

From: [nag.info](#)
To: [IPCN Submissions Mailbox](#)
Cc: [Tahlia Sexton](#)
Subject: Greenwich Hospital
Date: Thursday, 1 February 2024 2:08:08 PM

Independent Planning Commission
Attention: Tahlia Sexton

Following on from Margaret Curley's enquiry as to whether the IPC had received the Northwood Action Groups objection to the modification of the DA for Greenwich Hospital please find attached a copy of our objection that was lodged via the 'electronic form' on 30 January 2024.

Please let us know if this is sufficient as an objection or you need further information.

Regards
Stephen Curley
Secretary, Northwood Action Group Inc

Submission to the IPC regarding Greenwich Hospital Modification

The following submission was made via the IPC 'electronic form' on 30 January 2024

The Northwood Action Group objects to this modified development because of the following issues:

1. Although the IPC approved the original development the modification to the senior living units to incorporate 3 bedroom units pushes this development into more of a normal high rise housing development and further away from an integrated campus with the senior living units connected to hospital services. We ask that the IPC reassess its findings that the "proposed senior living is sufficiently related to hospital use". The DPE in its Assessment Report has not addressed the modifications to the senior living as needing to be assessed for the purposes of whether this changes the relatedness of the seniors living to the hospital. We suggest that the seniors living component should be assessed separated as a stand alone development application, noting that this land is zoned for hospital use. The funding of the hospital development is not a reason to connect the two developments.
2. The applicant has argued that this redevelopment is modelled on an 'age in place' concept and this seems critical to the assessment of this as an integrated development. There is almost no information given as to how the senior living units are 'age in place' and no guarantees or undertakings that will require the applicant to support this 'age in place' concept over the life of the senior living residents and subsequent residents. The provision of 'age in place' services including detailed services ongoing availability and cost (affordability) over the long term should be clearly set out in the conditions of consent. The only detail given by the applicant to date is that the corridors will be wider than traditional senior living units to accommodate 'hospital type' beds. An important consideration for 'age in place' would be on the spot nursing support and the inclusion of a nursing station in each of the two towers with appropriate communication ability between units and the nursing station. Before the IPC considers approving this development it should include consent conditions which requires the applicant to guarantee

that: i) the provision of a nursing station for each tower ii) incorporates the cost of 'age in place' in each senior living license iii) meals and cleaning services will continue to be available to residents.

3. We previously raised the care and management of the steeply sloping bushland on the southwest side of the development. We note that the DPE Assessment Report does not consider this issue. At the site inspection on Thursday 25 January it was mentioned that this bushland wasn't considered to be required to be assessed as part of this development because this bushland was already being remediated by Council and 'Bush Care'. Although this is a positive step it doesn't take away the responsibility of the applicant's duty of care to look after the bushland that will be impacted from this site's development and will significantly impact the sensitive Gore Creek bushland corridor. In particular the stormwater run-off both during construction and subsequent to development. Subsequent to development the bushland flow and sediment impacts should not exceed the current flow (before development). The IPC should get advice as to what would be appropriate requirements and include these as consent requirements for the protection of the bushland adjoining this site.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows