




**CITY OF
PARRAMATTA**

Community Engagement Report

263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford

June 2024



CONTENTS

- 1. Introduction 1
- 2. Community Engagement 2
- 3. Feedback from Exhibition Period 6
- 4. Submissions from Residents, Landowners and Individuals..... 7
- 5. Submissions from Organisations, Businesses and Strata Committees 40
- 6. Submissions from Government Agencies..... 45
- 7. Conclusion 47
- Appendix A1 – Submissions Summaries from Residents, Individuals and Landowners – Not Support
- Appendix A2 – Submissions Summaries from Residents, Individuals and Landowners – Neither Support nor Not Support
- Appendix A3 – Submission Summaries from Residents, Individuals and Landowners – Support
- Appendix B – Submission Summaries from Organisations, Businesses and Strata Committees
- Appendix C – Submission Summaries from Government Agencies

Document control:

No	Author	Version
1.	City of Parramatta Council	May 2024 – Seeking LPP endorsement for forwarding to Council to endorse for finalisation
2.	City of Parramatta Council	June 2024 – Seeking Council endorsement for finalisation

1. Introduction

1.1. Background

This Community Engagement Report forms an attachment to the Council report, which reports on the feedback from the exhibition of the Planning Proposal (PP), draft Planning Agreement (PA) and draft Site-Specific Development Control Plan (DCP) for **263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford** herein referred to as 'the site'.

1.2. Purpose of this Report

The purpose of this report attachment is to summarise and respond to the submissions received during the exhibition of the Planning Proposal for the site. This report attachment should be read in conjunction with the relevant reports to the Local Planning Panel and Council. At the time this Report was prepared, the targeted Council meeting was 8 July 2024.

2. Community Engagement

2.1. Who is the community?

The term 'community' includes (but is not limited to) residents, landowners, businesses, workers, visitors, interest groups, non-government organisations, and the development industry, and other industry sectors and stakeholders, including peak industry groups, strata committees and State public authorities.

2.2. Engagement principles

Council's **Community Engagement Strategy** includes eight key principles to guide engagement: building relationships, right to be involved, clarity of purpose, accessible and inclusive, timely and coordinated, tailored, transparent, and learning from practice. These key principles have been based on the Community Participation principles outlined in the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979*. These principles were used to inform the processes and engagement mechanisms undertaken during the exhibition period.

2.3. Engagement timeframe

Public exhibition of the PP, draft PA and draft DCP formally commenced on Monday 25 March 2024 and concluded on Wednesday 24 April 2024.

The documents were exhibited for a total of 31 calendar days. The extended exhibition period accounted for the public holidays in this period.

2.4. Engagement mechanisms

The exhibition period was supported by several engagement mechanisms to promote public participation and provide the opportunity for feedback on the proposal for the site. The engagement tools implemented are listed below with a short description of each:

1. Notification Emails:


The following Public Authorities and Peak Body Organisations were contacted via email and/or the Planning Portal:

- Transport for NSW
- School Infrastructure NSW
- Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure – Crown Lands
- Epping Civic Trust
- Epping Chamber of Commerce

2. Notification Letters:

At the commencement of the exhibition period, 5,679 letters were sent to nearby landowners and occupiers to notify them of the Public Exhibition of the proposal.

The mail out area was roughly bound by Moseley Street to the north, Rembrandt Street and Rickard Street to the east, Cox Park and Galaringi and Eric Mobbs Memorial Park to the south, and Jenkins Road to the west. For the specific mail out area, refer to the image below.



3. Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs):

Frequently Asked Questions were provided on Council's Participate Parramatta webpage, providing answers to commonly asked questions relating to the 'who, what, where' of the Planning Proposal. Providing Frequently Asked Questions was important due to the size and complexity of the Planning Proposal.

4. Social Media:

The proposal was promoted across Council's social media channels via a mixture of paid advertisements and organic posts.

An approximate 26,925 people were reached across Council's main social media accounts and the Participate Parramatta social media account.

- City of Parramatta Facebook – 44k followers
- Participate Parramatta Facebook – 6.9k followers
- City of Parramatta Instagram – 16k followers

5. City News (e-newsletter):

The feedback opportunity and the broader project was promoted via both CityNews and the Participate Parramatta community newsletter.

- The March-April edition of City News went out to approximately 37k people and was opened 45% of the time.
- The Participate Parramatta Community Newsletter went out to 17,569 people on March 26, 2024. The email was opened 40% of the time and the various website links within the newsletter that included a link to the Planning Proposal were clicked 246 times.

6. Media Release

As required by Council's Community Consultation Strategy as this is a Level 4 Planning Proposal, the community were also made aware of the Planning Proposal via a media release on 25 March 2024. The media release was viewed 1 time over the public exhibition period. The media release can be viewed via this link:

<https://www.cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au/about-parramatta/news/media-release/have-your-say-on-a-planning-proposal-in-carlingford>

7. Public notices:

The project was promoted twice via Parra News (the local Parramatta newspaper) during the exhibition period. The first ad was released on Tuesday 26 March 2024 and the second on Tuesday 9 April 2024. The Parra News ads can be viewed here:

<https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/read/68661058/parra-news-march-26-2024> (Page 7)

<https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/read/68673235/parra-news-april-9-2024> (Page 7)

8. Webpages:

a. Participate Parramatta website:

The Planning Proposal and supporting exhibition material were placed on the Participate Parramatta website for the duration of the exhibition period. This website raised awareness of the Planning Proposal public exhibition, informed the public regarding the purpose of the proposal, outlined where to view the exhibition material, and outlined how to provide feedback.

The Planning Proposal project page on Participate Parramatta garnered repeated interest from the community. It was viewed 7,076 times during the consultation period by 3,644 unique visitors.

A total of 26 documents were listed on the page. These documents were downloaded 1,497 times over the course of the exhibition by 564 unique participants. For a breakdown of the top 5 document downloads, see the below table.

Document Name	Number Of Downloads
1. Project Summary - English	357
2. Project Summary - Chinese	135
3. Transport Impact Assessment	106
4. Appendix 3 to Planning Proposal – Planning Proposal Drawings	105
5. Planning Proposal	98
TOTAL	801

A link to Participate Parramatta is provided here:

<https://participate.cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au/263-281-pennant-hills-road>

b. City of Parramatta website:

The Planning Proposal was also advertised on the city of Parramatta website which received 13 views over the period of the public exhibition. A link to the City of Parramatta website is provided here:

<https://www.cityofparramatta.nsw.gov.au/about-parramatta/news/on-exhibition/public-exhibition-for-263-281-pennant-hills-road-carlingford>

9. Hard Copy Documentation:

Hard copies of the Planning Proposal and supporting information were made available at the following locations during the exhibition period:

- Council's Customer Contact Centre at PHIVE, 5 Parramatta Square, Parramatta
- Carlingford Library at 17 Lloyds Avenue, Carlingford
- Council Reception at 126 Church Street, Parramatta

10. NSW Planning Portal:

The NSW Government Planning Portal provides public access to a range of planning services and information including site specific Planning Proposals. Information on the Planning Proposal was provided on the Planning Portal during the public exhibition period and can be accessed via the following link:

11. 'Phone a Planner' sessions:

Phone a Planner sessions were facilitated through an online booking system, offering community members the opportunity to book 30-minute in and out-of-office hours appointments to speak with a Council Planner. Six bookings were made for the phone-a-planner sessions offered and answered the questions raised therein.

12. In-person Sessions

In-person sessions were offered to community members to give the opportunity to book in person appointments to speak with a Council Planner. No bookings were made for the in-person sessions.

The in-person sessions were a substitute to Community drop-in sessions which are a requirement for Level 4 Planning Proposals as per Council's Community Engagement Strategy. It was thought that the one-on-one in person sessions would offer a better and more personalised level of service for community members in this instance.

3. Feedback from Exhibition Period

3.1. Overview of Formal Feedback Received

Formal feedback on the exhibition of the Planning Proposal for the site is consistent with the community participation requirements established by the *EP&A Act* resulted in a total of **132 submissions**. This total does not include multiple submissions made by the same person which are counted as one submission.

The submissions are categorised into the following:

- **Residents, Individuals and Landowners:** 127 Submissions
- **Peak Body Organisations, Businesses and Strata Committees:** 3 Submissions
- **Government Agencies:** 2 Submissions

The feedback received from the community during the formal exhibition period is discussed in the sections below. For a detailed summary of submissions in each category along with the corresponding Council Officer response, refer to **Appendices A1, A2, A3, B and C** of this report.

4. Submissions from Residents, Landowners and Individuals

4.1. High Level Summary of Submissions

The total number of submissions received from the residents, landowners and individuals was 127. This total does not include multiple submissions made by the same person which are counted as one submission.

The below table enumerates these submissions and categorises their general view on the Planning Proposal. This table demonstrates the nature of the community's response.

Submissions – Did Not Support	104 (82%)
Submissions – Unsure	12 (9%)
Submissions – Support	11 (9%)
TOTAL	127 (100%)

A detailed summary of the issues in each category along with the corresponding Council Officer response, is contained within **Appendices A1, A2 and A3** of this report.

4.2. General Information

The following information provides general submitter information.

- a. All submissions are considered regardless of location.
- b. 124 submissions gave location information, and 120 submissions gave complete address information. Council officers have made a reasonable effort in good faith to identify spatial location in instances where incomplete address information was provided, however, this was not possible in all instances.
- c. Of the submissions where exact location was able to be established, the most submissions came from within the Parramatta LGA (111 submissions). However, 5 responses also came from outside the LGA.

4.3. Submissions not Supporting – Summary and Analysis

Council officers have considered the 104 submissions that did not support the Planning Proposal and identified 14 themes across them, as enumerated in the below table.

The main issues raised by submitters relevant to each theme are summarised, and then a response by council officers to each theme is provided.

Appendix A1 summarises and allocates 14 themes to the 104 submissions that did not support the Planning Proposal. In this Appendix, each submission received has been allocated a unique number, and if provided by the Submitter, the Street Name and Suburb is included. To ensure the privacy of submitters, names and street numbers have been withheld.

No.	Themes	Submissions raising issues under this theme not in support	
		Number	Percentage (rounded)
1	Impact of Greater Density on the Existing Local Area	57	55%
2	Traffic, Transport and Parking	79	76%
3	Built Form and Design	13	13%
4	Impact of Proposed Height on Adjoining Properties	15	14%
5	Visual Impact	18	17%
6	Environment and Sustainability	8	8%
7	Construction Impacts	1	1%
8	Provision of Local and State Infrastructure	34	33%
9	Impact on existing shopping centre and retail facilities	6	6%
10	Potential Reduction in Property Value	1	1%
11	Connection with the eastern side of Carlingford	1	1%
12	Affordable housing	12	12%
13	The Planning Process	21	20%
14	Clarifications	3	3%

Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on the Existing Local Area

Issues Raised:

- It is difficult to envisage the positive effects on the area.
- The proposal will destroy the character of Carlingford and make it an undesirable place to live.
- Submitters have expressed a view that Carlingford as a settlement has lost its glory and that the proposal jeopardises the appeal of a tranquil local suburb.
- The proposal will make the area unliveable for current residents who cannot afford to move.
- The proposal will result in an increase in crime/safety risks.
- Carlingford is not supported by sufficient public transport, desirable shopping precincts, schools or job opportunities.
- Concerns that the community will be too crowded and the changes are not in their best interests.

- Considers that when they first bought their unit nearby, they paid a premium price for the view of beautiful greenery, but now the area resembles the CBD.
- Submitter states that over development contributes to overcrowding and poor traffic conditions in Epping.
- The proposal does not include measures to mitigate the negative impacts caused by bringing more people into the area.
- Submitter requests that consideration be given to the impacts of overcrowding on residents and the community, and the resulting negative impacts on the economy of Carlingford.
- Inadequate parking around the Parramatta Metro station at Carlingford.
- Submitter does not agree that the amenities, open spaces, commercial space and library harmonises with the surrounding facilities, infrastructure and residents' needs.
- Considers that the developer is seeking profits at the expense of Carlingford residents' quality of life.
- Submitter considers that Carlingford cannot cope with the increase density, and that residents in the Carlingford Road developments have already resulted in overcrowding in public spaces and the shopping centre.
- An up-to-date Local Community Planning document is required to support and guide the development of the Carlingford precinct.
- Submitter recommends Council focus on bringing in employment close to Carlingford and similar suburbs instead of putting up more residential.
- Requests that the current needs of residents be prioritised above increasing provision of residential units.
- Considers that there are already many high-rise buildings in the area.
- Considers the proposal will result in larger built forms and higher densities than larger projects within Melrose Park.
- Considers that, before agreeing to these changes, consideration should be given to other developments which have occurred or are currently occurring in the local area.
- Considers low to medium density housing a more appropriate option, which would provide housing while being of a smaller building footprint and consistent in character with the surrounding area.

Council Officer Response:

- Whilst it is acknowledged that the Proposal will result in an uplift in the development permissible on the subject site and that Carlingford has been the subject of higher density developments, the growth of Carlingford is anticipated in strategic documents including the Parramatta Local Strategic Planning Statement (LSPS) 2036 which identifies Carlingford as a 'Growth Centre' which means it has been identified for higher density growth, the Parramatta Community Infrastructure Strategy (CIS) 2020 which also anticipates this growth as a result of higher density development and recommends a range of local infrastructure items to service this growth and Council's Local Housing Strategy which aims to align housing delivery with public transport including the goal to *provide 90% of new housing within the walking catchments of existing or committed public transport*.
- The CIS and Council's Outside of CBD Development Contributions Plan both identify the need for a publicly accessible Community Hub including an expanded library and community space which will be delivered via the VPA associated with this proposal. The proposal will also deliver an improved open space configuration including a 4,760 sqm central park and a 595 sqm community link.

- At the 4 December 2023 Council meeting, Council resolved to undertake a strategic planning exercise to guide the future growth of Carlingford. This work will aim to preserve of local character and will include an assessment of infrastructure demand.
- The proposal would increase density across the site from 2.3:1 to 3.6:1 allowing for an additional 197 additional residential units to be built on the site (when compared with the number of units that could be delivered on the site under current controls). The increase in density is consistent with the Parramatta Local Strategic Planning Statement (LSPS) which identifies Carlingford as a growth centre.
- Whilst Carlingford has experienced a growth in higher density developments, the Minister for Planning has recently written to all councils and planning panels asking them to *'prioritise the delivery of housing when assessing development applications and rezoning schemes, so that the entire planning system is geared to addressing the housing shortfall'*. The Minister further asks that *'...council teams prioritise the opportunity to deliver homes as part of merit considerations where, on balance, dwelling numbers may warrant a scale or built form that is different to or greater than the outcome originally anticipated'*.
- The assessment of proposals like this must balance the needs of existing residents with the need to accommodate more housing for new residents. The impacts of any new proposal must consider the existing community and ensure it can reasonably be accommodated.
- The Carlingford area is identified as a growth precinct in the LSPS and is zoned to provide higher density residential accommodation. It is well located to provide higher density dwellings given its proximity to local services and public transport.
- Whilst the increase in density will generate demand for Council facilities, the proposal includes the provision of open space and a Community Hub as identified in Council's Community Infrastructure Strategy and Outside of CBD Contributions Plan. Council has also resolved to undertake a strategic planning exercise to ensure growth in Carlingford is guided appropriately and growth meets infrastructure provision.
- The Council resolution of 4 December 2023 includes a request for the CEO to investigate the work required to review the planning controls for this Growth Precinct and for this to inform the 2024/25 budget. This work will include an investigation into potential land use zoning and controls required to support the growth of Carlingford.

Theme 2: Traffic, Transport and Parking

(i) Pennant Hills Road

Issues Raised:

- Potential for the proposal to result in traffic congestion on Pennant Hills Road.
- Pennant Hills Road needs to be widened.
- Pennant Hills Road is already congested.
- It is already difficult to turn on and off Pennant Hills Road, the proposal will make it worse.
- The installation of traffic signals will contribute to increased foot traffic and road congestion due to frequent stopping at key intersections over Pennant Hills Road.
- The signalling improvements at the Lloyd Avenue and Evans Road intersection will not improve traffic flow.
- The driving time along Carlingford Road and Pennant Hills Road to James Ruse during peak hours has arisen from 5 minutes during normal times to 20-25 minutes.

- States that Pennant Hills Road is already at maximum capacity during peak hours and school drop-off and pickup times.
- States that Pennant Hills Road already has one of the longest stretches of school zones in Sydney and increasing residential density will bring the road to a standstill.
- Submitter expresses that due to the development's proximity to Carlingford Public School (within 750m), traffic activity will increase significantly to surrounding roads and that they currently cannot support the increase this growth.
- States that Carlingford Road outside Carlingford Court, which joins onto Pennant Hills Road, is also beyond its capacity during peak hour, caused by the increased residential high-rise apartments built between Keeler Street and Carlingford Road.
- Considers that City of Parramatta Council and the developer are responsible for these upgrades in order for this project to be viable.

Council Officer Response:

- Whilst it is acknowledged that Pennant Hills Road is congested, the Applicant's cumulative impact assessment indicates that key intersections on Pennant Hills Road would deteriorate regardless of any development. As such the proposed development would have a negligible impact on the level of service for the Pennant Hills Road Corridor.
- The Applicant's TIA also indicates that the existing road network is close to capacity and that the estimated traffic generated by the proposal is relatively small compared to the background growth in traffic forecast by the applicant's modelling and the surrounding cumulative development traffic.
- Notwithstanding, the TIA does identify the signalisation of Evans Street/Lloyds Avenue and Pennant Hills Road and the intersection of Pennant Hills Road and Mosely Street as opportunities to improve the road network. However, it is considered that in regard to the Pennant Hills Road/Mosley Road intersection, the cost of these works would be disproportionate to the amount of traffic generated by the proposal.
- Transport for NSW (TfNSW) advice regarding associated traffic generation and proposed parking rates suggests that based on the TfNSW guide to Traffic Generating Development, the residential parking rates proposed by the applicant (which are slightly above those that currently apply to the site under Council's DCP) will result in an additional 18 vehicle trips per hour in the AM peak and 14 in the PM peak. Given the multiple route choices available, this additional traffic generation is unlikely to have a significant impact on the regional road network.
- Transport for NSW has advised that the development uplift proposed on the subject site necessitates the provision of traffic control signals (TCS) at the intersection of Pennant Hills Road / Evans Road / Lloyds Avenue in order to facilitate safe pedestrian movements across Pennant Hills Road to the existing bus zone on the southern side of Pennant Hills Road. Transport for NSW is consulting with the Department of Planning, Housing Infrastructure (DPHI) regarding the potential to deliver these works as 'works in kind' (WIK) to be credited against the State Government Housing and Productivity Contribution (HPC) that would be applicable to the proposed development.
- Transport for NSW will continue working with the Applicant, DPHI and Council to ensure the delivery of the above intersection upgrade is undertaken to ensure the success of the Travel Demand Management (TDM) of the proposed future development, pedestrian safety, and improved road safety outcomes for the wider community.
- Transport for NSW recommends that as part of any future Development Application (DA) for the site, the Applicant engages with TfNSW regarding the status of the proposed intersection works as some interim measures may need to be implemented by development to ensure pedestrian safety of future users of the development as part of the development's TDM strategy.
- The State Government is also proposing to upgrade the intersection of Pennant Hills Road and Carlingford Road to ease congestion and improve safety for road users. TfNSW proposes to improve

traffic flow and safety at this intersection by widening sections of Pennant Hills Road and Carlingford Road to provide additional turning lanes.

(ii) General

Issues Raised:

- Light rail will not reduce traffic generation.
- Considers that the opening of the Carlingford Light Rail will result in an increase of traffic during peak hour.
- Considers that just because there is a tram close by and buses that travel along Pennant Hills Road does not mean the residents will take public transport, making it hard to predict accurate figures for uptake.
- Carlingford is already subject to a high amount of growth.
- Benefits of light rail are yet to be demonstrated.
- Improved traffic management required.
- General safety risks will be caused by the proposal.
- Roadworks are required before Occupation Certificate is issued.
- Submitter objects to the increase in density and height due to the area's lack of strategic planning with regards to the local roads and transport network.
- Other proposals have not proceeded due to potential traffic impacts.
- Considers that before any high-density plans are approved, these major and expensive issues regarding traffic and parking should be addressed, and that not doing so will devalue the area and make it unappealing to current and future residents.
- Considers that high-rise developments threaten the management of traffic, including for passive road users, with examples evident in nearby suburbs such as Epping and Meadowbank.
- More traffic to increase potholes.
- Submitter states bike routes from Carlingford towards Epping, North Rocks and Castle Hill are poor or non-existent.
- Submitter requests a review of the 'long-term road congestion' that is discussed in Appendix 6 – Transport Impact Assessment.
- Submitter states that there are limited options to get to the Sydney CBD as the only way to get to Epping Station from Carlingford is by bus and the light rail only takes people to Parramatta, not the Sydney CBD.
- Submitter states development should be complemented with infrastructure and better traffic management.
- Submitter considers that there is already significant traffic, without any proper plan for connecting Carlingford to Epping.
- Considers that if building heights are to be increased, additional roads should be constructed.
- Submitter considers that there is no supporting infrastructure being built, such as additional roads.

