

**Submission - Staged Redevelopment of Greenwich Hospital
Stephen & Margaret Loomes**

To Whom it May Concern

This document examines the application and various reports for the Staged Redevelopment of Greenwich Hospital.

In essence, the development fails to meet the legal threshold eligibility criteria applicable to State Significant Development and the Seniors living units and villas component should be deleted as the site should continue to be preserved for use as a Hospital as per the current zoning.

In reviewing the application, it is extremely disappointing and of significant concern that this proposal does not differ greatly from Hammondcare's first application as well as bares no relation to that presented to the community by Hammondcare some 18 months ago. One would ask was this an attempt at misleading the community and government (Lane Cove Council and State Govt) or a change in focus? The fact that this submission still focuses on Hammondcare making money through residential accommodation (hospital care seems secondary to the proposal) and giving nothing back to the community or Greenwich neighborhood, gives a clear indication of their intent.

The attached examines the negative impact this development will have on parking and traffic in the area. It brings to your attention the grave bushfire hazards from developing an industrial site next to a reserve, the additional risks for accidents from children trying to access the schools in the area and more importantly, the significant detrimental impact on the bushland environment and the native animals that live in that habitat.

Finally, the submission argues that the planned senior living buildings will destroy the heritage value of the landscape, taking away a part of our local history.

This submission also points out that the area cannot accommodate such a development, as we are already suffering from the shortcomings of the existing arrangement, especially the unforeseen hospital traffic using St Vincent's Road, a road designated by the council and the school (built the footpath for this purpose) as a "safe zone:" for children to walk to school safely. Doubling up the size of the current development to the point of including residential housing and greater street access into St Vincent's Road is very concerning to the local residents a significant issue for the school for child safety reasons.

The Applicant should reconsider the scale of the development, and plan to redevelop the site to a hospital / medical Centre with parking and traffic management options consistent with that proposal and finally, repositioning the location of the respite clinic on St Vincent's Road as it is currently inappropriate for accessibility/parking and significantly compromise pedestrian safety (especially school children)in the precinct particularly in St Vincent's Avenue and surround. Applying for a development of double the size mainly due to the introduction of residential buildings is not in line with the "health Services" zoning of the property and we therefore strongly object to the revised development plan submitted by Hammond Care.

Regards,

Stephen & Margaret Loomes. Greenwich
e: stephen.loomes@suncorp.com.au

**Submission- Staged Redevelopment of Greenwich Hospital
Stephen & Margaret Loomes**

Contents:

1. Senior living housing on LEP SP2 land
2. Native Bushland and Animals
3. Heritage
4. Traffic
5. Greenwich Public School
6. Construction

**1. Senior living housing on LEP SP2 land
Submission- Staged Redevelopment of Greenwich Hospital – Stephen Loomes**

The hospital is in a SP2-Health Services Facility Zone. State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007 defines as health services facility a facility used to provide medical or other services relating to the maintenance or improvement of the health, or the restoration to health, of persons or the prevention of disease in or treatment of injury to persons, and includes the following:

- (a) day surgeries and medical centres,
- (b) community health service facilities,
- (c) health consulting rooms,
- (d) facilities for the transport of patients, including helipads and ambulance facilities,
- (e) hospitals.

The parcel where the hospital stands was categorised specifically as Health Services Facility Zone in order to have facilities that will service the health of NSW residents, not need for luxury housing.

A considerable part of the redevelopment is for a residential development. This is contrary to the idea of the planning instrument which is designed to encourage public infrastructure. The residential development should be subject to the same planning rules as any other residential development.

Equally so, the use of hospital land for seniors living will cause that land to be lost to public infra-structure forever and thus restrict the hospital from expansion when needed in the years to come.

**Submission- Staged Redevelopment of Greenwich Hospital
Stephen & Margaret Loomes**

We object to the proposed Serviced Seniors Living apartment blocks, as they are not compliant with zoning law, are too massive for the site and surrounding residential area and consequential unnecessary overlooking impacts. The land should be kept for hospital-only use.

2. Native Bushland and Animals

Lane Cove Council notes that "Lane Cove bushland is a significant part of the local character and has many values which make it significant to the people of Lane Cove and to the broader community".

