



AUSCRIPT AUSTRALASIA PTY LIMITED

ACN 110 028 825

T: 1800 AUSCRIPT (1800 287 274)

E: clientservices@auscript.com.au

W: www.auscript.com.au

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

TRANSCRIPT IN CONFIDENCE

O/N H-1289506

INDEPENDENT PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING WITH DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT

RE: REDEVELOPMENT OF GREENWICH HOSPITAL

PANEL: **PETER DUNCAN AM (Chair)**
ADRIAN PILTON

ASSISTING PANEL: **STEPHEN BARRY**
LINDSEY BLECHER

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING, INDUSTRY AND ENVIRONMENT: **KAREN HARRAGON**
MEGAN FU
CALEB BALL

LOCATION: **VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE**

DATE: **1.01 PM, THURSDAY, 1 OCTOBER 2020**

MR P. DUNCAN: Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we meet and I would also like to play my respects to elders past, present and emerging. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the concept application for Greenwich Hospital redevelopment which includes new
5 health care and allied health facilities, residential aged care and seniors housing. My name is Peter Duncan and joining me as my fellow commissioner, Adrian Pilton. We're the commissioners that have been appointed to review this application.

10 Joining us also from the office of the commission are Stephen Barry and Lindsey Blecher. Stephen might be a little late joining in, but he's going to be online later on. In the interests of openness and transparency and to ensure the full capture of information, today's meeting is being recorded and a complete transcript will be produced and made available on the commission's website. Karen, at this point,
15 would you like to introduce your team.

MS K. HARRAGON: Thank you. I'm Karen Harragon. I'm the director of the social infrastructure team with the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment, and I'm joined today by Megan Fu, one of our principal planners, and with Caleb Ball, who's also part of our team.
20

MR DUNCAN: Thank you. This meeting is one part of the commission's decision-making process. It is taking part in the preliminary stage of the process and will form one of several sources of information upon which the commission will base its decision. We did carry out a site inspection about a week ago with the applicant.
25 We have met with council this morning or earlier on today and we will be meeting with the applicant next week in a public meeting in the middle of October.

It's important for the commissioners to take questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever we consider it appropriate. If you're asked a question and not in a
30 position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put on the website as we do the transcript. To ensure the accuracy of the transcript, I would also request that all members today introduce themselves before speaking, if you can, each time you speak and that just ensures we get a better result with the transcript. So thanks very
35 much and Karen will now begin and over to you.

MS HARRAGON: Thank you. Karen Harragon. Megan is going to be managing the slides today and I'm going to be doing the first part of the presentation and then – and then Megan will be presenting the middle part and then I will be completing our
40 presentation. So I'm here today to outline the department's approach in assessing the application and in reaching its recommendation that is provided to IPC. I will provide a high-level overview of the proposal, the site and the context of the site within the Greenwich locality. We endeavour to do so in all so recognition of the specific questions that have been raised with us by the IPC.
45

The department's assessment report covers a large number of key issues that speak to a range of matters that were raised during the assessment of the project. The department considers these were issues that would satisfactorily resolve during assessment, addressed by the applicant or would be satisfactorily managed and mitigated by recommending conditions that have been provided to the IPC. It is important to note that this application is a concept proposal and the level of detail of the assessment reflects this in relation to relevant matters for consideration requiring a number of issues to be further interrogated with the subsequent development application with a detailed design, construction and operation of the development.

The key issues that we are going to focus on today are those items that the department considers are the key ones requiring resolution at this stage to establish the envelopes and the scale of the development and these include site suitability, built form, residential amenity, heritage, parking and traffic and, as I mentioned before, will also have information at the end of our presentation relating to the declaration of the SSD and also in relation to the seniors living SEPP.

To assist today, we have prepared two packages of diagrams. We have provided a copy of those to you today should there be any issues with the quality of the presentations, but, otherwise, we are going to take you through the slides. We have numbered these so that we can take you to these, if required. We also have key conditions in that package that warrant discussion at the relevant time. We will also respond to specific as I mentioned before in the IPC's correspondence.

I would like to take you part A and I would like you just – go to page 2. So here you have an aerial photograph of the site, the current aerial photograph of the site. The proposal before you today is a staged significant development application for the concept proposals for the redevelopment of Greenwich Hospital which is located on River Road in Greenwich.

The Greenwich Hospital site is made up of two parcels of land, with the eastern parcel containing Pallister, a state-significant development that Megan is indicating here with her cursor, and this lot forms a curtilage of Pallister, the listed heritage item. The bulk of the hospital is located on the remaining lot. As you can see here depicted by the River Building, the main hospital wing and the Blue Gum Building. If you would like to move to page 3.

