

11 March 2019

DP&E

Dear Teresa

**Subject: Greenwich Hospital (SSD 8699) at 97-115 River Road, Greenwich**

I object to this SSD/development proposal for Greenwich Hospital since it has substantial and significant number of breaches and compromises against the LEP, DCP and SEPPs. The developer (hospital owned by Hammondcare) attempts to claim that these breaches are minor but the breaches are significant and cannot be even ignored even if this development is an SSD due to its impact on the area.

This development represents extreme overdevelopment. The size, bulk and scale of the development are grossly divergent with the location. The density and FSR are more than the maximum in the area. Increased FSR will lead to unacceptable consequences to the area and exceed the maximum allowable height for aged care.

This is a large complex for aged care totalling more than 14 levels with Villas and much more. The change of use to aged care apartments is unacceptable and should be rejected.

This development has considerable addition of several storey high building perched on an elevated point. This development has the markings of a high density residential building without the necessary controls concealing the true intent of such a development – to build more residential units. The proposed development of units and villas is not for the provision of health care and as such should not be allowed.

We would like to note that the application for this development is under the guise of aged and health services. As such the development contravenes a number of the guidelines and regulations. This development must be assessed to conform to LEP and SEPP guidelines. There is also non-compliance with the Development Control Plan.

Contrary to what has been admitted by the developer the proposed does not satisfy the SEPP for aged care facility. There are several breaches in guidelines that the DP&E should not ignore but move to reject this proposal.

This proposed development does not sit well in the adjacent environment. It will be highly visible from any street and nearby site. This buildings are already at the high end and given the natural contours of the site will result in a great number of properties being affected.

This development is a high contrast to this area's neighbourhood character. It is lacking any sympathy with its surrounds. Greenwich is a unique suburb with a village atmosphere and we as residents are proud of its character. This development will take this away altering the look and feel of the community.

The development is for 89 units aged care in the busiest and most dangerous road in Greenwich which is unsuitable to take on more density. The traffic has not been well thought out; most intersections on River Road are very busy and dangerous. The cumulative effects of other

developments in the area that use the same roads have been ignored in the traffic assessment reports.

Driveways and side streets feeding onto River Road will further be affected as it will be harder to exit and enter due to the increase in traffic.

This development will also affect Greenwich Public school due to its location and increase in traffic which will place school children at risk especially at school drop off and pickup times and even at peak hours. Greenwich Public School is a community sensitive location and the risk for the school children is increased as the hospital site takes on more people, more cars, more parking and activity close to the school. There should be a more rigorous investigation of how any risk for the school children can be eliminated. My daughter and many of our friends attend the school and I am not comfortable with the risk that this development will bring on daily basis.

The proposed will have large quantity of concrete, high walls taking away natural vegetation, many will not be replaced. There is also lack of adequate open space relevant to the site size and scale with much landscaping than the original site.

There is a lack of infrastructure in the area and there is no infrastructure to support this proposed development. In fact there is a reduction in infrastructure, services and amenity. Senior Citizens tend to be big resources takers. There is a drastic impact on the environment and local community yet there are no measures to counter these consequences.

There is no adequate car parking for the number of staff, visitors and service cars for such a facility. Off street parking is inadequate in this area. This development will bring more traffic, more service cars and more pedestrians which will place more demand on the streets and parking.

The state heritage listed Pallister House is directly affected. This is a significant heritage item that should be protected in its entirety without taking anything away from its setting and surrounding. Yet this development is encroaching on Pallister House beyond its tolerance level thus affecting its significance and prominence.

This development undermines the faith of the community in the DP&E and puts a shadow over this development.

The developer has not consulted with the residents. The developer has never made time to talk to the residents. Residents have been ignored and their opinions disregarded.

Despite some of the assertions presented in the application by the developer there will be significant impact on the community and the area with negative impacts from this development if approved.

This development should be rejected based on the above reasons.

Regards

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]