

Community Engagement Report

Harmonisation Supplementary Matters and Housekeeping
Proposal
May 2026

CONTENTS

- 1. Introduction.....1
- 2. Community Engagement2
- 3. Feedback from the Exhibition Period.....4
- 4. Submissions from Residents, Landowners and Individuals.....5
- 5. Submissions from Organisations and Businesses..... 15
- 6. Submissions from Government Agencies 16
- 7. Conclusion 18
- Appendix A1 – Submission Summary Table – Residents, Individuals and Landowners who support..... 19
- Appendix A2 – Submission Summary Table – Residents, Individuals and Landowners who neither support nor not support26
- Appendix A3 – Submission Summary Table – Residents, Individuals and Landowners who support, to an extent..... 27
- Appendix A4 – Submission Summary Table – Residents, Individuals and Landowners that do not support29

Document control:

No.	Author	Version
1.	City of Parramatta Council	May 2026 – Post-exhibition Report to Council

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 **draft Harmonisation Supplementary Matters and Housekeeping Planning Proposal (draft Planning Proposal)**.

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 draft Planning Proposal. This report attachment should be read in conjunction with the relevant Council report.

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 government 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 draft Planning Proposal formally commenced on Monday 2 March 2026 and concluded on Wednesday 15 April 2026.

The proposal was exhibited for 30 business days in accordance with the Gateway Determination.

2.4. Engagement mechanism

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:

2.4.1. Notification emails

The following public authorities were contacted in accordance with the [Gateway determination](#):

- Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water
- Heritage NSW
- Transport for NSW

Landowners impacted by the Planning Proposal, as well as businesses that asked to be informed, were also notified.

2.4.2. Notification letters

At the commencement of the exhibition period, 8,620 letters were sent to nearby landowners and occupiers to notify them of the public exhibition of the proposal. The letter contained a QR code redirecting landowners to the project page resulting in a total of 1,922 scans.

2.4.3. Webpages

Participate Parramatta website:

The draft Planning Proposal was placed on the Participate Parramatta website for the duration of the

exhibition period. This website informed the public about the purpose of the exhibition, where to view exhibition material, and outlined how to provide feedback.

The project page on Participate Parramatta garnered repeated interest from the community. During the consultation period, the page was viewed 7,528 times by 3,327 unique visitors. The public exhibition documents were also downloaded 117 times.

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) were provided on Council's Participate Parramatta webpage, providing answers to commonly asked questions relating to the 'who, what, where' of the planning proposal.

A link to Participate Parramatta is provided here:

[City of Parramatta Council | Draft Parramatta Harmonisation Supplementary Matters and Housekeeping Planning Proposal](#)

City of Parramatta Website

The draft Planning Proposal was also advertised on the City of Parramatta website at the beginning of the public exhibition period and was viewed a total of 158 times by 107 visitors with 1 click to the Participate Parramatta project page.

A link to the City of Parramatta website is provided here:

[Harmonisation Supplementary Matters and Housekeeping Planning Proposal | City of Parramatta](#)

Social media

The project was promoted on Council's social media platforms which received an average engagement rate of 3.56%.

City of Parramatta's social media pages accounted for a reach of 13,089 unique users, 466 engagements and 30 link clicks.

Across six posts, 93 reactions, 4 comments and 7 shares were received.

2.4.4. Digital newsletters

Stakeholders who are signed up to the following City of Parramatta's digital newsletters were notified via email:

- Participate Parramatta Newsletter – 11 March 2026
 - The newsletter had a reach of approximately 20.8k, a 46% open rate and 33 engagements with the post.
- Participate Parramatta Newsletter – 24 March 2026
 - The newsletter had a reach of approximately 20.8k, a 48% open rate and 20 engagements with the post.

2.4.5. Hard copy documentation

Hard copies of the draft Planning Proposal and supporting information were made available at Council's Customer Contact Centre at PHIVE – 5 Parramatta Square, Parramatta and Carlingford Library – 17 Lloyds Avenue, Carlingford.

3. Feedback from the Exhibition Period

3.1. Overview of formal feedback received

Formal feedback on the exhibition of the draft Planning Proposal is consistent with the community participation requirements established by the *EP&A Act 1979* and resulted in a total of **136 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:** 130 submissions,
- **Organisations and Businesses:** 1 submission,
- **Government Agencies:** 5 submissions.

The feedback received from the community during the formal exhibition period is discussed in the sections below. For a detailed summary of each individual submission in each category along with the corresponding Council officer response, refer to the **Appendices A1, A2, A3 and A4** of this report.

4. Submissions from Residents, Landowners and Individuals

4.1. High level overview of submissions

A total of 130 submissions were received from the residents, landowners and individuals. This total does not include multiple submissions made by the same person which are counted as one submission.

The table below categorises the submissions' overall view on the draft Planning Proposal.

Category	Number of submitters
Submissions – Did not support	18 (14%)
Submissions – Neither support nor not support	8 (6%)
Submissions – Support, to an extent	11 (8%)
Submissions – Support	93 (72%)
TOTAL	130 (100%)

The following information provides general submitter information:

- a. All submissions are considered regardless of location.
- b. Of the 130 submissions, the majority were from residents of Carlingford (73) and North Rocks (32), with the remainder from Oatlands (7), Northmead (6), Epping (3), and one each from Lilyfield, North Parramatta, Rydalmere and West Hoxton; 5 submissions did not provide a location.

4.2. Item 28 – Removal of clause 6.19 Subdivisions for dual occupancies prohibited on certain land

A total of **73 submissions** were received in relation to **Item 28** of the draft Planning Proposal regarding the removal of *clause 6.19 Subdivisions for dual occupancies prohibited on certain land* from the *Parramatta Local Environmental Plan 2023 (PLEP 2023)*. The table below categorises the submissions' overall view for Item 28.

Category	Number of submitters
Submissions – Did not support	17 (23%)
Submissions – Neither support nor not support	3 (4%)
Submissions – Support, to an extent	9 (12%)
Submissions – Support	44 (60%)
TOTAL	73 (100%)

4.2.1. Submissions in Support of item 28 – the removal of Clause 6.19 from PLEP 2023

Council received **44 submissions** (60%) in support of the removal of clause 6.19 from PLEP 2023. A detailed summary of each submission is provided at **Appendix A1**. A summary of comments provided in support for **Item 28** is provided below:

- Properties in the area can accommodate dual occupancies, making more efficient use of land and better utilisation of existing infrastructure.
- It will increase housing supply and make housing and dwellings that can accommodate families more affordable.
- The amendment reflects a shift to prioritising housing density.
- It is a positive step toward sustainable housing growth and provide more flexibility.
- Provides fair and consistent controls across the Parramatta LGA and aligns to the NSW Government Low and Mid-Rise Housing Policy.
- Carlingford is located near amenities such as shopping centres and schools and is close to major infrastructure including the Oakes Road bus interchange.
- It is important for Council to invest in infrastructure to support increase in density, especially due to the developments in North Rocks and Muirfield Golf Course.
- In established suburbs such as Carlingford, enabling well designed dual occupancies supports urban renewal and increased density while maintaining existing character of residential areas.

Council officer response:

- Submissions in support of the proposal have been noted.
- Infrastructure is addressed in Theme 3 Infrastructure Capacity.

