



New South Wales Government
Independent Planning Commission

TRANSCRIPT OF MEETING

RE: GREENWICH HOSPITAL REDEVELOPMENT - DETAILED DESIGN
(SSD-13619238)

GREENWICH HOSPITAL MODIFICATION 1 - AMENDMENTS TO
ENVELOPES AND GFA (SSD-8699-MOD-1)

COUNCIL MEETING

PANEL: MR ADRIAN PILTON (PANEL CHAIR)
MS WENDY LEWIN
PROF ELIZABETH TAYLOR AO

OFFICE OF THE IPC: STEVE BARRY
TAHLIA SEXTON

LANE COVE
COUNCIL: CLR MERRI SOUTHWOOD
CHRIS SHORTT
MARK BRISBY

LOCATION: ZOOM VIDEO CONFERENCE

DATE: 10:30AM – 11:30AM
MONDAY, 22 JANUARY 2024

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

MR PILTON: Good morning, everybody. Then we'll start the meeting. Thank you. Good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge that I'm speaking to you from Gadigal Land, and I acknowledge the traditional owners of all the country from which we virtually meet today and pay my respects to their elders, past and present. Welcome to the meeting today to discuss the Greenwich Hospital redevelopment, detailed design, and Greenwich Hospital modification one currently before the Commission for determination. The Applicant, HammondCare, is seeking consent for the design, construction and operation of the Greenwich Hospital and Integrated Health Care Campus, including an 11-storey replacement building, new seniors service, seniors living buildings and respite care facility, and the use of Pallister House. My name is Adrian Pilton. I am the chair of this commission panel. I'm joined by my fellow commissioners, Wendy Lewin and Professor Elizabeth Taylor. We're also joined by Tahlia Sexton and Steve Barry from the Office of the Independent Planning Commission. 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. This meeting is one part of the Commission's consideration of this matter and will form one of several sources of information upon which the Commission will base its determination. It is important for the commissioners to ask questions of attendees and to clarify issues whenever it is considered appropriate. If you are asked a question and are not in a position to answer, please feel free to take the question on notice and provide any additional information in writing, which we will then put up on our website. I request that all members here today introduce themselves before speaking for the first time, and for all members to ensure that they do not speak over the top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin. So, I'll hand over to you to start your presentation. Thank you.

MR BRISBY: Okay. My name is Mark Brisby. I'm the Director of Planning and Sustainability here at Lane Cove Council. The matter of the Greenwich Hospital applications being managed by Chris Shortt, our Senior Town Planner. And I'll hand over to Chris to go through the Council's issues. Thank you.

MR SHORTT: Good morning, everyone. Chris Shortt here, Senior Planner from Lane Cove Council. I suggest, do we want to just go through the agenda items in order of the agenda that was sent to us?

MR PILTON: Yes, that'll be good. Unless you prefer to do something else.

MR SHORTT: No, that makes sense. So, a lot of the issues I'll talk about today are, I guess, issues that we have raised previously with the concept design and most recently in our submission in October of 2022. So, in this detailed design I do, I guess we can talk about, the additional GFA and impacts on built form. So as per our letter on October 2022, essentially, we feel that what was approved in the original concept design has essentially that's maxed out the, overall density for the site. Notwithstanding that, the seniors living component is a part that we never actually

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

supported. And, given that it was contrary to the SP2 zoning objectives for that site, we believe that it should be special uses for a hospital only and not for the seniors living component. And given that that was essentially overridden in the original determination, I guess this detail design, which, is requesting additional GFA, it
5 doesn't change Council's position on that use and essentially is, I guess, exacerbating a non-compliant use for the site and similarly with the hospital component- Although we don't we don't object to the hospital use given that that's compliant for the site. Accumulatively with the large seniors living building and the redevelopment of the hospital, essentially, we feel like that was, the overall bulk and scale was maximised
10 in the original concept design, and any additional GFA would be an overdevelopment of the site. So that's how we feel in terms of the additional gross floor area for the buildings in the seniors living buildings as well as the hospital building. So, we feel that it's at its capacity in the concept design. Do you want me to move on to the following, the other issues?

