

SUBMISSIONS ON MP 07_0166 WAHROONGA ESTATE REDEVELOPMENT FROM THE PUBLIC

Part A – Public submissions

No.	Date recd	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Preferred Project Report Response
1	7 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ High level of traffic along Fox Valley Rd and Mount Pleasant Ave ▪ Schools in the area affected and doubling of residents will cause traffic chaos ▪ Destroying the natural environment of bushland and habitat of wallabies, possums etc. ▪ Little conservation of the site ▪ Medium to high density housing unsuitable for an area that has no transport, trains etc. 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>No evidence suggests that existing schools in the area will be affected. Department of Education provided a response to the exhibited documents dated 13 May 2009.</p> <p>The site is recognised in the Draft North Sub-Regional Strategy as an industrial cluster that should be considered for strengthening. The site exists as a significant living-working community and represents an excellent example of planning to reduce dependency of car related travel. Proper planning of an expanded specialised centre and associated residential component (as proposed) will have further benefits in reducing the reliance on car travel in the region.</p> <p>The DGRs required a Transport Management and Accessibility Plan to be produced, which formed Appendix J of the exhibited material. Its purpose is to investigate all forms of transport and, in particular, how to move people from being car dependent to these alternative forms.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan will also retain the existing powerful owl habitat.</p> <p>The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p>
2	11 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal will further exacerbate flow of traffic ▪ Should create an alternative to the short cut drivers take to get from Ryde Rd to Pennant Hills Rd, M2 didn't achieve this ▪ Should widen the Comenarra & Fox Valley Rds with a beefed up intersection at Pennant Hills Rd ▪ Halt any developments along these roads that will add to traffic 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The responsibility to provide alternative transport routes from Ryde Road to Pennant Hills Road lies with the road authority. It is unrealistic to associate this Ryde Road / Pennant Hills Road link with this development</p>

					as it is an existing situation. Widening of The Comenarra Parkway and Fox Valley Roads is not the controlling factor – it's the intersections at either end that need to be modified to increase efficiency. The traffic analysis indicated that, with this development, both roads fall within the environmental road capacity set by the RTA. Main intersections at Pennant Hills Road, Pacific Highway, Kissing Point Road and the Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection is proposed to be upgraded as generally explained in the RTA's Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee submission dated 18 June 2009.
3	14 May & 4 & 9 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Medium density dwellings on north side of Mt Pleasant Rd out of character with surrounding low density dwellings ▪ Effectiveness of proposed buffer on north side of Mt Pleasant Rd questionable due to limited space and height of buildings ▪ Osborn Rd is already too busy and congested and should not be made busier as a result of the proposal ▪ Proposed Osborn Rd link would impact the ecological corridor connection with Lane Cove NP ▪ Installation of lights at intersection of Mt Pleasant Rd and Pennant Hills Rd would enhance safety, assist with smooth flow of traffic and aid bushfire evacuation 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal and the proposed high density housing located to the north of Mt Pleasant Road will be replaced by medium density housing.</p> <p>RTA has confirmed that it will not support the provision of new traffic signals at the Pennant Hills Road / Mt Pleasant Avenue intersection.</p> <p>Subsequent traffic modelling, provided to RTA and DoP, indicates that the proposed Mt Pleasant Precinct development could still satisfactorily proceed with access only via Mt Pleasant Avenue (with no traffic control signals). It is also noted that this modelling was provided to RTA and DoP based on the exhibited Concept Plan proposal (and not the reduced Preferred Project Report proposal).</p>
4	17 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal will change character of area from low density and hospital to high rise residential and commercial ▪ Unclear that public transport required for proposed density is being provided ▪ Main roads in area are already congested, not clear adequate provision for increased traffic loads ▪ Proposal relies too heavily on single entrance/exit to main north/west area bounded by Comenarra Pkwy and Fox Valley Rd, more complete multiple accesses should be mandatory 	<p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a “<i>Knowledge Asset and Key Industry</i>” and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site. It is noted that the Estate will not have any significant retail development that might compete with other existing town centres and the overall retail hierarchy.</p> <p>The 2008–09 Mini-Budget announced a review of State infrastructure contributions and water infrastructure levies that apply to the development of greenfield housing sites, infill development and employment lands (including industrial). The review also applied to local government levies charged under sections 94 and 94A of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> (EP&A Act).</p> <p>The objective of the review was to ensure that infrastructure levies are consistent with the Government's plans to boost housing supply and affordability as well as support business and provide a stimulus to the construction industry.</p> <p>On 17 December 2008, the Premier, the Hon. Nathan Rees MP, announced a package of reforms to infrastructure levies, including a change to the way that State infrastructure contributions are calculated, by removing rail infrastructure and bus subsidies – leading to a reduction in the charges. The responsibility for providing public transport infrastructure for greenfield housing sites, infill development and</p>

					<p>employment lands lies with the State Government.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p>
5	19 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern about impact of proposal on already heavy traffic flow ▪ There are existing difficulties entering or leaving Browns Rd at certain times ▪ Major restructuring of traffic required, any increase in traffic could bring traffic to a complete standstill on Comenarra Pkwy and Fox Valley Rd ▪ Construction traffic impacts increases concerns ▪ Prohibiting parking on Fox Valley Rd is not a viable solution it would make things worse with cars parked in side streets creating local access and noise problems ▪ Even if parking is increased at the hospital there is a reluctance to pay and will also impact side street parking ▪ Relocation of kindergarten will assist safety, but if 40KPH limit imposed along Fox Valley Rd will cause further delays ▪ Are existing delays at Fox Valley/Pacific Hwy and Comenarra/Pennant Hills Rd intersections and combined with existing large development approvals traffic will only get worse ▪ Solution could be a park and ride facility away from the site ▪ Existing bus service timetables are more suitable to hospital visiting rather than residential use, closest bus stop on Comenarra to Browns Rd requires dangerous crossing ▪ The following are required: changes to phasing of traffic lights at major junctions; reduce heavy vehicles on Pennant Hills Rd with tunnels; better parking in whole area; traffic control system at Browns/Comenarra intersection; scheme for traffic from F3 and Pacific Hwy to bypass Fox Valley Rd; and no further major development approved in affected area 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>In regard to the intersection of The Comenarra Parkway and Browns Road, the RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ addressing future traffic concerns along The Comenarra Parkway as a result of the development proposal, the RTA requires the developer to widen The Comenarra Parkway to provide two traffic lanes in each direction between Fox Valley Road and Browns Road; ▪ facilitating vehicles turning right into and out of Browns Road as a result of future upgrades to The Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection it is recommended that consideration be given to the provision of a seagull treatment at the intersection of The Comenarra Parkway / Browns Road. <p>Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>Parking prohibition along Fox Valley Road has been minimised and is necessary to ensure an acceptable traffic solution. Adequate car parking will be provided associated with each new building. Parking associated with the hospital will be subject of a separate car parking strategy as part of the separate project application for the hospital.</p> <p>Widening of The Comenarra Parkway and Fox Valley Roads is not the controlling factor – it's the intersections at either end that need to be modified to increase efficiency. The traffic analysis indicated that, with this development, both roads fall within the environmental road capacity set by the RTA. Main intersections at Pennant Hills Road, Pacific Highway, Kissing Point Road and the Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection is proposed to be upgraded as generally explained in the RTA's Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee submission dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>In regard to the comment on additional traffic plant during construction phases, it is expected that the consent authority will require a construction / noise / traffic management plan produced and submitted prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate to allow onsite construction</p>

					to commence. The responsibility to provide alternative transport routes/solutions as suggested lies with the road authority. It is unrealistic to associate such upgrades with this development.
6	19 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic study is inadequate ▪ Comenarra Pkwy is poorly developed, heavily used and has traffic hold ups at Pennant Hills Rd and Lane Cove Rd intersections during peak hour – upgrades to intersections should be mandatory for development to go ahead ▪ Existing traffic conditions all along Comenarra Pkwy and Fox Valley Rd are inadequate and will be burdened beyond breaking point 	<p>Further detail is required on where the traffic study is deemed inadequate before a response can be provided to this point.</p> <p>Main intersections at Pennant Hills Road, Pacific Highway, Kissing Point Road and the Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection is proposed to be upgraded as generally explained in the RTA's Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee submission dated 18 June 2009. Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in the above mentioned letter.</p> <p>The concerns with traffic conditions on The Comenarra Parkway and Fox Valley Roads are a function of the intersections at either end that need to be modified to increase efficiency. The traffic analysis indicated that, with this development, both roads fall within the environmental road capacity set by the RTA. The RTA's Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee submission dated 18 June 2009 confirms they have no objections to the exhibited concept plan subject to works being undertaken as generally described within their letter.</p>
7	20 May 2009	LGA Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned by size and scale of proposal ▪ Lack of transport infrastructure means roads will be overwhelmed ▪ Likely other infrastructure (sewers and drainage) wont cope ▪ Safety issues in event of major fire ▪ Impacts on rare BGHF ▪ Development should not proceed until local Council satisfied traffic issues addressed and until fire authorities are satisfied 	<p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. In regard to drainage, Appendix R of the exhibition material outlined, conceptually, how stormwater would be addressed. It will be designed to best practice, with further detail provided with individual project / development applications as outlined in the Statement of Commitments.</p> <p>In times of bushfire threat, a suite of recommendations were proposed in Appendix L of the exhibited material, in particular that, upon approval of the Concept Plan, an Emergency Liaison Committee be established by the landowner. The purpose of the committee shall be to co-ordinate the preparation of the various Estate Evacuation Plans, implement evacuation drills and reviews of the individual Evacuation Plans. The Chair Person of the Committee shall also attend the Local Emergency Management Committee meetings and bring to those meetings and the Emergency Service Combat Agencies/support Welfare Agencies the</p>

					<p>emergency planning protocols and issues related to the various land uses within the Estate.</p> <p>The Preferred Project Plan has been modified to preserve more native flora and fauna. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>The RTA's Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee submission dated 18 June 2009 confirms they have no objections to the exhibited concept plan subject to works being undertaken as generally described within their letter.</p>
8	20 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rezoning should not be approved until traffic problems solved to satisfaction of Councils ▪ Comenarra Pkwy is already inadequate and can not cope with a major increase in traffic ▪ Should be no further loss of BGHF, a CEEC under State and Federal legislation ▪ Commercial, retail, school and residential expansion should be reduced to better fit site capabilities and to cater for traffic and BGHF 	<p>The RTA's Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee submission dated 18 June 2009 confirms they have no objections to the exhibited concept plan subject to works being undertaken as generally described within their letter.</p> <p>The concerns with traffic conditions on The Comenarra Parkway are a function of the intersections at either end that need to be modified to increase efficiency. The traffic analysis indicated that, with this development, both roads fall within the environmental road capacity set by the RTA.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p>
9	20 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern resultant traffic increase to Pennant Hills Rd will be immense ▪ Pennant Hills Rd is running over capacity during peak times ▪ No mention to integrate development of Pennant Hills Rd with the San development and current Hornsby Council rezonings ▪ Any increase in bulk housing in these northern suburbs mustn't proceed until action on a F3/M2 link road and timing commensurate with road completion 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>There is no need to delay important planning decisions such as this proposal on the basis of the F3/M2 link. The traffic analysis in Appendix J considered the benefits on the F3/M2 link however accepted that this may not be in place for some time and therefore reported on what upgrades were required to existing roads to cater for background growth + this development proposal.</p>
10	21 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Not convinced traffic modelling is accurate ▪ Once development goes through and with no changes to Comenarra Pkwy exiting delays will become worse ▪ Car pooling scheme comes with no guarantees ▪ Strongly object to proposal 	<p>Further detail is required on where the traffic study is deemed inaccurate before a response can be provided to this point.</p> <p>A suite of road upgrade works were outlined in the RTA's Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee submission dated 18 June 2009, including upgrades to main intersections at Pennant Hills Road, Pacific Highway, Kissing Point Road and the Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road.</p>

					A Statement of Commitment is provided in relation to implantation of the car sharing scheme. A Statement of Commitment is binding to any Part 3A approval.
11	21 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose in strongest terms endangering/destruction of significant tracts of important BGHF Stands of BGHF are almost non-existent in the Sydney region, a stand has been protected in Pymble and its unconceivable to allow the stand on the site to be damaged or destroyed 	The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).
12	21 May 2009	Community Member	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans on display at 17/15/09 open day significantly different to DoP website Development Report writer and Traffic report writer who attended open day seemed to have complete lack of understanding about proposal and implications for local area Proposed school has been moved again with no detail on car parking, bus arrangements or noise considerations for surrounding residents High visitor parking fees at hospital result in congested on-street parking, this problem will multiply with increased hospital facilities Assumptions of 1 car per 6 people is a short sighted view of reality Confusion among developer's representatives at open day, one saying virtually all houses from new school site along Fox Valley to Strone Ave would be demolished, another showing a plan saying some would remain Developers do not care about the surrounding areas beyond the site and the plans should be rejected 	<p>Documentation on display at the Community Information day was obtained from the Concept Plan document.</p> <p>Concept Plan approval is sought for key development parameters, including a coordinated precinct plan outlining future growth areas for each user of the site; Conceptual road design and traffic management options; Maximum gross floor areas for each precinct; Broad land use distribution across the development allotments; Landscape, open space and public domain concepts; General building heights, build-to lines and setbacks. Details for the final designs developed within these parameters (including details associated with the school) will be provided under separate Project / Development applications, which will be available for public comment.</p> <p>Parking prohibition along Fox Valley Road has been minimised and is necessary to ensure an acceptable traffic solution. Adequate car parking will be provided associated with each new building. Parking associated with the hospital will be subject of a separate car parking strategy as part of the separate project application for the hospital.</p> <p>Dispute that the surrounding development (and users) have not been considered as part of planning this proposal.</p>
13	21 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supportive of hospital expansion and nursing facilities, but do not support large amount of commercial, residential and retail development Concerned about increase in traffic, no approval should be issued unless traffic management is resolved to satisfaction of local councils Should be no loss of BGHF 	<p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p> <p>For it to be successful as a working-living community, it needs to have a mix of commercial, residential and retail development. It is noted that the Estate will not have any significant retail development that might compete with other existing town centres and the overall retail hierarchy.</p> <p>The proposed residential development is required to make the hospital feasible. The proposed residential density is appropriate for the specialized employment centre.</p> <p>As mentioned, the amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha</p>

					originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).
14	21 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal gives no thought to Mt Pleasant Ave, which is a no through residential road accessing busy Pennant Hills Rd ▪ In 1999 Hornsby Council said no new developments should be permitted to obtain access from Mt Pleasant Ave and Pennant Hills Rd without first resolving the existing traffic deficiency ▪ Mt Pleasant Ave already accommodates school and retirement village traffic, it is narrow and was not designed to accommodate this traffic, street parking exacerbates safety issues/sightlines ▪ Proposal is unacceptable, Osborn Rd link needs to be completed before development begins ▪ Mt Pleasant Ave should be closed on boundary between Hornsby and Ku-ring-gai Council areas 	<p>Following extensive feedback from local residents during the exhibition period, and ongoing discussions with the RTA, additional traffic modelling was conducted regarding the access options for the Mt Pleasant Precinct. Due to the nature of development proposed in this precinct (ie partly associated with the retirement village with typically lower vehicle movements or movements outside of peak periods), analysis estimated that the Mt Pleasant precinct would generate about 46 additional trips during peak hours.</p> <p>Based on RTA guidelines, confinement of additional traffic to Mt Pleasant Avenue would not elevate the traffic level on this road above the RTA environmental goals for this road.</p> <p>This modelling therefore indicates that the proposed Mt Pleasant Precinct development could still satisfactorily proceed with access only via Mt Pleasant Avenue (with no traffic control signals). It is also noted that this modelling was provided to RTA and DoP based on the exhibited Concept Plan proposal (and not the reduced Preferred Project Report proposal for this precinct).</p> <p>The Osborn Road link has therefore been deleted from the proposal.</p> <p>Disagree that Mt Pleasant Road be closed because of cross LGA boundary issues.</p>
15	22 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Osborn Rd/Pennant Hills Rd intersection is already dangerous with existing volume problems, added traffic will present great difficulties for residents and increase danger for schools located on corners of the intersection ▪ If development proceeds would be more appropriate for lights at Mt Pleasant Ave/Pennant Hills Rd intersection, while it would result in two sets of lights in close proximity it would have safety advantages of slowing traffic 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p> <p>Vehicle movements from the proposed development will access Pennant Hills Road via Mt Pleasant Avenue.</p> <p>RTA has confirmed that it will not support the provision of new traffic signals at the Pennant Hills Road / Mt Pleasant Avenue intersection.</p> <p>Subsequent traffic modelling, provided to RTA and DoP, indicates that the proposed Mt Pleasant Precinct development could still satisfactorily proceed with access only via Mt Pleasant Avenue (with no traffic control signals). It is also noted that this modelling was provided to RTA and DoP based on the exhibited Concept Plan proposal (and not the reduced Preferred Project Report proposal).</p>
16	22 May 2009	Community Member	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adequate visual impact assessment/sketches not provided and photo montages contradict amount of vegetation screening for buildings along Fox Valley Rd ▪ Scale model should have been provided ▪ Existence of a few trees shouldn't be justification for increased heights, sufficient justification for building heights from a planning and urban design perspective must be provided ▪ 4-6 storeys along Fox Valley Rd is excessive and not keeping with the existing local character which is predominantly 2 storey low density residential development ▪ Buildings along Fox Valley Rd should be setback, limited to 2/3 storeys with height of buildings increasing towards centre of the site ▪ Taller buildings should be located on lower parts of the site sloping away from main roads (Comenarra and Fox Valley) to reduce perceived height ▪ Appropriate buffers should be provided between development and EECs, standard government policy is a minimum 50m vegetated buffer 	<p>We understand that the Department are happy with the presentation and assessment of visual impact, including the absence of a model.</p> <p>A thorough assessment of the proposed built form is included in the Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>The Preferred Concept Plan includes the retention of several existing buildings along Fox Valley Way. Proposed residential development will be compliant with building design and SEPP 65 requirements.</p> <p>The proposed APZs and riparian buffers have been agreed with the relevant authorities.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Off-site offsets should be investigated for loss of EECs 	<p>school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p>
17	22 May 2009	LGA Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development will affect CEEC BGHF, this must not be allowed 	<p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p>
18	23 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disapproval for proposal, disgrace the way the area is being developed, lots of real estate, poor infrastructure and roads that wont be able to cope 	<p>Concerns noted. We have regularly consulted with infrastructure service authorities and the RTA, all of which have indicated that the proposal can proceed subject to upgrade works being conducted.</p>
19	25 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased traffic from development will increase danger of Warwick PI/Comenarra Pkwy intersection, cause congestion on Warwick PI and reduce on street parking by 20-25% Concerns could be addressed by traffic calming devices on the new access road joining Warwick PI, ban parking on the new access road, use vacant land between Warwick PI and Fox Valley Rd to exit onto Comenarra Pkwy for southbound traffic 	<p>The link from Fox Valley Road to Warwick Place has been removed due to the deletion (in part) of the residential east precinct. It is proposed to investigate installation of a minor road at the rear of the existing dwellings that front The Comenarra Parkway that connects Warwick Place to The Comenarra Parkway. It is considered that this may assist in enhancing east and west sight distances along The Comenarra Parkway.</p>
20	25 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not object to redevelopment per se, but strongly object to direct traffic from proposal through Osborn Rd Mt Pleasant Ave/Pennant Hills Rd intersection is already dangerous Osborn Rd/Pennant Hills Rd intersection is subject to frequent accidents Osborn Rd is already busy from Loreto school traffic and on street parking Traffic lights should be installed at Mt Pleasant Ave/Pennant Hills Rd intersection, there are already many sets of lights on Pennant Hills Rd – one more will make little difference and assist safety at Osborn Rd/Pennant Hills Rd intersection by slowing traffic on Pennant Hills Rd 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal, with traffic from the proposed Mt Pleasant precinct to access Pennant Hills Road via Mt Pleasant Avenue.</p> <p>RTA has confirmed that it will not support the provision of new traffic signals at the Pennant Hills Road / Mt Pleasant Avenue intersection. In fact RTA strongly recommended a connection be constructed between the development and Osborn Road to access the existing capacity within the traffic lights at Pennant Hills Road / Osborn Road.</p> <p>Subsequent traffic modelling, provided to RTA and DoP, indicates that the proposed Mt Pleasant Precinct development could still satisfactorily proceed with access only via Mt Pleasant Avenue (with no traffic control signals). It is also noted that this modelling was provided to RTA and DoP based on the exhibited Concept Plan proposal (and not the reduced Preferred Project Report proposal).</p>
21	25 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly object to linking Osborn Rd to proposed development in Mt Pleasant Ave and banning right hand turns from Mt Pleasant Rd into Pennant Hills Rd, making Osborn Rd only access for 100s of residents Osborn Rd is narrow and carries lots of traffic particularly from Loreto, on street parking is also taken up by the school Linking the proposed development to Osborn Rd with the associated traffic increase would be negligent and dangerous and banning right hand turns from Mt Pleasant would exacerbate the situation Osborn Rd/Pennant Hills Rd intersection is already dangerous No rezoning should be granted until traffic problems are solved to satisfaction of local residents and councils Development in Mt Pleasant should not be linked to Osborn Rd Consideration should be given to traffic lights at Mt Pleasant Ave/Pennant Hills Rd 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal, with traffic from the proposed Mt Pleasant precinct to access Pennant Hills Road via Mt Pleasant Avenue.</p> <p>RTA has confirmed that it will not support the provision of new traffic signals at the Pennant Hills Road / Mt Pleasant Avenue intersection. In fact RTA strongly recommended a connection be constructed between the development and Osborn Road to access the existing capacity within the traffic lights at Pennant Hills Road / Osborn Road.</p> <p>Subsequent traffic modelling, provided to RTA and DoP, indicates that the proposed Mt Pleasant Precinct development could still satisfactorily proceed with access only via Mt Pleasant Avenue (with no traffic control signals). It is also noted that this modelling was provided to RTA and</p>

				intersection, this would also slow traffic on Pennant Hills Rd	DoP based on the exhibited Concept Plan proposal (and not the reduced Preferred Project Report proposal). RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades. Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.
22	26 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about proposal to link Mt Pleasant Ave with Osborn Rd and impact of increased population and traffic in area, but particularly Osborn Rd ▪ Volume of traffic on Osborn Rd is already very high, particularly from Loreto ▪ On-street parking used by school creates passing problems as Osborn Rd is narrow ▪ Additional traffic will create further problems and be a danger to pupils ▪ Are existing delays exiting Osborn Rd onto Pennant Hills Rd ▪ Best solution is traffic lights at Mt Pleasant Ave/Pennant Hills Rd intersection as will slow traffic on Pennant Hills, reduce accidents, and improve traffic flow ▪ If development is to go ahead greater consultation required with Osborn Rd residents and far greater impact studies required ▪ Comenarra Pkwy is already incapable of coping with regular traffic flows and Pennant Hills Rd is a disaster 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal, with traffic from the proposed Mt Pleasant precinct to access Pennant Hills Road via Mt Pleasant Avenue.</p> <p>RTA has confirmed that it will not support the provision of new traffic signals at the Pennant Hills Road / Mt Pleasant Avenue intersection. In fact RTA strongly recommended a connection be constructed between the development and Osborn Road to access the existing capacity within the traffic lights at Pennant Hills Road / Osborn Road.</p> <p>Subsequent traffic modelling, provided to RTA and DoP, indicates that the proposed Mt Pleasant Precinct development could still satisfactorily proceed with access only via Mt Pleasant Avenue (with no traffic control signals). It is also noted that this modelling was provided to RTA and DoP based on the exhibited Concept Plan proposal (and not the reduced Preferred Project Report proposal).</p> <p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades (including The Comenarra Parkway and Pennant Hills Road). Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.</p>
23	26 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supporting infrastructure in area is not as it needs to be to support such a large development ▪ Pennant Hills Rd is a bottleneck, a tunnel or ring road is required ▪ Existing natural waterfall and creek drainage can't support increased flows ▪ Electricity already blacks out several times a year ▪ There should be no loss of Federally and State protected BGHF ▪ Proposed link from Mt Pleasant Rd to Osborn Rd is not supported as Osborn Rd is already at full capacity and increased traffic will make it unsafe ▪ Traffic light at Osborn/Pennant Hills Rd intersection are already unsafe ▪ Any widening of Osborn Rd to accommodate increased traffic would result in significant loss of Blue Gums and the BGHF ▪ Mt Pleasant Rd should be used to access the development and lights should be installed at the intersection with Pennant Hills Rd ▪ The developers did not consult with the community in developing the concept plan as required by the DGRs ▪ Commercial, retail, school and residential expansion should be reduced to better fit with site 	<p>We have regularly consulted with infrastructure service authorities and the RTA, all of which have indicated that the proposal can proceed subject to upgrade works being conducted.</p> <p>The issue with Pennant Hills Road is because of the number of traffic controlled intersections that connect into this road. The responsibility to provide alternative transport routes/solutions as suggested lies with the road authority. It is unrealistic to associate such upgrades with this development.</p> <p>In regard to drainage, Appendix R of the exhibition material outlined, conceptually, how stormwater would be addressed. It will be designed to best practice, with further detail provided with individual project / development applications as outlined in the Statement of Commitments.</p> <p>Regarding electricity supply, Energy Australia provided advice to Dept Planning on 14 May 2009 advising that several new electrical substations on the property is required and at least one high voltage underground cable back to Energy Australia's Turrumurra Zone substation may be</p>

				and infrastructure capabilities	<p>required to supply the site at the developer's cost.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal, with traffic from the proposed Mt Pleasant precinct to access Pennant Hills Road via Mt Pleasant Avenue.</p> <p>RTA has confirmed that it will not support the provision of new traffic signals at the Pennant Hills Road / Mt Pleasant Avenue intersection.</p> <p>In preparing the concept plan, presentations were made to the Community Reference Group to obtain information and disseminate information back to their constituents. The Community Reference Group is independently facilitated and is made up of representatives from Kuring-gai Council (Councillors and staff), local residents, STEP Community Environment representative, San and SDA. Separate presentations were also provided to onsite user groups. We have satisfied our Director General Requirements regarding consultation.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p> <p>For it to be successful as a working-living community, it needs to have a mix of commercial, residential and retail development. It is noted that the Estate will not have any significant retail development that might compete with other existing town centres and the overall retail hierarchy.</p> <p>As mentioned, service authorities (including RTA) have accepted the proposal subject to a number of upgrade works being undertaken.</p>
24	26 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agree San should be expanded but link between Mt Pleasant Rd and Osborn Rd should not be permitted ▪ Osborn Rd is already busy and the intersection with Pennant Hills Rd dangerous, any increased in traffic on Osborn Rd will add to the current problems ▪ Cumulative traffic impacts of current Hornsby Council rezonings of residences bounded by Normanhurst Road, Buckingham Avenue and Huddart Avenue and this proposal need to be considered 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal, with traffic from the proposed Mt Pleasant precinct to access Pennant Hills Road via Mt Pleasant Avenue.</p> <p>The traffic analysis modelled the surrounding road networks based on existing situations, existing situations + background growth and existing situations + background growth + the proposed development. Cumulative traffic impacts have been considered as part of this development.</p>
25	27 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Acknowledge proposal will bring some advantages such as health services ▪ Size of commercial, retail, school and residential expansion is inappropriate and will have a significant impact on local environment and infrastructure, size should be reduced to better fit with site capabilities ▪ Large increases in traffic movements will result, congestion points exist at critical local road intersections, modelling assumes intersections will be improved and then states existing 	<p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p> <p>For it to be successful as a working-living community, it needs to have a</p>

				<p>conditions and ownership will constrain improvement opportunities and in some cases it will not be possible to improve current conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal will result in traffic and parking chaos especially during morning and evening rush hour and weekends ▪ No rezoning should be granted until traffic problems are solved to satisfaction of Ku-ring-gai and Hornsby councils ▪ There should be no loss of BGHF 	<p>mix of commercial, residential and retail development. It is noted that the Estate will not have any significant retail development that might compete with other existing town centres and the overall retail hierarchy.</p> <p>As mentioned, service authorities (including RTA) have accepted the proposal subject to a number of upgrade works being undertaken.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Main intersections at Pennant Hills Road, Pacific Highway, Kissing Point Road and the Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection are proposed to be upgraded as generally explained in the RTA's Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee submission dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>Traffic and parking has been modelled with regard to the proposed use and densities. A parking plan will be addressed when residential/hospital details have been finalised.</p> <p>The proposal has been assessed by the RTA who have indicated that the proposal can proceed subject to a number of road upgrade/improvement works being undertaken (as generally provided in their letter dated 18 June 2009). The development/rezoning should proceed on the basis of RTA approval.</p> <p>As mentioned above, retention of existing conservation precinct to the south east and the proposed relocation of detention basin and playing field to the north will minimise impacts on BGHF.</p>
26	27 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Object to proposal to connect Mt Pleasant Ave to Osborn Rd, based on Osborn Rd coping with increased traffic, visibility at Osborn Rd/Pennant Hills Rd intersection, intersection usability, emergency service access, pedestrian safety and BGHF ▪ Link should be removed from plans 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p>
27	27 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Osborn Rd is already crowded and increased traffic from proposal can't be accommodated without inconveniencing existing residents with only access to Pennant Hills Rd from Osborn Rd ▪ Object to proposed link, it should be removed ▪ Plan should focus on traffic signals at Mt Pleasant Rd and Pennant Hills Rd 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal, with traffic from the proposed Mt Pleasant precinct to access Pennant Hills Road via Mt Pleasant Avenue.</p> <p>RTA has confirmed that it will not support the provision of new traffic signals at the Pennant Hills Road / Mt Pleasant Avenue intersection.</p>
28	28 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about impacts on local traffic which is already bad ▪ Concerned vegetation in the area is being depleted, particularly BGHF protected under Federal and State legislation ▪ Concerned local infrastructure being overwhelmed by huge scale of project and additional population to area ▪ No rezoning should be granted until traffic problems are solved to satisfaction of local councils ▪ Should be no loss of BGHF ▪ Commercial, retail, school and residential expansion should be reduced to better fit site capabilities 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in</p>

					<p>Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>Infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. Service authorities (including RTA) have accepted the proposal subject to a number of upgrade works being undertaken.</p> <p>The proposal has been assessed by the RTA who have indicated that the proposal can proceed subject to a number of road upgrade/improvement works being undertaken (as generally provided in their letter dated 18 June 2009). The development/rezoning should proceed on the basis of RTA approval.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p> <p>For it to be successful as a working-living community, it needs to have a mix of commercial, residential and retail development. It is noted that the Estate will not have any significant retail development that might compete with other existing town centres and the overall retail hierarchy.</p>
29	28 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extra NSW Government infrastructure requirements for proposal need to be considered ▪ Documentation does not include costed RTA upgrade requirements to accommodate additional traffic ▪ Intersection at Browns Rd/Comenarra Pkwy is already at standstill during peaks and the volume continues to rise, a roundabout is required ▪ A Victorian type bushfire in the locality and through the development does not bear thinking about 	<p>Further explanation is required on what extra NSW Government infrastructure this comment relates to before a response can be provided to this point.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads. Documentation regarding costs of upgrades is not publicly available.</p> <p>In regard to the intersection of The Comenarra Parkway and Browns Road, the RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To address future traffic concerns along The Comenarra Parkway as a result of the development proposal, the RTA requires the developer to widen The Comenarra Parkway to provide two traffic lanes in each direction between Fox Valley Road and Browns Road; ▪ To facilitate vehicles turning right into and out of Browns Road as a result of future upgrades to The Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection it is recommended that consideration be given to the provision of a seagull treatment at the intersection of The Comenarra Parkway / Browns Road.

					<p>Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>A bushfire report was produced as part of this proposal (Appendix L) in accordance with the provisions of the RFS Planning for Bushfire Protection.</p>
30	29 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to proposal unless traffic issues (particularly narrow nature of Osborn Rd) and environmental impacts (particularly BGHF) are fully resolved in advance 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal and slight redesign of the school will minimise impact on BGHF.</p>
31	29 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roads on the Normanhurst side of the proposal are dead ends and any further traffic will cause more problems with traffic delays and accidents Any further development of the size of the proposal will impact native fauna, birds have been disappearing over the years with every new development 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal, with traffic from the proposed Mt Pleasant precinct to access Pennant Hills Road via Mt Pleasant Avenue. A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>As mentioned above, the Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p>
32	29 May 2009	LGA Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation provides virtually none of the effects of the proposal on the total infrastructure eg. sewerage, water, electricity and transport Nothing mentioned about bushfire, yet the site is just outside the bushfire zone Wonder whether study authors considered anything further than site proposed for development Are existing local traffic delays and proposal is to introduce many extra vehicles to already over extended facility Site should be allowed to develop, but current plan needs scaling down and thorough investigation on how each piece of infrastructure is to be handled Ku-ring-gai residents do not want to be left funding or living with development approved on ad hoc basis 	<p>Infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. Service authorities (including RTA) have accepted the proposal subject to a number of upgrade works being undertaken.</p> <p>A bushfire report was produced as part of this proposal (Appendix L) in accordance with the provisions of the RFS Planning for Bushfire Protection. The RFS letter dated confirms they have no objections to the exhibited concept plan subject to recommendations of the proposal's bushfire report being adopted.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site. As mentioned, service authorities (including RTA) have accepted the proposal subject to a number of upgrade works being undertaken.</p> <p>In accordance with planning legislation, the purpose of the concept plan</p>

					is to ensure that development on the site is considered in its entirety and not on an individual basis.
33	29 May 2009	LGA Resident	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full support for new K-12 school, current school has reputation for excellent education, offering this through to Y12 would greatly benefit community Is a need for a new secondary school that can provide proven excellence in education in the area 	Noted
34	30 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accepted need for public utilities such as the hospital to expand Development site contains sloping areas of densely covered bushland which raises fire safety issues for proposed medium density residential development Scale of proposal is disproportionate to infrastructure available in the area Site is some distance from closest train station and has no other transport except for buses Scale of development will change the natural landscape of the area which would impact property prices Objection to Ministers use of powers under Part 3A, local Councils should still have a significant role in the decision making process Proposed development is disproportional to the geographic, social, and infrastructure characteristics of the area and is also contrary to the Governments Metropolitan Strategy 	<p>A bushfire report was produced as part of this proposal (Appendix L) in accordance with the provisions of the RFS Planning for Bushfire Protection. An addendum to this report accompanies the Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>The proposed density is appropriate for any specialised centre which is a hub of employment. Public transport will improve overtime as density increases.</p> <p>Infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. Service authorities (including RTA) have accepted the proposal subject to a number of upgrade works being undertaken.</p> <p>No evidence suggests that property prices will be impacted as a result of this proposal.</p> <p>Part 3A is part of planning legislation.</p> <p>The proposal has been formulated with due consideration to site opportunity and constraints, infrastructure availability and funding requirements to enable the hospital to expand its services to reflect community demands over the next 15-20 years. We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p>
35	31 May 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing Osborn Rd/Pennant Hills Rd intersection is dangerous for vehicles and pedestrians, several accidents have occurred recently Existing Osborn Rd/Pennant Hills Rd intersection does not have sufficient turning space for large vehicles and sight lines do not meet Australian Standards Sight lines, speed limits, road widths and pedestrian safety all need to be improved at Osborn Rd/Pennant Hills Rd intersection Osborn Rd is narrow and busy, exit sight lines from Loreto do not meet Australian Standards Traffic on Osborn Rd is increased during school times and out of school activities Osborn Rd needs to be widened, on-street parking resolved and blind spots from Loreto addressed 	The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.
36	1 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing queuing at the Fox Valley Rd/Comenarra Pkwy intersection often back to Pennant Hills Rd More capacity throughout may just increase the number of short-cutters Strongly disagree with proposal for western side of Comenarra Pkwy to have temporary merging lane as will not fix problem at intersection of Comenarra/Pennant Hills Rd, short lanes are often avoided due to merging issues, will take up existing car parking and make exiting from 180 Comenarra Pkwy less safe 	A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads. This includes concept plans for the upgrade of the Fox Valley Road / Comenarra Parkway and Comenarra Parkway/Pennant Hills

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correct solution for proposal is 2 lanes turning right onto Fox Valley Rd, this would leave 1 lane to go straight ahead on Comenarra Pkwy Noting proposed increase in residents, a road link between Mt Pleasant Ave and Fox Valley Rd should be seriously investigated 9 trees behind the road and existing school sporting field should be protected, with 10m parallel to the road for the length of the field protected for a green zone to screen the larger buildings and provide habitat To be a more reasonable fit with the neighbourhood, the first row of buildings in Precinct I & J fronting Comenarra Pkwy (behind the recommended green zone) should be limited to 2 storeys given the land is already elevated and behind could be 4 storeys 	<p>Road intersections.</p> <p>A link between Mt Pleasant Ave and Fox Valley Road is unfeasible due to topography of land, impact on environmental corridors and cost.</p> <p>The possible retention of trees behind the existing school can be further investigated at the Project / Development Application stage for this precinct.</p>
37	01 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan does not mention proposals for developing and maintaining the border with Georgina CIs Particularly concerned about bushfire as boundary is steep, hard to access and has not been maintained resulting in major undergrowth Request that the boundary area be required to be maintained as suggested by Ku-ring-gai Council to SDA in March 2007 	<p>Unclear as to the intent of the Georgina Close point.</p> <p>A bushfire report was produced as part of this proposal (Appendix L) in accordance with the provisions of the RFS Planning for Bushfire Protection.</p>
38	01 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of BGHF and STIF has undisputed impacts on long term viability of the communities and is unacceptable Proposal represents 7% loss of BGHF remaining in Ku-ring-gai Plan needs to be modified to avoid loss of significant vegetation Redevelopment must use Ku-ring-gai DCP parking rates to avoid congestion in surrounding residential areas Proposal can not assume transport infrastructure upgrades will occur, development should not proceed until plans are in place to resolve transport infrastructure capacity concerns Have never made any political donations, but aware the developer, JPG have made such donations 	<p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>The traffic report (Appendix J) contained within the exhibited material provides justification as to variations to the Ku-ring-gai DCP in relation to this unique proposal. The DCP parking rates are blanket rates applied throughout the whole of the LGA and it is deemed reasonable to vary these rates (where it can be justified) if non-standard situations were to apply (as in the case of this working-living proposal).</p> <p>The proposal does not assume traffic infrastructure upgrades will just occur. Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>Information about political donations is public information and can be easily accessed.</p>
39	01 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Modelling of traffic delays at Fox Valley Rd and Pacific Hwy are way out for morning peak If Fox Valley Rd is to be a mix of 1 and 2 lanes it will be a traffic jam and there will be difficulty getting out of driveways, it is supposed to be residential but heavy vehicles use it as a short cut Concerned about bushfire risk, rules for private residents are strict and should not be any different for developers Should be more discussion on pitfalls before determination Couldn't find total housing numbers in report Additional people from proposal will swamp railway stations, there must be a plan to build better parking facilities at local stations Report doesn't mention Warrawee station, isn't it as important as the other stations 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads. Further explanation is required in relation to this statement on traffic modelling before a response can be provided to this point.</p> <p>Heavy vehicle use of Fox Valley Road is an enforcement issue for Council, the RTA or police.</p> <p>A bushfire report was produced as part of this proposal (Appendix L) in</p>

					<p>accordance with the provisions of the RFS Planning for Bushfire Protection. An addendum to this report accompanies the Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>The documentation provided was a thorough assessment of the proposal and the environmental impact, consistent with the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements.</p> <p>Housing numbers were tabulated on pages 6,7,44 and 45 of the Concept Plan document.</p> <p>The proposed density is appropriate for any specialised centre which is a hub of employment. Public transport will improve overtime as density increases and parking plans will be developed to fine tune parking on the site.</p> <p>Warrawee station is just as important as the other stations in proximity to this proposal. Its omission was an oversight.</p>
40	1 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about massive expansion, not worried what is done inside the property, but fed up with cars parked in local public streets associated with SDA ▪ Proposed extensions do not provide adequate car parking and are yet to see a car sharing exercise work ▪ Need for reduction in street parking now ▪ Hospital staff are parking in Fox Valley Shopping Centre car park and on Fox Valley Rd rather than at hospital, parking metres should be installed ▪ Fox Valley Rd couldn't cope with extra buses given narrow width and parked cars ▪ Doctors at San are very kind, but seems an executive decision to expand too much ▪ Documentation was so large some things were not evident unless you read every word ▪ Concerned by trucks on Fox Valley Rd as it is already busy ▪ Objection to any construction, digging etc near Coups Creek, due to protected native vegetation ▪ Consideration needs to be given to native birds many of which are becoming rare in suburban Sydney ▪ As long as all development kept in San property no objection, but they are already making problems on local roads, more traffic will make it impossible to drive ▪ A large multi-storey car park should be built on the San site 	<p>We understand that there are no parking restrictions that currently exist on local roads. Implementation of parking restrictions is a Council matter.</p> <p>RTA's letter to Department of Planning, dated 18 June 2009, outlines a number of road improvement / upgrade works as part of this proposal. This includes the removal of on street parking in Fox Valley Road in the form of peak hour parking or permanent parking restrictions. This needs to be conducted in consultation with Council's Local Traffic Committee.</p> <p>The need for the hospital to expand is a function of the community demand for hospital services over the next 15-20 years.</p> <p>Heavy vehicle use of Fox Valley Road is an enforcement issue for Council, the RTA or police.</p> <p>No construction works is required deep within the Coups Creek corridor.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Multi-storey carparking is proposed for the San site – details of which will follow in subsequent Project / Development applications.</p> <p>With regard to the impacts on native birds, the amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed) and full protection of the powerful owl habitat. Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p>

41	1 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed size of redevelopment will strain already overloaded local infrastructure, particularly traffic Concern proposed to link Aged Care facility in Mt Pleasant Ave with Osborn Rd Osborn Rd is narrow and there is already heavy traffic for the school, additional traffic would be a disaster 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. Service authorities (including RTA) have accepted the proposal subject to a number of upgrade works being undertaken.</p> <p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p>
42	2 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Osborn Rd can not cope with existing traffic, especially during school time 5 roads rely on Osborn Rd for access, to add more is ridiculous The Minister mustn't live locally to say the traffic lights are under utilised Pennant Hills Rd does cope now, adding more dwellings wont help, accidents that occur now at the lights indicate it wont cope 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on surrounding roads.</p>
43	2 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over last 22 years traffic has increased on Osborn Rd from local roads and Loreto Intersection of Osborn Rd and Mt Pleasant Ave is dangerous and has been subject of alarming number of road accidents Osborn Rd will not cope with proposal to connect Mt Pleasant Rd, resulting in delays and danger for pedestrians and vehicles Objection to any loss of high gum forest for proposed link More sensible and safer outcome would be to establish traffic lights at Mt Pleasant Ave in addition to Osborn Rd Objection to proposed development in general given poor local infrastructure, but if must go ahead Mt Pleasant Ave and Osborn Rd should not be linked 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p> <p>RTA has confirmed that it will not support the provision of new traffic signals at the Pennant Hills Road / Mt Pleasant Avenue intersection.</p> <p>Infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. Service authorities (including RTA) have accepted the proposal subject to a number of upgrade works being undertaken.</p>
44	2 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed link between Mt Pleasant Ave and Osborn Rd would result in beyond traffic capacity in Osborn Rd Proposed link would require widening of Osborn Rd and major changes to the intersection with Pennant Hills Rd Proposed link would mean demolition of 2 houses in Osborn Rd and removal of significant Blue Gums Proposed link would reduce property values in Osborn Demolition of houses in Mt Pleasant Ave and replacement with 3-4 storey residential blocks is not consistent with low density residential bushland setting Emergency vehicle access and evacuation of residents would be difficult using Osborn Rd, more logical to use Mt Pleasant Ave If link goes ahead all residents from Mt Pleasant wanting to turn right into Pennant Hills Rd would need to use Osborn Rd 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal and the proposed high density housing will be replaced with medium density,</p>
45	2 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned by impact of large proposal on local environment by destroying tracts of critically endangered BGHF Difficult to see how already congested local intersections between Thornleigh and Pacific Hwy at Warrawee can be improved by adding traffic generated by proposed expansion of retail and residential Expansion of roadways is constrained by the geography of the land 	<p>As mentioned, the amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared</p>

					to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing). A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.
46	2 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Total scope of proposal is overwhelming ▪ Proposal involves significant destruction of critically endangered BGHF ▪ Increase in traffic has not been fully investigated ▪ Rezoning should only be given if there is no loss of BGHF and a realistic traffic plan is developed, a much smaller development is required to achieve this 	<p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a “<i>Knowledge Asset and Key Industry</i>” and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital’s status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The proposed rezoning scheme has been revisited. It is proposed to delete the R1 General Residential zone and utilise the R2, R3 and R4 zones with a similar list of permissible uses as proposed by Ku-ring-gai Council in their exhibited Town Centre LEP. The B4 zone has been deleted and replaced with the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone and , it is noted that the SP2 zone has been expanded to include the residential precinct to the immediate south of the hospital precinct.</p>
47	2 June 2009	MLC	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No rezoning should be approved unless there is no loss of critically endangered BGHF and traffic problems solved to satisfaction of local councils ▪ Expansion of hospital and nursing faculty may not overwhelm the local infrastructure and environment, but school, commercial and residential expansion is more concerning ▪ Large increase in traffic movements will result from the proposal, congestion points exist at critical local road intersections, modelling assumes intersections will be improved and then states existing conditions and ownership will constrain improvement opportunities and in some cases it will not be possible to improve current conditions ▪ Support for moderate expansion of hospital 	<p>The proposed rezoning scheme has been revisited.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to</p>