Greenwich Hospital commenced operation on the site in 1966. It currently provides rehabilitation, palliative and support care, mental health for people – older people, pain management and other vital support services. In 2008, HammondCare became the operators of the hospital. Healthcare has continued to be provided by the current operator in the various buildings which are spread out across the site and which vary in height between one to five storeys, as can be seen by the three images depicted here.

The hospital currently has 78 beds and 75 staff operate on the site. The site has approximately 150 car parking spaces and they are scattered through the site in a

number of parking areas. The building on the site are no longer fit for the delivery of modern healthcare practices. The concept proposal seeks to redevelop the site to provide larger, contemporary and improved health facilities, including housing for seniors living in a integrated development campus.

5

If you could turn page 4. The concept proposal seeks to demolish the majority of the buildings on the site, except for the heritage listed Pallister. Pallister is listed as both a state and local heritage item. Pallister was originally a private residence followed by a range of welfare and community activities, including its use as a girls home in the 1936 when it was run by Ms Anna Pallister, from which its name is taken. It is a rare example of a late-Victorian gentleman's residence and has remnant garden setting with Greenwich. It sits on the higher part of the site and a late-Victorian house, a teardrop-shaped carriage loop, mature fig tree and the bridle path from the corner of River Road and St Vincents Road also form key contributory elements to the heritage item.

As shown previously on page 2, the site is surrounded by low-density residential properties, except bushland and Bob Campbell Oval, which you can see in the bottom left-hand corner of the diagram, and the Greenwich Public School to the north, which is just sitting outside of the top of the image. The site contains remnant bushland in the south-west which forms part of the corridor within the adjoining bushland.

If you can turn to page 5 of part A, I'm now going to talk about the proposal in a bit more detail. The current proposal, as defined by the RTS, seeks approval for a concept proposal for a new healthcare and allied health facilities and residential aged care and seniors housing and integrated care campus. This includes four new building envelopes, three basement car parks and new site access arrangements. In addition, the proposal includes heritage conservation works to Pallister, as well as concept landscaping details. We have a full set of architectural plans available today. So, if at any time you would like us to take me to a more detailed set, we will be able bring those to the screen.

No works – it's worth noting that no works are proposed as part of this application. It is a concept only. The proposal would result in – if facilitated by this concept, would result in a proposal where an increase of 72 beds from 78 to 150 and an increase in staff from 75 positions to approximately 174 staff. The seniors living component would indicatively provide 89 two-bedroom units. Car parking is proposed to be increased on site from 150 spaces to two hundred – 329 car parking spaces.

I'm just going to talk to you a little bit now about the nature of the submissions received by the department. A total of 177 public submissions were received and this includes 161 objections. 10 submissions were also received from special interest groups and these included eight objections. The council has also objected to the proposal and it's on the basis of both these public submissions and the council's objections that the matter has been brought to the IPC.

The main concerns raised in public submissions and also in council's submission include site suitability for the seniors living component development, bulk and scale, particularly the building heights, overdevelopment of the site, restricting future ability of the hospital services to be able to expand on the site, impact on the character of the locality at the streetscape, general concerns about the impact on heritage, tree loss and biodiversity impacts and the increase in traffic and associated impacts, particularly in relation to the safety of children attending Greenwich Public School. There was also concerns raised regarding parking impacts amenity impacts including view loss, overshadowing and privacy. There was also general concerns raised about adjoining bushland.

So we're now going to take you to page 6 so that we can talk to you in more detail about some of these elements. The applicant submitted an amended proposal and response to submission which included the removal of the seniors living villas from within the heritage curtilage of Pallister and replaced it with a new respite care facility, resulting in increased health facilities and a reduction in the number of concept building envelopes within the site and I will just get Megan to bring her cursor over that area that we're talking about now. So those hatched areas were previously for seniors living villas and they've now been removed. So the final development that we're now considering is that which is presented on this screen.

The amended proposal also provided a more sympathetic response to the surrounding properties and the heritage on the site with greater setbacks and transitions in height of buildings – building envelopes at the development interfaces. It also increased the tree retention and landscaping as part of the proposal. Reconfiguration of the developmental layout to increase protection of the heritage curtilage of Pallister House was also achieved and the revised staging to deliver the redeveloped hospital in the first stage to facilitate decanting of the functions from the – within the existing buildings.

The amended proposal and RTS was placed on exhibition with a total of 119 public submissions being received. This included another 109 objections. Eight submissions were also received from special interest groups and this included six objections. Council also maintained its objection to the proposal. The main concerns raised in the public submissions remained the same as those generally raised in the original exhibition. Council maintained its objection based on the site being inappropriate for the seniors living and the heritage impacts from the respite centre within the heritage curtilage.

I'm now going to hand over to Megan who will talk about the next part of our presentation.

