

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
Support for rezoning to R2 Low Density Residential		
<p>Support for R2 Low Density Residential zoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supportive of the R2 Low Density zoning proposed and expect the proposed R2 zoning will replicate the existing list of permissible uses • R2 is supported as any other use will increase traffic when the road traffic is already busy. Least impact to the nearby residents. • R2 will have the least impact on adjoining neighbourhoods in terms of noise, traffic on a 24-hour-basis • Current proposal of a 9 block subdivision the best outcome possible • Fully Support R2 • Strictly maintain the development control of R2 • Supportive of the rezoning as it is consistent with strategic plans as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Greater Sydney Regional Plan (A Metropolis of Three Cities) Objective 6,10 and 14 ○ North District Plan, N3, N5 and N12 ○ Future Transport Strategy 2056 ○ Ku-ring-gai LSPS K1, K3, K4 and K21 ○ Ku-ring-gai Community Strategic Plan 2038, C4.1, C6.1 and L2.1 ○ consistent with SEPPs and applicable Ministerial Directives (s9.1 directions) • Support for R2 as planning controls are consistent with the local and surrounding area. • Low density only - with no option to increase to medium level of density due to its low-density surroundings, infrastructure and existing structures <p>Benefits of R2 Low Density Residential</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Complement the surrounding neighbourhood, preserving its residential nature without over taxing demands on current infrastructure and services. • Will allow development of much need residential housing in an area which is conveniently located to public transport, shops, services, parks and facilities. • Enhances the existing lifestyle in the community and the value of properties in the surrounding area and will not disrupt the existing community feel. 	<p>Support is noted.</p> <p>The proposed R2 Low Density Residential zoning is consistent with the zoning of the surrounding residential properties.</p> <p>From a review of the submissions received from the residential properties directly adjoining the subject sites, the majority were in support of the proposed R2 Low Density Residential zone.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>
<p>Supportive of low density residential with retaining some parts as open space</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support change in zoning to R2: Low Density Residential on the premise that a third of the land is retained as green space for the community. 	<p>The purpose of planning proposal to rezone the site is to facilitate the future divestment of the land if and when required by Council to fund high priority community infrastructure. Low density and/or a park on the site will reduce the dwelling yield which will reduce the financial return to Council thereby reducing funds available to the Ku-ring-gai community.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the site can't be kept for community use, then limit rezoning to low density residential and retain some land as green space. • Missed opportunity to have smaller blocks and include park for recreation and play equipment, for example well planned older suburbs of Canberra 	<p>A park on this site is not considered high priority community infrastructure. Council's Open Space Acquisition Strategy identifies this area as a low priority area for additional open space. Roseville chase is ranked 6 out of 7 in terms of priority (where 1 is the highest and 7 is the lowest) refer Ku-Ring-Gai Open Space Acquisition Strategy, Part 5, Figure 5 - Acquisition Priority Rankings, page 48</p> <p>https://www.krq.nsw.gov.au/files/assets/public/hptrim/information-management-publications-public-website-ku-ring-gai-council-website-planning-and-development/open_space_acquisition_strategy_-_november_2006_-_part_5.pdf</p>	
Object to rezoning to R2 Low Density Residential		
<p>Not supportive of R2 Zoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not support R2 Zoning • Dispute that putting a few house on a 10000sqm block of land is the "highest and best use" • Plan to convert this recreational space to a residential area is quite absurd. • It will make the area crowded • It should be kept R1 like the rest of the neighbourhood. • Object R2 as developers will just then apply for R3 and succeed • Any upzoning of the site is inconsistent with current zoning around the local Roseville Chase Neighbourhood Shops and surrounding area. The site is about 300 metres from the shops. • This is a suburb, not an area where it is even close to train station or have shops around. Definitely object as it will affect the whole suburb appearance. 	<p>The planning proposal seeks to rezone the subject sites to R2 Low Density Residential – this is consistent with the existing zoning of the surrounding residential area of Roseville Chase.</p> <p>The planning proposal proposes controls which result in the potential for up to 9 additional dwellings, this would be subject to further separate development application process.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal</p>
Amenity Impacts		
<p>Amenity Impacts Residential Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents also create noise, parking and lighting. Think parties, 2 car households, teenager's loud music. • What would be interesting is a 'study' on the difference of noise pollution between residential uses and recreation uses, not considering the five years of construction noise to build the R2/3 density! • Amazing, do you really think density housing, around two cars to each household, parties, social activities, is better? • This proposed development will result in a significant number of people residing within the new development. This will result in increased noise levels. • It would result in a loss of view from our house thus reduces in housing price • The proposed height of the development will have impacts to our current outlook and view, reducing our property value. 	<p>While residential land uses can result in general neighbourhood noise – such as noise from pets, power tools, vehicles, air conditioners musical instruments and electronically amplified sound equipment (radios, TVs, CDs) – the noise and amenity impacts from 9 additional low density residential would be no greater than existing potential noise from the existing residential neighbourhood.</p> <p>The subject site and surrounding residential properties do not provide any significant views (e.g. water views). The views currently available from surrounding properties would be general district views and an open outlook across the subject sites. Various courts have considered the rights to views, and property owners have no right to a view; the law is clear on this point and has been since 1937.</p> <p>The potential for reduction or increase in an individuals property value is not a planning matter for consideration under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local residents must in some way be compensated for lost of ambience, and extra noise and traffic and perhaps loss of property value 		
Increased Density - Medium and High Density and Seniors Housing		
Support for Medium Density (R3) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sydney is facing a housing affordability crisis where the median house price is now over 14 times the national average full-time salary locking out young Australians from the housing market. The main cause is the widespread detached houses limiting the supply of new affordable housing closer to the city. Ku-ring-gai should build more affordable housing medium-density housing to allow young families and people from different cultural backgrounds to move in to make a vibrant community Happy to see it proceed to R3 Medium Density Residential if council seeks it. 	<p>Support for medium density residential development is noted.</p> <p>The planning proposal is seeking to rezone the subject site to R2 Low Density Residential not R3 Medium Density Residential.</p>	No amendment to planning proposal
Retirement / Over 55's Housing / Boarding Houses Support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supportive of rezoning to residential but rezoning for only 9 low density residential blocks is a wasted opportunity to enhance local community Why not develop a retirement village like Watermark Castle Cove Retirement instead so older members can down size and free up 9 existing facility houses. Older residents will be able to retain all of their familiar support networks. Examples for uses that don't appear to be considered that have minimal impact on the local community are mental health hospital, aged care, retirement living and over 55's. Do not support <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not support changes to R2 Controls, and or increased opportunity for boarding houses or higher density over 55 living 	<p>The planning proposal seeks to rezone the subject site to R2 Low Density Residential.</p> <p>The <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021</i> permits development for seniors housing within the R2 Low Density Residential zone if the Seniors Housing will be provided for by an operator.</p>	No amendment to planning proposal
Objection to Medium (R3) and High Density (R4) Residential Apartments / High Density <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is disappointing to hear about the rezoning of green space for apartments Do not need more apartments - Lindfield looks so different these days after the development of sites for apartments. Please don't let this happen to Roseville Chase as well. No high-density housing behind my back fences Demand for public space is greater than apartments. Nobody wants unit blocks etc in the area 	<p>The comments objecting to higher density development (both medium and high density) are noted.</p> <p>The planning proposal seeks to rezone the subject site to R2 Low Density Residential – and not medium (R3) or high (R4) density residential zoning.</p>	No amendment to planning proposal

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not require higher density residential spaces when there is such limited park space in our area. This has become even more apparent during the past couple of years. <p>Medium Density</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are more than enough sites where medium density living is able to occur. This can be a very sneaky way to change what we had already fought for before with prior applications for medium density/boarding house type applications nearby to this one in Warrane Rd. Stop trying to increase housing density for profit Not sell it off for units, town houses The land is not suited for medium density Development of 40 townhouses is not conducive to the area, as our local roads will not cope with such an increase in traffic that 100+ new residents would bring. I also doubt the stormwater drains would cope, particularly after heavy rain. R3 zoning proposed in earlier proposal is inappropriate given the surrounding land uses Planning to reduce green public recreational space and build R3 density is considered creating liveable neighbourhoods? R3 will cause more traffic The site does not lend itself to an increase in density beyond that of its surrounding Oppose the change of zoning for the site from RE1 to R3 as indicated in the June 2020 KRG Council meeting. As R3 will alter the landscape and infrastructure of this suburb. R3 will change the whole nature of the area & the reasons why most people have made the conscious decision to raise a family and settle into this area. It will decrease existing residents' satisfaction of their suburb as they will be impacted through increased noise, Rezoning to R3 in an isolated pocket of R2 zoning is inconsistent with council policy planning higher density on main roads or around shopping centres. Medium density residential does not generates jobs for the broader economy. The vacant bowling club generates more jobs than the residential subdivision. No medium to high density buildings in this area and it should continue to be this way, site is on a quiet suburban street, not on a medium to high density corridor The site is surrounded by 14 adjoining properties zoned R2, consisting of single and double storey detached dwellings. The rezoning to R2 then upzoning to R3 would result in negative impacts on the amenity of the adjoining properties. 		
---	--	--

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If this development were to go ahead, a precedent would be set for the approval of more multi-dwelling housing <p>High density and recreational land</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Combination of both high density residential with recreational areas would be extremely detrimental to the overall ambiance of living in the area and could negatively impact the value of surrounding properties. <p>Misrepresentation of the true intention of planning proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Very insincere and dishonest to rezone to Low Density with a view to rezone again to mid or high density in the future after sale. If the councillors want to do this, they should be upfront about their intentions The fact that <i>"It is likely that the state government will support a rezone to R2, and that either at the same time or at a subsequent point in time within the next year or two there will be another proposal to then make it R3."</i> (Sam Ngai 28th July 2021 – email: Roseville Chase Bowling Club – Update) therefore, making this planning application under a false pretence. Once zoning is changed it would be an easy task for council to have it changed again to medium Density Residential and a precedent would be set for multi-dwelling housing to be approved We do not agree with any such suggestions to up zone to R3 in future. There is significant risk that further rezoning, will revert to medium density rather than the current proposed low density. This space will be then taken over by developers and their for-profit interest will apply pressure to council to reconsider the zoning again. In its resolution of 30 June 2020 Council made it clear that it is not satisfied with low density zoning, to provide around 9 blocks. Instead, despite the State Government's rejection of Council's proposal to rezone the land as medium density, Council will pursue that rezoning, resulting in around 37 villas on the site. Council is prepared to remove much needed, flat, accessible recreational land, then pursue population growth of well over 100 residents. If it is rezoned, a caveat should be placed on the land to prohibit further rezoning Question whether this proposal is what is actually intended or an intermediary development approval to get to a higher density outcome. This brings into question the integrity of the process and indeed the Ku-ring-gai Council. <p>Impacts of increased density</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Diminish existing residents' enjoyment of their suburb through impacts such as increased traffic, noise and loss of privacy 	<p>The intention of the planning proposal is to rezone the subject sites to R2 Low Density Residential. Part 1 of the planning proposal sets out the objectives and intended outcomes, and states:</p> <p><i>Rezone the site so as to enable redevelopment of the site for the purposes of residential accommodation;</i></p> <p>Part 2 of the planning proposal sets out the explanation of provisions (i.e how the objective and intended outcomes will be achieved) and states:</p> <p><i>Rezone the site from RE1 Public Recreation to <u>R2 Low Density Residential</u></i></p> <p>At OMC 20 July 2021, which is when Council last considered this matter, Council resolved to resubmit the revised planning proposal (seeking R2 Low Density Residential) to the Department of Planning for a Gateway Determination.</p> <p><i>A. Council resubmit the revised planning proposals for 4 Pennant Avenue, Gordon (Attachment A16-A23) and 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase (Attachment A5 – A15) to the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment for a Gateway Determination in accordance with Section 3.34 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.</i></p> <p><i>B. Upon receipt of a Gateway Determination, the public exhibition process is carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the Gateway Determination and the Ku-ring-gai Community Participation Plan.</i></p> <p><i>C. A report be brought back at the end of the exhibition process.</i></p> <p>If Council were to seek an R3 Medium Density Residential zoning on the subject site in the future, this would be subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Further consideration and a formal resolution of Council to prepare a planning proposal to specifically rezone the site to R3 Medium Density Residential. The planning proposal for R3 Medium Density Residential would be required to be sent to the Department of Planning seeking a Gateway Determination. If a Gateway Determination was assessed and issued by the Department of Planning, the planning proposal for R3 Medium Density Residential would be required to be placed on formal public exhibition, and residents would be again be notified and have an opportunity to provide any comments. 	
---	---	--

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Following public exhibition, Council would be required to consider any submissions received and then make a final determination on whether to proceed with the planning proposal for R3 Medium Density Residential or to not proceed. <p>It is incorrect to say that it would be an easy task - all planning proposals are subject to the same legislative requirements and processes – including Gateway Determination by the Department of Planning, formal public exhibition, notification and reporting to Council.</p>	
Affordable Housing		
Affordable housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council seems to have a reputation of selling to developers at any cost. Understand the need for medium density housing and would like it to be affordable for real people like first time buyers not investors, but the reality is it never is. If residential was to be placed on the site, it should be affordable housing (community housing) and the land should not be sold, but offered to a not-for-profit community housing provider to deliver housing to ensure that key workers / essential workers can afford to live in the area they work in. 	<p>Council does not currently have an Affordable Housing Policy in place. The Ku-ring-gai Local Strategic Planning Statement includes a specific Local Planning Priority identifying this as a key priority for future:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> K5 Providing affordable housing that retains and strengthens the local residential and business community <p>The LSPS also identified the following actions for Council to undertake:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Undertake a Housing Affordability Study to determine the profile of local residents and essential workers in need of affordable housing, and the appropriate location for viable provision. Prepare a SEPP 70 Affordable Housing Contribution Scheme for Ku-ring-gai to enable a mechanism for the delivery of local affordable housing <p>Additionally, the Ku-ring-gai Housing Strategy identified a Housing Priority to <i>Encourage diversity and choice of housing</i>, with a specific objective to investigate housing affordability.</p> <p>The rezoning of the site would not preclude Council from making the land available to community housing providers in the future.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal
Development Standards		
Height <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is surrounded by mostly single level dwellings which will all be affected by buildings of 9.5m in height. Lot Size <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed plot size is significantly smaller than the surrounding properties. 	<p>The maximum height of buildings proposed by the planning proposal for the subject site is 9.5m, which allows for 2 storey residential development. This is the same maximum height of buildings which applies to all surrounding residential properties.</p> <p>The minimum lot size proposed by the planning proposal for the subject site is 790sqm. This is the exact same minimum lot size that applies to all the surrounding residential properties should they subdivide. While the minimum lot size is 790sqm, the configuration suggested in the Urban Design Study has lot sizes ranging from 805sqm – 900sqm due to the site shape and configuration with the new road.</p>	No amendment to planning proposal
Open Space and Recreation		
Do not support RE1 Public Recreation zoning and objection to any future recreation uses on site <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Oppose the land being maintained as RE1, as there is ample public recreation space within the vicinity of the site and the Ku-ring-gai area 	<p>Comments noted and supported</p> <p>The sites location does not meet Council's criteria for new parks as per the Open Space Acquisition Strategy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is not considered a good location for a park as it is surrounded on 3-sides by housing with rear fences facing the site 	No amendment to planning proposal.

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE

Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase

16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RE1 not supported due to noise and traffic movements. R2 Low Density will be more quiet on a 24 hour basis • Given the poor location for the site and the potential traffic, parking and noise issues the retention of the site as RE1 public recreation does not represent an appropriate use • Opposed to the site developed as recreation area, to which members of the public would have 24-hour access. The site is contained by surrounding residential properties and to a large extent is out of sight of public scrutiny. The possibility would exist for people to gather for the consumption of alcohol or other substances, partying, generating noise and disturbance for neighbours. • It is simply not an appropriate location for these activities anymore. • The site is at the end of a cul-de-sac, it has poor access being surrounded on 3 sides and could not only be made a more appropriate recreational area by resuming some of the properties providing access to Babbage Road. • To have more intensive sporting activities on the site would destroy the current lifestyle in the area well beyond just the surrounding street, access to the area is limited to only a few roads into the chase. Intensive sporting activities would put tremendous pressure on those access points, parking is completely inadequate for any such activities. • The continuation of this zoning will be extremely detrimental to the overall ambiance of living in the area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is also long, or deep, and the rear parts of the site lack any potential for passive surveillance • The site only has one street frontage which impacts on access and public safety • A park on this site is not considered high priority community infrastructure. Council's Open Space Acquisition Strategy identifies this area as a low priority area for additional open space • Roseville chase is ranked 6 out of 7 in terms of priority (where 1 is the highest and 7 is the lowest) refer Ku-Ring-Gai Open Space Acquisition Strategy, Part 5, Figure 5 - Acquisition Priority Rankings, page 48 https://www.krg.nsw.gov.au/files/assets/public/hptrim/information-management-publications-public-website-ku-ring-gai-council-website-planning-and-development/open_space_acquisition_strategy_-_november_2006_-_part_5.pdf 	
<p>Support for retaining RE1 Public Recreation zoning and support for recreation uses on the site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roseville Chase has population of 1600, comprising 83% families - we are strongly in favour of retaining community recreational areas. • This space should remain as recreation space to ensure that future generations have access to safe, green areas. • Building more residential by killing the green open space means there is less green open are for the residents and the kids to play. • Council has a responsibility to ensure that future recreation space is preserved for its original intended purpose - i.e. recreation. Do not change zoning. • The other nearby land that is referenced in council documents as recreational (eg. echo point park), to purportedly support council's notion that this land is surplus to need, is not flat and serves a completely different recreational purpose. For example, it is not suited to any form of sport or organised sport. • It's close to the main road so gets quite a bit of car noise, but that's not an issue if used for sports or recreation or other community purposes. • The land was always intended for public use and should be retained as such 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A park on this site is not considered high priority community infrastructure. ▪ Council's Open Space Acquisition Strategy identifies this area as a low priority area for additional open space ▪ Roseville chase is ranked 6 out of 7 in terms of priority (where 1 is the highest and 7 is the lowest) refer Ku-Ring-Gai Open Space Acquisition Strategy, Part 5, Figure 5 - Acquisition Priority Rankings, page 48 https://www.krg.nsw.gov.au/files/assets/public/hptrim/information-management-publications-public-website-ku-ring-gai-council-website-planning-and-development/open_space_acquisition_strategy_-_november_2006_-_part_5.pdf ▪ The site is within reasonable proximity to Echo Point Park, Castle Cove Park and Malga Avenue West Park ▪ Provision of additional facilities would be in conflict with what is provided, in addition increase the financial burden of Council to maintain additional facilities. • The site would require significant remedial works to provide a functional surface for recreation 	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Needs to be remained recreation and no over development is needed in this lovely suburb • We need green spaces now more than ever. • Do not sacrifice sporting facilities, today's youth desperately needs areas for such activities that do not cost a lot of money to enjoy. • Will allow residents to stay in the area to enjoy the green open space rather having to travel to St Ives or Gordon areas. • Once all such land is gone, its gone forever. Any land set aside for recreation or sporting facilities should be permanently marked as such and never changed. • Numerous people use this space every day for picnicking, children play and family time. There is no other level green space easily accessible to children and families. • Need for flat public recreational area in Roseville Chase on the south side of Boundary/Warringah Roads, this area is perfect, from all directions for young, mature and older residents and their families. • Need to protect this rare open flat land space we already have to remain as 'public reserve' status in Roseville Chase. • This site is the rare accessible and relatively level area that could be used for recreational activities in the local community, which is crucial for the well being of our local residents of all ages in the years to come. • Missed opportunity to maintain the area for public use as was originally intended. Open space is at a premium in Sydney. • Continue to protect this precious open space for current and future generations, and to revitalise this asset to provide multifunctional, multigenerational recreational facilities, in consultation with the local community. • The site is irregular in shape and large enough, to provide a recreational area that can support distinct activity areas from informal play areas to sports activities • Retaining the site for open space and recreational activity will deliver social benefits that outweigh its sale. It is essentially one of the only level areas suitable for a range of recreational activities that could be accommodated in a significantly sized park. • Ku-ring-gai should consider its responsibility to provide and maintain public spaces instead of disposing of the limited amount of land available for such areas • To acquire land to provide such badly needed facilities would be very expensive. However, Council already owns this recreational land – a significant saving, so the money saved in purchasing land could be spent on managing and maintaining this site to provide multi-functional, multi-generational recreational facilities. 		
---	--	--

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents in the area have purchased their properties on the basis of the land being 'Public Recreation' and this should be maintained not to alter the characteristics of the neighbourhood. The proposal states Council is committed to providing additional open space in Ku-ring-gai, and will "offset or compensate for the loss of this site". However, there is no better site – in fact, there is no other site - available in the Roseville Chase area to meet the local community's recreational needs. Moreover, Council already owns this site. Once this precious public reserve is sold, it will be lost to the community forever, with Council unable to provide an appropriate replacement. The council has not fulfilled the NSW Department of Planning's request to provide further justification to demonstrate the wider consequences of this loss of open space and how Council may offset or compensate for this loss <p>Why is council removing open space?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> On what basis have you decided to remove recreational public space Why deprive local residents of valuable and necessary outdoor green space? This proposal is another example of the lack of compassion for people's wellbeing and putting profits ahead of the health and well-being of its people. What sense does it make to cause disruption whilst depriving the community of much-needed space for exercise, recreation, and activity? For financial gain? Apart from your own profit, what benefit would this development provide to the Roseville community? <p>Need for parks during lockdown</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pandemic and associated lockdowns these past two years have highlighted very clearly how important open, green space is not just for physical exercise but mental wellbeing. Being parents to young children has particularly shown our primary-aged child struggle with the isolation of lockdown and reduced human interactions that would otherwise be a normal part of their daily lives at school, sport, extracurricular activities and church. Being outdoors has been a lifeline to children. You may already be aware of the strong community within this small and intimate corner of Sydney, and no doubt having green space and bushland surrounding us has been a big factor allowing us to stay safe during the pandemic and reduce the load and burden on the health system. It baffles us that this could possibly be considered as an option at all Covid highlighted that walking tracks and recreational are critical for the health and wellbeing of all communities. 		
---	--	--