					<p>2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>The proposal has been formulated with due consideration to site opportunity and constraints, infrastructure availability and funding requirements to enable the hospital to expand its services to reflect community demands over the next 15-20 years. We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p> <p>Further explanation is required in relation to those concerns that relate to the school, commercial and residential expansion before a response can be provided to this point.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads. Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009.</p>
48	2 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing traffic grid lock at Mt Pleasant Ave and Pennant Hills intersection would be significantly worsened making the intersection more dangerous ▪ Proposal would over turn the L&E Court ruling preventing further development of the site without properly addressing all factors of the ruling ▪ Concerned Mt Pleasant Ave does not have capacity for effective evacuation of residents in event of bushfire 	<p>Following extensive feedback from local residents during the exhibition period, and ongoing discussions with the RTA, additional traffic modelling was conducted regarding the access options for the Mt Pleasant Precinct. Due to the nature of development proposed in this precinct (ie partly associated with the retirement village with typically lower vehicle movements or movements outside of peak periods), analysis estimated that the Mt Pleasant precinct would generate about 46 additional trips during peak hours.</p> <p>Based on RTA guidelines, confinement of additional traffic to Mt Pleasant Avenue would not elevate the traffic level on this road above the RTA environmental goals for this road.</p> <p>This modelling therefore indicates that the proposed Mt Pleasant Precinct development could still satisfactorily proceed with access only via Mt Pleasant Avenue (with no traffic control signals). It is also noted that this modelling was provided to RTA and DoP based on the exhibited Concept Plan proposal (and not the reduced Preferred Project Report proposal).</p> <p>The Osborn Road link has therefore been deleted from the proposal.</p> <p>A bushfire report was produced as part of this proposal (Appendix L) in accordance with the provisions of the RFS Planning for Bushfire Protection. In times of bushfire threat, a suite of recommendations were proposed in Appendix L of the exhibited material, in particular that, upon approval of the Concept Plan, an Emergency Liaison Committee be established by the landowner. The purpose of the committee shall be to co-ordinate the preparation of the various Estate Evacuation Plans, implement evacuation drills and reviews of the individual Evacuation Plans. The Chair Person of the Committee shall also attend the Local</p>

					Emergency Management Committee meetings and bring to those meetings and the Emergency Service Combat Agencies/support Welfare Agencies the emergency planning protocols and issues related to the various land uses within the Estate. An addendum to this report accompanies the Preferred Project Report.
49	3 June 2009	Local Business Owner	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Location of proposed retail to build on links with the existing shops is disputed as the retail areas are separated by a busy intersection ▪ Documentation indicates there is zero supermarket and grocery in Fox Valley Shopping Centre – shop 1 is a supermarket and liquor store with 350m² floor area, although given limited pasting trade has become primarily convenience shopping ▪ Resulting increase in trade from proposal warrants two similar sized supermarkets in the area, they would not compete as studies show supermarket shoppers are inclined to drive to bigger local supermarkets ▪ Inclusion of additional 2000 m² of retail floor space, particularly 1000 m² of supermarket is not supported, it would threaten the viability of the existing Fox Valley Neighbourhood Centre 	<p>It is considered necessary to include a small proportion of retail to support the proposal and the proposed location adjacent to the existing centre is the best location in the circumstances.</p> <p>The proposed neighbourhood centre would be of an order to complement the existing centre opposite.</p>
50	3 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The hospital is a valuable local asset ▪ Concerned about traffic volumes, particularly on Fox Valley Rd between Strone Ave and Comenarra Pkwy ▪ There needs to be a right hand turn bay into the hospital ▪ There is no mention of bus/taxi bays to allow 2 continuous lane flows or how many lanes and how traffic will turn and proceed at intersections ▪ Comenarra Pkwy should be 2 lanes up hill from Jordon St, there should also be a left turn lane from Comenarra Pkwy around the current school into Fox Valley Rd, an alternative would be a two lane road in the abandoned RTA corridor 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>RTA has confirmed that the Comenarra Parkway does not need to be duplicated. Widening of The Comenarra Parkway is not the controlling factor – it's the intersections at either end that need to be modified to increase efficiency. The traffic analysis indicated that, with this development, The Comenarra Parkway fall within the environmental road capacity set by the RTA. Main intersections at Pennant Hills Road, Pacific Highway, Kissing Point Road and the Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection is proposed to be upgraded as generally explained in the RTA's Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee submission dated 18 June 2009.</p>
51	3 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There is a lack of visibility at the end of Osborn Rd near the traffic lights ▪ There is a lack of visibility at the entry to Loreto from Osborn Rd ▪ Buses entering/existing the school need to brake in Osborn Rd and wait ▪ Weekend school activities result in on-street parking in Osborn Rd being at capacity ▪ Already can sometimes take more than one set of lights to turn right from Osborn Rd into Pennant Hills Rd ▪ There are regularly accidents at the Osborn Rd/Pennant Hills Rd intersection ▪ The forest at Loreto will be corroded by need to widen the road ▪ While supporting the development, Osborn Rd traffic requirements need to be carefully considered 	The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.
52	4 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Existing amount of traffic in Normanhurst is phenomenal, particularly with cars using Comenarra Pkwy as a 'back way' ▪ Proposed development will stuff up the quiet community except in peak hours ▪ Share car scheme – yeah right ▪ Almost 30% bushland kept is nothing ▪ Its all about the money not the residents ▪ Existing traffic is bad don't make it worse 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The revised Concept Plan involves the deletion of the proposed development and roads to the east of Fox Valley Road and retain conservation precinct and the area's amenity.</p>

					<p>Details of the car sharing scheme are provided in the documentation and it is anticipated that proper functioning of the proposal will be subject to a condition of consent.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p>
53	4 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Environmental factors have been dismissed, the remaining valuable BGHF should be protected ▪ Traffic movement should be essential element in Town Planning ▪ Appalling traffic congestion at peak times on all access routes can not be ignored in this overdevelopment proposal ▪ Addition of over 650 dwellings, commercial and retail is sheer madness ▪ Must be a more sensible civic strategy for expansion of the hospital 	<p>As mentioned above, the Preferred Plan involves the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school sports field and relocation of stormwater detention facilities to minimise impacts on native flora and fauna and in particular minimise its impact on loss of BGHF.</p> <p>In addition to all other factors (including the needs of the hospital to expand), traffic, bushfire and ecology were the three main considerations that were focused on in preparing the Concept Plan. In fact there were numerous iterations of the Concept Plan based on these three main considerations. Further refinements have occurred following exhibition, as documented in the attached Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>Traffic issues are not being ignored. A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The proposed residential development is required to ensure the hospital development feasible. The proposed residential density is appropriate for the specialised centre and is consistent with other densities of other developments, namely the UTS development.</p>
54	4 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic congestion is already bad and will worsen, likely figures presently under represent existing situation ▪ Parking problems will spill into neighbouring residential streets ▪ Area is not suitable for retrofitting higher traffic density ▪ Train stations are not conveniently close ▪ Area proposed for school is relatively small and lacks playing fields, opportunity exists to provide more extensive playing fields for locals ▪ Once land is rezoned commercial and residential the entire area could be open to piece-meal stakeholders ▪ Constructions impacts/inconvenience would be prolonged ▪ Medium to high-rise buildings would change the quiet, leafy suburban character of the area ▪ Far better areas exist close to train stations for this kind of development, eg adjacent to Thornleigh Station ▪ Before massive developments are randomly plonked into suburban areas concept for greater Sydney should be addressed and approved by community including not requiring 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Onsite parking is proposed as outlined in the traffic analysis (Appendix J of exhibited Concept Plan).</p> <p>The proposed density is appropriate for any specialised centre which is considered an employment hub. The proposed residential density is consistent with other densities of other developments, namely the UTS development. Public transport will improve overtime as density increases.</p> <p>The proposed location of the school, and its size, reflects the future</p>

				retrofitting, orientation towards transport/employment hubs, locking in of green/open spaces and integration of cycle tracks	<p>needs of the school (including its possible expansion). Its land size allocation reflects the size Department of Education expects for government run schools.</p> <p>The comment regarding provision of playing fields for existing local residents is a Council matter (Section 94).</p> <p>This Concept Plan provides a coordinated approach to how the site will be developed into the future. Over the last 100 year association with this site, development of the land has been conducted in a piece-meal approach. Future development of the site needs to be consistent with this Concept Plan. It is expected that the only stakeholder that will make decisions on how this proposal is constructed is the landowner (SDA).</p> <p>In regard to the comment on construction impacts, it is expected that the consent authority will require a construction / noise / traffic management plan produced and submitted prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate to allow onsite construction to commence.</p> <p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a “<i>Knowledge Asset and Key Industry</i>” and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital’s status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p>
55	5 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal will generate increased traffic and environmental problems and adversely affect the quality of life of nearby existing residents ▪ Current traffic banks up to Lucinda Ave from Pacific Hwy in morning peak and from Comenarra Pkwy in evening ▪ Comenarra Pkwy is a car park from Pennant Hills to Fox Valley Rd at peak hours, current congestion makes it difficult for existing residents to drive locally ▪ Proposal will add to congestion and air pollution 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The additional development and associated traffic is considered justified in this location. Being located directly adjacent to employment will assist in ensuring the neighbourhood achieves high sustainability.</p>
56	5 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal is inappropriate in size and density and out of character with predominantly freestanding houses on large blocks ▪ It will cause overcrowding, competition for local services and change the character of the neighbourhood ▪ Fox Valley Rd is already at choking point during peak periods, making it 4 lanes instead of 2 will only exacerbate problems of getting onto Pacific Hwy and Comenarra Pkwy ▪ Removing parking from Fox Valley Rd will clog side streets, or people will have to pay for parking ▪ Nonsense most people will use bicycles and not have cars ▪ Proposal will exceed 10 dwelling per hectare in Metro Strategy 	<p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a “<i>Knowledge Asset and Key Industry</i>” and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital’s status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site. The proposed residential and commercial/retail development densities are considered appropriate for a specialized centre.</p> <p>Widening of The Comenarra Parkway is not the controlling factor – it’s</p>

					<p>the intersections at either end that need to be modified to increase efficiency. The traffic analysis indicated that, with this development, Fox Valley Road falls within the environmental road capacity set by the RTA. Main intersections at Pennant Hills Road, Pacific Highway, Kissing Point Road and the Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection are proposed to be upgraded as generally explained in the RTA's Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee submission dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements and traffic generation.</p> <p>The proposed dwelling density is considered appropriate for its location within a specialised employment hub.</p>
57	5 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Currently difficult to access Browns Rd and problem will get worse from proposal, it will at least require a roundabout at Browns Rd and Comenarra Pkwy intersection 	<p>In regard to the intersection of The Comenarra Parkway and Browns Road, the RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To address future traffic concerns along The Comenarra Parkway as a result of the development proposal, the RTA requires the developer to widen The Comenarra Parkway to provide two traffic lanes in each direction between Fox Valley Road and Browns Road; ▪ To facilitate vehicles turning right into and out of Browns Road as a result of future upgrades to The Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection it is recommended that consideration be given to the provision of a seagull treatment at the intersection of The Comenarra Parkway / Browns Road. <p>Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>In regard to the comment on additional traffic plant during development phased, it is expected that the consent authority will require a construction / noise / traffic management plan produced and submitted prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate to allow onsite construction to commence.</p>
58	5 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consideration to the residence in the area must be give a priority ▪ No rezoning should be granted until traffic problems are solved to satisfaction of local councils ▪ Should be no loss of Blue Gum High Forest ▪ Commercial, retail, school and residential expansion should be reduced to better fit site capabilities 	<p>A consultation program was conducted during the Public Exhibition period which included web information, neighbourhood letterbox drop and door knock, information sessions for staff and residents, public information day and media coverage.</p> <p>The RTA's Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee submission dated 18 June 2009 confirms they have no objections to the exhibited concept plan subject to works being undertaken as generally described within their letter.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p> <p>For it to be successful as a working-living community, it needs to have a mix of commercial, residential and retail development. It is noted that the</p>

					<p>Estate will not have any significant retail development that might compete with other existing town centres and the overall retail hierarchy.</p> <p>The proposal has been assessed by the RTA who have indicated that the proposal can proceed subject to a number of road upgrade/improvement works being undertaken (as generally provided in their letter dated 18 June 2009). The development/rezoning should proceed on the basis of RTA approval.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The Preferred Plan proposes to minimise impacts on BGHF through the reduction of vegetation loss and significant retention of BGHF and STIF areas.</p> <p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p>
59	5 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned height of proposed dwellings/buildings in E of Precinct E Residential East Area will result in overlooking/loss of privacy and overshadowing of existing dwellings in Georgina Ave, particularly given steep topography ▪ Redirection of surface run off from adjacent catchments should not be permitted ▪ Concerned that large increase of hard surface run off/redirection of stormwater flows increase risk of properties in Georgina Ave with natural watercourses being flooded ▪ ACA have done little to maintain boundary with Georgina Ave properties for bushfire safety and anticipated that nothing will change ▪ Toe of embankment for proposed stormwater retention basin could possibly encroach into properties in Georgina Ave and needs to be relocated and catchments feeding into it must be limited to those that currently exist 	<p>The residential east precinct has been deleted (excluding the lots fronting The Comenarra Parkway). These comments relating to existing dwellings in Georgina Ave are therefore considered to be addressed.</p> <p>A bushfire report was produced as part of this proposal (Appendix L) in accordance with the provisions of the RFS Planning for Bushfire Protection. An addendum to this report accompanies the Preferred Project Report.</p>
60	7 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal is not in keeping with areas quiet, leafy nature ▪ Site does not, nor could not support the required infrastructure to support increase in population and traffic ▪ Current roads and intersections that lead to the site are close or at capacity particularly intersection of Fox Valley/Pacific Hwy and Fox Valley/Lucinda Ave, causing traffic delays ▪ Plans don't indicate upgrades for these intersections unlike entry to hospital, instead indicate RTA bare some of the costs of upgrades and understate area can't support the traffic ▪ Instead of reducing density a car sharing scheme is proposed, unlikely it will work due to lack of public transport ▪ If approved proposed upgrades may increase traffic as cars use area to avoid other delays ▪ Wahroonga and Warrawee stations are closest to the site and both have existing access problems in peak periods due to the number of students, another school would result in more students at these stations ▪ Documentation unclear as to what 'linkages to an integrated transport network' is ▪ Town centres plan is for higher density development along train corridors, site is not in 	<p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a "<i>Knowledge Asset and Key Industry</i>" and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p> <p>Infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. Service authorities (including RTA) have accepted the proposal subject to a number of upgrade works being undertaken.</p>

				<p>these corridors but within quiet residential streets with limited public transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Surrounding bush and limited access is of concern for bushfire and evacuation ▪ Development should not impact frog or wildlife populations associated with watercourse that runs from SE corner past Campbell Drive ▪ Ridge location means noise from development will travel and increase noise in quiet area 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads. Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>The proposed residential density is appropriate for the specialized centre and public transport is considered to improve over time.</p> <p>An addendum to the bushfire report accompanies the Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>As mentioned above, the revised Preferred Plan involves the retention of a significant amount of vegetation with the removal of most of the proposed development in the eastern precinct and redesign of the school. This will ensure impacts on native flora are minimised and protect wildlife populations.</p>
61	7 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned very large project has only been on public exhibition for a short time ▪ Increase in traffic in the area is a major concern, there is need to improve traffic flow before any additional persons are added ▪ 11,000 construction jobs will result in increased traffic, unclear where tradesmen will park ▪ Concerned information provided at open day regarding church staying the same was misleading as plans show 1600m² increase ▪ No references to 'walking school bus', would be good idea to reduce traffic chaos associated with new school ▪ Existing bus service is not frequent, plans are unclear as to whether services will be increased ▪ Should be facilities for the public as part of the proposal, eg branch of Council library and public swimming pool ▪ Object to any reduction of native vegetation, site is large and development can be made without reducing bushland 	<p>The project was placed on exhibition for the statutory period of time. During the exhibition period, the Minister for Planning authorised the exhibition period to be extended for a further 2 weeks to give the community the opportunity to read and understand the documentation to inform submissions.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Construction workers will not be onsite all at the one time. This is a 20year plan with numerous stages. In regard to the comment on construction impacts, it is expected that the consent authority will require a construction / noise / traffic management plan produced and submitted prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate to allow onsite construction to commence.</p> <p>Documentation on display at the Community Information day was obtained from the Concept Plan document.</p> <p>Public transport will improve over time as residential density increases.</p> <p>Council will collect Section 94 contributions from this development which will go toward community infrastructure and services as outlined in Council's Section 94 plan.</p> <p>As mentioned, the amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF</p>

					and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).
62	8 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Multi-storey urban development is not logical as site is 2km from rail station ▪ Proposal fails to provide adequate car parking, even to minimal standard DCP rates ▪ Though not clear in documentation, appears much of proposed car parking is not underground but in open space having major impact on visual environment ▪ Proposal fails to allocate adequate "family space" ▪ Given distance from station 2 cars will be needed per unit ▪ Thinking people will not purchase the units so they will be moved to public housing recipients who have no choice 	<p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a "Knowledge Asset and Key Industry" and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p> <p>The traffic report (Appendix J) contained within the exhibited material provides justification as to variations to the Ku-ring-gai DCP in relation to this unique proposal. The DCP parking rates are blanket rates applied throughout the whole of the LGA and it is deemed reasonable to vary these rates (where it can be justified) if non-standard situations were to apply (as in the case of this working-living proposal).</p> <p>Most of the onsite car parking, as shown in Figures 79 and 80 in the exhibited concept plan is designated as subterranean parking.</p> <p>Passive open space is provided in between building clusters and surrounding green space. The central square, as shown in Figure 45 as well as the front lawn of the San provide two examples of passive open space areas.</p> <p>There is no proposal to transform this proposal into a public housing estate.</p>
63	8 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unconvinced plans to alleviate traffic congestion in area are sufficient ▪ Fox Valley/Comenarra junction is already struggling with traffic during peak periods, additional roundabouts/junctions on Fox Valley Rd will not alleviate the situation ▪ Concerned about impact of commercial traffic/pollution/safety on pre-school on Fox Valley Rd ▪ Difficult to visualise the aesthetic impact from plans eg height of buildings, removal of trees and impact of the surrounding canopy 	<p>The proposed upgrades to road infrastructure have been supported by the Roads and Traffic Authority.</p> <p>Extensive traffic analysis and modelling has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements and generation expected in relation to the school, hospital and residential uses.</p>
64	8 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern Osborn Rd is to be hijacked for through traffic ▪ Osborn Rd is narrow and already full ▪ Support for traffic lights at Mt Pleasant Ave ▪ If approved non-residential traffic will use Osborn Rd as a shortcut ▪ Opposed to overall scale of development as not in keeping with residential area ▪ BGHF is now listed as critically endangered ▪ Residents should have been consulted first, glossy brochures are sugar coating proposal 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p> <p>RTA has confirmed that it will not support the provision of new traffic signals at the Pennant Hills Road / Mt Pleasant Avenue intersection.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention</p>

					<p>facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>In preparing the concept plan, presentations were made to the Community Reference Group to obtain information and disseminate information back to their constituents. The Community Reference Group is independently facilitated and is made up of representatives from Kuring-gai Council (Councillors and staff), local residents, STEP Community Environment representative, San and SDA. Separate presentations were also provided to onsite user groups. We have satisfied our Director General Requirements regarding consultation.</p>
65	8 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concept Plan does not adequately fall within Schedule 1 of MP SEPP as proposed residential development greatly exceeds any other component and should be modified to only development reasonably related to the hospital ▪ Proposal is for three distinct residential development precincts with little interaction, major local impact will be increased traffic on already busy roads ▪ Consent authorities to best control such development is local councils, using established consultation processes 	<p>The capital value of the proposal exceeds \$15 million and is therefore of the kind described in Category 18 of Schedule 1, Group 7- Health and Public service facilities of Part 3A projects, outlined in the Major Projects SEPP.</p> <p>The value of the residential component of the project exceeds \$100 million indicating that this portion of the project is also a Major Project as defined in Category 13 of Schedule 1, Group 5 – Residential, Commercial or Retail projects.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Part 3A is part of planning legislation and the Major Projects SEPP is a function of this legislation. The Minister for Planning is the responsible consent authority in relation to Major Projects such as this one.</p>
66	8 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal will cause excessive increase in traffic on roads which are already jammed ▪ Fox Valley Rd and Comenarra Pkwy feed into larger roads which already can't cope with traffic and area subject of daily delays ▪ Suggestion to make Fox Valley Rd 2 lanes will not work as will only cause congestion when it reverts back to 1 lane ▪ Preservation of BGHF does not appear mentioned in documentation ▪ Development of site for housing to raise capital for hospital does not constitute "State Significance", proposal should be considered as 3 separate developments: educational facilities; housing development and hospital expansion 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>The notion of considering this proposal as 3 separate projects is a fragmented way of dealing with planning matters and is not supported.</p>
67	8 June	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for overall development concept ▪ Objection to installation of left hand turn lane at Kissing Point Rd as it would cause a 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic</p>