MS M. FU: I'm going – hi. I'm Megan. I'm going to talk about site suitability and have moved on to package B. The site is zoned special – SP2 Special Health Services Facilities under council's LEP. Development of a hospital component is consistent with the objectives of the zone. The delivery of expanded hospital

facilities is also consistent with strategic policies to increase hospital beds and support the aging population. Therefore, the site is suitable for the hospital.

5 Concerns regarding the scale of the hospital building will be discussed when I
discuss built form. The key issue raised regarding site suitability by council and the
public submissions was the use of the site for seniors living and potentially
restricting future development and health service facilities. The seniors housing
component forms part of the applicant's proposal to deliver an innovated and
integrated model of health care. It aims to reduce occupational hospital beds by
10 providing more access to care at home. The seniors housing component is not
permitted in the zone, but the seniors housing allows the seniors housing on land
zone primarily for urban purposes. This includes SP2 zones where hospitals are
permitted. The zoning map is shown on page 2 in the package.

15 In relation to the site suitability for the seniors housing, the department has
considered the requirements of the seniors housing step which aims to encourage the
provision of additional and diverse housing for seniors. Seniors housing is not
required to be consistent with the underlying objectives of the zone. The seniors
housing step, however, does require development meet certain site and zone
20 requirements. The key concern raised by council and community submissions was
that the seniors housing was not compatible with the low-density residential
character of the area.

The department is satisfied that the site-related requirements have been met, except
25 the site requirements of clause 29 which relate to the impact of bulk, scale, built
form of the proposed development is likely to have on existing approved and
future uses of the land in the vicinity. The design principles encourage built form
that responds to the characteristics of its site and its neighbourhood.

30 If you now turn to page 3 in the package. In considering whether it is compatible,
the department has considered with it fits. To do this, we noted the objective of the
surrounding R2 zone was to maintain the low-density character in each
development is not highly visible from Lane Cove River. The objective of E2 zone
is to protect environmental sensitive land. It was also noted that the surrounding land
35 within 400 metres is the local neighbourhood context is generally restricted to a 9.5
metre height control, except a few pockets of 12 metres. These – council also
recently amended its LEP so that the multi-dwelling housing is prohibited in the
surrounding R2 zone, reinforcing the desired low-density residential character.

40 Also of relevance is that the site has no height or floor space controls. The site is
significantly larger than that of the surrounding land which allows for amenity
impacts to be mitigated through provision of adequate separations and setbacks.
Existing buildings on the site are also significantly higher than the surrounding
height control. Notwithstanding, the department considers that the proposed seven
45 storeys for the seniors housing does not fit in the local neighbourhood scale. The
local neighbourhood ranges from one to three storeys with occasional high built form
normally located on a main road. The impact from seven storey development is not

what would be reasonably expected for development within the surrounding R2 zone.

5 If you could please turn to page 4 in the package. The department, therefore,
recommends that the building envelopes be modified to ensure that it fits with the
local neighbourhood scale. The department considers that the height of the northern
building envelope should be reduced to no higher than the existing main hospital
10 adjacent Pallister. The reduced heights would be more consistent with existing built
form on the site, with similar amenity impacts and provides a greater gradual
transition in height to the hospital building.

15 The modified envelopes would provide a better fit with the neighbourhood. It would
be comparable to the form of the opposing school site and other taller forms located
on key roads. It would also reflect the secondary nature of the – this part of the
development. Subject to the reduction in the size of the envelopes, the department
considers that the site is suitable for development of seniors housing under the
seniors housing step.

20 I'm now going to talk about built form and I'm moving to page 5 in the slide package.
The concept proposal includes a provision of four building envelopes, including a
10-storey hospital building, including the basement and plan, a three-storey respite
facility building and two seven-storey seniors housing developments. As previously
25 mentioned, the site is not subject to height or floor space controls. Objections were
raised in public submissions about the height, scale, heritage and amenity impact of
the building envelopes. Heritage and amenity impacts will be assessed by me and
Karen later, after my built form discussion.

30 In response to the initial concerns raised, the applicant deleted the seniors living
envelopes within the heritage curtilage and replaced it with a respite centre, as
previously shown on page 6, in part A. The design of the envelope at the interface
with Pallister and with residences to the west were also stepped to improve the built
form relationship and mitigate the impacts. This is shown on part 6 – on page 6 –
35 page 6, in part B. Shown here.

The department carefully considered the concerns raised in public submissions and
the information provided by the applicant and concluded that the height and scale of
the hospital building envelopes are acceptable as there is no height control for
hospital development on the site and the bulk of the building has been located to
40 minimise amenity impacts, including overshadowing of adjoining residences and
bushland. The scale is consistent with the size of modern hospital buildings in urban
settings and supports operational efficiencies.

45 Vertical expansion also supports the retention of Pallister within a landscape setting.
The building envelope provides appropriate transitions in height from River Road
with a three to four-storey podium and a setback – a 30-metre setback of the 10-
storey tower. The respite building is also an appropriate scale for its location. The

design principles have also been prepared by the applicant to guide detailed design of the building, particularly ensuring that there's an adequate relationship for Pallister and reinstating its garden landscaping and minimising impacts on streetscape.

