

15 Nov 2019

Dear Sir/Madam

I want to express my objection to the proposal to redevelop Greenwich Hospital.

The proposal gives more space to aged residential units rather than more hospital beds (which are really needed) and medical capacity to the extent that when examining the DA reports and EIS the reader forgets that the DA relates to a medical services site, as the dominant factor is the high density residential units.

My concerns are itemised as follows:

- a) The size of this development is too large. It is far too high and too big for the area. I ask that the size and height be reduced to a more acceptable/suitable level such as an R2 rating.
- b) Local residents will suffer privacy intrusion from patients, lights operating 24 hours per day and increased noise from the activities associated with these buildings – all incompatible with normal residential living.
- c) The size of the development will have a direct impact on traffic. The larger the development, the more residents it will attract which leads to more visitors and guests to an area which is already congested with traffic. The traffic on most days in the area is unbearable, especially during peak times - to/from work and the school drop off and pick up times.
- d) The huge size of the facility will also lead to greater number of nurses, cleaning staff, other service staff, admin staff, doctors, other health professionals etc. which leads to larger than usual influx of traffic to the area. This scale of development will attract greater number of service vehicles to the aged care facility. For example the numerous visits from various delivery vans, food trucks, laundry vehicles to name a few. This is in addition to the extra traffic from high density residential units.
- e) The residential units proposed in this development cannot be guaranteed to only house senior citizens in the future. As such, the proposed residential units will highly likely in a couple of years house much younger residents and therefore be just another high-rise building. This would be out of character to the other houses in the area.
- f) It is already very difficult for me and my family to exit from Portview Road or Park Road on to River Road. This problem will be further exacerbated with the proposed large development. Especially when there are many developments nearby that have already been approved.
- g) The consultation process does not seem to be in line with due process. A major concern to the community is the speed at which the consultation has been proceeding for such a major decision and impact a large number of residents. As a minimum the consultation process should be extended as this is a major issue for the community. A development of this size and cost should have an extended information night for local residents. People most affected in Greenwich, St Leonards and Northwood were not given the courtesy of being informed. The number of days (28) may be the required exhibition time but it is insufficient to adequately scrutinise the multitude of pages in the DA documents by the residents.
- h) The traffic study submitted for this proposal is dismissive of the true impact. River Road and the surrounding roads are highly-travelled streets. Moving higher volumes of traffic through the streets will exacerbate the situation. These streets within the area are important for circulation of locals and visitors. There are several spots around the school that have flow conflict, due to circulation and flow of cars and pedestrians and even between vehicles and pedestrians.

- i) The area of circulation roadways will reach critical situation in a very short time especially due to the high rise residential developments that are bringing in more people to the area who are forced to use River Road. This development will mean that there will be large traffic jams in the morning peak hour along River Road heading east and again in the afternoon heading west yet nothing is mentioned of this in the report nor is it estimated how long the signal changes will take. This will frustrate drivers heading to school pick-up/drop-off, work and home even more than they are currently frustrated, potentially leading to accidents.
- j) The proposal traffic assessment did not include cumulative effect of all the high residential developments that have recently been approved or built and in turn did not include the additional cars, foot traffic, traffic flows from the new developments in the area that is not far from this proposed redevelopment. Northwood and Longueville residents will also be affected by the much heavier traffic associated with the site.
- k) It is very difficult to leave Greenwich Road to join River Road. There is a lot of traffic generated from the additional residents and most surrounding streets are narrow and congested. It is very hard to move within that area surrounding the Greenwich Public School. The State government does not have plans to improve the traffic issues and does not have the funds to correct the problem either. The traffic will become even more congested in these streets with traffic with no easy solution.
- l) The affect that the proposal will have on the surrounding bushland. 'The development' includes buildings, internal roads, paving, landscaping and terracing and storm-water works. It is incalculable what the effects will eventually be on the surrounding bushland and Gore Creek Valley.
- m) The proposal does not identify or appraise noise problems that will affect the community. River Road and Greenwich Road by the nature of location are busy, polluted and noisy roads.
- n) The Department of Education will have a difficult time accepting the additional traffic around Greenwich Public School. Safety concerns from more traffic and cars have not been addressed properly. The new proposal does not have enough features to include protecting students, pedestrians and the community from risks of more traffic and cars. The increased danger to Greenwich School children using the crossing outside the hospital due to huge number 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.
- o) The new proposal will impact the residents in the area. It will not be a liveable area as the roads will be congested and overcrowded. It will not be the walkable, connected and safe.
- p) 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.
- q) 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.
- r) The total area of Lot 4 is part of the Pallister House grounds and, as such, is protected under the NSW Heritage Act, making it illegal to build anything on it, including a Respite Centre.
- s) There is insufficient regard to good urban design, open space, suitable pedestrian flow, heritage, parking and traffic.

The residents of the area deserve better amenities, infrastructure and services as well as excellent plan for roads with less congestion rather than more seniors units living. The traffic around the

intersection of River Road and Greenwich is already at capacity. Adding to the traffic at this intersection will lead to more accidents.

Please reject this development application for a much smaller sized structures and facility which is more suitable for the area.

I hope you can take my concerns into consideration to protect the community, amenities and the local residents.

Yours Sincerely