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rob Stokes was correct to point out “... <i>how important green open space is to people during the pandemic</i>” but the vast majority of residents in our municipality contend that such space is important all the time. • During the coronavirus pandemic, in a time when we experienced restriction on movement and everyday activities, collectively we all understood the importance of our favourite open space or park and the importance of these places to connect communities and provide places for people to rest, relax, exercise, gather or be on their own. “ <i>A 50-year Vision for Greater Sydney’s Open Space and Parklands</i>” • It is likely there will be future pandemics and this is required to be considered in decision making <p>Importance of open space with increased density</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council has stated that it would seek to up zone the site to R3 Medium Density Residential. It has also identified Roseville Chase for medium density housing in its Local Strategic Planning Statement (LSPS), to be delivered in the 2031-2036 period. Medium density housing in the area would make the site an even more vital piece of recreational infrastructure for the local community. 		
<p>Lack of recreational land and sporting facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is insufficient recreational land in our ward. There are not enough local parks, nor recreational areas to service the existing needs of residents. • This part of the LGA is sorely lacking in community space for picnics and recreational activity. • Council provides minimal accessible, multi-functional recreational facilities in the Roseville Chase area. • Local facilities are over-burdened with the community desperate for more recreation space. • There are not enough recreational areas in Roseville chase with increased number of younger families and children locating to this area needing access to easily walkable public space • Currently our area has inadequate recreational facilities to meet community demand and this extra space would benefit the community and reduce pressure on Castle Cove Oval, which is currently closed for six months • There is a considerable lack of sporting fields in Ku-ring-gai and to lose an existing sports venue seems counter-productive. • Roseville has a high demand for outdoor recreational spaces. • Very little recreational or open space in Roseville Chase with most of us dog owners currently having to go to Willoughby LGA 	<p>The site location does not meet Council's criteria for new parks as per the Open Space Acquisition Strategy as set out in the Planning Proposal.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not considered a good location for a park as it is surrounded on 3-sides by housing with rear fences facing the site • The site is also long, or deep, and the rear parts of the site lack any potential for passive surveillance • The site only has one street frontage which impacts on access and public safety • A park on this site is not considered high priority community infrastructure. Council's Open Space Acquisition Strategy identifies this area as a low priority area for additional open space • Roseville chase is ranked 6 out of 7 in terms of priority (where 1 is the highest and 7 is the lowest) refer Ku-Ring-Gai Open Space Acquisition Strategy, Part 5, Figure 5 - Acquisition Priority Rankings, page 48 • https://www.krg.nsw.gov.au/files/assets/public/hptrim/information-management-publications-public-website-ku-ring-gai-council-website-planning-and-development/open_space_acquisition_strategy_-_november_2006_-_part_5.pdf • The site is within reasonable proximity to Echo Point Park, Castle Cove Park and Malga Avenue West Park • The area is in close proximity to regional open space areas extending along Middle Cove • The site is not suitable for organised sports due to the proximity to residential properties 	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We do not want to have to get into our cars and drive several kilometres over busy roads to find somewhere to “ play “. • Ku-ring-gai council has a shortage of open space and land for sporting and recreational facilities. To dispose of over 10,000 sq m of council owned land to provide facilities in distant town centres is short-sighted. • There are no local basketball or netball courts or futsal / 5 a side football fields or places where our community can gather for recreation. Currently there seems to be nowhere in our LGA where kids and their parents can gather for a game of friendly basketball. • Roseville Ward already is already proposed to lose two tennis courts situated on the Lindfield Library site with the reclassification approved development application and proposed council sale and redevelopment of the library site for seven storey unit development. We understand that the two courts are not to be replaced in the proposed Lindfield Hub or elsewhere in Ku-ring-gai despite the shortfall of sporting facilities. The Roseville Ward community cannot afford to lose more recreational facilities which will never be replaced once sold off for additional housing. • The nearest parks I can take my children to are Castle Cove Park or Willoughby Park, neither of which are in Ku-ring-gai Council. • For Roseville resident east of Archold Road and south of Park Street the closest parkland space is located in Roseville Chase. • The Roseville Chase section of the Ku-ring-gai LGA is poorly lacking in recreational facilities <p>Benefit to the local schools and local clubs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local public junior and high schools would greatly benefit from another field. I know my sons now at the local high school sit around for half their sport time as they need to share the field with different teams. There is not enough field space for them to all play at once and have a decent length of game or decent field size for sports such as soccer and cricket. • There are any number of sporting groups for children that would benefit from this space. Has Council considered this in the context of the report they commissioned? • We are constantly short fields for weekend club and mid-week school sport. 		
<p>Underutilisation of East Roseville Bowling Club Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal states that, under the Ku-ring-gai Local Strategic Planning Statement (KLSPS), a key reason for rezoning and selling off the ERBC site is that it is an “<i>under-utilised or surplus asset</i>”. • Council must take full responsibility for the under-utilisation of this important public asset. Council has seen fit to abandon the site where the once carefully 	<p>The subject site has continuously been leased to the bowling club since the 1950's for their exclusive use, and accordingly the site has not served the same public open space function for the wider community that a park or reserve would.</p> <p>General maintenance and grass cutting of the former bowling has continued since the Club vacated the site, however it is noted the buildings have been vandalised.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<p>maintained bowling greens are now weed-infested and the old clubhouse has been vandalised. Despite this, the community values this open space and regularly uses the site for numerous purposes including dog exercise, children's ball games, bike riding, meeting place etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The clubhouse is a soundly built, double-brick building with a large function area, commercial kitchen and bathroom facilities. It could be argued that the clubhouse is becoming a victim of demolition by neglect. Although Council has been responsible for the site since the ERBC vacated in 2017, as of 10 October 2021, Council has not even secured the clubhouse's windows and doors, or installed security cameras to ensure the safety of the both the building and the local community. Consequently, many of the window and door panes have been smashed and broken glass litters the surrounding area. Nearby residents advise that copper piping has also been removed from the building. Residents can only hope that the clubhouse's once warm and welcoming interior – including its timber honour boards - has not been vandalised. 	<p>Council is committed to providing additional open space throughout Ku-ring-gai. Council will offset or compensate for the loss of this site by continuing to acquire sites that are better suited for the provision of the open space and recreation needs to the community.</p>										
<p>Declaration of Trust 1953 – Public Reserve</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site subject to a Declaration of Trust signed by the council in 1953 which held the land as a public reserve. Surprising that this Declaration of Trust seems to have been overturned Declaration of Trust declared that the site be held as a public reserve subject to such ordinances, conditions, regulations and/or by-laws that do now or at any future time apply to public reserves within the Municipality. How is there any justification for Council to use this land for anything by a public reserve when the Title states "<i>and shall henceforth be held by the Council as a public reserve subject to such ordinances conditions regulations and/or by-laws that do now or at any future time apply to public reserves within the boundaries of the said Municipality</i>". Find it hard to believe that rezoning can be contemplated on land protected by caveat as a public reserve (RE1) now and in the future. Unfair that the current LEP allows such legal precedence to be overturned only in the favour of the council. Council should respect and honour the intent shown by previous Mayors in 1953 and 1959 in their Declarations of Trust that the site be retained as public reserve from then and into the future. Adding to their binding nature, the Declarations of Trust are protected by four caveats "<i>forbidding the registration of any dealing affecting the land</i>" contrary to the Declaration of Trust. It appears that in order to have the caveat removed, 	<p>The whole of 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase was reclassified from community land to operational land as part of the preparation of the Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan 2015 on 5 March 2015. A public hearing into the proposed reclassification of the property was held on 12 June 2013, and adjoining owners were notified by letter and a notice was placed in the North Shore Times on 17 May 2013. Council resolved to proceed with the reclassification of the site on 26 November 2013.</p> <p>As part of the reclassification process, all interests in the land including the 1953 Declaration of Trust were discharged as part of the process.</p> <p>The site is listed in Schedule 4 of the KLEP 2015, which notes 'nil' for any trusts, etc are not discharged:</p> <p>Schedule 4 - Part 2 Land classified, or reclassified, as operational land—interests changed</p> <table> <tr> <th>Column 1</th><th>Column 2</th><th>Column 3</th></tr> <tr> <th>Locality</th><th>Description</th><th>Any trusts etc not discharged</th></tr> <tr> <td>Roseville Chase</td><td>47 Warrane Road, being Lots 33 and 34, DP 3285; Lot 3, DP 26343; Lot B, DP 403780</td><td>Nil</td></tr> </table> <p>It is acknowledged that the title information contained at Appendix 5 of the planning proposal includes references to the trusts and other encumbrances on the title which were discharged as part of the reclassification in 2015. While the trusts and other encumbrances were discharged as part of the reclassification process in 2015, the certificate of title is not automatically update and this requires a separate</p>	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Locality	Description	Any trusts etc not discharged	Roseville Chase	47 Warrane Road, being Lots 33 and 34, DP 3285; Lot 3, DP 26343; Lot B, DP 403780	Nil	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>
Column 1	Column 2	Column 3									
Locality	Description	Any trusts etc not discharged									
Roseville Chase	47 Warrane Road, being Lots 33 and 34, DP 3285; Lot 3, DP 26343; Lot B, DP 403780	Nil									

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE

Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase

16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<p>Council would have to satisfy the Registrar-General that the protection afforded by the Declaration of Trust ceases to be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to Thomson Reuters, <i>Land Titles Office Practice NSW</i> (at 29 April 2021) [55.250]⁴, for the Registrar-General's caveat to be withdrawn, Council would be required to show either that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>"(i) when the unregistered interest which it protects has ceased to exist or has ceased to be binding on the registered proprietor; or</i> <i>"(ii) when all parties beneficially interested in the subject matter of the caveat, being free from incapacity, request the Registrar-General to withdraw it."</i> The need for a public reserve is still required, and Council has failed to establish why the Declarations of Trust should cease to be binding on it. At present there is a clear legal impediment to the planning proposal going ahead. Council should honour its forebears' commitment to the local community and continue to protect and provide this site which is brilliantly located to serve its original purpose as a public reserve. In the 1950s with a much small population in the Roseville Chase area, Council saw the public benefit in preserving the site as public reserve. Now, more than six decades later with a far greater local population, it is even more important to preserve this precious open space. The title deeds of the relevant lots show that at the time of the council gaining possession of the land, a caveat was placed on the land not allowing the use to be changed <p>Public Reserve – Not just Bowling Club</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site was acquired for open space and East Roseville Bowling Club just happened to lease it. It could just have easily been a Tennis Club This is a spurious argument. There is no mention in the Declarations that the land was being protected solely as and limited only to a bowling club site. Moreover, in each of those Declarations, Council has reiterated the importance of protecting the land as public reserve. It was acquired for open space use. The fact East Roseville Bowling Club has not resigned a lease does not mean it's 'purpose' as open space is no longer required. 	<p>process and a new certificate of title to be issued. Councils solicitors have recently had a new certificate of title issued.</p>	
<p>Comments on existing parks in surrounding area</p> <p><i>Echo Point Park</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Echo Point Park, which is poorly maintained and is only accessible by car (with no footpath provided on any of the steep access routes). No suitable access for the disabled or people with mobility issues and is of quite sloping terrain. 	<p>Comments on the existing parks in the surrounding areas are noted, parks and open space are regularly reviewed and where practical upgrades to access and improvements to facilities and services area made.</p> <p>The subject site has continuously been leased to the bowling club since the 1950's for their exclusive use, and accordingly the site has not served the same public open space function for the wider community that a park or reserve would.</p> <p>Council is committed to providing additional open space throughout Ku-ring-gai.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE

Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase

16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Its recreational use is primarily for bushwalking, picnicking, fishing etc rather than for general exercise, games etc. On weekends it is overutilized primarily by people driving there from other areas. • With lockdown it has had unbelievable usage with carparking stretching up old Babbage road, almost to Malga Avenue on the weekends. • Path under Roseville bridge has not changed in 20 years possibly. This area seems to be forgotten. • The 'beach' is oyster encrusted and the water filthy with boat diesel and bull sharks. <p><i>Malga Reserve</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malga Reserve is also only accessible by car due to the steep terrain and lack of footpaths. Because of its inaccessible location, the playground is rarely used by residents. • The playground is only suitable for older primary aged children, and the unfenced area alongside Babbage Road is unsafe for ballgames. • Malga St Reserve (on paper) may be 4300sqm, but it's solid bush except for the upgraded playground which I'd 'guestimate' at being 300sqm • We are told this 4000sqm land was purposely built to provide us with recreational use. If you take the fenced off area of Malga reserve, it is probably closer to 1300sqm, • It is a very awkward shape with no room to exercise, kick a ball, or move around. The positioning and location of the park, as well as the facilities on site do not provide a suitable means for residents to utilise the space, and certainly not fit for purpose. • Is 'pocket' park essentially offering a playground area • Malga reserve is difficult to access as steep topography to the south, west and east presents a challenge to walkability, to people with mobility issues, to parents with small children and to children on bicycles. On its northern boundary are Babbage and Warringah roads that carry considerable traffic funnelling in and out of Roseville Chase and Castle Cove. • It is already overcrowded. • It is in a gully and unattractive to children. • No rubbish bin facilities, no toilets and no-where to exercise or let dogs off leash. <p><i>Roseville Chase Oval</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roseville Chase Oval, only accessible by car, unless you live very nearby, and there are no other facilities beyond an oval. Difficult to access, with no footpath and very steep terrain to walk up and down. 	<p>Council will offset or compensate for the loss of this site by continuing to acquire sites that are better suited for the provision of the open space and recreation needs to the community.</p>	
---	---	--

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to poor accessibility due to steep terrain and again no footpath. Its use is limited further during the rugby season due to competition matches <p><i>Castle Cove Park</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Castle Cove Park, to rely on facilities provided by another Council is questionable. • It is not an easy walk for most people from the site or from many parts of Roseville Chase, with access via a steep hill on Holly Street and access is by car. • There is only an over-used, half-sized basketball court at Castle Cove Park, and the jump track alongside the park appears to be maintained by younger members of the community and is not safe to use. • It is unsuitable for small children as it is an off-leash dog park and contains a dirt bike circuit • It is regularly used by sporting clubs restricting residents to use the facility • Castlecove Oval, even before Covid, was very heavily and increasingly used by football and cricket clubs, dog owners and families with young children, and many people of all ages just enjoying exercising in the open air. • Currently unusable due to planned upgrade done by Willoughby Council • Heavily patronised by Castle Cove and Roseville Chase residents as it is the only large flat recreational space on the peninsula. It should not be an excuse for or preclude Ku-ring-gai Council from providing a similar multifunctional recreation facility that is badly needed by the 3,269 people in the Roseville Chase area. • This is the only multipurpose open green area in our local East Roseville/ Castle Cove area • how dare you have the audacity to palm us off to another LGA. <p><i>Roseville Golf Club</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The golf course is private gold club an inaccessible to the public. • This is mostly, a golfing area and the public are discouraged from wandering around <p><i>Cnr Malaga/Babbage Road</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A children's playground with one picnic ground • Beside this area is a patch of rough ground where parents are not allowed to park and decorated by a leaning sideways • All other ground is sloping and pure scrub and weeds. • It is small • Babbage Rd playground, only recently rejuvenated is well utilized and further opportunity for recreation space would be eagerly used. <p><i>Kinkell Brae on Allard Ave.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This a bush reserve on the side of a cliff and is basically impenetrable and looked after by a Bush Regeneration organisation. 		
---	--	--

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<p><i>Calga Street Reserve</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single ex-building block, grassed but not a table of chair or any signage whatsoever to say it is a reserve. • It is hard to find, squashed in between houses. <p><i>The Community Centre</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Half of the building area has been leased to a private childcare centre. • Half the remaining area is a playground and the other a hard surface car park. • On the weekends there are sometimes pop up churches and martial art classes. <p>No room for anything else outside.</p> <p><i>Cardigan Reserve</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is just that, a bush reserve of unusable land filled with scrub and bush and probably part of the original Water Board Reserve. It has no tracks or entry points and no signage. 		
Alternate uses of the site		
<p>Suggested alternative uses of the site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Multi-functional across sports and leisure and multi-generational in nature. • Made into a park for walking dogs/ fenced leash-free dog area • Community gardens and low maintenance gardens including opportunity for a vegetable/herb garden • The site is flat and lends itself to a quick conversion to a recreational complex • Sports fields/ multi-purpose sports courts • Basketball courts • Soccer • Netball courts • Tennis courts/ tennis practice board • Barefoot bowling • Children's playground • BBQ facilities • Picnic area • Exercise equipment • Swimming pool • Cricket nets • Jogging/ roller skating / bike riding path around the perimeter • Roller park or skateboard park • Multipurpose field that could support Hockey club • Weekend markets like North Sydney and Northern Beaches • Arts and music centre which would be of direct benefit to residents, including the 72% of residents that are families with children 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not suitable for organised or active sports due to the proximity to residential properties and potential noise/lighting/traffic impacts • Council's most successful community gardens is in Turramurra and occupies about 1,000sqm (about 1/10th of the subject site area). This garden was initiated by an active, well-organised and established community group who approached Council seeking a site. These pre-requisites have not been met in this case. • There is a children's playground within about 200 metres of the site • Barbeque and Picnic facilities are available at Echo Point Reserve and Davidson Reserve among others • Access to natural areas is available along the foreshore of Middle Cove • A community facility cannot be supported for this site. Council's Community Facilities Strategy identifies priority locations for new community centres and libraries <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A sub-regional level facility – a new large facility centrally located in Gordon. This facility would have an arts/cultural focus and be part of a larger civic/cultural precinct that also includes the Council administration, Council chambers and Gordon library. Marian Street Theatre, while physically separate, will form part of the cultural component of the sub-regional facility. ○ District level facilities – new large, multipurpose community facilities located in the local centres of Turramurra, St Ives and Lindfield. The facilities would be based on the community hub model, ideally co-locating branch library and community centre space. These facilities would serve the needs of their districts (that is, suburbs surrounding the facilities). ○ In terms of small neighbourhood level facilities two new local facilities are proposed for the northern parts of the LGA to balance the current inequitable distribution where Roseville and Lindfield have more facilities than the northern suburbs 	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE

Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase

16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revitalise as community use, have seen local children playing games on the disused greens like table tennis championship and mini soccer games • Council should seize this opportunity to create outstanding multi-functional, multi-generational recreational facilities, in consultation with the local community <p>Suggestions for re-use of the old clubhouse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenities in the old clubhouse could be tapped into for water, power, toilets and so on. • Community hall • Arts and Music space to rival the Willoughby park centre • Café/ restaurant • Playgroup • Personal Gym/ yoga/ Pilates • Men's shed • Lifeline bookshop • Dance classes • Cards-fitness for all ages <p>Landscaping</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KMC's own open space designers would come up with great ideas – or maybe a competition could be held. • It could be professionally landscaped with low grassy hills and strategically placed rocks, many trees, native grasses and shrubs planted, perhaps tables and benches around a water feature, <p>Rose garden</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good idea to revitalise "Roseville" and bring back its history for the local community. It would also attract visitors and school children coming to enjoy and learn different types of roses as a local Education centre. <p>Examples of facilities/uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The West Lindfield Bowling Club • Warners Park in Northbridge/Castlecrag is a multi-purpose open space consisting of bushland, recreational grass areas, a children's playground, the Warners Park Community Centre, the Willoughby Community Garden, a car park and the former Northbridge Bowling Club. • The Pavilions at Artarmon Reserve • Imagine a community garden in this area as in Warners Park Northbridge or in Cammeray opposite Anzac Park Public. • An obstacle course like the one along Ann St in Enfield. 	<p>https://www.krq.nsw.gov.au/Planning-and-development/Planning-policies-and-guidelines/Strategies-and-management-plans/Community-Facilities-Strategy</p> <p>As noted in the planning proposal - the site is affected by contamination from past land uses and activities on the site. This would dramatically increase the cost of construction of the park. Such costs are not budgeted for and must be avoided to ensure maximum funds are available to create new parks with high levels of facilities and amenities.</p>	
--	--	--

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Development on Eastern Valley Way near Castlecrag is a good example. Excellent facilities to walk around and an amazing community garden. Willoughby Council with consultation with residents and many years of negotiation managed to have the development with landscaping and a community facility. Works well, blends in and I'm sure everyone has forgotten the derelict land that was there before. 		
Cycling facility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A facility for cycling as a sport and encourage grassroots participation in cycling (school children and teenagers) through a learn to cycle course and centre. The North Shore generally is poor in cycling infrastructure and this cycling infrastructure goes beyond the implementation of cycling lanes. The development of a facility that is like Heffron Park Criterium Track in Maroubra or the Victoria Park Cycling track in the Adelaide Parklands. Opportunity to setup a base for a local club (Northern Suburbs Cycling club) to race on dedicated track and establish safe facility off the trafficable roads for children and adults to learn. The land size is adequate for a track in multiple configurations with surveillance by others from a clubhouse. The facility could be used for multiple other purposes throughout the day. This is a opportunity to establish a piece of community infrastructure that will draw people from far and wide, be utilised for the benefit of the next generation through a safe learning environment and contribute to the livability of the North Shore Area by tying into the increase in cycling infrastructure across Greater Sydney. 	<p>An initial assessment suggests the site does not lend itself to provide significant cycling infrastructure, with insufficient connectivity to dedicated routes or trails.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>
Support for Netball Club <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roseville netball club can use its space for meetings and gatherings for netballers If permitted we would love for location to be our headquarters. We could train there, have our monthly committee meetings and social events. We could also rent space to store our equipment Local netball club is lacking a facility for training Oppose Netball court <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No net ball courts it will have negative impacts, Inappropriate to allow such noisy sporting activities directly behind out back fences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> An initial site assessment has identified that the is not suitable for organised or active sports due to the proximity to residential properties and potential noise/lighting/traffic impacts and financial considerations. Comments noted 	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>
Swimming pool <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The nearest safe swimming is at Northbridge (a harbour pool), the Warringah Aquatic Centre at Forestville and the Willoughby Leisure Centre. All of these centres are becoming increasingly crowded. This is bound to accelerate in the 	<p>The site is not suitable for organised or active sports due to the proximity to residential properties and potential noise/lighting/traffic impacts.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<p>future because of state government policies of residential densification. They all require motor transport to get to them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is high time that Ku-ring-gai Council provided an easily accessible public swimming pool enabling safe swimming. The former bowling club site is ideally located for the construction of that facility and the land is already in public ownership. 		
<p>Hockey club</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Northern Sydney and Beaches Hockey Association is looking for a site to develop a hockey centre. Wouldn't this site be ideal for their purposes? It already has a good club house and off street parking. Please give consideration to repurposing the bowling club to another sporting/recreation use. 	<p>The site is not suitable for organised or active sports due to the proximity to residential properties and potential noise/lighting/traffic impacts</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>
<p>Keep as a bowling club</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use your time and resources to encourage continued bowling use as this sport is good for your elderly rate payers. What has Council done to keep bowling use on the site? Bowling is very good for this older age group being low impact and you still get the standing, bending etc to keep the back, arms and legs operating. 	<p>The retention of the site for lawns bowls would require significant investment to renew the facilities, in addition to the high ongoing cost of specialised turf management action.</p> <p>With a 0.5452% participation rate across the North District current operational facilities meet the demand without the renewal of this site.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>
Infrastructure and Facilities		
<p>Overcrowding of local facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overcrowded, public hospitals, pre-pandemic overcrowded trains, struggling to cope with overdevelopment, Increase population and therefore directly impact quality of education at local schools primarily Castle Cove Primary School, Roseville Chase Preschool; 	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>The planning proposal to rezone the site to R2 Low Density Residential would result in 9 additional dwellings to the surrounding area. The planning proposal was referred to state government agencies, such as Transport for NSW, who did not raise any concern with the potential impact on infrastructure.</p> <p>The provision of infrastructure and facilities to support the community is a key priority for Council, and in the LSPS there are two Local Planning Priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> K1. Providing well-planned and sustainable local infrastructure to support growth and change K2. Collaborating with State Government Agencies and the community to deliver infrastructure projects. 	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>
<p>Insufficient Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There have been issues with the main line that runs down Warrane Road on the side of the bowling club and have been a drop in local water pressure. Existing water supply infrastructure would not be sufficient. No consideration of potential requirements for changes to electricity supply requirements to the area and where possible kiosk substations would be placed. 	<p>The comments regarding impact on water and electricity infrastructure are noted. The planning proposal was referred to both Sydney Water and Ausgrid. Ausgrid raised no objection to the planning proposal, and Sydney Water advised there was water and wastewater servicing the subject site.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<p>Misrepresentation/ adequacy of facilities</p> <p>Shops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal states it will provide opportunity for local infill development in an existing urban area with “walkable access to centres, facilities and public transport”. This is complete misrepresentation of the local commercial area on Babbage Road. The only shop in walking distance providing everyday consumer goods is a bulk dispensary which has very limited general pharmaceutical items. The other outlets include a gun shop, funeral parlour, pool shop, party shop, speciality liquor outlet, podiatrist and three restaurants. The Roseville Chase community centre houses a preschool during weekdays and is available for hire for functions/meetings etc, but provides no other community services. Wouldn't describe Roseville Chase as a local centre The nearby shops are quite useless for residents. The local shops located on Babbage Road do not provide essential items to accommodate sustainable living without access to sufficient transport and a more established shopping centre. The only shop which would provide any benefit to the residents is a chemist that is only open during normal business hours. <p>Public transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Easy transport is not true. We have within easy walking distance bus access that can take passengers to either the city or Chatswood train station however I have stood many times for the timetabled bus to arrive, only to see it go pass as it is at full capacity. This the case in the mornings and you can easily wait over one and a half hours before a suitable bus, stops, and or you give up, walk home and grab the car. 	<p>Shops</p> <p>The subject site is located within close proximity to the Roseville Chase Neighbourhood Centre. The centre provides surrounding residents access to retail and commercial services, and well as access to community facilities and public transport. While it is acknowledged that there is not currently any convenience retail – such as a neighbourhood supermarket - within the mix of tenancies, this may change over time. The Ku-ring-gai Retail and Commercial Centres Strategy (AEC, 2020) undertook an analysis of all centres in Ku-ring-gai, and noted that Roseville Chase neighbourhood centre had the following strengths:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No vacancies Landscaping Easy car parking <p>The strategy also noted that there is the opportunity for the tenancies to be remixed for more convenience-based tenants over time.</p> <p>The Traffic and Transport also notes that the Castle Cove Neighbourhood Centre is located around 750m/10 minutes walk from the site, and has additional neighbourhood retail offerings including a convenience store.</p> <p>Public transport</p> <p>In addition to the existing/local bus services, the introduction of the limited stops 160X Express Bus (Dee Why to Chatswood, via Frenchs Forest) at the end of 2020 provides additional capacity and operates as a quasi-rapid bus service along this route, taking advantage of existing No Stopping and Clearway restrictions along the corridor and less frequent stopping patterns. This service stops at the Roseville Chase shops, which is a 5 minute walk from the site.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>
<p>Comments on Council and Government Strategies and Policies</p>		
<p>Council Strategies and Policies</p> <p><i>Ku-ring-gai Open space Acquisition Strategy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal states that Council's Open Space Acquisition Strategy (OSAS) “requires new parks have at least two street frontages; the subject site does not meet this requirement”. However, the ERBC is not a new park or public reserve, so this requirement does not apply. Moreover, Council itself provides a solution to this issue – “<i>The site is in a reasonably prominent location and is visible from a public street</i>”. “OSAS requires that new parks have at least 2 street frontages,” Super easy fix – buy the four properties on Rowe St, or the six properties on Babbage Rd. This 	<p>Open Space Acquisition Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site location does not meet Council's criteria for new parks as per the Open Space Acquisition Strategy: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is not considered a good location for a park as it is surrounded on 3-sides by housing with rear fences facing the park The park is also long, or deep, and the rear parts of the site lack any potential for passive surveillance The site only has one street frontage which impacts on access and public safety A park on this site is not considered high priority community infrastructure. Council's Open Space Acquisition Strategy identifies this area as a low priority area for additional open space 	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE

Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase

16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<p>would be a much cheaper option than purchasing 'new open space' further North and out of our area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are claims the site needs two access points this is easily achieved by a split road and removal of part of the fence. This is a requirement for new parks, but how the facility is created and used may not make it a park or require two access points. Currently Council is only at 50% of its Open Space targets set in 2019. One of its key obstacles is the cost of acquiring land in Ku-ring-gai. This site provides an excellent asset already owned by Council that can be upgraded to better meet the current and future needs of the local community, rather than being divested for development. <p><i>Community Strategic Plan</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council should also consider Community Strategic Plan (Appendix 6) that notes the need to "conserve our local assets for future generations " <p><i>LSPS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the Ku-ring-gai Council LSPS the overarching vision statement for the area states: '<i>Strategically located in the heart of Sydney's North District, Ku-ring-gai is an area of socially connected, healthy, sustainable communities that support vibrant local centres, live in harmony with the unique natural environment, and conserve our local assets for future generations.</i>' I call on Council to honour its vision statement and conserve the former East Roseville Bowling Club site as an invaluable local asset for future generations, to help provide and support a socially connected, healthy, sustainable community in the Roseville Chase area. The KLPS includes a specific Action: "<i>Continue to utilise asset recycling to invest in new assets or to revitalise existing assets (ongoing).</i>" The planning proposal uses this action as an excuse for selling off the ERBC site to fund other projects, describing the action as "asset recycling". However, Council should recognise that it has a golden opportunity to "recycle" and "revitalise" this precious "existing asset", which Council already owns and is correctly zoned, to provide recreational facilities more appropriate for the changing needs of current and future residents in the Roseville Chase area and surrounding areas. <p><i>Housing strategy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The letter from the Department of Planning, Industry & Environment, does not refer to this site or any site other than the Roseville Memorial Club or Lindfield Village Hub as a requirement for additional housing to meet the 2026 housing targets. This same letter states that Council is to consider neighbourhood centres 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roseville chase is ranked 6 out of 7 in terms of priority (where 1 is the highest and 7 is the lowest) refer Ku-Ring-Gai Open Space Acquisition Strategy, Part 5, Figure 5 - Acquisition Priority Rankings, page 48 https://www.krg.nsw.gov.au/files/assets/public/hprim/information-management-publications-public-website-ku-ring-gai-council-website-planning-and-development/open_space_acquisition_strategy_-_november_2006_-_part_5.pdf The site is within reasonable proximity to Echo Point Park, Castle Cove Park and Malga Avenue West Park The area is in close proximity to regional open space areas extending along Middle Cove <p>Community Strategic Plan and Ku-ring-gai Local Strategic Planning Statement</p> <p>It is acknowledged that the Community Strategic Plan and LSPS include key priorities to conserve local assets for future generations, however both these strategic documents also highlight the importance of Council utilising asset recycling, in which underutilised or surplus assets are divested with the capital being used to fund the provision of new community facilities and infrastructure or revitalise existing community facilities and infrastructure. The former Roseville Bowling Club site is no longer required for the purposes it was acquired, and its retention as open space for public recreation is not considered the best use of the site having regard for the availability of open space in the surrounding area for residents.</p> <p>Housing Strategy</p> <p>While the Housing Strategy Approval Letter does not specifically refer to the finalisation of this planning proposal as a requirement, should the planning proposal proceed, then any additional dwellings arising as a result of the residential zoning would be included and count towards Councils housing delivery. The proposed rezoning to R2 Low Density Residential would result in 9 new dwellings.</p>	
--	---	--

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<p>for housing from 2031. If this proceeds then increased open and recreational space would be required for the amenity of the expanded population at this time.</p> <p><i>North District Plan</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Action 73(b) of the North District Plan requires the use of existing open space to be maximised, protected, enhanced and expanded so that all residential areas are within 400m of open space. Council should apply its undertaking through its Open Space Strategy 2005 to “<i>implement a program of improvements to existing recreation, sporting and leisure activities</i>” to the former ERBC site. Action 73b North District Plan which requires the use of existing space to be maximised. We agree maximise and renew with some imagination, selling off a good site is not maximising the use of existing space. Retaining the site for open space is consistent with the North District Plan priority to deliver high quality open space. Planning Priority N20 <p><i>Acquisition and Divestment of Land Policy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Whilst the rezoning and divestment of the property is consistent with council's Acquisition and Divestment Policy, it shows an absence of foresight and planning for the future of the Roseville Chase and Ku-ring-gai community. The Acquisition and Divestment Strategy states under Fundamental Principles that due consideration must be given to Best Value for Money – Achieving “best value” may include financial, social and environmental benefits. <p>Government Policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the government has a policy of population growth, then it really needs to rethink it's approach. Think outside the box instead of taking the easy way out at the expense of the well being of it's people. NSW Government has introduced a “Public Spaces Legacy Program, Covid 19 - importance of access to open space”. A major objective of the NSW Public Spaces Legacy Program refers to improving the quality of existing public and open spaces. The document also indicates that Ku-ring-gai Council could qualify for available funding of up to \$4.75m. With Premier Perrottet supporting massive increases in population for Australia and hence Sydney (AFR Oct 12, 2021 ‘Australia needs ‘explosive’ surge of 2 million migrants’). An increase demand for development is expected and with that the need for more open space and recreational facilities, not just in town centres but also around Neighbourhood Centres. 	<p>North District Plan</p> <p>Due to the low density residential nature of the surrounding area, and the availability of existing open space, the Open Space Acquisition Strategy has identified the area as a low priority zone. The loss of this site as open space will not have significant wider consequences noting that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are no significant increases in population or density planned for the surrounding area The existing area is currently well served by existing parks and open space The site has been continuously leased to the bowling club since the 1950's for their exclusive use, and accordingly the site has not served the same public open space function for the wider community that a park or reserve would. <p>Council is committed to providing additional open space throughout Ku-ring-gai, with the loss of this site offset by acquiring sites that are better suited for the provision of open space and recreation needs of the community. This commitment is demonstrated through the Local Planning Priorities and Actions contained in the LSPS.</p> <p>Acquisition and Divestment of Land Policy</p> <p>Comments regarding acquisition and divestment of land policy are noted. This is a planning proposal, and only considers the LEP amendments to the zoning and development standards applying to the site. Any future divestment of the site would be subject to a further Council resolution.</p> <p>Government Policies</p> <p>Comments on NSW State government, and Federal government population policies are noted.</p> <p>The NSW Public Spaces Legacy Program offers funding for new and upgraded public spaces to Councils that achieve significant improvement in timeframes for their assessment of DAs and rezoning proposals during the pandemic. The be eligible for funding, Councils needed to have set out a project plan for the preparation of the LEP to provide 6-10years of housing or employment capacity by 30 June 2021. Council's resolutions on the Ku-ring-gai Housing Strategy meant that participation in the NSW Public Legacy Program was not possible.</p>	
Carbon Emissions and Climate change		

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE

Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase

16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As 75% of Australia's current carbon emissions come from buildings such as apartments and shared commercial premises (PICA, 2018), why would our community, let alone local government, want to contribute to this statistic? Doesn't meet the current commitments for net zero emissions. Complete disregard for green space (climate change) and community accessible space. You destroyed many trees for the boundary road development and recently near the Malga bridge - perfectly good trees - gone!!! Reconsider our reputation and quality of life in the "green" suburbs is endangered by overdevelopment. Let's leave a few green spaces and trees for a change and do our bit to avoid global warming The rezoning would have many negative impacts on the Roseville Chase area. By removing the current recreational space the council could be going against our NSW State governments plans in terms of Sustainability. You will be aware of the recent announcement of a commitment to achieving net zero emissions by 2050 	<p>Council has in place a Climate Change Policy supported by a Climate Change Adaptation Strategy. These plans provide an adaptation response to climate change, through a series of prioritised adaptation controls to reduce Council's, the community's and the natural and built environment's vulnerability and increase its resilience to the impacts of more frequent and extreme weather events as a result of changing climate.</p> <p>The Ku-ring-gai Local Strategic Planning Statement (LSPS) also acknowledges the importance of planning for climate resilience and adaptation to the impacts of urban and natural hazards. It includes the following associated Planning Priorities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> K39. Reducing the vulnerability, and increasing resilience, to the impacts of climate change on Council, the community and the natural and built environment, and K43. Mitigating the impacts of urban and natural hazards. 	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>
Traffic and Parking		
<p>Increased traffic/ road can't cope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The road infrastructure in this ward simply cannot support increased traffic without impacting on the safety of its residents and visitors. 47 Warrane Road has restricted access as it is a dead end, which means more traffic will be on our side streets and with it, an increase in danger for the locals. If the site is rezoned to R2 Low Density Residential, we would urge the council to consider the traffic problems which will affect us and other local residents. Increase traffic congestion in local area and major roads primarily Warringah road and Babbage road. Concerned about the access to the site is in a small cul-de-sac serving only seven houses Driveway parking for drop off is not always sufficient and this is clearly outlined in the Transport impact assessment. There are currently 7 existing houses in the cul-de-sac of Warrane Road that would use this section of road. Effectively this will more than double the number of cars parked in the street without any additional provision. There will all be a significant increase the traffic flow which is a safety concern for pedestrian traffic and children in the street. 	<p>The peak hour traffic generation of the proposed R2 Low Density residential zone would result in approximately 9 additional vehicle trips (2-way), or an average of 1 additional trip approximately every 6 minutes. Once distributed to the surrounding road network, it is not expected to have a significant additional impact to the performance of surrounding roads and intersections.</p> <p>New dwellings in the R2 low density residential zone would be required to provide accommodation for 2 cars in accordance with the Ku-ring-gai DCP. There would also be capacity on-site for visitors' vehicles, in the driveway.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>
<p>Driving behaviour</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regularly witness many drivers do not heed the Give Way signs at intersections on Warrane Road, Allan Street, etc. More traffic would without doubt increase risks of accidents. 	<p>There have been no recorded crashes on Warrane Road between Duntroon Avenue and the northern end (Babbage Road) since 2009. This indicates drivers are travelling in the area with due care. 1 additional trip approximately every 6 minutes during the AM/PM peak hours is unlikely to significantly increase the risk of crashes.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Have witnessed motorists tempers rise, horns are sounded and aggressive actions have been taken by several motorists. 		
<p>Lack of footpaths/ speed humps/ risk for pedestrians</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is presently a severe lack of footpaths in this ward, which means pedestrians and joggers are forced to walk on the road, which is extremely dangerous especially for those with prams, children or dogs, or the elderly. The recent speed humps have increased the risk of this situation, and it's only a matter of time before someone is killed. Forget the speed humps and deal with the more pressing requirements. 	<p>It is noted that there is no footpath on either side of Warrane Road between Babbage Road and Rowe Street. Provision of a footpath would improve and encourage walking access between the site and Roseville Chase neighbourhood shops and express bus services.</p> <p>Speed cushions were installed in Babbage Road between Malga Avenue and Allard Avenue in response to residents' complaints of speeding vehicles and absence of a footpath. Speed counts were undertaken and the speed of vehicles was found to be excessive.</p>	<p>Recommend that a site-specific DCP be prepared to provide detailed guidance on future development outcomes on site. Site-specific DCP to require that a footpath be constructed on the eastern side of Warrane Road between Babbage Road and Rowe Street, with kerb ramp connections to Rowe Street footpath as part of the redevelopment of the site.</p>
<p>Proposed new road design (Urban Design Study)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The insufficient vehicular access and parking for any new R2 or R3 development as a result of roads being only 6.5m wide, with no street parking provided. This is clearly uncharacteristic of the area and will potentially turn Warrane Road into a parking lot for the new development. The proposed 6.5m road is outlined to provide no street parking, who will undoubtedly own cars, with the report relying on parking within individual dwellings. Although the proposed houses have double garages there will be need for street parking. Most households in the area have more than two vehicles, with most people only using street parking as they use garages for storage. The allocation for onsite parking will not be sufficient. At any one time there are always 6 – 8 vehicles parked in the cul-de-sac of Warrane Road. Not planning for any street parking is not within character of the area and will encourage the overflow of vehicles into Warrane Road, Rowe Street and other surrounding streets. <p>Parking will be required for</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residents Visitors Delivery drivers Trades people Garbage truck <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed new road has been limited to 6.5 metres in width. This allows for dual passage with no parking, which is not consistent with the character of the area. The surrounding streets are significantly wider, therefore, it would be expected that the new development would blend in to meet the needs and character of the neighbourhood. <p>Warrane Road 9.3 metres Rowe St 7.9 metres</p>	<p>New dwellings in the R2 low density residential zone would be required to provide accommodation for 2 cars in accordance with the Ku-ring-gai DCP. There would also be capacity on-site for visitors' or trades vehicles, in the driveway. A turning area for larger vehicles and waste collection vehicles can be accommodated on the site.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<p>Allan St 7.8 metres</p> <p>Duntroon Ave 12.7 metres</p> <p>Malvern Ave 9.2 metres</p>		
<p>Existing traffic issues</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic Lights at Boundary Road and Eastern Valley Way are already a bottle neck trying to drive East and West to and from Chatswood. Sit there for up to 5 sets of light changes with priority being given to Eastern Valley Way traffic flow. Adding any further dense population in this area would severely impact existing problems. Pulling out of Allan St or Rowe St onto Babbage Road/Boundary Road, either side of the shops, to turn left towards Chatswood into the oncoming traffic from Roseville Bridge is currently life threatening, this change would dramatically increase the risk of fatal accidents. School traffic in our area is always challenging especially in children drop-off and pickup times, this situation currently has cars bypassing onto alternate roads in the Roseville Chase area. Several of these existing roads, you already have to pull over for 2 cars to pass. Even the school bus going down Griffith Ave has had some close calls and stationary vehicles hit by the bus. People use the Warrane Road to avoid Boundary St. Babbage Road intersection Already too much traffic On weekends, we cannot even get out of our drive ways due to cars parked across them or in them, and in recent times, we have had cars parked on both sides of Babbage road and Allard Street to the point that one could not drive past or get through on either road. As the last Forest Line bus stop before the city has moved, we have seen a huge increase in the number of parked cars in ours and the surrounding streets 	<p>The traffic study included analysis of key intersections including Clive Street/Boundary Street, Babbage Road/Boundary Street and Babbage Road/Clive Street using intersection modelling software. The analysis found that with background growth and the traffic impact of this proposal, the above intersections would perform with acceptably during peak hours. As a result, no road network upgrades are required or recommended.</p> <p>The mid-block pedestrian crossing on Babbage Road outside Roseville Chase shops provides better exit opportunities from Allan Street (than Rowe Street), when the crossing is activated. Residents of the area could also use Duntroon Avenue to access Babbage Road.</p> <p>Council constantly works with bus operators to manage bus access issues, and there have been no complaints from the school bus operator regarding access difficulties in Griffith Avenue and Malga Avenue.</p> <p>The proposal is unlikely to impact on conditions on Babbage Road near Allard Avenue, which can be reviewed separately.</p> <p>Route 270 to/from the City is still able to be accessed from the stops on Warringah Road near the Malga Avenue overpass. The introduction of the 160X express bus (limited stops) between Chatswood and Dee Why (via Frenchs Forest) has likely attracted new users that may drive and park in surrounding streets to access the stop at the Roseville Chase shops. However, parked cars in narrower streets such as Allan Street have been managed through the introduction of short stay parking restrictions on one side of the road.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>
<p>Comments on traffic study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic study does not provide a valid representation of the Roseville Chase community regarding their vehicular and public transport use. 	<p>The traffic study used data from the Bureau of Transport Statistics (BTS) and Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) for the relevant Travel Zone in Roseville Chase to provide an indication of the community's travel behaviours for Journeys to Work.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>
<p>Comments on road changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't want Cul-de-sac at the end of Warrane Road to be reopened. By maintaining R2 Low Density residential setting it is expected that there will be no requirement to change any of the roads, and thereby minimising any traffic and noise impacts 	<p>It is not proposed to open the cul-de-sac at the northern end of Warrane Road to vehicle traffic.</p> <p>The peak hour traffic generation of the proposed R2 Low Density residential zone would result in approximately 9 additional vehicle trips (2-way), or an average of 1 additional trip approximately every 6 minutes. This is not expected to have a significant additional impact to the performance of the surrounding road network.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