Some submissions in support of clause 6.19 also requested further information. The points raised and the Council officer responses are below:

Submission	Council officer response
• Will a covenant that states there can be no more than one main building on site be voided by the removal of Clause 6.19.	• Whilst clause 1.9A Suspension of covenants, agreements and instruments of PLEP 2023 allows Council to suspend the operation of restrictive covenants, this Clause does not

Submission	Council officer response
	apply to certain circumstances. Given the circumstances of this particular case are unknown it is not possible to respond accurately, residents should seek Council development advisory staff advice in the first instance.
- There is strong demand for transport infrastructure in Carlingford due to excessive number of cars parking on the street. - Strong demand for Oakes Road M2 bus stop linking to both Carlingford Station and Cherrybrook Metro Station.	- Dual Occupancy development is already permitted in the precinct where subdivision is currently prohibited so technically there is no increase in permitted density of development. - It is acknowledged that allowing subdivision may increase the rate at which Dual occupancy is developed and bring this additional density forward. - The provision and improvements to public transport are out of scope for this draft Planning Proposal and is managed by Transport for NSW. The area is primarily serviced by buses and the level of service provided is determined via contracts between the Service Operators and TfNSW which are reviewed periodically. Future reviews of the Bus Contract that applies to the area will determine whether services should be increased as development of dual occupancies increases.

4.2.2. Submissions not in support of Item 28 – the removal of clause 6.19 from PLEP 2023

Council received **29 submissions** (40%) that either did not support, were unsure or supported to an extent the removal of clause 6.19 from PLEP 2023. Of the 29 submissions, 5 themes were identified and are provided in the table below. This total does not include multiple submissions made by the same person which are counted as one submission.

The main issues raised by submitters for each theme are summarised and a Council officer response is provided for each issue. A detailed summary of each submission is provided at **Appendix A2, A3 and A4**. 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.	Theme	Submissions	
		Number	Percentage (rounded)
1	Density increase	12	41%
2	Traffic, congestion, parking impacts and transport infrastructure	14	48%
3	Infrastructure capacity (other than transport infrastructure)	12	41%
4	Neighbourhood character	13	45%
5	Clarifications	8	28%

Theme 1: Density increase

Issues raised:

- Removing Clause 6.19 risks enabling dual occupancy where previously identified as unsuitable.
- Additional housing should be in areas already zoned for higher density housing and with access to major public transport options better suited to support additional population.
- There is sufficient redevelopment occurring already and impacts of the redevelopment of the RIDBC are yet to be felt.
- There are already existing and new high density residential developments on main roads such as Jenkins Road and Pennant Hills Road.
- Clause 6.19 should have been removed earlier to prevent proliferation of high rises in Carlingford.
- Council is seeking increased revenue with no resolution to existing problems associated with a lack of green space, cramped housing and traffic congestion and a lack of schools.
- Suggests Council should focus on liveability rather than increasing population density.
- Home ownership of a large piece of land is hard to achieve as housing becomes denser.
- Removing Clause 6.19 addresses housing shortages by offering affordable and diverse options for families, first-home buyers and young people.
- The proposal maintains responsible planning and utilises existing residential land more efficiently.

Council officer response:

- Clause 6.19 is an anomaly inherited from the former Hills Council. Its removal only seeks to permit the subdivision of dual occupancies where they are already permissible subject to consent.
- Whilst the removal of this clause may encourage dual occupancies development, there is no increase in maximum density controls proposed.
- Potential dual occupancy developments will provide an alternative to residential flat buildings.
- It is appropriate to remove clause 6.19 as part of this Planning Proposal to ensure consistency with the remainder of the LGA, where both dual occupancies and the subdivision of dual occupancies are permitted in residential zones, including in Carlingford and North Rocks where dual occupancy with subdivision is now permitted following the introduction of the State Government Low and Mid-Rise (LMR) Housing Policy aimed at increasing dwelling diversity.
- Removing clause 6.19 is aimed at ensuring an equitable and consistent approach to dual occupancy subdivision across the LGA. It is not related to revenue increase.
- Impacts on local infrastructure is addressed in Theme 4.
- Impacts on liveability and neighbourhood character is addressed in Theme 3.
- The submissions that support the proposal to an extent are noted.

Theme 2: Traffic, congestion, parking impacts and transport infrastructure

Issues raised:

- Local roads are not designed to accommodate additional density.
- North Rocks was not designed to support higher density living, increased parking demand or the additional pressure on essential services.
- Parking at North Rocks Shopping Centre cannot support additional households.
- Housing growth is a priority over infrastructure needs such as roads and parking.
- Additional dwellings will lead to more vehicles, worsen traffic congestion and parking, particularly on North Rocks Road, Pennant Hills Road and Church Street, reduce service levels and result in safety concerns.

- Potential traffic and parking issues around Snowdon Avenue and Carlingford West Public School, especially during pick up and drop off times. A traffic, parking and infrastructure assessment should be undertaken before clause 6.19 removal.
- North Rocks does not have alternative routes to the M2 Motorway, Pennant Hills Road and North Rocks Road/Barclay Road that are capable of absorbing additional traffic.
- Removing clause 6.19 will exacerbate current North Rocks Road upgrades.
- Additional dual occupancies will place pressure on local street infrastructure as the number of vehicles competing for parking may restrict access for residents, visitors, emergency services and waste collection vehicles.
- North Rocks faces extreme daily congestion due to the suburb's proximity to the M2's north, west and city access ramps, Pennant Hills Road connection to Parramatta, Blacktown and the Hills district.
- Will subdivisions consider off street parking.
- Residents use private vehicles rather than public transport due to limited availability, effectiveness and coverage.
- Insufficient public transport will lead to higher car dependency unless bus services (Route 549) are expanded in frequency and operating hours.
- Additional commuter parking is required at Barclay Road and Aiken Road M2 bus stops to support increased demand.
- Parramatta Light Rail should travel from Carlingford to Parramatta along North Rocks Road.

Council officer comments:

- Impacts related to density are addressed in Theme 1.
- Impacts on local infrastructure are addressed in Theme 3.
- The removal of Clause 6.19 may encourage dual occupancy development; however subdivision will not occur on all properties, and any additional traffic generation will be widely distributed. A traffic, parking or infrastructure assessment is not required to remove clause 6.19. As outlined, parking controls for dual occupancy subdivisions are regulated by PLEP 2023 or the State Environmental Planning Policy Exempt and Complying Development 2008 (Codes SEPP).
- It is considered that the local road network can accommodate the potential increase in traffic generation.
- Future development applications or complying developments would be subject to the requirements of PDCP 2023 or the Codes SEPP regarding vehicular access, turning areas, sightlines, road setbacks which address vehicular safety.
- In the case of a DA, parking impacts are addressed in accordance with Part 6 of the PDCP 2023 where dual occupancies require at least one parking space on site per dwelling. In the case of a Complying Development, the Codes SEPP requires at least one off-street parking space for each dwelling.
- Future applications for dual occupancy development would be subject to the Parramatta Outside of CBD Contributions Plan which provides for local traffic and transport works.
- As discussed above, the provision and improvements to public transport are out of scope for this draft Planning Proposal and is managed by Transport for NSW. The area is primarily serviced by buses and the level of service provided is determined via contracts between the Service Operators and TfNSW which are reviewed periodically. Future reviews of the Bus Contract that applies to the area will determine whether services should be increased as development of dual occupancies increases.
- Various modes of public transport are available in the subject areas. Transport for NSW raised no concerns in relation to the proposed amendment.
- The provision of additional commuter car parking is managed by Transport for NSW; furthermore, the potential increase in parking demand is not considered to be significant.
- There are currently no proposed changes or upgrades to the existing Parramatta Light Rail route.

