



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)

DEPARTMENT MEETING

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

OFFICE OF THE IPC: TAHLIA SEXTON

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING,
HOUSING AND
INFRASTRUCTURE: KAREN HARRAGON
MEGAN FU
TOM DALES

LOCATION: IPC - SUITE 15.02 LEVEL 15,
135 KING STREET, SYDNEY NSW 2000

DATE: 9:00AM – 10:00AM
MONDAY, 22 JANUARY 2024

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

<THE MEETING COMMENCED

MR PILTON: Good morning and welcome. Before we begin, I would like to acknowledge the traditional owners of the land on which we made the Gadigal people of the Eora nation, 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 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, Ms Wendy Lewin and Professor Elizabeth Taylor. We're also joined by Tahlia Sexton 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's 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 they do not speak on top of each other to ensure accuracy of the transcript. We will now begin. Over to you Karen

MS HARRAGON: Thank you. Karen Harragon, so good morning. I'm Karen Harragon, Director, Social and Infrastructure Assessments at the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure. I am here with my colleagues, Megan Fu and Tom Dales, to outline the Department's assessment of the applications, which led to our recommendation. Today, we're going to focus on the assessment rather than the details of the actual project. We imagine the Applicant will do well, but we're more than happy to come back if there's any specifics you want to know. So, if we go to slide two. As you may be aware, the operators of the current Greenwich Hospital on the site are seeking approval for a detailed design, construction and operation of an integrated hospital and seniors housing campus. It would provide specialised care services for seniors and people with complex health needs, including rehabilitation, palliative care and specialist dementia care. The project comprises an 11 story replacement hospital building, two new five and six story seniors housing buildings, and a 2 to 3 respite care facility. The project also continues the adaptive reuse of the heritage significant Pallister House for research and administrative functions. The stage design is the subsequent application of the concept proposal approved by the Commission on 10th November 2020. The concept proposal comprises an integrated health and residential aged care campus, including four building envelopes with an integrated basement. Moves to the next slide. This application is state significant development, and as it is a stage of the concept proposal that includes hospital

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

development, with the capital investment value greater than 30 million. So, it remains SSD as stipulated in the concept proposal approval.

5 The SSD application seeks approval for the entire redevelopment, but with a four
stage construction and delivery process. Due to the critical need to facilitate staged
and continued operation on site, a concurrent modification application has been
lodged and has been assessed by the Department in parallel with the detailed stage.
10 The modification seeks to modify the approved concept proposal to support the SSD
detailed application. The modification predominantly seeks to increase the concepts
approved GFA or gross floor area and to modify the footprint of the envelopes,
particularly the lower levels of the hospital building envelope. The most notable
example of this is shown in the drawing depicting the building envelopes on level
15 five in your pack, and also extracted here for some for ease. You'll see here were the
lower levels of the north eastern wing of the building envelope have been rotated
away from River Road. There are no increases sought as part of the Mod for any of
the envelopes. The Commission is the consent authority as Council have objected to
20 the SSD application. Council have also objected to the modification on the same
grounds as its objection to the SSD. While Council supports the proposed hospital
expansion, it objects to the seniors housing, which it is not permitted in the current
Special Use Health Services Facility zone under the Council's LEP. It also objects to
the increased GFA, which intensifies the senior housing use and adds the perceived
25 bulk of the northern wing of the hospital building, particularly when viewed from
River Road. Whilst the seniors housing is not permissible under the zone, it
continues to be permissible under the Seniors Housing SEPP, Housing for Seniors or
People with a Disability, which we will refer to as the Seniors Housing SEPP going
forward.

This SEPP continues to apply to this development, as the SSD application is a
subsequent stage of a concept football concept of development under the Seniors
30 Housing SEPP. The Department also received 9 and 11 submissions from the public
and interest groups on the respective SSD applications and the modification
application. Of these submissions, six were objections to the SSD and nine were
objections to the modification. The key concerns were light spill, noise impacts,
35 traffic, bulk and scale, biodiversity impacts, stormwater impacts, traffic, tree
removal, visual impacts, and the senior housing use. Increased number of beds and
units and inconsistencies with the character of the area and also the increased GFA.
The Department's assessment report covers the key issues which we will discuss
today, and we will touch also on a couple of the other issues which are listed in the
40 agenda. The Department considers these issues were satisfactorily resolved during
assessment and were addressed by the Applicant or would be satisfactorily managed
and mitigated by the recommended conditions of consent that we have put forward.
As acknowledged by the Commission's approval of the concept proposal, the
justification and strategic merit of the development and the public benefit of the
45 proposal has been established and it was supported in its approval of the concept. So
we will not delve into these matters any further unless the Department you wish to
further advice from us. I will now hand over to Megan to talk through the built form,

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

urban design and amenity impacts and some of our key conditions related to these elements of the project.

