

CIF Session 1 - Mortdale Community Centre - 23rd November 2016

CIF Session 2 - Oatley Community Hall - 26th November (10-12)

CIF Session 2 - Oatley Community Hall - 26th November (3-5)

| CIF | Theme | Comments |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Session 1 | Myles Dunphy Reserve | Planned upgrade to Boardwalk is not sensitive the MDR |
| Session 1 | Scale of Proposed Development | All other buildings in Oatley are only 2-3 stories |
| Session 1 | Scale of Proposed Development | Oatley is not a 'high rise' zone - anything over 2 stories is 'high-rise' |
| Session 1 | Scale of Proposed Development | Oatley has a village atmosphere - this development is in consistent with this |
| Session 1 | Accommodation for Seniors | Buildings over 2 stories will lead to social isolation for Seniors - people won't be encourage to come out of their tower in the upper floors and come down to the common areas |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | You need to think carefully about what you do here |
| Session 1 | Accommodation for Seniors | Uniting Care facility on Oatley Rd - a good example of aged care in the area |
| Session 1 | Scale of Proposed Development | Building on the western side of Oatley train station - this is the kind of 'high-rise' proposed for the site and would not look good |
| Session 1 | Accommodation for Seniors | Support for the concept of seniors housing but not of the scale proposed for the site |
| Session 1 | Impact of Development | Development would have an impact on the surrounding area beyond the site - especially the surrounding streetscape if trees have to be removed for car park or access |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Public land should never go into private hands |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Nearby Oatley Park has more than sufficient facilities for the community for recreation |
| Session 1 | Impact of Development | Access to the site is very poor - this will be a problem during construction and afterwards |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | The area should be re-vegetated or allocated for a community garden - not built on or developed |
| Session 1 | Accommodation for Seniors | You talk about 'seniors housing' and 'aged care' these are not the same - what is proposed here? |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Session 1 | Impact of Development | Combined development and improved community services will unacceptably increase the intensive use of the site |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Feeling that the former Hurstville Council allowed the former Bowling Club become derelict so that they could demolish it and facilitate development |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Who will pay to maintain the site and the community facilities in the long term? If it's Council then that means ratepayers will pay for something we don't want |
| Session 1 | Community Facilities | Oatley Park is a good example of a local park that has community facilities and encourages people to access the park |
| Session 1 | Scale of Proposed Development | The site is too small for what is proposed |
| Session 1 | Process and/or Consultation | The survey is not objective. It's a disgrace that it pre-supposes that an aged care facility will already be there and you are only asking about what we want to see next to it - I don't want it at all. |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Not opposed to density housing - it is necessary but for every increase in intensive land use we need to preserve more open space to offset this |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | In 1945 this site was purchased by Council for a public park - it should not be subject to any change in the original intent |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Younger families need access to the site and to public open space |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Who will "own" the 50% community zone of the site? |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | The new Sothern Plans released by the Greater Sydney Commission note the real need for open green space - why build on this site and then have to "look" for more? |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | There has been a real change in the nature of housing in the area - there are now far fewer quarter acre blocks with many having been converted to duplexes. People now need even more access to open space. |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | This is an improved version from the 2012 proposal |
| Session 1 | Scale of Proposed Development | In 2012 the economics of the development were done and considered - they are missing from this version but needed. I want to know what Council is expecting receive from this lease and do the financial make sense for a development of this scale? Fear that if this is approved as a concept without a business case then once approved when the business case is complete it will show that the site is not economically feasible unless the scale or intensity is increased. |
| Session 1 | Myles Dunphy Reserve | The Reserve is not well used because of poor access - strongly support better access to the site to allow |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|--|
| | | people to enjoy it |
| Session 1 | Scale of Proposed Development | Personal view is that the scale of what is currently proposed is OK. The suggested proportion of operational land at 50% is appropriate |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Back to bush is impossible for this site |
| Session 1 | Scale of Proposed Development | Agree the site is best suited to aged care rather than other types of seniors housing - Council needs to be clear what is proposed in a nursing home |
| Session 1 | Impact of Development | The traffic report completed for the Planning proposal was conducted during construction of the western section of the new station and lots of roads etc. were blocked off - I don't think the current traffic report is very accurate |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | What does the 51%/49% split mean - I am suspicious this may have implications like company ownership |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Unstructured open space is critical for social well-being and mental health. |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Open space has multiple benefits and is useful for multi generations - you need a mix of open space that included places that do not have structured activities like equipment or sports fields which is not useful for many groups |