Theme 3: Infrastructure capacity (other than transport infrastructure)

Issues raised:

- The needs of existing residents and planning for growth are not balanced.
- Infrastructure upgrades are required to support the removal of clause 6.19.
- There is limited green space and open area for families in the LGA.
- Housing growth is a priority over infrastructure needs such as drainage, schools and community facilities and utilities.
- North Rocks Shopping Centre cannot support additional households.
- There are no proposed improvements to the provision of schools, daycares and other community facilities to cater for the potential growth.
- The proposal does not account for cumulative impacts on existing infrastructure of surrounding developments such as Carlingford, North Parramatta and potentially the former Royal Institute for Deaf and Blind Children (RIDBC) site.
- Clause 6.19 ensures development is consistent with the local infrastructure provision.
- Gradual erosion of planning controls can increase infrastructure demand overtime.
- Lack of continuous footpaths is a safety issue for residents and school children who need to share road space with vehicles.
- Potential dual occupancy developments in Linley Close may worsen stormwater impacts given low-lying properties, reliance on soakage pits, lack of stormwater easements and increased site coverage.

Council officer response:

- Impacts related to density are addressed in Theme 1.
- Infrastructure requirements for future dual occupancy subdivision will be subject to the City of Parramatta (Outside CBD) Development Contribution Plan 2021. The potential for dual occupancy subdivision will also be considered in the review of this plan, which contributes to the provision of local infrastructure (including open space, community facilities, traffic and transport works) to support any increase in density.
- Additional dual occupancy developments are expected to occur progressively, helping to ensure utility demand can be managed without any immediate increase.
- The provision of private infrastructure including retail facilities is beyond the scope of the Planning Proposal, however Council's strategic planning frameworks including zoning and development controls address and respond to market demand for private infrastructure.
- The NSW Government is responsible for the provision of State infrastructure and services including schools and Classified roads.
- The removal of clause 6.19 seeks to standardise the approach to dual occupancy subdivision across the LGA following the introduction of the State Government's LMR Policy. See Theme 1 for a detailed response.
- Future applications for dual occupancy development and development on the former RIDBC site would be subject to the Parramatta Outside of CBD Contributions Plan. Future development on the former RIDBC site will also be subject to a Planning Agreement for additional infrastructure if the rezoning is approved by the State Government.
- Pedestrian infrastructure is addressed through Council's capital works programs.
- All DAs and complying developments (including those on Linley Close) must comply with Council's *Development Engineering Design Guidelines* which set out stormwater management requirements for the LGA.

Theme 4: Neighbourhood character

Issues raised:

- The removal of clause 6.19 would result in development that is no longer consistent with the established character of the area and will diminish residents' quality of life.
- The Kingsdene area should remain as it is, being one occupancy per lot.
- Additional housing and site clearing will increase risks to the environment, catchment pollution, stormwater absorption, plant and animal habitats and may contribute to localised flooding during heavy rainfall.
- The gradual erosion of planning controls can lead to the loss of larger family homes.
- North Rocks is not a designated growth precinct, rather an environmentally sensitive, low-density suburb that provides green relief in the Parramatta LGA.
- Dual occupancies can dominate and overshadow neighbouring single dwellings.
- Recent redevelopments feature single dwellings that enhance the neighbourhood's look and value. Subdividing dual occupancies would significantly alter the established character.
- There should be minimum standards for green space to prevent consequences of increased dual occupancies in North Rocks.

Council officer response:

- Impacts resulting from an increase in density are addressed in Theme 1.
- Dual occupancies are already permitted in the Kingsdene area.
- Development applications for dual occupancy subdivision would be subject to applicable controls in the PDCP 2023 which seek to minimise the impact on neighbourhood character, the streetscape, overshadowing and the natural environment including Part 2: Design in Context, Part 3: Residential Development and Part 5: Environmental Management.
- Requirements for stormwater management is addressed in Theme 3.
- PDCP 2023 Part 3 contains controls regarding minimum landscaping standards.
- PDCP 2023 deep soil controls and the Codes SEPP maximum gross floor area controls assist in minimising hard surfaces.
- Complying development applications must meet the Codes SEPP standards for setbacks, landscaping, floor area, and boundary wall length to help preserve neighbourhood character and minimise environmental impacts.
- The removal of clause 6.19 seeks to standardise the approach to dual occupancy subdivision across the LGA following the introduction of the State Government LMR Policy. See Theme 1 for a detailed response.

Theme 5: Clarifications

Issue raised	Council officer response
• Submitter considers the removal of clause 6.19 acceptable if subdivision of dual occupancies complies with relevant provisions such as zoning, minimum lot size, frontage, access, parking and infrastructure standards to support appropriate land use.	• Development applications and complying developments are required to comply with PLEP 2023 and Codes SEPP development standards accordingly. However Clause 6.19 would need to be removed so that subdivision of dual occupancies would be permissible subject to development consent.

Issue raised	Council officer response
- Dual occupancy development should be subject to review and assessment by the public. - Submitter expects Yarralumla Drive residents be notified and able to comment before development approvals. - Submitter does not agree with the removal of clause 6.19 to allow land to be subdivided without consent from surrounding property owners.	- Notification of development applications are required in line with Council's Community Engagement Strategy. Complying Developments are also subject to mandatory notification requirements. - Neighbouring properties are notified as detailed in the point above, and can provide comment to development applications.
The notification letter explaining the removal of clause 6.19 was difficult to comprehend.	- Noted, the removal of clause 6.19 is a complex issue. - The notification letter issued at the commencement of the exhibition period included links to the project page which contained the project background, timeline, documents and answers to common questions in the FAQs. - Council officer contact details have been provided on the project page to assist with all queries and clarifications related to the Planning Proposal.
Submitters do not consider the removal of clause 6.19 a housekeeping or minor amendment.	The removal of Clause 6.19 is considered a 'housekeeping' amendment as it seeks to ensure a consistent approach to dual occupancy subdivision across the LGA in line with recent Government changes and to reduce regulatory complexity.
Clause 6.11 Dual occupancies prohibited on certain land should also be removed from PLEP 2023 for consistency as dual occupancies are permitted under the Housing SEPP.	It is not proposed to remove Clause 6.11 of PLEP2023 as it aligns with Council's existing policy position regarding dual occupancy development and ensures this position is maintained should the LMR policy be amended or repealed.

4.3. Other items or no comments provided

The remainder of the **57 submissions** were in relation to other items in the draft Planning Proposal, sought clarifications on the Planning Proposal or did not provide comment. The table below categorises the submissions' overall view.

Category	Raised other items or sought clarifications	No comments provided
Submissions – Did not support	0	1

Category	Raised other items or sought clarifications	No comments provided
Submissions – Neither support nor not support	3	2
Submissions – Support, to an extent	1*	2
Submissions – Support	3	46
TOTAL	7	51

*In addition to Item 28 (removal of clause 6.19), this submission also raised concerns in relation to other items in the draft Planning Proposal.