5 MS FU: Good morning. My name is Megan Fu. I'm Principal Planning Officer in Karen's team. Firstly, I'm going to discuss the modified concept. But as the concept proposal envelopes closely mirror the buildings, the assessment of impacts are similar for the proposed buildings in the SSD application. The concept proposal facilitates a demolition of the majority of the buildings on the site, except for the heritage listed Pallister House. We will discuss heritage later, noting that the heritage impact or the scale of development was supported at the concept stage, subject to design refinement in the detailed design. Concept proposal included four building envelopes. Modified concept proposal continues to consist of four building envelopes, which we can see in the drawing of level four. As Karen said earlier, the envelopes have the same heights as the approved envelope. Modified concept seeks to increase the gross floor area of the hospital and seniors building envelopes. The overall increase in additional GFA is 2403m², and that's 9.83% increase in relation to the hospital envelope. The increased GFA is predominantly located on the lower levels. One of the key changes is the lowering of the basement, which supports a full basement level at level one, which allows for full hospital level at level four. The previously approved split is shown in the black dotted line on slide level four. The other key changes to the hospital envelope are the reorientation of the north eastern wing as described by Karen, which occurs on levels five and six, which you can see on site level six on the slide.

10

15

20

25 The horizontal depth of the northern wings are also increased. The Department supports the reorientation as it increases the separation to the residential properties on the opposite side of River Road, with setback from the front boundary increased from 6m to 10m. The increased depth would be indiscernible from the public domain in the vicinity, and indiscernible within the context of the hospital building when viewed from afar. Minor changes are also made to the tower envelope, with the indented corners of each of the wings filled in. The setback and separations are generally unchanged, including maintaining consistent separation to the heritage listed Pallister. The Department considers the modified envelope will not significantly increase the overall bulk and scale and would result in similar or reduced amenity impacts. Therefore, the changes and additional GFA are acceptable in relation to the hospital envelope. In relation to the seniors building envelopes, the increased GFA can largely be contained in the approved envelopes. The only changes to these envelopes are filling out of the indented corners as shown on the level four drawing, but the indented corners are filled out on all the levels. The Applicant has indicated that the additional GFA is required for additional circulation space, required for the adaptability of the buildings, and building standards for residential aged care facilities which the building the seniors housing buildings. The Department supports a future proofing of the buildings and considers the additional GFA can be supported and would not significantly increase the overall bulk and scale of the buildings.

30

35

40

45

Concept proposal established design principles, and the Seniors Housing SEPP also

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

sets out design principles for seniors housing. The detailed design responds to these principles and has been reviewed by the State Design Review Panel. The state reviews- the SDRP, supported the combined uses on the site and integrated podium structure. Some of the positive design features noted by the SDRP were the
5 integrated landscape elements, landscape spaces for care, meeting dementia design principles and universal design of apartments. The improved layout of the seniors housing buildings, including improved cross ventilation, was also a design evolution that was supported, as it is the community access to large areas of the site. Outstanding matters identified during assessment were connected by the by the
10 SDRP were connecting with the country, landscape strategy, entrances, design of workspaces and sustainability. The Applicant provided further information throughout the assessment process, which was reviewed by the Government Architect's Office, and these matters were largely addressed to their satisfaction. The concept proposal also required the retention of tree 167, which you can see on the
15 second diagram on the slide. The detailed design has complied with that consideration of range reorientation of the Southern Seniors building to minimise view impacts to the west and impacts on Pallister was explored in the SDRP process, but was discounted due to the impact on future amenity for residents and minimal improvement on views.

20 Modulation of this building was investigated further to minimise the view and visual impacts. In relation to the hospital building, the Department considers that the design is appropriate as it represents- as it presents as a contemporary institutional building with a larger floor plate for the podium and lower tower, which is generally
25 consistent with the height of existing buildings on the site along River Road. The taller tower element is set back further and has large setbacks to property boundaries. The overall bulk and scale is consistent with the concept proposal, and further minimised through the modulation of the building with the four wings, articulation through different materials and colours, and the integrated landscaping elements
30 including stepped landscape terraces. The one story building would be prominent and highly visible when viewed from River road, but it would appear as a seven storey building given the podium and low levels are situated below level River Road. The building size and dimension are appropriate for the type of use and the materials appropriate for the heritage and landscape setting. In relation to the seniors buildings.
35 The proposed buildings, at five and six storeys, meet the respective height limits of RL 56.36 and RL 60.65 stipulated in the conditions of the concept approval. These are also maintained in the modified concept proposal. Buildings- Northern seniors buildings have also been shifted south to comply with the conditions of the concept proposal, which aligns it with adjacent property to the west.

40 A minimum 16 metre separation between the two buildings is still achieved. The seniors building provides a transition in height across the site from the taller hospital, located centrally on the site, to the lower scale residential buildings to the west. The building form is articulated with stonework and brickwork and landscaping elements
45 to minimise the prominent form and attempt to integrate the form with the landscape setting. The overall bulk and scale is consistent with the concept proposal. The respite building situated to the east of the hospital building, is a low scale building

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

within the landscaped area. Its scale and design is appropriate for that part of the site as per the approved concept.