5 In relation to the building envelopes for the seniors living, the seniors housing sets out design principles. Of relevance is clause 33 and they include amenity and streetscape as shown on page 33, page 7, in part B. The remaining principles relating to visual and acoustic privacy, solar access and design for climate, stormwater, crime prevention, accessibility and waste management would need to be addressed in the
10 detailed design, but conceptually is able to comply.

Whilst developments standards that cannot be used as grounds for are identified in the seniors housing step, they are not material to this discussion as we are not recommending refusal. As noted earlier, the existing and desired character of the
15 area and desirable elements include a low-scale residential character and the bushland setting.

If we turn to page 8, in part B, the department carefully considered the concerns raised in public submissions and the information provided by the applicant. We
20 concluded that the subject – subject to conditions requiring the reduction in the height and an increased setback to align with the front setback of the adjoining dwelling, the height and scale of the seniors living would also be acceptable as they have been located outside of the remnant vegetation on the site and largely contained to previously disturbed areas.

25 The height, as amended by the conditions, would ensure that the building sits within the bushland setting instead of protruding significantly above it. Views to Pallister from River Road would be achieved and the positioning on the envelopes ensure that the landscape setting for Pallister is also retained. Smaller building envelopes for the
30 seniors living buildings would also be appropriate to reflect the secondary nature of their use.

The department has also recommended a condition capping the GFA for the seniors living building envelopes to 10,990 square metres to reflect the reduced size of the
35 seniors living envelopes. This would ensure that the design of the future buildings still provides articulation modulation within that envelope instead of filling up the envelope and reducing design features that are required to respond to the surrounding context.

40 I'm now going to talk about amenity impacts. I'm going to move through slides fairly quickly, as most of these diagrams are from the assessment report that we can go back to in the discussion later. Given the bulk and scale of the development, the proposal would result in public and private view impacts, overshadowing, privacy impacts and noise impacts. These were all raised as issues in the community
45 submissions. If you please turn to page 9, in part B, in relation to view impacts from public open spaces and the public would have a moderate impact to these areas.

The most significant views that the LEP aims to protect are those from Lane Cove River.

5 The applicant's view impact assessment demonstrates that the impact on Bob Campbell Oval is moderate as it is screened by landscape setting. This is representative of the view from the river as it adjoins the river. Furthermore, the department has recommended reductions in the size of the seniors living envelopes to a similar scale as the current development and, therefore, they would have minor impacts from that direction.

10 If you turn to page 10, in part B, in relation to impacts along River Road, the increased setback and height reduction of the northern envelope – northern seniors living envelope would also minimise the visual prominence of the seniors living and ensure the hospital appears as the primary use of the site. In relation to the hospital envelope, the department considers visual impact is reasonable as the scale of the development is consistent with what would be expected of – for development of the SP2 zone. The main hospital building has also been stepped at River Road with a podium and a setback of 30 metres for the tower.

20 If you could turn to page 11. In relation to view impacts on residential properties, residents to the north would experience intrusion in – to its outlook of the new hospital tower and properties to the south would be impacted by both components of the development. The department has considered the views currently enjoyed by neighbouring properties and the applicant's analysis in relation to these view loss impacts. As previously noted, the department considers the views from – view impacts from the hospital acceptable and, whilst the tower form is taller than development in the area, it would minimise the footprint at the lower levels. The view impacts to properties to the south would also be largely mitigated by the retained landscaping around Pallister, as shown in the bottom photos on page 11.

30 If we go to page 12, in part B, the most visually noticeable impacts would be residents to the west. If we go to page 12, in part B, the department considered the reorientation of the southern building envelope to reduce these view impacts. Reorientating the southern envelope would reduce the breadth of the development footprint when – from this viewpoint, but, given the distance and existing intrusions into this view from the existing hospital buildings, the department concluded that the benefits are marginal compared to the loss of amenity for the development. A bushland outlook around the development site would still be maintained.

40 If we go to page 14, concern was raised in public submissions about the potential overshadowing of adjoining bushland and private – on adjoining bushland and private properties. The department considers that the overshadowing impacts are acceptable as the development results in overshadowing a private properties before 10 am to the west and south-west and after 2 pm to the east and south-east in mid-winter. These properties would still maintain three hours of solar access to private living and open space areas during mid-winter. The impacts on the bushland would

also be comparable with impacts on the existing buildings on the site and existing shadows resulting from the steep terrain in this location.