Council officers received **7 submissions** in relation to clarifications and other items in the draft Planning Proposal. The main issues raised by submitters for each submission are summarised, with a Council officer response provided. A detailed summary of each submission is provided at **Appendix A1, A2, A3 and A4**. 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.

Other items	
Issue raised	Council officer response
<i>Item 4 – Amend the Heritage Schedule and Map – remove Heritage Item 1169 at 3 A'Beckett Street, Granville</i> - Removal of the heritage item sets a precedent that unapproved demolition of heritage items results in unencumbered land. - Suggest a restriction should remain on the use of the land as though the heritage item was not demolished. - A fine is not enough of a disincentive, as the owner should be aware of the heritage item on their land.	- In 2012, this heritage item was demolished without Council approval and a fine was issued. - The heritage listing framework is intended to apply to buildings and places that physically exist and retain heritage significance. In this case, as the heritage item no longer exists its heritage significance cannot be conserved or managed through planning controls. - Retaining the site on the heritage schedule would not achieve the intended purpose of heritage protection under the planning framework. - Deterrence and punishment for unlawful works are matters addressed through the provisions of the Heritage Act 1977. The purpose of heritage listing is to enable the conservation of heritage items, not to operate as a punitive measure once demolition has occurred.
<i>Removed item – Places of Public Worship</i> - Clarification is sought for the Department's reasoning for not supporting Places of Public Worship (PoPW) as an Additional Permitted Use (APU) in R2 Low Density Residential zones. - Questions how Council will support existing PoPW in R2 zones and whether Council will develop a policy to ensure existing PoPW can respond to community needs.	DPHI requested Council undertake further study in relation to this item raising concerns about incompatibility with the R2 zone's intended low density character. DPHI recommended that allowing Places of Public Worship in the R2 Zone should be addressed through site specific planning proposals which could be assessed on their individual merits.

	• Council has removed this item from the Planning Proposal so as not to delay the subject Planning Proposal. • Existing Places of Public Worship in the R2 zone can operate under their current approvals and existing use rights.
<i>Item 30 to item 70 – Public reserves to be rezoned</i> • Supportive of these items as they ensure recreational uses are embedded into the LEP.	• Noted.

Clarifications	
Issue raised	Council officer response
• Consider removing heritage item I119 at 48 Oxford Street, Epping as Council has approved DA/485/2016/B for demolition.	• Noted and to be considered as part of a future housekeeping planning proposal.
• The Planning Proposal is poorly worded and inaccessible and suggests it should be reworded and presented again.	• The notification letter included links to the project page which contained the project background, timeline, documents and answers to common questions in the FAQs. • Council officer contact details have been provided on the project page to assist with all queries and clarifications related to the Planning Proposal. • Landowners were also provided with the opportunity to book 'phone a planner' sessions with Council officers.
• The proposal is long overdue and a good approach to reducing complexity.	• Noted.
• Questions how to live in the Oatlands neighbourhood and what homes are available.	• Not applicable.

5. Submissions from Organisations and Businesses

5.1. Summary of submissions

A submission was received from a planning consultant on behalf of a landowner. A summary of their submission and a Council officer response is provided below.

Think Planners on behalf of Sekisui House Australia (SHA)

Comments:

- SHA are developing a significant portion of the Melrose Park North precinct and request for the inclusion of a housekeeping amendment.
- Request PLEP 2023 Floor Space Ratio (FSR) map for the Melrose North Precinct is amended to address an anomaly between LEP and DCP controls to align with the approved masterplan for the site.
- The current FSR applies a blanket FSR across the SHA landholding which is inconsistent with the approved masterplan and GFA allocations in the DCP which results in reliance on clause 4.6 variations and inefficient planning administration.

Council officer response:

- The requested amendment to the Planning Proposal can not be supported. It is not possible to include a matter of this nature in a Planning Proposal post exhibition.
- An amendment to the FSR map is beyond the scope of a housekeeping amendment and requires separate investigation by Council officers in consultation with the landowner. The applicant could lodge a Planning Proposal to progress the amendment requested or it can be resolved in a future housekeeping amendment.

6. Submissions from Government Agencies

6.1. Consultation

The following Government agencies were consulted for the draft Planning Proposal:

- Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW)
- Heritage NSW
- Crown Lands NSW
- Transport for NSW
- Sydney Water

6.2. High level summary of submissions

A total of 5 submissions were received. A summary of their submissions and a Council officer response is provided below.

DCCEEW – Heritage NSW

Comments:

- Raised no objection.
- No identified impacts on Aboriginal cultural heritage.
- No identified impacts on State Heritage Register items or historical archaeology.
- Heritage NSW acknowledges proposed heritage amendments are either administrative in nature or provide greater accuracy to Council's local heritage items.

Council officer response:

- Noted.

Crown Lands NSW

Comments:

- The Department has no objections to the proposed amendments and request the following points be considered:
 - Any changes affecting Crown Land within the LGA must be consistent with the Community and Crown Land Plan of Management 2023.
 - Should any amendments part of this proposal result in new subdivision or development where Crown Public road(s) (formed or unformed) will be required to provide access,

Council must accept transfer of control of such roads before approving any such proposal.

- Native Title has not been investigated over any Crown land that may be included within the proposal footprint and until such time as Native Title is determined, restrictions of the use of the land may apply under the Native Title Act 1993.
- Any Crown land included in this proposal may be subject to Aboriginal Land Claim that may affect how the land can be used.

Council officer response:

Proposed amendments are consistent.

Sydney Water

Comments:

- Support the rezonings of Sydney Water owned land in item 15 and item 16.

Council officer response:

- Noted.

DCCEEW – Conservation Programs, Heritage and Regulation Group (CPHR)

Comments:

- CPHR support all the biodiversity related changes in the draft Planning Proposal.
- Recommend Council contact its Biodiversity Values Map team to ensure consistency of item one (87-129 Pennant Hills Road, Parramatta) with its Biodiversity Values Map.

Council officer response:

- Noted. Biodiversity Map Team advice confirmed that the proposed amendment is consistent with the application of the Biodiversity Values Map).

Transport for NSW

Comments:

- Transport for NSW provided ownership and project details related to certain affected lots and raised no objections to the exhibited amendments.

Council officer response:

- Noted.

7. Conclusion

The Participate Parramatta and City of Parramatta websites will be regularly updated to inform the public of reporting processes and next steps of the draft Planning Proposal. 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 – Submission Summary Table – Residents, Individuals and Landowners who support

This Appendix summarises and provides a response to the submissions that support the draft Harmonisation Supplementary Matters and Housekeeping Planning Proposal where a comment was made.

Of the 93 submissions indicating support, 46 did not provide any comment or reason for their support, and all of these submissions are from addresses within the areas affected by Clause 6.19. These submissions are not included in the submission summary table below, however their support for the Planning Proposal is included in the total count.

These submissions were received from **residents, individuals and landowners** during public exhibition. The responses provided in **Appendix A1** should be read in conjunction with **Section 4.2 and 4.3** of the Community Engagement Report.

