new driveway off Warrambool Street and use the loading docks on the southern side of the Non-Clinical Services Building.</p> <p>Noise generated by the NCS itself will generally be associated with the dirty workshop adjoining Warrambool Street. EMM have concluded that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ activities within the workshop are expected to relate to minor repairs using hand held manual and electrical tools which would only generate minor to moderate degrees of noise;</li> <li>▪ the workshop is fully enclosed and as such noise breakout from the building envelope is expected to be minimal;</li> <li>▪ noise breakout to the St Patricks Catholic Primary School will typically be masked by road traffic noise on Warrambool Street; and</li> </ul>	N/A

Issue	Referral Comment	Response to Submission	Reference to information
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ there is substantial setback (approximately 35m) to the nearest structure on the school site.</li> </ul> <p>Accordingly, noise impact associated with delivery and service vehicles to St Patrick's Catholic Primary School is expected to have a negligible impact.</p> <p>The loading dock area is screened from St Vincent's Private Hospital by the NCS. As such, noise impacts to this receiver are expected to be negligible.</p> <p>In summary, it is concluded that the potential noise impact to nearby sensitive receivers from logistics vehicle movements and activities associated with the Non-Clinical Services Building will be minimal.</p>	
<p><b>Parking and Access</b></p>	<p>2. Provide further explanation as to how the forecast parking demand of 147 public spaces is calculated.</p> <p>3. Address the vehicle access restrictions identified in the swept path analysis for large vehicles utilising the existing service access at Animoo Avenue to the rear of the hospital.</p>	<p>2. PTC have confirmed the demand for 147 public spaces with an additional parking demand study. Refer to <b>Appendix E</b>.</p> <p>3. PTC have confirmed that the proposed redevelopment of the Griffith Base Hospital will reduce access via Animoo Avenue for service vehicles. Deliveries to St Vincent's Private Community Hospital (SVPCH) will remain via the Animoo Avenue access. Deliveries to the new main hospital building will be via Warambool Street and made at the NCS building loading dock.</p> <p>Oxygen refills will be delivered via the existing Animoo Avenue access. As oxygen will be filled from the rear of a semi-trailer, a reversing manoeuvre is required. This allows the semi-trailer to drive forward into the site, undertake a 3-point turning manoeuvre and drive forward out of the site. It is noted that while the semi-trailer is driving in and out of the site, the vehicle will need both sides of the road. This is considered acceptable based on low frequency of</p>	<p>Addendum Parking Study (<b>Appendix D</b>).</p>

Issue	Referral Comment	Response to Submission	Reference to information
		<p>this delivery (currently less than once a month).</p> <p>This bay will also serve as a turning area for other large trucks making deliveries to SVPCH if required. For smaller trucks making deliveries to SVPCH, the vehicle can make a 3-point turn manoeuvre at the end of the road near the NCS building.</p>	
<b>Parking Demand</b>	<p>Clarify how the total number of outpatients (468 people) and visitors (149 people) is determined in terms of the forecast parking demand – the increase in the number of outpatient beds by 25 equates to a total number of presentations of 153,283 on a pro-rata basis.</p>	<p>The total number of Outpatients at 468 people is calculated based on;</p> <p>Outpatients occasions of service per annum / Number of weekdays per annum / Factor of services per visit</p> <p>= 153,283 / 252 [260 weekdays less 8 public holidays] / 1.3 [patients may use more than one service per visit]</p> <p>= 468</p> <p>The total number of Visitors at 149 people is calculated based on;</p> <p>Number of inpatient beds x Bed occupancy x Average visitors per bed</p> <p>= 117 x 85% x 1.5</p> <p>= 149</p>	N/A
<b>Architectural Plans and Considerations</b>	<p>4. Provide a response to the design recommendations identified by the Government Architect New South Wales in the correspondence dated 24 March 2021.</p> <p>5. Confirm the floor space ratio (FSR) and the gross floor area (GFA) as the Environmental Impact Statement states the proposal will have a FSR of 0.28:1 based on a gross floor area (GFA) of 18,145sqm, which is different to the</p>	<p>4. DJRD's response to the Government Architect NSW design recommendations are included on page 8 of the Architectural Design Statement. DJRD have not included the items the panel supported, only the recommendations.</p> <p>5. The correct FSR is listed on the architectural plans. The correct GFA is 19,337sqm and FSR of 0.3:1.</p> <p>6. Dimensions and RL's have been added to East and West Elevations, refer to <b>Appendix C</b>.</p> <p>7. The Hearse Bay has been added to site plan, refer to <b>Appendix C</b>.</p>	Amended Architectural Plans ( <b>Appendix C</b> ).