15

MR PILTON: Yes please. Just work through the agenda.

MR SHORTT: Okay. No worries. Okay. In terms of developers contributions, we've actually, and I understand I saw the draft conditions, and I'm unsure if you've already
20 made your decision in terms of whether they're applicable to this side or not. However, for these, seniors living we do feel that in terms of- It's a significant increase, to the intensity of use of the site. Regardless of the classification of the social housing provider. If this was supported by the IPC. We want we in terms of having another- Is it 89 seniors living apartments, that's going to put a significant
25 larger strain on infrastructure now and in the future. And we feel that the 7.11 contribution to offset that demand, is required for the site. So, we will, continue to ask for that. And since the previous, correspondence, the rates for the 20, the 2023, 24 have indexed slightly so that that amount will slightly be increased. Following the meeting today, we will provide an updated written submission, detailing what's
30 discussed today at the meeting verbally. But yes, we feel that, not for the hospital- We take that there's not even the upgrade wouldn't require, a 711 contribution, but for the affordable housing, we stand by that requirement. Moving on to the - okay, the in the draft conditions, for construction hours, I think it's D4 in your draft conditions, we would like to or we request that we have an updated standard
35 construction hours condition that is across the LGA wide, which is a little bit different to, the condition, that has been put in place.

We would like that to be replaced with our condition to be consistent with the LGA. The main differences are, essentially we, on Saturdays we, cap the construction
40 hours from 8 a.m. to 12 noon. Your condition has 8 a.m. to 1:00 pm, and it just gives a little bit more respite that one hour earlier on Saturday mornings, to cap construction between 8 and 12. And also, it's a little bit more in depth our condition, also it requires a respite period Monday to Friday between 12 and 1:30. And that just gives, local residents a bit more- Yes, respite is the word to- between certain times-
45 a little bit of certainty if they have to get something done or, you know, if they've got young children, how they can deal with that during the construction period. So yes, we would be requesting that your condition, D4 be upgraded with Council standard

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

E1 hours of construction. Furthermore, I've seen the updated plans and Council does appreciate that you have included, an updated, pedestrian pathway in context of children that are going to be travelling up to the school to provide them a little bit more of a designated path where they're not, you know, skipping across River Road, which can be quite dangerous.

So, I'm not sure if you would still be including our, condition or if that's not required, if it's dealt with on the plans. We also, wish to discuss the condition that we requested for the infrastructure bond, which it doesn't seem to have been included in your draft conditions. And, essentially, we were just wondering how that will be dealt with if during construction, say, Council street trees get damaged or, Council assets, kerb, gutter, etc. gets damaged. Can we guarantee that the Applicant and or the developer will be adequately repairing or restoring or Council's infrastructure. Given that, we won't have a bond if we have to do it ourselves, to repair any damage that occurs. We just want to make sure that, it's watertight and we don't end up in a situation where Council's out of pocket for, any damage that's caused during the construction period. And also, I see that they have quite a comprehensive condition has been put in. I think it's E 32 for outdoor lighting. And we appreciate that. Given from our previous, submission that discusses impacts- not only light spill to neighbours, but also on into the bushland and to the wildlife, to- So, we're happy with that condition that has been included. And, yes, I think that pretty much sums up what I'll be- Council will be putting in writing in relation to, our latest submission on the, the detailed design development.

MR PILTON: If I could just clarify, those aren't our conditions. Those are the suggested conditions that the Department are suggested to us, and we will be examining those in due course.

MR SHORTT: Yes. So, then we'd be requesting going back to the Department to, to modifying and obviously adding our 7.11 and infrastructure bond conditions.

MR PILTON: Yes. Appreciate that. Thank you. So is that the end of the presentation. Might switch to questions if-

MR SHORTT: Yes, that's pretty much it. Like I said I'll be we'll be giving you a written submission as well.