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

Submission No.	Submitter location	Submission summary	Council officer response
4	Oakes Road, Carlingford	Submitter is supportive of the Planning Proposal.	Noted.
8	Murray Farm Road, Carlingford	Submitter believes the removal of Clause 6.19 allows for more equitable land use and better housing flexibility in Carlingford.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
20	Lamb Street, Lilyfield	- Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19 as there is nothing that warrants the affected area being subject to dual occupancy rules that differ from the rest of the LGA. - As most blocks in the area can comfortably accommodate dual occupancies, it will help make dwellings that can accommodate families more affordable. - Submitter grew up in a former housing commission house in Oatlands and notes that people could get on the property ladder. - Submitter suggests current planning restrictions has limited development to large dwellings on large blocks of land making it unaffordable for working class and/or essential workers. - Submitter states Parramatta needs more options for affordable housing that are not just high-rise apartments.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
22	Iona Avenue, North Rocks	Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19.	Noted.
24	Montefiore Avenue, West Hoxton	Submitter supports the proposal and considers it a good approach to reducing complexity.	Noted.
25	Williams Road, North Rocks	Submitter supports the proposal and considers it a good approach to making controls more consistent across the LGA and not to hold on to former controls and regulations from previous Council areas.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
29	Parkland Road, Carlingford	Submitter agrees with the proposal and notes the State government is pursuing more housing.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
35	Farnell Avenue, Carlingford	Submitter supports the proposal and notes that it is long overdue.	Refer to Clarifications in Section 4.3 of the Community Engagement Report.

Submission No.	Submitter location	Submission summary	Council officer response
39	Lanceley Avenue, Carlingford	Submitter supports the proposal and notes that it enables development on underutilised land.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
41	Thornton Avenue, Carlingford	Submitter supports the proposal as Carlingford is located close to major infrastructure.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
47	Lochinvar Parade, Carlingford	Submitter welcomes the removal of Clause 6.19 and expressed concern with not being able to subdivide despite being able to construct dual occupancies.	Noted.
48	Bettington Road, Oatlands	Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19.	Noted.
54	Acacia Court, Oatlands	Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19 as the current restrictions prevents the conversion of existing strata dual occupancies to Torrens title.	Noted.
58	Coral Tree Drive, Carlingford	Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19 as it will allow the development of additional housing, increase jobs (in construction) and efficiently use infrastructure and land.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
59	Rifle Range Road, Northmead	- Submitter suggests the removal of Clause 6.19 will help address the housing affordability crisis as it contributes to local housing supply. - The proposal will unlock additional residential lots, enable diverse housing development and increase the overall supply of housing in the area.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
60	Rifle Range Road, Northmead	- Submitter suggests the removal of Clause 6.19 will help address the housing affordability crisis as it contributes to local housing supply. - The proposal will unlock additional residential lots, enable diverse housing development and increase the overall supply of housing in the area.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
62	Karingal Avenue, Carlingford	- Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19 as it will provide more consistent planning controls and improve housing supply in Carlingford. - The submitter supports the harmonisation of planning controls across the City of Parramatta.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
66	Meckiff Avenue, North Rocks	- Submitter is a property owner in North Rocks and supports the removal of Clause 6.19 as it provides consistent controls across the Parramatta LGA reducing regulatory complexity and improves housing supply. - The amendments streamline planning controls and align with the NSW Government Low and Mid-Rise Housing Policy which provides greater housing flexibility and efficient use of residential land in established suburbs.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
69	Murray Farm Road, Carlingford	Submitter states that Parramatta's LEP and DCP are arguably the most restrictive in Western Sydney and that Council appears to be the sole outlier resisting a shift to prioritising increased housing density.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
70	Sophia Crescent, North Rocks	- Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19. - Submitter notes that it is important for Council to invest in infrastructure to support increasing density as a result of the proposed changes of this Planning Proposal, the development at 361-365 North Rocks Road and the Muirfield Golf Course.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.

Submission No.	Submitter location	Submission summary	Council officer response
		Submitter suggests that North Rocks' road and transport infrastructure requires major upgrades.	
74	Lime Grove, Carlingford	Submitter questions whether a covenant that states there can be no more than one main building on site is voided by the removal of Clause 6.19.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
76	Roland Avenue, Northmead	Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19 as the land can be used more efficiently.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
79	Felton Road, Carlingford	Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19 as it will provide greater flexibility for residential development and better reflects the needs of the community.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
82	Carmen Drive, Carlingford	- Submitter strongly supports the removal of Clause 6.19. - Submitter states that their understanding of NSW state planning reforms were to be located near main transport hubs. - Submitter states that under these policy reforms, properties along their street meets the minimum controls for dual occupancy development and that the removal of Clause 6.19 is a welcome amendment that supports further dual occupancy development. - Submitter argues there is strong demand for transport infrastructure in their local area of Carlingford due to excessive number of cars parking on the street. - The submitter provided an attachment showing that there is political and community support for the Oakes Road M2 bus stop to be a major transport hub linking to both Carlingford Station and the Cherrybrook Metro Station (see addendum).	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
83	Lemongrove Avenue, Carlingford	Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19.	Noted.
85	Snowdon Avenue, Carlingford	Submitter states the City of Parramatta needs more housing and notes dual occupancies have already been developed in the local area.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
86	North Rocks Road, North Rocks	Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19 as it improves housing supply, housing diversity, implements fair, consistent planning controls and better utilisation of existing infrastructure, enhances property flexibility and value and aligns with State and local strategic planning goals.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
87	Kerrie Road, Oatlands	- Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19 stating that as Council has already considered the capacity for local schools and other public resources. - The submitter also suggests that the amendment contribute to improving housing in the City of Parramatta.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
90	Windermere Avenue, Northmead	Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19 as it will contribute positively to the planning framework and future development in the area.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
91	Carmen Drive, Carlingford	Submitter agrees with the proposal as it makes development and subdivision of dual occupancies consistent.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
92	Hilar Avenue,	Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19.	Noted.

Submission No.	Submitter location	Submission summary	Council officer response
	Carlingford		
93	Spears Road, North Rocks	• Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19. • This is a positive change removing an outdated control and helps align the planning approach with the rest of the Parramatta LGA.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
94	Woodbury Street, North Rocks	• Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19.	• Noted.
95	North Rocks Road, North Rocks	• Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19. • Allowing subdivision for dual occupancy will help increase housing supply, offer more housing choice for families and allow for more efficient use of larger residential blocks. • Given the growing demand for housing in the Parramatta LGA, the proposal is a positive step toward sustainable housing growth.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
96	Felton Road, Carlingford	• Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19. • Allowing subdivision of dual occupancies is a sensible planning change to help improve housing supply, encourage better land use outcomes and provide more flexibility for property owners. • In established suburbs such as Carlingford, enabling well designed dual occupancies supports urban renewal while maintaining existing character of residential areas. • This amendment assists in delivering additional housing without requiring major increases in building density. This aligns with broader planning objectives to provide diverse housing options within existing neighbourhoods.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
97	Elm Place, North Rocks	• Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19.	• Noted.
98	N/A	• Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19. • Submitter states their home is over 70 years old and needs to be rebuilt. • Rebuilding into a dual occupancy is more financially feasible than a single dwelling. • Submitter states their single dwelling home is between two-storey dwellings which does not look harmonised. • Submitter supports the State Governments LMR policy to relieve housing supply stress and improve looks from the street.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
99	N/A	• Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19. • This amendment is a sensible and positive step for land in residential areas be used more efficiently. • Increasing opportunities for dual occupancy development will help provide additional housing supply without requiring large-scale redevelopment. • This approach supports more diverse housing choice and responds to the growing housing demand. • The proposal is consistent with broader housing policy direction of local and state government.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
100	Lanceley Avenue, Carlingford	• Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19. • Submitter states their street is wide and lot sizes are large enough.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.