Issue	Referral Comment	Response to Submission	Reference to information
	<p>architectural plans that identify an FSR of 0.3:1 based on a GFA of 19,337sqm.</p> <p>6. Provide dimensions (including RLs) on the architectural plans showing the maximum building height of the western and eastern wings of the new Clinical Services Building.</p> <p>7. Show the intended location of the mortuary and parking area for the hearse at the rear of the hospital on the architectural plans.</p>		
<p><b>Surrounding Development</b></p>	<p>8. Provide details of the separate approval for the construction of the Non Clinical Services Building and the approved floor plans.</p>	<p>8. The “Proposed Redevelopment of Non-clinical Support Building and associated works” was determined by a Review of Environmental Factors prepared by Urbis and endorsed by NSW Health Infrastructure, REF Approval 18/2020, dated 07 August 2020.</p> <p>The scope of work associated with the approval includes the following activity:</p> <p>Demolition:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Demolition of buildings 7, 8, 9.</li> <li>▪ Demolition of covered walkway and mortuary shelter and removal of paving and vegetation.</li> </ul> <p>Alterations and Additions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Replacement/alteration of existing administration facilities for the purposes of a nonclinical support (NCS) building (max height: 5.6m/setback 6.8m from boundary).</li> </ul> <p>Car Park Works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Construction of new vehicle access from Warrambool Street to the outpatient car park.</li> </ul>	<p>Refer to the stamped REF plans at <b>Appendix F.</b></p>

Issue	Referral Comment	Response to Submission	Reference to information
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Removal of existing property access into Warrambool Street and outpatient car park.</li> </ul> <p>Ancillary Works:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Removal of trees.</li> <li>▪ Services installation/in-ground civil works, including excavation and utility services diversions and augmentations: water, gas, stormwater, sewer, electricity and communications</li> </ul> <p>The specific environmental factors identified by Urbis as requiring consideration as a result of the proposed activity included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Aboriginal Heritage</li> <li>▪ Heritage and Archaeology</li> <li>▪ Soil and Geology</li> <li>▪ Hydrology, Flooding and Water Quality</li> <li>▪ Ecology</li> <li>▪ Noise and vibration</li> <li>▪ Air quality and Energy</li> <li>▪ Visual Amenity</li> <li>▪ Traffic, Access and Parking</li> <li>▪ Hazardous Materials and Contamination</li> <li>▪ Waste Generation</li> <li>▪ Cumulative impacts</li> </ul> <p>The specific mitigation measures imposed by NSW Health Infrastructure that the approval is subject to includes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Access and pedestrian movements</li> <li>▪ Air Quality and Dust Management</li> <li>▪ Aboriginal Heritage</li> </ul>	