	2009			<p>bottleneck causing more traffic than already exists, the nature strip has major underground utility infrastructure and existing landscaping, much of the nature strip is private land, existing rear driveway access would be impacted and potential subdivision ability would be effected</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Installation of left hand turn lane at Kissing Point Rd should not be considered in overall project 	<p>movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads. Such recommended upgrades includes Kissing Point Road / Comenarra Parkway intersection (as amended via point 3 in RTA's letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009).</p>
68	8 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about proposed link road between Mt Pleasant Ave and Osborn Rd Osborn Rd and Currawong Ave are already at capacity, with Osborn Rd often above capacity due to 6 residential feeder roads and school traffic Lower half of Osborn Rd is not wide enough for 2 lanes of traffic when accounting street parking, there is also a visibility issue for top half of Osborn Rd Osborn/Pennant Hills intersection is already dangerous, concerned only matter of time before a fatality and that is without increasing the traffic More families are moving into the area and there is a dearth of decent local parks, would be a shame if residents couldn't enjoy – due to increased traffic congestion their locality for recreation 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p> <p>The provision of local parks is a Council responsibility, as provided for in their Section 94 program. In terms of traffic congestion comments, a traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p>
69	8 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No rezoning should be granted until traffic problems are solved to satisfaction of local councils Commercial, retail, school and residential expansion should be reduced to better fit site capabilities 	<p>The proposal has been assessed by the RTA who have indicated that the proposal can proceed subject to a number of road upgrade/improvement works being undertaken (as generally provided in their letter dated 18 June 2009). The development/rezoning should proceed on the basis of RTA approval.</p> <p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p>
70	8 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose the substantial number of dwellings to be offered for sale as local roads do not cater for such an increase and it will add to congestion Comenarra Pkwy is already a standstill during peak hours preventing local residents from leaving side streets Fox Valley Rd is already congested by those seeking free parking, proposal will worsen this unless adequate free parking is provided 	<p>Based on the exhibited proposal, a traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Plans are in place to upgrade a number of intersections along the Comenarra Parkway, as recommended by the RTA in their letter dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>Parking provision has been made within the estate for onsite parking. We understand that there are no parking restrictions that currently exist on local roads. Further consideration of parking will be had as part of the separate hospital proposal.</p> <p>RTA's letter mentioned above outlines a number of road improvement / upgrade works as part of this proposal. This includes the removal of on street parking in Fox Valley Road in the form of peak hour parking or permanent parking restrictions. This needs to be conducted in consultation with Council's Local Traffic Committee.</p>
71	8 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed 3 storey unit blocks located close to northern boundary of site will overlook/overshadow existing dwellings in Rivertop Close and Osborn Rd and there is no room for screen planting 	<p>There is no evidence to suggest property values will be impacted as a result of this proposal.</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern existing trees would need to be removed for these proposed unit blocks reducing privacy and eroding existing bushland views 3 storey unit blocks are out of character with surrounding low density dwellings Property values would be negatively impacted Osborn Rd is already overburdened with local resident and school traffic, the proposed access from Mt Pleasant Ave would worsen the situation 	<p>The buildings adjacent to Rivertop Close have been reverted to townhouses. Being located to the south, no overshadowing will occur.</p> <p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal and the proposed high density housing on to the north of Mt Pleasant Avenue will be replaced by medium density housing.</p>
72	8 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Osborn Rd traffic volumes are at capacity from existing local resident and school traffic Intersection of Pennant Hills/Osborn Rd is dangerous, narrow for large turning vehicles and has poor visibility Enlarging Osborn Rd would impact on avenue of BGHF and local bush environment 3 storey buildings proposed on Mt Pleasant Ave are out of character with surrounding bushland setting Mt Pleasant Ave development should be scaled back and traffic signals added at intersection of Pennant Hills Rd and Mt Pleasant Ave Proposed link between Mt Pleasant Ave and Osborn Rd should be deleted 	<p>Following extensive feedback from local residents during the exhibition period, and ongoing discussions with the RTA, additional traffic modelling was conducted regarding the access options for the Mt Pleasant Precinct. Due to the nature of development proposed in this precinct (ie partly associated with the retirement village with typically lower vehicle movements or movements outside of peak periods), analysis estimated that the Mt Pleasant precinct would generate about 46 additional trips during peak hours.</p> <p>Based on RTA guidelines, confinement of additional traffic to Mt Pleasant Avenue would not elevate the traffic level on this road above the RTA environmental goals for this road.</p> <p>This modelling therefore indicates that the proposed Mt Pleasant Precinct development could still satisfactorily proceed with access only via Mt Pleasant Avenue (with no traffic control signals). It is also noted that this modelling was provided to RTA and DoP based on the exhibited Concept Plan proposal (and not the reduced Preferred Project Report proposal).</p> <p>RTA has confirmed that it will not support the provision of new traffic signals at the Pennant Hills Road / Mt Pleasant Avenue intersection.</p> <p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal and the proposed high density housing to the north of Mt Pleasant Avenue will be replaced by medium density housing.</p>
73	8 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Understand need to upgrade hospital, but inclusion of K-12 school, retail and residential is too great for Fox Valley Rd and Comenarra Pkwy to support Sufficient safe pedestrian use of existing infrastructure has not been proposed, it will be unsafe for children and people with disabilities and difficult for pedestrians to cross dual lane roads/roundabouts Has been significant increase in traffic at the Lucinda/Fox Valley roundabout over past year which will only get worse from proposal Car sharing scheme may help in small way, but will not alleviate volume of traffic during hospital visiting hours and school time Area was selected as quiet, unspoilt and safe, should remain that way Proposal is just too large a scale 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads. Fox Valley Road and Comenarra Parkway are deemed capable of accepting the additional traffic this proposal creates.</p> <p>With regard to pedestrian safety, particularly in relation to the children and disabled, the concern is noted. It is recognised that satisfactory drop off and pick up arrangements will be required. Details of this will be provided at Project Application stage.</p> <p>Plans are in place, as endorsed by RTA, to upgrade the Lucinda / Fox Valley Road roundabout to cater not only for this proposal but future growth in the area.</p> <p>Extensive traffic analysis and modelling has been carried out on the anticipated traffic generation and parking demand. Details of the car sharing scheme are provided in the documentation.</p> <p>The proposal has been formulated with due consideration to site opportunity and constraints, infrastructure availability and funding</p>

					requirements to enable the hospital to expand its services to reflect community demands over the next 15-20 years. We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.
74	8 June 2009	Local Resident	Other	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Traffic calming devices should be installed on proposed street linking Fox Valley Rd to Warwick PI ▪ Proposed houses on Comenarra Pkwy east of Fox Valley Rd should have no direct access to Comenarra Pkwy ▪ Intersection upgrades at Fox Valley/Comenarra and Pennant Hills/Comenarra should occur before redevelopment of commercial and residential precincts ▪ Overhead pedestrian bridges should be installed on northern and eastern side of Fox Valley/Comenarra intersection and Fox Valley/hospital entrance for increased pedestrian traffic ▪ Bus inlays should be installed on both sides of Fox Valley Rd near hospital and new school so traffic is not impeded ▪ Require left hand only turn for exit from commercial buildings marked blue on Plan ▪ No stopping/parking should be allowed between Comenarra Pkwy and new school ▪ Permanent speed camera should be installed on Comenarra Pkwy for steep slope ▪ Proposed car parking rates should be reviewed, they are considerably less than current standards ▪ Area has little good public transport and dependant on vehicle travel, reduced parking and vehicle sharing will not work in area ▪ Subsidised bus services should be provided for first 5 years after residential development ▪ S94 contribution should be made to upgrade rundown Regional Park on opposite side of Comenarra Pkwy ▪ Special entry/exit points at new school for drop off/pick up should be provided ▪ Suitable fencing/landscaping should be provided around dams/ponds 	<p>The link from Fox Valley Road to Warwick Place has been removed due to the deletion (in part) of the residential east precinct. It is proposed to investigate installation of a minor road at the rear of the existing dwellings that front The Comenarra Parkway that connects Warwick Place to The Comenarra Parkway. It is considered that this may assist in enhancing east and west sight distances along The Comenarra Parkway (exiting from Warwick Place).</p> <p>There are no plans proposed for installation of overhead pedestrian bridges.</p> <p>Provision of bus inlays and vehicle entry/exit points from commercial buildings can be investigated during detail design.</p> <p>On-street parking on Fox Valley Road is proposed to be removed in the form of either peak hour parking or permanent parking restrictions.</p> <p>Installation of speed camera's relate to an enforcement issue and is not a function of this proposal.</p> <p>The traffic report (Appendix J) contained within the exhibited material provides justification as to variations to the Ku-ring-gai DCP in relation to this unique proposal. The DCP parking rates are blanket rates applied throughout the whole of the LGA and it is deemed reasonable to vary these rates (where it can be justified) if non-standard situations were to apply (as in the case of this working-living proposal).</p> <p>Extensive traffic analysis and modelling has been carried out on the anticipated traffic generation and parking demand. It is anticipated that public transport will increase as density develops. Details of the car sharing scheme are provided in the documentation. It is anticipated that proper functioning of the proposed scheme will be subject to a condition of consent.</p> <p>On 17 December 2008, the Premier, the Hon. Nathan Rees MP, announced a package of reforms to infrastructure levies, including a change to the way that State infrastructure contributions are calculated, by removing rail infrastructure and bus subsidies – leading to a reduction in the charges. The responsibility for providing public transport infrastructure for greenfield housing sites, infill development and employment lands lies with the State Government.</p> <p>Section 94 contributions are proposed to be paid consistent with the relevant Section 94 plan in place at the time of development.</p> <p>Provision of designated entry/exit points to the school for drop off / pick up as well as fencing / landscaping for stormwater management devices can be investigated during detail design.</p>

75	8 June 2009	Community Member	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Size and scope of proposal is unacceptably large and out of character with surrounding suburbs ▪ Proposal will destroy sustainability of ecosystems which are rare and significant ▪ EA makes false and misleading conclusions which brings into question the whole report ▪ Proposal will have negative impact on local and regional traffic flow, during peak hours local major intersections can not cope, additional traffic will result in additional congestion ▪ Proposed upgraded intersection will not alleviate current or additional traffic from the proposal ▪ Proposed combined development will overwhelm local infrastructure and environment ▪ Car sharing scheme is questionable and such schemes have not been proven effective in NSW ▪ Given isolated nature of site any promotion of modal shift to public transport is likely to have little practical effect ▪ There has been little public consultation and the developer is a major donor to the Labor Party ▪ Recommended mitigation and management strategies for threatened species and communities do not adequately address proposed reduction in biodiversity, there should be no impact ▪ Hollow bearing trees to be retained are potential fuel in a bushfire ▪ Stormwater and drainage strategy may not be effective given climate change impacts, not enough attention given to water quality retention and treatment ▪ Noise and air pollution is not adequately addressed given local topography ▪ Object to rezoning 	<p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a “<i>Knowledge Asset and Key Industry</i>” and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital’s status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site. It is noted that the Estate will not have any significant retail development that might compete with other existing town centres and the overall retail hierarchy.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>Further explanation is required as to the basis of the comment that the EA is false and misleading before a response can be provided.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads. Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>Infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. Service authorities have confirmed this in writing to Department of Planning during the exhibition period.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that the Car sharing scheme will not work, particularly as the site presents a unique opportunity to create a living-working community.</p> <p>The proposed residential densities are considered appropriate for a specialised centre of this size. Transport infrastructure is anticipated to improve over time.</p> <p>Extensive consultation has occurred, over and above the statutory consultation requirements. Consultation conducted during the exhibition period is outlined in the Preferred Project Report. Political donations have nothing to do with public consultation obligations.</p>
----	-------------	------------------	-----------	--	--

					<p>An addendum to the bushfire report accompanies the Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>Further explanation is required as to the basis of objection to the rezoning before a response can be provided.</p>
76	9 June 2009	Local School	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned planned residential expansion in Mt Pleasant Ave behind Loreto school grounds ▪ Loreto has worked closely with Council and residents on recent DAs to create a safe traffic environment around the school ▪ Increased traffic in Osborn Rd and Mt Pleasant Ave will place pressure on road system, potentially impact safety of students and Loreto road usage ▪ Request developer required to consider and document existing and long term needs of the school and part of a Traffic Management Plan, the school is happy to meet and discuss but to date haven't been consulted ▪ Concerned any through road in Osborn Rd would impact protected Blue Gum Forest immediately adjacent to Osborn Rd, which school has worked hard to protect 	<p>Further explanation is required as to the concerns of developing in the Mt Pleasant precinct before a response can be provided.</p> <p>Following extensive feedback from local residents during the exhibition period, and ongoing discussions with the RTA, additional traffic modelling was conducted regarding the access options for the Mt Pleasant Precinct. Due to the nature of development proposed in this precinct (ie partly associated with the retirement village with typically lower vehicle movements or movements outside of peak periods), analysis estimated that the Mt Pleasant precinct would generate about 46 additional trips during peak hours.</p> <p>Based on RTA guidelines, confinement of additional traffic to Mt Pleasant Avenue would not elevate the traffic level on this road above the RTA environmental goals for this road.</p> <p>This modelling therefore indicates that the proposed Mt Pleasant Precinct development could still satisfactorily proceed with access only via Mt Pleasant Avenue (with no traffic control signals). It is also noted that this modelling was provided to RTA and DoP based on the exhibited Concept Plan proposal (and not the reduced Preferred Project Report proposal).</p> <p>Happy to engage in consultation with the school as required.</p> <p>The Osborn Road link has therefore been deleted from the proposal.</p>
77	9 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Site is distant from established public transport links and not within reasonable walking distance of a rail station ▪ Area can not accommodate massive increase in traffic associated with proposed increase in residential population and jobs ▪ Unless Estate is a ghetto/closed community proposed car share scheme will be unworkable ▪ Traffic on Fox Valley Rd and Comenarra Pkwy in peak periods already exceeds capacity, how can this be rectified and why hasn't it been already? ▪ Local terrain does not permit worthwhile road widening ▪ Additional traffic would increase pollution and destroy amenity of the area ▪ Limited parking proposed will do nothing to speed up traffic flow ▪ Hospital visitors parking at local shopping centre is an ongoing problem and impacts viability of centre, with local residents going elsewhere to shop if there is no parking ▪ The Estate may not be able to evacuate hospital patients and residents in bushfire events the resulting congestion on Fox Valley Rd could be fatal ▪ Electricity system does not currently provide a fully reliable service, questionable how it would cope with increased demand ▪ Local residents would be affected for a number of years by construction impacts ▪ Disagree there is a need for proposed retail area, locality is already well served ▪ Development is not State significant as hospital and school are private not public facilities, while proposal fits into definition of hospital under Part 3A the major component is commercial non-hospital development 	<p>Extensive modelling has been carried out to determine the proposed density levels and site suitability. It is considered that public transport will be improved overtime.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The proposed working / living community provides an excellent opportunity to establish a car share scheme. There is no evidence to suggest that the scheme will not work.</p> <p>For most part, road widening does not need to occur.</p> <p>Evidence suggests that removing street parking (either completely or during peak hours) increases the efficiency of the road.</p> <p>No evidence suggests that hospital visitors park at the Fox Valley shops. The Fox Valley shops have timed parking restrictions which are enforced by Council.</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal is inappropriate in peaceful, beautiful area ▪ Development of hospital and school would be acceptable, but huge residential development with increased pollution and no supporting transport infrastructure will cause problems now and in future ▪ Concerned by developer reputation and track record ▪ Concerned CEO of San Hospital has sold house and moved out of area 	<p>In times of bushfire threat, a suite of recommendations were proposed in Appendix L of the exhibited material, in particular that, upon approval of the Concept Plan, an Emergency Liaison Committee be established by the landowner. The purpose of the committee shall be to co-ordinate the preparation of the various Estate Evacuation Plans, implement evacuation drills and reviews of the individual Evacuation Plans. The Chair Person of the Committee shall also attend the Local Emergency Management Committee meetings and bring to those meetings and the Emergency Service Combat Agencies/support Welfare Agencies the emergency planning protocols and issues related to the various land uses within the Estate. An addendum to this report accompanies the Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>Infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. Regarding electricity supply, Energy Australia provided advice to Dept Planning on 14 May 2009 advising that several new electrical substations on the property is required and at least one high voltage underground cable back to Energy Australia's Turramurra Zone substation may be required to supply the site at the developer's cost.</p> <p>In regard to the comment on impacts during construction phases, it is expected that the consent authority will require a construction / noise / traffic management plan produced and submitted prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate to allow onsite construction to commence.</p> <p>The premise of this proposal is to create a working / living community – where most of the needs of the onsite workers / residents are provided onsite (thereby reducing car travel). A small retail / convenience component to the proposal is important.</p> <p>The proposal is state significant for many reasons as outlined in Appendix A of the exhibited Concept Plan.</p> <p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a “<i>Knowledge Asset and Key Industry</i>” and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p> <p>The comment about the developer's reputation and track record is unsubstantiated.</p> <p>The comment about the San CEO is not relevant.</p>
78	9 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal is a monstrosity dumped at the head waters of Lane Cove NP ▪ Questionable whether such a big hospital is needed in area, any funding should go into public not private hospitals ▪ Hospital has virtually no public transport, existing traffic problems should be fixed before a 	<p>The proposal is well planned and considered and reflects the needs of the hospital and onsite user groups.</p> <p>The proposal has been formulated with due consideration to site opportunity and constraints, infrastructure availability and funding</p>

				<p>large increase in size</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questionable need for new school for students driven in private cars and subsidised by Government ▪ Local area already has adequate supermarket facilities ▪ Questionable need for expansion of church facilities and where additional SDAs will come from ▪ Area is residential not commercial, existing commercial buildings should be relocated to commercial zones ▪ Questionable who needs additional living accommodation, looks like a ghetto ▪ Traffic problem in area is already bad enough, dread thought of traffic effect if proposal is built ▪ Loss of vegetation, habitat, open space, aesthetics, water/air quality would be horrific 	<p>requirements to enable the hospital to expand its services to reflect community demands over the next 15-20 years.</p> <p>The school and the church expansion has been driven by expected growth to occur in the area over the next 25 years.</p> <p>The premise of this proposal is to create a working / living community – where most of the needs of the onsite workers / residents are provided onsite (thereby reducing car travel). A small retail / convenience component to the proposal is important.</p> <p>As part of the proposal, land is proposed to be rezoned to reflect the existing, and future, use of the land as contemplated by the Concept Plan.</p> <p>Accommodation is needed for students, staff and other onsite users.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>In addition, there is a commitment to employ best practice water sensitive urban design measures.</p>
79	9 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fox Valley Rd is narrow, windy and has heavy traffic in peaks and turning right out of hospital difficult ▪ Proposal should address access and circulation during construction phase and when project finished ▪ Recommended movement of heavy construction vehicles be limited to evening hours only ▪ Recommended prior to any demolition/construction: Fox Valley be widened along whole frontage of Estate, traffic lights be installed where loop road meets Fox Valley Rd, turning lanes for right hand turns from Fox Valley Rd into loop roads be constructed ▪ Redevelopment is a worthy project which will benefit the community 	<p>The traffic analysis indicated that, with this development, Fox Valley Road falls within the environmental road capacity set by the RTA. The RTA have agreed with our recommendation to either completely remove, or remove in peak hours, street parking in Fox Valley Road to enhance efficiency. Fox Valley Road does not need to be widened.</p> <p>In regard to the comment on impacts during construction phases, it is expected that the consent authority will require a construction / noise / traffic management plan produced and submitted prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate to allow onsite construction to commence.</p> <p>Comment regarding the benefits this proposal provides to the community are noted.</p>
80	9 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Intersection of Osborn Rd and Pennant Hills Rd is dangerous and Osborn Rd is already at capacity for vehicles, any increase in volume on Osborn Rd is unsustainable ▪ Concerned by proposal to demolish houses in Mt Pleasant and replace with 3 storey unit blocks, which are out of character with surrounding low density dwellings ▪ Loreto Normanhurst traffic is considerable, at times it takes more than one set of lights to 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal, with traffic from the proposed Mt Pleasant precinct to access Pennant Hills Road via Mt Pleasant Avenue.</p> <p>The 3 storey unit blocks that backed onto existing residential dwellings off Osborn Road (per the exhibited Concept Plan) have been deleted and</p>

				<p>turn right or traverse the Osborn Rd and Pennant Hills Rd intersection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increase in traffic would create difficulties for emergency vehicles in event of fire and where evacuation of the Aged Care and school facilities are needed ▪ Areas of bushland on the Estate adjoining Pennant Hills Park and the National Park add to fire risk ▪ Widening of Osborn Rd will involve removal of Blue Gums, this goes against Council tree removal policies ▪ Proposal involves demolition of my house for Osborn Rd link, I have no plans or desire to move ▪ Proposal will destroy unique lifestyle created by existing cul-de-sac and devalue property ▪ The area is low density and it should stay that way, 3 storey residential blocks on Mt Pleasant Ave was cause significant change in appearance of neighbourhood ▪ Alternative options which should be considered are: scale back development in Mt Pleasant Ave or traffic signals at Mt Pleasant Ave and Pennant Hills Rd ▪ Proposed link from Mt Pleasant to Osborn Rd should be removed from the plans 	<p>replaced with medium density lots as shown in the attached Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>No properties in Osborn Road need to be acquired due to the deletion of the Osborn Road link.</p> <p>RTA has confirmed that it will not support the provision of new traffic signals at the Pennant Hills Road / Mt Pleasant Avenue intersection.</p>
81	9 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Increased traffic from development will increase danger of Warwick PI/Comenarra Pkwy intersection, cause congestion on Warwick PI and reduce on street parking by 20-25% ▪ Concerns could be addressed by traffic calming devices on the new access road joining Warwick PI, ban parking on the new access road, use vacant land between Warwick PI and Fox Valley Rd to exit onto Comenarra Pkwy for southbound traffic 	<p>The link from Fox Valley Road to Warwick Place has been removed due to the deletion (in part) of the residential east precinct. It is proposed to investigate installation of a minor road at the rear of the existing dwellings that front The Comenarra Parkway that connects Warwick Place to The Comenarra Parkway. It is considered that this may assist in enhancing east and west sight distances along The Comenarra Parkway.</p>

82	9 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Object to overdevelopment of site, proposal shows scant concern for local residents, nor increase to congestion on Pacific Hwy ▪ Fox Valley Rd is already congested in the morning and evening, this will be impassable by the extra traffic generated by the proposal ▪ Proposed school will generate more traffic in peak hours, will also slow traffic ▪ Unclear who will police proposed car policy ▪ Removal of on-street parking will push cars to park in surrounding streets, this already happens with Fox Valley shops preventing genuine customers parking ▪ Pacific Hwy is already congested ▪ Construction impacts will be lengthy given proposed staged approach ▪ Increased population will make bushfire evacuation difficult and residents will be in competition with patients to evacuate ▪ Concerned about statement that the site will be going 'green', its green now but development will make it very 'ungreen' ▪ Development should meet Green Council of Australia 5 or 6 star rating, rather than adopting ESD outcomes ▪ Studies show that greater concentration of development results in more social problems – dysfunction behaviour 	<p>Dispute that the surrounding development (and users) have not been considered as part of planning this proposal.</p> <p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads. This includes upgrades to intersections along Fox Valley Road as well as the removal (either completely or in peak periods) of street parking along the frontage of the site.</p> <p>The car share scheme is a function of the Part 3A proposal.</p> <p>No evidence suggests that hospital visitors park at the Fox Valley shops. The Fox Valley shops have timed parking restrictions which are enforced by Council.</p> <p>In regard to the comment on impacts during construction phases, it is expected that the consent authority will require a construction / noise / traffic management plan produced and submitted prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate to allow onsite construction to commence.</p> <p>In times of bushfire threat, a suite of recommendations were proposed in Appendix L of the exhibited material, in particular that, upon approval of the Concept Plan, an Emergency Liaison Committee be established by the landowner. The purpose of the committee shall be to co-ordinate the preparation of the various Estate Evacuation Plans, implement evacuation drills and reviews of the individual Evacuation Plans. The Chair Person of the Committee shall also attend the Local Emergency Management Committee meetings and bring to those meetings and the Emergency Service Combat Agencies/support Welfare Agencies the emergency planning protocols and issues related to the various land uses within the Estate. An addendum to this report accompanies the Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>The site adopts sound ESD principles.</p> <p>A social impact analysis was exhibited as part of this proposal.</p>
----	-------------	----------------	-----------	---	---

