

DA No. 64/2021 – SUMMARY OF ISSUES	RESPONSE
Tree removal/tree loss/impact on bushland (51 + mentions in pro-formas)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> removing green space 	<p>As per Council's requirements, a minimum of 1:1 tree removal: replacement ratio would normally apply to this DA. However, as per requirements of CI's Tree Officer, increased ratio of 2:1 has been applied.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> extent of tree and canopy loss 	<p>Open Space & Urban Services (OSUS) is satisfied that the initial loss of canopy cover will be replenished as the planted advanced trees grow to occupy vacant canopy space.</p> <p>Existing building foot print will be overlaid by the new building footprint where (or as close as) possible.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can development be designed around trees 	<p>The proposed design represents the minimum space required to accommodate the sporting facility.</p> <p>Further in relation this issue, the applicant's arborist and design team have noted the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>the final design reflects the most appropriate building footprint to minimise vegetation impact;</i> <i>the location of the proposed facility was strategically chosen to prevent limiting the golf course opportunity and retaining as many existing trees as possible; and</i> <i>considerable planning with the traffic engineer and arboriculture specialists was undertaken in the design stage to ensure the set out of the loading dock and carpark ramp would prevent the encroachment into the root zones of high value trees</i>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can tree loss be minimised 	<p>Existing building foot print will be overlaid by the new building footprint as close as possible.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> time taken for canopy to regenerate 	<p>Optimal planting requirements in specialised soil mix will ensure best growing conditions for advanced trees and shrub layers to regenerate the canopy.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> questioning BDAR and survey effort 	<p>A peer review has been carried out and found that the BDAR has met all statutory requirements.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> impact on Powerful Owl 	<p>Immediate Powerful Owl habitat trees have not been affected. The remaining habitat components were assessed under the BAM as the removal of foraging habitat, which is included within the ecosystem credits calculated to offset its loss (Table 10 of the BDAR). The BDAR considered impacts of removal of 'prescribed habitat' on Powerful Owl, including the impacts of removal of non-native vegetation and reduction of habitat connectivity (Table 14 of the BDAR).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> impact grey headed flying fox 	<p>Immediate Flying fox habitat trees have not been affected. The BDAR identified that the subject land does not contain any breeding sites that are suitable for the species to utilise, therefore no targeted survey was required (Table 11 of the BDAR). The BDAR considered impacts of removal of 'prescribed habitat' on Grey-headed Flying-Fox, including the impacts of removal of non-native vegetation and reduction of habitat connectivity (Table 14 of the BDAR).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> impact on southern myotis 	<p>The BDAR indicates there is no habitat on the subject land because Gore Creek is piped within the subject land, and</p>