| Session 1 | Community Facilities | A men's shed or community garden nursery is a good idea for the site and was already proposed. Why are these things only possible with development of the site? |
| Session 1 | Process and/or Consultation | I feel like Council is only going through the motions for consultation. Why are they still progressing when there was overwhelming opposition to the proposal in previous consultation rounds? |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | We need spaces that are available for passive recreation - open and natural not built out. |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Community facilities should not be a trade-off for open space - We have to justify keeping land that was purchased as a park and are being asked to trade of facilities for development that could occur somewhere else |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Why isn't Council considering development of aged care in a more appropriate location like the Car Park at McMahon st - it should be built here. |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | This is an inappropriate site for this development - the site has known issues with landfill, gradient, access, water - I have requested access to the report on land and sub-surface soils but it is not ready yet |
| Session 1 | Scale of Proposed Development | This is unprecedented scale of development for this area - 18.5m is double the usual 2 stories or 9m from the rest of the area - this is NOT Oatley West |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | I personally want the whole site put back to bush or park - there aren't enough places kids can go |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Given the site has already been cleared - it should be retained now as passive open space for the community. |
| Session 1 | Process and/or Consultation | We campaigned against the Coles development to be as big as it is and now its size is being used as precedent for development of this scale in Oatley |
| Session 1 | Accommodation for Seniors | If Council feel that Seniors housing is really important - what other sites are they considering? |
| Session 1 | Scale of Proposed Development | The character of the site must ensure the look and materials are in keeping with the natural bush location |
| Session 1 | Process and/or Consultation | Consultations happen but they don't make any difference |
| Session 1 | Process and/or Consultation | The consultation strategy is frustrating - it doesn't allow for conversation |
| Session 1 | Scale of Proposed Development | We need a diagram or map that shown where the Club footprint used to be relative to the proposed building envelope |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | There is a heritage culvert (drain) built in 1888 - need to assess any impacts on this |
| Session 1 | Impact of Development | There is a service track for Sydney Water - need to check if it is still used |
| Session 1 | Process and/or Consultation | There is no 'closing date' for the consultation - what is open and for how long? |
| Session 1 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Council must ensure this site is not sold as residential aged-care housing |
| Session 1 | Scale of Proposed Development | Consider that once this Planning Proposal is agreed the developer will come back and request more - including parking for staff |
| Session 1 | Community Facilities | Community garden is a good idea for this suite |
| Session 1 | Scale of Proposed Development | Nothing more than 2 stories should be approved for this site |
| Session 1 | Scale of Proposed Development | View from the village - visual impact should be reduced through good design - green walls and appropriate colours etc. |
| Session 1 | Community Facilities | Gungahbay trees are a good choice for a safe tree |
| Session 1 | Community Facilities | Walking trails should be sensitively designed |
| Session 1 | Scale of Proposed Development | Car paring should not encroach outside the current site - not remove trees to build a car park |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Session 1 | Scale of Proposed Development | You must get the landscaping right - maintain the Oatley character and our way of life |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | Too high - this is not Hurstville |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | 18 metre height approval is the 'end of Oatley West' |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Knock down rebuild across the LGA is intensifying development at a small scale but with bigger cumulative impact |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | This will be the biggest building in Oatley |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | This site is OK for seniors housing/nursing home but not what is proposed |
| Session 2 | Impact of Development | Proximity to the station would mean commuters likely to use the public car park |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | The site is too small for what is proposed - you should offer to buy the neighbours houses |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | 5 stories is misleading - ty it is really 7 because it includes 1 story below ground and 1 at the top to house plant and equipment and services |
| Session 2 | Impact of Development | With clever design you could capitalise on the gradient of the site and minimise the impact above ground |
| Session 2 | Impact of Development | The bulk of the building is at the highest point of the site - exacerbating the impact of the scale |