Submission No.	Submitter location	Submission summary	Council officer response
		- The amendment will bring more people to the neighbourhood which is a welcome change. - Homes in the street are old, with redevelopment rare due to the prohibition. - The restriction does not allow owners to capitalise on space available to them. - Submitter also notes they are close to amenities such as shopping centres and schools.	
102	Watson Place, Northmead	Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19.	Noted.
112	Brickfield Street, North Parramatta	Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19 and considers it a positive for the area as it allows for more housing options.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
113	Pepperina Place, Carlingford	Support the removal of PLEP 2023 clause 6.19 subdivision for dual occupancies on certain lands.	Noted.
115	Lochinvar Paraded, Carlingford	- Support the planning proposal to maximise land use other than apartments. - The owner now has more housing choice when rebuilding. - Dual occupancies are a great option for parents and children living together but at a lower cost.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
117	Cambridge Street, Epping	- Submitter states the Gateway determination report does not appear publicly accessible and would like to understand the Department's reasoning for not supporting Places of Public Worship (PoPW) as an Additional Permitted Use (APU) in R2 Low Density Residential zones. - Submitter questions how Council will support existing PoPW in R2 zones and whether Council will develop a policy to ensure existing PoPW can respond to community needs.	Refer to Other items in Section 4.3 of the Community Engagement Report.
120	Rifle Range Road, Northmead	- Support the removal of PLEP 2023 clause 6.19 subdivision for dual occupancies. - Submitter makes note of difficulty utilising equity of their current dual occupancy due to clause 6.19. - The prohibition clause is inconsistent with existing builds in the street and contradicts the desire to increase housing density (other than multilevel developments that decrease neighbourhood feel) close to city centres. - Dual occupancies allow for a balance of increased density whilst keeping the neighbourhood feel. - Submitter provided aerial view of their neighbourhood to demonstrate surrounding dual occupancy development. This image has been omitted as it included identifiable information.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
122	Murray Farm Road, Carlingford	Submitter states the removal of Clause 6.19 will ease the house supply crisis.	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.
129	Moorilla Avenue, Carlingford	- Submitter believes the proposal will improve housing availability. - A lot of the houses in the area are nearly a quarter acre land, which can easily accommodate two houses. - There is also nearby access to the Oakes Road bus interchange which makes the area	Refer to Section 4.2.1 of the Community Engagement Report.

Submission No.	Submitter location	Submission summary	Council officer response
		convenient for commuters.	



Appendix A2 – Submission Summary Table – Residents, Individuals and Landowners who neither support nor not support

This Appendix summarises and provides a response to 8 submissions that selected “Unsure” to if they support the draft Harmonisation Supplementary Matters and Housekeeping Planning Proposal. These submissions were received from **residents, individuals and landowners** during public exhibition. The responses provided in **Appendix A2** should be read in conjunction with **Section 4.2 and 4.3** of the Community Engagement Report.

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

Submission No.	Submitter location	Submission summary	Council officer response
18	Citrus Grove, Carlingford	No comment provided.	Noted.
19	Tudor Place, Carlingford	- Submitter considers the proposal poorly worded and inaccessible for those with a language other than English or less than a university education level. - The proposal should be reworded and presented again.	Refer to Clarifications in Section 4.3 of Community Engagement Report.
21	Arcadian Circuit, Carlingford	No comment provided.	Noted.
88	New North Rocks Road, North Rocks	- Submitter questions how additional stormwater demands will be planned in the areas where clause 6.19 is removed. - Submitter questions whether subdivided land will need to consider off street parking.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 2: Traffic, congestion, parking impacts and transport infrastructure Theme 3: Infrastructure capacity
121	Niblick Crescent, Oatlands	Submitter states they are looking for a home in the area and would like to know options available or how to live in the neighbourhood.	Refer to Clarifications in Section 4.3 of Community Engagement Report.
133	Carlingford	- Submitter states that owning a standalone home on a large piece of land is become harder to achieve. - Submitter states there is a significant imbalance in ancestry since the 2021 Census and Australians are becoming a minority in the local area. - The submitter suggests Carlingford will become smaller and is changing drastically which is affecting their values and way of life.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 1: Density increase
134	Epping	Consider removing heritage item I119 at 48 Oxford Street Epping as Council approved DA/485/2016/B for its demolition.	Refer to Clarifications in Section 4.3 of Community Engagement Report.
135	Not stated	Submitter raised concerns with the language used in the notification letter.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 5: Clarifications

Appendix A3 – Submission Summary Table – Residents, Individuals and Landowners who support, to an extent

This Appendix summarises and provides a response to **11** submissions that support, to an extent the draft Harmonisation Supplementary Matters and Housekeeping Planning Proposal. These submissions were received from **residents, individuals and landowners** during public exhibition. The responses provided in **Appendix A3** should be read in conjunction with **Section 4.2 and 4.3** of the Community Engagement Report.

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

Submission No.	Submitter location	Submission summary	Council officer response
2	Pepperina Place, Carlingford	No comment provided.	Noted.
12	Not stated	It is noted that whilst the submitter indicated support to an extent the issues provided in the submission all oppose the removal of Clause 6.19: - Does not agree with the removal of Clause 6.19 as it will provide no benefit due to the redevelopment of the old RIDBC site. - Submitter states that the amendment allows the demolition of green space which affects native wildlife that frequents the area. - The proposal will exacerbate congestion as roads are already at capacity. - Submitter suggests there is no plan to alleviate the strain on utilities such as electricity and water.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 1: Density increase Theme 2: Traffic, congestion, parking impacts and transport infrastructure Theme 3: Infrastructure capacity Theme 4: Neighbourhood character
23	Lemongrove Avenue, Carlingford	No comment provided.	Noted.
32	Wyburn Avenue, Carlingford	Submitter agrees with the removal of Clause 6.19 as it helps alleviate the housing shortage in Sydney.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 1: Density increase
33	Wyburn Avenue, Carlingford	- Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19 as it provides housing for young people. - Submitter wishes it was amended years earlier to prevent the proliferation of high rises in Carlingford. - Submitter states the neighbourhood character of the area has changed.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 1: Density increase
36	Pindari Avenue, Carlingford	- Submitter supports the removal of Clause 6.19 as it can increase housing supply and provide more affordable options for families and first-home buyers. - Submitter states it is important that everyone has access to safe and secure housing, particularly during a housing shortage. - Submitter suggests the proposal makes better use of existing land as it maintains responsible planning and neighbourhood character.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 1: Density increase Theme 4: Neighbourhood character
53	Bray Court, North Rocks	It is noted that whilst the submitter indicated support to an extent the issues provided in the submission all oppose the removal of Clause 6.19: Submitter suggests the removal of Clause 6.19 has the potential to lead to significant increased density and although supported in principle, the impacts to the local transport	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 2: Traffic, congestion, parking impacts and transport infrastructure Theme 3: Infrastructure capacity

