

# Summary of Submissions

PP-2022-1137



Issues Raised	Proponent Response	PPA Team Response
Community Submissions		
<p><u>Traffic congestion (63%)</u></p> <p>Issues raised in community submissions concerning traffic impacts, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>existing construction near the site which is already causing many traffic issues; and</li> <li>cumulative traffic impacts of the proposal with the 2 existing aged care facilities and townhouses near the site.</li> </ul>	<p>TfNSW raised no concerns in relation to the proposal and the Traffic, Transport and Parking Assessment Report that was submitted with the PP.</p> <p>Council also raised no concerns.</p> <p>Any future development of the subject site would be subject to a Development Application where the impact on the surrounding road network would need to be addressed and assessed.</p>	<p>The proponent's response to traffic impacts is adequate, with TfNSW raising no objection with the planning proposal.</p> <p>It is also noted that the Council officer's pre-Gateway assessment of the planning proposal did not identify unacceptable traffic impacts from the proposal.</p>
<p><u>Biodiversity loss (63%)</u></p> <p>Community submission raised concerns about potential biodiversity impacts, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the loss of native vegetation and fauna; and</li> <li>mental health through further urbanisation and loss of bushland.</li> </ul>	<p>In response to community and agency submissions, the proponent states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>other than the individual indicated tree (Turpentine #51), they have all appeared at once in historical aerial photographic record which is not consistent with natural regeneration;</li> <li>Biodiversity Offsets Scheme are not triggered and thus the NSW Biodiversity Assessment Method (BAM) is not directly relevant. However, the avoidance of impact has been demonstrated in the proposal by the tree retention</li> </ul>	<p>The proponent has adequately addressed community and agency submissions on this matter, noting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BCS has confirmed they have no outstanding issues or comments, including tree retention and biodiversity impacts; and</li> <li>the Ku-ring-gai Development Control Plan</li> </ul>

# Summary of Submissions

PP-2022-1137



Issues Raised	Proponent Response	PPA Team Response
	<p>plan which was in turn informed by the combined ecological assessments; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>the proponent has considered retaining as many trees as viable. Any trees not retained would compromise basic and design and viability of the proposal due to the location and size of the trees being within the development footprint.</li></ul>	<p>(DCP) 2024 includes controls which can ensure appropriate consideration of tree retention as part of the development application process, including preparation of a vegetation management plan and a landscape plan.</p>
<p><u>Lack of car parking (52%)</u></p> <p>Issues raised in community submissions concerning car parking impacts, include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>existing area around the site lacks car parking; and</li><li>approximately 40 additional dwellings will further there may be even less than it is currently.</li></ul>	<p>TfNSW and Council have raised no objections and concerns with the planning proposal concerning car parking. Application of reduced car parking rates would be better considered through Council's wider master planning process to ensure a consistent policy approach.</p>	<p>The proponent has adequately addressed potential carparking impacts, which can be further considered during the development application process, including appropriately applying the car and bicycle parking rates in Council's Kuring-gai DCP 2024.</p> <p>It is also noted that TfNSW's submission and the Council officer's pre-Gateway assessment of the planning proposal did not identify unacceptable car parking impacts from the proposal.</p>

# Summary of Submissions

PP-2022-1137



Issues Raised	Proponent Response	PPA Team Response
<p>Need for infrastructure improvements (40%)</p> <p>Community submissions raised concerns with poor infrastructure and planning in the area, including over-urbanisation and over-population. Submissions requested infrastructure upgrades and improvements to align with the projected population increase.</p>	<p>The density proposed for the site is consistent with adjoining development, and any future development applications will ensure an appropriate level of amenity is maintained for existing development.</p>	<p>The proponent's response is adequate, because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>the proposal seeks to implement a land use zone and development standards which are consistent with land to the immediate east and west of the site; and</li><li>TfNSW and Ausgrid have not raised concerns with the proposal, including on its impact to existing infrastructure.</li></ul>
<p>Privacy issues for nearby residents (6%)</p>	<p>Privacy concerns due to overshadowing will be addressed as part of a future DA on site. The proponent has prepared shadow diagrams as part of the planning proposal and can be found in the Urban Design Report.</p>	<p>Proponent's justification is adequate, because the planning proposal has adequately demonstrated that a future residential flat building can adequately address State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021 and the Apartment Design Guide (ADG), including ADG compliant:</p>

# Summary of Submissions

PP-2022-1137



Issues Raised	Proponent Response	PPA Team Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• minimum 6m setbacks up to 4 storeys and a minimum 9m for the fifth storey to property boundaries;</li><li>• minimum 12m-18m building separation to adjoining residential flat buildings; and</li><li>• solar access to proposed and existing dwelling surrounding the site.</li></ul>
Outdated studies (6%)	No objections to the traffic studies were raised by TfNSW or Council's Strategic Transport Engineer.	Proponent's justification is adequate, noting there is no outstanding agency issues or concerns with the planning proposal.
Noise (5%)	Acoustic issues related to construction to be managed as part of the construction management plan provided at DA stage.	Proponent's justification is adequate. Noise management and hours of construction can be adequately addressed through the development application process.