| Session 2 | Impact of Development | Entrance at Mulga Rd/River Rd is far too narrow - concern this road would need to be widened and removal of vegetation on the edge of the MDR would have to take place to fit a road and walkway |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Because the previous proposals did not proceed - people have invested in their homes which may now be negatively impacted by the development (neighbour comment) |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | 18.5m is too high for development at this site - it will be the gateway to precedent for other buildings of this size and scale |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | General support for seniors housing or aged acre housing but not at this scale |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Uncertain about the tenure of the site - sale vs leasing arrangements for the site - who will continue to own it and how long would a lease be for? |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Oatley has some highly prized stone walls in the LGA and there are two good examples at this site - will they be retained? |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | OK with 5 stories and supportive of the location adjacent to the railway line |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | 5 stories is too high - would be supportive of 3 stories |
| Session 2 | Environmental Concerns | No assessment of the impact of light pollution has been considered. This is important for neighbours but also for nocturnal predators from the adjacent MDR including the Powerful Owl and species of Micro Bats |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | Visual impact of the development will be amplified because the building its sited at the highest point of the block |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Access to the site is dangerous - especially for elderly residents d pedestrians |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | A wide drop off and turning bay at the front door will be required for Ambulance and patient drop off |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | The access road will need to be wide enough for trucks serving the building as well as Ambulance. Fire Trucks and other Emergency vehicles. This would require a significant bigger road than currently exists |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Provision of community facilities and BBQs, toilets, picnic shelters etc. will encourage groups to gather there at night and will lead to anti-social youth behaviours because it is a secluded area |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Walking distance from the train may lead to the site becoming a known gather place you youths |
| Session 2 | Impact of Development | Delays to train station redevelopment incl traffic bottlenecks has led to ongoing negative impacts in the area - this will be worse |
| Session 2 | Impact of Development | Hard surfaced car parks etc will increase storm water run-off into the MDR - if the development is to proceed it must include Water Sensitive Deign principles to minimise impact on the surrounding Reserve |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Not opposed to the development but think that compromise with the community is important - Coles development ids a recent example of this in practice |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | 3 stories would be acceptable - this is more in keeping with the character of the areas. Oatley is not Hurstville |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | Why a decision now during Administration. Feel like the Train Station redevelopment set the precedent t for this |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | Very short lead time for notice of consultation and invitation to participate |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | Let's be realistic about consultation and not rush through |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | 80 bed nursing home in Mimosa St (Hillcrest) - a good example locally |
| Session 2 | Environmental Concerns | There are errors in the Environmental Assessment - does not include a known population of Acacia Prominens (Gosford Wattle) which has been determined to be an endangered population |
| Session 2 | Environmental Concerns | Sydney Turpentine-Ironbark Forest occurs adjacent to the site and encroaches on some boundaries. This community is listed as endangered in NSW |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | The site currently has a listing of 'Category 2 for the purposes of Bush Fire risk. Until the 1960's this area was open forest with a light grassy understorey but regrowth ad dense woody shrubs make the land much more prone to bushfire risk It has been a long time since the District Bushfire Management Committee (the local determining authority) has conducted a risk assessment of the site - this should be requested by Council because if in fact it now meets the criteria for 'Category 1' assessment then the prescribed setbacks for development would change |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | The site is not suitable for this type of infrastructure - especially the requirements for access roads in emergencies where the proposed access is directly adjacent to the area of greatest bushfire risk |
| Session 2 | Environmental Concerns | Site is prone to catastrophic firestorm event. Example of Jannali fire in 1994 given where embers blew across the Woronora river |
| Session 2 | Impact of Development | Stormwater run-off of the site must be contained and remediated if it is not to impact the MDR. A pipe and easement approach is old fashioned and out of step with current trends in water sensitive urban design |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Support for aged care facilities in the area and recognised need for good quality passive open space with walkways and greenery |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | 5 stories will require multiple lifts to provide access to residents and visitors - this will be noisy and have to be housed on the roof |
| Session 2 | Impact of Development | Any nursing home will need to have 24hr medical care - this will have a greater impact on the nearby houses and residents |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | Council is only doing consultation as window dressing - how do they respond when the overwhelming community sentiment is opposed to the development? They proceed anyway - example of Lower Gannons Park consultation given as an example. My belief is that the decision is already made |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | All the Councillors and Administrator are pro development |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | The Council name should not be 'Georges River' it should be St George |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Council allowed the site to become dilapidated so that they could redevelop |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | Understand the need for 2 story development - this is more appropriate |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | I volunteer with elderly and in my experience high-rise developments always lead to closed doors are far more anti-social. Why can't we consider more open and accessible designs - like a 'MEWS' style development?? |
| Session 2 | Environmental Concerns | Groundwater impacts have not been adequately addressed in Planning proposal |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | The Bowling Club should never have been approved in the first place - this is Public Land and should be returned to bush land. Council is using the precedent of a building being there to set up the case for re-development |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | I believe the Proposal needs to be for at least 100 beds if it is to be financial viable |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Concerns about the access - Council should consider an overpass over the railway or under it accessed from the Public Carpark on Oatley Parade |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | Neighbour - didn't receive the letter box drop and only found out from another neighbour. Very short lead time for invitation to attend the session |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Support that the land will be used - vacant land currently is not ideal |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | Why not consider terraced or excavated site so that the top of the building is consistent with the rest of the neighbourhood |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Access of the site is too narrow to be suitable - concerns about how this will be dealt with |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Want to see the original sandstone block at the site re-purposed or re-used for a new retaining wall |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Approval of this Planning Proposal will set a precedent for larger development in the area |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | There has been virtually no ongoing communication about this issue - this event was only advertised in the leader this week |
| Session 2 | Environmental Concerns | There are significant concerns for a residential facility of this nature located close to a known flying fox colony - health issues |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Will the adjoining neighbours be compensated? |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Can elderly residents be realistically cared for in a site like this given bushfire risks and access issues? |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | Approval will set the precedent for other 5 story buildings in the area |
| Session 2 | Myles Dunphy Reserve | Can the proposed building be seen from the MDR? |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | How high is the proposed building in relation to the Station? Would it exceed the current height of the platforms? |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Support for people wanting to remain in their communities - what about the Oatley Hall site for Nursing Home accommodation? |
| Session 2 | Impact of Development | Important that the aesthetics if the building are sympathetic to the area and are environmentally friendly |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | The site should include multifunctional community space |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | Council should engage directly with neighbours |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Concerns about the design quality of the buildings |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | Approval will set precedent for this kind of development |
| Session 2 | Myles Dunphy Reserve | Current state of the Reserve is very poor and could be improved |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | 80 bed nursing home around the corner (Hillcrest in Mimosa St, Oatley) is only 3 stories |
| Session 2 | Impact of Development | Parking will need consideration - times, not overrun my staff etc. |
| Session 2 | Impact of Development | How will operational noise be considered? Arrivals of staff and services, deliveries, ambulances, running of plant and equipment - the site is a natural amphitheatre and so will echo all the noise |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | Would it be possible to make this project viable at 60 beds and 3 stories? - 3 stories is more considerate of the local area |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Recreational uses and revegetation is the preferred community option for this site |
| Session 2 | Accommodation for Seniors | Agree there is a need for more aged care accommodation in the suburb |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | The site is no good to anyone the way it is and something needs to be done |
| Session 2 | Myles Dunphy Reserve | There needs to be recognition of the Dunphy family and legacy at the site |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Why not consider other site - conduct a potential land survey of the dis-used car park at CNR Hurstville Rd and Yarran Rd |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Should there be a better and more integrated traffic network for the Area to make movement more efficient? |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | A decision after 2017 is too long away |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | This is one of the better proposals |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | 3 stories would be acceptable to the community - 5 stories and we will fight to the death |
| Session 2 | Impact of Development | Concern about residents of the home looking into people's backyards |
| Session 2 | Myles Dunphy Reserve | Trail walk should connect to Yarran St and Myrtle St so community can walk through the Reserve safely (Note this is already a local shortcut) |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | The natural ground is much lower than the old Bowling Club site - more analysis of natural ground level is required |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | More consideration needs to be given to setbacks for neighbours |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | Consultation seems like a white wash - there were 78 objections to the proposal and only 4 in support. Most people are against the development and there is a lot of anger in the community |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Want to see the site returned to bushland |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | This is a waste of public money |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | 3 stories is high enough. Keen to preserve the village atmosphere |
| Session 2 | Community Facilities | Don't want BBQs or any other infrastructure - should be left as open space or returned to bush |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | There is an active bush care group - they want it to be re-generated and left as public space\ |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Community uses or centre would be better than aged care facility |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Council left the site to degrade on purpose s they could begin t=the redevelopment |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Session 2 | Accommodation for Seniors | This option should have been built at Mortdale Community Centre not here |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Has the RTA need involved in assessing site suitability? |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Myles Dunphy fought for open space and natural bush - this proposal goes against everything he fought for |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | Why is the administrator pushing this through now about not making a decision? |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | Dispirited with community consultation |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Access to the site is very poor and there is a real chance of an accident at night for pedestrians |
| Session 2 | Accommodation for Seniors | Not appropriate for this site |
| Session 2 | Community Facilities | Bike tracks are not a good idea for this site - too narrow and incompatible with pedestrians or passive recreation especially if they are seniors |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | How many of the 3-5 stories could be underground? |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | This will create precedent for other development. Community care about where we live - this is awful |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | This is going to become an election issue. We won't really know where people stand until it is too late |
| Session 2 | Impact of Development | Where will staff park? |
| Session 2 | Scale of Proposed Development | Sewage services to the site are inadequate - there are often overflows downstream from the current pressure |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | Sick of people taking our land |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Who will own the title - tenure of the site long term? |
| Session 2 | Accommodation for Seniors | We don't need aged care in Oatley |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | Survey is poorly constructed - it doesn't ask for demographic data so you can't tell where respondents are from |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | Survey doesn't ask the right questions - it doesn't allow any discussion about what is suitable for the site but pre-supposes that the only choice is about what kind of aged care accommodation and services should look like |
| Session 2 | Process and/or Consultation | Council didn't promote consultation events on Facebook site |
| Session 2 | Community Facilities | Any landscaping should be natural and in keeping with the Reserve (natural) |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Aren't there better locations for aged care accommodation that Council could use? |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Why not consider the alternative site at Yarran Rd and Hurstville Rd |
| Session 2 | Redevelopment of the site - General | This site is isolated from major shopping precinct in Oatley |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | Survey is biased towards the development |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | Don't like the format of the session - people have to stand |
| Session 3 | Scale of Proposed Development | Don't need 5 stories - 2 is enough |
| Session 3 | Accommodation for Seniors | Good use of site for Seniors/aged care |
| Session 3 | Community Facilities | Should be redeveloped for community recreation not bushland as it doesn't get used |
| Session 3 | Redevelopment of the site - General | This option would have been better at the site of the Mortdale Community Centre |
| Session 3 | Scale of Proposed Development | Prefer the building to spread out across the site rather than go up in height |
| Session 3 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Community didn't want Coles site - we already had the IGA. T has brought a lot of big trucks to the area |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | Council doesn't listen to feedback |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | Invitation letter (for neighbours) didn't give a clear description of what the session was about |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | Site is isolated and access is problematic |
| Session 3 | Redevelopment of the site - General | The area should be added to the Myles Dunphy Reserve |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | Who will review the consultants work? |
| Session 3 | Impact of Development | In order to improve access to the site will an area of the MDR have to be removed? |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | Low level of trust in Council consultation process - they don't listen when the answer from community is 'no' |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | Why is Council pursuing this when 276 objections were received on the subdivision issue? |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | In 2009 public overwhelmingly requested the site be left as public recreation |
| Session 3 | Scale of Proposed Development | Car parking for the site should go underground |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|---|
| Session 3 | Redevelopment of the site - General | What does Council get paid to lease the site? How will this amount be determined? |
| Session 3 | Scale of Proposed Development | Building should not have a flat roof - this is not in keeping with the surrounding buildings |