83	9 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No rezoning should be granted until traffic problems are solved to satisfaction of local councils ▪ Current peak hour traffic is unacceptable for local residents ▪ Should be no loss of BGHF, it makes the area unique and its loss would mean losing species which rely on this Forest for protection ▪ Project is huge and completely overwhelming for capabilities and resources for size of area 	<p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades. Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA are therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p>
84	9 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development should include adequate improvements to the road system and access to new development areas ▪ Road improvements must be done upfront or in conjunction with the project ▪ Finding parking near the hospital is currently impossible ▪ The development site is large, areas of BGHF should be preserved 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. The timing of works will be documented in the above VPA which will be exhibited for public viewing and prior to any construction occurring on site as contemplated by this Concept Plan.</p> <p>Additional carparking facilities are proposed within the Hospital precinct.</p> <p>As mentioned, the amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the</p>

					SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).
85	9 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about scale of proposal and impact on local traffic and BGHF No rezoning should be granted until traffic problems are solved to satisfaction of local councils Should be no loss of BGHF Commercial, retail, school and residential expansion should be reduced to better fit site capabilities 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades. Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.</p> <p>The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p>
86	9 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Major roads such as Fox Valley and Comenarra Pkwy are already congested, such a massive expansion would not support traffic increases 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Widening of The Comenarra Parkway and Fox Valley Roads is not the controlling factor – it's the intersections at either end that need to be modified to increase efficiency. The traffic analysis indicated that, with this development, both roads fall within the environmental road capacity set by the RTA. Main intersections at Pennant Hills Road, Pacific Highway, Kissing Point Road and the Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection is proposed to be upgraded as generally explained in the RTA's Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee submission dated 18 June 2009.</p>
87	10 June	Local	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned not proposed to put in place sufficient and safe upgrades to existing road 	A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and

	2009	Resident		<p>infrastructure required to service the development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Understand need to upgrade hospital, but proposal is too great for Fox Valley Rd and Comenarra Pkwy, there is already a lot of traffic and delays on these roads which will only get worse from the increased traffic ▪ Car sharing program may help but will not alleviate the huge volumes of traffic ▪ Safety issues for pedestrians, particularly children trying to cross Fox Valley Rd if 2 lanes wide ▪ Bought in area because it is quiet and safe and want it to remain so, proposal is too large scale 	<p>then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Widening of The Comenarra Parkway and Fox Valley Roads is not the controlling factor – it's the intersections at either end that need to be modified to increase efficiency. The traffic analysis indicated that, with this development, both roads fall within the environmental road capacity set by the RTA. Main intersections at Pennant Hills Road, Pacific Highway, Kissing Point Road and the Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection is proposed to be upgraded as generally explained in the RTA's Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee submission dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>Traffic signals are proposed outside the school for safe pedestrian crossing.</p> <p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a “<i>Knowledge Asset and Key Industry</i>” and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site. An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p>
88	10 June 2009	Community Member	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal has employment, community and satisfaction benefits for local area 	Noted
89	10 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expansion of hospital by 50% understandable, but other development is mad and abandonment of 'The San's' humanitarian principles ▪ There are high parking costs and is a lack of parking in the area ▪ There are traffic jams in the local area and there will be frequent chaos at local intersections if development proceeds ▪ Losing any BGHF would be tragic, the hospital should gift this area to National Parks or Ku-ring-gai Council, better than saturating the area with high density residences 	<p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site. An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements.</p> <p>Existing parking costs are comparable to other hospitals in Sydney. Additional onsite parking is proposed within the Hospital precinct.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended</p>

					<p>road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p>
90	10 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In peak hours local main roads are choked to capacity, more vehicles in the area would be uncontrollable ▪ Further traffic would make it impossible to evacuate the area along The Broadway during a fire, last time a fire went through it was during peak hours and it was almost impossible to evacuate and allow Fire vehicles in, made worse by 'spectators' ▪ Already difficult to get a car park at the Fox Valley Shopping Centre, proposal will make this worse ▪ Street parking situation is very serious from hospital staff and visitors parking on both Fox Valley Rd and Comenarra Pkwy, proposal will make this worse 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>In times of bushfire threat, a suite of recommendations were proposed in Appendix L of the exhibited material, in particular that, upon approval of the Concept Plan, an Emergency Liaison Committee be established by the landowner. The purpose of the committee shall be to co-ordinate the preparation of the various Estate Evacuation Plans, implement evacuation drills and reviews of the individual Evacuation Plans. The Chair Person of the Committee shall also attend the Local Emergency Management Committee meetings and bring to those meetings and the Emergency Service Combat Agencies/support Welfare Agencies the emergency planning protocols and issues related to the various land uses within the Estate. An addendum to this report accompanies the Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>No evidence suggests that hospital visitors park at the Fox Valley shops. The Fox Valley shops have timed parking restrictions which are enforced by Council. Additional onsite parking is proposed.</p> <p>Street parking is either proposed to be completely removed, or removed during peak hours along the frontage of the site. This increases the efficiency of Fox Valley Road.</p>
91	10 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about impact on ability to easily access home and local amenities given scale of proposal ▪ Some development may be supportable, but not at proposed scale given current level of road use around the site ▪ Level of residential, commercial, retail and school expansion is too much for current infrastructure (particularly roads and car parking), consideration should be given to reducing the amount of residential and commercial expansion to suit site capabilities ▪ No rezoning should be granted until traffic problems are solved to satisfaction of local councils ▪ BGHF should be preserved 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p>

					<p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades. Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.</p> <p>The Preferred Plan involves the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct and redesign of the school and involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p>
92	10 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Current infrastructure can't support such a massive project ▪ Rezoning should not be granted until traffic problems are solved to satisfaction of local councils ▪ Development would make cycling on Fox Valley Rd miserable and nearly impossible ▪ Do not allow BGHF to be cut down 	<p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p> <p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades. Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.</p> <p>Cycling throughout the estate is considered as part of the Concept Plan.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p>
93	10 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Should be no loss of critically endangered BGHF as a result of proposal ▪ Does not appear to be adequate road infrastructure for development of this scale ▪ Comenarra Pkwy is standstill during peak hours, increased traffic is not viable ▪ No rezoning should be granted until traffic problems are solved to satisfaction of local councils 	<p>As mentioned, the Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended</p>

					<p>road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades. Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.</p>
94	10 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Object to loss and damage of critically endangered BGHF a fragile, highly valued ecosystem ▪ Object to rezoning approval until issues with local traffic infrastructure are solved, local traffic conditions have worsened recently and hard to see how infrastructure will cope ▪ Object to sheer scale of proposal, commercial, retail, school and residential expansion should be significantly reduced ▪ Size of proposal will negatively affect surrounding area and property values ▪ There is no lack of schools, churches or shopping centres in local area, there is some need for expansion of hospital, but not such a huge development ▪ Local wildlife have been impacted by higher density development, traffic and local forests are dying back due to pollution and stress on environment 	<p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades. Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.</p> <p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest property values will be impacted as a result of this proposal.</p> <p>The premise of this proposal is to create a working / living community – where most of the needs of the onsite workers / residents are provided onsite (thereby reducing car travel). A small retail / convenience component to the proposal is important.</p>
95	10 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expansion of hospital supported, but overall size and scope of proposal is not ▪ Little of proposed new facilities are needed for hospital and should be viewed as separate from hospital expansion ▪ Proposal will impose impossible traffic loads and while its is stated congestion points will be fixed, it is also stated existing conditions and ownership will constrain improvement opportunities and in some cases it will not be possible to improve current conditions ▪ Proposal will lead to destruction of much of remaining bushland including critically 	<p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p>

				<p>endangered BGHF</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Biobanking will not work as there is little or no BGHF left for offsets ▪ Proposal should be scaled back to ensure hospital can expand but BGHF is saved and traffic safety ensured 	<p>The proposed facilities are needed to support the expansion to the hospital, school and other onsite uses.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>Biobanking is not proposed.</p>
96	10 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No rezoning should be granted until traffic problems are solved to satisfaction of local councils ▪ NO loss of BGHF ▪ Commercial, retail, school and residential expansion should be reduced to better fit site capabilities ▪ Hornsby and Chatswood retail centres are examples of traffic problems from ignoring overdevelopment 	<p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades. Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.</p> <p>The Preferred Plan will result in minimal impacts on native flora and fauna, in particular, loss of BGHF.</p> <p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p>
97	11 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objection to proposed connection between Mt Pleasant Ave and Osborn Rd ▪ Increase in dwelling density has implications in event of bushfires ▪ Traffic report did not adequately address peak traffic conditions for Osborn Rd, particularly afternoon school peak and weekend school activities ▪ Has become increasingly difficult to access driveways in Osborn Rd due to increase in school activities, proposed link will exacerbate this ▪ Osborn Rd would be subject to substantial traffic increases from Mt Pleasant Ave traffic even without the additional development ▪ Existing illegal parking and resulting safety visibility issues in Osborn Rd from activities associated with Loreto would be exacerbated from increased traffic ▪ Osborn Rd intersection has poor visibility and is dangerous ▪ Access for service and emergency vehicles is an issue as Osborn Rd is narrow, this also 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal, with traffic from the proposed Mt Pleasant precinct to access Pennant Hills Road via Mt Pleasant Avenue.</p> <p>In times of bushfire threat, a suite of recommendations were proposed in Appendix L of the exhibited material, in particular that, upon approval of the Concept Plan, an Emergency Liaison Committee be established by the landowner. The purpose of the committee shall be to co-ordinate the preparation of the various Estate Evacuation Plans, implement evacuation drills and reviews of the individual Evacuation Plans. The Chair Person of the Committee shall also attend the Local Emergency Management Committee meetings and bring to those meetings and the Emergency Service Combat Agencies/support Welfare Agencies the emergency planning protocols and issues related to the various land</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> has implications for evacuation ▪ Concerned about threat to BGHF as any attempt to widen Osborn Rd will result in removal of avenue of Blue Gums ▪ Destruction of ecological corridors that join bush on Loreto to Lane Cove NP is of great concern ▪ Area has poor public transport (including limited off peak train services, limited access to station platforms for disabled people, limited station parking and limited bus services) making car use likely ▪ Proposed 3 storey residential blocks in Mt Pleasant Ave is out of character with existing low density bushland setting and would destroy environmental character, would also negatively impact aspect and property values 	<p>uses within the Estate.</p> <p>The 3 storey unit blocks that backed onto existing residential dwellings off Osborn Road (per the exhibited Concept Plan) have been deleted and replaced with medium density lots as shown in the attached Preferred Project Report.</p>
98	11 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Exiting Browns Rd to Comenarra Pkwy is an increasingly difficult task due to over-capacity on local main arteries ▪ Agreement hospital continuously makes improvements and provides staff accommodation, though unsure how extent of proposed development will not create catastrophic increase in vehicle movements in small area with steep hills, valleys and narrow roads 	<p>In regard to the intersection of The Comenarra Parkway and Browns Road, the RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To address future traffic concerns along The Comenarra Parkway as a result of the development proposal, the RTA requires the developer to widen The Comenarra Parkway to provide two traffic lanes in each direction between Fox Valley Road and Browns Road; ▪ To facilitate vehicles turning right into and out of Browns Road as a result of future upgrades to The Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection it is recommended that consideration be given to the provision of a seagull treatment at the intersection of The Comenarra Parkway / Browns Road. <p>Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p>
99	11 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Issue with destruction of BGHF that has stood in way of development proposals so far ▪ Issue with lack of consultation from developer despite stipulation in DGRs ▪ Proposed access through Osborn Rd will bring dangerously high traffic volumes on narrow street, given existing traffic volumes from local schools and congestion at Pennant Hills Rd intersection 	<p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>Extensive consultation has occurred, over and above the statutory consultation requirements. Consultation conducted during the exhibition period is outlined in the Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal, with traffic from the proposed Mt Pleasant precinct to access Pennant Hills Road via Mt Pleasant Avenue.</p>
100	13	Local	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Size of proposal will have enormous impact on bushland and surrounding suburbs 	<p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a "Knowledge</p>

	June 2009	Resident		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Before development begins increased traffic needs to be dealt with and loss of bushland, particularly BGHF minimised Size of development needs to be reduced 	<p><i>Asset and Key Industry</i>" and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>As mentioned, the Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p>
101	14 June 2009	Community Member	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure, roads, rail, water and power is inadequate for proposal Greater issue of overpopulation relevant, without proposal compounding problem of Sydney being 'too full' 	<p>Infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed.</p> <p>The proposed residential development is required to ensure the hospital is feasible. In addition, the proposed density is considered appropriate for the specialised centre.</p>
102	14 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remaining BGHF should have recreational access not be bulldozed to increase population density in an area where transport infrastructure is limited Humans are not the only species living in the area 	<p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>In addition, the proposed density of the residential development is appropriate for a specialised centre of this size.</p>
103	14 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration of a proposal to reduce heavy impact on critically endangered BGHF, as well as STIF and other communities is unacceptable Retention of BGHF and STIF should be prioritised as regional disturbance has gone beyond considering strategies of mitigation 	<p>As mentioned, the Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Appreciation for need for hospital expansion and financial logic for residential development, however focusing on hospital services and vegetation retention/integrity should have far greater priority than residential development 	<p>The proposed residential development is required to ensure the hospital development is feasible. The proposed density is appropriate for the specialised centre of this size.</p>
104	14 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed scale too big given location limitations and negative environmental impacts ▪ Development should be limited to minor hospital upgrades and low density housing, confined to cleared areas to reduce impact on struggling local infrastructure and natural environment ▪ Large population increases are expected under the town centres plan, adding the Wahroonga Estate population over same time horizon could be too much for locality to absorb ▪ Locality is currently affected by significant traffic problems creating delays, road system can't absorb an increase let alone major vehicle movement increases under this proposal ▪ Recommended intersection upgrades are not adequate to deal with expected population increase and commitment to carry out these is vague ▪ Issues can be addressed by reducing size and density of development to level more appropriate for site ▪ Location is subject to bushfire risk, expansion will put people at unnecessary risk ▪ Rather than clearing vegetation for APZs development should be decreased ▪ Adding extra traffic from proposed development may hamper evacuation ▪ CEECs BGHF/STIF should be preserved and vegetation buffer left between bushland and built environment ▪ Concerned pressure and capacity of existing water supply system may be reduced, overall capacity needs to be increased ▪ Does not seem to be sufficient plans to upgrade the downstream sewerage network to cope with increased capacity ▪ Does not seem to be sufficient consideration for returns to wider community in terms of upgrades to local park, libraries, ovals etc 	<p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p> <p>With regard to the population increase, the site is viewed as a specialised centre and the proposed residential density is appropriate for the specialised centre of this size.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address roadworks as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>In times of bushfire threat, a suite of recommendations were proposed in Appendix L of the exhibited material, in particular that, upon approval of the Concept Plan, an Emergency Liaison Committee be established by the landowner. The purpose of the committee shall be to co-ordinate the preparation of the various Estate Evacuation Plans, implement evacuation drills and reviews of the individual Evacuation Plans. The Chair Person of the Committee shall also attend the Local Emergency Management Committee meetings and bring to those meetings and the Emergency Service Combat Agencies/support Welfare Agencies the emergency planning protocols and issues related to the various land uses within the Estate.</p> <p>In regard to the comment about clearing vegetation for APZ's, one must be mindful that part of the clearing is required to protect existing development from bushfire threat, consistent with Planning for Bushfire guidelines of Rural Fire Service.</p> <p>As mentioned, the Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>In regard to the comment about wider community returns, the proposal will contribute Section 94 Contributions to the local Councils for provision of such facilities, as defined in the Section 94 plan.</p>

105	14 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Extra people living in area will mean too much traffic and local residents will suffer ▪ Environmental impact from clearing vital bushland home to vulnerable species ▪ Stretching of local resources (parks, ovals etc) without compensation to local community via new resources ▪ Unsightly large towering buildings where currently single dwellings ▪ Noise/construction/traffic disruption during construction will be unpleasant for local community 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>In regard to the comment about wider community returns, the proposal will contribute Section 94 Contributions to the local Councils for provision of such facilities, as defined in the Section 94 plan.</p> <p>The revised Preferred Plan involves the concentration of higher density residential development to the centre of the site and involves medium density housing around. In particular, the Preferred Plan replaces the proposed high density lots on the northern side of Mt Pleasant Ave with medium density,</p> <p>In regard to the comment on construction impacts, it is expected that the consent authority will require a construction / noise / traffic management plan produced and submitted prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate to allow onsite construction to commence.</p>
106	14 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ San car use already high given infrequent bus services and distance to trains, idea people will live, work and share cars overly optimistic ▪ Proposal for reduced provision of car parking will only choke local roads ▪ Report regarding local traffic conditions contains incorrect/misleading statements ▪ Local roads are already very congested ▪ Relying on parking restrictions while reducing hospital parking will be a disaster for parking and traffic in the area, particularly parking at Fox Valley shops ▪ Key intersections area already have poor level of service, proposed improvements are inadequate ▪ Parking discounts for live/work community are a huge assumption ▪ Comparative school traffic analysis are flawed as like schools have not been used, traffic report does not mention impacts from increased buses, provision of drop off facility or student parking 	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that this proposal is overly optimistic. In fact, this is best planning practice – ie to provide accommodation close to where people work so that, in addition to numerous positives, vehicle use is reduced.</p> <p>The proposal does not seek to reduce car parking, particularly associated with the hospital. Car parking is proposed onsite.</p> <p>Further information is required on where the traffic report is deemed incorrect or misleading before a response can be provided to this point.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>No evidence suggests that hospital visitors park at the Fox Valley shops. The Fox Valley shops have timed parking restrictions which are enforced by Council.</p> <p>RTA supports the proposed intersection improvements, as outlined in</p>

					<p>their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>The traffic report (Appendix J) contained within the exhibited material provides justification as to variations to the Ku-ring-gai DCP in relation to this unique proposal. The DCP parking rates are blanket rates applied throughout the whole of the LGA and it is deemed reasonable to vary these rates (where it can be justified) if non-standard situations were to apply (as in the case of this working-living proposal).</p> <p>The traffic analysis provided a thorough assessment of the proposal and no objections to the proposal have been raised by the RTA.</p>
107	14 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unclear what impact of increased population will be on bushland and recreation needs, seems little understanding of required open space facilities ▪ No spatial requirements are provided for outdoor areas such as playgrounds, sports fields ▪ Open space master plan should be prepared covering both recreation facilities and use of bushland ▪ Proposed clearing and modification of BGHF for APZs will have significant impact on regional scale ▪ Clearing and modification of STIF will impact bushland corridors and biodiversity ▪ Fragmentation and loss of habitat for threatened fauna is of concern, mitigation measures have not adequately been addressed ▪ BGHF would be hard to offset as so little remains, more appropriate to retain/ manage/ enhance bushland and setback development further to minimise APZs ▪ School oval and stormwater basin should be better planned to ensure BGHF does not require removal ▪ Long term management of bushland should be part of a legal agreement ▪ Proposal to increase population will adversely impact traffic network especially in absence of effective mass transport system ▪ Traffic study does not include detailed modelling only minimal projections, additional studies are required which should produce different outcomes to the identified upgrades which appear to be absolute minimum response ▪ Cycle/pedestrian paths and street trees should be incorporated ▪ Proposed traffic management changes for Mt Pleasant Ave do not appear to be resolved and don't account for logistics associated with Osborn Rd school ▪ Site is not well serviced by transport and proposed reduced car parking provision has not been justified it will have flow on parking congestion problems in locality 	<p>The proposal will include a Biodiversity Management Plan which will ensure that the current conservation area is better preserved.</p> <p>In regard to the comment about playgrounds, sports fields etc, the proposal will contribute Section 94 Contributions to the local Councils for provision of such facilities, as defined in the Section 94 plan. There may be opportunity for the school oval to be used as sports fields but this would be subject to further consideration at a later stage.</p> <p>In regard to the comment about clearing vegetation for APZ's, one must be mindful that part of the clearing is required to protect existing development from bushfire threat, consistent with Planning for Bushfire guidelines of Rural Fire Service.</p> <p>The prepared Concept Plan includes areas outlining open space and recreational facilities.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>In response to the comment about the School Oval and stormwater basin, we agree with this comment and have modified the proposal to reduce the amount of impact on the BGHF in this area.</p> <p>Long term management of the bushland is covered in our Statement of Commitments.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The traffic analysis provided a thorough assessment of the proposal and no objections to the proposal have been raised by the RTA.</p>

					<p>Location of cycle/pedestrian paths are more appropriately addressed at the Project / Development application stage.</p> <p>Following extensive feedback from local residents during the exhibition period, and ongoing discussions with the RTA, additional traffic modelling was conducted regarding the access options for the Mt Pleasant Precinct. Due to the nature of development proposed in this precinct (ie partly associated with the retirement village with typically lower vehicle movements or movements outside of peak periods), analysis estimated that the Mt Pleasant precinct would generate about 46 additional trips during peak hours.</p> <p>Based on RTA guidelines, confinement of additional traffic to Mt Pleasant Avenue would not elevate the traffic level on this road above the RTA environmental goals for this road.</p> <p>This modelling therefore indicates that the proposed Mt Pleasant Precinct development could still satisfactorily proceed with access only via Mt Pleasant Avenue (with no traffic control signals). It is also noted that this modelling was provided to RTA and DoP based on the exhibited Concept Plan proposal (and not the reduced Preferred Project Report proposal).</p> <p>The traffic report (Appendix J) contained within the exhibited material provides justification as to variations to the Ku-ring-gai DCP in relation to this unique proposal. The DCP parking rates are blanket rates applied throughout the whole of the LGA and it is deemed reasonable to vary these rates (where it can be justified) if non-standard situations were to apply (as in the case of this working-living proposal).</p>
108	15 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ More investigations should be taken into transport infrastructure, particularly critical intersections of Pacific Hwy/Fox Valley Rd and Fox Valley Rd/ Comenarra Pkwy ▪ Significant loss of critically endangered BGHF is unnecessary and detrimental to the environment ▪ Other areas on North Shore are being developed closer to the railway line, seems developing areas with endangered bushland and traffic congestion is not logical or responsive to local needs ▪ Proposal would result in increased congestion/delays on already inadequate roads ▪ Plans should be put on hold unless Councils given assurances optimal flow of traffic ensured 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads. This includes upgrades to Fox Valley Road intersections at Comenarra Parkway and Pacific Highway.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>Extensive modelling has been carried out in relation to residential densities and traffic generation. The site is considered suitable for the development.</p> <p>The traffic results, considered by RTA, have been supported subject to a suite of road upgrade works being undertaken.</p> <p>Strongly dispute that the plans be placed on hold. RTA, in their letter to</p>

					Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades. Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.
109	15 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose connection of Osborn Rd and Mt Pleasant Ave as will cause traffic chaos, already have traffic problems from school and don't need any more 	The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.
110	15 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local roads already struggle to cope with traffic in peak hours, increased traffic can't be absorbed and problems can't be solved by proposed upgrades as relevant land is privately owned ▪ Traffic report does not address impact of emerging traffic stresses associated with numerous unit developments ▪ Train stations are some distance from the site, there is no public bus service and the private service is limited – most people have to use cars ▪ Doubtful many people filling new jobs will live on-site and will therefore contribute to increased traffic ▪ Documentation promises linkages to an integrated transport network but there isn't one ▪ Additional cars, demolition, building works and loss of vegetation create pollution ▪ Proposal does not address bushfire risks of The Broadway area ▪ Evacuation would be a problem for number of residents, students and patients ▪ On-street parking by hospital users impacts amenity of the area and parking at the local shops, problem will become even worse ▪ Expanded hospital facilities will benefit those who can pay for them, other sections of proposal are purely money making ventures with no benefits for area ▪ Unless traffic problems are solved proposal should not be approved 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The traffic report has considered the background traffic growth in its analysis of this proposal.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p> <p>The site is a specialised employment centre. Public transport will improve as density increases.</p> <p>Statement of Commitment addresses land tenure.</p> <p>We are not required to address bushfire risk of other areas – that responsibility lies with Council and the RFS.</p> <p>On-street parking will either be completely removed or removed during peak hours. Additional parking will be available onsite. No evidence suggests that hospital visitors park at the Fox Valley shops. The Fox Valley shops have timed parking restrictions which are enforced by Council.</p> <p>Unsubstantiated claim that the proposal is a money making venture with no benefits to the area.</p>
111	15 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We bought in the area as is quiet and safe redevelopment would ruin it ▪ Concerned sufficient and safe upgrades to existing road infrastructure are not proposed to service redevelopment ▪ Understand need for hospital upgrade, but inclusion of K-12 school, retail and residential is too great for Fox Valley Rd and Comenarra Pkwy to support ▪ Already been significant increase in traffic at Fox Valley/Lucinda Ave roundabout over past year making access difficult in peak times, which will only get worse ▪ Car sharing scheme may help but will not alleviate huge volumes visiting the hospital and proposed school particularly during peak times ▪ Concern for safety of pedestrians, particularly children crossing Fox Valley Rd 	<p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a "<i>Knowledge Asset and Key Industry</i>" and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site. It is noted that the Estate will not have any significant retail development that might compete with other existing town</p>

					<p>centres and the overall retail hierarchy.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades. Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>The volume of traffic attending the hospital and school has been considered as part of the traffic analysis and reviewed by RTA as part of their comments on the proposal.</p> <p>Traffic signals are proposed outside the school for safe pedestrian crossing.</p>
112	16 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned Part 3A process reduces public ability to comment/object ▪ Proponent is a major donor to Labor Party this should be properly declared ▪ No assessment of impact on wildlife provided, need to be assured no endangered species live in the area or that they will be relocated ▪ Traffic modelling assumes certain areas have been upgraded by government, yet there are no guarantee any of these areas will be upgraded, unless there is commitment for the upgrades the modelling is inaccurate and should be redone ▪ Any approval should go with a watertight commitment with recommended traffic upgrades ▪ Support for intention for hospital to expand and increase services 	<p>Part 3A falls within the legislative framework of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979. Public consultation occurs just the same under Part 3A as it does if Council were the consent authority. The public should feel welcome to make their submissions known about any proposal and it should not matter who the consent authority is.</p> <p>Information about political donations is public information and can be easily accessed.</p> <p>As mentioned above, the Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>An ecology assessment was conducted and was placed on public exhibition with the Concept Plan.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades. Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the</p>

					<p>Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. A Statement of Commitment is binding to a Part 3A approval.</p> <p>Support for the hospital expansion is noted.</p>
113	16 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal will result in increased traffic on Mt Pleasant Ave during construction, this will be complicated by narrow carriageway and on-street parking ▪ New population associated with proposed development will also result in increased traffic on Mt Pleasant Ave ▪ Developer previously disregarded curfews and road rules on Mt Pleasant Ave during construction of retirement village ▪ No rezoning should be approved until traffic problems are rectified to council satisfaction 	<p>In regard to the comment on construction traffic impacts, it is expected that the consent authority will require a construction / noise / traffic management plan produced and submitted prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate to allow onsite construction to commence.</p> <p>Following extensive feedback from local residents during the exhibition period, and ongoing discussions with the RTA, additional traffic modelling was conducted regarding the access options for the Mt Pleasant Precinct. Due to the nature of development proposed in this precinct (ie partly associated with the retirement village with typically lower vehicle movements or movements outside of peak periods), analysis estimated that the Mt Pleasant precinct would generate about 46 additional trips during peak hours.</p> <p>Based on RTA guidelines, confinement of additional traffic to Mt Pleasant Avenue would not elevate the traffic level on this road above the RTA environmental goals for this road.</p> <p>Curfews and road rules are an enforcement issue for either Council or the police. JPG is unaware of previous concerns with construction of the retirement village.</p> <p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades (including The Comenarra Parkway and Pennant Hills Road). Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.</p>
114	16 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Over last 14 years has been significant build up of traffic on local road network ▪ Cars are at standstill during certain times and the duration of these periods is getting longer ▪ No rezoning should be granted until traffic problems are solved to satisfaction of local councils ▪ Unique ecosystem must be preserved and not destroyed by overdevelopment ▪ Should be no loss of BGHF as a consequence of the proposal ▪ Areas infrastructure can not cater for such a massive development ▪ Proposed commercial, retail, school and residential expansion should be reduced to better fit site capabilities 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades (including The Comenarra Parkway and Pennant Hills Road). Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in</p>

					<p>Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p>
115	16 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose connection of Osborn Rd and Mt Pleasant Ave due to potential traffic chaos ▪ Safety should be paramount and not compromised by additional risk 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p>
116	16 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal is unnecessary gross overdevelopment of site impacting local neighbourhood and natural features of the site ▪ Future development of hospital-related facilities is an acceptable use of the site ▪ Location remote from public transport/poor serviced by buses and within low density setting is unsuitable for development of a town centre ▪ Development of site for high density housing is not consistent with State or local planning strategies ▪ Development proposed is not required to enable Ku-ring-gai to meet housing targets ▪ Housing development in Mt Pleasant and Residential East precincts should not be allowed due to unacceptable fire and evacuation risks and unacceptable impacts on native vegetation and habitat including CEECs ▪ Addition of K-12 school and thousands of residents will impose unacceptable pressure on local road system given location remote from public transport/poor serviced by buses, school should be reduced to K-6 as current ▪ Traffic modelling assumes identified upgrades were completed, however this is likely to be incorrect as many identified upgrades are unlikely to be achievable given private ownership constraints ▪ No development should be allowed until road improvements have been made and traffic management improved ▪ Proposal would result in total or partial loss of BGHF and STIF ▪ CEEC mapping is not consistent with Ku-ring-gai Council mapping, resulting in underestimation of loss of CEECs ▪ Proposal needs to be referred to DEWHA as a controlled action for STIF ▪ Proposal will impact habitat of threatened fauna ▪ Proposal has number of problems associated with bushfire risk including access and evacuation, any medium density housing in bushfire evacuation risk areas would be negligent ▪ Unacceptable loss of vegetation for APZs resulting in fragmentation of remaining vegetation and reduced sustainability ▪ If approved engineering solutions to minimise bushfire risk should be investigated ▪ Proven that urban stormwater runoff into urban bushland results in weeds and loss of plant diversity which will impact Lane Cove NP downstream, proposal does not incorporate adequate WSUD ▪ Any approval must ensure best practice WSUD is employed and no additional stormwater 	<p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p> <p>Support for the hospital expansion is noted.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site.</p> <p>The Preferred Plan will involve the replacement of high density housing to the north of Mount Pleasant Avenue with medium density development. Proposed high density housing will be concentrated towards the centre of the site.</p> <p>The proposed density is justified to meet the objectives of the State.</p> <p>Development proposed in Mt Pleasant and Residential East precincts have been amended following submissions made during public exhibition. Modifications are shown within the attached Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>Vegetation and riparian zones will be managed in accordance with Biodiversity Management Plan. Amount of environmental conservation has been significantly increased with retention of eastern precinct.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding</p>

				<p>allowed to enter non-riparian bushland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All bushland on site should be retained for conservation and transferred to National Parks to ensure protection in perpetuity with adequate funds for management 	<p>roads.</p> <p>Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. The timing of works will be documented in the above VPA which will be exhibited for public viewing and prior to any construction occurring on site as contemplated by this Concept Plan.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>Proposal was referred to DEWHA and response was provided on 5 November 2008.</p> <p>Stormwater and water quality control will be to best practice. Details will be provided at Project / Development Applications stage.</p>
117	16 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose connection of Osborn Rd and Mt Pleasant Ave due to potential traffic chaos 	The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.
118	16 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose connection of Osborn Rd and Mt Pleasant Ave due to potential traffic chaos Osborn Rd already has heavy traffic due to Loreto, proposal will bring it to a stand still 	The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.
119	16 June 2009	Local Resident	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would love children to complete entire education at one campus Existing school has fantastic reputation and a high school would be popular with local families Proposal sees relocation of school away from busy intersection to location better suited for education Expansion of hospital of significant benefit to community 	Noted
120	16 June 2009	Community Member	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal gives children at existing school space to grow into a high school in a better location away from the intersection Would appreciate continuity of education for children Proposal provides opportunity for hospital to expand its exceptional facilities Proposal will provide more affordable housing for younger families with lower financial means 	Noted
121	16 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose connection of Osborn Rd and Mt Pleasant Ave due to potential traffic chaos and hazard 	The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.
122	17 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose connection of Osborn Rd and Mt Pleasant Ave due to potential traffic chaos and hazard and impact on bushland Osborn Rd is only entry/exit for residents in surrounding streets if proposal goes ahead will negatively impact local residents Area should remain low density residential bush environment Traffic lights should be added to Mt Pleasant Ave and Pennant Hills Rd 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p> <p>The 3 storey unit blocks that backed onto existing residential dwellings off Osborn Road (per the exhibited Concept Plan) have been deleted and replaced with medium density lots as shown in the attached Preferred Project Report.</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Entire scale of expansion should be reduced and not approved unless traffic issues are solved to satisfaction of residents ▪ BGHF should remain intact ▪ Osborn Rd link should be removed from plans 	<p>RTA has confirmed that it will not support the provision of new traffic signals at the Pennant Hills Road / Mt Pleasant Avenue intersection.</p> <p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades (including The Comenarra Parkway and Pennant Hills Road). Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.</p> <p>The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p>
123	17 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ San plays an important role in providing good hospital services ▪ BGHF should be preserved for beauty and habitat importance, should be no loss ▪ Size and scope of expansion will have deleterious effect on local community ▪ Proposal for K-12 school in tight spot will cause traffic nightmare, particularly given lack of public transport ▪ Extent of proposed housing development questionable, given existing traffic and lack of public transport majority of homes will need 2 cars ▪ Few stations have adequate car parking ▪ Thought of retail/supermarket is another potential nightmare ▪ Unclear who pays for works such as Osborn Rd link and it will merely shift problem to Pennant Hills Rd ▪ Previous dumping of toxic waste many years ago needs to be addressed ▪ Any further pollution due to human activities will significantly effect the Lane Cove River and NP and eventually the outer reaches of the Harbour ▪ No rezoning should be approved until traffic problems are resolved ▪ Commercial, retail, school and residential expansion should be reduced to better fit site and surrounding capabilities 	<p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>With regard to traffic impacts from the proposed school use, a satisfactory drop off and pick up parking arrangement will be prepared as part of a separate project application.</p> <p>The proposed residential densities are considered suitable for the site, and public transport will increase over time as densities increase.</p> <p>Its proposed to have a small retail / commercial convenience store onsite to cater for users within walking distance to the site (for convenience shopping).</p> <p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p> <p>A Contamination Assessment has been conducted onsite. Recommendations from this report will be addressed as required during future Project / Development applications. Evidence from the community on previous onsite waste disposal would be welcomed.</p> <p>Unsubstantiated claim that pollution from development of this site will significantly affect downstream environments.</p>

					RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades (including The Comenarra Parkway and Pennant Hills Road). Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.
124	17 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objection to connection of Mt Pleasant Ave to Osborn Rd ▪ Osborn Rd is narrow, already has 5 feeder streets and a large high school, there is also poor visibility and lane operation at Pennant Hills Rd intersection ▪ Existing situation will become worse if Mt Pleasant Ave joins the morning queue 	The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.
125	17 June 2009	Community Member	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Would be a bonus to have a Senior school to maintain the continuity of higher education ▪ There is a lack of choice for co-educational schools in the area and it needs a High school such as that proposed 	Noted
126	17 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose connection of Osborn Rd and Mt Pleasant Ave due to potential traffic chaos 	The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.
127	17 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal would adversely affect sensitive ecologically threatened communities located on the site ▪ Native fauna would be impacted by loss of bushland ▪ Surrounding traffic provisions are not able to support such a major increase in density 	<p>As mentioned, the Preferred Plan involves a significant reduction in vegetation loss and will preserve native flora and fauna. In particular BGHF and STIF.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p>
128	17 June 2009	Community Member	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Any reduction in the bushland on site could have an adverse impact on threatened fauna species ▪ Vital destruction of BGHF on the site is stopped before plan approved ▪ Maintaining viability of both vegetation and fauna communities is vital, destroying any of these will make viability more uncertain 	The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).
129	17 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose connection of Osborn Rd and Mt Pleasant Ave, Osborn Rd is already difficult to negotiate due to narrowness and parked vehicles and proposed connection will only make it worse ▪ Access and egress of local residents and emergency vehicles will be compromised by proposed connection, potentially putting lives at risk 	The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.
130	17 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Use of Osborn Rd is potentially disastrous, it is already overloaded, too narrow and at times blocked by parked cars ▪ Traffic jam which would result has potential to cause death when emergency vehicles can not access any streets off Osborn Rd ▪ Widening Osborn Rd would destroy critically endangered BGHF 	The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.
131	18 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Comenarra Pkwy can't cope with traffic volumes in morning and afternoon peak hours ▪ Without a major upgrade, traffic congestion will only increase 	A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Area is surrounded by bushland and if bushfire evacuation is required the current road network would be inadequate ▪ Access to and from Comenarra Pkwy from Browns Rd which is a current problem hasn't been addressed ▪ Traffic congestion between the hospital and Pacific Hwy is already a problem ▪ Do not support high school and retail development on the site 	<p>of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Widening of The Comenarra Parkway is not the controlling factor – it's the intersections at either end that need to be modified to increase efficiency. The traffic analysis indicated that, with this development, the road fall within the environmental road capacity set by the RTA. Main intersections at Pennant Hills Road, Pacific Highway, Kissing Point Road and the Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection is proposed to be upgraded as generally explained in the RTA's Sydney Regional Development Advisory Committee submission dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>In regard to the intersection of The Comenarra Parkway and Browns Road, the RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To address future traffic concerns along The Comenarra Parkway as a result of the development proposal, the RTA requires the developer to widen The Comenarra Parkway to provide two traffic lanes in each direction between Fox Valley Road and Browns Road; ▪ To facilitate vehicles turning right into and out of Browns Road as a result of future upgrades to The Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection it is recommended that consideration be given to the provision of a seagull treatment at the intersection of The Comenarra Parkway / Browns Road. <p>Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>Further evidence is required on reasons for not supporting the school expansion and retail development is required before a response is provided.</p>
132	18 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Expansion of hospital is only part of proposal which would benefit community ▪ Local road capacity is already at maximum and during peak hour is at a stand still ▪ Roads in vicinity of Thornleigh Market Place are already congested and subject to accidents, this would be made worse by more cars ▪ Traffic problems should be addressed before rezoning is approved ▪ Should be no loss of BGHF as is one of the last areas in the locality ▪ Commercial, retail and residential expansion should be reduced to better suit capability of area and traffic situation 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads. This includes proposed upgrades to the Pennant Hills Road / Comenarra Parkway intersection (in the vicinity of Thornleigh Market Place).</p> <p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades (including The Comenarra Parkway and Pennant Hills Road). Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.</p>

					<p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGFH and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p>
133	18 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Apparent success of proposal is predicated on numerous key intersection upgrades but no evidence suggesting they can be achieved in entirety given road reserve and private ownership limitations ▪ Although VPA or DCA is proposed for staging road works its difficult to delay such a large undertaking midway through a staged development ▪ May be that development can occur in stages if upgrades can be provided to accommodate additional traffic demand from that stage ▪ Proposed upgrade for Comenarra Pkwy/Kissing Pt Rd intersection would have negative impact on safety of pedestrians particularly school children given two crossing movements would be required, upgrade would also increase traffic and parking demand in Kissing Point Rd ▪ Comenarra Pkwy/Woods St intersection (access to Thornleigh Plaza) is impacted by traffic on Fox Valley Rd and should be examined, Yanko/Ryde Rd is other key intersection which should be examined ▪ More detail on impacts in Osborn Rd from proposed link should be provided, including if road classification would change and what the implications would be, also increasing traffic past Loreto access point requires assessment for safety and accessibility ▪ Traffic generation of school staff does not appear to have been calculated ▪ Most high schools commence before 8:30 is therefore likely 100% of school arrival demand will be during AM peak, not 60% stated in report, conversely larger schools tend to generate higher car occupancy rates than estimated but this should be confirmed ▪ School will generate more AM peak hour trips than modelled which may or may not impact local intersections ▪ Proposed car parking rates for residential components appropriate given on-site trip containment and travel strategies in TMAP ▪ Parking demand for school doesn't appear to have been calculated, staff/student parking, drop off and short term parking need to be confirmed ▪ Need to review impact of lost on-street car parking on local residential streets ▪ No additional development should be allowed before providing strict measures that require staged intersection upgrade works, level of service of upgrades should provide better operating conditions than existing 	<p>Concept intersection designs have been produced and submitted to RTA and Department of Planning for each of the intersection upgrades.</p> <p>As outlined in our Statement of Commitments, the VPA or DCA with RTA is to be entered into prior to the first construction certificate being issued for development contemplated by the Wahroonga Estate Concept Plan. This document, which will be exhibited for public viewing, will outline when works need to be completed throughout the life of the project.</p> <p>The RTA has recommended modifications to our proposal at Kissing Point Road, as outlined in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>As addressed in the attached response from traffic experts Halcrow, further consultation has been had with the RTA, SRDAC and Council's engineers with regard to intersection works. It is considered that the proposed works are feasible but will require detailed survey.</p> <p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal. The development will not access Osborn Road.</p> <p>Traffic generation has been modelled on proposed development including school use. Proposed school has been modelled on anticipated demand.</p> <p>Comments regarding car parking rates noted.</p> <p>In regard to school parking, details will be provided at Project / Development Application phase.</p> <p>On site parking will be provided in accordance with the relevant requirements.</p>
134	18 June 2009	Local Community Group	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal will adversely and acceptably impact sensitive environmental areas ▪ Loss of any more BGFH/STIF further threatens viability and impacts threatened fauna species ▪ Naïve to suggest car sharing scheme will have more than a minor impact on the traffic 	<p>Details of the car sharing scheme are provided in the documentation and it is anticipated that proper functioning of the proposal will be subject to a condition of consent.</p> <p>There is no intention to widen Fox Valley Road that will remove trees and</p>