- Notes that although the light rail at Carlingford is soon due to open, it only provides connections to Parramatta and does not provide transport connectivity for people wanting to head towards the city. Therefore, the only option for those heading east is to drive down Carlingford Road to Epping and cross the already congested Epping Bridge or park at Epping and take the Metro although there is no parking. Considers that there is also the option of taking the M2, but the nearest entrance involves driving down the congested Pennant Hills Road.
- Questions whether the bus timetables will be affected due to increased traffic congestion around the proposed Carlingford development.
- Notes that the light rail will be introduced sometime in the future and expresses concern that this will affect the current bus timetables along Pennant Hills Road to and from Parramatta, noting these bus services are currently used extensively and at maximum capacity.
- Submitter raises issues with the study of peak hour road traffic due to being observed in a 60 minute period on 24 March 2022, being a school term and still being impacted by Covid-19. Suggests a new periods covering 90 minutes in the morning (7:30am – 9:00am) and 120 minutes in the afternoon (4:30pm – 6:30pm).

Council Officer Response:

- Whilst it is acknowledged light rail will not completely prevent the use of private vehicles trips it will provide residents with another transport option and help to reduce reliance on private transport.
- The proposal delivers higher density residential development within close proximity to public transport including the Carlingford Light Rail Stop and high frequency bus routes on Pennant Hills Road. This is in accordance with Council and State Government policies regarding housing delivery, including the State Government's Regional and District Plans which aim to align residential development with investment in public transport and prioritise opportunities for people to use public transport. Council's Local Housing Strategy aims to align housing delivery with public transport including the goal to *provide 90% of new housing within the walking catchments of existing or committed public transport*.
- The proposed signalisation of Evans Road/Lloyds Avenue and Pennant Hills Road will provide a safe means for pedestrians to access the other side of Pennant Hills Road. Various interim measures will also be employed to provide safe pedestrian access prior to this intersection upgrade. Safety risks associated with pedestrians and traffic will be assessed at the development application stage.
- Road works will be undertaken in accordance with any future development application on the site and would normally be required prior the issue of any Occupation Certificate/ Construction Certificate.
- The Council resolution of 4 December 2023 includes a request for the CEO to investigate the work required to review the planning controls for this Growth Precinct and for this to inform the 2024/25 budget. This work will include an investigation into the traffic studies required to support the growth of Carlingford.
- The formation of potholes and general road maintenance are outside the scope of this Planning Proposal.
- Whilst higher density developments do generate more traffic than lower density development, they also serve to contain/limit congestion in one location thereby preventing traffic congestion elsewhere and traffic studies associated with planning proposals and development applications aim to ensure traffic generation is acceptable. It should also be noted that the Minister for Planning has recently written to all councils and planning panels asking them to *'prioritise the delivery of housing when assessing development applications and rezoning schemes, so that the entire planning system is geared to addressing the housing shortfall'*. The Minister further asks that *'...council teams prioritise the opportunity to deliver homes as part of merit considerations where, on balance, dwelling numbers may warrant a scale or built form that is different to or greater than the outcome originally anticipated'*

- The site is located within 400m of the Carlingford Light Rail Stop which will provide access to Parramatta CBD, Westmead and Camelia. A high frequency bus service is also available on Pennant Hills Road which provides a connection eastward.
- The draft DCP requires active transport routes in accordance with the Bike Plan and the Outside of CBD Contributions Plan. These routes aim to provide access via Pennant Hills Road and through the site from the Light Rail Stop to Carlingford Shops. Bike routes outside of this are outside the scope of this Proposal.
- Public transport routes are outside of the scope of this proposal and are the responsibility of the State Government.
- The Transport Impact Assessment has been prepared by traffic consultants that use a range of inputs including those from TfNSW and are considered a reasonable estimate of future traffic growth.

(iii) Local Traffic Impact

Issues Raised:

- The proposal will result in traffic congestion on local roads including Post Office Street, Moseley Road and Shirley Street.
- Questions how Post Office Street will cope with the volume of cars, given that vehicular access is via Shirley Street.
- Raises concern with Post Office Street not being wide enough to support on street parking on both sides of the street and that one side should be prohibited from on street parking.
- There will be major issues with traffic flow to both Jenkins Road and Pennant Hills Road, which are currently at maximum capacity.
- Considers it unacceptable that trucks continue travelling along Jenkins Road when it is supposed to be closed to heavy vehicles (3t and over).
- Shirley Street will not be able to support the number of trucks that will be onsite during construction.
- Submitter suggests retaining the Janell Crescent to support Shirley Street in carrying traffic to Pennant Hills Road.
- The proposed accessway cannot support the proposed development.
- Additionally shares concerns that Shirley Street will not be able to support traffic to the proposed shopping centre, childcare centre and library.
- The proposed development will greatly affect all major roads into, out of, and around Carlingford.
- Traffic accidents on Lloyds Avenue.
- Notes that there will be over 700 units and, assuming each unit has a minimum of 2 cars per unit, this will result in at least 1,400 additional cars on local roads, along with the other motor vehicles travelling to the childcare centre, retail shopping and community hall.
- Although there may be plans for widening of Shirley Street, the submitter is not convinced this will alleviate congestion.
- Submitter suggests both north and southbound lanes need to be widened from two to three as there are inadequate turning lanes into Adderton Road, Marsden Road and Carlingford Road.

- States access to Pennant Hills Road from Post Office Street must be included in any proposal.
- Submitter raises issue that turns within the precinct are dangerous, for example, Cumberland Highway onto Moseley Street. Submitter raises numerous junctions that would present more traffic and safety issues as a result of higher scale buildings.
- Considers that City of Parramatta Council and the developer are responsible for these upgrades in order for this project to be viable.

Council Officer Response:

- Whilst the Applicant's TIA does not identify Post Office or Moseley Street as being subject to unacceptable traffic impacts as a result of the proposal, it does indicate that the existing road network is close to capacity and that the estimated traffic generated by the proposal is relatively small compared to the background growth in traffic and the surrounding cumulative development traffic.
- The City of Parramatta (Outside CBD) Development Contributions Plan 2021 (Amendment 1) already identifies the need and funding for roundabouts at several intersections on Post Office Street.
- Council plans to upgrade the Pennant Hills Road/Moseley Street intersection and Council's Traffic and Transport team are currently preparing a project brief to select a traffic consultant to undertake traffic modelling to support this work.
- There are already traffic accidents on Lloyds Avenue.
- The Site Significant Development Control Plan requires future development on the subject site to widen the southern side of Shirley Street to improve two way traffic flow and to provide on-street parking as the site develops and will be assessed in more detail at the development application stage, noting that the existing zoning would allow for development on the site within the current road alignment.
- Construction traffic will be addressed the Applicant's Construction Traffic Management Plan assessed at the development application stage.
- Janell Crescent is no longer operational and cannot be used as an access to Pennant Hills Road. Generally TfNSW would raise concerns if Janell Crescent were to be re-opened particularly as it is in close proximity to a major intersection.
- As previously detailed, TfNSW has announced plans to upgrade the intersection of Carlingford Road and Pennant Hills Road. Turning lanes into Adderton Road, Marsden Road are outside of the scope of this Planning Proposal.
- As detailed, TfNSW has advised that the signalisation of Evans Road/Lloyds Avenue/Pennant Hills Road is required to support the proposal, it will also be upgrading Carlingford Road and Council has already identified a range of upgrades to intersections in the local road network. Council's resolution of 4 December 2023 identifies that Council will undertake strategic planning work in Carlingford, this will include an analysis of current and future traffic issues including safety. Traffic safety will also be addressed at the Development Application stage of the proposal.

(iv) Vehicular/Pedestrian Safety

Issues Raised:

- Recommends a blanket 40km/h speed limit within the area bounded by Moseley Street, Jenkins Road and Pennant Hills Road as the current speed limit is not appropriate for the existing and future density.
- Traffic congestion caused by the proposal will endanger pedestrian safety.

- Pennant Hills Road is already unsafe for pedestrians and difficult to cross.
- Considers that Post Office Street has been negatively impacted by the new parking spaces provided for the new apartments, which has made it dangerous for residents to exit existing complexes, due to parked cars obstructing the view from the driveway.
- Pedestrian safety when accessing bus stops on both sides of Pennant Hills Road.
- Raises concerns that no plans are in place to lay a footpath through Shirley Street Reserve for pedestrian access to the new light rail.
- Considers that the increased numbers of residents in the area will cause bad traffic congestion and may pose more danger to schoolchildren on the street.
- States that traffic will result in the need for frequent road maintenance.

Council Officer Response:

- Speed limits between Jenkins Road, Moseley Street, Jenkins Road and Pennant Hills Road are outside of the scope of this proposal and are generally determined by the local traffic committee at the development application stage and may adjust local traffic conditions if appropriate.
- The previously detailed signalisation of the Evans Road/Lloyds Avenue/Pennant Hills Road intersection will ensure that pedestrians can safely access bus stops on the southern side of Pennant Hills Road. The proposal will also be required to provide footpaths where they adjoin the frontage of the site. Pedestrian safety will be assessed as part of any future development application on the site.
- TfNSW has also advised that interim safety measures may be required for the pedestrians until the intersection upgrade is provided. Such measures will be considered at the development application stage.
- Whilst Shirley Street Reserve is outside the scope of this Planning Proposal, a pedestrian crossing across Shirley Street will be provided prior to the issue of any Occupation Certificate for residential development on the site in accordance with the Planning Agreement for the previously approved Additional Permitted Use for the site.
- Council is continuously working to maintain the local road network. Any issues can be reported to Council. State and Regional roads are the responsibility of the State Government.

(v) Parking Provision

Issues Raised:

- The proposal should ensure that sufficient residential parking is provided.
- The proposed 20 spaces for the Community Hub are insufficient to cater for demand.
- Developments rarely provide sufficient parking.
- Insufficient parking on Shirley Street.
- Considers that overflow of cars from residents will be parked in the streets.
- Considers the reduction to 0.8 car spaces per unit for buildings exceeding 25 floors too little.

Council Officer Response:

- The draft SSDCP exhibited provides maximum parking rates for residential, commercial and childcare uses, it is proposed that in the final DCP, these rates are slightly higher for 1 and 3 bedroom units and halved for visitor spaces. These slightly elevated rates will ensure that sufficient parking is provided within the development and that on-street parking is minimised.
- The draft SSDCP also includes controls requiring the extension of the Shirley Street to allow for on-street parking and two way traffic.
- The proposed 20 parking spaces for the Community Hub is considered adequate as it is consistent with parking provision of similar developments.

Theme 3: Built Form and Design

Issues Raised:

- Developments are often built quickly, do not comply with building codes and have flammable cladding.
- Such developments are not built well.
- Considers that these developments create a visual blight, are often built quickly, do not comply with building codes and have flammable cladding.
- Submitter questions the requirement for 7 storey basement car parks when public transport is available.
- Requests a bus bay to be incorporated into the site plan on the northern side fronting Pennant Hills Road.
- States that the distance between buildings is narrowing and is not good design for developing communities.
- The development will cause wind tunnels.
- Concerns were raised that insufficient open space has been provided and requests for the public open space to be completed at stage 1 and if the development stops at stage 1, the money for public facilities should be included in stage 2.
- States that a new supermarket is not needed as there is a Coles and Woolworths at Carlingford Court.
- Suggests opportunities for local artists to contribute to a public artwalk and gardens should be considered to improve amenity within the pathways to the light rail.
- Too many buildings proposed for a small block.
- Considers that the proposal looks reasonable on paper but would have negative consequences when implemented.
- Submitter identifies themselves as a senior, and states it is very important to them to be able to visit the community library safely and accessibly near where their friends live, along with the nearby parks and shopping centre.

Council Officer Response:

- Construction and compliance with building codes and cladding materials will be dealt with through the development application stage.

- The proposal has been designed to respond to the local context, site-specific DCP objectives and provisions define the developments building envelope and aims to provide an appropriate relationship with the surrounding locality.
- The proposed basement parking is the subject of the development application, however it should be designed to accommodate storage and parking in accordance with the proposed DCP.
- Despite being close to public transport, development should provide a sufficient level of parking in order to also reduce on-street parking. It should be noted that if the site was in an area was not well serviced by public transport, the reliance on private vehicles would be greater.
- The location of bus bays is subject to detailed design and consultation with State Government authorities and is outside the scope of this proposal.
- The distance between residential flat buildings within and external to the site is guided by the Apartment Design Guide separation distance controls to ensure amenity within apartments and for open spaces.
- The Wind Study submitted prepared by Windtech with the Planning Proposal indicates that whilst the proposal will be subject to wind impacts, there are several mitigation measures that can be adopted to mitigate impacts and these will be addressed at the development application stage.
- In accordance with the associated Planning Agreement, the open space and the Community Hub will be delivered as part of Stage 2 of the proposal. The Planning Agreement is associated with Planning Proposal and requires the open space to be dedicated upon the issue of the issue of the Occupation Certificate for Building F, the warm shell Community Facility is to be dedicated upon issue of the Occupation Certificate for this facility.
- The Applicant's retail impact statement advises that the supermarket will assist in addressing the substantial undersupply of supermarket floorspace within the Parramatta LGA and that there is sufficient future floorspace demand over the short, medium and long term to accommodate the proposed development on the subject site which will account for only 6% of the total retail floor space demand by 2029 and 16% of the growth in demand to 2038.
- The Applicant will be delivering infrastructure items as provided in the Planning Agreement, these items are identified in Council's Community Infrastructure Strategy and also Outside of CBD Contributions Plan. The provision of public artwork will be considered at the Development Application stage.
- The proposal including the proposed density of 3.6:1 has been assessed being able to be accommodated on the subject site, future development will be required to comply with relevant controls and standards.
- Regarding accessibility requirements for community infrastructure proposed on the subject site, these will be considered at the development application stage to ensure appropriate design accommodating safety and accessibility.

Theme 4: Impact of Proposed Height on Adjoining Properties

No.12 Shirley Street

Issues Raised:

- Overshadowing and loss of privacy at 12 Shirley Street.
- Property owners at 12 Shirley Street explained that they were of the understanding that a parcel of open space would adjoin their northern side.
- The construction of Building E would undermine their efforts towards energy efficiency and environmental sustainability.

Council Officer Response:

- No. 12 Shirley Street, located to the west of the subject site is currently under construction for an 11 storey residential flat building. The subject Proposal will result in the northern side of this property being rezoned from RE1 Public Recreation to R4 High Density Residential and will accommodate Block E, an up to 10 storey high residential flat building.
- The Applicant's overshadowing analysis, dated 1 May 2024, indicates that, when factoring in the previously approved development application, 93% of apartments within this site would meet solar access guidelines of the ADG. When factoring in the proposed scheme, this figure falls by 7% to 86% and as such, is consistent with the ADG requirements. It is also proposed that the Height of Buildings map be reduced to further align with the reference scheme. It is proposed that the maximum height of buildings for Block E be reduced from 56m to 46m.
- Verification of the Applicant's analysis also indicates that the proposal's impact on solar collectors at 12 Shirley Street would meet the ADG guidelines requiring a minimum of 4 hours solar access to solar collectors in mid-winter.
- In regard to privacy impacts on surrounding properties, this issue will be addressed at the development application stage and ADG guidelines regarding separation distances will be applied to ensure appropriate distances between buildings and habitable rooms.

No. 8-10 Shirley Street

Issues Raised:

- Residents have already been negatively impacted at 8 Shirley Street regarding sunlight and solar panels.

Council Officer Response:

- No 8-10 Shirley Street, to the west of the subject site accommodates a 10 Storey residential flat building currently under construction. The Applicant's solar analysis, dated 1 May 2024, indicates that when factoring the approved development, 98% of apartments within this building received 2 hours of direct solar access during mid-winter.
- No 8-10 Shirley Street, to the west of the subject site accommodates a 10 Storey residential flat building currently under construction. The Applicant's solar analysis, dated 1 May 2024, indicates- that when factoring in the proposed scheme, this figure drops to 79% which is within the 70% minimum requirement in the ADG.
- It should be noted that this property is impacted by proposed Block G which is within the existing 33m maximum Height of Building Control in Parramatta LEP 2023. The Proposed Maximum Height of Building control for Block G will be reduced from 56m to 33m.
- The Applicants Verification Statement also states that the proposal complies with the solar access requirement of 4 hours solar access to collectors in mid-winter. This issue will be further addressed at the Development Application stage.

No 2-6. Shirley Street

Issues Raised:

- Overshadowing of 2-6 Shirley Street – impact on solar panels.

Council Officer Response:

- No 2-6 Shirley Street, located to the west of the subject site, contains a four storey residential flat building. The Applicant has advised that whilst the previously approved development results in overshadowing of this property, under the proposed scheme, this property would be impacted by proposed Block G which remains within the existing 33m maximum height of building control under Parramatta LEP 2023. Analysis

of overshadowing impacts including on solar collectors will be further addressed at the Development Application stage.

No. 346-362 Pennant Hills Road

Issues Raised:

- Resident raised concerns regarding overshadowing of 346-362 Pennant Hills Road.

Council Officer Response:

- The Applicant's overshadowing analysis, dated 23 April 2024 and 18 April 2024, indicates that for 346-363 Pennant Hills Roads, whilst the proposal would increase overshadowing by 17% in midwinter, this increase is within the 20% maximum additional overshadowing prescribed by the ADG. Verification of the Applicant's analysis also indicates that the proposal's impact on Solar collectors at this property would meet the ADG guidelines requiring a minimum of 4 hours solar access to solar collectors in mid-winter. This issue will be further addressed at the Development Application stage.

Theme 5: Visual Impact

Issues Raised:

- The proposal is out of context with the surrounding development on Shirley Street.
- The proposal will create blight.
- Submitter objects to the proposed height of the buildings along Pennant Hills Road almost tripling and doubling that of other roads as it will be an eyesore to the community and does not fit in with the current landscape of the area.
- Visual impact of the proposal on surrounding area.
- 110m (29 storeys) on Pennant Hills Road is too high.
- No blocks should be higher than 12 storeys.
- Objects to the proposed heights as they contradict the original development of reducing building heights the further away developments get from Carlingford Station.

Council Officer Response:

- Whilst the proposal will result in a significant increase in building height on Pennant Hills Road, the proposed distribution of height has been designed to ensure a lower scale of development on Shirley Street. Whilst inconsistent with the original plans to increase height around the Carlingford Light Rail Stop, the concentration of height on Pennant Hills Road is also consistent with existing DCP controls that require more substantial buildings on the Pennant Hills Road frontage.
- In order to reduce visual impact, the SSDCP for the site includes a range of objectives and controls to encourage buildings to respond to the local context including envelope controls and building form controls including:
 - o Objectives that encourage buildings to respond to the local context including adjoining properties.
 - o Minimum podium and tower setbacks.
 - o Controls to guide building form.
 - o Controls to guide building materials.
- In response to submissions raising concerns around the issue of height, it is proposed to reduce the maximum height of buildings to further align with the reference scheme. Proposed heights will range from 110m to 33m (Refer to the Council Report).

- Whilst the proposal is of a greater scale than the existing development in Shirley Street, it has been designed to distribute greater height to the Pennant Hills Road frontage in accordance with the existing DCP controls and to reduce visual impacts on Shirley Street.
- The Proposal should also be considered in the context of the State Government's correspondence of August 2023 asking Council's to prioritise the opportunity to deliver homes as part of merit considerations where, on balance, dwelling numbers may warrant a scale or built form that is different to or greater than the outcome originally anticipated.

Theme 6: Environment and Sustainability

Issues Raised:

- The proposal will cause an increase in noise generation.
- Noise and pollution will impact resident's mental health.
- Requests that decisionmakers consider the profound personal impacts that the proposed development will have on residents including mental health and well-being.
- Considers that the proposed development must account for the added stress on local residents and also the quality of life for the people who move into the new development – it is not only about living in the apartments.
- How will light pollution be mitigated.
- Requests an acoustic study to depict changes in noise level.
- That 1% of the total parking spaces should be made available to the public as free EV charging stations for all developers seeking approval on high-density development.
- Requests Council to ask the developer to submit a power consumption analysis in MWh and MW.
- Requests Council push the State Government to update BASIX otherwise new development are all outdated even by the time they built.
- Submitter raises that the lack of roof space for solar panels will negatively impact energy generation and use.
- Submitter questions the resilience and sustainability of the proposed development in relation to energy use.
- Detrimental effects on environmental amenity.
- Questions what impact this will have on the Carlingford community and raises concerns for peoples' safety and wellbeing.
- Considers that the proposed development is only going to cause an increase in traffic noise and pollution and that residents will suffer with disruption to their wellbeing and mental health.
- Considers that the proposed development must account for the added stress on local residents and also the quality of life for the people who move into the new development – it is not only about living in the apartments.

Council Officer Response:

- Council's existing DCP requires the provision of EV ready connection to at least one parking space.

- All future development applications involving the proposal will be required to comply with BASIX requirements. Solar panels are a matter for the applicant and are outside the scope of this Planning Proposal.
- Council is unable to request the Applicant to submit a power consumption analysis in MWh and MW, requirements for developers including resilience and sustainability requirements are provided through the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.
- Acoustic impacts from traffic including noise attenuation measures will be considered at the development application stage.
- Visual impacts including lighting will be assessed at the development application stage.
- Impacts of the subject Planning Proposal on environmental amenity have been assessed in accordance with the Planning Proposal Guidelines and the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act. A further and more detailed assessment will be undertaken at the development application stage.

Theme 7: Construction Impacts

Issues Raised:

- Considers that this development will put pressure of current Carlingford residents, who are already fed up with the building underway, with noise from 7am all day long.