"Aesthetic Values

Bushland reserves are easily accessible to most residents with many of the walking tracks running from suburban areas past parks, creeks and the Lane Cove River, often with stunning views.

It reduces noise, air and visual pollution, creates a feeling of peace and space. The proximity to bushland creates a suburb identity, provides a bushland frame to many views, and makes Lane Cove an attractive place in which to live.

Natural Heritage, Habitat and Scientific Values

Bushland is our natural heritage. It determines the visual identity of the landscape.

Remnant bushland vegetation of past ecosystems has an important scientific, educational and community heritage values.

Bushland provides a habitat for native plant and animal species, conserves rare and endangered flora and fauna, and enables the long-term survival of existing animal and plant communities.

Lane Cove bushland forms part of a vital link and wildlife corridor extending from Sydney Harbour to the expansive areas in the upper Lane Cove valley and further to the city outskirts."

I reiterate my comments from my previous objection noting that having lived in this beautiful area for many years waking to the wonderful chorus of bird life (Kookaburra's, Rosellas, Magpies, Currawongs, parakeets etc) and being blessed to see an Owl sitting on our fence or the electrical wires outside our place of an evening, I think it would be a travesty to allow this development as it will result in all the native animals (a lot of them) leaving this beautiful area.

Should this redevelopment be approved than another part of the bushland and it's animals will be lost and it will only be time before developers look to another bit of bushland and before we know it, Lane Cove will be a concrete jungle like so many other parts of Sydney today.

**Submission- Staged Redevelopment of Greenwich Hospital
Stephen & Margaret Loomes**

Furthermore, the removal of over 40% of the trees on the site*, most associated with the "Serviced Seniors Living" apartments and landscaping, roads, etc, will drastically change the nature of the site and remove its "bush environment" forever not to mention endangerment to the breeding pairs and territories of several species;

On these grounds, we object to this development with removal of a large proportion of the site's trees, which will have significant impact on the environment resulting in loss of habitat for wildlife and the resultant impact to native flora and fauna.

3. Heritage

The proposal includes the building of senior living villas at Lot 4, DP 584287. That area is a Heritage Listing area in the State Heritage Register. The heritage item is not just the house in the middle of that lot, but the whole landscape, as the reason why it is significant is that Lot 4 is all that is left as an example of European settlement, including the use of the gardens and driveways, fenced paddock and pools.

The Seniors living units and villas component should be deleted as the site should continue to be preserved for use as a Hospital as per the current zoning. There is conflict between future hospital expansion needs and provision of for-profit housing, together with continuing severe conflict with zone objectives.

The current proposal will totally change the landscape, as from an open garden and trees area it will become the setting for two large housing complexes. The proposal continues to have the removal of trees from the heritage area and it is also mentioning the need of pruning down the remaining trees. Besides this affecting the connectivity of the local bushland corridor, it will translate this heritage area to a totally different landscape.

Through the years, to assist with growth and development of the area, most of the land that used to be part of the Standish property were given for resident housing and then to the hospital. The only space left was Lot 4, clearly marked as a heritage listed area, as a historic example of how the area was during the first century of European settlement.

The proposed location of the respite clinic on St Vincent's Road is inappropriate for accessibility/parking reasons and would be difficult for outpatients to find. It should be consolidated with other health services and better located for public transport;

**Submission- Staged Redevelopment of Greenwich Hospital
Stephen & Margaret Loomes**

On these grounds, we object to the proposal, as the Seniors living units and villas component should be deleted as the site should continue to be preserved for use as a Hospital as per the current zoning as the senior villas will destroy the heritage value of Lot 4.

4. Traffic

One can't underestimate the significant impact on traffic flow along both River Road and St Vincent's road this proposal will have let alone the increased danger to Greenwich School children and residents as they negotiate their way around the vicinity of the hospital.