5 The impacts on the landscape setting are mitigated through the incorporation of
landscape walls, terraces and roofs across the site. This complements the retained
30.8% tree canopy and 46.5% deep soil provided across the site. Whilst there is a
minor reduction to- was due to the redevelopment, there is a minor Reduction
Department considers the project can be supported, given that it's only a 1%
reduction in tree canopy and 8.5% in deep soil. Trees will be planted to offset the
10 trees to be removed, as required by the conditions of the concept proposal. The tree
planting would also improve the quality of vegetation on the site post development.
Given that it will support regeneration works, replace dying and overgrown trees and
will use indigenous species as required by our conditions of consent- Recommended
conditions of consent.

15 The Department considers the project would provide high quality open spaces for the
future residents, hospital staff, patients and visitors, and for the local community.
The addition of a shared path through the site will also improve connectivity,
improve access for community and provide a more pleasant path compared to the
20 narrow and damaged footpath along the eastern side of River Road. It would also be
more suitable for vulnerable users and comply with accessibility requirements of the
seniors housing set. Minor restoration works are required along the route to the bus
stops to ensure accessibility requirements in the set are met, and this requirement has
been included in the recommended conditions.

25 Another key factor in determining the appropriateness of the built form of the seniors
housing is residential amenity. SEPP 65 residential apartment development and the
Apartment Design Guide provide relevant criteria to ensure adequate amenity for the
adequate amenity for the units. While the seniors housing buildings are designed as
30 residential aged care facilities, the units are capable of being occupied as separate
domiciles and therefore the criteria does apply. The Department undertook a detailed
assessment and found that there is overall compliance with the design criteria in the
ADG, except some minor deficiencies. Amenity would be provided for future
residents. As previously stated, the minimum 16 metre separation would meet the 12
35 metre criteria. And at 71.9% and 60.7%, the project complies with the 70% of units
that would be required to receive two hours of solar access during mid-winter, and
60% of units that are required to be cross ventilated.

40 A minor non-compliance is the amount of private, communal open space with
adequate solar access, while 2727m² will be provided. This only equates to 8.1% of
the entire site, where 25% is required. But when looking at it in terms of just stage
three, the seniors housing portion of the site, it is 29.8% of the site. However, this
area is heavily shadowed throughout the day and does not meet the requirement of
50% of sunlight for two hours in winter, but this is mitigated by the significant
45 passive open space across the site with high levels of sunlight, including a garden
nursery in proximity to the seniors housing. The Department has recommended
conditions requiring the project demonstrates compliance with the senior housing

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

SEPP standards, especially concerning accessibility and usability for self-contained dwellings during certification stages and prior to occupation of the seniors housing. Conditions are also recommended to ensure accessibility recommendations are implemented. Now that we have established that future residents will receive
5 adequate amenity, I would like to discuss impacts on residential amenity of the adjoining and neighbouring properties. In considering the view impacts. The impacts on views and outlook are generally consistent with the findings in the concept proposal, with minimal discernible difference except improvements to the height limits imposed by the concept. As noted earlier, the potential to improve outlook for
10 residents in the suburb of Northwood from reorientation of the seniors- Southern seniors building would be marginal and would result in adverse amenity for future residents by overlooking each other.

The conditions of the concept proposal also required further view analysis from Lane
15 Cove River. The Applicant's analysis confirms that there would be negligible impacts on views from Lane Cove River, given the distance and screening from the landscape setting. Accordingly, the Department considers the view effects are acceptable. Overshadowing, in terms of solar access. The project would result in
20 minor overshadowing of adjacent properties, but generally to only parts of the affected properties. All these properties are already in shadow due to the topography of the land. All impacted properties would retain a minimum of three hours of solar access in midwinter to living areas and private open space. Accordingly, the Department considers that ocean impacts are also acceptable. Concerns were raised
25 in public submissions about potential overlooking of adjoining properties by the seniors, housing, and impacts on privacy. A minimum 20 metre setback to the west and 34 metre setback to the south is provided. From the seniors housing, and this exceeds the required 12 metre by the apartment design guide. However, further mitigation of privacy impacts have been incorporated into the design as required by the conditions of the concept proposal. This includes recessed balconies and
30 windows, angled blade walls, planter boxes facing along all the west facing balconies, and deep walls.

This is illustrated in the figures on this slide and on the next slide. However, the Department has recommended that the tree planting in the bushland regeneration
35 areas, which adjoins the most affected residents to the west and southwest, be identified in consultation with these residents. Permission has also been recommended that solid fencing be provided where accepted by the residents. Given the potential light spill and increased activity in the garden nursery in proximity to these properties, also in relation to the hospital building, the lower levels of the
40 hospital will not result in overlooking, but the tower has the potential to, but at approximately 30 metre setback to the northern and 60 metre setbacks to the eastern and southern property boundaries. Landscaping, landscaping buffers to the east and the south overlooking impacts are minimised. Therefore, the Department considers privacy impacts acceptable subject to these additional conditions regarding
45 consultation on tree planting and offer of solid fencing. In relation to noise. The conditions of the concept proposal also require the Applicant assess the noise impacts from the basement entrance, which is located in the closest proximity to the

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

adjoining residents- residential properties to the west, to serve to demonstrate the appropriateness of the entrance or relocate the entrance. The Department is satisfied that the noise impact assessment demonstrates that no adverse noise impacts are associated with the location of this entrance, as it will not be gated. I will not now
5 hand over to Tom to discuss transport and traffic impacts.

MR DALES: Thanks Meg, and good morning panel as well. Thomas Dales, Senior Development Assessment Officer in Karen's team. I'll be covering off on traffic, car parking, transport and access. So just in terms of traffic, the conditions of the concept
10 proposal required a further traffic assessment, including use of more current traffic data. The traffic assessment included additional traffic surveys undertaken in 2021 which found that there were no increase in traffic, and the figures used from 2017 for the concept proposal remained relevant. The traffic assessment concluded that the project would generate 88 and 80 additional trips in the AM at peak- PM peak
15 periods, respectively. And revised traffic generation rates for seniors housing and at a lower rate for dementia beds were applied in the Applicant's traffic assessment. So concerns were raised by Council Transport for New South Wales regarding the chip trip generation rates or the traffic data used. And the Department is satisfied that the additional traffic generated by this development will not adversely impact the road
20 network, as levels of service will remain the same. The Department notes that the buildings and units are universal design and allows adaptability of buildings and uses, and this adaptability could result in potential future variations to the traffic generation rates. So as a result, the Department has recommended a condition restricting the use solely to seniors housing unless further consent is obtained for
25 another use, so impacts can be assessed at that time.

The Department has also recommended a condition requiring a road safety audit for construction vehicles access at Saint Vincent's Road. Given the steep and narrow access and potential issues which turn path with turn paths and sightlines. Having
30 regard to car parking, the Transport and Parking Assessment Report identifies 269 car parking spaces are required in accordance with the Council's DCP and the seniors housing set for the proposed uses across the site. The application proposes 329 parking spaces. So that's a surplus, and this surplus parking supply is provided for peak demand during special occasions where visitor and patient activity increases, and in the inevitable event of use by parents carers for nearby schools. The
35 Department is satisfied that the car parking proposed would be satisfactory as the project is proposed to be staged. The Department recommends a condition requiring additional car parking numbers prior to occupation for each of the relevant stages. The proposed adaptability of the building could result in the potential generation of
40 greater parking requirements in the future, so it has been recommended, that further consent be obtained for any change of use. Regarding transport, in relation to public transport the seniors housing SEPP identifies specific requirements for access to facilities. It requires the bus service be available both to and from the site to a local centre. With necessary services at least once between 8 a.m. and 12 p.m. each day,
45 and at least once between 12 p.m. and 6 p.m. each day from Monday to Friday.

For development, where the site adjoins land zoned primarily for urban purposes, the

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

bus service must be provided daily. The conditions of the concept proposal also require that the Applicant provide a shuttle bus service. And so as the bus service route servicing the site does not operate on Sundays, the Department has recommended a condition requiring that the Applicant provide or ensure Sunday bus services are available. So therefore, the Applicant must either provide the shuttle bus service or seek to have Sunday services added to the bus route 261. Terms of access- Vehicle access points remain the same, but given the additional traffic, a left in left out in arrangement for the eastern River Road, vehicle access is required. And right turn movements are to be prohibited to reduce vehicle conflict. A condition has been recommended to ensure this arrangement is implemented before operation, and also a condition is recommended to ensure, existing signage is fixed as per the recommendations of the Road Safety Assessment and future signage is installed for pedestrian and vehicle safety. Yes next slide please.

15 MS HARRAGON: Oh, sorry. I did that to myself. So, Karen Harragon, I'm now going to talk to you about flooding initially. And then biodiversity. The site is subject to overland flood injury in the 1% annual exceedance probability AEP through to the PMF. The site is not affected by mainstream flooding from Gore Creek, which adjoins it to- along that boundary. The site is predominantly H1 low risk during flood events where no restrictions apply except localised areas of higher risk during the PMF, including Saint Vincent's Driveway and parts of the Signalised River road access road. These areas reach H4 classification, where it is unsafe for people and vehicles. A small area along the steep slopes in the bushland is classified as H6 during the PMF, where it is not suitable for people, vehicles or buildings. The access roads are classified H5 during PMF events and therefore are unsafe for people with vehicles- and vehicles. Subsequently, while all floor levels and entrances exits are located above PMF, shelter in place is still proposed for the vulnerable and other occupants during the short period PMF events, it's actually got a quite short arrival time. So, even though the flood maps show the flooding to not be excessive, we have pursued a fairly rigorous set of flood emergency management plan procedures that will need to be progressed to a final outcome.

So what are the other things that the project does is to provide some fairly good improvements for those dwellings located along the south. And they've done that by the implementation of a landscape bund that surrounds the site. And that's actually going to deliver a fairly big improvement for the adjoining southern properties who are experiencing- experienced flood injury at the 1% AEP, with a fairly significant improvement for them. I'm just going to quickly touch on the flood inquiry. The New South Wales 2022 flood inquiry identified that sensitive issues should be located on land above the PMF and supporting essential services above, and all essential supporting services above the flood planning level. Although the development is on a site affected by the PMF, the Department considers the site of the proposed development as the facility is an existing facility and the development would improve the hospital's flood resilience. It would also improve overland flow impacts to the adjoining properties to the south, which I mentioned earlier. The Applicant has actually determined its flood planning level at the PMF because of the nature of the quite close flood events in terms of the impacts between the 1% and the PMF. So all

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

of the buildings, including the carpark, have been developed with a flood- a planning level, in excess of the PMF. The Department has also had regard to the draft shelter in place guideline in its assessment of the project and matters of public interest with respect to flooding and managing risk to hospital occupants.

5

As the proposed shelter in place strategy is expected to be able to manage and mitigate risk to staff, patients and visitors during the PMF, giving the very short duration which is approximately at its maximum one hour, and shallow floodwaters. It would generally meet the criteria in the draft shelter in place guideline, which has not yet been adopted by government. The Department considers the site acceptable in relation to flood risks, and has recommended finalisation of the Flood Emergency Response Plan in consultation with relevant agencies. The flood assessment also recommends that it continue to be revised as each of the stages of development come online, so it's developed in consultation with the actual residents of the site so that it's a fit for purpose for the people who are actually occupying the site. I'm going to quickly talk about biodiversity. The Department concluded in its assessment of the concept proposal that the project avoids and minimises biodiversity impacts by locating the building envelopes when predominantly cleared areas of the site. A revised assessment was submitted with the detailed SSD, which revised the vegetation assessment for the site. The project would result in the removal of 0.43 hectares of coastal and sandstone moist forest, and indirect impacts on 0.63 hectares of P.c.t 1.841 vegetation asset protection zones to manage bushfire risk.

A further 0.46 hectares of non-native trees and shrubs have also been proposed to be removed. The coastal sandstone gallery forest, P.c.t 1.828, in the south west corner of the site, is remnant vegetation that is characterised as a threatened ecological community. It is to be retained and protected. Four threatened species of fauna were recorded in surveys for the Biodiversity Assessment, but only as part of the surveying work- Sorry, but only the Southern Myotis is present. The Department considers that the project would result in the loss of biodiversity values on site, but the impacts can be adequately compensated. Conditions of concern are recommended, requiring that biodiversity offsets 11 ecosystem credits and seven species credits are retired before the removal of any vegetation. The Department has also recommended conditions to ensure that the biodiversity mitigation measures are implemented during construction and operation, and this includes the development biodiversity management during construction, through a vegetation management plan which will protect remnant vegetation in the south west and guides bushland regeneration works at all levels. Project condition requiring management of slight spill on bushland areas is also recommended, and will go some way to supporting the ongoing use of this site by the southern myotis, who is a fishing bat and relies on the on the watercourse nearby. Megan will now discuss development contributions and heritage before I sum up.

MS FU: The Applicant is seeking exemption from development contributions. Council requested contributions for the seniors housing component, but not for the hospital component. The Department agrees that applying contributions for the hospital component would be unreasonable, given the hospital would provide a

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

significant public benefit, consistent with what Council's contribution plan levies for. HammondCare is a NSW health affiliated health organisation that offers and recognises the new small New South Wales Health entitlements. Affiliated health organisations are not for profit and treated as part of the public health system, as they significantly contribute to the operation of that system. The seniors housing component is exempt from local Development contributions pursuant to ministerial direction dated 14th September 2007, which is still in force. It is exempt as development for the purpose of any form of seniors housing as defined under the Seniors Housing exempt- Seniors Housing SEPP is exempt from development contributions if provided by the housing provider. HammondCare is a social housing provider under that SEPP, as it is not for profit organisation and provides rental housing. Units would not be sold. The Department is satisfied that no development contributions should be imposed for the project as long. In relation to heritage. Pallister is a state and locally listed heritage item. No works are proposed for Pallister except for conservation works. The Heritage Impact Statement concluded that that the overall proposal will have a positive heritage impact on the site, allowing for the site's social significance as a place of service to the community continues without erasing the earlier layers of history. It also concluded that the project is sympathetic in its design and approach to- and enhances Pallister's significance and mitigates the new buildings. Scheduled conservation works for Pallister forms part of the application.

The Department considers the design provides a sympathetic response to the heritage item and setting. It includes modulation of the buildings and stepped forms at the interfaces Pallister and landscape terraces and walls to address the setting. The Department notes that the project also support the ongoing conservation of Pallister through the continued adaptive reuse of the item, and reinstates views to Pallister from River Road. The Department has recommended conditions requiring a suitably experienced and qualified consultant, be engaged for the conservation works and completion of the conservation works, except any ongoing elements prior to final stage of occupation. The preparation and implementation of a heritage interpretation plan for occupation of the project is also recommended.

MS HARRAGON: Karen Harragon. Thank you. Megan, I will now present our assessment summary and conclusion. So overall, the Department concludes the impacts of the project are acceptable, subject to the Department's recommended conditions. In summary, the Department considers that the proposal is in the public interest as it would provide for a contemporary modern health facility- health infrastructure facility in an area of care and within a region that is facing an increasing demand from an ageing population. The project would increase diversity in seniors housing, with integrated care provided through its co-location with a specialised health care services and clients. The project has been designed to be adaptable, so it can respond to ongoing change in the health needs of the state, and with improvements in technology in that area. The redeveloped campus would provide 174 operational jobs when completed and 300 construction jobs. The Department has concluded that the modified building envelopes and the proposed built form is acceptable, given the scale is generally consistent with the approved

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

concept proposal, and incorporates design elements to address amenity impacts, responds to the heritage setting and provides adequate amenity for future uses.

5 Amenity impacts are satisfactory as privacy treatments have been provided to
minimise overlooking of adjacent properties and overshadowing impacts are
acceptable. Traffic and transport impacts are acceptable as additional traffic
generated would not impact traffic efficiency or road safety, and road safety audits
10 have demonstrated that the access points at River Road and Saint Vincent's Road do
not require any upgrades, subject to a road safety assessment for each of the
construction stages. Flooding impacts can be adequately managed to ensure no
additional adverse impacts on property- adjoining properties, and improved
emergency response procedures would be implemented for the site post each of the
15 redevelopment stages. Biodiversity impacts and tree removal can be appropriately
managed on the site, and where impacts are proposed can be adequately offset with
additional planning, protection and biodiversity offsets. That ends our formal
presentation. I note you have mentioned conditions in the agenda item. We've
touched on a few of these that we've imposed as non-standard conditions on this
consent. If there's any other conditions you'd like us to speak directly to, we're happy
20 to go through them as well.

MR PILTON: Thanks, Karen. Maybe I could just kick off with a quick question
about the accessibility and so on. You mentioned that they've done a road safety
audit or you've asked for a road safety audit. I'm just wondering about accessibility
for elderly people and so on. It's quite- The state owned parts of the road outside, I'm
25 just wondering about getting to the bus stop across the road and so on is I think
there's a requirement for an accessibility audit.

MS FU: There was an accessibility audit, and it found that subject to minor
rectifications of the footpath along River Road to get to the bus stop, it would meet
30 the accessibility requirements.

MR PILTON: Oh-

MS FU: -And but we've conditioned that they confirm that as part of the construction
35 and pre-operation stages.

MR PILTON: Thank you very much. Wendy?

MS LEWIN: Well, that was one of my interests as well. Just to- We were curious to
40 know what the issues are around the increased number of seniors housing.
Department supports it, but what was it to do with high bulk scale, or were there
other issues that the Council and public-

MS HARRAGON: -As in the concerns raised by the community Council more
45 generally?

MS LEWIN: Yes.

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

MS HARRAGON: So it's obviously a significant amount of development that's going on to a site as compared to the existing development. So from I guess from the point of view of the Department, we recognise that the greater value that will be returned from the redevelopment of this site. Goes beyond just the residents who occupied the site and will go to, I guess, modernising what is become a building that needs modernising. I'll be careful when my words there- And even just the site- And when we go to site, it's- you can see that the movement around the entire site would be quite challenging at the moment on the footpaths and the development of probably a very high specified, development site for a large number of residents we think would bring quite a significant value to the region. And partnering that with accessibility to those specialised services within the same site. The number of units that have that access, we think is quite a positive for the area. So the Applicant, in revisiting their approach to the number of seniors living, has revisited the mix of the development as well. I recall was it all two bedroom to start with. So their indicative was all two bedroom. And they've now come forward with actually having quite a good mix. And I think that also reflects the suitability of that better meeting the needs of people in the older age group and people with disabilities. There's even a strong view that the three bedroom ones that are proposed. The third bedroom is actually, almost like a slash second living area as well. And there's some evidence that the Applicant found that, it's quite likely many people in that age group, particularly if they're infirm, are likely to be also in separate bedrooms. So, it's not unlikely to expect that it's not going to be the families living in this. It's likely to still just be a primary couple and a- one person and a carer in many circumstances, so.

MS FU: But a part of the other reason why we support- The community were non supportive of the seniors housing is largely because they wanted to retain the site for hospital use. But given the- well, the Applicant has now made the buildings universal design. So there is flexibility in the future if there is a greater demand for hospital use in the future, that can now be accommodated, subject to just some traffic and parking things that might need to be sorted out. So that's another reason why we're supportive of this design. And even maybe the slightly increased GFA as all other modified envelopes.

MR PILTON: Thanks, Elizabeth.

PROF TAYLOR: Yes. Could I just follow down that line? Because I was very interested to see that when you consolidated the 2020 conditions, there was a condition that had been requested by the commissioners regarding ensuring that there was a very strong link between the approval that was given for seniors living and how that tied in with overcoming the fact that it wasn't zoned for that. And that doesn't seem to have appeared in the final consolidated version. So I'm assuming that was just maybe an oversight or-

MS HARRAGON: Can I just check with my colleague? We imposed a condition? About the maintaining seniors.

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

MS FU: In terms of it has to be seniors housing that there's a definitely a condition (crosstalk).

5 PROF TAYLOR: It's weak the way it is written in the existing set of documents. So this is more a nuance to make sure that the wording that was provided by the commissioners in 2020 is specifically included in the 2023 conditions, and that does not seem to have happened. The terminology is certainly there, but that's perhaps something to take on notice, because that really does raise the whole issue of the language. Perhaps when you say nursery, of course, I'm assuming you're meaning a
10 plant nursery. So, it might be worth saying- and sort of your statements about the two and three bedroom, all of those the language that is about carers. And because my assumption is that all of the even the disability uses here will be aged or seniors, rather than you're not expecting a 21 year old in a-

15 MS FU: That is generally the intention of the Applicant. We might look at reworking the conditions.

PROF TAYLOR: So, that's why that whole logical flow of language, which was captured particularly by the commissioners in 2020, would be useful to see reflected
20 the whole way through the language into the new area because I would suspect that that some of the concerns that have been raised more recently would be addressed by seeing that certainty of it really was about end use. And as you say, the idea that it can be moved back into hospital possibilities makes a lot of sense as well.

25 MS HARRAGON: So, we can go back and revisit the robustness of the condition set. But I think it's probably worth just reflecting back on what the seniors housing does. So it's only has to be one person that meets the category of the person with a disability-

30 PROF TAYLOR: Yes-

MS HARRAGON: -One person over 55. So there could be a, you know, one year old, I was going to say a- yes, divorced child coming back and living with mum and dad in their 90s, I'm sure.

35 PROF TAYLOR: Yes. Oh yes. Yes, yes. So sorry I understand-

MS HARRAGON: -Some of those as well. So yes-

40 MS FU: -Because yeah, generally the condition that we've used is the same one that's used for all approvals under the seniors housing SEPP.

PROF TAYLOR: Which was the actual wording- Its clauses 39 and 40 of the
45 statement of reasons, 39 to 41, where the commissioners actually did give a specific recommendation. That doesn't seem to have appeared in the other. So I was just interested in reading as you were going through it, that it was obvious the intent was there. But, it's amazing how over time these things can get misinterpreted or-

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

MS HARRAGON: -And certainly, when the Department- and the Department's now revisiting more of the role of approving seniors living with that part of development coming over, if there was a likelihood that a site could be sold to individual
5 landowners, we'd be looking for restrictions on titles and things like that. But we can still look at how we could, make a more robust what we've put forward.

PROF TAYLOR: Which was one of the requirements suggested was that they did a whole analysis of that whether it was licensing or leasing. And so, they actually put
10 that in there as part of it. So I think so, it's probably worth rereading there. The other quick area, if you don't mind, was the area that it seemed to be less than aspirational, their ecological sustainable development targets. There was one for the hospital where they suggested they might try and meet the target, and I could not understand why there would be safety concerns about actually certifying, because there is
15 numerous examples of hospitals being able to certify themselves to four star rating. So is there any particular reason why there's no expectation with the condition that-

MS FU: We have recommended a condition that they comply with the Four Star, or they provide an alternate process that's more appropriate.
20

PROF TAYLOR: So how-

MS FU: They have come back, with, further concerns with complying with that four star being that the tool that they were using is no longer available or, yes, no longer
25 available or in place. So there is a more updated tool that they could use, but it would require significant redesign. So- but that now given how far we are into process, we've got a condition that requires them to do it, or they'll have to demonstrate an alternate process for the.

PROF TAYLOR: Seniors living there doing the BASIX. And that would be seven
30 star rating.

MS FU: I don't think BASIX has a set currently-

PROF TAYLOR: Currently that is the requirement.
35

MS LEWIN: I think it commenced in September last year.

MS FU: Yes, that requirement doesn't apply to them because the previous - that they
40 were lodged under the previous SEPP when the previous basic SEPP applied. Yes, unfortunately.

PROF TAYLOR: So that would be level six. Then they would be going for.

MS HARRAGON: So we can provide more details about that because it was
45 something that we had- We pursued with a fair bit of rigour in terms of what's appropriate. Because of the court case, we had regard to the court case that had come

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

down about the BASIX certificates and different, seniors living. So we were quite cautious in making sure that what the legislation required of us was being pursued. Notwithstanding the greyness that that court case identified sits within the legislation.

5

PROF TAYLOR: So is there no requirement, then, for Pallister House to consider any mechanisms as part of the heritage refurbishment? And there's nothing said at all about respite.

10 MS FU: The respite I think is the same as what they target for the hospital. They consider it part of the hospital component. And then Pallister- they haven't.

PROF TAYLOR: But they haven't. But I mean, I suppose anyway- Yes, we can discuss that further.

15

MR PILTON: Can I just ask you to clarify that the question about working hours? Why you wouldn't just go along with the standard working hours?

MS HARRAGON: The construction or operation?

20

MR PILTON: Sorry, construction.

MS FU: Construction- They've sought extended construction hours on Saturday. So it was an earlier half hour start, and then they've gone, a couple of extra hours in the evening and we've allowed- in the afternoon sorry- And we've supported the afternoon because they're going with shorter construction hours during the week. So basically we give them the extra because they've said that they'll reduce the impacts during the week. And I don't think if we didn't give them the extra on Saturday that they would, change their weekday construction hours, which means then it would lengthen the overall construction time frame. So given the offset of the shorter construction hours Monday to Friday, we've given them the afternoon- a couple of extra hours in the afternoon on Saturday.

25

30

MS HARRAGON: And typically what we also do is that we go beyond just like the state's noise requirements as well. We also usually reflect back on what does the local Council have. So we do consider that a little bit, but it's this duality of trying to deliver a project on the site. As you know, the longer you protract the noise, the more challenging it becomes, particularly for a stage development where you're going to have occupants on site as well as the adjacent. That's- Yes, trying to come up with a balance that it's- an efficient construction schedule. And where they've made some wise decisions about shortening the day ones.

35

40

MR PILTON: Okay, thank you.

45 PROF TAYLOR: Could I just ask a question? The traffic or the bus service? Did you consider the safety or the access for workers as well as for the- in terms of the expectations or the conditions that you put on? Because if there is nurses and sort of

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

people that perhaps tolls have significant challenges for in terms of car travel, how is that being factored into the bus?

5 MS HARRAGON: -Yes, I don't think we specifically looked at that because it was really, for us we were more focused on the seniors living component of supporting People who have no access to a vehicle or no longer can drive. But we could go back and we could look at that in terms of driving. Because obviously the traffic report considers and has been proposed on its modelling, an expectation of a number of people not coming to site by vehicle.

10 PROF TAYLOR: That'd be great because-

MS HARRAGON: -And even just some information around what time those movements start in terms of being able to cater for people who have shift work that you would expect from the nursing and nursing group and-

PROF TAYLOR: -Cleaning and- Yes.

20 MR PILTON: Asking a question about just go on to the landscaping aspect about deep soil. I'm quite intrigued that it says the deep soil is 46.5% of the site. Seems to be an incredibly high proportion because it's a very big site. Seems like an awful lot of was it 16,000m² or something of deep soil? I can't find anything on the plans that actually shows where the deep soil areas are or what they mean. It might be a question more appropriate to the Applicant.

25 MS FU: If you look at, I think it's largely because they kept lot- that eastern lot apart from the Pallister and the respite, there's large portion-

30 MR PILTON: -Saying that the existing virgin soil. Yes okay.

MS FU: But we did get the Applicant to verify and clarify those numbers. So, I'm sure that they've got all the information handy. I don't think we eventually got an actual plan that showed it, but they should have that.

35 MR PILTON: Just thinking on the similar project that Wahroonga, they actually have a plan that shows that, which is much easier to understand. But we will ask the Applicant. Wendy, any-

40 MS LEWIN: At this stage, I think. One thing that we can't read particularly clearly on the documents that we have, are the locations and levels of the essential services, you know, and sensitive users, systems. So I think we'll just have to try and find some more information from the Applicant, whether plant and essential support services are above the predicted maximum flood level and so on. So we'll have to interrogate this a little more. I can't see any reference to it in some of the assessment
45 documents.

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

MS HARRAGON: And if they haven't already proposed it, we probably haven't been as aggressive with this project as we have with some others where we've had like four metres flows coming through sites because we've actually been conditioning those that, as you can imagine, telling that you intend to put these in locations. We're
5 now sort of partnering with our condition set. So, it's about before you start building, you show the- you confirm the design again, and then that you also do a validation that it's actually been delivered with that two partner. So that we can, I guess, be able to take regard that it's actually what, what we've assessed has been delivered correctly given the ability to have certifier and changes.

10 MR PILTON: I think time's moving on here, so before you wrap, you got anything else Elizabeth?

PROF TAYLOR: I mean, the affordable housing. Do they have any requirements for
15 affordable housing?

MS FU: We haven't conditioned affordable housing. The SEPP only requires it for if they've got bonus floor space. And in this instance, there were no floor space caps for this site. So, we haven't conditioned.

20 PROF TAYLOR: Okay.

MR PILTON: We'll leave it at that. Thank you very much for coming in.

25 MR DALES: Thanks very much.

MR PILTON: Thank you.

MS HARRAGON: Will you do a follow up for us? For the things that I might have
30 missed in my little notes?

MS SEXTON: We'll send a formal letter with that. Thank you.

MS HARRAGON: But it'd be nice to see the site cleaned up and rehabilitated along
35 the waterway. And yeah.

MR PILTON: It's not real attractive at the moment.

MS HARRAGON: No it's not. And even just the footpath, the public footpath is in
40 this -

MR PILTON: Awful.

MS HARRAGON: Almost impassable and I think interesting just to see how that
45 little hub operates, because I think the car parking at the moment is used by the parents for the school as well. Yes, which is why we potentially think they're also not

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER

keen for it to be redeveloped because there is no parking for parents. So yes, it's become a bit of a handy to go to when you want to pick your kids up, so.

MR PILTON: Okay, thanks. Thank you very much.

5

<THE MEETING CONCLUDED

TRANSCRIBED BY LAW IN ORDER