Council Officer Response:

- Construction impacts of the proposal will be assessed at the development application stage and are outside the scope of the Planning Proposal.

Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure

Issues Raised:

- The proposed library and community space are not required.
- There is already an existing library.
- Public amenities are irrelevant.
- There is insufficient existing community infrastructure to support the proposal.
- No supporting infrastructure – e.g. roads, schools, shops.
- Submitter considers access to proposed community facilities will be limited for anyone outside of the immediate area of the precinct.
- The proposal will put pressure on local schools where there is already insufficient capacity.
- The proposal will increase demand for health facilities.
- States that the present Labor Minister has promised in various broadcasts that infrastructure comes first, followed by additional homes, and therefore roads should be widened, and new primary and secondary schools built, before considering increasing density.
- Submitter suggests public transport infrastructure such as a train line connecting Carlingford to Epping or Eastwood is needed to support the population.
- Submitter considers that the only benefits of the planning proposal to the community are the increased facilities.

Council Officer Response:

- The provision of community facilities is an important consideration in the strategic planning for any precinct. The Parramatta Community Infrastructure Strategy 2020 identifies that the future community of Carlingford is set to experience significant growth in population as a result of increasing high density development and that this growth will impact the immediate area surrounding Carlingford Library and will place an even greater demand on the library service, which is already operating above capacity. This Plan and the Parramatta Out of CBD Contributions Plan also recommends that Carlingford Library is *redeveloped into a larger facility of 1,800m, located within a new community hub in Carlingford close by to public transport, ideally the future light rail stop as well as an additional 800sq.m community space*. Staff research into alternative sites for a Community Hub indicated that the subject site is the most appropriate and available site for this community infrastructure, with no alternative sites available.
- Whilst the proposal will generate an increased demand for retail services in the local area, it also includes 2,600 sqm (an additional 600 sqm) of retail floor space which will service the future resident population on site.
- Previous advice from Schools Infrastructure indicates that there is sufficient capacity in the existing and proposed schools infrastructure to support the potential student population associated with the proposal.
- The State Government is responsible for the provision of public health facilities and is aware of the need of growing populations. Private health facilities can be provided by the market as required and can be located in appropriate zones in the surrounding areas.
- Schools Infrastructure has previously advised that existing and planned schools facilities would provide sufficient capacity to accommodate the additional demand associated with the proposal. Transport for NSW has also announced road widening for Pennant Hills Road and an upgrade to the intersection of Pennant Hills Road and Carlingford Road. The timing of this infrastructure is outside the scope of this proposal.
- In their response Schools Infrastructure did not raise any objection to the Planning Proposal and noted the proposal does not meet the criteria (from the Local Environmental Planning Guideline 2021) for the proposal to be sent to the Department of Education for referral and comment as it will facilitate 197 additional dwellings above what the current planning controls allow which is less than the 250 additional dwellings which would trigger the requirement for a referral.
- Public transport routes are the responsibility of the State Government and are informed by Government analysis of growth areas.
- The subject proposal includes an improved land use configuration that will allow for a more useable and publicly accessible open space when compared with the Development Application approved for the rear of this site. The Proposal has been lodged and assessed in accordance with State Government legislation. The Proposal will also contribute to housing supply in accordance with State Government correspondence of August 2023 regarding housing availability.

Theme 9: Impact on existing shopping centre and retail facilities

Issues Raised:

- The proposal will make Carlingford Court shopping centre even busier, existing shopping facilities cannot meet demand.
- There are already not enough parking spaces at Carlingford Court.
- Both shopping centres already have parking issues and entry and exit issues.

Council Officer Response:

- Whilst the proposal will increase the resident population on the site and therefore will result in some increase in activity at Carlingford Court, it also proposes a 600 sqm increase in retail floor space on the site which will service the population on the site and will provide a 'containment function', effectively reducing trips from the site to local services.

Theme 10: Potential Reduction in Property Value

Issues Raised:

- These changes are not in the best interests of the community.
- How residents will be compensated for the reduction of their property value in response to the proposed development.

Council Officer Response:

- Impact on property value is a consideration outside of the scope of this Planning Proposal.

Theme 11: Connection with the eastern side of Carlingford

Issues Raised:

- The proposal fails to consider the eastern side of Carlingford and the development needs to consider connections between the site and adjacent areas.
- The decision not to use the Metro to connect the subject site and the eastern side of Carlingford is a failure of infrastructure planning.
- Recommends a pedestrian overpass to be installed over key intersections along Pennant Hills Road to connect both sides of Carlingford to prevent frequent intermittent stopping of traffic.

Council Officer Response:

- Whilst the assessment of this proposal has considered the broader local context, the proposal relates only to the subject site. The applicant is in discussions with TfNSW regarding the signalisation of the Evans Road/Lloyd Avenue/Pennant Hills Road intersection to enable access to the southern side of Pennant Hills Road, TfNSW will programme traffic signals according to TfNSW has not suggested an overpass.
- Future strategic planning work within the Carlingford area will investigate the issues around connectivity to the east.
- Public transport routes are a matter for the State Government to determine, however it is considered that the additional development delivered by this proposal would not warrant a change to the metro line.

Theme 12: Affordable housing

Issues Raised:

- The proposal does not include affordable/social housing.
- Government should be building its own affordable housing.
- Criticises the State Government for not addressing the lack of affordable housing, and pandering to developers, to the detriment of the community.

- Considers that the development should include social housing.

Council Officer Response:

- The proposal does not include the provision of affordable/social housing. Assessment of the Proposal identified the need for provision of a Community Hub including library and community space in accordance with the Parramatta Community Infrastructure Strategy and the Parramatta Outside of CBD Contributions Plan. The provision of these facilities is considered to be of a higher priority in this case given the lack of suitable sites for this infrastructure and the identified demand. Council's Draft Affordable Rental Housing Policy states '*3.9.1 Critical need for infrastructure: Where there is a critical need for community or public infrastructure in the location that can be addressed through a planning agreement, Council may waive the Affordable Rental Housing contribution*'.
- Affordable housing provision by the Government is out of the scope of this Planning Proposal.

Theme 13: The Planning Process

Issues Raised:

- Concerns raised that significant alterations to initial plans are being proposed.
- Concerns raised that there is a deviation from the planning laws.
- Why was the full extent of the development not submitted in the first instance. They get a second chance.
- Concerns regarding the change in Council's position after being offered a financial contribution.
- Considers the new library to be an incentive for the development to be approved.
- All developments need in order to attain approval are some open space and appealing facilities.
- States it is clear that local residents cannot influence the outcome and the development will be approved regardless of community feedback.
- Considers that builders always win out against those with less power.
- All feedback and concerns from the community be considered and listened to.
- Proposal is prioritising development over residents.
- Councillors should represent residents and should not allow for further development.
- Concerns current residents are being disregarded in the decision making process.
- Local residents cannot influence the outcome and the development will be approved regardless of community feedback.
- Raises concerns about Sydney becoming a high-rise city, with unsightly buildings that no one can afford to live in.
- Considers that the developer is seeking to appeal to Council rather than residents.
- Considers that Councillors are elected to represent the position of ratepayers and residents and should therefore disallow this and any further high-rise development in Carlingford.

- Submitter states that town planning is important for all types of infrastructure to support the community and does not consider that this has been taken into account.
- States that retaining the existing zoning and height controls for Building E and preserving the original plans to use the site for community open space would uphold the principles of fairness and community wellbeing.
- Considers that the proposed amendments raised in the submission would still allow the planning proposal to achieve the benefits sought, and that there does not appear to be a compelling case to allow a 56-metre building to be constructed at the Building E site, noting the potential negative impacts on residents at 12 Shirley Street.

Council Officer Response:

- The proposed scheme is different to the original Development Application, approved by the Joint Regional Planning Panel when it was in the Hills Local Government Area as this application only applied to the property adjoining Shirley Street, and as a Development Application, complied with the planning controls of Hills Council. Since then, this site and the adjoining site on Pennant Hills Road have been purchased by Karimbla Properties and the subject Planning Proposal has been lodged with the aim of amending planning controls to facilitate additional development on the site.
- The subject Planning Proposal is the appropriate mechanism to amend planning controls or achieve an amended land use regime and is being undertaken in accordance with the NSW Planning Assessment Act 1979. As such, in order to deliver the proposed scheme which includes increased height and density controls and an amended land use regime, a Planning Proposal is required.
- The previously refused Development Application was not refused by Council but the Sydney Central City Planning Panel. The subject Planning Proposal has been lodged in accordance with legislative requirements and has been identified as having strategic merit through the issue of a Gateway Certificate by the NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure.
- The proposal is a significant change to the plans originally approved for the rear of the site. The proposal also includes the dedication of a reconfigured open space making it more accessible and useable with greater solar access and a more usable layout as well as a 2,500 sqm Community Hub including its warm shell fit out.
- The Planning Proposal has been assessed in accordance with the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act and State Government Guidelines. Importantly the strategic merit of the Proposal is also identified through the Gateway Determination issued by the NSW Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure. The Community Hub is identified in the Outside of CBD Development Contributions Plan and Community Infrastructure Strategy as a local infrastructure item required to service the community. Importantly these Plans also identified that the existing library is operating above capacity.
- The subject proposal aims to amend Parramatta Local Environmental Plan 2023 in order to facilitate the subject development and has been lodged and assessed in accordance with the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. The NSW DPPI has also issued a Gateway Determination which reflects that the Proposal has demonstrated strategic merit.
- Public Exhibition and consultation regarding the Proposal has been undertaken in accordance with the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979, the NSW Planning Proposal Guidelines and the Gateway Determination. All issues raised through public consultation will be addressed through the consultation process. Public consultation does often result in changes to Planning Proposal and in this case, the proposed Height of Buildings Map has been amended to more closely align with the reference scheme.

- The Proposal does include a community benefit in accordance with Council policies and the NSW Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 and has been processed in accordance with State Government requirements.
- Councillors are elected to represent their local community and it is for them to decide how matters like these are determined when fulfilling their roles in accordance with the Local Government Act.
- Whilst consideration of the impacts on the broader locality is part of the assessment of this Planning Proposal, the densification of Sydney is outside of this scope. However, it should be noted that Carlingford is an identified 'growth precinct' in Council's LSPS and it is anticipated to experience higher density growth.

Theme 14: Clarifications

Issues Raised:

- Submitter states the dwelling numbers provided under Section 3.1.1 of the planning proposal were taken from a Parramatta Council brochure titled "High Growth Areas" recasting Carlingford precinct as a town centre and considers this number an exaggeration as it will require multi-functional land uses other than R4 zoning.
- Submitter questions why the Hills LEP 2012 is not adhered to when utilised as context for the Urban Design Report.
- States the section along Pennant Hills Road is drawn inaccurately and 1 Post Office Street should be moved closer to the left demonstrating that the alignment for the Building B and C are incompatible for the precinct.
- States the direct pedestrian access to Pennant Hills Road is different to the Access + Servicing (PP01.7 in Attachment 03).
- Raises issues with the drawings for the Planning Proposal stating incoherency between colours and heights and FSRs being out of scale.
- Requests wind tunnel tests to be undertaken due to the scale of the proposed development.
- Questions whether excavation for underground car parking will impact on the development of any future Metro path.
- Requests Council undertake their own transport studies for the entire precinct.
- Submitter feels the Ecologically Sustainable Development Report (Appendix 9) is inadequate as it does not provide any Green House Gas calculations, no estimation of resource/power consumption and energy required to provide the materials.
- Requests City of Parramatta Council to investigate population dynamics and demographics within the Carlingford precinct over time.
- Submitter questions the accuracy of population forecasts due to no cohort survival analysis being completed.
- Requests that the original DA approval be upheld.

Council Officer Response:

- The housing target of 4,430 for the Carlingford Precinct in section 3.1.1 of the Planning Proposal is a typographical error, it should be 4,470. This figure has been taken from Council's endorsed Local

Strategic Planning Statement and Local Housing Strategy. The Council resolution of 4 December 2023 includes a request for the CEO to investigate the work required to review the planning controls for this Growth Precinct and for this to inform the 2024/25 budget. This work will include an investigation into potential land use zoning and controls required to support the growth of Carlingford.

- The reference to the site being in the Hills Shire District in the Urban Design Report (Fender Katsalidis) in support of the Planning Proposal is a typographical error as the site is located within the Parramatta LGA. The site was previously located in the Hills Shire LGA before it was amalgamated into the Parramatta LGA several years ago as such, the provisions and land use planning controls of Parramatta LEP 2023 apply.
- The sections along Pennant Hills Road from the Reference Scheme (by Fender Katsalidis) is sufficient for the purpose of a Reference Scheme. More detailed sections of Pennant Hills Road and detailed designs of Buildings B and C will be provided at detailed design/development application stage.
- Pedestrian access to the site from Pennant Hills Road is proposed to be between buildings A/B, B/C and C/D. There is to be no vehicle access provided via Pennant Hills Road as it will be provided via Shirley Street. Additionally, there will be a loading zone off Pennant Hills Road to service the residential/commercial part of the development.
- The colours in the Planning Proposal Drawings (Fender Katsalidis) to support the Planning Proposal are indicative. The mapping provided in the Planning Proposal report is the primary source for proposed height and FSR. All final drawings (LEP Maps) will align with the Parramatta LEP 2023.
- Further and more detailed Wind Impact testing will be undertaken at development application stage.
- The State Government will work closely with Council before finalising any potential future Metro alignments. This is not something which needs to be considered at this stage.
- A future review of the planning controls for the Carlingford Growth Precinct will likely include a traffic and transport study.
- The Ecologically Sustainable Development Report supporting the Planning Proposal is sufficient for a Planning Proposal. More detailed consideration of Ecologically Sustainable Development will be given at development application stage.
- The original approved development application on the site only relates to one of the seven lots which makes up the full site. Since the approval of this development application the seven smaller lots along Pennant Hills Road were purchased by the new owner as such the Planning Proposal applies to all seven lots and allows for developer to submit a new scheme considering full site.
- Relevant and historical population statistics and trends are gathered from Census and ABS data. Population dynamics and forecasts are completed by the Federal Government and is out of the scope of this Planning Proposal.
- Population forecasts in City of Parramatta's Local Housing Strategy and Local Strategic Planning Statement utilise data from the Department of Planning and ABS. The preparation of a cohort survival analysis is outside of the scope of this Planning Proposal. It has been noted and may be considered as part of future analysis for strategic planning in the LGA.

Council officers have considered the 104 submissions from individuals categorised as 'not support'.

Appendix A1 summarises and responds to each of the issues raised in these submissions.

4.4. Submissions Neither Supporting nor Not Supporting – Summary and Analysis

Council officers have considered the 12 submissions that could not be categorised into either “support” or “do not support” and identified 6 themes across them, as enumerated in the below table. This total does not include multiple submissions made by the same person which are counted as one submission.

The main issues raised by submitters relevant to each theme are summarised, and then a response by council officers to each theme is provided.

Appendix A2 summarises and allocates 6 themes to the 12 submissions that could not be categorised into either “support” or “do not support”. In this Appendix, each submission received has been allocated a unique number, and if provided by the Submitter, the Street Name and Suburb is included. To ensure the privacy of submitters, names and street numbers have been withheld.

No	Themes	Submissions raising issues under this theme	
		Number	Percentage (rounded)
1	Proposed Density and Height	3	25%
2	Infrastructure Provision	4	33%
3	Traffic and Parking	9	75%
4	Active Transport	3	25%
5	Solar Access	1	8%
6	Design	4	33%

Theme 1: Proposed Density and Height

Issues Raised:

- Submitter considers that the increase in units, and therefore number of residents, is quite high and some further guarantees should be put in place, for example, related to access to public transport, public education, and recreational facilities.
- Consider the planning proposal's viability of an extension of the Parramatta Light Rail from Carlingford to Epping to reduce the impacts on traffic and existing bus routes towards Epping.
- Submitter identifies density and building height as a key concern.

Council Officer Response:

- Carlingford is an identified Growth Precinct in the Local Strategic Planning Statement 2036 and is anticipated to grow with higher density development. It is considered that the site has adequate access to public transport facilities. The site is located in close proximity to bus services and light rail. Schools Infrastructure has previously advised that the existing and planned education facilities. The proposal is also in close proximity to Carlingford Court Shops, Carlingford Village Shops, Galangari and Cox Park and the Carlingford Bowling Club. The proposal also includes the delivery of the Community Hub (Library and Community Facility) and centralised open space.
- Whilst the proposal will result in a significant increase in building height on Pennant Hills Road and Shirley Street, the proposed distribution of height has been designed to ensure a lower scale of development on Shirley Street which is consistent with intent of the existing DCP controls that require more substantial buildings on the Pennant Hills Road frontage.

- Public transport routes are the responsibility of the State Government.

Theme 2: Infrastructure Provision

Issues Raised:

- Aside from the Metro service to Parramatta, which is yet to be delivered, the submitter cannot see any upcoming infrastructure that will assist with the amenity of the whole area.
- Notes that units at the bottom of Carlingford Road have green space but it is not accessible to residents.
- States that residential developments should include amenities for families to live and play.
- Submitter queries where children will go to school and access medical services, noting that local schools are at capacity and many doctors are not accepting new patients.
- Wants to ensure that funding for community facilities is not another example of “privatisation of public resources/utilities”.
- Include a community dog park as part of the open space as the closest park is John Wearn Reserve in North Rocks.
- Include underground electrical conduits for power cables to make development and installation more streamlined, improve greening strategies and removing overhead power lines.

Council Officer Response:

- The Proposal includes the delivery of a Community Hub (including library and community facility) and centralised open space that will be publicly available to residents within and outside of the facility.
- Schools Infrastructure NSW has previously advised that there is sufficient capacity in existing and planned education facilities to accommodate the proposed increase in student population.
- In their response Schools Infrastructure did not raise any objection to the Planning Proposal and noted the proposal does not meet the criteria (from the Local Environmental Planning Guideline 2021) for the proposal to be sent to the Department of Education for referral and comment as it will facilitate 197 additional dwellings above what the current planning controls allow which is less than the 250 additional dwellings which would trigger the requirement for a referral.
- The provision of private medical facilities is outside the scope of this Planning Proposal.
- The Proposal includes the provision and dedication of a Community Hub (including library and community facility) and public open space.
- The Community Hub and Public Open Space will be dedicated to Council as part of the Planning Agreement. The final uses for these spaces is out of scope of the Planning Proposal.
- A control has been included in the SSDCP to facilitate undergrounding of electrical cables.

Theme 3: Traffic, Parking and Transport

Potential Traffic Impacts

Issues Raised:

- The proposal will cause traffic congestion and parking issues.

- Submitter asks if any new traffic signalling systems will be installed and where?
- An increase in density will affect the flow of traffic on an already congested Pennant Hills Road.
- Submitter cannot see how Pennant Hills Road and Shirley Street, in its current state, can support the new development.
- Considers Shirley Street for major upgrades as it currently barely facilitates more than one lane and the road is in poor condition.
- Suggests keeping Janell Crescent to provide access to Pennant Hills Road in order to share the demand placed on Shirley Street which the submitter deems insufficient to support the new high density residential area.
- Considers the junction at Shirley Street and Evans Road crossing Pennant Hills Road to be already very congested. Submitter considers adding more intersections for cars to enter and exit the complex would likely lead to more accidents occurring. The submitter states that the area is dangerous due to the constant varying speeds from cars and buses and cars from Shirley Street turning onto Evans Road. Proposes a way to mitigate this issue, by extending Marsden Road to join with Shirley Street, creating an intersection in that area. Suggests that, with an effective traffic light system, this would allow new residents to bypass Pennant Hills Road if they wish to enter Marsden Road, and also bypass the 'dangerous' portion of Pennant Hills Road if they wish to travel north towards Pennant Hills. Suggests this will support commuters wanting to enter Carlingford Road as it would allow cars from Shirley Street to turn left and safely enter the right turn lane that turns onto Carlingford Road.
- Considers that it is hard to judge the transport impact of the project just by giving the local intersections arbitrary ratings. Considers that if residents could only afford to live in a house an hour away from their work, they would not be pleased to find out Council has blocked new housing closer to their workplace only because they would have to travel through one intersection rated 'F' if they moved, there, and also pointed out that there are more modes of transport than just cars. Considers that undertaking a VMT analysis like what is required in California would provide more relevant information to understand the transport impacts.
- Asks where vehicle entry and exit points will be located.
- Submitter notes that access to the site will not be provided through Janell Crescent and that no road from the development will provide direct connections to Pennant Hills Road, with access to the development only through Shirley Street.
- Suggests keeping Janell Crescent to provide access to Pennant Hills Road in order to share the demand placed on Shirley Street which the submitter deems insufficient to support the new high density residential area.
- Submitter states that traffic and transport impacts need to be appropriately managed during the construction and operation and post-completion of the development.

Council officer Response:

- Whilst the proposal will generate additional traffic, the Applicant's traffic impact assessment indicates that the existing road network is close to capacity and that the estimated traffic generated by the proposal is relatively small compared to the background growth in traffic forecast by the applicant's modelling and the surrounding cumulative development traffic.

- The Applicant's cumulative impact assessment prepared indicates that key intersections on Pennant Hills Road would deteriorate regardless of any development. As such the proposed development would have a negligible impact on the level of service for the Pennant Hills Road Corridor.
- The proposed SSDCP includes parking rates slightly above those exhibited – it is considered that these rates are sufficient to provide for the proposal and to minimise on-street parking.
- TfNSW has advised that the proposed uplift requires the signalisation of the Evans Road/Lloyd Avenue/Pennant Hills Road intersection. The Applicant is currently discussing the delivery of this regional infrastructure as Works in Kind to be credited through the Housing and Productivity Contribution.
- The State Government is also proposing to upgrade the intersection of Pennant Hills Road and Carlingford Road to ease congestion and improve safety for road users. TfNSW proposes to improve traffic flow and safety at this intersection by widening sections of Pennant Hills Road and Carlingford Road to provide additional turning lanes.
- The Site-Specific Development Control Plan requires future development on the subject site to widen the southern side of Shirley Street to improve two way traffic flow and to provide on-street parking as the site develops and will be assessed in more detail at the development application stage, noting that the existing zoning would allow for development on the site within the current road alignment.
- The Transport Impact Assessment has been prepared by traffic consultants that use a range of inputs including those from TfNSW and are considered a reasonable estimate of future traffic growth.
- Vehicle entry to the site will be provided from Shirley Street, there is no access to Pennant Hills Road directly from the site as this would contribute to traffic congestion on a Classified Road which TfNSW does not generally permit.
- Construction traffic will be managed through a Construction Traffic Management Plan. Operational traffic will be required to comply with development conditions issued for any development approval.
- The State Government is also proposing to upgrade the intersection of Pennant Hills Road and Carlingford Road to ease congestion and improve safety for road users. TfNSW proposes to improve traffic flow and safety at this intersection by widening sections of Pennant Hills Road and Carlingford Road to provide additional turning lanes.

Vehicular and Pedestrian Safety Issues

Issues Raised:

- Notes that currently, many commuters are performing a very dangerous manoeuvre by turning left from Post Office Street onto Pennant Hills Road, merging across all four lanes, and then cutting into the traffic waiting to turn right.
- Submitter considers that with more people using Shirley Street, the incident rate of accidents will worsen noting that previously, accidents have resulted from cars attempting to cross Pennant Hills Road from Shirley Street into Evans Road.
- Considers that the current signage on Shirley Street/Lloyds Avenue is very misleading as it says, “no right turn”, so commuters are under the impression they are permitted to go straight. Strongly suggests changing the signage to say, “left turn only” and maybe even constructing a thin traffic island to assist with this.
- Safety when moving across Pennant Hills Road to access bus stops on both sides without having to walk to the Marsden Road intersection or to Lloyds Avenue which also involves crossing Evans Road.
- A pedestrian crossing should be implemented nearby to Evans Road as there are only pedestrian crossings at Marsden Road and Coleman Avenue.

- Notes the proposed traffic control signals at Evans Road is long overdue and requests the estimated duration of the construction period for the development.

Council Officer Response:

- Advice regarding traffic accidents is noted. Traffic safety issues associated with the proposal will be addressed at the Development Application stage.
- Signage is outside of the scope of the Planning Proposal.
- Transport for NSW (TfNSW) has advised that the development uplift proposed on the subject site necessitates the provision of traffic control signals (TCS) at the intersection of Pennant Hills Road/Evans Road/Lloyds Avenue in order to facilitate safe pedestrian movements across Pennant Hills Road to the existing bus zone on the southern side of Pennant Hills Road.

Public Transport Issue

Issues Raised:

- Submitter suggests consideration to work with TfNSW to move the bus stop along Pennant Hills Road to just before 283 Pennant Hills Road to accommodate future bus-only infrastructure (lane, lights and shelter).

Council Officer Response:

- Provision of further transport infrastructure will be subject to Transport for NSW.

Theme 4: Active Transport

Issues Raised:

- The submitter considers that there appears to be a mismatch between the plans for the Central Park area and Parramatta's Draft Bike Plan. Notes that on the Bike Plan map the path through Central Park is marked as being separated path for bikes, but the plans presented elsewhere show stair access only.
- Questions the lack of bike paths and social spaces for residents.
- Including a cycle path along Shirley Street for its length up to Pennant Hills Road as an extension to the Parramatta cycleway and linking it with cycle paths in Epping.

Council Officer Response:

- The proposal will include the provision of bike paths both along the Pennant Hills Road frontage and through the site to link the Light Rail stop to Carlingford Shops. The bike path through the site is still in the design stage, detailed designs will be addressed at the development application stage.
- The proposal will provide opportunities for social spaces in accordance with the CIS and Council's Outside of CBD Development Contributions Plan which both identify the need for a publicly accessible Community Hub including an expanded library and community space which will be delivered via the VPA associated with this proposal. The proposal will also deliver an improved open space configuration including a 4,760 sqm central park and a 595 sqm community link.
- The proposal will provide pedestrian/cycle links through the site and along Pennant Hills Road and provides better access to the Carlingford Light Rail stop.

Theme 5: Solar Access

Issues Raised:

- Impact of the proposal on solar access to adjoining properties.

Council Officer Response:

- The applicant has provided additional solar access modelling which demonstrates that the proposal can largely comply with the requirements of the Apartment Design Guide in regard to overshadowing of neighbouring properties and solar collectors. See theme Four in Objections for further detail.

Theme 6: Design

Issues Raised:

- More space in between buildings for landscaping.
- Development seems built form density and bulk is very big to envisage the positive effects on the area.
- Provisioning a footbridge across Pennant Hills Road between two bus stops should be included as part of the development proposal:
 - o To access the new shopping and facilities from the development.
 - o Similar to access for residents in Dundas Valley to go to parks and walks.
- Suggests increasing the number of shopping centres to distribute retail activity from Carlingford Court and to increase the number of parking spaces for the community centre from 20 to 30 or 40.

Council Officer Response:

- The proposal will need to comply with the SSDCP setbacks which allow for deep soil planting as well as Council guidelines regarding landscaping and the public domain.
- Whilst the proposal will permit the site be developed for a higher density, it does deliver community benefit including a reconfigured and more useable open space and a Community Hub in accordance with Councils Parramatta Outside CBD Contributions Plan and Community Infrastructure Strategy.
- The applicant is in discussion with TfNSW regarding the signalisation of the Evans Road/Lloyd Avenue/Pennant Hills intersection to facilitate safe pedestrian access to the opposite side of Pennant Hills Road, the provision of a pedestrian bridge would be at the request of the State Government.
- Whilst the proposal does include a retail component that can service the future resident population, this is not a retail centre of substantial size.
- The proposal does not include a commercial zone, only an Additional Permitted Use to allow up to 2,600 sqm of retail land use, it cannot accommodate a larger retail provision.
- The proposed 20 parking spaces for the community hub is consistent with that of similar developments and is considered sufficient.

Council officers have considered the 12 submissions.

Appendix A2 summarises and responds to the issues raised.

4.5. Submissions Supporting – Summary and Response

Council officers have considered the 11 submissions in support and identified 10 themes across them. These themes are discussed, enumerated, and responded to in the below table. This total does not include multiple submissions made by the same person which are counted as one submission.

The main issues raised by submitters relevant to each theme are summarised, and then a response by council officers to each theme is provided.

Appendix A3 summarises and allocates 10 themes to the 11 submissions received in support of the Planning Proposal. In this Appendix, each submission received has been allocated a unique number, and if provided by the Submitter, the Street Name and Suburb is included. To ensure the privacy of submitters, names and street numbers have been withheld.

Theme No.	Themes	Submissions raising issues under this theme in support	
		Number	Percentage (rounded)
1	Housing Supply and Density	5	45%
2	Suggestions for Public Transport	4	36%
3	Suggestions to Improve Traffic and Transport Links	5	45%
4	Good Location	2	18%
5	Developments should go ahead but improvements are suggested	2	18%
6	The Development is Appealing (General Support)	1	9%
7	Good Use of Space	2	18%
8	Affordable Housing	2	18%
9	Government Policy	1	9%
10	Public Artwork	1	9%

Theme 1: Housing Supply and Density

Points Raised:

- Densification is a key aspect to solving the housing shortage in Sydney.
- The location is very suitable for high density development.
- In the midst of the housing crisis, this proposal allows the creation of more apartments that are desperately needed as reasonably possible.
- Stagnation in the construction of homes in Hornsby, Hills and Parramatta areas for the past five years has driven housing prices up.

Council Officer Response:

- Noted. Carlingford has been identified as a growth precinct in Council's Local Housing Strategy 2020 contributing approximately 723 new dwellings against the planned forecast of 4470 new dwellings.

Theme 2: Suggestions for Public Transport

Points Raised:

- Modifications to public transport are crucial.
- An increase in bus frequency and priority between Carlingford and Epping.
- Strong public transport links between the development site, light rail, train lines would help alleviate traffic concerns many people hold in the Carlingford area.
- Considers that the light rail in its current form will be good, but insufficient and that it should be extended to Epping or with bus priority modifications along Carlingford Road.
- Bus routes, stops and service frequency to be reviewed to minimise the need for using a car.

Council Officer Response:

- Noted. Council recognises that public transport is a crucial part of the planning proposal, however development for the light rail, bus routes and improvements to roads are the responsibility of Transport for NSW. These have been addressed in the TIA.

Theme 3: Suggestions to Improve Traffic and Transport Links

Points Raised:

- Keep driveways off Pennant Hills Road and improve the accessibility of backstreets to assist in addressing traffic concerns.
- Opportunity to extend the current bike path alongside the light rail station up the hill to Carlingford.
- Link up the light rail path along Marsden Road which would increase the value of all the existing assets.
- Shared path up Pennant Hills Road is good but requires many road crossings and suggests the provision of a more direct route that might be less steep.
- Requests a bus shelter where residents will be taking bus services.
- There needs to be an emphasis on walkability and improved access to public transport.
- The decision not to use the Metro to connect the subject site and the eastern side of Carlingford is a failure of infrastructure planning.
- The installation of traffic signals on Pennant Hills Road will contribute to increased foot traffic and road congestion.
- A pedestrian overpass should be installed over key intersections of Pennant Hills Road to connect both sides of Carlingford.
- Prioritise the upgrade of Evans Road and Pennant Hills Road before major development occurs for safety reasons.

Council Officer Response:

- The proposal includes bike paths in accordance with the Parramatta Bike Plan and Out of Centre Contributions Plan including a path through the site to the light rail and to the Carlingford shops.

- The proposed pedestrian/bike paths will link the site to Light Rail Stop and also the Carlingford Shops.
- Provisioning further transport infrastructure will be subject to Transport for NSW.
- The installation of Traffic signals is a requirement of Transport for NSW and can be supported within the road network.
- Any pedestrian overpass/bridge over Pennant Hills Road would be at the request of the State Government.
- Transport for NSW is consulting with the Department of Planning, Housing Infrastructure) regarding the potential to deliver the upgrade of the Pennant Hills Road/Lloyds Avenue/ Evans Road intersection as 'works in kind' (WIK) to be credited against the State Government Housing and Productivity Contribution (HPC) that would be applicable to the proposed development, but timing of any future upgrade will be determined by the State Government.

Theme 4: Good Location

Points Raised:

- Site is located a short walk from the upcoming light rail stop.
- Provides connectivity to Parramatta and a short bus ride to Epping Station.
- Site is close to amenities such as schools, shopping centres and a library.
- Supportive of more residential housing close to transport hubs and the inclusion of retail and community spaces.

Council Officer Response:

- Noted.

Theme 5: Development should go ahead by improvements are suggested

Points Raised:

- Suggests Council accept the current proposal but ask for more, so the area is a liveable space.
- More mature native trees planted, and gardens regularly maintained to support tree canopy.
- Requests use of solar panels to generate power.
- Requests a trolley bay.
- Requests an extensively planned landscape with consideration of aesthetic, environmental and recreational issues.
- Requests adequate paved pedestrian footpaths with consideration to those living with disability along the entire length of Shirley Street and Pennant Hills Road.
- Requests adequate waste disposal and an area for tenants to leave unwanted items for regular collection by Council.

- Request better connections to surrounding areas.

Council Officer Response:

- Noted.
- Landscaping will be addressed at the development application stage. Garden maintenance, solar panels, trolley bays is outside the scope of this proposal.
- Footpaths will be addressed at the detail design stage and will be provided as conditions to any development approval and will need to comply with relevant disabled access requirements.
- Detailed design of the proposal including waste disposal will be addressed at the Development Application stage.
- The proposal will provide pedestrian/cycle links through the site and along Pennant Hills Road and provides better access to the Carlingford Light Rail stop. Public transport connections are the responsibility of the State Government.

Theme 6: The Development is appealing (General Support)

Points Raised:

- The plan looks appealing, and the provision of community facilities is welcome.

Council Officer Response:

- Noted.

Theme 7: Good Use of Space

Points Raised:

- Appears to be a good use of space to provide accommodation and services.

Council Officer Response:

- Noted.

Theme 8: Affordable Housing

Points Raised:

- Developer needs to ensure the additional units being added are used for the purpose of affordable housing to allow a diverse demography of the community the opportunity to enjoy a high quality of life.
- Why has no affordable and social housing been provided? The community facilities are not enough.

Council Officer Response:

- Noted, this planning proposal does not include affordable or social housing in lieu of critical social infrastructure.
- Assessment of the Proposal identified the need for provision of a Community Hub including library and community space in accordance with the Parramatta Community Infrastructure Strategy and the

Parramatta Outside of CBD Contributions Plan. The provision of these facilities is considered to be of a higher priority in this case given the lack of suitable sites for this infrastructure and the identified demand. Council's Draft Affordable Rental Housing Policy states '3.9.1 Critical need for infrastructure: Where there is a critical need for community or public infrastructure in the location that can be addressed through a planning agreement, Council may waive the Affordable Rental Housing contribution'.

Theme 9: Government Policy

Points Raised:

- The proposal is the best outcome for the new state government policies.

Council Officer Response:

- Noted.

Theme 10: Public Artwork

Points Raised:

- Opportunities for local artists to contribute to a public artwork and gardens should be considered to improve amenity within the pathways to the light rail.

Council Officer Response:

- Noted. Landscape design and public art will be dealt with at development application stage.
- The site-specific DCP includes controls to encourage public art within the central open space or through site links.

Council officers have considered the 11 submissions.

Appendix A3 summarises and responds to the issues raised.

5. Submissions from Organisations, Businesses and Strata Committees

5.1. High Level Summary of Submissions

The total number of submissions received from Organisations, Businesses and Strata Committees was three (3). The following Peak Body Organisations and businesses Strata provided a submission regarding the Planning Proposal for the 263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford site:

- Strata Management Committee for 2-6 Shirley Street, Carlingford
- Epping Civic Trust
- Vicinity Centres

The below table categorises their general view on the Planning Proposal.

Submissions – Support	0 (0%)
Submissions – Did Not Support	2 (67%)
Submissions – Neither Support nor Not Support	1 (33%)
TOTAL	3 (100%)

Council officers have considered the 3 submissions and identified 6 themes across them, as enumerated in the below table.

Appendix B summarises and allocates the themes to the 3 submissions Organisations, Businesses and Strata Committees. In this Appendix, each submission received has been allocated a unique number, and if provided by the Submitter, the Street Name and Suburb is included. To ensure the privacy of submitters, names and street numbers have been withheld.

No	Themes	Submissions raising issues under this theme	
		Number	Percentage (rounded)
1	Proposed Scale and Density	1	33%
2	Height	1	33%
3	Traffic, Transport and Parking	3	100%
4	Proposed Retail Development	2	67%
5	Strategic Planning and Infrastructure	1	33%
6	School Capacity	1	33%

Theme 1: Proposed Scale and Density

Issues Raised:

- Concerns regarding the proposed scale and density.

Council Officer Response:

- Whilst the Proposal presents a scale and density above that currently permitted on the site, Carlingford has been identified as a 'growth centre' in Parramatta LSPS 2036 in anticipation of its growth in higher density residential development. This is also consistent with Council's Local Housing Strategy which aims to align housing delivery with public transport including the goal to *provide 90% of new housing within the walking catchments of existing or committed public transport*.
- The Proposal has been designed to distribute height away from the Shirley Road frontage and toward Pennant Hills Road in order to reduce visual impact and preserve street character. The draft SSDCP also includes a range of objectives and controls to guide future building form on the site including building envelope, setbacks for landscaping.
- A future strategic planning exercise will also look at the planning controls and infrastructure required to support future growth.

Theme 2: Height

Issues Raised:

- Buildings are too tall.
- Overshadowing over 2-6 Shirley Street.
- Submitter requests the shade diagram and to amend the height if it impacts 2-6 Shirley Street.

Council Officer Response:

- Whilst the proposal will result in a significant increase in building height on Pennant Hills Road and Shirley Street, the proposed distribution of height has been designed to ensure a lower scale of development on Shirley Street which is consistent with intent of the existing DCP controls that require more substantial buildings on the Pennant Hills Road frontage.
- In order to reduce visual impact, the SSDCP for the site includes a range of objectives and controls to encourage buildings to respond to the local context including envelope controls and building form controls including:
 - o Objectives that encourage buildings to respond to the local context including adjoining properties.
 - o Minimum podium and tower setbacks.
 - o Controls to guide building form.
 - o Controls to guide building materials.
- In response to submissions raising concerns around the issue of height, it is proposed to reduce the maximum height of buildings throughout the site to align more closely with the reference scheme as shown in the final Planning Proposal.
- The Proposal should also be considered in the context of the State Government's correspondence of August 2023 asking Council's to *'prioritise the opportunity to deliver homes as part of merit considerations where, on balance, dwelling numbers may warrant a scale or built form that is different to or greater than the outcome originally anticipated'*.

- No 2-6 Shirley Street, located to the west of the subject site, contains a four storey residential flat building. The Applicant has advised that whilst the previously approved development would overshadow this property, under the proposed scheme, this property would be impacted by proposed Block G, which remains within the existing 33m maximum height of building control under Parramatta LEP 2023.
- Analysis of overshadowing impacts including on solar collectors will be further addressed at the Development Application stage. The Applicant's sun access images are available at Appendix 4A of Attachment 1 (PP) to the Council Report.

Theme 3: Traffic, Transport and Parking

Issues Raised:

- Carparking issues caused by the proposal.
- Kerbside parking is unlimited on the western side of the road at the southern section of Shirley Street.
- Shirley Street is used to gain access to Marsden Road through Pennant Hills Road.
- Submitter fears Shirley Street won't be able to support traffic during school hours.
- Shirley Street being the only access point is a concern.
- Submitter references a 2013 article from the Hills Shire Times the Independent Traffic Committee requested the Hills Shire Council to develop a strategy for Shirley Street, including the consideration of indented parking bays on both sides of the road, footpath paving, landscaping, street lighting, pedestrian safety issues and parking restrictions. The submitter also states that although the Baulkham Hills Shire Council was amalgamated into Parramatta, it does not negate the contents or authenticity of the article.
- Supporting transport plan doesn't realistically address the traffic impacts borne from the planning proposal.
- Questions the traffic plan's expectation that there will only be a 1-2% increase in traffic on Carlingford Road.
- Reduce car parking on site.
- Incoming light rail doesn't accommodate eastbound travel.
- Claims the frequently used 550 bus route (Carlingford to Macquarie Centre) requires more buses at peak times and will be unable to support any increase in density within the precinct.

Council Officer Response:

- The draft SSDCP exhibited provides maximum parking rates for residential, commercial and childcare uses, it is proposed that in the final DCP, these rates are slightly higher for 1 and 3 bedroom units and halved for visitor spaces. These slightly elevated rates will ensure that sufficient parking is provided within the development and that on-street parking is minimised.
- Whilst Shirley Street will be subject to increased traffic, the draft SSDCP also includes controls requiring the widening of Shirley Street to allow for on-street parking and two-way traffic.
- The applicant's traffic impact assessment indicates that the local existing road network is close to capacity and that the estimated traffic generated by the proposal is relatively small compared to the background growth in traffic forecast by the applicant's modelling and the surrounding cumulative development traffic.

- The Transport Impact Assessment has been prepared by traffic consultants that use a range of inputs including those from TfNSW and are considered a reasonable estimate of future traffic growth.
- The State Government is responsible for the Light Rail transport. Whilst it does not accommodate east bound travel, bus services are available eastward.
- Bus services are the responsibility of the State Government, changes in bus routes as a result of population growth are planned by transport authorities.

Theme 4: Proposed Retail Development

Issues Raised:

- Objects to additional retail in Carlingford as it is already serviced by two major retail areas and additional retail stores.
- Submitter raises concerns with the increase in retail GFA from 2,000 sqm to 2,600 sqm due to inconsistencies with the objectives, strategic planning intent of the area and Ministerial Directions. Submitter requests removing this increase from the development.
- Submitter suggests retail floor space should be contained within existing employment zones rather than being developed in addition to residential within residentially zones, additionally notes that the site is located within 400m walking distance of the E1 zone at the Light Rail stop which would be a more suitable location for retail floorspace.
- Considers the allowable 2,000 sqm of non-residential floor space to be adequate for the facilitation of the LEP objective under R4 High Density Residential “to enable land uses that provide facilities or services to meet the day to day needs of residents”.
- States retaining 2,000 sqm of retail floorspace would provide for the implementation of 600 sqm elsewhere closer to transport and services and that it better aligns with the City Central District Plan.
- Submitter raises the progression of the planning proposal could set a precedent for retail centres encroaching on areas not suitable for retail functions and should be directed to E1 zones close to the site.