5 If we turn to page 15, in part B, concern was raised in public submissions about the potential overlooking of adjoining properties by the seniors living and hospital development components. The department considers that adequate setbacks have been incorporated into the design to ensure the overlooking is minimised. This includes a 20-metre setback to the west and a 34-metre setback to the south. This exceeds the 12 metres required by the apartment design guide. Further mitigation of privacy impacts associated with the development can be addressed in the future DA. 10 The department has recommended a condition in this regard. In particular, privacy measures such as facing non-habitable areas to adjacent residential areas, the use of devices like fixed louvers, high windowsills and planter boxes for balconies.

15 If you turn to page 16, concern was raised in public submissions about the potential acoustic impacts by the development. The department considers that acoustic impacts would be a matter to be addressed in the next DA, but notes that the car parking facing the west under the seniors living, shown here, could be – could have adverse impacts. The department has demonstrated a – has recommended a 20 condition requiring the relocation of the car park, unless it can be demonstrated that noise impacts from the operation of the car park entry meets relevant criteria.

I'm now going to hand over to Karen to talk about heritage. Karen, you're muted.

25 MS HARRAGON: Thank you, Megan. I'm now going to continue to talk in the part B that Megan will be presenting on and I'm going to be talking about heritage. If you could turn to page 17, in part B. I will just move my screen over.

30 As we mentioned before, Pallister is a state and locally significant heritage item. No works were proposed to the Pallister, except for conservation works which will facilitate its ongoing use. As discussed earlier, it is a rare example of a late-Victorian gentleman's residence and remnant garden setting. The house, the teardrop-shaped carriage loop, the mature fig tree and the bridle path from the corner of River Road and St Vincents Road are all significant elements of the listing.

35 As shown in page 6, in the part A package, the original proposal included seniors housing villas within the heritage curtilage and also proposed removal of a number of significant trees across the site. In response to concerns raised by Heritage New South Wales, council and the public submissions, as well as the department, these 40 villas were removed as part of the response to submissions and this included a reduction in the amount of trees that were now required to be taken. The villas were replaced by a three-storey single building, the respite centre, which is situated further away from the St Vincents Road access and screened by the landscape setting. This increases the distance from the curtilage and the significant elements of the listing.

45 If you would now like to turn to page 18. The hospital building envelope was modified in the revised design as well and this provides a more sympathetic interface

with Pallister, including improving view lines from River Road. So, if you can see here in the top diagram, the EIS depicted built form in that location and you can now see that the view of Pallister House is now the primary view line from River Road.

- 5 If you would like to turn to page 18 – actually, I think we’re on page 19. Is that correct, Megan?

MS FU: Yes.

- 10 MS HARRAGON: The southern seniors living envelope has also been stepped at the interface with Pallister to improve the relationship. The size of the basement was also reduced so that it no longer falls within the heritage curtilage. You can see here now where the existing ground level line is and you can see where the previous senior living’s footprint was depicted in that diagram. The council and community
15 members maintained concerns regarding the impacts on Pallister, given the bulk and scale and the perceived dominance of the development. Heritage New South Wales, however, were generally satisfied with the revised building envelopes and also the greater tree retention and the additional planting and the revised design provided in the RTS. The landscape setting and the connection between Pallister and St Vincents
20 Road would also be maintained under the revised proposal. Heritage New South Wales did, however, request that the design be refined to increase setbacks to Pallister where possible.

- If we can turn to page 20. The department’s recommended conditions requiring the
25 reduction in the height of the seniors living would also result in improved heritage outcomes as it would sit lower in the backdrop of Pallister. The yellow outline shows the height reduction. So that removal of one storey of the building as per our recommended conditions would provide the visibility of the Pallister being a more dominant element when viewed from St Vincents.

- 30 The department notes that reorientating the southern seniors living buildings by pushing it in the direction of the red arrow could also increase the separation with Pallister and remove it from the backdrop from more viewpoints. A condition requiring further consideration of the reorientation in future DAs has also been
35 recommended.

- The department considers the proposed development as modified by the recommended conditions would result in satisfactory heritage impacts. The proposal would provide facilities to support ongoing health and compatible uses –
40 views to Pallister would be reintroduced, larger envelopes separated from the heritage curtilage and the respite centre located within the heritage setting is lower and screened from Pallister. Furthermore, the redevelopment would ensure the ongoing conservation and use of Pallister for social benefit for the community. To manage the heritage impact, the department has also recommended conditions
45 requiring future application include a schedule of conservation works, an interpretation plan and an archaeological program.

I'm now going to take you through parking and traffic. If you would like to turn to page 21, traffic. One the key issues raised in the public submissions was in relation to additional traffic and subsequent impacts on pedestrian safety, particularly those children attending Greenwich Public School who are making pedestrian movements around this site to get access to the school. The currency of the traffic assessment was also raised as an issue, given community development that has impacted traffic movements in the area.