Issue	Referral Comment	Response to Submission	Reference to information
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Community Notification</li> <li>▪ Contamination</li> <li>▪ Dilapidation Report</li> <li>▪ Erosion and Sediment Control</li> <li>▪ Construction Site Management</li> <li>▪ Construction Traffic Management</li> <li>▪ Construction Waste Management</li> <li>▪ Noise Management Measures</li> <li>▪ Non-Aboriginal Heritage</li> <li>▪ Restriction on hours during construction</li> <li>▪ Services and Utilities</li> <li>▪ Traffic Management</li> <li>▪ Tree Management and Landscape</li> <li>▪ Vibration Management</li> <li>▪ Work as Executed documents</li> </ul>	
<b>Timing and Future Uses</b>	<p>9. Provide a brief outline of the likely future uses to be undertaken in the Community Health Centre.</p>	<p>The future use of Building 33 as the Community Health Centre will include services such as community care nursing, sexual health, population health, Aged care assessment team (ACAT), speech pathology, occupational therapy, Transitional Aged Care Program (TACP) and counselling services. Any future use or fit-out works associated with this building would be subject to the required approvals process.</p>	<p>N/A</p>
	<p>10. Provide a summary of the enabling works currently being undertaken on the hospital site and timing for those works.</p>	<p>The replacement works currently being undertaken includes construction of a non-clinical services building housing the kitchen, maintenance and other essential services, construction of a temporary paediatric ward, construction of a temporary carpark, and demolition of buildings within the new hospital construction zone, such as the existing kitchen and paediatric ward.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Issue	Referral Comment	Response to Submission	Reference to information
		<p>These works were the subject of a separate approvals process under Part 5 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act and are scheduled to be completed by early 2022.</p>	
<b>Transport for NSW</b>			
<b>Traffic Generation</b>	<p>The subject site has frontage to the western side of Warrambool Street. Warrambool Street also provides access and parking for the existing school grounds located on the eastern side of Warrambool Street.</p> <p>In discussions prior to submission of the application both Council and TfNSW raised concerns regarding the location of the access to the emergency Department and the non-clinical services building from Warrambool Street whereas there appears to be access to the northern part of Animoo Street especially for the non-clinical building.</p> <p>The assessment of the impact of the additional traffic on Warrambool Street and the nearby existing land uses such as the school needs to consider the traffic generation due to both the Emergency Department and the non-clinical services building.</p>	<p>PTC have confirmed that the pre-redevelopment traffic on Warrambool Street was generated from the Outpatient car park, Maternity car park, Nurses Training School car park as noted on Figure 23 of the Traffic and Parking Report lodged with the SSDA package.</p> <p>The post-redevelopment traffic on Warrambool Street will be generated from the Non-Clinical Services carpark and loading dock, Emergency Vehicle access and Nurses Education car park (as noted on Figure 24 of the Traffic and Parking Report lodged with the SSDA).</p> <p>PTC's calculation demonstrates a decrease in traffic along Warrambool Street post-redevelopment as the public and staff will no longer use Warrambool Street to access the Outpatient car park (23 spaces) and Maternity car park (18 spaces).</p> <p>However, PTC note that the nature of the traffic on Warrambool Street will change due to the proposed development. PTC have provided mitigation measures to address potential impacts including additional signage and line marking and an education session with St Patrick's School. These measures will be considered with the relevant stakeholders.</p>	Appendix H
<b>Pedestrian access</b>	<p>Appropriate pedestrian treatment shall be implemented within Warrambool Street to</p>	<p>Noted, this will be completed in post-consent matters.</p>	N/A

Issue	Referral Comment	Response to Submission	Reference to information
	provide convenient and safe pedestrian and cycle access across Warrambool Street to the satisfaction of Council.		
<b>Green Travel Plan</b>	It is requested that the applicant be conditioned to update the GTP in consultation with TfNSW.	Noted, this will be completed in post-consent matters.	N/A
<b>Heritage NSW – Aboriginal Cultural Heritage</b>			
<b>Heritage Management Plan</b>	In response to this and as standard for SSD projects, we recommend that a Heritage Management Plan be developed. The purpose would be to describe how any unexpected finds would be managed and for the Applicant to clarify the SSD boundary, which will then inform approval and management processes.	A Heritage Management Plan will be prepared.	N/A
<b>Interpretation Strategy and Plan</b>	Should the proposal be approved, we provide the following recommended conditions:  1. The Applicant is to prepare an Interpretation Strategy and Plan to guide the interpretation of the Aboriginal cultural heritage, archaeology and Aboriginal history of the Griffith Base Hospital site. The strategy and plan would be prepared in consultation with Aboriginal Stakeholders.	An Interpretation Strategy and Plan will be prepared.	N/A
<b>Heritage Management Plan</b>	Prior to the commencement of construction, the Applicant is to prepare a Heritage Management Plan for the development to the satisfaction of the Secretary. This plan must:	A Heritage Management Plan will be prepared. The Heritage Management will comply with the listed provisions.	N/A

Issue	Referral Comment	Response to Submission	Reference to information
	<p>(a) Be prepared by suitably qualified and experienced persons whose appointment has been endorsed by the Secretary;</p> <p>(b) Be prepared in consultation with Heritage NSW and the Registered Aboriginal Parties;</p> <p>(c) Include a map showing the SSD boundary, AHIP 4667 boundary and the extent of site 49-2-0180. The purpose of the map will be to inform the approval pathway (SSD or AHIP) and management options, if Aboriginal objects are uncovered during works.</p> <p>(d) Include a description of the measures that would be implemented for:</p> <p>(e) include a program to monitor and report on the effectiveness of these measures and any heritage impacts of the project.</p>		
<b>Heritage Council NSW</b>			
<b>General comment</b>	The subject site is not listed on the State Heritage Register (SHR), nor is it in the immediate vicinity of any SHR items. Further, the site does not contain any known historical archaeological relics. Therefore, no further heritage comments are required.	Noted and accepted.	N/A
<b>NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA)</b>			
<b>General comment</b>	Based on the information provided, the proposal does not appear to require an	Noted and accepted.	N/A