Local character		
Consistent with local character <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal will improve the amenity of the area and to ensure the character of the area is maintained 	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>The planning proposal seeks to rezone the subject site to the same zoning and development standards applying to the surrounding area, ensuring that any future development on the site will be of a consistent character.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>
Not cohesive with street character <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Development is not cohesive with the street character Development has clearly overlooked retaining the character of the surrounding existing housing and street Discontinuity with the character of area in terms of scale and type of development This proposal will fundamentally destroy the character of our community which relies heavily on a few remaining shared green spaces. Not cohesive with the requirements of our community nor in keeping with the street character and surrounding low-density residential dwellings of the area. A major objective of council development planning is that any development not dominate the local area but harmonise and be in sympathy with the area and contribute to the locality in which it is proposed, as well as minimising the impact on adjoining properties. We do not see evidence that this has been considered in the development. Maintain green suburb 	<p>The maximum building height will be consistent with surrounding development, and the bulk and scale applicable to the site is also consistent, so the dwellings erected are expected to be of similar style and scale.</p> <p>The Urban Design Study (Appendix 6) included draft DCP controls to guide development on the site, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> roof forms will be pitched and hipped, with articulation via the use of some single storey elements. provision of an articulation zone within the front setback has been proposed to encourage articulation of the front façade to support an attractive streetscape. Materiality is to be consistent with the adjacent development, to maintain a cohesive character throughout this area. 	<p>Recommend that a site specific DCP be prepared to ensure greater control and guidance on future development outcomes on the site.</p> <p>Site-specific DCP to be prepared in accordance with the site specific controls contained in section 3.8 of the Urban Design Study.</p>
Retain the history of site / building		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Upsetting to see the current condition of this historical building, which was opened in 1953. It is a great landmark in our area and a custodian of many memories and community events, and it would be a shame to see it go. The former bowling site is very much part of the historic fabric of the Roseville Chase area. Its clubhouse is one of the oldest buildings in the suburb, dating back to the 1950s. It is a solid, well-built structure that warrants being retained and repurposed. This land hosts countless memories and is a historical and a cultural institution. The proposal claims the site does not have any heritage values that would be protected or enhanced through use as open space. It is true that the site is not listed by the National Trust, but Council's claim the former ERBC site has no heritage value is completely incorrect. ERBC was a local institution, commenced and maintained by many local residents from its inception. Many members were war veterans who gave their time, labour and money to support and develop the club and its lands. 	<p>The site has not been identified in heritage studies as a potential heritage item or as part of a potential conservation area. It is noted that these post-exhibition submissions are the first indicators of any potential heritage value in the planning process to date. Based on these submissions, the potential social significance from the site's historic use is acknowledged. The site does not appear to have aesthetic significance for its architecture or design. Historically, it demonstrates the post-war development of Roseville Chase and the popularity of lawn bowls at this time. It is not rare for the age of the buildings or as an example of a bowling club of this period; noting Council is proposing to list a significant example in Killara. Many older buildings are recorded in the vicinity in the 1943 aerial photo.</p> <p>When the significant use is no longer viable, buildings are in poor repair and with site contamination issues, it is recognised that the significance of this use cannot be conserved and maintained in situ with the original or another similar use.</p> <p>An appropriate means to recognise the social and historic value of the site to the community at this stage in the planning process would be to insert a requirement in the DCP for a photographic recording and/or interpretation of this use as a part of the future development application. The recording would document the named awnings and other structures and spaces.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The local heritage value of the club is even evident in the awning supports around all three greens, each bearing the name/s of the members who donated funds to the project. Each of the greens was named after a valued member, including my own father, John Crowhurst. Many key local events were held at the club including birthday parties and weddings. 		
Sale of site, Use of funds and Council ownership		
<p>Other source of funds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council is pinning its hopes on the sale of the site to avoid putting its reputation at risk if it fails to deliver on already promised projects and to stave off any significant risk to its overall budget position. Perhaps it should explore other sources of revenue (e.g. grants, loans) to address its shortfall in funding. Claims to use the money for a long list of so called projects, most of which should be paid for out of the rate collection such as gutters, footpaths. Major projects such as the Lindfield Hub with more infrastructure and hard services, should be paid for by the people i.e. developers, <p>Funds from future sale of site being used for projects outside of Roseville Chase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council has indicated that once the land is sold, little, if any of the money generated would be used in our local ward, rather, it would go to Gordon/St Ives/etc. wards. Section 94, Development Contributions, states that: <i>"If you're a developer about to embark on a development project with an estimated cost of \$500,000 or more, you may be required by local Council to provide Section 94 contributions. This payment will allow council to provide new services and public amenities to meet the needs of the local community as a result of the new development works."</i> As already stated, our ward is dangerously lacking in its pedestrian and vehicular infrastructure. Roseville Chase sits in the far south/east corner of your patch. Why should these rate payers on our small blocks (compared to most of Ku-Ring-Gai) fund northern projects? Extremely disheartening and disrespectful to think the sale will fund Gordon. This is very unfair for the community. The fact that the council do not intend to reinvest the money from any potential sale back into the area "...the majority (of the councillors) want to sell the site to fund other projects up north." Sam Ngai 29th July 2021 email: Seeking your feedback: Potential rezone/sale of Roseville Chase Bowling Club This is also not in line with the requirements outlined by the NSW Department of Planning If it is sold proceeds of any sale should be retained in the ward. 	<p>As set out in the Planning Proposal a major part of Council's financial and asset strategy is the use of funds from the sale of various property assets to fund the renewal of existing infrastructure assets, to upgrade existing assets and to construct new assets, across the Local Government Area</p> <p>This asset recycling assists Council fund specific civic and community projects through the sale of under-utilised or surplus assets (property). The reasoning for Council to divest these assets is to ensure that Council meets the future needs of the community by providing purpose built facilities and maintaining financial sustainability. Council's Long Term Financial Plan identifies asset sales as a short, medium and long term funding strategy. The KLPS includes a specific Action: <i>Continue to utilise asset recycling to invest in new assets or to revitalise existing assets (ongoing).</i></p> <p>This planning proposal will facilitate the future planning and redevelopment of the site. The site has been vacant since the East Roseville Club vacated the site in 2017, and the site is no longer required for the purpose that it was acquired for. The sites current zoning of RE1 Public Recreation is not considered the highest or best use of the site, and so the planning proposal is seeking to amend the zoning to R2 Low Density Residential.</p> <p>The sites present an opportunity for Council to utilise the process of asset recycling to invest in new assets or revitalise existing assets.</p> <p>The Ku-ring-gai Long Term Financial Plan and the Delivery Program 2018-2021 and Operational Plan 2020-2021 identify projects which are to be funded from asset sales.</p> <p>Projects with funding from asset sales include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Renewal of existing assets – projects with funding from asset sales are the St Ives Sports Centre and Marian Street Theatre Upgrade/new assets – including the renewal of buildings, roads, kerb and gutter, footpaths, stormwater network, swimming pool, parks, tennis courts and other recreational assets Major town centre projects – such as the Lindfield Village Hub and Turramurra Hub, which involve the construction of many large new buildings, underground carparking and associated infrastructure. 	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE

Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase

16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roseville Chase as a whole has only approximately 50% footpaths, kerb and gutter. Young families in the area, walk strollers in the middle of roads, infants ride bikes on the roads. If there is no guarantee Roseville Chase residents are going to benefit, why should we allow you to benefit? Should the sale of the land proceed Council should be maximising the value for the community through analysing the highest and best use whilst considering the impact to the community and significant portions of the proceeds should be reinvested into the community. <p>Suggestions of how funds should be spent in Roseville Chase</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Put a picket fence around Roseville Chase Oval and put a second level on the clubhouse. A second story could be built to provide function room for the multiple clubs that use Roseville Chase Oval club house. Our community has long requested a footpath to the Echo Point Park along Babbage Road, where we take our lives into our own hands each time we walk down there. Echo point park upgrades and additional facilities; Two Creek Track upgrades from Echo Point towards East Lindfield (in line with what has been recently undertaken in the East Killara portion of the trail; Reserves upgrades in Malga Ave, Calga Ave and adjacent to Babbage Rd; Roseville Chase Oval upgrades including mens and womens change rooms (only mens currently exist) when sport is now generally mixed, picnic facilities, additional level on the club house for functions etc, better drainage and irrigation In Roseville Chase, footpaths have proved hard to get funding for (having been involved in getting funding for the Malga Avenue footpath some years ago, which was an agonising process and took a number of years) and certainly not a footpath that services the Reserve from Babbage Road, which makes it hard to get to safely. Council commissioned a report in the last few years that identifies the need for additional sporting facilities. An obvious alternative would be to extend the club facilities at Roseville Chase Oval and add a multi- use basketball / netball / futsal / tennis court above the car park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any future divestment of this site is earmarked to assist Council in meeting community expectations for the renewal and replacement of community infrastructure. 	
<p>Objection to selling Council Land / Strategy of Asset Recycling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The bowling green land which had been leased to the Bowling Club should remain under the control of KMC Object selling of the land We should not be selling it off assets to big business for a quick buck Council must reassess their strategy of selling off public recreational land to provide little or no benefit to the local community. 	<p>As set out in the Planning Proposal a major part of Council's financial and asset strategy is the use of funds from the sale of various property assets to fund the renewal of existing infrastructure assets, to upgrade existing assets and to construct new assets, across the Local Government Area.</p> <p>This asset recycling assists Council fund specific civic and community projects through the sale of under-utilised or surplus assets (property). The reasoning for Council to divest these assets is to ensure that Council meets the future needs of the community by providing purpose built facilities and maintaining financial</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE

Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase

16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It astounds me that Council's asset recycling involves selling open space to fund purchasing open space. • This land can only be sold once. The funds raised by the sale would only represent a very small proportion of Council's income for any one year, which typically averages about \$155m. For this relatively small financial return Council proposes to sacrifice the enormous community benefits of owning and using the site in perpetuity. • The Council also claims divestment of current assets "to provide purpose built facilities and maintaining financial sustainability". So they are prepared to destroy one excellent facility to build another. Further they use the word sustainability. Surely recycling an excellent building and leasing it out would be not only be what they claim but a genuine regeneration/recycling project, sustainable and a money earner. • Selling land is a very short-term fix to an ongoing problem. If capital works are required, then rates must be set aside to provide for them. This would have to be done once all asset lands have been sold. • a money-grabbing attempt to sell Council owned land which would result in a loss of more open green space to the community, now and for future generations 	<p>sustainability. Council's Long Term Financial Plan identifies asset sales as a short, medium and long term funding strategy. The KLSPS includes a specific Action: <i>Continue to utilise asset recycling to invest in new assets or to revitalise existing assets (ongoing)</i>.</p> <p>The Ku-ring-gai Long Term Financial Plan and the Delivery Program 2018-2021 and Operational Plan 2020-2021 identify projects which are to be funded from asset sales.</p> <p>Projects with funding from asset sales include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Renewal of existing assets – projects with funding from asset sales are the St Ives Sports Centre and Marian Street Theatre • Upgrade/new assets – including the renewal of buildings, roads, kerb and gutter, footpaths, stormwater network, swimming pool, parks, tennis courts and other recreational assets • Major town centre projects – such as the Lindfield Village Hub and Turramurra Hub, which involve the construction of many large new buildings, underground carparking and associated infrastructure. • Any future divestment of this site is earmarked to assist Council in meeting community expectations for the renewal and replacement of community infrastructure. 	
<p>Lease of site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All resumptions of public land of any kind back to early 2019 should be properly re-advertised with decent lead times and public interest catered for with open Public/ Council meetings especially those with immediate interests in each project. • Can the Council show any advertising for new lease holders since 2017 when the current lease was ended. Can they show what interest groups were approached? I venture to suggest none. There would be plenty of local groups who would be interested in taking up the lease especially as it comes with a great two storey building, cottage, sealed carpark and additional cottage and still have room for plenty of other activities of all kinds as well. • In five years there has been no attempt to earn money by leasing, no attempt to find tenants, no recycling or revitalisation, no community consultation on usage. 	<p>There is no resumption of public land in this instance. The plan entails a planning proposal to amend planning controls on the site.</p> <p>When the East Roseville Club notified its intention not to renew the lease, consideration was given by Council of the land's value for open space or ongoing recreational and sporting use. The assessment concluded the land was not suitable for open space and similarly for retention as a sporting or recreational facility and the potential adverse impact on the adjoining residential properties as well as the wider residential area in terms of noise, parking and lighting especially given urban development that has occurred since the bowling club was established in 1948.</p> <p>It is noted there were some changes and delays by the state government in the process of issuing a final gateway determination and this has caused some uncertainty.</p> <p>For the reasons set out above and the need to obtain planning approval for any change in the use of the site from a bowling club, short term leasing of the land was not considered to be practical.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal</p>
<p>Land contamination</p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is contaminated and will need full remediation before any change of use/intensification of use occurs. • Before any development can occur we would expect the contaminated land be fully remediated • The ERBC haven't 'contaminated' the site unless they buried their beer bottle on the green. You're not even allowed to walk on the green without special shoes on, 	<p>A Stage 1 and Stage 2 Contamination Investigation have been undertaken for the site (See Appendix 3 and 4 of the planning proposal). The investigations have identified a number of areas of environmental concern from past activities on the site, including uncontrolled demolition, uncontrolled filling, application of herbicides and pesticides and chemical storage. The investigations concluded that the site could be made suitable for future land uses, subject to remediation.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE

Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase

16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<p>so I doubt they would dig it up, and as for 'dramatically' increasing the cost of construction, this is a given for any Council project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal states the site is affected by contamination given the past use, and that this would dramatically increase the cost of construction of the park. Such costs are not budgeted for and must be avoided to ensure maximum funds are available to create new parks with high levels of facilities and amenities. 	<p>A Remedial Action Plan (RAP) (See Appendix 8 of the planning proposal) has been prepared and notes that taking into consideration the extent of redevelopment works under the proposed R2 Low Density Residential zone, the preferred remedial option for the site is excavation and offsite disposal of contaminated soil.</p>										
Reclassification											
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Misleading to have proposed to the public and the councillors in 2016 when proposing reclassification of the site that a large part of the site would be retained for recreational use. Planning Proposal to Rezone Land at 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase March 2021 by BBC Consulting Planners, Page 13 IV. Land Classification states: <i>"The original intent of the reclassification of the site to "operational land" was to allow Council to permit the subdivision of the site so as to have the cottage within the south western corner of the site and its associated curtilage with its own lot and title. This was then intended to be rezoned in the future to R2 Low Density Residential which would have allowed the future lawful residential use of the site whilst retaining the public recreational zoning of the remainder of the site for ongoing use."</i> 	<p>The whole of 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase was reclassified from community land to operational land as part of the preparation of the Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan 2015 on 5 March 2015.</p> <p>Schedule 4 - Part 2 Land classified, or reclassified, as operational land—interests changed</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Column 1</th><th>Column 2</th><th>Column 3</th></tr> <tr> <th>Locality</th><th>Description</th><th>Any trusts etc not discharged</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Roseville Chase</td><td>47 Warrane Road, being Lots 33 and 34, DP 3285; Lot 3, DP 26343; Lot B, DP 403780</td><td>Nil</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <p>At the time of the reclassification, the East Roseville Bowling Club still leased the site and accordingly the intention would have been to retain the public recreation zoning for their ongoing use. The termination of the lease in 2017 required Council to consider how to best utilise the site into the future.</p>	Column 1	Column 2	Column 3	Locality	Description	Any trusts etc not discharged	Roseville Chase	47 Warrane Road, being Lots 33 and 34, DP 3285; Lot 3, DP 26343; Lot B, DP 403780	Nil	<p>No amendment to planning proposal</p>
Column 1	Column 2	Column 3									
Locality	Description	Any trusts etc not discharged									
Roseville Chase	47 Warrane Road, being Lots 33 and 34, DP 3285; Lot 3, DP 26343; Lot B, DP 403780	Nil									
Planning proposal Documents											
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The reports contained in the document supporting council(s) view albeit they were undertaken for the most part recently (2020) they do not consider the impact Covid has had on this area. Reading your report which seems to have barrel scraped positive arguments, used Orwellian language techniques to justify the Council grab 	<p>The format and content of the planning proposal document is guided by the Department of Planning <i>Local Environmental Plan Making Guideline</i>.</p> <p>The planning proposal was most recently updated in June 2021, and accordingly the impacts of Covid have been considered where appropriate.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal</p>									
Future Development - Impacts											
<p>Impacts on surrounding properties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We would expect a detailed infrastructure report would be conducted to determine the impact on storm water runoff to surrounding properties. No cut and fill assessment of the land or proposal has been done of how new property grades will be achieved without affecting neighbouring properties. Assume the final DA proposal will allow adequate set back from boundary of 24 Rowe Street so as to retain our privacy and outlook 	<p>The future development impacts on surrounding properties are not a matter for consideration at the planning proposal stage. The planning proposal only considers the high level LEP amendments, such as zoning and development standards to be applied to the site.</p> <p>These detailed matters such as stormwater runoff, cut and fill, and impacts on privacy would be taken into consideration as part of the assessment of a future Development Application on the subject site.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal</p>									
Decision making process											

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<p>Councillors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We feel that before any decision is made, a site visit by councillors is warranted. • It is unfair of council to make decisions without at least looking at the site. Councillors need to be aware of the impact that the proposed development will have on existing residences. Looking at a plan on paper does not do justice to such a major rezoning proposal • The decision taking place at the time of an election, with there appearing to be vested interests within the council <i>"public exhibition usually doesn't really change the outcome that's already in the minds of those determining the outcome."</i> Sam Ngai 28th July 2021 – email: Roseville Chase Bowling Club – Update • Going ahead with the proposal to rezone 47 Warrane Road would not only show how uncaring the decision makers are for the wellbeing of the residents in the area and also how short term their thinking is. • Please consider your role as councillors is not only to look after the requirements of the community in the short term, but make decisions that are positive for the community over the long term 	<p>The matters raised in these comments are a matter for Councillors to consider in their decision making process.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal</p>
<p>Making decisions during COVID</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During this Covid time to make major decisions that affect our community cannot be truly justified, even though you have created a sixty page document would suggest otherwise. • Ratepayers could not attend meetings or could not meet in groups to discuss these matters. Online/Zoom conversations simply do not cut it. 	<p>The planning proposal was placed on public exhibition from 16 September to 15 October 2021. The public exhibition and the ability of the community to review the documents and provide feedback has not been affected due to Covid restrictions.</p> <p>The Department of Planning, Industry and Environment has identified planning as an essential function during the Covid-19 pandemic, and made changes to the planning legislation through the <i>COVID-19 Legislation Amendments (emergency Measures) Act 2020</i> to ensure planning functions will still be carried out. It is essential and expect that Council will continue both DA assessment and strategic planning to ensure the continued productivity, investment and community wellbeing.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal</p>
<p>Community consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council didn't ask anyone, in case they didn't like the idea. A simple case of fait accompli with everyone too busy with Covid to fight back. This is not only undemocratic but suggests a ruling elite, circa 12th Century. • Heard about this resumption until recently but the Council appointed "expert" organisations much earlier to justify selling off the land before we heard anything at all. None of these experts apparently spoke to locals. • It can cause nothing but deep resentment that the Council hired a private company to attempt to justify stripping the ratepayers of their public use land and before just a few were notified that this sell-off was about to happen. • Love to see a proper engagement without community as to how best that space could service us all 	<p>The public exhibition and community consultation of a planning proposal is governed by the processes and procedure outlined in the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>, and Councils Community Participation Plan.</p> <p>Following the public exhibition, a report is prepared for Councillors to consider the matters raised and to make a final decision on whether to proceed with the planning proposal or not – the matter is not fait accompli as suggested.</p> <p>Planning proposals are required to provide justification and evidence to support the proposed amendments to the LEP, and accordingly Council engaged the services of consultants in order to prepare the specialist reports needed. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban design 	<p>No amendment to planning proposal.</p>

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Without a shred of evidence or community consultation and between hired consultants and the Council's fixed viewpoint with an apparent aim of selling off everything for development, the 'Justification' is assumed to be "don't argue", "correct as it stands" Not so, it is not what ratepayers want. To assume you know better is the highest form of arrogance. take the time and courtesy to meet the local residents and hear them, listen to them and have the courage to come up with a compromise. Council, by not calling for tenders for alternative operational community uses of the site has clearly made a unilateral decision without the input of the local community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contamination Traffic and Transport 	
General comments		
Comments on similar proposals <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Already apparently taken away is the Gordon Bowling Club and very public attempts to grab golf courses. The public property stealing has to stop now and the East Roseville Bowling Club site is as good as any to start. 	<p>Due to declining membership, the former Gordon Bowling Club terminated its lease with Council in 2018 on the Gordon Bowling Club site and the site is no longer required for the reasons it was acquired. This site is subject to a separate planning proposal process.</p> <p>The Ku-ring-gai Local Strategic Planning Statement highlights the importance of Council utilising asset recycling, being the sale of surplus assets, and return of capital to invest in new assets or to revitalise existing assets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> K1. Providing well planned and sustainable infrastructure to support growth and change Action: Continue to utilise asset recycling to invest in new assets or to revitalise existing assets. 	No amendment to planning proposal.
Comments on recently approved dwellings / rezoning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Houses near this facility have been knocked down and massive ugly houses put up with very little garden to speak of. Which suggests to me there is very little monitoring on responsible building. Babbage Rd has had some rezoning. I'm sure it won't be long before all of it is rezoned. Ku-Ring-Gai has numerous main highway corridors to rezone. Roseville Chase is on the very outer edge of Ku-ring-gai LGA and it has seemed as though we are often forgotten in favour of improvements in the north part of the LGA, and undesirable development occurs on the outer edges of the LGA, perhaps where it is thought that fewer people will object. For example the destruction of Victoria Street, Roseville to allow large apartment development. It is time to govern for the whole of the LGA, not just those living in the north of the LGA. Live in this area because of the ratio of green: built environment. One has only to take a drive along the back streets near Lindfield station and beyond to see what rezoning can quickly become with the plethora of apartments now occupying sites which were previously mostly single storey homes with generous gardens. 	<p>Comments on recently approved and constructed dwellings, particularly apartments within Roseville are noted.</p> <p>The planning proposal is seeking to rezone the site to R2 Low Density Residential – not medium or high density. The permitted land uses under the R2 Low Density Residential zone are single dwelling houses consistent with the predominant land use of the surrounding area, apartments and townhouses are not permitted.</p>	No amendment to planning proposal.

SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE
Planning Proposal for 47 Warrane Road, Roseville Chase
16 September 2021 to 15 October 2021