The applicant's traffic and parking impact assessment concluded that the additional traffic resulting from the proposal would not adversely impact the road network and that upgrades would not be required as the level of service at the impact at intersections would remain the same. The department notes that council and Transport for New South Wales did not raise any concerns regarding the additional traffic related to the development. However, the department's own observations notes that the traffic assessment uses survey data from 2017. The traffic distribution assumption does not reflect travel behaviour and the traffic assessment is based on building envelopes and not actually units from a SSD application.

Although these deficiencies do not raise significant concern in relation to consideration of a concept application, the future detailed DA, when approval is sought to carry out such work, will need to include a further detailed traffic impact assessment. Also, as a detailed design of the access arrangements are being addressed in the future DA and given the increased traffic, the department has also included a condition requiring road safety analysis be undertaken as part of the future DA to ensure that pedestrian safety is optimised by the development within the site and at its interfaces, particularly for students and for seniors.

I'm now going to move to car parking. The concept proposal includes 329 car parking spaces. This is an increase of 179 onsite parking spaces from that which is currently provided onsite of 150. These park – car parking spaces are to be primarily located within basement car parks. Concerns were raised in the public submissions about the adequacy of provision of additional car parking spaces on the site and the subsequent on-street parking impacts. The department is satisfied that the additional car parking would meet demand generated by the new development as conceptualised in this application. However, this would also be the subject of a future DA as the capacity of the current envelopes is conceptual and, as such, is indicative in relation to the number of units and the number of parking spaces.

More broadly about transport, when the – while the proposal meets the requirements of clause 26 in the seniors SEPP regarding location and access to facilities, the department notes that traffic and parking impact assessment acknowledges the limited public transport options available to the site. The department recommends that the applicant provide a free frequent daily shuttle service for the residents of the site to local retail centres and public transport nodes. This would also support more sustainable transport to and from the site and reduce associated traffic.

So I would now like to – just checking in on the time, I would like to talk to you about two of the matters also raised by the commission in relation to SRD matters and the senior SEPP and then we will conclude our presentation. So I'm now going to get access and present a new slide. Just checking that you can see that there.

5

MR DUNCAN: Yes, yes.

MS HARRAGON: Okay. So I'm going to talk to you a little bit about how is a project considered to be SSD. We understand there was some concerns around the relationship of the seniors housing development in relation to that. So I'm going to quickly take you through a couple of slides. They're very, I guess, directed at about legislation. So, hopefully, we might be able to follow our approach to that discussion.

10
15 So section 4.36 of the EP&A Act says that a:

A state environment or planning policy may declare any development or any class or description of development to be state significant development.

20 So, in respect of this proposal, clause 7 of the SRD SEPP is a relevant provision. So I'm going to go into more detail in each of the elements of the SRD SEPP, but that's – so, sorry – in relation to clause 8 and, primarily, it's composed of two parts, sections 1 and sections 2. So I'm now about to take you through each of those separately.

25

So – just one second. If a development satisfied the – satisfies the terms of clause 8.1 of the SRD SEPP, then it is declared to be SSD. Under the SRD SEPP, development is declared to be significant if the development of the land concerned is, by the operation of an environmental planning instrument, not permissible without consent under part 4 and (b) the development is specified in schedule 1 or 2.

30

So the uses in relation to our proposal are both permitted uses of the site. The hospital is a permitted use within the LEP and the seniors component is a permitted use under the seniors living SEPP. So, therefore, clause 8, part 1, part A, of the SRD SEPP is satisfied. So, in relation to schedules 1 and 2, the relevant schedule here is in relation to clause 14 of schedule 1 and, in that respect, the development that has a capital investment value of more than 30 million purpose such as in hospital is considered to be – is considered to be SSD. So we are satisfied that this development, where the hospital components are over 30 million, the hospital components are considered to be satisfying the provisions for being SSD.

35
40

So I'm now going to take you to section 2 of clause 8 and section – so I will just quickly go here so you can see it in a bit better detail. So subsection or subclause 2:

45

If a single proposed development the subject of one development application comprises development that is only partly SSD declared under subclause 1, the

remainder of the development is also declared to be state significant development.

5 So I'm now going to talk to you about that in a little bit more detail. Because the health uses within the proposed development are SSD, this clause references the remainder of this development is also SSD. There is one relevant exception to this and this is contained in clause 8, subsection (2), subsection (a). That clause has the effect that the remaining components of the development are not declared SSD, only if the secretary makes a determination that they are not sufficiently related. The
10 default position in relation to clause 8(2) of the SRD SEPP is that the secretary is to start from position that the non-SSD component of the SSD are to be declared SSD and only to carve out those components where the secretary determines that those non-SSD components are not sufficiently related to the development as a whole.

15 So I'm now going to put that in the context of this development. In this instance, the department is satisfied that the seniors living component can be considered as part of the SSD application as part 2 of clause 8 of the SRD SEPP clarifies, if the development application comprises development that is only partly SSD and in this instance being the hospital component, the remainder of the development is also
20 declared to be SSD, except for any part of the development that the secretary determines is not sufficiently related. The department has considered whether there are physical and functional relationships between the two uses and whether the seniors living component is separately and practically assessed as a separate application.