MR PILTON: What date would that be.

MR SHORTT: Very soon. Because I understand that we still have some time to provide that, there's a-

MS SEXTON: Submissions close online on the 2nd of February.

MR SHORTT: Okay. yes, we'll try to provide it well before the second. Thank you.

MR PILTON: Elizabeth. Any questions?

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

PROF. TAYLOR: Not- We've just got a query here about the affordable housing seniors living was- Did you have any comment to make on that?

5 MR SHORTT: Oh sorry, yes, I missed that one, yes. We would still be retaining our request if this application is supported that at least 10% of dwellings in the seniors living be affordable housing. We understand that there is a requirement to have a diverse, demographic. And there will- there is a need for affordable housing in this, senior's component. So, we would maintain that position.

10 PROF. TAYLOR: So, can I also ask, did you see a positive benefit in the redesign, now incorporating the idea that the seniors living could translate to a hospital setting in the future? So, sort of what is being managed in terms of end user expectations and the relationship between seniors ending up in hospital?

15 MR SHORTT: Yes. I mean, I understand the idea that it's sort of, an interconnectivity and they're talking about, that eventually, perhaps people in the seniors living component would then transition into the hospital for sort of end of life for- you know that- but there's still, I guess, our issues. It's they're still seen as living
20 apartments in that's the category we feel they call it. I understand there's the argument put up by the Applicant. It's sort of an integrated process, but we still feel the- I guess the impact in terms of, you know, vehicle movements in terms of, visitors, in terms all those types of things there, there is an impact. And it's and in the end, it's still not permissible in the SP2 zone. So, yes, we maintain our position on
25 that.

PROF. TAYLOR: Okay. Thank you.

30 MR PILTON: Wendy?

MS LEWIN: No, that last question from Elizabeth was a question I was going to raise with you. And it related to this notion of universal use of, and design, of the seniors housing and its association with the hospital future palliative care and so on. But I think that's - you've addressed that. So thank you.

35 MR SHORTT: Thank you.

40 MR PILTON: Well, I don't have any questions either at this stage of the game - sorry Elizabeth go ahead -

PROF. TAYLOR: I was just, I did have one more about - did you have any comments about the level of ecological sustainable development metrics that have been factored into the design? Because that goes to your sort of the contributions that you will require to infrastructure in the Council, I would have assumed.

45 MR SHORTT: No, not really any further comment on that. I mean, yes, the infrastructure contributions are standard, for protecting Councils' assets. And so yes,

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

that they're sort of we apply them to all developments. So yes, as per our plan. So, yes.

5 MR PILTON: Okay. All right, so unless Councils got anything else to say, we might wrap the meeting up at this stage. And thank you for coming along today.

10 MR BRISBY: Just before we finish the chat, some of the queries we've had from the residents- has the commission made a decision on the determination meeting or- And would it be a public meeting?

15 MR PILTON: Well, no, we haven't made any decisions. This is a start of our exercise. If you like, we'll be visiting the site on Thursday, and then we have a process to go through. We will be taking into account residents' submissions that, are available online, I believe. Yes. So, it's a process we have to go through.

20 MR BRISBY: And we've also just a little bit confused in that the Department seemed to have finalised and published their assessment report, yet the submissions that's still open for submissions, until the 2nd of February. What residents are asking what will happen to those submissions as in relation to the assessment report?

25 MR PILTON: We will take all those submissions into account when we're going through and looking at the Department's report and their suggested conditions of consent, and the process will work its way through, and we'll make a final determination in several weeks. Anyway, it's-

MR BRISBY: Thank you that that's, finalises our queries. yes.

MR PILTON: Okay. Thank you very much. And thank you all for attending today.

30 MR BRISBY: Thank you very much, chair. Thank you very much.

MR PILTON: You're welcome.

<THE MEETING CONCLUDED

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER