



## Summary of Submissions

### PP060: Planning Proposal – Huntingdale Park Estate Large Lot Residential Precinct

Public Exhibition: 26 May to 25 June 2021

No.	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Council Comment
1	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Appreciate beauty of the Estate, want children to be able to experience same character and beauty, therefore proposal is appalling. Oppose higher density in such a congested space and streets – traffic safety and servicing concerns. Concern at unsafe and very poor pedestrian access to shops, public transport and medical facilities. Concern at loss of privacy.	Discussed proposal in phone call, clarified intention of proposal will not increase density in existing large lot areas and submitter indicated support for this proposal. Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
2	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Reaffirms the intended design of the area. Concerns about medium density.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
3	Individual (landowner in the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Object to multi-dwelling housing complex (5 dwellings) in area (Lot 710). Support PP060 because will prevent this type of development from occurring on the other large lot properties. Proposal rectifies zoning anomaly and codifies original intent of Estate developers and Council approvals. Estate originally planned with the larger residential lots forming a buffer to the estate development as it grew denser and as it descended the hill and approached Berry township. Most residents bought within Estate with an honest belief that multi-dwelling housing not permitted.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
4	Individual (relative of landowners in the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Very few of these blocks are available, those that do exist need to be preserved, less chance of large lot development occurring in future. Confirms intended design and allows for a diversity of housing, not just medium density. Preserve the character, scenic amenity and liveability of the area. Will prevent overdevelopment in areas closer to farmland and natural surroundings. Provides greater control of appropriate planning to council. Rezoning will stop future inappropriate development like that proposed at 52 Parker Crescent, Berry.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
5	Individual (landowner in the Estate)	<b>Support proposal. Support protecting adjacent agricultural uses.</b> The area in question is not appropriate for medium density housing. Lots on the western side of Parker Crescent adjoin a working farm. Not appropriate to allow medium density housing to back onto a working rural property.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
6	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b>	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.

No.	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Council Comment
		Would like Berry to remain a country town with a country feel, concern about overcrowding from duplexes and townhouses like Sydney. Berry once 'town of trees', need more trees and birdlife and not to use all available space for development and money.	
7	Household (residents of the Estate)	<p><b>Support proposal.</b></p> <p>Strongly support. Purchased on belief that the area will provide for single residence lots, compensating for medium density at Hitchcocks Lane. PP060 is prudent way of returning the Estate to the purpose intended.</p> <p>Concern at duplex approvals and attempts to subdivide large lots. Shoalhaven needs good mixture of larger area blocks to compensate for the current trend of mass housing on small lots with permanent destruction of native vegetation and wildlife habitat, and rural pasture. Large lot developers and the subsequent owners should be encouraged by Council to minimise clearing and to replant native species wherever possible.</p>	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
8	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<p><b>Support proposal.</b></p> <p>Bought into the early stages of the estate - lots were meant to get bigger as they went back into the estate - current zoning allows for lots in western edge to be much smaller than eastern blocks. Originally planned large lots as transition and buffer from the normal residential lots and the rural landscape abutting the development</p> <p>New R5 zoning of the large lots will protect from overdevelopment and protect the natural environment. Also concerned about traffic volumes and safety.</p>	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
9	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<p><b>Support proposal.</b></p> <p>Consistent with the original intention of these large lots and within the original plan for Huntingdale Park. Will help protect the estate from unsympathetic development.</p>	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
10	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<p><b>Support proposal.</b></p> <p>New R5 rezoning will help protect Berry's heritage and recognition of its rural and regional status. Overdevelopment will comprise this and increased traffic would be detrimental to family. Rezoning is consistent with the original plans for these large lots.</p>	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
11	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<p><b>Support proposal.</b></p> <p>This was the original intention for the larger blocks of land and was in the original plan for Huntingdale Park.</p> <p>Will preserve the natural environment surrounding the estate. Will provide an aesthetic feature from the smaller blocks to the rural landscape.</p> <p>Prevent Huntingdale Park from overdevelopment. Less traffic entering and exiting the Estate with less dwellings and a safer environment for young families.</p>	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
12	Household (residents of the Estate)	<p><b>Support proposal.</b></p> <p>Would make a great difference to Huntingdale Estate - getting too busy. In danger of changing the estate into an estate that no one wants to live in. Need to protect the environment and the character of Berry.</p>	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.

No.	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Council Comment
13	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Land sold on the premise there was not going to be multi dwelling occupancy other than the medium density lots on Huntingdale Park Road. Concerned at overdevelopment.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
14	Household (residents of Berry)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Concern Huntingdale Park has altered the amenity of the town. Large lots included in the later stages an attempt to preserve some of the town character and avoid further urban sprawl. Surprise and concern that larger lots being exploited by property developers for financial gain. Concern about vegetation loss and strain on the environment. Concern about overdevelopment, drainage and traffic impacts, including evacuation and emergency access. Believes estate is inadequately served by a single access street to several hundred dwellings.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
15	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Should be protected from overdevelopment. Consistent with the original intention of these large lots. Didn't buy to be living on top of each other. Love the current look and space of Huntingdale Park and the difference it has to other estates.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
16	Individual (resident of Nowra, works in Berry)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Limit overdevelopment - large lots designed to keep a particular aesthetic for this area. Townhouses and duplexes are not in keeping. People move to the country to have space, not be crammed on top of each other. Concern about parking, narrow roads and traffic safety. Too often seeing companies in estates trying to make as much money as possible without consideration for families already in the area. Concerned about precedent - If council say yes to one set of townhouses, will have them popping up all over the place - too close on all sides to boundaries. Spend a lot of time here with clients and trades working to make it a beautiful area, would like it to stay that way. Absolutely object to any kind of units.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
17	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will help protect the estate from overdevelopment,</li> <li>Will help to protect the natural environment on the edges of the estate,</li> <li>Consistent with the original intention of these large lots and the original estate plan.</li> </ul>	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
18	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Purposely purchased land due to the semi rural feel. Would be very disappointed if that lifestyle was lost due to the overdevelopment of the larger blocks.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
19	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b>	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
20	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> 1. Consistent with the original intention and plans.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.

No.	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Council Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Will help protect the estate from overdevelopment.</li> <li>3. Will help protect the natural environment on the edges of the estate.</li> <li>4. Will provide a suitable transition and buffer from the normal residential lots to the rural landscape abutting the development.</li> <li>5. No need for additional high density, strata title developments on the higher side of Huntingdale.</li> <li>6. Majority residents purchased these blocks of land under the impression (and contract) that there would only be single dwelling blocks.</li> <li>7. Will help to maintain the character of the area and avoid crowding.</li> </ul>	
21	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<p><b>Support proposal.</b></p> <p>Advised the estate did not include multi-dwellings on one block when purchasing. Also informed of possible changes to future stages of development, but what resulted was in excess of what was expected at time of purchase. Has previously written to Council expressing concerns about the overdevelopment of this estate.</p> <p>Fully support PP - will be consistent with the original plans for the large blocks in Huntingdale Estate. Very concerned about development in the Huntingdale Estate Berry as already experiencing traffic concerns. Concerned about loss of character.</p>	<p>Submission of support for proposal.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
22	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<p><b>Support proposal.</b></p> <p>Advised the estate did not include multi-dwellings on one block when purchasing. Also informed of possible changes to future stages of development, but what resulted was in excess of what was expected at time of purchase. Has previously written to Council expressing concerns about the overdevelopment of this estate.</p> <p>Fully support PP - will be consistent with the original plans for the large blocks in Huntingdale Estate. Very concerned about development in the Huntingdale Estate Berry as already experiencing traffic concerns. Concerned about loss of character.</p>	<p>Submission of support for proposal.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
23	Individual (resident of Berry)	<p><b>Support proposal.</b></p> <p>Support prohibiting multi-dwelling development to ensure outcomes as intended at the time of subdivision.</p>	<p>Submission of support for proposal.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
24	Household (residents of the Estate)	<p><b>Support proposal.</b></p> <p>Bought lot and designed home abiding by the contract of sale. In contracts there was only a limited number of lots that could have dual occupancy in this semi-rural area. Concerned about excess dual occupancies and homes built on top of each other.</p> <p>Large lots offer a buffer between the suburban and rural land and will make for an environment that is pleasant to the eye and fits in with the surroundings. Already has enough high density living. Concerned about developer intentions and profit-driven development. Concerned about parking problems on narrow roads and one way in and out. Concern about becoming like Sydney.</p>	<p>Submission of support for proposal.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>

No.	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Council Comment
25	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>proposed rezoning will be key to protecting native vegetation and environment.</li> <li>proposal will prevent loss of existing character and excessive development. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>consistent with the initial intention of the allocation of these large lots and the original plan for the Huntingdale Park Estate development.</li> </ul> </li> <li>will provide a sustainable buffer and transition from residential lots to the rural properties which border the Estate.</li> </ul>	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
26	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Supports proposal.</b> When purchasing believed that the original intention of these large lots was to blend with the aesthetic of rural land directly behind and medium density development would be positioned away from rural land. These lots were sold at a premium price at the time to reflect their value as large lots adjoining rural space. Concerned at additional subdivision in area.  This new re-zoning is consistent with the original intention of these large lots and the original plan. Infrastructure has not been planned for higher densities i.e., traffic flow (safety), drainage, water pressure and power. Will protect the natural environment on the edges of the estate. Will provide a suitable transition and buffer from normal residential lots to the rural landscape.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
27	Individual (relative of Estate landowners)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Relatives bought land to not just build a home but to create a lifestyle, for space to grow their own fruit and vegetables and enjoy the rural assets. To get out of Sydney and not be jammed up against neighbours with all the issues of parking, traffic, noise and congestion. Oppose multi-dwelling application at 52 Parker Crescent.  Bigger blocks should be a transition buffer between the rural land and more condensed development closer to town. If one of these lifestyle blocks is lost to development it cannot be replaced. It will place more pressure on roads, services and infrastructure that was never planned for. Believe it was planning error not to do this initially.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
28	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Understood when purchasing the land that only single dwellings could be built on each lot. Appears rules have changed without consulting the community. Multi-dwelling housing and dual occupancy affecting lifestyles. Concerned about noise and traffic impacts. Support preventing additional multi-dwelling housing in area.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
29	Household (residents of Berry)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Support prohibition of multi-dwelling development on large lot properties as this represents only developer interests. Need to support permanent, long term homeowners and occupiers for sense of community.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
30	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b>	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.

No.	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Council Comment
		<p>Consistent with original intention of these large lots. Created to act as a buffer between rural farmland and forest and other residential development. Lots were only meant to have one dwelling each.</p> <p>Some lots back out onto working farm, and farming activities and hunting, therefore only single dwellings with large backyards are appropriate.</p> <p>R5 zone will protect the natural environment as many lots back out onto forest and the creek, habitat for wombats, echidnas, kangaroos, birds, snakes, and only single dwellings are appropriate on periphery.</p>	
31	Individual (relative of landowners in the Estate)	<p><b>Support proposal.</b></p> <p>Very few of these blocks are available, those that do exist need to be preserved, less chance of large lot development occurring in future.</p> <p>Proposed rezoning confirms the intended design of the area and allows for a diversity of housing, not just medium density development. Also serves to preserve the character, scenic amenity and liveability of the area. Will prevent overdevelopment in areas closer to farmland and natural surroundings. Provides greater control of appropriate planning to council. Rezoning will stop future inappropriate development like that proposed at 52 Parker Crescent, Berry.</p>	<p>Submission of support for proposal.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
32	Individual (relative of landowners in the Estate)	<p><b>Support proposal.</b></p> <p>Relatives bought land to not just build a home but to create a lifestyle, for space to grow their own fruit and vegetables and enjoy the rural assets of Berry and the Shoalhaven area. To get out of Sydney and not be jammed up against their neighbour with all the issues of parking, traffic, noise and congestion.</p> <p>Oppose multi-dwelling application at 52 Parker Crescent.</p> <p>Bigger blocks should be a transition buffer between the rural land and more condensed development closer to town. If one of these lifestyle blocks is lost to development it cannot be replaced. It will place more pressure on roads, services and infrastructure that was never planned for. Believe it was planning error not to do this initially.</p>	<p>Submission of support for proposal.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
33	Individual (resident of Berry)	<p><b>Support proposal.</b></p> <p>The rezoning is consistent with the original intention and original plan for Huntingdale Park.</p>	<p>Submission of support for proposal.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
34	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<p><b>Support proposal.</b></p> <p>Support the arguments contained in the document. Concerned about impact of smaller lot sizes on existing infrastructure. Agree that higher density housing surrounding relatively high risk bush fire zone is imprudent.</p>	<p>Submission of support for proposal.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>
35	Household (residents of the Estate)	<p><b>Support proposal.</b></p> <p>Will help protect the estate and town from overdevelopment.</p>	<p>Submission of support for proposal.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>



No.	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Council Comment
36	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Purchased the land with understanding that the larger lots would be single dwelling with the intention of graduating the density of housing to spread out at the perimeter meeting the surrounding farmland. This was part of the appeal, both from an aesthetic and environmental standpoint. Overdevelopment and infrastructure overload is a risk unless this rezoning occurs.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
37	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Reasons: original intention of these large lots was not for multi dwelling purposes; R5 Zoning will protect the Estate from over development. Traffic is already a major issue in peak times, any over development will only add to the issue. Rezoning will also ensure a more natural blending of the residential estate to the bushland.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
38	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Consistent with the original intention of these large lots and the original plan for Huntingdale Park Estate. Restrictions on subdividing these large blocks will help protect from overdevelopment and help protect the natural environment of the area, minimising the impact on the natural habitat (land and animals).	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
39	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> The rezoning is consistent with the original intention and planning of the estate.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
40	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> The rezoning is consistent with the original intention and planning of the estate.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
41	Household (residents of Berry)	<b>Neutral on proposal.</b> Does not support further rezoning of land from rural to residential. Concern about overdevelopment of Berry and surrounds and loss of rural land and character.	Position on proposal confirmed as neutral in a phone call – submission relates to growth planning across Berry generally. No change recommended.
42	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Have purchased a very challenging block in subject area, spending a lot of money to meet council requirements. Initial intent of the larger blocks in this area was as a buffer to the farm land. The initial plan has [already] allowed for higher density areas. Other owners of large blocks have built single dwelling as this was what we believed was the required regulation. Multi-dwelling on these blocks changes the nature of the area. Support ½ acre blocks be rezoned to secure the initial intent of the developer and the agreed plan. Please consider the rezoning to R2 to protect the environment and create a buffer to farmland.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
43	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Purchased lot with understanding that only one dwelling was permitted on these large lots. Live on the edge of the farm and bush and have sighted wildlife and many animals and rare birds - Wombats, Wallabies, Echidna's & Nesting Birds are living in the surrounding Bush & have made their home here. Fear could be lost if multiple dwellings built close to the perimeters of the	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.

No.	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Council Comment
		Cattle Farm & Bush. Area is so small & requires protection from further over development, excessive vehicles, man power & machinery. Please protect one of the most desirable landscapes for wildlife in the Berry region.	
44	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Abundance of multi dwelling applications already approved in the estate - contrary to initial appeal and the 88B instruction we were given. Smaller subdivisions are not what the Huntingdale community wants.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
45	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Live close to Connors View and all those lots have their only access past our home. Support rezoning because: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• consistent with the original intention of these large lots and the original plan for Huntingdale Park Estate.</li> <li>• will help protect the estate from overdevelopment</li> <li>• will help to protect the natural environment on the edges of the estate</li> <li>• suitable transition and buffer from the normal residential lots to rural landscape</li> <li>• will reduce unnecessary, additional traffic going past home</li> </ul> Believe Berry is currently nearing capacity with its current infrastructure - further development will compromise the integrity of the township.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
46	Household (landowners in the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Currently renting in North Nowra whilst building a home in the estate. Rezoning will align planning controls for large lots with the existing and future character of the area. Do not favour over-development of Huntingdale with high-density housing, as one of the unique features of the area that we appreciate is the open spaces and large block sizes. The larger blocks will enable planting of native plants once the houses have been built, that will encourage native birds and animals and sustain the natural beauty of the area. Multiple dwellings on a residential block will result in virtually no green space, which would be a tragedy in a location as beautiful as the Shoalhaven.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
47	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Purchased after being assured that only one dwelling [except a granny flat] was allowed on each large block.  If multi dwellings on larger blocks are allowed, will cause unmeasurable damage to tranquillity, bushland & the wild life. Recently had a subdivision constructed below our home & it is very noticeable that the wild life living in the natural bushland has decreased significantly. I also believe the larger blocks on the surrounds of the estate act as a natural buffer for normal residential block on other parts of Huntingdale. Hope rezoning happens without delay.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
48	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Allowing multiple dwellings on these lots would result in damage to the remaining natural areas and creek areas, ruin the context of the areas and remove the 'buffering' effect of having one	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.



No.	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Council Comment
		dwelling per large lot. Extremely upsetting to the owners who understood this to be the intention and have already built or have approval to build their (one) dwelling on their lot.	
49	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Please do not allow large lots of land to be over developed with multi dwellings in the Huntingdale estate and our community, taking away from the reason we, neighbours and friends who have moved here, and turning a lovely community into an overdeveloped estate.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
50	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Ensure original intention of these large lots in Huntingdale Park as it was when we purchased our lots in 2018. Will help prevent overdevelopment of Huntingdale Park which only has one way in and one way out. Will help to maintain a more rural environment.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
51	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Believe multi-dwelling lots would negatively impact and change the original intention of the estate. Appreciate relatively small number of residents. Children ride their bikes around the small streets and we feel safe that all residents are aware and keep a look out for them in our small community. Multi-dwellings will increase the number of cars and residents in the area, taking away one of the main reasons why we moved to the area.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
52	Individual (landowner in the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b>	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
53	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Do not wish to see the rural landscape removed for multi-dwelling housing and loss of beautiful native wildlife.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
54	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> This was the intention when the estate was designed and approved.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
55	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> - consistent with the original intention of the developer, and presumably the council in approving the original plan. - will help protect the estate from overdevelopment. - Will help protect the environment and rural landscape on the edges of the estate.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
56	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Concern amount of traffic on and near Connors View if R5 Zoning is not approved. Especially as there are many young families in the area with young children. An issue which is seemingly overlooked in many cases is the extra traffic that will be generated in future years when those children are grown and have cars of their own. Berry does not have the infrastructure to cope with these numbers now.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.

No.	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Council Comment
57	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> For safety and aesthetic reasons.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
58	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Want to protect the half acre lots from over development and to protect the natural environment that the half acre blocks back on to.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
59	Individual (landowner in Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Bought large block for new home, to have more space, large garden and rural atmosphere. Large garden important private space, not crowded by adjoining houses and no negatives of suburban living. Ideal opportunity for country lifestyle, to build a passive energy home, lessen carbon footprint and ongoing reliance on non-renewable resources.  Object to multi-dwelling development proposed on Parker Crescent - would not have happened if the land had originally been zoned as R5. To rezone R5 is only to ensure that it is preserved as intended. Larger lifestyle blocks at edge of the Estate as buffer with rural land. The blocks are further away from town and less dense living here won't impact stormwater by preserving landscapes and won't exacerbate traffic issues for the community. Will preserve the transition area from farmland to residential and prevent Berry from an over built appearance. Needs to be more of this type of development as housing diversity eroded. Support changes to minimum lot size. Once these large blocks are sub-divided and off sold, lost forever.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
60	Household (residents of Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Concerned about the additional traffic and the overall impact on character [if not rezoned].	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
61	Landowners in the Estate	<b>Object to proposal.</b> 1. Proposed rezoning results in significant de-valuing of land. Purchased in the knowledge that multi-dwelling housing was permissible. 2. Area Specific DCP Chapter N3 applies and notes " <i>limited supply of new housing lots available in Berry</i> ". Estate subdivision sold out in Nov 2020 - outcome of this housing shortfall then justifies new Hitchcock's Lane Subdivision (PP027). PP060 reduces residential capacity of the Estate, obviously inconsistent with the housing needs of Berry. This has already justified further urban expansion and is clearly inconsistent with the aims of urban consolidation, optimal use of existing resources and protection of rural lands. 3. Chapter N3 was prepared with reference to community-led Berry <i>Community Strategic Plan 2016: Strategic focus 4.2: "Provide a distinct town edge that retains views to the escarpment to the north and minimises residential subdivision and housing release at the rural interface</i> . PP060 is back zoning that will reduce residential capacity. Even prior to PP060 additional rezoning for residential expansion and subdivision is required at the rural/urban interface (Hitchcocks Lane, PP027) to meet the housing needs of Berry. Clearly the planning proposal is inconsistent with this endorsed strategic focus for Berry.	Objection considered with points addressed below. Minor changes to PP made to emphasise that proposal is supported by strategic plans and policies. PP060 is consistent with Council's approach to planning for similar residential zones across Shoalhaven that see their zoning reviewed/adjusted after subdivision. Council is also committed to keeping the <i>Shoalhaven Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2014</i> updated in response to the range of planning changes that can impact on its operation as intended.  1. Acknowledge that PP will not allow for multi-dwelling housing on large lots proposed to be zoned R5. This is consistent with strategic objectives and plans for this part of the Estate, going back to DCP 70 (adopted in 1998) which identified the large lot areas and guided the Estate development and approvals. Large lots have high values in Berry and many residents in the area purchased these lots with the understanding that the large lot, low density characteristics of the lots would be retained as per the DCP and subdivision approval and not be developed and subdivided into multi-dwelling developments.

No.	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Council Comment
		<p>4. Recent multi-unit developments in Estate extremely popular, sold very quickly. Clear market demand for housing diversity and more affordable housing products. PP060 will eliminate capacity for similar in Huntingdale and Berry generally. Shoalhaven LEP Clause 4.1A prohibits multi-dwelling housing on lots under 900m<sup>2</sup> in R1 and R3 zones and typical lot sizes in Huntingdale are ~700m<sup>2</sup>. Bulk of existing land outside Huntingdale is zoned R2 or R5, and Hitchcocks Lane subdivision (PP027) will be zoned R2. Multi-dwelling housing is prohibited in these zones.</p> <p>Subject land is only substantial pocket of R1 zoned land in Berry with lot sizes capable of supporting multi-dwelling development. PP states (Sec. 3.2) that it <i>“does not compromise the provision of housing choice or greater affordability in the area”</i> - review of the current zoning provisions in Berry and lot size requirements of Clause 4.1A indicates that this comment is simply untrue, false, and misleading.</p> <p>5. PP report seeks to justify rezoning by stating that it aims to mitigate visual impacts of development in a scenic location. DCP Chapter N3 addresses the visual impacts west of the Princess Hwy and provides artistic impressions from viewpoints. These, as well as current views (below) show that the Estate, and the future Hitchcocks Lane subdivision are largely screened from Princes Hwy by existing and recommended landscaping. Besides Princes Hwy and southbound on-ramp, cannot establish any important vantage points. Residential development is well established. Counterintuitive to seek to reduce visual impacts associated by back zoning existing residential land - identified that this will force further urban expansion with its own associated visual impacts.</p>  <p>Above: View of Huntingdale Estate from the south bound land of the Princes Highway looking north-west.</p>  <p>Above: View of Huntingdale Estate from the south bound land of the Princes Highway looking west.</p> <p>6. PP report indicates that planning controls have changed in recent times to allow for increased density and intensity over the areas identified that have been subdivided into lots ≥2000m<sup>2</sup>. Do not agree, noting that even under former Shoalhaven Local Environmental</p>	<p>2. Hitchcocks Lane subdivision (PP029) is a land release area identified in (and justified by) the Shoalhaven Growth Management Strategy (GMS) 2014, and will provide additional new greenfield housing to meet the needs of Berry. PP060 does not substantially reduce the capacity of the Estate as it affects a defined number of properties (that are constrained by topography and in some cases vegetation) and many of the existing large lots have already been developed/approved with single dwellings and the intentions of a number of landowners of remaining vacant lots indicate they also wish to develop their lots for low density development as was originally envisaged.</p> <p>3. The amended site-specific DCP Chapter N3 reiterates and retains the longstanding intention for large lots along the rural-residential interface of the Estate. PP060 is generally consistent with the <i>Berry Community Strategic Plan 2014 (Strategic Focus 4.2)</i>, as it assists in preserving views of the escarpment along the fringe of the Estate and minimises subdivision at the western rural interface.</p> <p>4. DCP Chapter N3 supports provision of housing choice and more affordable housing products, primarily by encouraging smaller homes on smaller lots (small homes are a recognised housing supply gap in the area and are more likely to provide relative affordability than larger homes). Small lot housing is proposed as part of the Hitchcocks Lane subdivision, as this area is centrally located, flat and primarily cleared, in closer walking distance to town and adjacent to a planned future embellished park. Multi-dwelling housing can provide housing diversity, but this and affordability, actually depends on the size, specification and tenure type of individual developments, as well as localised market and economic conditions.</p> <p>5. Higher density development on the ridgelines of the Estate is likely to have visual impacts beyond those visible today (as the area is not fully established) and from within the Estate itself as well as from viewpoints along roads and the Highway. The housing in the elevated areas of the Estate (including large lot areas) is currently visible due to elevation, but may become less visible over time as landscaping around homes establishes and grows. Higher density development will increase hardstand areas around developments, reducing opportunities for landscaping/vegetation screening over time. Along Connors View would likely require additional vegetation removal for development and bushfire mitigation, thereby exacerbating visual</p>