Submission No.	Submitter location	Submission summary	Council officer response
		infrastructure in North Rocks has not been considered. - States 'Legoland' style duplexes in suburbs such as North Ryde, Dundas and Telopea as examples of potential outcomes from the amendment. Submitter considers this development to have negative impacts on green space, street parking, and neighbourhood character. - Submitter suggests that there should be minimum standards to accommodate the potential consequences (green space, design, transport) from increased development of dual occupancies in North Rocks. - Submitter suggests that it would seem logical to augment the Parramatta Light Rail to travel from Carlingford to Parramatta along North Rocks Road to alleviate congestion on the local road network as it is already at a standstill during peak hour periods.	Theme 4: Neighbourhood character
68	Benghazi Road, Carlingford	- Submitter considers the removal of Clause 6.19 acceptable if the subdivision of attached dual occupancies comply with relevant provisions such as zoning, minimum lot size, frontage, access, parking and infrastructure standards. - Submitter states that complying with the abovementioned development standards supports appropriate land use, provides flexibility in property ownership and contributes to housing supply.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 5: Clarifications
77	Sophia Crescent, North Rocks	It is noted that whilst the submitter indicated support to an extent the issues provided in the submission all oppose the removal of Clause 6.19: - Submitter does not support the removal of Clause 6.19 and suggests it should be changed to dual occupancy development prohibition to ensure that future dual occupancy development is subject to review and assessment by the public. - Submitter suggests that removing prohibition on future dual occupancy will result in pressure on local infrastructure in North Rocks such as roads, public transport and schools with the nearby RIDBC redevelopment adding to pressure local area.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 3: Infrastructure capacity Theme 5: Clarifications
118	Wondabah Place, Carlingford	- Submitter states that their understanding is that subdivision for dual occupancies is not allowed but development of dual occupancies is permitted. - They request that if their understanding is incorrect, they would appreciate clarification.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 5: Clarifications
123	Park Road, Rydalmere	- Support item 28 for the removal of clause 6.19. - Support item 30 to item 70 to ensure recreational uses are embedded in the LEP. - Oppose to item 4 as it sets a precedent that unapproved demolition of heritage items results in unencumbered land. A restriction should remain on the use of the land as though the heritage item was not demolished. - Submitter notes a fine is not enough disincentive, as the owner should be aware of the heritage item.	Refer to Other items in Section 4.3 of the Community Engagement Report.

Appendix A4 – Submission Summary Table – Residents, Individuals and Landowners that do not support

This Appendix summarises and provides a response to **18** submissions that do not support the Harmonisation Supplementary Matters and Housekeeping Planning Proposal. These submissions were received from **residents, individuals and landowners** during public exhibition. The responses provided in **Appendix A4** should be read in conjunction with **Section 4.2** of the Community Engagement Report.

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

Submission no.	Submitter location	Submission summary	Council officer response
1	Paragon Drive, North Rocks	- The removal of Clause 6.19 will increase density, worsen traffic congestion and further loss of trees. - Suggests the impacts from the redevelopment of the nearby Royal Institute for Deaf and Blind Children (RIDBC) are yet to be felt and that there is sufficient redevelopment occurring already. - Suggests Council should focus on liveability rather than increasing population density.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 1: Density increase Theme 2: Traffic, congestion, parking impacts and transport infrastructure Theme 4: Neighbourhood character
14	Norfolk Place, Carlingford	- Submitter is concerned the removal of Clause 6.19 will negatively impact on the local community, particularly in relation to traffic congestion, parking and local infrastructure. - Submitter raises that street parking is limited and that local roads are not designed to accommodate additional density. - Submitter states that increasing the number of dwellings will lead to more vehicles, congestion and will result in safety concerns. - Infrastructure such as road capacity, parking availability, drainage, schools and community facilities are not considered in the proposal with increasing housing density seemingly being the priority. - Suggests that most residents chose the area for its established character, low density and liveability, and that allowing subdivision of dual occupancies would erode this character and diminish residents' quality of life. - Requests Council to undertake a comprehensive assessment of traffic, parking and infrastructure impacts before removing Clause 6.19. - Does not believe that the proposal appropriately balances the needs of existing residents with the objectives of planning for growth.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 2: Traffic, congestion, parking impacts and transport infrastructure Theme 3: Infrastructure capacity Theme 4: Neighbourhood character
15	Balaka Drive, Carlingford	- Submitter opposes the removal of Clause 6.19 due to existing and new high density residential developments on main roads such as Jenkins Road and Pennant Hills Road. - Submitter states the removal of Clause 6.19 will result in an increase in dwellings, people, traffic and congestion. - Submitter states that residents use private vehicles in contrast to public transport due to limited availability and effectiveness (light rail, heavy rail, buses). - Submitter suggests upgrades on North Rocks Road are progressing slowly, causing congestion and will be exacerbated by removing clause 6.19.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 1: Density increase Theme 2: Traffic, congestion, parking impacts and transport infrastructure

Submission no.	Submitter location	Submission summary	Council officer response
31	Elm Place, North Rocks	- The removal of Clause 6.19 will increase traffic congestion on North Rocks Road, Pennant Hills Road and Church Street. - Insufficient public transport will lead to higher car dependency unless bus services (Route 549) are expanded in frequency and operating hours. - Additional commuter parking is required at Barclay Road and Aiken Road M2 bus stops to support increased demand. - The North Rocks Shopping Centre lacks the retail capacity and parking needed to support additional households. - Submitter is concerned about the risks additional housing poses to the natural environment, green corridors, catchment pollution and significant local plant and animal habitats.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 2: Traffic, congestion, parking impacts and transport infrastructure Theme 3: Infrastructure capacity Theme 4: Neighbourhood character
34	Hibiscus Avenue, Carlingford	- Submitter suggests Council is seeking to increase density for additional revenue. - Submitter suggests there is limited green space and open area for families in the LGA. - Submitter suggests there are no existing projects to improve the limited provision of infrastructure such as schools, daycares and other facilities for children to use. - Submitter suggests that people will rely on private vehicles as public transport is difficult to use and underfunded.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 1: Density increase Theme 2: Traffic, congestion, parking impacts and transport infrastructure Theme 3: Infrastructure capacity
37	Woodbury Street, North Rocks	Submitter states the removal of Clause 6.19 will ruin the streetscape and increase congestion on North Rocks Road.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 2: Traffic, congestion, parking impacts and transport infrastructure Theme 4: Neighbourhood character
45	Hilar Avenue, Carlingford	No comment provided.	Noted.
52	Wilshire Avenue, Carlingford	- Submitter does not consider the removal of Clause 6.19 a housekeeping or minor amendment. - Submitter moved into their current home to avoid being within Parramatta LGA due to the development of dual occupancies but were re-amalgamated into the City of Parramatta. - Submitter suggests the character of their local area will be destroyed by removing Clause 6.19 and deems the amendment unacceptable.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 4: Neighbourhood character Theme 5: Clarifications
56	Edwin Street, Oatlands	- Submitter considers Clause 6.19 an important planning control as it ensures development occurs in a manner consistent with the character of the area and capacity of local infrastructure. - Submitter considers the removal of a safeguard risks enabling inappropriate dual occupancy in areas previously identified as unsuitable. - Submitter suggests increased dual occupancies will place additional pressure on local street infrastructure as the number of vehicles competing for parking may restrict access for residents, visitors, emergency services	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 1: Density increase Theme 2: Traffic, congestion, parking impacts and transport infrastructure Theme 3: Infrastructure capacity Theme 4: Neighbourhood character