| Session 3 | Accommodation for Seniors | Multi-story buildings are not good models for aged care - the residents are often isolated |
| Session 3 | Accommodation for Seniors | Casa Mia in Padstow - a good local example of aged care accommodation |
| Session 3 | Accommodation for Seniors | Wareena Centre in Bangor - a good local example of aged care accommodation |
| Session 3 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Traffic and access is poor - speed of the turn into the site is very dangerous |
| Session 3 | Community Facilities | Not keen on BBQs or other infrastructure - this will result in more traffic and rubbish. The site should be preserved for passive recreation purposes |
| Session 3 | Community Facilities | There are more than enough parks and facilities across Oatley |
| Session 3 | Impact of Development | BBQs etc. will increase the risk of fire |
| Session 3 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Who will pay for the ongoing maintenance of the facilities and the park |
| Session 3 | Scale of Proposed Development | The building will need adequate turning circles for emergency vehicles and delivery trucks as well as adequate parking for staff |
| Session 3 | Scale of Proposed Development | I would probably support abuilding if it was the same size and scale of others in the area |
| Session 3 | Scale of Proposed Development | This sets a worrying precedent - not only for Oatley but also for redevelopment of other aged care facilities in the area |
| Session 3 | Scale of Proposed Development | Maybe willing to support a larger footprint if it were lower in height |
| Session 3 | Community Facilities | Don't agree with the need for any community facilities at the site |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | Have met with David Coleman MP (Member for Banks) and he is opposed to the development in its original form |
| Session 3 | Impact of Development | Vastly different access needs for this site compared to the Bowling Club |
| Session 3 | Scale of Proposed Development | Safety for access to the site is a real problem - how will access to the site pass safety assessment for heavy vehicles |
| Session 3 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Concept of aged care development is probably sensible but not of this scale |

| | | |
|-----------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | How will you promote the survey widely to ensure as many people as possible fill it out? |
| Session 3 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Strongly opposed to the redevelopment and perceived selling off of parkland |
| Session 3 | Redevelopment of the site - General | In 2010 Councils own lawyers advised this site was part of the MDR - Council has no right to re-zone it for development |
| Session 3 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Would like the site to be returned to bushland - no buildings of any kind |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | Council has mis-led the community from the get-go - this is just the next round |
| Session 3 | Scale of Proposed Development | What are the real height restrictions of the site? |
| Session 3 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Bush fire risk is a real issue here |
| Session 3 | Accommodation for Seniors | This is not an appropriate site for seniors housing - it is not suitable for an emergency evacuation situation for fire (not bushfire) where the lifts will be out of action |
| Session 3 | Scale of Proposed Development | 3 story walk up should be the maximum allowed for evacuation of dependant residents |
| Session 3 | Redevelopment of the site - General | There have been a number of local closures of Ambulance and Fire station - access and response times to this site need to be assessed as they are likely not suitable for aged care |
| Session 3 | Impact of Development | Privacy concerns for neighbours - how will these issues be addressed? |
| Session 3 | Community Facilities | Would be good if the community facilities were multi-functional and include some facility for arts (gave Hazlehurst Gallery as an example) |
| Session 3 | Community Facilities | Facilities must be multi-generations and multi-purpose |
| Session 3 | Redevelopment of the site - General | Something needs to happen with the site - it is unsafe and unsightly and shouldn't be left as is |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | There were 276 submissions against the subdivision of the lots and the Administrator has tossed them all. The consultants who addressed the submissions failed to address the points raised in their report |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | The Administrator approved the GRC Operational plan incl this matter in July, however the Planning Proposal was initiated in June - this means the Op Plan was just a rubber stamp |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | 8th Nov - Council resolved to put this Planning Proposal on public exhibition. There were 6 speakers against this at the meeting yet the notice advertising the sessions were advertised in her leader days later - the booking and advertising copy must have been submitted before the Council meeting and so the decision |

| | | |
|-----------|-----------------------------|--|
| | | was already made |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | John Rayner is from Sutherland where there is a shortage of aged care accommodation beds - he didn't support carving up parks for accommodation there so why is he doing it here? |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | Council consultants, Ansell did not take into account 600 aged care beds due to come online in the region when preparing their report - the shortage of aged care accommodation is exaggerated |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | Integrity of the survey is suspect - participate wanted proof that each survey will be recorded and assessed by an independent third party |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | Participants want to see the detail of the plans before they can support the project - the planning proposal process makes it difficult to know what you are agreeing to |
| Session 3 | Process and/or Consultation | Low levels of trust in the process of decision making - it has taken so long to get here - "the people you are planning this accommodation for will be dead long before it is built" |