Council Officer Response:

- The proposed supermarket use is anticipated to primarily support the residents of the proposed development. Total retail development on the site will be restricted to a total of 2,600 sqm and is considered to be consistent with the relevant Ministerial Directions and relevant zone objectives.
- The supermarket would also serve to contain trips within the development by serving the resident population.
- Future strategic planning work in the Carlingford area will include an analysis of commercial and retail floorspace required to service the growing population.

Theme 5: Strategic Planning and Infrastructure

Issues Raised:

- Believes the area needs to be properly planned and controlled to make Carlingford a pleasant place to live in.

Council Officer Response:

- Future strategic planning work will be undertaken to guide the future growth of Carlingford will include an analysis of existing and future land use requirements, infrastructure needs, traffic studies and built form controls.

Theme 6: School Capacity

Issues Raised:

- Primary and secondary school capacity is inadequate and will be unable to support increases in density in addition to significant loss of open playground space in schools due to the construction of demountables.

Council Officer Response:

- Schools Infrastructure has previously advised that there is sufficient capacity in the existing and planned schools facilities to accommodate the potential student population associated with the proposal.
- In their response Schools Infrastructure did not raise any objection to the Planning Proposal and noted the proposal does not meet the criteria (from the Local Environmental Planning Guideline 2021) for the proposal to be sent to the Department of Education for referral and comment as it will facilitate 197 additional dwellings above what the current planning controls allow which is less than the 250 additional dwellings which would trigger the requirement for a referral.

Council officers have considered the 3 submissions.

Appendix B summarises and responds to the issues raised.

6. Submissions from Government Agencies

6.1. Consultation

Condition 3 of the Gateway Determination, issued by the Department of Planning, Housing, and Infrastructure on 19 February 2024, required Council to consult with **Transport for NSW** under Section 3.34 (2) (d) of the Act and/or comply with the requirements of relevant Section 9.1 Directions:

In addition to the above Council staff also elected to consult with the following public authorities as part of the public exhibition process:

- **School Infrastructure NSW (SINSW)**
- **Department of Planning, Housing, and Infrastructure (DPHI) – Crown Lands**

At the time of finalising this report the response from DPHI - Crown Lands was outstanding as it had not been received.

6.2. High Level Summary of Submissions

At the time of writing this report the total number of submissions received from Government Agencies was 2 (two). **Transport for NSW** and **SINSW** were the only Government Agencies which provided a formal submission regarding the Planning Proposal for the site. The response from DPHI – Crown Lands is outstanding as it has not been received.

Agency: Transport for NSW (TfNSW)

Comments:

- Supports implementation of traffic control signals at the Pennant Hills Road, Evans Road and Lloyds Avenue intersection for safe pedestrian movement.
- TfNSW has been liaising with DPHI for the traffic control signals to be credited against the HPC (Housing and Productivity Contribution) levies.
- TfNSW recommends that as part of any future DA, the applicant engages TfNSW for the status of proposed intersection works to ensure pedestrian safety of future users of the development's Travel Demand Management Strategy.
- TfNSW agrees that the resultant generation of new traffic is unlikely to have an impact on the surrounding classified network (agrees with the modelling and proposed maximum car parking rate proposed).
- No objection was raised regarding revised maximum parking rates.

Council Officer Response:

- The TfNSW submission and correspondence regarding revised parking rates is noted.

Agency: School Infrastructure NSW (SINSW) – Draft Response

Comments:

- The proposal does not meet the criteria (from the Local Environmental Planning Guideline 2021) for the proposal to be sent to the Department of Education (DoE) for referral and comment, however Council is requested to monitor and consider the impacts of population growth on schools planning in the locality.
- The Department of Education (DoE) does not have further comments on specific requirements in relation to this Planning Proposal.
- DoE requests that transport planning for the proposal be guided by the NSW Government's Movement and Place Framework (MAPF) and its related Built Environment Indicators.
- SINSW requests the MAPF 'Primary Schools' built environment indicator be used to consider the impact on adjacent places/uses and emphasise movement that supports place. The metrics aid in assessing the effect of infrastructure on the accessibility of public schools in an area in relation to walkability and public transport access.

Council Officer Response:

- It is noted the proposal does not meet the criteria (from the Local Environmental Planning Guideline 2021) for the proposal to be sent to the Department of Education for referral and comment as it will facilitate 197 additional dwellings above what the current planning controls allow which is less than the 250 additional dwellings which would trigger the requirement for a referral.
- The application of the Movement and Place Framework (MAPF) is acknowledged. The 'Primary Schools' indicator shows the development is within 800m walking distance Carlingford Public School and Gateway Community Highschool. Walkability to local public schools is noted in the Planning Proposal.
- Consideration of the MAPF will be done at the Development Application stage.
- A site-specific DCP and existing controls in the Parramatta DCP 2023 will support the subject development and its proposed density.

Council officers have considered the 2 submissions.

Appendix C summarises and responds to the issues raised.

7. Conclusion

Due to further review and feedback received during the exhibition period for the Planning Proposal for the 263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford amendments were made to the Planning Proposal, Draft Site-Specific Development Control Plan and draft Planning Agreement which are detailed in the Local Planning Panel and Council reports.

The Participate Parramatta and City of Parramatta websites will be regularly updated to inform the public of reporting processes and next steps of the Planning Proposal for the site. Additionally, the Participate Parramatta website will be updated following Council reporting.

A project contacts list has been developed to serve as the principal method for future updates on the Planning Proposal. Submitters that provided their email address were automatically placed on this mailing list.

Appendix A1 – Submissions Summaries from Residents, Individuals and Landowners – Not Support

Submission Summary Table – APPENDIX A1 – Residents, Individuals and Landowners that do not support

This document summarises and provides a response to the **104** submissions received **residents, individuals and landowners** in response to the exhibition of the Planning Proposal, draft Development Control Plan, and draft Planning Agreement for 263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford. Each submission has been allocated a unique number submission. **Appendix A1** is to be read in conjunction with **Section 4.3** of the Community Engagement Report. The response to each submission is linked to the themes outlined and responded to in **Section 4.3** of the Community Engagement Report.

To ensure the privacy of submitters, names and street numbers have been withheld.

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
1	D09380087, D09377725	Post Office Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter objects to the increase of 197 residential units due to high density resulting in congestion. Considers that it is currently already inconvenient to drive along Shirley Street while demolition works are being undertaken, as there is not enough room for cars to pass each other without having to stop, pull aside and give way to others, and that this will only get worse once new residents start moving in. Notes that there are several new residential developments within proximity to the subject site, and other construction sites, contributing to the increase or new units in the area. Requests that the current needs of residents be prioritised above increasing provision of residential units. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General)</p>
2	D09377732	Lincluden Place, Oatlands	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the only benefits of the planning proposal to the community are the increased facilities. Suggests the proposal should be refused as road widenings are required with any proposal for increased density and are preferable to increased facilities as they would attract more road traffic. Considers that the developer is seeking to appeal to Council rather than residents. Considers travel on Pennant Hills Road challenging as a regular user. 	<p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General, Local Traffic Impact)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure</p> <p>Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process</p>
3	D09379836	Mountain Street, Epping	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that there is already significant traffic, without any proper plan for connecting Carlingford to Epping. Considers that traffic congestion is an issue that should be solved first. Considers that if building heights are to be increased, additional roads should be constructed. 	<p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General)</p>
4	D09379849	Eyles Avenue, Epping	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that there is no supporting infrastructure being built, such as additional roads. Considers that Pennant Hills is already congested, and the addition of 	<p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General)</p>

263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford (RZ/5/2023)

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			multiple residences and retail will only add to the existing congestion on Pennant Hills Road.	
5	D09379867	Lynden Avenue, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter objects to the planning proposal as increased density will result in traffic congestion and stretch public and community infrastructure which are already at their limit. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General) Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure
6	D09379870	Jenkins Road, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that there are already too many high-rise buildings in the vicinity. Considers that not enough is being done to combat the increased traffic, and negatively impacted road conditions, such as potholes from trucks. Considers it unacceptable that trucks continue travelling along Jenkins Road when it is supposed to be closed to heavy vehicles (3t and over). Considers that there is an insufficient increase in public facilities to accommodate the increase in population. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General) Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure
8	D09379880	Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter states they reside across the road from the proposed development and already have difficulty getting in and out of their driveway, at all times. Considers that if a referendum were to be held, the resulting vote would be unanimous to disallow the project. Considers that talk of "public amenities" is irrelevant. Considers that Councillors are elected to represent the position of ratepayers and residents and should therefore disallow this and any further high-rise development in Carlingford. 	Refer to Theme 2: Transport/Traffic and Parking (Local Traffic Impact) Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process Point 2 is noted.
9	D09379887	Buckleys Road, Winston Hills	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter states that proposal for 29 storeys is too high. 	Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact
10	D09379893	Post Office Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that significant alterations to the original plans are being proposed. Notes that Shirley Street currently does not have any buildings above 5 storeys, apart from the newly built blocks which are up to 12 floors and that no blocks along the street should be higher than 12 floors. Considers that there are already significant impacts on existing residents. Considers that the provisions for a new library and community hub are not what the area needs. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process
11	D09379902	Northam Drive, North Rocks	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter objects to more apartments being constructed as more apartments are consistently being built in an already overcrowded area. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
12	D09379908	Tripoli Avenue, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the height of the proposed development is too high. States that Pennant Hills Road is unable to cater for high volumes of traffic. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road) Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact
13	D09379920	Arcadia Street, Schofields	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the proposed development will result in significant traffic impacts. States that roads and other infrastructure need to be built to support commuters, including toll-free roads. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Local Traffic Impact)
14	D09379937	Kirby Street, Rydalmere	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter states that town planning is important for all types of infrastructure to support the community and does not consider that this has been taken into account. States that the local area does not need additional housing, especially as it is already densely built up. States that the intersection is already congested. States that green space and planning laws should be upheld and not altered simply because developers are seeking to make a profit. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, Local Traffic Impact) Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process
15	D09379945	Karril Avenue, Beecroft	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter states that the size and scale of the proposed development will significantly impact local traffic and amenity for those living in surrounding streets. Considers that there is an existing, functional library space. Considers that there is insufficient public parking to use the proposed shopping facilities and park, therefore serving only those living in the new units and not the broader community. Considers that the height of the proposed development is too high, impeding the environmental aesthetics of the area. Considers that local traffic, near misses and road accidents at key intersections along Pennant Hills Road already cause gridlocks and disarray, and that increased development will worsen these issues. Considers that Pennant Hills Road should be widened in this area rather than being used for more housing. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Local Traffic Impact, Vehicular/Pedestrian Safety) Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure
16	D09379957, D09416140	Grigg Avenue, North Epping / Ferntree Place, Epping	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter states that over development contributes to overcrowding and poor traffic conditions in Epping. Submitter states development should be complemented with infrastructure and better traffic management. Submitter considers that the traffic situation in Carlingford and Epping is already bad and that it would be prudent to first improve traffic flow and road and parking infrastructure before approving the proposed development. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General, Local Traffic Impact) Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure

263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford (RZ/5/2023)

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
18	D09379969	Marsden Road, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers that the area is overpopulated and that every street within the area is continually lined with parked cars. • States that intersections along Pennant Hills Road are becoming more dangerous as people take detours to avoid traffic congestion. • Considers that all roads within the vicinity are becoming increasingly congested and the proposed development is not helping to alleviate traffic concerns. • Considers that the area is not appropriate for high density development and no regard has been given to road and transport considerations. • Considers that the light rail will not address the issue of transport and traffic congestion as it will not replace car usage. • Considers it disingenuous to propose another library as part of the development as there is one currently servicing the area. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density of the Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Vehicular/Pedestrian Safety)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure</p>
19	D09379975	Simpson Street, Dundas	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter states that developments such as the one proposed do nothing to address the lack of affordable housing for low-income earners and only profit developers. • Considers that the government should be building its own affordable housing developments rather than approving overdevelopment. 	<p>Refer to Theme 12: Affordable Housing</p>
20	D09379989	Marsden Road, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers the proposal to be an overdevelopment of the site, which is already a traffic bottleneck and states that car accidents are becoming a daily issue and not just during peak hour. • Requests maintenance of local infrastructure, such as widening Pennant Hills Road. • States community and local infrastructure such as schools, parking and roads are at their limits. • Considers that the proposal is inappropriate and would make the area unliveable for current residents who cannot afford to move. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Vehicular/Pedestrian Safety)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure</p>
21	D09380290	Honiton Avenue, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers that the roads surrounding the area are already not coping with the current traffic demand and considers that the proposed development will contribute to further traffic issues and road congestion. 	<p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, Local Traffic Impact)</p>
23	D09380326	Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers that the traffic in Carlingford is set to worsen. • Considers that Pennant Hills Road is already crowded and will not be able to support many more residents. 	<p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General)</p>
24	D09381072	Keeler Street, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p>	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on the Local Area</p>

263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford (RZ/5/2023)

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the proposed development, once built, will be the tallest building in the local area and will permanently change the population density of the Carlingford area. 	
25	D09381079	Supply Street, Dundas Valley	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that Pennant Hills Road cannot support an increased population in the Carlingford area, given the existing traffic. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road)
27	D09381097	Post Office Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the proposed development is too tall and comprises of too many buildings. Considers that there are too many households proposed for the small block. States that Shirley Street is already not coping with the current developments, let alone the new proposal. Considers that Post Office Street has been negatively impacted by the new parking spaces provided for the new apartments, which has made it dangerous for residents to exit existing complexes, due to parked cars obstructing the view from the driveway. Considers that if the proposed development were to go ahead, it would be unbearable for Shirley Street residents. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General, Local Traffic Impact, Vehicular/Pedestrian Safety, Parking Provision)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 3: Built Form and Design</p> <p>Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact</p>
28	D09381102	Keeler Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers the proposed development will worsen existing bad traffic conditions, with particular negative impacts to the Post Office Street exit on to Pennant Hills Road. Considers that traffic measures must be put in place and that the proposed development should not be approved until an improved traffic management plan is implemented and determined to be effective. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General, Local Traffic Impact)
29	D09381106, D09386414, D09386428, D09386496	Post Office Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the addition of 197 units will exacerbate existing congested traffic conditions and increased density cannot be supported by Shirley Street and surrounding streets. Considers that traffic is already congested, and surrounding streets will not be able to support the new high density area. Submitters considers that the roads do have significant capacity, which will be further strained with the increase of new residents. Considers that Shirley Street will not be able to support the number of trucks that will be onsite during construction. Suggests retaining Janell Crescent to support Shirley Street in carrying traffic to Pennant Hills Road. Submitter suggests that Janell Crescent should be retained as the second access point for the high-density area as Shirley Street is not able to support the increased usage. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Local Traffic Impact)

263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford (RZ/5/2023)

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers that the accessway proposed cannot support the high-density community with the addition of 197 units. • Considers that it would be sensible to retain Janell Crescent as a means to access facilities in the area, such as supermarket, library and childcare, rather than only using Shirley Street, which is very narrow. 	
30	D09381117, D09381193	Post Office Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers that traffic is already congested and the addition of another two hundred units will only make it worse. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General, Local Traffic Impact)
31	D09381152	Boundary Road, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers that Shirley Street and the surrounding street networking is unable to support the number of new units proposed as part of the development. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Local Traffic Impact)
32	D09381172, D09394242	Post Office Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter states that Shirley Street cannot support the heavy traffic that will result from the additional proposed units. • States that their greatest concern is traffic, and that the streets should be upgraded to support high density development. • Submitter notes that access to the site will not be provided via Janell Crescent and that no road from the development will provide direct connections to Pennant Hills Road, with the development being accessible from Shirley Street only. • Considers that Shirley Street is a very small, narrow street, which will not be able to support a large volume of traffic. • Requests that Council consider upgrading Shirley Street. • Suggests keeping the space that was Janell Crescent to provide access to Pennant Hills Road, in order to share the demand placed on Shirley Street, which is insufficient to support the new high-density residential area. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General, Local Traffic Impact)
33	D09381208	Post Office Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter states that Shirley Street cannot support the increase in traffic caused by the additional units. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Local Traffic Impact)
34	D09381393	Coronet Court, North Rocks	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter states that the proposal does not include measures to mitigate the negative impacts caused by bringing more people into the area, suggesting this means the developer is only interested in making a profit. • Considers that the proposal looks reasonable on paper but would have negative consequences when implemented. • Considers it already challenging driving from Jenkins Road to Carlingford Road along Pennant Hills Road. • States that every day there are cars queuing to join Pennant Hills Road from Evans Road, some resorting to queuing across Pennant Hills Road as other drivers will not give way. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on the Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport, Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Local Traffic Impacts, Vehicular/Pedestrian Safety)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 3: Built Form and Design</p>

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Notes that a pedestrian was recently killed while crossing Coleman Avenue when they had right of way, citing this as an example of why additional density should not be permitted in an established high-density area. States that the current traffic congestion issues should be addressed before the planning proposal may be considered. 	
35	D09381397	Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter states that the proposal will negatively impact the community and make it unliveable. States that traffic is already regularly at a standstill, with some demonstrating dangerous behaviour on the roads. States the public transport system is inadequate. States that the increase in population that will result from this proposal will destroy the existing character of Carlingford. Raises concerns that residents will eventually be living amongst "concrete canyons", gridlocked traffic and lack of solar access. Raises concerns regarding the change in Council's position after being offered a financial contribution, calling into question the integrity of Councillors. Considers that current residents are being disregarded in the decision-making process. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, Local Traffic Impacts, Vehicular/Pedestrian Safety)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 3: Built Form and Design</p> <p>Refer to Theme 4: Impact of Height/Proposal on Adjoining Properties</p> <p>Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure</p> <p>Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process</p>
36	D09381399	Curtis Court, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter is sceptical about why the full extent of the development was not submitted in the first instance, suggesting that developers seem to get a second chance once they have their foot in the door on their initial submission. States that roadworks are needed before the development is given a certificate of occupation. States that public space should be completed at stage 1 and if the development stops at stage 1, the monies for public facilities should be included in stage 2. Considers that the development should include social housing. Notes that traffic congestion is already severe during peak hour. 	<p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 3: Built Form and Design</p> <p>Refer to Theme 12: Affordable Housing</p> <p>Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process</p>
37	D09381417	Post Office Street, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers the proposal will negatively impact traffic and shopping in the area and result in overcrowding. Considers that the proposal is seeking profits at the expense of residents' safety and quality of life. Considers that it will result in complex challenges for Council to solve, including traffic congestion, the inability of shopping facilities to meet the needs of residents, and increasing crime rate in the area. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Local Traffic Impact)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 9: Impact on existing shopping centre/retail facilities</p>

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
38	D09382796	Simpson St, Dundas Valley	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considers that the area is already becoming overdeveloped. Considers that these high-density developments do not help to address the lack of affordable housing available to low-income earners as they are built by developers, purchased by investors and rented at an unaffordable price. Considers that these developments create a visual blight, are often built quickly, do not comply with building codes and have flammable cladding. Considers that these developments rarely provide enough parking. Considers that these developments cause traffic congestion. Raises concerns that there are insufficient schools in the area to accommodate the influx of residents. Criticises the State Government for not addressing the lack of affordable housing, and pandering to developers, to the detriment of the community. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General, Parking Provision) Refer to Theme 3: Built Form and Design Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure Refer to Theme 12: Affordable Housing
39	D09382831	Parramatta LGA	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter objects to the proposed building height of 29 storeys, stating it is too high and inconsistent with the character of the surrounding area. Raises concerns that if the proposed development goes ahead, it will bring a large influx of new residents into Carlingford. Raises concerns about certain areas losing solar access due to the proposal. Considers low to medium density housing a more appropriate option, which would provide housing while being of a smaller building footprint and consistent in character with the surrounding area. Requests that common sense be used, and consideration given to how the proposal will impact residents of Carlingford and surrounds. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 4: Impact of Height/Proposal on Adjoining Properties
44	D09386436	Albemarle Street, Dundas	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter states that roads, schools and infrastructure are not coping with the current population. 	Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure
45	D09386452	Shirley Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the traffic infrastructure supporting Shirley Street, Post Office Street and Lloyds Avenue is already significantly inadequate, with regular accidents at the intersection of Lloyds Avenue and Pennant Hills Road. Submitter states that Shirley Street is already filled with parked cars due to construction works and cannot cope with a significantly increased volume of cars each day. Raises concerns that the proposal to increase height from 33 metres to 110 metres will set a precedent that will result in residents opposite completely losing solar access. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Local Traffic Impacts, Vehicular/Pedestrian Safety, Parking Provision) Refer to Theme 4: Impact of Height/Proposal on Adjoining Properties
46	D09386466	James Street, Carlingford	Not support:	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area

263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford (RZ/5/2023)