25 The seniors living and the hospital components are physically integrated as they share a common basement structure and common facilities located throughout the site. The functional relationship exists as the applicant has advised that care would be provided in the home and the seniors housing will be serviced by – will be
30 servicing seniors housing. Furthermore, the applicant – furthermore, given the heritage constraints of the site and its significance and the physical connections proposed, the department does not consider that the two uses can be practically assessed separately.

35 The applicant has argued that the seniors living is not seniors housing in a traditional sense and does not fall categorically into the defined housing – seniors housing types and falls between housing and health care. The department agrees that in this instance that the seniors housing component is complementary to the hospital development. Accordingly, the development considers the seniors housing
40 sufficiently related and has assessed the application as one SSD application. So I will just stop sharing there.

I will now return to the remainder of our presentation.

45 MR DUNCAN: Thanks, Karen.

MS HARRAGON: Excuse me for one moment. I've just lost my notes. Overall, the department concludes that the impacts of the concept development are acceptable, subject to the department's recommended modifications to the building envelopes. Additionally, environmental impacts can be appropriately managed or
5 mitigated through the implementation of the recommended conditions which we have taken you through during this presentation.

In summary, the department considers the proposal is in the public interest as it would provide for contemporary, modern health infrastructure facility in an area of
10 care and a regional area that is facing an increasing demand for the aging population. The proposals could increase diversity in seniors housing with integrated care to its location with a specialised health care services. The redeveloped campus would support 174 operational jobs when completed. The department has concluded that the proposed concept built form and scale of the seniors living as part of this
15 development should be modified, however, to be a benefit in the surrounding local context and to address future site constraints and should be subject to design requirements in the future DA.

Subject to the modifications to the concept seniors living development, the site is
20 considered suitable for the integrated uses and the redevelopment of the site. The concept proposal would have acceptable impacts in terms of view loss, overshadowing, overlooking and noise impacts, subject to design refinements to be undertaken as part of the future DA. Heritage impacts have been mitigated and can be further mitigated in the detailed design with sympathetic finishes and refinement
25 of the design in the future DA. The concept development would have acceptable traffic impacts and has capacity on site to provide sufficient car parking to address the demand, but will be subject to further detailed assessment in the future DA.

The department has recommended conditions to ensure that relevant matters are
30 considered in the future DA when an application is made to carry out work. So the only other matter that we would perhaps like to touch on is in relation to the consideration of the seniors living SEPP. Our assessment report does contain an appendices that goes through the requirements of the seniors living SEPP to the extent to which it is possible for a concept assessment. Otherwise, there have been
35 appropriate requirements imposed on the recommended conditions of consent that will require a full consideration of that SEPP in the next application.

Does the commission have any questions?

40 MR DUNCAN: Thanks, Karen. Thanks for the – to you and Megan for the comprehensive presentation and material. I have one and Adrian may follow with some, too, but we – talking about offsets to River Road earlier and the building alignment there. Would – Megan, we talked a bit about the ones inside the site, but would you like to make a comment on that frontage, particularly the – I guess it's the
45 north-western seniors living building.

MS FU: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: Megan, maybe if you could find a diagram that best speaks to that, either from our existing pack or from the architectural.

5 MR DUNCAN: Yes. I was looking at one – some cross-sections on the plans, actually. So I don't know – I can't see a plan. It's drawing SO4 probably shows it pretty well and the overall site plan does as well.

MS FU: Okay. I will just share my screen again.

10 MR DUNCAN: Yes. Site plan is SO2.

MS FU: So this one? Yes.

15 MR DUNCAN: It's still loading. Still loading, I think, Megan.

MS FU: Sorry.

20 MR DUNCAN: Yes. That's it. That's the building and the frontage. You can see there – just to the left that the – number 117 sort of and this was forward of that – that's on the building alignment, I think that one there.

MS FU: Yes. So basically - - -

25 MR DUNCAN: The setback

MS FU: So the seniors living is set back six and a half metres. The residential property, the dwelling, is about nine. So - - -

30 MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS FU: - - - we have recommended that that seniors living be set back a further three metres, approximately, to match and mirror that and that's largely to minimise the impacts on the streetscape and also specifically addressing the design requirements in the seniors housing SEPP.

35 MR DUNCAN: Okay. You've – so you've recommended the setback and the reduction in RL, too, I think, at that point, haven't you - - -

40 MS FU: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: - - - from- - -

MS FU: Yes, yes.