Issue	Referral Comment	Response to Submission	Reference to information
	<p>environment protection licence under the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997.</p> <p>However, the proposal is being undertaken on behalf of a New South Wales public authority and therefore the EPA is the appropriate regulatory authority for the proposal.</p> <p>The EPA has reviewed the EIS and notes that it provides the information required by the Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements and the EPA has no additional comment on the proposal.</p>		
<b>NSW DPIE Environment, Energy and Science</b>			
<b>Species credit</b>	<p>Section 3.3.2 of the BDAR indicates that the Superb Parrot is included in the BAM assessment as a species credit species, due to breeding habitat being present on site.</p> <p>However, the BAM-C credit report in Section 9 does not show the Superb Parrot as generating credits.</p> <p>Explain why the Superb Parrot is not in the output of the BAM-C.</p>	<p>The Superb Parrot has been included in the output of the BAM-C as demonstrated in the Revised BDAR Report at <b>Appendix E</b>.</p>	Appendix E
<b>Plant community type descriptions</b>	<p>Figure 9 shows vegetation mapping but the legend descriptions need to be more complete.</p> <p>Update Figure 9 with full PCT numbering and descriptions.</p>	<p>Figure 9 has been amended to include the full PCT numbering and descriptions.</p>	Appendix E

Issue	Referral Comment	Response to Submission	Reference to information
<b>Vegetation zones</b>	<p>The BDAR does not describe the vegetation zones according to section 5.3.1 of the BAM (2017).</p> <p>Exotic vegetation should be included in areas not requiring assessment.</p> <p>Present a map of the vegetation zones in the development site consistent with the requirements of Section 5.3.1 of the BAM.</p> <p>Include 'zone 3' as exotic vegetation in a map of areas that do not require assessment (see point 4).</p> <p>Submit digital files of these areas.</p>	<p>This is now included in Figure 11 of the revised report. The digital file is provided as Appendix E " Zone 3...shp".</p>	<p>Appendix E</p>
<b>Maps of offset areas</b>	<p>The BDAR should provide maps showing the areas of vegetation requiring offsets, areas of vegetation not requiring offsets and areas not requiring assessment (section 3.1 of the BAM Operational Manual Stage 2).</p> <p>Include figures showing areas requiring offsets, not requiring offsets and those that are not assessed.</p> <p>Submit digital files of these areas.</p>	<p>This is now included in Figure 12 of the revised report. The digital file is provided as Appendix E "Zone 1...shp".</p>	<p>Appendix E</p>
<b>Flooding</b>	<p>BCD has reviewed the flooding information in Section 6.18 of the EIS and in Appendix Z.</p> <p>The EIS does address the Secretary's requirements for flooding.</p>	<p>Noted and accepted.</p>	<p>N/A</p>

Issue	Referral Comment	Response to Submission	Reference to information
<b>Tree removal</b>	<p>Confirm the existing trees to be removed. Figure 5 of the BDAR shows the remnant vegetation within the development footprint to be removed and offset.</p> <p>However, the remnant vegetation at the southern boundary (Nooremar Avenue) is shown as being retained in the Landscape Report (Dwg. 0015) and the Arborist Report (Appendix 2).</p>	<p>Figure 5 on the amended BDAR has been updated to show the remnant vegetation along the southern boundary is to be retained.</p>	Appendix E
<b>Griffith City Council</b>			
Ambulance access on Warrambool Street	Concerns with traffic impacts associated with the ambulance access on Warrambool Street..	<p>Health Infrastructure held a meeting with Griffith City Council on 11 August to discuss solutions to possible traffic impacts associated with the ambulance access on Warrambool Street. The meeting minutes are provided at <b>Appendix H</b>.</p> <p>During the meeting, various pedestrian treatment measure were discussed. The Griffith City Council are supportive of the following pedestrian treatment measures proposed by Health Infrastructure. A copy of the meeting minutes noting the discussions and agreement are provided in Appendix H.</p>	Appendix H

## 5. UPDATED EVALUATION AND CONCLUSION

This Submissions Report has been prepared to address the matters raised by government agencies during the public exhibition of the proposed Griffith Base Hospital redevelopment (SSD- 9838218).

In summary, no significant material changes are proposed to facilitate the approval and construction of the Griffith Base Hospital than previously outlined in the SSDA package. Following lodgement of the SSDA and receipt of the DPIE's identification of key issues and submissions on the proposed development, the proponent has provided updated technical information and additional justification where requested to address questions and agency concerns.

