



---

# Lane Cove Bushland & Conservation Society Inc

---

P.O Box 989, Lane Cove NSW 1595

ABN 50 518 833 556

Email: [lanecove\\_bushland@yahoo.com](mailto:lanecove_bushland@yahoo.com)

Web. [www.lanecovebushland.org.au](http://www.lanecovebushland.org.au)

Teresa.Gizzi@planning.nsw.gov.au.

## **Redevelopment of Greenwich Hospital Site SSD 17- 8699**

The Lane Cove Bushland and Conservation Society has been advocating for the environment for the last 48 years, both supporting and challenging authorities on plans that impact on the environment. We are a respected community group in our local Council area, having representatives on Council Advisory Committees.

LCB&CS objects in the strongest terms to the proposal as exhibited for the redevelopment of the Greenwich Hospital site on two main fronts – the Principle and the Development.

### **The Principle.**

- 1 As noted, the site is zoned SP2 – Health Care Facilities, and the provision of these are outlined in the dictionary in the LEP. Under this zoning also permitted with consent “*any development that is ordinarily incidental or ancillary to development for that purpose*”

We cannot agree that Seniors Living, either in multi storied apartments or villas, fits the description of “ordinarily incidental or ancillary to” Health Care Facilities. These are purely accommodation for people of a certain age, whether they are able bodies, still working or frail. The implication of the siting of the tower blocks is that they will enjoy long distance and water views, making them very desirable to the more able bodied working people over the prescribed age.

### **We object to the inclusion of these apartments and villas as they are not incidental or ancillary to the Health Care Facilities elsewhere on the site.**

- 2 The provision of multi storied dwellings on this site flies against all the principles of good planning for that type of accommodation. It ticks very few of the requirements for higher density living. It is not close to a transport hub, and in fact has very limited public transport available – buses are one hour frequency during the majority of the day, going to and from Lane Cove Village via a very circuitous route and to and from Crows Nest and the city. These buses do not run late at night or on Sundays and public holidays.

The site is not close to shops, other than via the bus route listed above. The neighbourhood shops at Greenwich are too far for most people to walk and parking is always a premium in that area.

The site is even further away from other community facilities, other than the primary school (and few seniors would need that). The major health facilities at St Leonards are not serviced by public transport from this site.

The site is situated on a state road and subject to major traffic for most of the day, with congestion in morning and evening peak times.

**We object to the provision of Multi stories accommodation on this site as it does not satisfy good planning principle for this type of dwellings.**

- 3 Lack of public consultation. A development costing \$140,000,000 requires more than a token information night for a few local residents (probably before the details were finalised), notification to some local residents and one community group, and advertisements in newspapers, which the general public do not generally scrutinise. People most affected – notably residents of Northwood – the community group in Northwood and any other groups covering the Lane Cove area in general were not given the courtesy of being informed prior to word of mouth after the exhibition date. 28 days may be the legal stipulated exhibition time but it is patently insufficient to adequately scrutinise the multitude of information contained in the documents.

**We object to the development on the grounds of lack of public consultation and inadequate time to comment meaningfully in that time.**

### **The Development**

In addition to our objections to the apartment and villa in the previous The Principle section, we have problems with the whole of the development. Some of these relate to the apartments and villas but these are expressed purely to emphasise the overall dissatisfaction with the total development.

We have no objection to the provision of the hospital and associated medical facilities, but do have a problem with height and location of the complex.

- Although the overall FSR is small due to the use of the whole of the site area for this calculation, we believe the buildings themselves are too congested into the only area that can be built upon. We are not suggesting that the footprint be expanded into other areas but that it should be reduced.
- The apartments and hospital do not comply with setback requirements from River Road. The lower level of the apartments are shown at 5.0 m, the terrace to the hospital podium is at the most 2.0 m and the podium above about 7.0 m.
- The apartments do not comply with the DCP. They are over 40 m wide and even though there is a setback in the middle it does not break up the skyline and so the building will still be seen as some 60 m long.
- The visual impact will impinge on not only local residents in Greenwich and Northwood but would be seen by anyone travelling along River Road. The buildings would be much higher than any trees (not that these could be planted in the setbacks provided) as the present building are. This impact is a major concern for a large number of residents and the travelling public.
- The documents are contradictory in stating that the views from the apartments will include water and harbour views but that the buildings will not be seen from the harbour. They will definitely be seen from the harbour to the detriment of anyone using that waterway.
- As a comparison – the apartments are 20 m higher than “Riverglen” at the entry road and 10 m higher than the existing hospital. They are 27 m high at the western entry. The hospital tower is 27 m higher than the existing hospital and 23 m higher than “Bluegum”, now on the highest point of the site.

- There will be significant loss of mature trees with the increased footprint of the buildings and hard paved areas. There is little or no opportunity for deep soil planting in these areas so there is no chance for vegetation screening the buildings.
- There will also be significant loss of trees in the heritage area with the construction of the villas, which are shown as having a large footprint in this sensitive area.
- Parking, both above ground and below ground, is too close to Pallister House and both must be removed so that there is no damage to that heritage building.
- There could be major impact on services for the site, water, power, sewerage, gas and communications for such an influx of extra accommodation.
- Excavation for underground parking will have detrimental effect on sub-soil water movement now sustaining trees and vegetation in the heritage area and the southern slope down to Gore Creek reserve, as well as to local residences to the west of the site.

In conclusion the LCB&CS believe that the 'oppose' points outlined under "The Principle" and the concerns outlined under "The Development" warrant a rejection of the present proposals. Any new development must be re-designed in light of the criticism and problems identified and brought back to the public for better consultation before being placed on exhibition again for comment by all stakeholders, Council and the community who are concerned for the environment and the local amenity of the area, including this Society.

Doug Stuart for the Committee,  
Lane Cove Bushland and Conservation Society Inc