No.	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Council Comment
		<p>Plan 1985 the site was zoned 2c and this allowed for multi-dwelling housing and residential flat buildings.</p> <p>7. Recent development application (DA19/1857) referred to in Section 1.3 of PP report notes "significant community opposition" and 99 objections. Report notes the population of Berry is 2,667 (2016 census). Estimated population for 2020 is 4,798. Based on the 2016 population objections registered &lt;4% of residents. Estimated 2020 population, only 2% of residents registered objection. Not clear why such a small percentage considered a 'significant' proportion.</p> <p>8. Disagree land is so far from public transport (2km to the Berry train station) that current zoning unsuitable. Council's <i>Character Statements</i> by Roberts Day, identifies Berry as being highly accessible given Princes Hwy and South Coast train line. Short drive to station for an elderly person who needs to get to Sydney. As identified at point 4, these lots also represent some of the only appropriately zoned and sized lots for multi-dwelling housing within proximity of the Berry train station.</p> <p>9. Section 3.2 of PP suggests that surrounding rural land needs to be protected for agriculture and land use conflicts need to be reduced. PP is inconsistent with the protection of rural land as the reduction in dwelling capacity in this existing residential area has already resulted in rezoning of adjacent rural land at Hitchcock's Lane for residential development (PP027). With respect to managing land use conflicts, likelihood of the immediately adjoining rural land being used for intensive or extensive agriculture is minimal. Surrounding rural land is mapped as having severe limitations on the NSW land and soil capability mapping data base.</p> <p>10. 'Theme 2' of <i>Shoalhaven 2027 Community Strategic Plan</i> - managing appropriate and sustainable development is cited as of relevance. Unsure how PP, which seeks to reduce the development potential of the land, is in any way sustainable. Will result in the highest residential development possible being large homes on large lots, thus encouraging severe underutilisation of a very scarce resource in the Shoalhaven – that is, unincumbered residentially zoned land, with development potential located a few kilometres from a train station. We would suggest that the planning proposal is totally unsustainable and irresponsible to future generations.</p> <p>11. PP report suggests proposed rezoning will facilitate the delivery of an additional 14,600 homes by 2041. Dispute and believe that the proposal to reduce the development potential of the land will work against meeting these housing targets. Evidenced by the need for rezoning adjacent rural land (PP027).</p> <p>12. Does not meet the objectives of the Local Planning Directives issued under S9.1(2) of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>, Direction 3.1 – Residential zones. The objectives of this direction are:</p> <p><i>a. to encourage a variety and choice of housing types to provide for existing and future housing needs,</i></p> <p><i>b. to make efficient use of existing infrastructure and services and ensure that new housing has appropriate access to infrastructure and services, and</i></p>	<p>impacts. The images within the DCP Chapter N3 are artists impressions only (of mature vegetation).</p> <p>6. Recent planning control changes that impact the subject land are discussed in the PP document. PP060 is consistent with Council's approach to larger subdivision areas that were initially zoned Residential 2(c) under Shoalhaven LEP1985 (now zoned R1 General Residential under LEP2014) that saw the zoning of the area change when appropriate to reflect the nature/character of the subdivision once approved. The initial 2(c)/R1 zoning provides some initial flexibility until the final subdivision pattern is known or established (which is guided by DCP provisions) and then areas rezoned accordingly. This has occurred in various areas throughout the city and as such is not an unusual approach. In this case, longstanding DCP provisions (dating back to at least 1998) illustrate the desired character and future development intentions for the large lot areas of the Estate.</p> <p>7. The population figure used in the PP document represents the 2016 Usual Resident population of Berry using the ABS Census data for the 'State Suburb' geographical locality of Berry. The population figure quoted in the submission utilises the Estimated Resident Population figure for 'Berry and Surrounds' which includes surrounding suburbs. ERPs for suburb areas are adjusted after each census. More information can be found at <a href="https://profile.id.com.au/shoalhaven">https://profile.id.com.au/shoalhaven</a>. In relation to PP060, 85 submissions of support were received, including 63 households living in the Estate (and therefore affected by the proposal). This is a relatively high proportion of approximately 24% of households/landowners in the Estate expressing support for the proposed rezoning).</p> <p>8. A key factor in strategically locating homes closer to train stations is to support active and public transport use and reducing the need to drive to stations by encouraging walking and cycling. This is also important for people who do not have a car or are unable to drive.</p> <p>9. The rezoning of land south of Hitchcocks Lane is not related to PP060, and does not result from any reduction in residential capacity in Huntingdale Park Estate. The Hitchcocks Lane subdivision is identified in the Shoalhaven GMS 2014 and has been investigated as a growth area for a considerable amount of time. There is no requirement to 'maximise' us of all land zoned residential. The practice of planning for larger lots/lower density development at the rural/urban interface is a common practice across NSW and is consistent with principles and policies for</p>

No.	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Council Comment
		<p><i>c. to minimise the impact of residential development on the environment and resource lands.</i></p> <p>The planning proposal will limit housing choice and is inefficient use of existing infrastructure and services. For Council to argue otherwise is simply fanciful. Planning proposal is inconsistent with Paragraph 5(b) of the direction which clearly states a planning proposal "must not contain provisions which will reduce the permissible residential density of the land".</p> <p>13. PP states it will not have any adverse economic impacts. Strongly disagree - will reduce the amount of potential construction activity for the area and local economy and result in poorer housing choice. Major underutilisation of existing urban zoned land and results in a direct devaluation of the affected land.</p> <p>14. Multi-dwelling housing should remain a permissible land use within the area and the planning proposal should not proceed. Implore the Council to cease proceeding with the planning proposal and retain the current land use provisions applicable under the Shoalhaven LEP 2014.</p>	<p>protecting rural land uses through reducing land use conflicts (e.g. refer to NSW Department of Primary Industry policies on managing land use conflict for strategic planning: <a href="https://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/agriculture/lup">https://www.dpi.nsw.gov.au/agriculture/lup</a>)</p> <p>10. PP060 takes a place-based approach to planning for Berry, and provides housing for the community whilst considering land use constraints, infrastructure provision and efficient use of land. The large lots are not considered to be unencumbered for development purposes, and are constrained by steeper topography, bushfire risk, existing roads and water infrastructure, visual sensitivity and, along Connors View, native vegetation. There are more suitable areas for additional housing development that are to be rezoned south of Hitchcocks Lane.</p> <p>11. PP060 will not materially impact provision of Council's strategically identified future housing supply. It is also noted that any hypothetical number applied to this area would be based on the original residential subdivision.</p> <p>12. The PP document discusses the Section 9.1 Directions in detail. An inconsistency with Direction 3.1 is acknowledged in the exhibited document and fully justifies this as minor and therefore compliant with the direction and requirements of the EP&amp;A Act 1979. The NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment agreed that the inconsistency with 9.1 Direction 3.1 Residential Zones is justified in accordance with the terms of the Direction and that no further approval is required in relation to this direction (Gateway determination cover letter dated 16 April 2021).</p> <p>13. PP060 will not significantly affect construction activity in the locality – the Estate is currently experiencing construction activity associated with general house building and the additional Hitchcocks Lane subdivision will provide additional construction opportunities. Housing choice is discussed in detail within the PP document.</p> <p>14. PP060 is consistent with Council's approach to reviewing LEP controls and keeping them updated to align with strategic plans and policies and to respond to wider changes in the planning system. Adjusting zoning after subdivision is also consistent with the general approach to larger subdivision areas previously zoned 2(c) or now zoned R1.</p>
62	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b>	<p>Submission of support for proposal.</p> <p>No change recommended.</p>