45 MR DUNCAN: - - - 59.3 to 56; is that correct?

MS FU: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Yes. Okay. Just on this point, Adrian, do you want to raise - - -

MR A. PILTON: No. I was just going to ask how you determined that maximum height. Is that one storey off the top or something or - - -

5

MS FU: It's approximately two storeys - - -

MR PILTON: Two storeys.

10 MS FU: - - - and it's basically two reflect the height of development that's already on the site and it would be equivalent of five storeys and there are instances of other four-storey development across – or within the location or the locality. So we thought a five-storey building in that location, given that there's already a five-storey building on that site, would be a reasonable outcome.

15

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Okay. Well, I don't have any more questions, Karen. Adrian, do you have any further questions?

20

MR PILTON: I've just got a couple of questions. One is that the council, this morning when we met with them, pointed out that their DCP requires a two-to-one replacement ratio for trees that are cut down. I'm just wondering if the department has any comment on that. We've got more or less a one-to-one. I think you may have added a few more.

25

MS HARRAGON: So, whilst DCPs did not get strictly considered in relation to SSD, it's the policy of the department to still consider the provisions of any DCP as an appropriate consideration to take on board. So perhaps we could recommend a condition where there's consideration given in the future DAs for what capacity this site has to increase the number of trees without, I guess, impacting on the significance of some of those existing tree species because, obviously, what you wouldn't want to do is crowd out some of the larger trees that are already on site. So that would be something that the commission would like us to do? Recommend a condition that the applicant look for opportunities to increase that yield?

35

MS FU: Sorry to interrupt. It's Megan here. It's just the site is also subject to bushfire constraints and has to be managed as an inner protection area. So the increase planting of two-to-one would also potentially cause a fire risk and the environment energy service group has recommended a ratio of one-to-one.

40

MR PILTON: Okay.

MR DUNCAN: Well, then, perhaps maybe we can get some – we can think a little bit more about that and have a talk later, Karen, or could you – you've actually given us that view. So that's actually in the documentation, the bushfire issue?

45

MS FU: Yes.

MR DUNCAN: Okay.

5 MS HARRAGON: Megan, do we specifically address the DCP requirements as to why in this instance it would be not an appropriate one?

MS FU: No. The DCP hasn't been discussed.

10 MS HARRAGON: Yes. We will provide the IPC a supplementary email in that respect.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

15 MR DUNCAN: That would be good, Karen, because I think – I understand that it's not a conflict, but understand the issue. So it would be good to get something formally from you on that. Okay. Adrian, anything else?

MR PILTON: One other quick one. The conditions don't indicate any size for new
20 trees that are going to be planted. I'm just wondering if it's appropriate in a concept approval if we were to say that the tree – replacement trees have got to be planted at a particular size. Somewhere in the documents I saw something about 75 litres or a 100 litres, but I don't think it was in the conditions now.

25 MS FU: This is Megan speaking. Generally, we wouldn't do it in a concept because there's no works being undertaken and that's why we tend to do them in the detailed design application, but - - -

MR PILTON: Okay. I - - -

30 MS FU: - - - there's nothing - - -

MR PILTON: I appreciate that. Thank you.

35 MS HARRAGON: And, again, we could reconsider our current landscaping condition in terms of again asking the applicant to have regard to the suitability of planting stock, the size, to – in terms of achieving a quicker outcome. So we will provide an opportunity for a revised condition in that respect.

40 MR PILTON: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. And I think that probably answers – or not – it's not so
45 much a question, an issue raised in the council discussion was the issue of contributions. They didn't see anything in the conditions – draft conditions at this stage, but that's because we're talking about a concept. So I assume that would come later, as well.

MS FU: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: Yes. So the department still has to go through, in addition to these conditions, issuing of for this next application and - - -

5

MR DUNCAN: Yes.

MS HARRAGON: - - - the reference to “contributions requirements” are generally imposed on all our applications where an applicant is provided the opportunity to address what the provisions are in that local area and to seek either compliance or an exemption as to fit to what’s the contribution plan for the particular council because, in some instance, a development such as this might be already exempt under a council’s plans. So that’s a whole section that needs to be detailed in the next DA.

10

MR DUNCAN: I understand. Thanks, Karen. All right. Lindsay, is there anything from your point of view that you would like to raise?

MR BLECHER: No, thanks, Peter. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. All right. Karen, I think that has been comprehensive. I don’t have any further questions. Adrian?

20

MR PILTON: No further questions. Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: All right.

25

MS HARRAGON: Yes. So we will endeavour to take and respond to those additional matters and have those turned around hopefully tomorrow, if not first thing Monday.

30

MR DUNCAN: That’s terrific. Thank you.

MS FU: Thanks.

MR DUNCAN: Thanks for your time.

35

MS HARRAGON: Thank you.

MR DUNCAN: Okay. Bye.

40

MR PILTON: Thank you. Yes.

MS HARRAGON: Bye.

45

RECORDING CONCLUDED

[1.54 pm]