It is noted that there were no objections to the proposal, and no submissions from members of the public.

In summary, the proposal as amended is considered suitable for the site and worthy of support by the Minister for the following reasons:

- The project is consistent with the NSW Government and Griffith City Council policies for the site and surrounding area including the NSW State Priorities, the State Infrastructure Strategy 2018, the Riverina Murray Regional Plan, and the Griffith Local Strategic Planning Statement.
- The project will provide expanded inpatient, surgical, ambulatory care and critical care services to Griffith Base Hospital. It will also enable the consolidation of several ageing and dislocated buildings into an integrated and contemporary healthcare facility. The site is currently used as a hospital and provides a prime opportunity to take advantage of the existing use of the site to expand and improve existing facilities.
- The proposal is permissible in the R1 General Residential zone pursuant to the *Griffith Local Environmental Plan 2014* and is consistent with the objectives of the zone as it will deliver significant investment in and the construction of critical infrastructure, add to the creation of construction related and long-term operational jobs and will improve health facilities and services for the community of the Riverina-Murray region.
- The parkland setting and landscape solutions of the proposed development will reduce the impact of the scale of the building when viewed from surrounding streets. The proposed façade and exterior colour scheme of the new building have been designed to be sympathetic to the surrounding residential context and the site's parkland setting.
- The issues identified during the stakeholder consultation have been incorporated into the final design and detailed works and can be implemented in the construction and operation of the proposed development.
- The principles of ecologically sustainable development were an integral consideration in the design of the proposed development. The sustainability targets for the development will be achieved and the equivalent of a 4 star Green Star rating achieved.
- The proposal will result in the delivery of 172 jobs during the construction phase and an additional 86 jobs in operation, resulting in 441 operational jobs.

As outlined throughout this report, the proposed development as sought within the SSDA is in the public interest, responds to the statutory requirements under the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* and has adequately addressed and responded to the issued Secretary's Environmental Assessment Requirements (SEARs) for the project and each of the submissions received during the public exhibition period. As such, the proposal in its current form is considered appropriate for the site and should be supported by the Minister for Planning as the consent authority for State Significant Development.

# DISCLAIMER

This report is dated 25 August 2021 and incorporates information and events up to that date only and excludes any information arising, or event occurring, after that date which may affect the validity of Urbis Pty Ltd (**Urbis**) opinion in this report. Urbis prepared this report on the instructions, and for the benefit only, of Health Infrastructure (**Instructing Party**) for the purpose of Response to Submissions Report (**Purpose**) and not for any other purpose or use. To the extent permitted by applicable law, Urbis expressly disclaims all liability, whether direct or indirect, to the Instructing Party which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose other than the Purpose, and to any other person which relies or purports to rely on this report for any purpose whatsoever (including the Purpose).

In preparing this report, Urbis was required to make judgements which may be affected by unforeseen future events, the likelihood and effects of which are not capable of precise assessment.

All surveys, forecasts, projections and recommendations contained in or associated with this report are made in good faith and on the basis of information supplied to Urbis at the date of this report, and upon which Urbis relied. Achievement of the projections and budgets set out in this report will depend, among other things, on the actions of others over which Urbis has no control.

In preparing this report, Urbis may rely on or refer to documents in a language other than English, which Urbis may arrange to be translated. Urbis is not responsible for the accuracy or completeness of such translations and disclaims any liability for any statement or opinion made in this report being inaccurate or incomplete arising from such translations.

Whilst Urbis has made all reasonable inquiries it believes necessary in preparing this report, it is not responsible for determining the completeness or accuracy of information provided to it. Urbis (including its officers and personnel) is not liable for any errors or omissions, including in information provided by the Instructing Party or another person or upon which Urbis relies, provided that such errors or omissions are not made by Urbis recklessly or in bad faith.

This report has been prepared with due care and diligence by Urbis and the statements and opinions given by Urbis in this report are given in good faith and in the reasonable belief that they are correct and not misleading, subject to the limitations above.

# APPENDIX A

# SUBMISSIONS REGISTER

# APPENDIX B

# UPDATED MITIGATION MEASURES

**APPENDIX C**

**AMENDED ARCHITECTURAL PLANS**

# APPENDIX D

# TRAFFIC AND PARKING STUDY

# APPENDIX E

# AMENDED BDAR REPORT

# APPENDIX F

# STAMPED REF PLANS

# APPENDIX G

# ACOUSTIC STATEMENT

**APPENDIX H**

**CONSULTATION WITH GRIFFITH CITY  
COUNCIL**

