

Dear Planners

Ref Number: SSD 8699 - Greenwich Hospital Re-Development

I object to this development and have few concerns that I wish to bring to your attention. I support expanding the Greenwich Hospital however increasing the number of residential units will cause numerous serious issues that are unacceptable for the area. Many residents that I have spoken with don't believe that the impact on local residents has been considered thoroughly. My house is on Greenwich Road. I find it very difficult to exit my street to join River Road and drive past the Greenwich Public School and the hospital due to traffic congestion. The development will impact my street, affect my local amenities and add more congestion and traffic that may stop me exiting my street.

Some of the issues that further concern me include:

- The use of hospital land for seniors living will cause that land to be lost to public infrastructure forever and "sanitise" the land so as to prevent the hospital from expansion when needed in the years to come.
- Height, bulk, scale – loss of amenity to hundreds of nearby residents due to this and in- compatible with current expectations of residents, the landscape and of residential dwellings of only either one- or two-storeys; this is not an area zoned for industrial buildings.
- The traffic assessment reports lack real clarity and relies on a few questionable assumptions that council need to re-assess:
 - The background traffic growth rate for the traffic assessment report, of one and a half percent per annum, is based on a very low percentage that has been superseded due to the recent increase in residential developments. The cumulative effect of numerous recent developments that are approved or in the process of being approved has been ignored in this assessment.
 - There was no traffic site inspection conducted and the traffic study involved a desktop assessment only. This is an unrealistic assessment that is superficial at best.
- The report estimates a rate of 0.2 x 89 independent living units (18 movements/hour) using the RMS Guide. However, the RMS guide is based upon sites with good public transport options within the vicinity of the development and this site has average to poor public transport options and it has poor walking grades. This means the majority of independent living unit residents will rely on private vehicles to get to and from the development.
- The traffic flow around the school will be insurmountable while there will be an impact on the safety and wellbeing for residents, school children and their parents.
- The increased danger to Greenwich School children using the crossing outside the hospital due to huge numbers of vehicles – commercial, industrial and residential - entering and leaving the hospital grounds and many heavy, high vehicles (with limited sight-lines to people including small children) during the construction phase; these must be well-researched and provision made for safety of crossing users;
- Northwood and Longueville residents will also be affected by the much heavier traffic associated with the site.
- Parking is a challenge at best and there is a need for additional parking on site. Adding more staff and visitors to the site exacerbates the parking issues that

residents face to run errands each day. Parking in the area is already very difficult for residents and families. The loss of onsite parking means that more cars will be struggling for parking spots daily.

- The loss of Heritage significance will have major adverse impact on local character of Pallister House. The height of the proposed main hospital building causes it to dominate Pallister House and forever impair the immediate environment of this Heritage-registered grand residence. Pushing the hospital building back further from River Road will only cause it to loom further over Pallister House.
- The removal of trees and the building of a Respite Centre within the Heritage Curtilage will change the character of Pallister House; it is inappropriate on Pallister House's Heritage-zoned land.
- Hospital zoned SP-2 does not meet the objectives of the SEPP which is to provide facilities used to promote the maintenance or improvement of health, or restoration to health, or prevention of disease or treatment to injury to persons.

I hope that the DPIE planners will consider each of the objections I raised and reject this development.

Thank you for your consideration.

Yours faithfully