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter states that the area has too many high-rise buildings, and roads and schools should be built before more buildings are constructed. 	Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure
47	D09386475	Post Office Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter suggests public transport infrastructure such as a train line connecting Carlingford to Epping or Eastwood is needed to support the population. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General) Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure
48	D09386486	Post Office Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter raises concerns about the visual impacts of the proposed development as they are typically not well constructed and visually unappealing. Considers that the existing infrastructure in Carlingford is insufficient for the local population, stating that schools are at capacity, there is little parking at Carlingford Court, and the light rail station will be insufficient to service the volume of people in Carlingford. Adds that streets are also at capacity, noting that Shirley Street is barely wide enough for two cars, especially with the kerbside parking. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Local Traffic Impact) Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure
49	D09386490	Balaka Drive, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter raises concerns about traffic impacts. Submitter notes that many large apartment blocks are being built in Carlingford, with many using their garage for storage and parking their car on the street. Notes that traffic has increased over the years since development of Rouse Hill as people travel along local streets to avoid traffic congestion along Pennant Hills Road and North Rocks Road. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Parking Provision)
50	D09386501	Thallon St, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that Council has increased density without making any changes to account for increased traffic and parking requirements. Considers that the exit from Evans Road onto Pennant Hills Road is already chaotic; as is the traffic on Thallon Street. States that there is no parking available nor changes to rectify the situation. States that Council is happy to approve profit-making developments but not invest in the surrounding infrastructure to support increased density. States that roads and parking should be first addressed before increasing density. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Local Traffic Impact, Parking Provisions) Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure
52	D09386513	Felton Street, Telopea	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the community is already very crowded, with heavy traffic and the number of students almost exceeding the schools' capacity. Considers that the shopping centre is crowded as well, with it being difficult 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure

263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford (RZ/5/2023)

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> to find a car parking spot. Considers that the community will be significantly worse off if a residential development of this scale is to go ahead. 	Refer to Theme 9: Impact on existing shopping centre/retail facilities
53	D09386516	Boundary Road, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that traffic will worsen if the development goes ahead and 600 sqm of extra community space will not outweigh the traffic congestion. Considers that if the development were to go ahead, Pennant Hills Road will become just like Parramatta Road. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General)
54	D09386715	Thallon Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter states the proposal will contribute to more traffic on an already highly congested road. Considers that 1% of the total parking space should be made available to the public as free EV charging stations for all developers seeking approval on high-density development. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, Local Traffic Impact) Refer to Theme 6: Environment and Sustainability
55	D09386716	James Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that no planning or comment is provided on the significant impact this development will have regarding traffic, parking and the general pedestrian and vehicular safety of the bounding and surrounding streets/suburbs. Considers that, with the incoming light rail, there will be a significant influx of traffic, parking and safety issues for surrounding streets. As a resident of a street nearby, submitter considers that there is insufficient capacity in the area to accommodate traffic from the proposed development without upgrades to the surrounding streets. Considers that City of Parramatta Council and the developer are responsible for these upgrades in order for this project to be viable. Considers that the streets and parking provision should be upgraded regardless of the size of the development. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Local Traffic Impact, Vehicular/Pedestrian Safety, Parking Provision)
56	D09386717	Post Office Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the proposed development may be solving the short-term problem of housing shortage but at the cost of exhausting public resources that are already under significant stress. Considers that the traffic conditions on Pennant Hills Road, specifically around Carlingford Court, and on Carlingford Road is very chaotic. Considers that accidents have gone up, schools in the nearby areas (such as Carlingford West) have reached their enrolment capacity, and that there is a lack of proper health infrastructure in the nearby areas. Asks whether there are any plans of fixing these long-term issues as well. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Infrastructure Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road) Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure
58	D09386720	Honiton Avenue, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter states that the existing road infrastructure cannot support the large volume increase in vehicles generated from the proposed additional 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Local Traffic Impact)

263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford (RZ/5/2023)

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>dwellings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers that Pennant Hill Road is currently already heavily congested. • Raises concerns regarding overshadowing given the significant increase in the proposed height of the development, stating it will overshadow the road and the existing residential buildings opposite for most of the day. • States the proposal looks like “one giant wall along Pennant Hills Road”, which is visually unappealing and doesn't fit in with the look and feel of the existing streetscape. 	<p>Refer to Theme 4: Impact of Height/Proposal on Adjoining Properties</p> <p>Refer to Theme 5: Visual Amenity</p>
59	D09386722	Mosely Street, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers that there are too many units in the area already. • Submitter also raises concerns regarding traffic congestion. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking</p>
60	D09387602	Surrey Street, Epping	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter raises concerns that the significant increase in road traffic will not be adequately dealt with by an additional set of traffic lights. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking
61	D09387611	Talinga Street, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers that Pennant Hills Road and other roads in the surrounding network will be unable to cope with the proposed additional residential and commercial development. • States that Pennant Hills Road is already at maximum capacity during peak hours and school drop-off and pickup times. • States that Pennant Hills Road already has one of the longest stretches of school zones in Sydney and increasing residential density will bring the road to a standstill. • Submitter expresses that due to the development's proximity to Carlingford Public School (within 750m), traffic activity will increase significantly to surrounding roads and that they currently cannot support the increase this growth. • States that Lloyds Avenue and Post Office Street will become a bottleneck as there is no traffic light system at either of these roads and they will be an essential commute for all residents moving in. • States that unless Council is going widen Pennant Hills Road to have three lanes and the other roads and streets made dual-lane with traffic lights, there is no way the roads can cope. • States that numerous car accidents happen on a weekly basis as Council did not consider the flow-on impacts that an increased volume of cars would bring and also that the proposal will result in more major accidents. • States that traffic will result in the need for frequent road maintenance. • States that traffic will result in a significant increase in noise complaints due to beeping horns and cars travelling through the roads. • States that Carlingford Road outside Carlingford Court, which joins onto Pennant Hills Road, is also beyond its capacity during peak hour, caused 	<p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Local Traffic Impact, Parking Provision)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 6: Environment and Sustainability</p> <p>Refer to Theme 9: Impact on existing shopping centre/retail facilities</p>

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>by the increased residential high-rise apartments built between Keeler Street and Carlingford Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> States that traffic and the difficulty of ingress and egress to properties within the area is causing residents to sell, evidenced by the sale/lease signs outside apartment complexes along Keeler Street and Carlingford Road. Considers that the proposed development will result in the same outcome if approved. States that Carlingford Court and Carlingford Village, have a parking problem with both centres introducing parking rates in the last couple of years to manage local residents parking overnight and the traffic congestion while entering and exiting. States that the development proposal does not appear to consider provision of car parking. 	
62	D09387614	Orchard Road, Beecroft	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter states that the infrastructure is not in place to support the number of dwellings proposed. 	Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure
63	D09387617	Baker Street, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter does not see the need for Carlingford to become a high-density suburb. Considers that the local infrastructure is not being catered to, such as roads, additional traffic intersections, local streets. States that the area will not cope with a development of such size and scale in its proposed location unless there are some major road changes – and beyond that of additional traffic lights. States that the proposed development will greatly affect all major roads into, out of, and around Carlingford. Notes that the development site is directly opposite to two major roads, Marsden Road and Evans Road, with a major Carlingford Road intersection to the north and Jenkins Road to the west. Questions how Post Office Street will cope with the volume of cars, given that vehicular access is via Shirley Street. Considers that there will be major issues with traffic flow to both Jenkins Road and Pennant Hills Road, which are currently at maximum capacity, and questions how the roads will cope with such a large development being proposed. Notes that the light rail will be introduced sometime in the future and expresses concern that this will affect the current bus timetables along Pennant Hills Road to and from Parramatta, noting these bus services are currently used extensively and at maximum capacity. Questions whether the bus timetables will be affected due to increased traffic congestion around the proposed Carlingford development. Questions whether Pennant Hills Road be widened. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Local Traffic Impact, Vehicular/Pedestrian Safety, Parking Provision)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure</p>

263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford (RZ/5/2023)

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considers that Post Office Street is currently a challenge to navigate, with cars turning left and then wanting to immediately cut across two lanes of traffic to turn right at Carlingford Road. Considers that Jenkins Road will come to a standstill during peak hour. Notes that traffic is often queued up from Pennant Hills Road to Moseley Street and raises questions about the future impacts if the proposed development were to proceed. 	
64	D09388698	James Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> States that Pennant Hills Road is already congested and the traffic flow from Carlingford Road to Jenkins Road should addressed first. Notes that there is already an existing public library. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, Local Traffic Impact) Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure
65	D09388705	James Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> States that road infrastructure should be addressed first as roads are currently congested. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General)
66	D09388706	Cottee Drive, Epping	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considers that the increase in height and density is how the developer will achieve approval of the original development. Expresses scepticism that all developments need in order to attain approval are some open space and appealing facilities. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Area Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process
67	D09388707	Shirley Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter raises concerns about the plan to filter all traffic onto Shirley Street, which currently already has difficulty handling the volume of vehicles using that street. Additionally shares concerns that Shirley Street will not be able to support traffic to the proposed shopping centre, childcare centre and library. Raises concerns that the building heights will cause overshadowing and loss of natural light. Raises concerns that no plans are in place to lay a footpath through Shirley Street Reserve for pedestrian access to the new light rail. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Local Traffic Impact, Vehicular/Pedestrian Safety) Refer to Theme 4: Impact of Height/proposal on Adjoining Properties
68	D09388741	Post Office Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter objects to the increase in density and height due to the area's lack of strategic planning with regards to the local roads and transport network. Considers the new library to be an incentive for the development to be approved. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General) Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process
69	D09389944	Post Office Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers the proposal to be an example of overdevelopment at its worst and questions how Council will allow another 197 on the site. Considers that roads and infrastructure cannot cope with a development of 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Area Refer to Theme 2: Transport/Traffic and

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>this size, with Pennant Hills Road already consistently gridlocked.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter states that there are limited options to get to the Sydney CBD as the only way to get to Epping Station from Carlingford is by bus and the light rail only takes people to Parramatta, not the Sydney CBD. • States that they live in Shirley Street and are already experiencing street parking and access issues. • Questions how the developer can get approval for an increase in building height from 33 metres to 110 metres. • States they are completely confident that all local residents would be against this amendment. • Considers the offer of a new library to be moot as the current library is fine. • States that a new supermarket is not needed as there is a Coles and Woolworths at Carlingford Court. • Considers that this development will put pressure of current Carlingford residents, who are already fed up with the building underway, with noise from 7am all day long. • States it is clear that local residents cannot influence the outcome and the development will be approved regardless of community feedback. • Considers that builders always win out against those with less power. 	<p>Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Local Traffic Impact, Parking Provisions)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 3: Built Form and Design</p> <p>Refer to Theme 7: Construction Impacts</p> <p>Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure</p> <p>Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process</p> <p>Point 6 is noted. Council can only consider submissions that have been received through official channels.</p>
71	D09390162	Dunrossil Avenue, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers that increases in density will result in overcrowding in public spaces, the shopping centre, schools and worsen the area's traffic conditions (particularly to the Pennant Hills Road, Marsden Road and Carlingford Road intersection). • Considers that having a number of tall buildings on the site negatively affects the overall landscape. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, Local Traffic Impact)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact</p> <p>Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure</p>
72	D09390226	Panaview Crescent, North Rocks	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter objects to the proposal due to existing traffic congestion, inadequate access to major roads to the city and inadequate parking around the Parramatta Metro station at Carlingford. • Submitter suggests both north and southbound lanes need to be widened from two to three as there are inadequate turning lanes into Adderton Road, Marsden Road and Carlingford Road. • Considers that encouraging residents to use public transport would require many additional car spaces for the Carlingford to Parramatta Metro service, as the few in place are inadequate. • Considers that before any high-density plans are approved, these major and expensive issues regarding traffic and parking should be addressed, and that not doing so will devalue the area and make it unappealing to current and future residents. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Local Traffic Impact, Parking Provision)</p>

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States that high-density blocks need to be planned addressing transport issues, as only so many residents will catch public transport. 	
76	D09393706	Andrew Place, North Rocks	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the area is overpopulated, and that the current roads and infrastructure cannot accommodate more apartments. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure
77	D09393710	Cook Street, Baulkham Hills	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that increasing the height and number of residential dwellings will make the area too dense. Considers that there is already a lot of new development in the area and the roads and transport infrastructure cannot cope. Submitter is supportive of the additional community centre and public space. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking Point 3 is noted.
78	D09393721	Jason Place, North Rocks	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the area is already very crowded. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area
79	D09393739	Alma Street, Rydalmere	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that, while it is reasonable to increase density for housing, especially in proximity to public transport hubs, an increase of building height jeopardises the appeal of a tranquil local suburb. Considers that apartments of 3-4 storey as those seen of units from the 1970's are far more socially acceptable and to scale amongst its context and neighbours. Considers that high-rise developments threaten the management of traffic, including for passive road users, with examples evident in nearby suburbs such as Epping and Meadowbank. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking Refer to Theme 3: Built Form and Design
80	D09393745	Marwood Drive, Beecroft	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the development will result in too much population density for the area and increased traffic flow. Considers that overflow of cars from residents will be parked in the streets. Raises concerns regarding impacts of overshadowing on surrounding residents. Considers that traffic congestion along Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford Road, and Marsden Road is already chaotic and the additional demand placed on these roads by both the original and new proposal will make it gridlocked. Considers that just because there is a tram close by and buses that travel along Pennant Hills Road does not mean the residents will take public transport, making it hard to predict accurate figures for uptake. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Local Traffic Impact, Parking Provision) Refer to Theme 4: Impact of Height/Proposal on Adjoining Properties
82	D09393777	Captain Strom Place,	Not support:	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		Carlingford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that roads should be upgraded to have greater capacity for increased traffic volume before increasing the number of residents in the area, noting particular traffic challenges with Marsden Road. Considers that there is already a lack of parking and traffic is heavily congested. Considers that providing other facilities will not necessarily improve residents' quality of life. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, Local Traffic Impact, Parking Provision)
83	D09393794 / D09422015	Post Office Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the community will be too crowded and will worsen the traffic conditions in the Carlingford area. Submitter purchased a property nearby to the subject site due to the main living area and the windows being north facing, with no obstructions to the building, for ample solar access and views from the balcony. Raises concerns that if the Meriton Building E is built in front of Luxton (the submitter's building estate), they will experience loss of solar access and loss of privacy, due to the proximity of the two buildings. Requests that consideration be given to the impacts of overcrowding on residents and the community, and the resulting negative impacts on the economy of Carlingford. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking Refer to Theme 4: Impact of Height/Proposal on Adjoining Properties
84	D09393876	James Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers the existing infrastructure insufficient to handle any further increase of residents. Considers that the opening of the Carlingford Light Rail will result in an increase of traffic during peak hour. Submitter would support the existing plan for the area only and would not support any further changes from the plan. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process
85	D09393888	James Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that Carlingford is already suffering from the population increase resulting from the many new apartments that have been built recently. Considers that, while it may seem easier to build apartments, the supporting infrastructure is non-elastic and can only support so much of an increase in population. Considers the increase in new residents will cause further stress on supporting infrastructure. Considers it imprudent to increase the development by an additional 197 units. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure
86	D09393926	Charlotte Street, Dundas Valley	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that increasing the maximum height, and dramatically increasing the number of dwellings will cause chaos in the area. Considers that the road infrastructure will not cope. Anticipates that the developer will only provide one car space for each 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>dwelling, but every dwelling will have at least two cars. Considers the duplexes in surrounding streets as an example of this. States the parking arrangements of the proposed development will result in overcrowded street parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions the integrity of the development proposal and the developer's dealings with Council. 	Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process
87	D09393934	James Street, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter states that there is so many apartments and so much traffic in Carlingford already. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking</p>
88	D09393942	Keeler Street, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that currently there is traffic and parking congestion, and right at the busiest intersection too. Considers that the local school will not be able to accommodate more children. 	<p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Local Traffic Impacts)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure</p>
89	D09394015	Shirley Street, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the Stage 1 plan is sufficient and there is no need for additional storeys and objects to Stage 2 of the development. Considers that the community needs more green space than buildings. States that the distance between buildings is narrowing and is not good design for developing communities. Considers that increased numbers of residents in the area will cause bad traffic congestion and may pose more danger to schoolchildren on the street. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General, Vehicular/Pedestrian Safety)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 3: Built Form and Design</p> <p>Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure</p> <p>Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process</p>
90	D09394020	Post Office Street, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the community will be too crowded and will worsen the traffic conditions in the Carlingford area. Submitter purchased a property nearby to the subject site due to the main living area and the windows being north facing, with no obstructions to the building, for ample solar access and views from the balcony. Raises concerns that if the Meriton Building E is built in front of Luxton (the submitter's building estate), they will experience loss of solar access and loss of privacy, due to the proximity of the two buildings. Requests that consideration be given to the impacts of overcrowding on residents and the community, and the resulting negative impacts on the economy of Carlingford. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 4: Impact of Height/Proposal on Adjoining Properties</p>
91	D09394030	Ainslie Parade,	Not support:	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater

263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford (RZ/5/2023)

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		Carlingford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter questions how the increase in density will be supported by the already congested Pennant Hills Road and local schools. Considers 29-storey high rise buildings are not compatible with the existing mid-rise buildings and will negatively impact the streetscape. 	<p>Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact</p> <p>Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure</p>
93	D09394060	Wavell Avenue, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the proposed height is too high and will create a precedent on Pennant Hills Road. 	<p>Refer to Themes 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process</p>
94	D09394123	Thallon Street, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that their feedback will not be taken into account, in the face of Meriton's influence. Submitter states the area is already full of high-rise developments. Considers that the landscape has changed. Considers that when they first bought their unit nearby, they paid a premium price for the view of beautiful greenery, but now the area resembles the CBD. States that street parking is always full. Considers that noise pollution generated from roads and houses has increased due to more people living in the area. Considers that Carlingford as settlement village has lost its glory. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Parking Provision)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact</p> <p>Refer to Theme 6: Environment and Sustainability</p> <p>Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process</p>
95	D09396234	Lloyds Avenue, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the proposed development is overkill and an eyesore, given the size of the block and the current traffic conditions on Pennant Hills Road, Shirley Street, and Post Office Street. Submitter resides on Lloyds Avenue and notes that there is significant traffic along this small road, and there are numerous accidents occurring as cars attempt to exit Lloyds Avenue onto Pennant Hills Road. States other residents in Lloyds Avenue do not support the proposal. Considers the proposal to be driven by greed. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Local Traffic Impact)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact</p> <p>Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process</p> <p>Point 3 is noted. Council can only consider submissions that have been received through official channels.</p>
96	D09396242	Adderton Road, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers this proposal to be an overdevelopment of the Carlingford area, which will put high stress on a traffic system that is already very congested. 	<p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Local Traffic Impact)</p>
98	D09396883,	Jenkins Road,	Not support:	Refer to Theme 1: Impacts of Greater

263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford (RZ/5/2023)

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
	D09407343	Carlingford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers that over the past 5 years, over 2,000 new units have been delivered, but there has been no increase in schools. • Considers that the driving time along Carlingford Road and Pennant Hills Road to James Ruse during peak hours has arisen from 5 minutes during normal times to 20-25 minutes. • Considers that the development will further increase the strain on road infrastructure and the area will become gridlocked like Rozelle. • States secondary roads are also becoming congested. • States that the present Labor Minister has promised in various broadcasts that infrastructure comes first, followed by additional homes, and therefore roads should be widened, and new primary and secondary schools built, before considering <i>increasing density</i>. • States that the impacts of the already approved 3,000+ units are not being taken into consideration. • Submitter objects to all future developments in Carlingford until amenities and services are upgraded to adequately support the level of development that has taken place in the past five years. 	<p>Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General, Local Traffic Impact)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure</p>
99	D09397361	Lachlan Grove, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter stats traffic congestion is already dangerous on Pennant Hills Road and the local side streets. • States local schools are already overcrowded. • States Carlingford Court shopping centre is now too small and overcrowded, and the parking and surrounding roads are dangerous and the site of many accidents. • States the local medical facilities have long wait times and are overcrowded. • States parking on the streets has become a significant issue in all the back streets, with restricted room to safely travel on a narrow two-lane road, so drivers are required to pull over and give way to an oncoming vehicle before proceeding. • States that there are not enough parks and recreational facilities to cope with the already-growing population and the proposed development will only make the situation worse. • Submitter expresses hope that common sense will prevail and that the development will not proceed as planned. • Considers that there are already too many dwellings being crammed into what used to be single-dwelling allotments, which is destroying the once-safe and peaceful Carlingford area. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, Local Traffic Impact, Parking Provision)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure</p> <p>Refer to Theme 9: Impact on existing shopping centre/retail facilities</p> <p>Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process</p>
100	D09398708	Lochinvar Parade, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers that the roads around the subject site are already congested and experience high levels of traffic. • Considers that rezoning or increasing density will only make traffic congestion worse. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Local Traffic Impact)</p>

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States that roads and traffic should be improved before increasing the density and rezoning. 	
101	D09400394	Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter has been a resident of Carlingford since 1986 and expresses disappointment at seeing Carlingford becoming an overdeveloped community with increasing heights causing overshadowing and significant increase in traffic flow and filling local streets with parked cars. Submitter raises concerns regarding the proposed development's impacts on traffic flow, not only along Pennant Hills Road but on all surrounding streets and roads. Considers that the infrastructure is not in place to manage the increase in the number of motor vehicles that will come into the proposed area due to the new development. Notes that there will be over 700 units and, assuming each unit has a minimum of 2 cars per unit, this will result in at least 1,400 additional cars on local roads, along with the other motor vehicles travelling to the childcare centre, retail shopping and community hall. Submitter estimates an additional 1,600 motor vehicles on local roads daily, due to the proposed development. Submitter considers that the shortage of parking spaces will result in residents and visitors parking in neighbouring streets. Notes that Shirley Street is a very narrow, winding road and although there may be plans for widening, the submitter is not convinced this will alleviate congestion. Questions what impact this will have on the Carlingford community and raises concerns for peoples' safety and wellbeing. Submitter raises concerns that the two towers facing Pennant Hills Road will be up to 29 storeys and that they will be unsightly and cause overshadowing over the Waratah Gardens complexes opposite Pennant Hills Road. Considers that the proposed development will not fit in with the current streetscape. Considers the proposal contributes to overdevelopment of Carlingford and takes away the family friendly community. Considers that the proposed development is only going to cause an increase in traffic noise and pollution and that residents will suffer with disruption to their wellbeing and mental health. Requests that all feedback and concerns from the community be considered and listened to. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General, Local Traffic Impact, Parking Provision)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 4: Impact of Height/Proposal on Adjoining Properties</p> <p>Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact</p> <p>Refer to Theme 6: Environment and Sustainability</p> <p>Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process</p>
102	D09402301	Donald Street, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers 200 additional apartments a significant increase in addition to the many new apartments already being built. Raises concerns that the proposed development will contribute to too much 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Local Traffic Impact, Parking</p>

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>traffic congestion in the area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter objects to the proposed height of the buildings along Pennant Hills Road almost tripling and doubling that of other roads as it will be an eyesore to the community and does not fit in with the current landscape of the area. • Raises concerns that the proposed development will also contribute to more wind tunnels, as well as reducing solar access to neighbouring streets and houses. • Raises concerns regarding the number of cars that will be using Post Office Street and Shirley Street, as they are already busy enough, being home to many apartment buildings, and being comparatively small roads. • Raises concerns regarding the developer's proposal in trying to increase the height and number of apartments even further, noting that the original proposal is already a large development that will significantly change the landscape of Carlingford, considering this to be motivated by greed. • Raises concerns that the number of car parking spaces for the new library and community centre are too few when considering the number of people they will be servicing. • Requests that the plan be reconsidered to prevent greedy developers from ruining their beautiful suburb. • Notes that Carlingford has a lot of history and is prized for its small and safe community and suburban vibe but considers that by building the proposed number of apartments in such a small area and making buildings significantly higher than the surrounding houses and low-rise apartments, it will ruin Carlingford's charm and make it more like another congested, poorly-planned city. 	<p>Provision)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 3: Built Form and Design</p> <p>Refer to Theme 4: Impact of Height/Proposal on Adjoining Properties</p> <p>Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact</p> <p>Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process</p>
103	D09402316	Donald Street, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter requests that the maximum height be reduced, as there are already four other new apartment blocks in the area, and the proposed development will only contribute to an increase in people and traffic. • Notes that there is already a lot of traffic, especially at the east end of Post Office Street next to the Bunnings, where cars often have difficulty turning onto Pennant Hills Road. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Local Traffic Impact)</p>
104	D09402605	Post Office Street, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers that although the plan is promising to provide community spaces for the community around the proposed development, the scale of the development is going to put additional pressure on the already busy area which experiences significant traffic congestion during peak hours. • Notes that travel through Post Office Street and onto Carlingford Road and from Pennant Hills Road to Marsden Road takes considerable time. • Considers that there will also be additional traffic around the shopping centre and will add to the parking and traffic congestion there. • Considers that the proposed development must account for the added 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (General, Local Traffic Impact, Parking Provision)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 6: Environment and Sustainability</p> <p>Refer to Theme 9: Impact on existing</p>

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>stress on local residents and also the quality of life for the people who move into the new development – it is not only about living in the apartments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> States that the apartments must have sufficient parking spaces allocated to each unit, as the parking situation on the street is already bad and will be exacerbated by additional units. 	shopping centre/retail facilities
105	D09402609	Post Office Street, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the increase of the maximum height of building from 33 metres to 110 metres on the Pennant Hills Road frontage and additional 197 residential units will create too much pressure and density for such a small and already overcrowded area. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area
106	D09402611	Purchase Road, Cherrybrook	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the building will be too tall for the surrounding areas and unsightly for the suburb of Carlingford. Considers that the access roads are inadequate for such a large development and will cause congestion in the area, making it worse for current visitors and residents. Considers that the 20 car parking spaces proposed for the new library are far too few, taking into account the significant increase in residents that the new development will bring, and considering the current library has a similar amount of parking already. Submitter is a regular visitor to the area for church, shopping, dining, visiting relatives and the library and frequently drives past the development site and the streets that will be affected. 	<p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Local Traffic Impact, Parking Provision)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact</p> <p>Point 4 is noted.</p>
107	D09402627	Purchase Road, Cherrybrook	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter is a regular user of the current Carlingford Library and raises concerns that they will not be able to find parking at the library, given the few parking spaces to be provided, the size of the proposed development, and sudden increase in over 1,500+ residents. Notes that it is already difficult driving around Shirley Street and Lloyds Avenue onto Pennant Hills Road due to traffic congestion and considers that 29-storey developments in that area will only make things worse and more dangerous for all. Submitter identifies themselves as a senior, and states it is very important to them to be able to visit the community library safely and accessibly near where their friends live, along with the nearby parks and shopping centre. Submitter states that they frequent this part of Carlingford at least once a week, despite not living in the area. 	<p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, Local Traffic Impact, Parking Provision)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 3: Built Form and Design</p> <p>Point 4 is noted.</p>
108	D09402645	Tiptrees Avenue, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that there are too many cars on the streets. Considers that Carlingford, once a beautiful suburb, now has too many unsightly high-rise buildings generating significant traffic and pollution. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and</p>

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter states that while they understand the need for development, they do not support this type of development. 	Parking Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact
109	D09406385	Shirley Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter notes that when they purchased a property at 12 Shirley Street, it was communicated that the Building E site would be retained for open space, which influenced their decision to purchase, due to good solar access and no overshadowing from neighbouring buildings. Considers that if Building E were to be built, it would result in a significant loss of solar access to their apartment compared to what was anticipated when they first purchased. Raises concerns that the proposed height of Building E at 56 metres will result in significant overshadowing for many residents of 12 Shirley Street. Raises concerns regarding the environmental impacts of increased reliance on artificial lighting and heating, perceiving that the construction of Building E would undermine their efforts towards energy efficiency and environmental sustainability. Considers that the uncertainties raised by the planning proposal have had negative impacts on their mental health and wellbeing. Requests that decision makers consider the profound personal impacts that the proposed development will have on residents. States that retaining the existing zoning and height controls for Building E and preserving the original plans to use the site for community open space would uphold the principles of fairness and community wellbeing. Considers that the proposed amendments raised in the submission would still allow the planning proposal to achieve the benefits sought, and that there does not appear to be a compelling case to allow a 56-metre building to be constructed at the Building E site, noting the potential negative impacts on residents at 12 Shirley Street. 	Refer to Theme 4: Impact of Height/Proposal on Adjoining Properties Refer to Theme 6: Environment and Sustainability Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process
110	D09407160	Lloyds Avenue, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the proposed development will lead to the overpopulation of the area and further congestion to the already busy roads in the area. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area
111	D09408499	Donald Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter states that insufficient consideration has been given to addressing the increased traffic that will result from the expanded scope of the development. Considers that the internal streets will exacerbate congestion, especially during peak times on Post Office Street and Shirley Street as people exit onto Pennant Hills Road. States that in order to ease congestion, consideration should be given to how to access Pennant Hills Road from the development's internal road network. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport & Parking (General, Local Traffic Impact, Parking Provision) Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that, while appreciative of the need for further housing, it appears unnecessary to build such high apartments in Carlingford when the existing approved application was for a significant amount of housing already. States that community spaces should be evaluated if there is serious consideration to replace the old library, especially in relation to the amount of parking allocated. Considers that the proposed street parking for the park facilities should be evaluated as Shirley Street is already a narrow street, so Council should consider upgrading that street or ensuring the developer widens the road to accommodate the increase in traffic. 	Refer to Theme 14: Clarifications
113	D09413709	Shirley Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the proposal does not fit with the existing development in the area and is far too tall for surrounding properties. Submitter objects due to the proposal's likelihood of increasing traffic along Shirley Street, which is already congested. Considers that Council has not given any consideration to the surrounding complex at 2 Shirley Street, which is only three storeys. States that access to natural light in the apartments has already been significantly impacted due to the high-rise development at 8 Shirley Street. States that the enjoyment of their property has already been significantly impacted by reduced sunlight to their complex, apartments, the pool area and solar panels. Considers that a building of 29 storeys would be inconsiderate and unnecessary and contribute to the overdevelopment of the area. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport & Parking (Local Traffic Impact) Refer to Theme 4: Impact of Height/Proposal on Adjoining Properties Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact
114	D09413715	Shirley Street, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers 29 storeys to be excessive and unfair on surrounding properties in Shirley Street. States that Shirley Street is already congested, and the area already overdeveloped. Requests that the original DA approval be upheld. Considers that they have already been negatively impacted by the high-rise development at 8 Shirley Street due to significantly reduced sunlight to their apartments, pool area, and solar panels. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport & Parking (Local Traffic Impact) Refer to Theme 4: Impact of Height/Proposal on Adjoining Properties Refer to Theme 14: Clarifications
115	D09413722	Felton Road, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter objects to the proposal for several reasons, including that the infrastructure in the area will not be able to cope with the associated increase in population. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area
116	D09413739	Raimonde Road, Eastwood	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that there is no need for additional residential units given the size of the proposed development and others currently being 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>built, and furthermore, that there is insufficient infrastructure to support the development as it stands, even without the additional units.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Considers that, before agreeing to these changes, consideration should be given to other developments which have occurred or are currently occurring in the local area. Notes that in the past few years many houses in the area between Pennant Hills Road and Jenkins Road have been knocked down and replaced with high-rise residential buildings, but there has been no increase in infrastructure, with the only change being the closure of Carlingford railway station. Considers that this has put significant strain on Carlingford Road and the two local shopping centres, Carlingford Court and Carlingford Village. Considers that, in addition to the significant development at 263-281 Pennant Hills Road, there is currently a large building site on Pennant Hills Road opposite Carlingford Court and one on Jenkins Road past Post Office Street. Notes that although the light rail at Carlingford is soon due to open, it only provides connections to Parramatta and does not provide transport connectivity for people wanting to head towards the city. Therefore, the only option for those heading east is to drive down Carlingford Road to Epping and cross the already congested Epping Bridge or park at Epping and take the Metro although there is no parking. Considers that there is also the option of taking the M2, but the nearest entrance involves driving down the congested Pennant Hills Road. Carlingford is not supported by sufficient public transport, desirable shopping precincts, schools or job opportunities. States that these changes are not in the best interest of the community. 	<p>Refer to Themes 2: Traffic/Transport & Parking (Pennant Hills Road, General)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure</p> <p>Refer to Theme 9: Impact on existing shopping centre/retail facilities</p> <p>Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process</p>
119	D09416131	Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Raises concerns surrounding impacts on traffic and suggests the proposed signalling improvements will not alleviate congestion. Objects to the proposed heights as it will reduce solar access and questions how this will be mitigated. Questions how noise and light pollution from increased density will be mitigated and what materials will be used as part of the development to enable the above. Requests acoustic studies to depict changes and impacts in noise levels. Submitter queries how residents will be compensated for the reduction of their property value in response to the proposed development. 	<p>Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking</p> <p>Refer to Theme 4: Impact of Height/Proposal on Adjoining Properties</p> <p>Refer to Theme 6: Environment and Sustainability</p> <p>Refer to Theme 10: Potential Reduction in Property Value</p>
120	D09416967	Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers the height limit of 110m will negatively impact solar access for residents of the complex across the development (346-362 Pennant Hills Road – Waratah Gardens). 	<p>Refer to Theme 4: Impact of Height/Proposal on Adjoining Properties</p> <p>Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact</p>

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States the proposal does not provide any mitigation or compensation for the solar access loss. Notes the subject site is located on higher terrain and that the two towers will "stick out", negatively affecting the landscape. Submitter raises concerns that 15% affordable housing will not be met by the planning proposal. 	Refer to Theme 12: Affordable Housing
121	D09416972	Cox Crescent, Dundas Valley	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter does not consider the proposed building heights in alignment with the surrounding area stating that the average height is 11 storeys with taller buildings only being approved within the Parramatta CBD. Considers the proposal will result in larger built forms and higher densities than larger projects within Melrose Park. Questions how many units will be dedicated to affordable and/or social housing. Notes that the planning proposal does not commit to providing "significant housing stock". Submitter does not agree that the amenities, open spaces, commercial space and library harmonises with the surrounding facilities, infrastructure and residents' needs. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 3: Built Form and Design Refer to Theme 12: Affordable Housing
122	D09418653	Karingal Avenue, Carlingford	Not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter shares concerns with the increase in height, residents and traffic and its impacts on existing overcrowding in schools and peak hour traffic. Notes that the benefits of light rail have not yet been fully demonstrated. Considers the reduction to 0.8 car spaces per unit for buildings exceeding 25 floors too little. Suggests the signalling improvements at the Lloyds Avenue and Evans Road intersection will not improve traffic flow. States access to Pennant Hills Road from Post Office Street must be included in any proposal. Submitter considers access to proposed community facilities will be limited for anyone outside of the immediate area of the precinct. Objects to the proposed heights as they contradict the original development of reducing building heights the further away developments get from Carlingford Station. 	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and Parking (Pennant Hills Road, Local Traffic Impact, Parking Provision) Refer to Theme 5: Visual Impact Refer to Theme 8: Provision of Local and State Infrastructure
130	D09423270	Epping	Not Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter states the dwelling numbers provided under Section 3.1.1 of the planning proposal were taken from a Parramatta Council brochure titled "High Growth Areas" recasting Carlingford precinct as a town centre and considers this number an exaggeration as it will require multi-functional land uses other than R4 zoning. Submitter questions why the Hills LEP 2012 is not adhered to when utilised as context for the Urban Design Report. 	Refer to Theme 1: Impact of Greater Density on Existing Local Area Refer to Theme 6: Environment and Sustainability Refer to Theme 3: Built Form and Design

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> States the section along Pennant Hills Road is drawn inaccurately and 1 Post Office Street should be moved closer to the left demonstrating that the alignment for the Building B and C are incompatible for the precinct. States the direct pedestrian access to Pennant Hills Road is different to the Access + Servicing (PP01.7 in Attachment 03). Raises issues with the drawings for the Planning Proposal stating incoherency between colours and heights and FSRs being out of scale. Requests wind tunnel tests to be undertaken due to the scale of the proposed development. Submitter raises turns within the precinct are dangerous, for example, Cumberland Highway onto Moseley Street. Submitter raises numerous junctions that would present more traffic and safety issues as a result of higher scale buildings. Questions whether excavation for underground car parking will impact on the development of any future Metro path. Requests Council undertake their own transport studies for the entire precinct. Submitter feels the Ecologically Sustainable Development Report (Appendix 9) is inadequate as it does not provide any GHG calculations, no estimation of resource/power consumption and energy required to provide the materials. Submitter raises that the lack of roof space for solar panels will negatively impact energy generation and use. Submitter questions the resilience and sustainability of the proposed development in relation to energy use. Submitter questions the requirement for 7 storey basement car parks when public transport is available. Requests a bus bay to be incorporated into the site plan on the northern side fronting Pennant Hills Road. Requests City of Parramatta Council to investigate population dynamics and demographics within the Carlingford precinct over time. Submitter recommends Council focus on bringing in employment close to Carlingford and similar suburbs instead of putting up additional residential. Requests Council to ask the developer to submit a power consumption analysis in MWh and MW. Requests Council push the State government to update BASIX otherwise new development are all outdated even by the time they built. Submitter questions the accuracy of population forecasts due to no cohort survival analysis being completed. Requests public consultation begin earlier and on the basis of simpler drawings stating that once developers have invested millions of dollars in planning work, such projects gain their own momentum and are difficult to stop even if circumstances have changed. 	<p>Refer to Theme 13: Planning Process</p> <p>Refer to Theme 14: Clarifications</p>
131	D09423287	Post Office Street,	Not support:	Refer to Theme 2: Traffic/Transport and

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		Carlingford	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter shares concerns with the height limits being inconsistent with the existing built form strategy and suggests the heights should be limited to a natural ground level of 56m or 18 storeys. • Considers the lack of connectivity between the Parramatta Light Rail and other forms of rail (Metro and heavy rail) a missed opportunity of the planning proposal. • Submitter notes bike routes from Carlingford towards Epping, North Rocks and Castle Hill are poor or non-existent. • Submitter raises issues with the study of peak hour road traffic due to being observed in a 60 minute period on 24 March 2022, being a school term and still being impacted by Covid-19. Suggests new periods covering 90 minutes in the morning (7:30am – 9:00am) and 120 minutes in the afternoon (4:30pm – 6:30pm). • Recommends constructing an elevated pedestrian bridge crossing over Pennant Hills Road at the junction of Pennant Hills Road, Evans Road and Lloyds Avenue in addition to the traffic signalisation of the intersection. • Raises concern with O.02 and C.02 from Section 3.1 in the draft DCP regarding Shirley Street and that it needs widening and no parking on one side of the street from Post Office Street and Lloyds Avenue. • Raises concern with Post Office Street not being wide enough to support on street parking on both sides of the street and that one side should be prohibited from on street parking. • Recommends constructing traffic lights at Moseley Street and Pennant Hills Road to offset travel from Post Office Street on to Pennant Hills Road/Cumberland Highway. • Recommends a blanket 40km/h speed limit within the area bounded by Moseley Street, Jenkins Road and Pennant Hills Road as the current speed limit is not appropriate for the existing and future density. • Submitter requests a review of the 'long-term road congestion' that is discussed in Appendix 6 to the Planning Proposal – Transport Impact Assessment. 	<p>Parking (General, Local Traffic Impact & Vehicular/Pedestrian Safety)</p> <p>Refer to Theme 3: Built Form and Design</p> <p>Refer to Theme 11: Connections with the eastern side of Carlingford</p>

Appendix A2 – Submissions Summaries from Residents, Individuals and Landowners – Neither Support nor Not Support

Submission Summary Table – APPENDIX A2 – Residents, Individuals and landowners who neither support nor not support

This document summarises and provides a response to the **12** submissions received from **residents, individuals and landowners** in response to the exhibition of the Planning Proposal, draft Development Control Plan, and draft Planning Agreement for 263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford. Each submission has been allocated a unique submission number. **Appendix A2** is to be read in conjunction with **Section 4.4** of the Community Engagement Report. The response to each submission is linked to the themes outlined and responded to in **Section 4.4** of the Community Engagement Report.

To ensure the privacy of submitters, names and street numbers have been withheld.