No.	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Council Comment
63	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Will make sure that section of the estate will remain as intended with larger style blocks with single homes and avoiding overdevelopment. Keep traffic flow to minimum ensuring a safe place for our children to play. Protect environment. Purchased and made the move to Berry for the reason that the 'Ridge' would be a large lot only pocket of Huntingdale - as overdevelopment ruined the previous estate we lived in.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
64	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The original intention in Huntingdale Park was that all lots should have one house built on each lot and road network was designed for such. Multi dwellings will result in more cars than was planned for, possible road congestion and inadequate street parking.</li> <li>Issue of cars not being able to safely pass when there are cars parked both sides of the roads.</li> <li>Serious concerns for the safety of residents with only one road in and out for emergency.</li> <li>Multi dwellings detract from the amenity and original style and planning of Huntingdale Park and Berry.</li> <li>Half acre and larger lots with single dwellings allow for more trees and gardens - more in keeping with the rest of Berry and Huntingdale Park.</li> </ul>	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
65	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Appeal of building in Estate was natural bush outlook and low density housing. Preferably one house per block of land with a variety of architectural styles and sizes that provide an open landscape with natural environment transition to the surrounding rural landscape. Most people bought in the estate bought here for the above reasons. Already-allowed duplex developments increased the density too much and no further multi unit developments should be allowed. Traffic concerns.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
66	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Hoping this gets passed and implemented, to help protect the estate from overdevelopment.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
67	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Currently live on a half acre lot and were originally told that these large lots could not be subdivided. Rezoning these large lots will allow for consistency of the original plan. Concern about overdevelopment and negative impacts on the surrounding natural environment.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
68	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Protect the intended usage of the large blocks and preserve the general nature of the precinct. The Estate was always designed to blend rural into residential. Multi-dwelling developments on the outskirts of the Estate will totally ruin this aesthetic. More importantly, Huntingdale does not have the infrastructure to support multi-dwelling developments, especially road design for Connors View. Plans changed from a handful of blocks to dozens and multi-dwellings could blow this out. Sharp and narrow corner is already dangerous for vehicles and pedestrians. Concern about profit-driven development only, not benefiting people who live in Estate.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.

No.	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Council Comment
69	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Support only one residence on each large lot as original intention of estate. Ensure character maintained.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
70	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Will be as originally intended and hope sets a precedent.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
71	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Believe will prevent overdevelopment.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
72	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b>	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
73	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> In line with the original plan of the estate and why we chose to buy. Helps protect against over development and the safety on the roads, especially for children.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
74	Individual (resident of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> Moved from Canberra under the guidance that it was for single dwellings and would provide a safe environment. Support the flow from rural to suburbia and to protect the natural environment.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.
75	Household (residents of the Estate)	<b>Support proposal.</b> All future development within the nominated area to adhere with the natural landscape and beauty of the surrounding area.	Submission of support for proposal. No change recommended.

#### Form Letters

12 submissions (on behalf of 18 persons) were received with the same content (a form letter) expressing support for the Berry Forum position, discussed at the Forum meeting of 10 June 2021. This position supports the rezoning of large lot properties from R1 to R5 (Large Lot Residential), to prohibits multi-dwelling development. Of the 12 form letter submissions, 9 were received from households in Berry (outside of Huntingdale Park Estate), 1 from a household in Broughton Vale and 2 submissions did not include place of residence.