This development will mean that there will be large traffic back-ups in the morning peak hour along River Road heading east and again in the afternoon heading west yet nothing is made of this in the report nor is it estimated how long the signal changes will take. This will frustrate drivers heading to work and home even more than they are currently frustrated, potentially leading to accidents

River Road is a 50km residential road, with a public school opposite the entrance to the hospital on that road. However, the road network at the north shore of Sydney is funneling a vast number of cars to this small residential road. The reason is that River Road is the first and quickest access drivers have entering the North Shore from Gladesville Bridge heading to North Sydney, Neutral Bay or the City. St Vincent's Road also experiences heavier traffic volumes than normal. There is a one kilometer stretch of road at River Road in front of the hospital that there are no left or right turnst Vincent's Road is the first exit off River Road to the Greenwich peninsula. East bound drivers will turn right at St Vincent's Road, to avoid the traffic deadlock at the top of the hill at Greenwich Road. Those are the drivers to Greenwich peninsula, including parents driving their children to Greenwich School (K-1 Campus), private school buses picking up children from Greenwich and staff accessing the hospital from the side access road.

Cars must wait behind parked cars for the oncoming traffic to clear and local residents have to be extra careful when they exit their driveways and parked cars block the view to the oncoming traffic. This is significantly concerning as under the current proposal traffic flow on River Road will be a huge issue (for the state government and the Lane Cove Council) and will cause mayhem in St Vincent's Road creating safety issues for the hundreds of school children that use it as an "accepted" walkway to school each day and for the residents in the street and surrounding area. St Vincent Road was not built or meant to carry such a load.

The additional traffic issue from the intersection of St Vincent's and River Road is that the two lane east bound traffic becomes just one lane when cars turning right into St Vincent Road must wait for the oncoming traffic to clear. This creates even more traffic issues during peak time, as the two-lane road becomes one lane. The cars waiting to turn are piling up and after 5 or more cars are stopped, the tail reaches the top of the hill, which becomes a traffic hazard when cars find suddenly that lane blocked with no early visual warning due to the crest.

**Submission- Staged Redevelopment of Greenwich Hospital
Stephen & Margaret Loomes**

We object to this development due to the lack of planning for safety of local school children and the much-increased hazard to them of vastly increased internal traffic entering and exiting the site directly opposite the State Primary School and the likely blocking of St Vincents Rd for several hours each day. Furthermore, St Vincent's Road cannot accommodate the increase of traffic and parking needs this proposal will generate let alone the impact on the Greenwich Peninsula residents.

5. Greenwich Public School

The hospital is opposite to Greenwich Public School. As noted in my submission on "traffic" the limited parking in the area and traffic conditions on River Road, makes it almost impossible for parents to access the school via the intersection at St Vincent's Road.

Submission- Staged Redevelopment of Greenwich Hospital – Stephen Loomes

In addition, the Council (following representations from the School) have specifically built a footpath alongside the hospital property in St Vincent's Road as it is considered a safe passage for school children walking to school from the Greenwich peninsular (more appropriate and safer) than Greenwich and River Road. Schoolchildren coming from Greenwich peninsula have been taught only one crossing to reach the school: the main traffic lights at the hospital. Having accommodation and the ensuing driveways on St Vincent's Road will create a safety hazard for children and increasing the volume of traffic to double will mean that children will have to navigate daily through all the extra traffic, both pedestrian and cars accessing the hospital car parks.

Based on the above, we are against the proposal, as there has been no accommodation for the safety of the children attending the school opposite to the hospital.

6. Construction

We reiterate the development fails to meet the legal threshold eligibility criteria applicable to State Significant Development.

Apart from this, the construction site will be of a major scale. It has two major issues: scale and access.

The scale of the development is grossly over the top given the residential neighborhood in which the hospital is located. It will diminish Pallister House and be an eyesore (and impact living standards) for residents and visitors as far away as Northwood.

The construction will have major impact on the residents. As the land is at the top of the hill and with construction extended many levels up, the noise and dust pollution will affect

residents from many blocks away. Strict controls should be placed on hours work will take place, the days of the week, and the total duration of the project. Residents should be screened off from noise and dust. If houses are affected by dust or mud, cleaning services should be offered on a regular basis to upkeep the houses to a livable state. If roads and footpaths are affected during construction, they should be fixed on the day, not at the end of the project. As this is not an industrial area, but a residential area, construction should take place with extra care not to affect the enjoyment of living in the area of the local residents.

As no serious allowances are made to ensure that residents will not be affected by the construction of the development, we oppose this proposal.