Submission no.	Submitter location	Submission summary	Council officer response
		and waste collection vehicles. • High density development adds strain to existing infrastructure including roads, drainage systems, sewer capacity and community infrastructure. • Increased dwelling numbers generates additional traffic movements, affecting traffic flow and safety in residential streets. • Concerns with the gradual loss of larger family homes, resulting in the loss of established residential character. • Dual occupancy development usually results in site clearing leading to the loss of mature trees, increase urban heat, affect stormwater absorption and impacts to local wildlife. • Additional housing should be in areas already zoned for higher density with access to major public transport options. These areas are better suited to support additional population. • While the removal of Clause 6.19 may seem minor in nature, the gradual erosion of planning controls can lead to significant and unintended changes to neighbourhood character and infrastructure demand overtime.	
64	Pinetree Drive, Carlingford	• Submitter does not agree with the removal of Clause 6.19 to allow land to be subdivided without consent from surrounding property owners.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. • Theme 5: Clarifications
65	Treeview Place, North Rocks	• Submitter strongly opposes the introduction or extension of dual occupancy development in North Rocks. • North Rocks is an established, leafy, low density and family orientated character is fundamental to the wellbeing of residents and central to the suburbs identity. • Dual occupancies will significantly alter the neighbourhood character. • North Rocks is already facing infrastructure strain and is not ready to absorb additional population density. • North Rocks is constrained being locked between three major arterial roads, forming the only in and out access of the suburb. • North Rocks faces extreme daily congestion due to the suburb's proximity to the M2's north, west and city access ramps, Pennant Hills Road connection to Parramatta, the Hills District and Blacktown. • There are no alternative routes capable of absorbing additional traffic. • Any increase in density through dual occupancies would worsen congestion, reduce road safety and diminish quality of life. • Local infrastructure is already stretched with schools at capacity, community facilities heavily used and public transport options limited in frequency and coverage. • The suburb was not designed to support higher density living, increased parking demand or the additional pressure on essential services. • North Rocks is not a designated growth precinct, rather an environmentally sensitive, low-density suburb that provides green relief in the Parramatta LGA.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. • Theme 2: Traffic, congestion, parking impacts and transport infrastructure • Theme 3: Infrastructure capacity • Theme 4: Neighbourhood character

Submission no.	Submitter location	Submission summary	Council officer response
84	Epping Road, Epping	• Clause 6.11 for the prohibition of dual occupancy development should also be removed for consistency. • Dual occupancies are permitted under the Housing SEPP regardless of the LEP anyway.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. • Theme 5: Clarifications
101	Snowdon Avenue, Carlingford	• Object to the removal of Clause 6.19 and associated amendment to the Dual Occupancy Prohibition Map. • The removal of Clause 6.19 is considered a significant planning change that will alter the density, traffic and character of established residential areas such as Carlingford. • Significant concerns with the traffic and parking pressure around Carlingford West Public School, especially during pick up and drop off times. • Dual occupancy subdivision will inevitably add further vehicles to the local road network. • Snowdon Avenue already experiences traffic pressures during peak times due to the school and neighbouring streets. • Lack of continuous footpaths in the surrounding neighbourhood presents a safety concern for residents and school children who often need to share road space with vehicles. • Dual occupancies usually consist of 4 to 5 bedrooms in each dwelling which would result in a substantial increase in occupants and vehicles, impacting parking, waste collection and greater burden on local infrastructure. • Dual occupancies can dominate and overshadow neighbouring single dwellings. • Increased density and removal of existing homes will reduce tree canopy and green space that contribute to the long-established leafy character of the neighbourhood. • A reduction in vegetation and permeable surfaces also impacts urban heat island effect. • Higher density housing increases the volume of wastewater entering the sewer system, placing additional pressure on existing sewerage infrastructure. • Increased building footprints and hard surfaces will increase stormwater runoff leading to potential strain on drainage systems and may contribute to localised flooding during heavy rainfall. • Current redevelopments in the area consist of high-quality single dwellings which upgrade the appearance and value of the neighbourhood. They add to the character and quality of the community. Allowing subdivision of dual occupancies is a substantial shift away from the established character.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. • Theme 1: Density increase • Theme 2: Traffic, congestion, parking impacts and transport infrastructure • Theme 3: Infrastructure capacity • Theme 4: Neighbourhood character
103	Yarralumla Drive, Carlingford	• Submitter is concerned with the dual occupancy applications that will be lodged on the western side of Linley Close, where the rear boundaries adjoin properties on Yarralumla Drive. • Several Linley Close properties are below road level and dispose rainwater through soakage pits to the rear of their site.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. • Theme 3: Infrastructure capacity • Theme 5: Clarifications

Submission no.	Submitter location	Submission summary	Council officer response
		- There is no stormwater easement for the disposal of rainwater between the properties of Linley Close and Yarralumla Drive. - Applications for dual occupancies on Linley Close will need to consider how stormwater is managed and that there are no adverse impacts to those properties on Yarralumla Drive. - Dual occupancy developments will likely cover a larger site area, leaving less ground area for effective absorption pits. - Submitter assumes Council will notify residents of any proposed dual occupancy development in Linley Close prior to its approval, for the opportunity to consider and provide comment to Council.	
111	Snowdon Avenue, Carlingford	Submitter prefers to keep the Kingsdene area as it is, being one occupancy per lot of land.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 4: Neighbourhood character
126	Paragon Drive, North Rocks	- The existing infrastructure such as roads, shopping centre and schools are already at capacity due to recent developments in Carlingford and North Parramatta. - Additional dwellings will add unacceptable strain to infrastructure, worsening traffic congestion and reducing service levels. - With no capacity for infrastructure expansion, growth in the area is unsustainable. - If the development opposite the North Rocks shopping centre is approved, it will overwhelm existing infrastructure. - It fails to account for cumulative impacts of surrounding developments and the proposed harmonisation. - The proposal compounds existing pressures on local services and amenities. - This level of intensification is inappropriate given the current infrastructure constraints.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 1: Density increase Theme 2: Traffic, congestion, parking impacts and transport infrastructure Theme 3: Infrastructure capacity
131	North Rocks	- Submitter notes they have been living in North Rocks for 57 years. - Allowing dual occupancies is a mistake. - They are surrounded by large single dwellings that have an excess of cars. - Increasing the population in North Rocks with dual occupancies will result in streets like Balmain.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 2: Traffic, congestion, parking impacts and transport infrastructure
132	Edwin Street, Oatlands	- Macquarie Boys High School is earmarked for thousands of new residents. - Allowing subdivision of dual occupancies will reduce green space for local birds and animals. - Parking is already difficult on narrow local streets. - Existing sewer and stormwater may not handle increased flow. - NBN and electricity will be overloaded.	Refer to the following themes in Section 4.2.2 of the Community Engagement Report. Theme 1: Density increase Theme 4: Neighbourhood character

Submission no.	Submitter location	Submission summary	Council officer response
		- The development controls in Edwin Street were introduced after extensive community consultation held by the Hills Council and undoing these controls is a huge backstep. - Submitter suggests Council is only interested in collecting more rates at the expense of current residents and destruction of the pleasant neighbourhood.	