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
7	D09379876	Maier Close, Beecroft	<p>Neither support nor not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter raises concerns that the roads are heavily congested and that the high-rise buildings do not receive solar access. • Considers that more cars will be stationed there, overloading Pennant Hills Road and the surrounding area. • Considers that there needs to be more space amongst the buildings, with gardens interspersed. 	<p>Refer to Theme 3: Traffic, Parking and Transport</p> <p>Refer to Theme 5: Solar Access</p> <p>Refer to Theme 6: Design</p>
40	D09386339	Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford	<p>Neither support nor support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter states that the proposed development seems very big, and it is difficult to envisage the positive effects on the area. • Raises concerns regarding pedestrian safety when accessing bus stops on both sides of Pennant Hills Road outside the development as there is no means to cross Pennant Hills Road safely without walking to the Marsden Road intersection or to Lloyds Avenue, which also involves a dangerous crossing of Evans Road. • Suggests that the provision of an overhead footbridge across Pennant Hills Road between the two bus stops should be considered as part of the development proposal. 	<p>Refer to Theme 3: Traffic, Parking and Transport</p> <p>Refer to Theme 6: Design</p>
57	D09386718	Ryan Street, Dundas Valley	<p>Neither support nor not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers that the increase in units, and therefore number of residents, is quite high and some further guarantees should be put in place, for example, related to access to public transport, public education, and recreational facilities. • Considers that the development should include a pedestrian overpass over Pennant Hills Road to allow new residents to access parks and walks in Dundas Valley and likewise to allow residents on that side of Pennant Hills Road to access the new shopping and facilities created as part of the development. • Notes that currently there are only pedestrian crossings at Marsden Road and Coleman Avenue, and one should be implemented nearby to Evans Road. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Proposed Density and Height</p> <p>Refer to Theme 3: Traffic, Parking and Transport</p> <p>Refer to Theme 6: Design</p>
70	D09389952	Kent Street, Epping	<p>Neither support nor not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter identifies density, building height, and traffic as key concerns, stating that the roads in the local area are full, such as Carlingford Road and other intersections nearby, like Marsden Road. • States that, besides the Metro service to Parramatta, which is still a distance away from being 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Proposed Density and Height</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2:</p>

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>delivered, they cannot see any additional infrastructure that will assist with the amenity of the whole area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questions the lack of bike paths and social spaces for residents within the development. Notes that the unit development at the bottom of Carlingford Road have green space, but they are not accessible to residents. States that residential developments should include amenities for families to live and play. 	<p>Infrastructure Provision</p> <p>Refer Theme 3: Traffic, Parking and Transport</p> <p>Refer to Theme 4: Active Transport</p>
73	D09390742	Bettington Road, Oatlands	<p>Neither support nor not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter asks if any new traffic controls, such as traffic lights, other than the existing will be installed and if so, at which location(s). Asks where vehicle entry and exit points will be located. States that it is hard to see how this development will not detrimentally affect the flow of traffic on an already congested Pennant Hills Road. 	Refer to Theme 3: Traffic, Parking and Transport
79	D09393621, D09393646	Lloyds Avenue, Carlingford	<p>Neither support nor not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter cannot see how Pennant Hills Road and Shirley Street, in its current state, can support the new development. Considers that Shirley Street should undergo major upgrades as it currently barely facilitates more than one lane and the road is in poor condition. Considers the junction at Shirley Street and Evans Road crossing Pennant Hills Road to be already very congested. Submitter considers adding more intersections for cars to enter and exist the complex would likely lead to more accidents occurring. The submitter states that the area is dangerous due to the constant varying speeds from cars and buses and cars from Shirley Street turning on to Evans Road. Proposes a way to mitigate this issue, by extending Marsden Road to join with Shirley Street, creating an intersection in that area. Suggests that, with an effective traffic light system, this would allow new residents to bypass Pennant Hills Road if they wish to enter Marsden Road, and also bypass the 'dangerous' portion of Pennant Hills Road if they wish to travel north towards Pennant Hills. Suggests this will support commuters wanting to enter Carlingford Road as it would allow cars from Shirley Street to turn left and safely enter the right turning lane that turns onto Carlingford Road. Notes that currently, many commuters are performing a very dangerous manoeuvre by turning left from Post Office Street onto Pennant Hills Road, merging across all four lanes, and then cutting into the traffic waiting to turn right. Submitter considers that with more people using Shirley Street, the incident rate of accidents will worsen noting that previously, accidents have resulted from cars attempting to cross Pennant Hills Road from Shirley Street into Evans Road. Considers that the current signage on Shirley Street/Lloyds Avenue is very misleading as it says, "no right turn", so commuters are under the impression they are permitted to go straight. Strongly suggests changing the signage to say, "left turn only" and maybe even constructing a thin traffic island to assist with this. 	Refer to Theme 3: Traffic, Parking and Transport
92	D09394054	No address provided	Neither support nor not support:	Refer to Theme 3:

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter mostly supports the plan as it provides housing to people in an area with existing infrastructure, that is considered a desirable place to live. • The submitter considers that there appears to be a mismatch between the plans for the Central Park area and Parramatta's Draft Bike Plan. Notes that on the Bike Plan map the path through Central Park is marked as being a separated path for bikes, but the plans presented elsewhere show stair access only. • Considers that it is hard to judge the transport impact of the project just by giving the local intersections arbitrary ratings. Considers that if they could only afford to live in a house an hour away from their work, they would not be pleased to find out Council has blocked new housing closer to their workplace only because they would have to travel through one intersection rated 'F' if they moved there, and also pointed out that there are more modes of transport than just cars. • Considers that undertaking a VMT analysis like what is required in California would provide more relevant information to understand the transport impacts. 	Traffic, Parking and Transport Refer to Theme 4: Active Transport
112	D09413706	Lipsia Avenue, Carlingford	Neither support nor not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter queries where children will go to school and access medical services, noting that local schools are at capacity and many doctors are not accepting new patients. 	Refer to Theme 2: Infrastructure Provision
123	D09418658	Keeler Street, Carlingford	Neither support nor not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter states that traffic and transport impacts need to be appropriately managed during the construction and operation and post-completion of the development. • Notes the proposed traffic control signals at Evans Road is long overdue and requests the estimated duration of the construction period for the development. 	Refer to Theme 3: Traffic, Parking and Transport
124	D09418661	Brand Street, Carlingford	Neither support nor not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter supports the provision of community facilities and alignment with increased density. • Wants to ensure that funding for community facilities is not another example of "privatisation of public resources/utilities". • Requests Council to consider the impacts of the planning proposal on the viability of an extension of the Parramatta Light Rail from Carlingford to Epping to reduce the impacts on traffic and existing bus routes towards Epping. 	Refer to Theme 1: Proposed Density and Height Refer to Theme 2: Infrastructure Provision
126	D09419185	Post Office Street, Carlingford	Neither support nor not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter supports new developments in Carlingford as it can enhance the area, however shares concerns increased densities will increase existing congestion. • Raises issue of the existing limitation of parking spaces in Carlingford and how new apartments will induce more demand for parking. • Suggests increasing the number of shopping centres to distribute retail activity from Carlingford Court and to increase the number of parking spaces for the community centre from 20 to 30 or 40. 	Refer to Theme 3: Traffic, Parking and Transport Refer to Theme 6: Design
129	D09422410	No address provided	Neither support nor not support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter raises points for inclusion in the planning agreement. • Including a cycle path along Shirley Street for its length up to Pennant Hills Road as an extension to the Parramatta cycleway and linking it with cycle paths in Epping. 	Refer to Theme 2: Infrastructure Provision

263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford (RZ/5/2023)

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Submitter supports a new library.• Including a community dog park as part of the open space as the closest park is John Wearn Reserve in North Rocks.• Suggests consideration to work with TfNSW to move the bus stop along Pennant Hills Road to just before 283 Pennant Hills Road to accommodate future bus-only infrastructure (lane, lights and shelter).• Including underground electrical conduits for power cables to make development and installation more streamlined, improve greening strategies and removing overhead power lines.	<p>Refer to Theme 3: Traffic, Parking and Transport</p> <p>Refer to Theme 4: Active Transport</p>

Appendix A3 – Submission Summaries from Residents, Individuals and Landowners – Support

Submission Summary Table – APPENDIX A3 – Resident, Individuals and Landowners who support the changes

This document summarises and provides a response to the **11** submissions received from residents, individuals and landowners in response to the exhibition of the Planning Proposal, draft Development Control Plan, and draft Planning Agreement for 263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford. Each submission has been allocated a unique submission number. **Appendix A3** is to be read in conjunction with **Section 4.5** of the Community Engagement Report. The response to each submission is linked to the themes outlined and responded to in **Section 4.5** of the Community Engagement Report.

To ensure the privacy of submitters, names and street numbers have been withheld.

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
17	D09379966	Bebghazi Road, Carlingford	Support: <i>Submitter did not provide additional comments.</i>	Submission of support is noted
22	D09380303	Ferntree Place, Epping	Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> States that the site is located a short walk from the upcoming light rail stop, providing connectivity to Parramatta and a short bus ride to Epping Station. Considers that the site is close to amenities such as schools, shopping centres and a library. Considers the location to be very suitable for high density development. 	Submission of support is noted Refer to Theme 1: Housing Supply and Density Refer to Theme 4: Good Location
26	D09381090	Marshall Road, Carlingford	Support: <i>Submitter did not provide additional comments.</i>	Submission of support is noted
41	D09386360	Blaxland Road, Eastwood	Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers it crucial for there to be some public transport modifications to support the existing and now increasing high density in the area. Considers that the light rail in its current form will be good, but insufficient and that it should be extended to Epping or with bus priority modifications along Carlingford Road. 	Submission of support is noted Refer to Theme 2: Suggestions for Public Transport
42	D09386372	Donald Street, Carlingford	Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers that the plans look appealing and welcomes the provision of community facilities as part of the proposed development. 	Submission of support is noted Refer to Theme 6: Development is appealing
43	D09386404	Kissing Point Road, Dundas	Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter believes densification is a key aspect to solving the housing shortage in Sydney. Considers there to be a stagnation in the building of homes in Hornsby, Hills and Parramatta areas for the past five years, which has been difficult to see while they have been saving for a home. Would like to see an increase in bus frequency and priority between Carlingford and Epping to provide a strong public transport link between the development site, the light 	Submission of support is noted Refer to Theme 1: Housing Supply and Density Refer to Theme 2:

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<p>rail, and train lines, which they consider would help to alleviate the traffic concerns that many hold regarding the Carlingford area.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests keeping driveways off Pennant Hills Road and improving the accessibility of backstreets to assist in addressing traffic concerns. • Implores the developer to ensure the additional units being added are used for the purpose of affordable housing, so that a diverse demography of the community can have the opportunity to enjoy a high quality of life. 	<p>Suggestions for Public Transport</p> <p>Refer to Theme 3: Suggestions to Improve Traffic and Transport Links</p> <p>Refer to Theme 8: Affordable Housing</p>
51	D09386507	Marsden Road, Carlingford	<p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers that, in the midst of the housing crisis, this proposal allows the creation of more apartments that are desperately needed as soon as reasonably possible. • Notes that it is becoming increasingly competitive to enter the property market and very expensive to live in a public transport accessible area. • Notes that, given the traffic congestion that already exists in the area, the intersections between Pennant Hills Road and Marsden Road and Pennant Hills Road and Carlingford Road are likely to worsen, and hence the need for an emphasis on walkability and improved access to public transport. • Considers that the light rail stop, while offering connections to Parramatta, will not be sufficient for anyone working in other business hubs or the CBD. Requests that bus routes, stops and service frequency be reviewed to minimise the need for using a car, in the hopes this will minimise the impact on traffic in the area, which is already a challenge for many local residents. • Considers that, based on the general plans, it appears many of these issues are already being addressed. 	<p>Submission of support is noted</p> <p>Refer to Theme 1: Housing Supply and Density</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Suggestions for Public Transport</p> <p>Refer to Theme 3: Suggestions to traffic and transport links</p>
74	D09393615	Cook Street, Telopea	<p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter considers that it appears to be a good use of the space to provide accommodation and services. • Notes in the proposal there is a black arrow passing through the development that appears to refer to an accessway but there is no clear statement about this. • Notes that the current bike path alongside the light rail track stops just past the station and transfers onto the street. Considers that this would seem to be an opportunity to extend that path up the hill to Carlingford, providing a direct link for many residents and encourage the use of active transport to access the facilities. Considers that if this opportunity could be used to link up the light rail path to Carlingford and the existing shared use path along Marsden Road, then it would increase the value of all these existing assets. • Considers the current shared path up Pennant Hills Road to be good, but notes it requires many road crossings to reach the top of the hill. Suggests this presents an opportunity to provide a more direct route that might be less steep. 	<p>Submission of support is noted</p> <p>Refer to Theme 7: Good Use of Space</p> <p>Refer to Theme 3: Suggestions to improve traffic and transport links</p>
81	D09393768	Murray Street,	Support:	Submission of support is

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
		Northmead	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter is supportive of more residential housing close to transport hubs and the inclusion of retail and community spaces. 	<p>noted</p> <p>Refer to Theme 1: Housing Supply and Density</p> <p>Refer to Theme 4: Good Location</p>
97	D09396245	Buckland Avenue, Carlingford	<p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter considers the proposal the best outcome for the space and the new State Government policies. Considers that the proposal gives something to the community and will be less money spent by Council fighting a legal battle. Submitter would like to see mature native trees planted and gardens that are regularly maintained, to support tree canopy cover over an extended area. Requests an extensively planned landscape considering aesthetic, environmental, and recreational issues. Requests adequate paved pedestrian footpaths, taking into account those living with disability, for all of Shirley Street and the Pennant Hills Road perimeter. Requests the use of solar panels for generating power. Requests adequate waste disposal and an area for tenants to leave unwanted items for regular collection by arrangement with Council, so prevent people dumping on the footpath. Requests a trolley bay for the inevitable stray shopping trolleys that will appear. Requests a bus shelter where residents will be taking bus services. Asks Council to look into issues arising from high-density living, including the above points. Submitter believes the development will go ahead regardless of any opposition and considers the initial proposal to be unacceptable. Suggests that Council accept the current proposal but ask for more, as outlined above, so that the area is a liveable space. 	<p>Submission of support is noted</p> <p>Refer to Theme 3: Suggestions to improve traffic and transport links</p> <p>Refer to Theme 5: Development should go ahead but requests improvements</p> <p>Refer to Theme 7: Good use of Space</p> <p>Refer to Theme 9: Government Policy</p>
125	D09418729, D09423254	Boundary Road, Pennant Hills / Carlingford Road, Epping	<p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitter states it is important to take this opportunity to work with the developer to improve and modernise the built environment for Carlingford. States that an up-to-date Local Community Planning document is required to support and guide the development of the Carlingford precinct. Submitter believes the proposal fails to consider the eastern side of Carlingford and the development needs to consider connections between the subject site and adjacent areas. Expresses that the decision not to use the Metro to connect the subject site and the eastern side of Carlingford is a failure of infrastructure planning. 	<p>Submission of support is noted</p> <p>Refer to Theme 1: Housing Supply and Density</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Suggestions for Public Transport</p> <p>Refer to Theme 3:</p>

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter states that the installation of traffic signals will contribute to increased foot traffic and road congestion due to frequent stopping at key intersections over Pennant Hills Road. • Recommends a pedestrian overpass to be installed over key intersections along Pennant Hills Road to connect both sides of Carlingford to prevent frequent intermittent stopping of traffic. • Suggests prioritising the upgrade of the Evans Road and Pennant Hills Road intersection before any major development occurs due to safety concerns. • Submitter questions why no affordable and social housing has been provided due to the scale of the development and does not agree that the provision of community facilities is enough to offset this. • Recommends dedicating 10% of the dwellings to affordable and social housing and possibly partnering with a community housing organisation. • Suggests opportunities for local artists to contribute to a public artwalk and gardens should be considered to improve amenity within the pathways to the light rail. 	<p>Suggestions to Improve Traffic and Transport</p> <p>Refer to Theme 5: Development should go ahead but requests improvements</p> <p>Refer to Theme 8: Affordable Housing</p> <p>Refer to Theme 10: Public Artwork</p>

Appendix B – Submission Summaries from Organisations, Businesses and Strata Committees

Submission Summary Table – APPENDIX B – Organisations, Businesses and Strata Committees

This document summarises and provides a response to the **3** submissions received from **Organisations, Businesses and Strata Committees** in response to the exhibition of the Planning Proposal, draft Development Control Plan, and draft Planning Agreement for 263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford. Each submission has been allocated a unique submission number. **Appendix B** is to be read in conjunction with **Section 5** of the Community Engagement Report. The response to each submission is linked to the themes outlined and responded to in **Section 5** of the Community Engagement Report.

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter & Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
117	D09414111	Strata Management Committee for 2-6 Shirley Street, Carlingford	<p>Neither support or not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter states the number of units and the FSR for the project has increased by 50% and that the largest tower will be 29 storeys high. • States that the scale of the new buildings will overshadow and impact their block of units which will negatively affect their solar access and the effectiveness of their solar panels. • Submitter requests the shade diagram for the development and if it impacts solar access to their site, requests further amendments to the proposal's height to ensure their current level of solar access. • Notes that Shirley Street is a 2 lane, 7m wide road and constructed relative to the context of single storey homes and unlimited kerbside parking is permitted on the western side of the southern end of the street. • Notes that Shirley Street is utilised by residents of other streets to join traffic on Pennant Hills Road to gain access to Marsden Road. • Submitter fears that at the completion of the development, another 5,000+ cars will be added to the traffic using the road, the capacity of the road will be inadequate, especially during school hours. • Submitter references a 2013 article from the Hills Shire Times the Independent Traffic Committee requested the Hills Shire Council to develop a strategy for Shirley Street, including the consideration of indented parking bays on both sides of the road, footpath paving, landscaping, street lighting, pedestrian safety issues and parking restrictions. The submitter also states that although the Baulkham Hills Shire Council was amalgamated into Parramatta, it does not negate the contents or authenticity of the article. • Questions whether Council has taken parking spaces into consideration and requests the number of parking spots that will be mandated as part of the development. • Raises concerns regarding Shirley Street being the only access point to the development and states that traffic will increase tenfold over the current usage. • In the submitter's opinion, there should be direct road ingress and egress between the development and Pennant Hills Road to redirect traffic from Shirley Street, and without it, major traffic problems will occur. • Submitter objects to additional retail being included in the proposal and states that Carlingford is already well serviced by two retail centres, Carlingford Court and Carlingford Village in addition to other surrounding retail stores. • Believes the area needs to be properly planned and controlled to make Carlingford a pleasant place to live in. 	<p>Refer to Theme 1: Proposed Scale and Density</p> <p>Refer to Theme 2: Height</p> <p>Refer to Theme 3: Traffic, Transport and Parking</p> <p>Refer to Theme 4: Proposed Retail Development</p> <p>Refer to Theme 5: Strategic Planning</p>

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter & Location	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
127	D09419733	Epping Civic Trust, Epping	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter raises the supporting transport plan and does not realistically address the traffic impacts borne from the planning proposal. • States that the incoming light rail will support south and west-bound travel but does not accommodate eastbound travel. • Submitter claims the frequently used 550 bus route (Carlingford to Macquarie Centre) requires more buses at peak times and will be unable to support any increase in density within the precinct. • Questions the traffic plan's expectation that there will only be a 1-2% increase in traffic on Carlingford Road. • Raises an issue with Shirley Road being the only vehicular access path which will then turn into a bottleneck. • Submitter states there will not be enough parking spaces to accommodate the proposed library, the supermarket and other retail shops which will limit patronage to only residents within the precinct. • States the primary and secondary school capacity being inadequate and unable to support increases in density in addition to significant loss of open playground space in schools due to the construction of demountables. 	<p>Refer to Theme 3: Traffic, Transport and Parking</p> <p>Refer to Theme 6: School Capacity</p>
128	D09422016	Vicinity Centres, Chadstone Victoria	<p>Not support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitter raises concerns with the increase in retail GFA from 2,000sqm to 2,600sqm due to inconsistencies with the objectives, strategic planning intent of the area and Ministerial Directions. • Requests the increase of 2,000sqm to 2,600sqm for retail GFA to be removed from the planning proposal. • Submitter suggests retail floor space should be contained within existing employment zones rather than being developed in addition to residential within residentially zones, additionally notes that the site is located within 400m walking distance of the E1 zone at the Light Rail stop which would be a more suitable location for retail floorspace. • Considers the allowable 2,000sqm of non-residential floor space to be adequate for the facilitation of the LEP objective under R4 High Density Residential "to enable land uses that provide facilities or services to meet the day to day needs of residents". • States retaining 2,000sqm of retail floorspace would provide for the implementation of 600sqm elsewhere closer to transport and services and that it better aligns with the City Central District Plan. • Submitter raises the progression of the planning proposal could set a precedent for retail centres encroaching on areas not suitable for retail functions and should be directed to E1 zones close to the site. • Submitter requests Council carefully consider the implications of the existing poor performance of the intersections within the precinct because of increased residential density. • Suggests the assessment of the planning proposal to reduce provision of car parking on site to redirect trips to the light rail, bus and heavy rail. 	<p>Refer to Theme 3: Traffic, Transport and Parking</p> <p>Refer to Theme 4: Proposed Retail Development</p>

Appendix C – Submission Summaries from Government Agencies

Submission Summary Table – APPENDIX C – Government Agencies

This document summarises and provides a response to the **2** submissions received from **Government Agencies** in response to the exhibition of the Planning Proposal, draft Site-Specific Development Control Plan, and draft Planning Agreement for 263-281 Pennant Hills Road, Carlingford. Each submission has been allocated a unique submission number. **Appendix C** is to be read in conjunction with **Section 6** of the Community Engagement Report.

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Name	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
118	D09414419	Transport for NSW (TfNSW)	<p>Neither Support or Not Support – Advisory Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> TfNSW supports implementation of traffic control signals at the Pennant Hills Road, Evans Road and Lloyds Avenue intersection for safe pedestrian movement. TfNSW has been liaising with Department of Housing for the traffic control signals to be credited against the HPC (Housing and Productivity Contribution) levies. TfNSW recommends that as part of any future Development Application (DA) for the site, the Applicant engages with TfNSW regarding the status of the proposed intersection works as some interim measures may need to be implemented by development to ensure pedestrian safety of future users of the development as part of the development's Travel Demand Management strategy. TfNSW agrees with the modelling provided and maximum car parking rate proposed as part of the development and finds it appropriate for the precinct as the resultant generation of new traffic is unlikely to have an impact on the surrounding classified network. No objection was raised regarding revised maximum parking rates. 	The Transport for NSW submission and correspondence regarding revised parking rates is noted.
132	D09503828	Schools Infrastructure	<p>Neither Support or Not Support - Advisory Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> SINSW notes the proposal does not meet the criteria (from the Local Environmental Plan Making Guideline 2023 – Attachment B) to be sent to School Infrastructure/Department of Education (DoE) for referral and comment. SINSW requests Council to monitor and consider the impacts of population growth on schools planning in the locality. The DoE does not have further comments on specific requirements in relation to the Planning Proposal. DoE requests that transport planning for the proposal be guided by the NSW Government's Movement and Place Framework (MAPF) and its related Built Environment Indicators. SINSW requests the MAPF 'Primary Schools' built environment indicator be used to consider the impact on adjacent places/uses and emphasizes movement that supports place. The metrics aid in assessing the effect of infrastructure on the accessibility of public schools in an area pertaining to walkability and public transport access. 	<p>It is noted the proposal does not meet the criteria (from the Local Environmental Planning Guideline 2021) for the proposal to be sent to the Department of Education for referral and comment as it will facilitate 197 additional dwellings above what the current planning controls allow which is less than the 250 additional dwellings which would trigger the requirement for a referral.</p> <p>The application of the Movement and Place Framework (MAPF) is acknowledged. The 'Primary Schools' indicator shows the development is within 800m walking distance Carlingford Public School and Gateway Community Highschool. Walkability to local</p>

Submission No.	CM No.	Submitter Name	Summary of Submission	Council Officer Response
				<p>public schools is noted in the Planning Proposal.</p> <p>Consideration of the MAPF will be done at the Development Application stage.</p> <p>A site-specific DCP and existing controls in the Parramatta DCP 2023 will support the subject development and its proposed density.</p>