				<p>congestion that will be generated by the proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Widening of Fox Valley Rd would negatively effect the present Ku-ring-gai appearance with large trees and well tendered gardens which will be destroyed ▪ Provision of cheap housing for employees fine aim, but may impact unfavourably on existing houses in area, especially if hospital sell residential area ▪ 'Solution' to destroy bushland for bushfire protection is totally unacceptable ▪ Considerable issues with bushfire evacuation of hospital as well as aged care, child care and school children ▪ Development will alter character of area, a self contained (almost gated) community is not in keeping with atmosphere is LGA ▪ Applicants don't deny new University Hospital at Macquarie Uni will negatively impact SAN patient numbers, but no guarantee of this ▪ Danger current ambitious plans may be abandoned half completed 	<p>gardens. The proposal is to remove (either completely or only during peak hours) street parking which will enable two travel lanes in either direction for the frontage of the site. RTA has also indicated this parking restriction should extend to Pacific Highway for southbound travel (ie cars travelling from Pacific Highway to Wahroonga Estate).</p> <p>In regard to the comment about clearing vegetation for APZ's, one must be mindful that part of the clearing is required to protect existing development from bushfire threat, consistent with Planning for Bushfire guidelines of Rural Fire Service.</p> <p>In times of bushfire threat, a suite of recommendations were proposed in Appendix L of the exhibited material, in particular that, upon approval of the Concept Plan, an Emergency Liaison Committee be established by the landowner. The purpose of the committee shall be to co-ordinate the preparation of the various Estate Evacuation Plans, implement evacuation drills and reviews of the individual Evacuation Plans. The Chair Person of the Committee shall also attend the Local Emergency Management Committee meetings and bring to those meetings and the Emergency Service Combat Agencies/support Welfare Agencies the emergency planning protocols and issues related to the various land uses within the Estate.</p> <p>Unsubstantiated claim that this will be a gated community. A working/living community is best planning practice.</p>
135	18 June 2009	Local Community Group	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal is significant overdevelopment of the site, well beyond its current designation as a specialised medical centre ▪ Suspicious Concept Plan uses hospital expansion as a decoy to justify new residential and commercial development, such developments will change purpose of site from medical centre to mega real estate development ▪ Site is unsuited to such a development and shouldn't be countenanced in current scale and format ▪ Proposed housing is not required to meet dwelling targets for Ku-ring-gai ▪ Large medium-high density housing development is out of character with low density residential areas, remote from train line or other public transport and not consistent with State, local or generally accepted good planning principles ▪ Current and planned traffic infrastructure is inadequate to support full scope of development ▪ Demands of additional traffic must be meet before any work can commence, requirement for completion should be linked to prior to issue of Construction Certificates ▪ Fox Valley Rd and Comenarra Pkwy were never designed to carry the additional traffic from the proposal and are already at capacity in peak periods ▪ Likely recommended road upgrades will be unachievable due to constraints such as private ownership as such roads will not be able to carry the additional traffic ▪ Delays at Pacific Hwy/Fox Valley Rd and Pennant Hills Rd/Comenarra Pkwy intersections will be made worse if development proceeds as proposed with upgrades not completed prior to development commencement ▪ Currently many local streets are uses as 'rat runs' to avoid the major arterial, this will only get worse from proposal ▪ Impacts of Hornsby Housing Strategy increased densities haven't been considered in traffic studies ▪ Traffic report seems to optimistically underestimate likely level of real traffic generation by proposal as public transport is some distance and cars will remain likely transport for most uses proposed – higher assumptions should be used 	<p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a "<i>Knowledge Asset and Key Industry</i>" and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site. It is noted that the Estate will not have any significant retail development that might compete with other existing town centres and the overall retail hierarchy.</p> <p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p> <p>As mentioned earlier, the proposed residential development is required to ensure that the hospital development is feasible. The residential density proposed is appropriate for a specialised centre of this size.</p> <p>The Preferred Plan involves the deletion of high density housing to the north of Mt Pleasant Avenue and replacement with medium density housing. High density housing will be concentrated towards the centre of the site.</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal for Pennant Hills Rd/Comenarra Pkwy and Comenarra Pkwy/Woods St are deficient and need to be reconsidered ▪ Proposed Comenarra Pkwy/Kissing Point Rd upgrade would endanger pedestrians and should be re-examined ▪ Yanko Rd/Ryde Rd intersection should be examined as part of proposal ▪ Proposed Osborn Rd connection likely to be counter productive and less safe for current residents ▪ Vegetation and habitat impacts are extreme and unacceptable not only in relation to CEECs ▪ STIF on site is more extensive than that mapped by Ku-ring-gai mapping – which is a better representation, development should not proceed before DEWHA consider ‘controlled action’ for both BGHF and STIF ▪ Ku-ring-gai mapping indicates impacts on CEECs will be substantially worse than indicated ▪ Clearing/modification/fragmentation of vegetation will result in reduced long term sustainability, impacts on riparian zones leading to Lane Cove NP and loss of habitat for endangered fauna ▪ Remnant BGHF/STIF trees are recognised under TSC Act, but these have not been identified or considered ▪ Support for transfer of all bushland to Lane Cove NP, but with provision for funding ▪ Number of problems associated with bushfire risk including access and evacuation for both existing and future residents ▪ Requirement for modification of large areas of bushland for APZs is unacceptable ▪ Number of ESD opportunities haven’t been considered including solar orientation of buildings, energy and water re-use, solar panels, rooftop gardens etc ▪ Development should be accompanied by WSUD that retains natural watercourses and aims to retain runoff on site – no stormwater should be permitted to enter non-riparian area ▪ Development of Residential East and Mt Pleasant precincts should not be allowed and school should be reduced to K-6 for reasons above 	<p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades (including The Comenarra Parkway, Pacific Highway and Pennant Hills Road). Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.</p> <p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p> <p>The Preferred Plan has been amended to ensure the preservation of native flora and fauna. Significant tree species have been identified. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>In times of bushfire threat, a suite of recommendations were proposed in Appendix L of the exhibited material, in particular that, upon approval of the Concept Plan, an Emergency Liaison Committee be established by the landowner. The purpose of the committee shall be to co-ordinate the preparation of the various Estate Evacuation Plans, implement evacuation drills and reviews of the individual Evacuation Plans. The Chair Person of the Committee shall also attend the Local Emergency Management Committee meetings and bring to those meetings and the Emergency Service Combat Agencies/support Welfare Agencies the emergency planning protocols and issues related to the various land uses within the Estate.</p> <p>In regard to the comment about clearing vegetation for APZ’s, one must be mindful that part of the clearing is required to protect existing development from bushfire threat, consistent with Planning for Bushfire guidelines of Rural Fire Service.</p> <p>ESD and WSUD principles will be addressed at Project / Development Application stage.</p> <p>Residential East precinct has been mostly deleted and Mt Pleasant precinct has been modified to replace apartment buildings with medium density housing.</p>
136	18 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nature of existing community is individual houses and proposed high concentration of houses would alter character of area considerably ▪ Existing small stores contribute to character of area/community and they would be adversely affected by competition from proposed shops ▪ The locality has adequate shops, there is no need for shops on hospital grounds ▪ Traffic congestion on Comenarra Pkwy and Fox Valley Rd already needs urgent attention ▪ Long delays are experienced getting out of Browns Rd in peak periods and not uncommon for traffic to queue back to Pennant Hills Rd in PM peak, to add another housing development would be irresponsible ▪ Removing on-street parking from Fox Valley Rd would create more problems in searching 	<p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a “<i>Knowledge Asset and Key Industry</i>” and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital’s status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site. It is noted that the Estate will not have any significant retail development that might compete with other existing town</p>

				for car parking	<p>centres and the overall retail hierarchy.</p> <p>Proposed small scale retail opportunities on the site are not proposed to compete with existing Fox Valley shops.</p> <p>The premise of this proposal is to create a working / living community – where most of the needs of the onsite workers / residents are provided onsite (thereby reducing car travel). A small retail / convenience component to the proposal is important.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads. This includes proposed upgrades to the Pennant Hills Road / Comenarra Parkway intersection and Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection.</p> <p>In regard to the intersection of The Comenarra Parkway and Browns Road, the RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ To address future traffic concerns along The Comenarra Parkway as a result of the development proposal, the RTA requires the developer to widen The Comenarra Parkway to provide two traffic lanes in each direction between Fox Valley Road and Browns Road; ▪ To facilitate vehicles turning right into and out of Browns Road as a result of future upgrades to The Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection it is recommended that consideration be given to the provision of a seagull treatment at the intersection of The Comenarra Parkway / Browns Road. <p>Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>Car parking is provided onsite. At this stage, the RTA have recommended the removal (either completely or during peak periods) of street parking to assist efficiency of traffic movements.</p>
137	18 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for Ku-ring-gai Council submission ▪ Concerned dense expansion of site leaves little room for expansion of hospital beyond that envisaged in the Concept Plan compromising long term viability ▪ Proposed removal of on-street parking on Fox Valley Rd will impact neighbouring streets, DGR requiring protection of local streets has not been addressed ▪ Documentation states there will be linkages to an integrated transport network, there is no local integrated transport network ▪ Unrealistic to assume car pooling will reduce car ownership ▪ Not apparent that ACA own land required for Osborn Rd link and no consent for arrangement from RTA ▪ Traffic report is inaccurate regarding turning at Ada Ave and fails to note impacts of traffic using local 'rat runs' 	<p>The Ku-ring-gai Council submission is addressed separately in this Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>The San Executive has informed this Concept Plan by outlining their needs for expansion over the next 15-20 years. The information provided by the San has been incorporated into this proposal.</p> <p>Car parking is provided onsite. At this stage, the RTA have recommended the removal (either completely or during peak periods) of street parking to assist efficiency of traffic movements.</p> <p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p> <p>The traffic report does acknowledge Lucinda Avenue and Ada Street as</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Likely 90% of school arrival demand will be during AM peak, not 60% as stated ▪ Drop off space is minimal for size of school ▪ No indication of how pedestrian crossing and roundabouts on Fox Valley Rd will impact traffic flow or how extra land for road widening will be acquired ▪ Discounting of car parking for commercial uses based on hospital car parking will exacerbate existing hospital parking problems ▪ DGR to consider pedestrian crossing to Fox Valley Village Centre has not been addressed ▪ Density of housing is far greater than stated and a gross overdevelopment of site ▪ Proponent has not demonstrated why site being 0.008% of the LGA ought to bear 10% of the dwelling target identified in the Metro Strategy when area is not serviced by integrated transport network nor identified in Metro Strategy ▪ No firm statement is provided on how many dwellings will remain owned by ACA and how many sold which is fundamental to traffic discounting, tentative measures proposed to control occupation of dwellings are subject to numerous unknowns ▪ Area for school is not big enough for proposed enrolments and no evidence of demand for high school ▪ No formal consultations have taken place regarding transfer of conservation land ▪ Areas of proposed zones far exceed areas shown for development and should be reduced to only cover development for their purposes, leaving APZs within the environment conservation zone ▪ Concern BGHF/STIF CEECs to be further destroyed/disconnected, area to E of Fox Valley Rd of great concern given connectivity to Lane Cove NP ▪ 12 storeys will create small CBD appearance in a low density bushland setting and absence of visual landscape report remarkable ▪ There are a very large number of inconsistencies in the documentation, numbers affecting FSR, densities and locations of buildings vary significantly 	<p>existing “short-cut” routes and suggests ameliorative measures to Council to discourage this.</p> <p>Drop off space is a detail design issue and will be addressed at Project / Development Application stage.</p> <p>The roundabout shown in the exhibited Concept Plan, at the front of the proposed school, has been replaced with traffic signals to assist pedestrian movements.</p> <p>No DGR specifically mentioned pedestrian crossings to Fox Valley Village Centre. Traffic signals at Fox Valley Road / Comenarra Parkway provide pedestrian crossing points.</p> <p>Density of housing is as per stated. We contend that the Hospital’s status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site. It is noted that the Estate will not have any significant retail development that might compete with other existing town centres and the overall retail hierarchy.</p> <p>Refer Statement of Commitment re ACA retained dwelling numbers.</p> <p>Allowance for the school to expand is based on information provided by the School.</p> <p>Formal consultations have indeed taken place with DECC about the transfer of conservation land.</p> <p>The modified zoning plan shows the APZs in an environmental conservation zone.</p> <p>The Preferred Plan has been amended to ensure the preservation of native flora and fauna. In particular preservation of BGHF and STIF. Amendments include the deletion of a majority of the development and roads to the east of Fox Valley Road to retain an environmental conservation precinct.</p> <p>The built form parameters proposed as part of the SSS listing are considered appropriate for this specialised employment centre of State significance. Specific issues relating to height, bulk and overshadowing are matters that need to be considered and addressed as part of future Development Applications within the estate.</p> <p>Further explanation should be provided, including examples, on where the inconsistencies are deemed to apply before further response can be provided.</p>
138	19 June 2009	Local Community Group	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objection to link road between Mt Pleasant Ave and Osborn Rd, it should be removed from plans ▪ Osborn Rd cannot and should not be subject to increased traffic volumes ▪ Objection as scale of proposal will alter local area forever ▪ Objection as proposal will strain already overstretched local road and public transport network ▪ Objection to loss of precious BGHF, should be no loss 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p> <p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a “<i>Knowledge Asset and Key Industry</i>” and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objection to Osborn Rd link as it is at capacity and narrow, Loreto and non-school traffic has not been considered, Osborn/Pennant Hills Rd has poor visibility and is dangerous, pedestrian safety is at risk, emergency and waste service vehicle access will be compromised, any attempt to widen Osborn Rd will potentially involve removal of BGHF ▪ Destruction of ecological corridors that join bush within Loreto to Lane Cove NP is of great concern ▪ If evacuation of NW precinct required Mt Pleasant Ave should be used, Osborn Rd is needed for 6 streets that feed into it ▪ Proposed 4 storey residential blocks on Mt Pleasant Ave are out of character with low density bush environment, impact on the aspect of adjoining properties and affect property values ▪ Mt Pleasant Ave development should be scaled back and scale of commercial, retail, school and residential expansion reduced to better fit site capabilities ▪ Site is some distance from public transport and not close to shops and will have little impact on reduction of need for cars ▪ New traffic lights at Mt Pleasant intersection synchronised with Osborn Rd lights would be much safer, extra delay on Pennant Hills Rd would be minimal ▪ No approval should be issued until traffic issues solved to satisfaction of residents ▪ Discounting for traffic generation based on employees living on-site is excessive 	<p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site. It is noted that the Estate will not have any significant retail development that might compete with other existing town centres and the overall retail hierarchy.</p> <p>As mentioned, the Preferred Plan will ensure the preservation of native flora and fauna. In particular preservation of BGHF and STIF.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Mt Pleasant precinct has been modified to replace apartment buildings with medium density housing.</p> <p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p> <p>RTA has confirmed that it will not support the provision of new traffic signals at the Pennant Hills Road / Mt Pleasant Avenue intersection.</p> <p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades (including The Comenarra Parkway, Pacific Highway and Pennant Hills Road). Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.</p> <p>Further explanation should be provided, including examples, on where the traffic generation rates are deemed excessive before further response can be provided.</p>
139	19 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal fragments critically endangered BGHF and fragments STIF ▪ All bushland must be conserved with linkages to adjoining bushland ▪ Edge to area ratio of remaining bushland will be dramatically increased ▪ Documentation overestimates extent of BGHF and STIF in locality ▪ Bushland on SE side of Fox Valley Rd should not be cleared because of a number of intact Ephemeral watercourses and vegetation occurs on clay/shale transition soils, rare for locality – area should be Environment Protection zone 	<p>As mentioned, the Preferred Plan will ensure the preservation of greater proportions of native flora and fauna. In particular preservation of BGHF and STIF.</p> <p>The Residential East precinct has been mostly deleted. The previous road link has therefore been reduced such that the only additional traffic onto Warwick Place may come from the 4 existing and 2 proposed dwellings that front Comenarra Parkway.</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed BGHF zone is too narrow to be viable and would degrade further ▪ Appendix M states BGHF will be retained in Coups Creek corridor but Fig 18 of EA shows an oval and dam ▪ All BGHF and STIF should be retained and protected ▪ Discussion on conservation of local forest types in locality is incorrect given types of soils that forests are located on ▪ Site contains habitat for threatened fauna species, further studies are needed ▪ Site contains habitat for threatened flora species likely to be present in soil seed bank ▪ Proposed new access in SE from Warwick PI is pointless as residential areas would have sufficient access without road ▪ Should be contractual arrangement that conservation lands be transferred to National Parks ▪ Proposal will increase impacts of hard surface stormwater runoff downstream Lane Cove River, on bushland and riparian corridors ▪ APZs in and adjacent to riparian areas should be narrower as riparian areas have low bushfire risk, bushland suffers from lack of fire management ▪ Why aren't APZs narrower in areas of low bushfire risk from high risk areas 	
140	19 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Guarantee of proposed traffic changes should be a prerequisite for project ▪ Turning right from Strone St to Fox Valley Rd is already congested, amazing no changes have been proposed to intersection ▪ Destruction of vegetation is not in keeping with concerns about climate change ▪ Not enough detail to see how close school sits to adjoining houses and no details of screening, elevations or visual impact ▪ Proposed school will take away existing treed and lawn outlook and change the nature of where we live ▪ Value of our house will decrease far more than effects of current financial crisis ▪ Proponent has made a big deal about community consultation, we live directly next door and have had no contact ▪ 4-6 storeys along Fox Valley Rd is not in keeping with current local character of no more than 2 storeys ▪ Proposal will cause more people to park in local streets ▪ Given size of development 3D model should have been provided to allow greater understanding of impacts on surrounding area ▪ If local Council had more to say project would be more in keeping with current surroundings 	<p>Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. The timing of works will be documented in the above VPA which will be exhibited for public viewing and prior to any construction occurring on site as contemplated by this Concept Plan.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The comment about detail surrounding the school will be dealt with at Project / Development Application phase. As per Clause 8.2 of the Concept Plan, approval is not sought for individual building designs (as shown on the Concept Plan) but rather the framework for developing each precinct.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest the value of surrounding property will decrease as a result of the proposal.</p> <p>Extensive consultation has occurred, over and above the statutory consultation requirements. Consultation conducted during the exhibition period is outlined in the Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>Parking provision has been made within the estate for onsite parking. We understand that there are no parking restrictions that currently exist on local roads.</p> <p>Unsubstantiated comment regarding Councils involvement in the process. Both State and Local Government are governed by the same planning assessment guidelines in NSW.</p>
141	19	Local	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Endorsement of redevelopment 	Noted

	June 2009	Resident		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposed low yield of residential density component compared to similar developments within Sydney should be commended ▪ Proposed employment generation complies with the Metropolitan Strategy, hospitals need to be expanded for aging population and school provides an alternative to existing schools ▪ Reported traffic issues have more to do with congestion on M2/M7 and F3 out of Sydney pushing traffic onto local roads especially during peak 	
142	19 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Documentation appears to be drafted in misleading form so as to making it difficult for average person to understand totality of proposal ▪ Proposal is gross overdevelopment of site ▪ Existing roads are congested at peak hour and can't cope with large scale development, access to local amenities would be severely hampered ▪ Lack of bushfire threat stated in proposal is wrong and misleading proven by recent history, present hospital has been evacuated due to a bushfire ▪ Evacuation of hospital, schools and other uses would become necessary due to smoke, there is only one way in and out and Fox Valley Rd is narrow hindering emergency vehicle access ▪ Site contains last remaining local stand of BGHF, incorporating it in residential sites will place pressure to remove trees for safety reasons and result in its total destruction ▪ Local schools of similar enrolment to that proposed would take 1/3 of the main western site ▪ Unbelievable scale of proposal can fit on site ▪ Applicants have asserted proposal has full community support which it doesn't ▪ Proposal is one out of selfish greed by applicants out of proportion for needs of small community 	<p>Further explanation is required as to the basis of the comment that the EA is misleading before a response can be provided.</p> <p>Further explanation is required as to why the proposal is deemed an overdevelopment of the site before a response can be provided. The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a "<i>Knowledge Asset and Key Industry</i>" and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital's status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site. It is noted that the Estate will not have any significant retail development that might compete with other existing town centres and the overall retail hierarchy.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Further explanation is required as to the basis of the comment that the bushfire report is misleading before a response can be provided. We note that</p> <p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p> <p>We have not said that the proposal has full community support.</p> <p>Unsubstantiated claim that the proposal is being carried out for greed. The proposal makes good planning sense and is one that should be commended.</p>
143	19 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for submissions #135 and Ku-ring-gai Council submission ▪ Application has nothing to do with hospital, should not be Part 3A and should fail on this ground ▪ Proposal will produce gridlock congestion on Fox Valley Rd and surrounding intersections 	<p>The Ku-ring-gai Council submission is addressed separately in this Preferred Project Report. Also, refer to #135 PPR response.</p> <p>The hospital component is a key function of this proposal. Like all precincts, framework is set to dictate how the hospital precinct will</p>

			<p>that will be insoluble</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Access for ambulances and fire fighting will be jeopardised ▪ Hospital and nurses accommodation should be allowed to expand, but no other development should occur ▪ Proposed loss of bushland and construction of APZs is unacceptable ▪ Headwaters of Lane Cove River will be loaded with nutrients ▪ Should application be approved it should be staged so traffic, environmental and other impacts can be evaluated before next stage is approved ▪ Over last 30 years Adventists have shown no interest in proper management of bushland ▪ All bushland not alienated by development should be transferred to Lane Cove NP 	<p>expand under this Concept Plan. Further detail design of the hospital precinct will be provided at the Project / Development Application stage. The proposal is a Part 3A project as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The capital value of the proposal exceeds \$15 million and is therefore of the kind described in Category 18 of Schedule 1, Group 7- Health and Public service facilities of Part 3A projects, outlined in the Major Projects SEPP. ▪ The value of the residential component of the project exceeds \$100 million indicating that this portion of the project is also a Major Project as defined in Category 13 of Schedule 1, Group 5 – Residential, Commercial or Retail projects. <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>Access for emergency services will still be available.</p> <p>The comment about allowing some expansion but not others is a piecemeal approach to planning this site. An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning's Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced and involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>With regard to impacts on Lane Cove River, the proposal is committed to the employment of best practice water sensitive urban design measures,</p> <p>Traffic, environmental and other impacts will be evaluated by the Consent Authority at each stage of the proposal before a Project / Development Application is issued as required by Section 79C of the Environmental, Planning and Assessment Act, 1979.</p> <p>Dispute in the strongest terms that bushland has been poorly managed. In fact, over the last 5 years alone, approximately \$100,000p.a has been spent on managing weeds alone. A Conservation Management Plan is in</p>
--	--	--	---	--

					place for conservation land surrounding the retirement village. Also, during a recent site inspection with DECC staff, we were congratulated on how impressive the Coups Creek corridor looked. It is expected that a function of this Concept Plan will require a Conservation Management Plan to be put in place for the entire land proposed to be zoned for Conservation.
144	19 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support for submissions #135 and #138 ▪ Concerned about impacts on local traffic an 	<p>Refer to #135 and #138 PPR response.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p>
145	19 June 2009	Local Community Group	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objection to environmental impacts including loss of BGHF and STIF listed as critically endangered under EPBC and TSC Acts, loss of urban corridor protection for the CEECs, loss of powerful owl and large-eared pied bat habitat, loss of foraging habitat for grey-headed flying fox, loss of bushland connectivity for fauna movement and adverse impacts on riparian zones led to Lane Cove NP downstream of development site ▪ Vegetation survey methodology is inadequate, Ku-ring-gai mapping provides more accurate representation of vegetation ▪ Key Threatening Processes of CEECs have been disregarded ▪ Loss of majority of BGHF cant be sanctioned ▪ Clearing BGHF for APZs will leave small areas not capable of functioning as a sustainable ecological community ▪ Every remnants of BGHF are crucial to survival of community and must be protected, BGHF on site has good connectivity to other bush increasing viability ▪ Weeds cant be used as a justification for reduction in value/clearing of remnant BGHF/STIF and stating remnants are not recoverable – refer St Ives example ▪ Remnant BGHF/STIF trees are recognised under TSC Act, but have not been identified/considered in the documentation ▪ Assertions that nearby BGHF remnants exist are questionable as soil is not shale and BGHF only occurs on shale ▪ Location of school oval requires clearing of BGHF and excessive fill that will alter hydrology, location needs to be reassessed and high school deleted ▪ Mapping of STIF differs to Ku-ring-gai Council mapping, proposal should not proceed until DEWHA assess controlled action relating to STIF ▪ Proposal will have significant detrimental impact on BGHF and STIF and as such is a Key Threatening Process and contrary to s5A92) of EP&A Act ▪ Roosting boxes for powerful owls is not a long term solution due to financial and management/maintenance issues, maintaining hollow bearing trees is best ▪ Retention of STIF is vital for grey-headed flying fox, removal will have significant impact on reproduction and recovery of species ▪ Claim of little or no impact on large-eared pied bat rejected given inadequate assessment ▪ Significant increase in residential dwellings will overload current sewerage system that runs adjacent to Lane Cove River ▪ A BMP is a worthwhile initiative but cant be used to justify large scale clearing and there are no details on funding, administration and management ▪ Proposed clearing of 60% of native vegetation on land with topographical constraints is an unacceptable over-development 	<p>The Preferred Plan has been amended to ensure the preservation of native flora and fauna. In particular preservation of BGHF and STIF. The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced and involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing) and will protect the powerful owl and large eared pied bat.</p> <p>In addition, vegetation and riparian zones will be managed in accordance with Biodiversity Management Plan.</p> <p>Mapping inconsistencies have been noted and addressed.</p> <p>With regard to impacts on Lane Cove River, the proposal is committed to the employment of best practice water sensitive urban design measures,</p>

146	19 June 2009	Local Community Group	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Objection to considerable loss of foraging habitat for grey headed flying fox listed as vulnerable on TSC and EPBC Acts ▪ Incremental loss of foraging habitat was recognised by NSW and Commonwealth Scientific Committees as the primary threat causing population decline ▪ Statements that a 'reasonable amount of foraging habitat will be lost' but that 'no direct impact will occur' for the species is inconsistent and objection to assertion that large amounts of foraging habitats – sizable STIF areas with capacity to remain viable are not common ▪ The population currently uses all available foraging habitat in the locality, any loss will impact the species ▪ University of Sydney research has identified further decline of population since listing in 2001, any loss of foraging habitat will impact the species ▪ Nectar and pollen from Turpentine is vital for the survival of the single young born to females each year ▪ STIF on site is only 5.5km from Ku-ring-gai Flying-fox Reserve making it important for females in first weeks after birth ▪ STIF mapping is not consistent with Ku-ring-gai mapping ▪ Proposed road and buildings east of Fox Valley Rd would fragment STIF given steep slope requiring cut and fill and need for APZs, they should be deleted ▪ Other areas of BGHF/STIF need to be given maximum protection ▪ Impacts of microbats have not been properly assessed, the 2004 study was inaccurate in duration and some species difficult to monitor with call detection 	<p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>Mapping inconsistencies have been noted and addressed</p> <p>Potential impacts on microbats and grey headed flying fox are covered in flora and fauna report.</p>
147	19 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose connection of Osborn Rd and Mt Pleasant Ave due to potential traffic chaos it will cause 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p>
148	19 June 2009	Community Group	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strong objection to proposal ▪ Concerned 60% of bush will be cleared or modified and only 13% will remain undisturbed bushland ▪ BGHF is probably largest remnant outside of the Dalrymple Hay Reserve, outrageous only proposed to retain 3% ▪ Undisturbed bush should be protected in perpetuity and would make important addition to Lane Cove NP or be protected under a voluntary conservation agreement under the National Parks and Wildlife Act ▪ Traffic infrastructure needs to be significantly upgraded to support the proposed mini township, but likely to be difficult due to private land ownership at relevant intersections ▪ Development purports to be a hospital upgrade but there is little information provided on the hospital expansion 	<p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>There will be significant corridors of bushland zoned for conservation. Discussions are ongoing with DECC with regard to ownership and management of these lands.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The Concept Plan sets the framework for expansion of the hospital precinct, along with other precincts. Building designs shown in other precincts (as opposed to the hospital precinct) are indicative only as we do not seek approval under the Concept Plan for such building designs.</p>
149	19 June	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose connection of Osborn Rd and Mt Pleasant Ave due to potential traffic chaos and danger it will cause 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p>

	2009				
150	19 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Questionable whether commercial/retail development opposite existing Fox Valley Neighbourhood Centre will enhance viability of existing Centre, additional traffic generated will exacerbate congestion at intersection ▪ School site is not large enough for 3 levels of education, high school should be deleted and school site reduced to prevent clearing of BGHF ▪ Extent of fill required for school oval will alter hydrology and impact bushland ▪ Adequate, safe drop off zones and parking haven't been provided for the school ▪ Increase in traffic due to school enrolment can't be justified ▪ Increase in dwellings will exacerbate existing congestion problems, particularly during peak hours ▪ Mapping of BGHF/STIF differs to the more accurate Ku-ring-gai Council mapping ▪ Council's mapped area of STIF is greater than 2ha satisfying EPBC Act criteria ▪ Remaining areas of BGHF/STIF are so small viability will be threatened and role for fauna movement/habitat will be impacted ▪ Remnant BGHF/STIF trees are recognised under TSC Act, but have not been identified/considered in the documentation ▪ Potential for erosion and depleted water quality will create downstream impacts ▪ Proposal will result in increased weed invasion ▪ Further road congestion will inhibit emergency vehicles accessing the hospital ▪ Proposed access road to Warwick Place should be deleted, it involves destruction/fragmentation of STIF and the entry point is outside of the development site and privately owned 	<p>It is considered necessary to include a small proportion of retail to support the proposal and the proposed location adjacent to the existing centre is the best location in the circumstances.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The proposed location of the school, and its size, reflects the future needs of the school (including its possible expansion). Its land size allocation reflects the size Department of Education expects for government run schools. Allowance for the school to expand is based on information provided by the School.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>The issue of mapping inconsistency has been addressed.</p> <p>There is a commitment to employ best practice water sensitive urban design measures to protect existing hydrology on the site.</p> <p>Erosion control and water quality control will be designed to best practice. Details will be provided at Project / Development Application stage.</p> <p>Management of weeds will be addressed in a Conservation Management Plan to be formulated for the onsite conservation land.</p> <p>Disagree that emergency vehicles will be impacted.</p> <p>Proposed access road to Warwick Place will now only provide access to the 4 existing and 2 proposed dwellings off Comenarra Parkway.</p>
151	19 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about potentially massive increase of traffic on Fox Valley Rd to development site from Pacific Hwy and adjoining roads ▪ Concerned about impact of access to Ada Ave South during construction and when extent of proposal realised ▪ Scale of proposal is inappropriate given distance from railway stations, relative lack of other public transport and above traffic concerns ▪ Traffic problems must be addressed before approval is given ▪ Smaller scale development would be more appropriate 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>In regard to the comment on impacts during construction phases, it is expected that the consent authority will require a construction / noise /</p>

					<p>traffic management plan produced and submitted prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate to allow onsite construction to commence.</p> <p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a “<i>Knowledge Asset and Key Industry</i>” and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital’s status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site. It is noted that the Estate will not have any significant retail development that might compete with other existing town centres and the overall retail hierarchy.</p> <p>Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. The timing of works will be documented in the above VPA which will be exhibited for public viewing and prior to any construction occurring on site as contemplated by this Concept Plan.</p> <p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning’s Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p>
152	19 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal will unduly pressure already stressed local road network ▪ Proposal will put more pressure on traffic flow, on-street parking, pedestrian crossings and noise on Fox Valley Rd ▪ No provision for greater access points to development, these potentially need to be through Normanhurst or from Pacific Hwy or Monavale Rd ▪ Fox Valley Rd and Comenarra Pkwy are at capacity during peak hours ▪ Preservation of open space is important in Ku-ring-gai, proposal will decrease amenity ▪ Remnants of local forest habitat should be preserved and open spaces kept for recreation and public purposes 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>As mentioned, the Preferred Plan involves a significant reduction in vegetation loss through the deletion of the Residential East precinct and increase levels of amenity. In addition, proposed density levels are appropriate for the specialised centre.</p>
153	19 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Oppose any road connection between Osborn Rd and Mt Pleasant Ave/WER ▪ No analysis shows proposed Osborn link is feasible or safe, cost of link would be greater than a set of lights at Mt Pleasant Ave/Pennant Hills Rd which are required anyway ▪ Traffic report omits basic information regarding existing conditions of Osborn Rd and its intersection with Pennant Hills Rd ▪ Oppose any loss of BGHF due to WER or any link with Osborn Rd 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p>
154	19 June 2009	LGA Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Proposal will destroy 2 CEECs ▪ Further loss of rare bushland will affect ability of native fauna to move, breed and feed ▪ Destruction of bush exposes urban-bush interfaces which result in deterioration of good bush by nutrient, weeds, light and stormwater runoff 	<p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF</p>

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction of CEECs will further reduce habitat of endangered fauna, increasing chances of extinction Incremental loss of bush is not in the interests of a healthy sustainable country for future generations 	<p>EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p> <p>The proposal involves a commitment to employ best practice water sensitive urban design measures.</p>
155	22 June 2009	Community Member	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal for bulk housing is not positioned in a transport corridor or close to rail station to promote public transport, it therefore fails to meet State government urban consolidation policies Development of the scale proposed should be held in abeyance until plans for the F3/Sydney Orbital link are confirmed 	<p>The proposed density is appropriate for any specialised centre which is considered an employment hub. Public transport will improve overtime as density increases.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>There is no need to delay important planning decisions such as this proposal on the basis of the F3/M2 link. The traffic analysis in Appendix J considered the benefits on the F3/M2 link however accepted that this may not be in place for some time and therefore reported on what upgrades were required to existing roads to cater for background growth + this development proposal.</p>
156	22 June 2009	Community Group	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal is a substantial overdevelopment of the site given current role as specialised medical centre Proposal supposed to be for hospital expansion should not include development of mini township Concerned about impact on CEECs and fauna corridors of Coups Ck and Fox Valley Proposal requires extensive clearing/modification of vegetation, overall connectivity between bushland will be greatly reduced and generally remaining bush is impacted by edged effects and weeds Opposition to destruction of valuable habitat particularly as so few metropolitan corridors remain Major discrepancies between mapping provided and Ku-ring-gai mapping and result is substantially more BGHF/STIF will be cleared than is estimated Vulnerable or endangered fauna are likely to be affected by substantial habitat loss Existing and proposed traffic infrastructure not extensive enough to address needs of development Some of land required for road upgrades is in private ownership, unclear how upgrades can be made 	<p>The Draft North Subregional Strategy lists the San as a “<i>Knowledge Asset and Key Industry</i>” and is also recognised as an existing cluster of business activity associated with knowledge infrastructure identified above and the skill base of its resident workforce, which can be leveraged for ongoing success.</p> <p>We contend that the Hospital’s status as a specialised employment centre should be acknowledged in the context of the North Sub-Regional Strategy. As a result it is proposed that the urban design objectives prepared for other town centres such as height, density and built form should be applied to the site. It is noted that the Estate will not have any significant retail development that might compete with other existing town centres and the overall retail hierarchy.</p> <p>An extensive range of environmental studies and constraints / opportunities mapping was conducted as part of this proposal, and as required by the Department of Planning’s Director General Requirements. In addition, infrastructure service authorities were consulted as outlined in Appendix Q of the exhibition material. Services can be augmented and upgraded to cater for the development as proposed. The proposed uses are deemed appropriate and are justified.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p>

					<p>The issue of mapping inconsistency has been addressed.</p> <p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p>
157	23 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Major concern is doubling of traffic on Fox Valley Rd and Comenarra Pkwy, which are already overstressed at times ▪ Doubling the size of the school, apartments and shopping centre would result in even more cars ▪ Important to consider loss of remnant BGHF and associated wildlife, a remaining remnant of a beautiful forest which covered much of the North Shore 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p>
158	23 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Strongly object to hundreds of new houses and apartments, which will increase cars and traffic chaos ▪ Road system will not cope with increased traffic, even if proposed road changes are done roads will still be congested at times ▪ Unclear and concerned as to what will happen in time of emergency evacuation with traffic gridlock, possibility people will be burnt in cars ▪ Proposal tries to cram too many buildings in area without upgrading road infrastructure ▪ Saddened by loss of local flora and fauna ▪ Flora and Fauna study is a 2 day environmental impact study and is inadequate ▪ Time given to local residents to understand proposal is too short ▪ Was site declared State significant by previous Minister because developer is State significant donor? 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>In times of bushfire threat, a suite of recommendations were proposed in Appendix L of the exhibited material, in particular that, upon approval of the Concept Plan, an Emergency Liaison Committee be established by the landowner. The purpose of the committee shall be to co-ordinate the preparation of the various Estate Evacuation Plans, implement evacuation drills and reviews of the individual Evacuation Plans. The Chair Person of the Committee shall also attend the Local Emergency Management Committee meetings and bring to those meetings and the Emergency Service Combat Agencies/support Welfare Agencies the emergency planning protocols and issues related to the various land uses within the Estate.</p> <p>As mentioned, the amount of vegetation loss has been significantly reduced with the deletion of the majority of the Residential East precinct, redesign of the school, removal of proposed buildings near the rear of the SDA offices (in Fox Valley Road precinct) and relocation of stormwater detention facilities. The Preferred Project Plan involves 4.6 ha of BGHF and STIF EEC to be retained or re-established (compared to 0.17 ha originally proposed). Of this 4.6 ha total, approximately 1.4 ha of EEC is to be regenerated. 0.78 ha of EEC is proposed to be cleared (compared to 2.43 ha originally proposed for clearing).</p>

					<p>The project was placed on exhibition for the statutory period of time. During the exhibition period, the Minister for Planning authorised the exhibition period to be extended for a further 2 weeks to give the community the opportunity to read and understand the documentation to inform submissions.</p> <p>Application was made under available legislation. The reason for its State significance is outlined in the SSS report.</p>
159	24 June 2009	MP	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerns relate to environmental, bushfire, density and residential impact, but biggest concern is traffic ▪ Comenarra Pkwy and Fox Valley Rd exceed capacity during peak periods, , proposed development will impose significant additional traffic onto already stretched roads – makes no sense to worsen traffic difficulties ▪ Proposed Mt Pleasant Ave/Osborn Rd link will have considerable impact on existing residents and would add traffic to a road (Mt Pleasant Ave) that serves a major school (Loreto) ▪ Unless traffic issues have been resolved to satisfaction of local residents development should not be approved 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads. In addition to RTA approval, a bushfire report was produced as part of this proposal (Appendix L) in accordance with the provisions of the RFS Planning for Bushfire Protection. An addendum to this report accompanies the Preferred Project Report.</p> <p>The Osborn link has been deleted from the proposal.</p> <p>RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to a number of roadwork upgrades (including The Comenarra Parkway and Pennant Hills Road). Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009. In our opinion, the RTA is therefore satisfied that the proposal (and rezoning) can be approved as proposed.</p>
160	24 June 2009	Local Resident	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As member of SAH staff do not object to expansion of hospital itself which will be of great community benefit ▪ Roads in area are already overcrowded, if there was a bushfire people living in area would not be able to get out in a hurry ▪ Unclear why need to build more shops when there is adequate shopping 5 minutes away ▪ Wahroonga and surrounding areas have always has a unique village atmosphere and if proposed development goes ahead this will be lost ▪ The SDA school in Castle Hill could take the students from the existing school on the hospital site ▪ Idea that housing would be built for staff members (does this mean SDA staff members would be able to purchase affordable housing?) is this not discrimination 	<p>A traffic analysis has been conducted that considers the existing traffic movements, increases those movements with background growth and then considers what impact the proposed development will have on top of existing + background growth movements. A suite of recommended road upgrades have been proposed (and generally supported by RTA) that maintains, or improves, existing level of service on surrounding roads.</p> <p>The premise of this proposal is to create a working / living community – where most of the needs of the onsite workers / residents are provided onsite (thereby reducing car travel). A small retail / convenience component to the proposal is important.</p> <p>As mentioned, the development should be treated as a specialised centre. The proposed dwelling density is considered appropriate for its location within a specialised employment hub.</p> <p>The proposed school has been modelled on anticipated demand.</p> <p>There is a significant amount of housing owned by the SDA, this will remain the case.</p>

Part B – Pro-forma – submissions

No.	Date recd	Submitter	Nature	Comment	Preferred Project Report Response
A1 – A10	Various	Local Residents	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposed to the application and unacceptable impacts on Mt Pleasant Ave ▪ Mt Pleasant Ave already carries an unacceptable level of traffic at all times of the day and night from the existing SDA development and Girls High School ▪ Mt Pleasant Ave is narrow, has blind spots and was never intended to cope with large developments ▪ In November 1999 the Hornsby Council Traffic Engineer stated there was to be no new development permitted to obtain access from Mt Pleasant Ave onto Pennant Hills Rd without resolving the existing traffic deficiency ▪ The plans show a potential link to Osborn Rd, this should be done before the redevelopment begins and Mt Pleasant Ave closed at the boundary of Hornsby/Ku-ring-gai LGAs 	<p>Following extensive feedback from local residents during the exhibition period, and ongoing discussions with the RTA, additional traffic modelling was conducted regarding the access options for the Mt Pleasant Precinct. Due to the nature of development proposed in this precinct (ie partly associated with the retirement village with typically lower vehicle movements or movements outside of peak periods), analysis estimated that the Mt Pleasant precinct would generate about 46 additional trips during peak hours.</p> <p>Based on RTA guidelines, confinement of additional traffic to Mt Pleasant Avenue would not elevate the traffic level on this road above the RTA environmental goals for this road.</p> <p>This modelling therefore indicates that the proposed Mt Pleasant Precinct development could still satisfactorily proceed with access only via Mt Pleasant Avenue (with no traffic control signals). It is also noted that this modelling was provided to RTA and DoP based on the exhibited Concept Plan proposal (and not the reduced Preferred Project Report proposal).</p> <p>The Osborn Road link has therefore been deleted from the proposal.</p>
B1 – B 41	Various	Local Residents	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Intersection of Osborn Rd and Pennant Hills Rd is dangerous and Osborn Rd is already at capacity for vehicles, any increase in volume on Osborn Rd is unsustainable ▪ Suggestions that this intersection is under utilised fail to capture the existing situation and have not be calculated with reference to peak times ▪ Loreto Normanhurst traffic has not been considered, at times it takes more than one set of lights to turn right or traverse the Osborn Rd and Pennant Hills Rd intersection ▪ Loreto facilities are used by the public outside of school hours, the approval for these facilities can not have accounted for traffic increases under the current proposal ▪ Access for ambulance, police and fire vehicles is an issue and also evacuation during fire events, Osborn Rd in narrower than Mt Pleasant Rd ▪ Widening of Osborn Rd will involve removal of Blue Gums, the BGHF is a loved feature of the area and the destruction of ecological corridors is of great concern. There should be no loss of BGHF ▪ The area is part of a large low density bushland environment and it should stay that way, 3 storey residential blocks on Mt Pleasant Ave is totally out of character with the area ▪ Proposed development will adversely affect property values ▪ If proposal cant be accommodated via the existing traffic flow, 2 options are to scale back development in Mt Pleasant Ave or traffic signals at Mt Pleasant Ave and Pennant Hills Rd ▪ No approval should be granted until traffic issues are resolved to satisfaction of residents ▪ Scale of commercial, retail, school and residential expansion should be reduced to better fit site capabilities ▪ Proposed link from Mt Pleasant to Osborn Rd should be removed from the plans 	<p>The Osborn Road link has been deleted from the proposal.</p> <p>Vehicle movements from the proposed development will access Pennant Hills Road via Mt Pleasant Avenue.</p> <p>RTA has confirmed that it will not support the provision of new traffic signals at the Pennant Hills Road / Mt Pleasant Avenue intersection.</p> <p>Subsequent traffic modelling, provided to RTA and DoP, indicates that the proposed Mt Pleasant Precinct development could still satisfactorily proceed with access only via Mt Pleasant Avenue (with no traffic control signals). It is also noted that this modelling was provided to RTA and DoP based on the exhibited Concept Plan proposal (and not the reduced Preferred Project Report proposal).</p>
C1	4 June	Petition 45	Objection	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about impacts on local traffic volume and ease of movement in the area 	In regard to the intersection of The Comenarra Parkway and Browns

	2009	Local Resident Signatures		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Particular concern about impact on access to and from Browns Road onto Comenarra Pkwy, which at peak times is currently difficult as there is no control of traffic at the intersection Additional traffic plant around the area and on Fox Valley Rd during development phase is of concern 	<p>Road, the RTA, in their letter to Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009, advise that they have no objections to the development as proposed under the Concept Plan subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To address future traffic concerns along The Comenarra Parkway as a result of the development proposal, the RTA requires the developer to widen The Comenarra Parkway to provide two traffic lanes in each direction between Fox Valley Road and Browns Road; To facilitate vehicles turning right into and out of Browns Road as a result of future upgrades to The Comenarra Parkway / Fox Valley Road intersection it is recommended that consideration be given to the provision of a seagull treatment at the intersection of The Comenarra Parkway / Browns Road. <p>Statement of Commitments have been provided within this Preferred Project report committing to negotiate a VPA or other mechanism with the RTA to address works as generally described in their letter to the Department of Planning dated 18 June 2009.</p> <p>In regard to the comment on additional traffic plant during development phased, it is expected that the consent authority will require a construction / noise / traffic management plan produced and submitted prior to the issue of a Construction Certificate to allow onsite construction to commence.</p>
D1 – D39	10, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22 & 25 June 2009	Various	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal has benefits for entire community and in particular teachers, parents and students of the School Proposal would allow children to complete entire education at one campus and the new location is in a safer area better suited to educational purposes Expanded hospital and provision of affordable housing also of benefit to community 	Noted
E1-E58	15, 17 & 19 June 2009	Various	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal will assist the Hospital meet increased demand for medical and nursing services in the area Critical the Hospital plans now to enable it to serve community needs over next 20 years 	Noted
F1 – F163	11, 17 & 19 June 2009	Various	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Many colleagues at San hospital can't afford a property in Wahroonga, proposal would enable them to live and work on-site Features such as car pooling and focus on pedestrian/cycle friendly environment appealing Expanded hospital and school and new retail can only benefit entire Wahroonga area 	Noted
G1 – G59	17 & 19 June 2009	Various	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal has substantial benefits for local area Proposal will deliver bigger and better hospital, new school catering for high school students, additional retail and housing Plans include large portion of open space and protection/maintenance of native bushland Creation of 5000 jobs is beneficial 	Noted
H1 – H95	17 & 19 June	Various	Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome proposal enabling hospital to grow and meet increasing demand for medical and nursing services in area Appreciate planning for residential accommodation and affordable housing to enable staff to live and work on-site 	Noted

				<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Features such as car pooling and focus on pedestrian/cycle friendly environment appealing▪ New retail, relocation of school and other facilities will benefit Wahroonga area	
--	--	--	--	---	--