	200 m downstream the creek is less than 3m width, therefore there is no habitat for Southern Myotis and no targeted survey is required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> errors in BDAR 	A peer review has been carried out and the BDAR has met all statutory requirements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BDAR doesn't address Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest (EEC) 	No EEC's have been found on the proposed site. Whilst the land above Stevenson Road may comprise a small area of Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest, this land is outside the subject site and development footprint. It would need to be addressed as part of the REF for the roadwork projects if proposed to be disturbed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BDAR doesn't address white bellied sea-eagle 	A peer review has been carried out and found the BDAR has met all statutory requirements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> BDAR doesn't address brush turkey or tawny frogmouth 	A peer review has been carried out and found the BDAR has met all statutory requirements.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ecological report needs to address all SEPP 19 bushland not just adjoining land to SEPP 19 	A peer review has been carried out and found the BDAR has met all statutory requirements. Further, OSUS is satisfied that the proposed sports precinct addresses the requirements/provisions of SEPP 19.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> impact on fungi 	No threatened fungi were identified within the subject land during the field survey.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> impact of tree loss on flora and fauna generally 	There will be no net loss of vegetation as the removed vegetation will be replenished.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> impact of tree loss on possums, birds and smaller creatures and microbats 	There will be no net loss of vegetation as the removed vegetation will be replenished, whilst the BDAR adequately addresses the impact on fauna and proposes mitigation measures where required.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> increase in heat from vegetation loss 	Whilst it is acknowledged there may be initial, short-term impacts, there will be no net loss of vegetation as the removed vegetation will be replenished.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> overall impact on environmental (particularly from whole project including roadworks and roundabout) 	BDAR adequately addresses the impact on the environment as a result of the proposed development, noting that the roadworks is a separate project.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> impact of tree loss from road works not taken into account impact of trees in Stevenson Street 	Separate project. Any potential removal of trees for the Stevenson St and roundabout works will be addressed by the relevant REF.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> contrary to draft Climate Resilience Plan 2021-26 for increase on tree canopy 	There will be a net increase in canopy as a result of the replanting to be undertaken as part of development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contrary to vision for Lane Cove Golf Course 	A multi-purpose facility is specifically identified for this site under the North District Plan (i.e. <i>"to make better use of the existing Lane Cove golf course"</i>).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No bushland Rehabilitation and Maintenance Plan as per Part H of DCP 	This can be a post-consent requirement and has been included in draft conditions.
Contamination/geotechnical issues (16 + mentions in pro-formas)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PSI report doesn't conclude site is suitable for development. Needs further investigation. 	Agreed –development to be staged to address this issue, with demolition done as Stage 1 and then further testing. (DSI, RAP) and remediation works to be done and Site Audit Report to be submitted prior to construction of Stage 2.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> site previously filled and full of contaminants <ul style="list-style-type: none"> needs a contamination report 	As above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> cost of decontamination 	This will be determined once the DSI is completed and the extent of remediation works are known. This is an issue for the applicant.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no RAP provided 	As above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> report doesn't refer to lowering of site for basement 	Report adequately addresses site conditions and further geotech and site classification required with CC.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> report incorrectly refers to distance of acid sulphate soils within 3km from site 	Agreed, but actual site doesn't contain ASS which was correctly identified.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SoEE incorrectly concludes site is suitable for proposed development 	Agreed – site cannot be deemed suitable until DSI and RAP done and remediation works completed and validated. Staged consent facilitates this occurring (as above).
Impact on views/height and bulk of building (25 + mentions in pro-formas)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DA needs to be accompanied by a Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) against "Tenacity" principles objector undertook own VIA against "Tenacity and deemed unsatisfactory impact visual impact generally visual impact due to tree loss 	<p>Agreed. VIA based on Tenacity requested from applicant as part of RFI following exhibition. VIA submitted which found as follows:</p> <p>"The proposal is not considered to block significant existing views or unacceptably change the character of views. It does not give rise to significant, unacceptable visual impact on the private domain. While a change to the existing nature of views, the overall visual impact of the proposal is assessed as being minor on the Tenacity scale."</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> height excessive will dominate setting general bulk and scale of building excessive 	<p>Height considered reasonable and appropriate for site due the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No height limit under LEP. Elevations and sections submitted with DA indicate building is lower than surrounding residences. Design reflects contours and responds to topography. CI's Bushland Officer satisfied design meets criteria in Section H of DCP re bulk scale and height. VIA indicated that careful consideration has been given to siting and design detail to mitigate visual impact and found height bulk and scale acceptable with no significant impact on views.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> overdevelopment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No height limit nor FSR. Setbacks reasonable and generally adopts existing footprint. Sufficient carparking provided and no non-compliances with DCP to suggest an overdevelopment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 3 storeys too high – inconsistent with Part H of DCP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No height limit under LEP. The 3-storey component comprises a mezzanine contained in the roof space of the building above the courts. Its removal would not lower the height or make any difference to bulk of building, which CI's Bushland Officer is satisfied meets the requirements of Council's DCP Part H – Bushland.
Noise impact/noise pollution (29 + mentions in pro-formas)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> contradiction between noise and light spillage reports 	Clarification provided by applicant via additional information.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> extra noise from additional traffic not assessed 	Acoustic report confirms that there will be no significant adverse impact from increased traffic movements. CI's EHO advised that use of the venue for after-hours events i.e. up until midnight will need to be managed under the Liquor Licensing provisions i.e. zero exceedance of background noise after midnight i.e. onsite security, signage, traffic management systems to reduce speed of vehicles entering

	and leaving the venue.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> noise generally 	Covered by acoustic report and addendum/update to same. See other comments in table re this issue.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> additional noise from outdoor courts 	Revised acoustic report has found noise impact satisfactory including outdoor areas as verified by Council's EHO.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> hours of operation excessive <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6am-12am excessive 	Hours proposed essentially same as those currently operating and consistent with other similar facilities in nearby suburbs. Council will be the facility manager and will put in place appropriate management and operational measures to control excessive noise where required and deal with any complaints as necessary.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> noise from indoor court use and frequency of same 	Council's EHO has advised that the revised acoustic report confirms that indoor noise will be controlled.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> separate noise report submitted by objector raising additional issues and querying noise modelling 	This report was reviewed by applicant's acoustic consultant who addressed all points and updated modelling where req'd and found noise levels/impact still satisfactory, as verified by Council's EHO.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> increased noise impact from higher building and outdoor area and bistro 	Agreed more impact than existing building due to increase size and usage but acoustic report has found noise impact satisfactory including outdoor areas as verified by Council's EHO.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> hours of bistro should be 10pm or 9pm 	Controlled by Liquor Licence and also by Council as facility manager, who will deal with any complaints as necessary
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> query on contents/findings of acoustic report 	Council's EHO is satisfied as to the veracity of the contents, findings and recommendations of the updated acoustic report subject to an amendment to the hours of operation as above.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> surrounding houses should be sound-proofed development should be sound proofed. 	Acoustic report doesn't indicate this is necessary. Noise will be controlled by mitigation measure in acoustic report.
Parking and traffic (56 + mentions in pro-formas)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> insufficient parking 	No specific rate under DCP and CI's Traffic Co-Ordinator satisfied with calculation of parking in Traffic Assessment, with further details subsequently provided by applicant in relation to occurrence of and arrangements for infrequent special events.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> too much parking 	As above.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> congestion created by development 	TfNSW and CI's Traffic Co-Ordinator satisfied with traffic impact of development. subject to roundabout and access road being in place as pre-requisite. Traffic study indicates traffic impact has satisfactorily addressed on this basis as confirmed by TfNSW and CI Traffic Engineer.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> impact from construction traffic 	This is a valid concern and will be addressed via a Construction Management Plan, which will be conditioned to be provided to and approved by Council prior to issue of CC to manage construction traffic and parking, dust, waste disposal, noise and construction hours, complaints and resident liaison etc
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> traffic study doesn't include cumulative impact of other developments in vicinity 	TfNSW and CI's Traffic Co-Ordinator satisfied as to veracity of traffic study and basis for report.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> traffic reports done during COVID and not accurate 	Section 2.4 of the Traffic Assessment specifically addresses the impact of COVID on traffic counts and has adjusted them appropriately as follows:

	<p><i>"To determine accurate traffic volumes on River Road and Northwood Road due to potential transport changes during the COVID-19 period, historical automatic traffic classification counts conducted on 29 November 2017 were used to further calibrate the detailed 2020 counts. Therefore, the 2020 traffic counts have been increased by 80%."</i></p> <p>TfNSW and CI's Traffic Co-Ordinator were both satisfied as to veracity of the traffic study on this basis.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traffic report doesn't include gym 	No gym proposed (see above).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lack of public transport <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ irregular and not on Sunday 	<p>Bus stops are located in immediate proximity to the site providing bus services to the proposed facility but it is agreed that services are less frequent on Sundays in particular. As such, the proposed development makes allowance for sufficient parking of private vehicles to accommodate those patrons coming to the site in this manner, which the traffic assessment indicates will be the main mode of transport to the site. This will be augmented by the external roadworks being done as a pre-cursor to provide access to the facility. The site is also accessible via ferry from Northwood wharf to a lesser degree and will be accessed by school buses during the week when used by school groups, as well as other community groups who would also use mini-buses to transport patrons to the site.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • general increase in traffic and impact in Stevenson St • traffic study needs to incorporate/address cumulative impact of roundabout • turning Stevenson St into major thoroughfare • need to retain access int Stevenson Street 	<p>Roundabout and Stevenson Street not part of this DA. These issues to be addressed as part of separate REF.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on 6 properties in Stevenson Street • poor sight distance for roundabout at Stevenson Street 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • failure to include access road and roundabout (should be part of same DA to allow impact of entire project to be addressed) 	External roadworks being undertaken as separate projects under Part 5 of EPA Act (and/or SEPP Infrastructure).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • multi-purpose rooms not included in traffic assessment 	The multi-purpose rooms were addressed/included in the Traffic Assessment and in particular the parking calculations (Tables 6.3 and 6.4 for Scenarios 1 and 2).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no pedestrian access/poor safety 	Draft condition requires Shared Use Pathway (SUP) from site to River Road to provide pedestrian access. Accessible access pathways and lifts provided from development site to the golf course.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • existing access driveway off River Road should be retained 	Existing driveway is being retained but as left-in/left-out as per TfNSW requirements as secondary access and for service vehicles to the loading dock
Privacy and amenity impacts (30 + mentions in pro-formas)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact from noise and traffic 	Addressed under specific headings elsewhere in table.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • light spillage to adjoining properties 	Light Spillage report submitted and recommendations deemed to satisfactorily address impact by Councils EHO.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • issues with lighting report 	Amendments/clarifications sought to report and EHO satisfied with additional information.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of sunlight 	Shadow diagrams submitted with DA indicate no impact of shadow from new facility due to distance of building from

	residences to south and level of building below residences to south.
• adverse social impact/no public benefit	Not agreed. Proposed development likely to result in positive social benefits and health outcomes.
• amenity generally (non-specific)/impact on neighbourhood	Considered that design and siting of building and adoption mitigation measures will satisfactory address/ameliorate any significant adverse impacts on amenity
• insufficient setbacks	Setbacks considered appropriate as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No specific setbacks nominated for this site under DCP. • Building generally constructed over footprint of existing structures and adopts appropriate setbacks to south in direction of closest residences, all of which are built above proposed building. • Position of building and resulting setbacks constrained or dictated by shape/configuration of site and particularly location of embankment to south.
• impact on adjoining residences (generally)	Discussion provided above and elsewhere in table re impacts from light, traffic, noise, solar access.
• delivery time should be limited to reduce impact	Not considered necessary (or practical) to restrict delivery times once facility operational as location of loading dock at eastern end behind building will assist in reducing/protecting residences from noise of deliveries. This dock also accessed by secondary access as opposed to Stevenson Street. However, Construction Management Plan will address delivery times and operation of delivery vehicles during construction phase.
• incompatible with surrounding neighbourhood	Site zoned RE1 in which use permissible and site already used for recreational activities. Accept use is being intensified but considered that impact being appropriately minimised/ameliorated through siting, mitigation measures, facility management and liquor licence.
Aboriginal impact (1)	
• No investigation of Aboriginal sites done	Site inspected by Aboriginal Heritage Office who confirmed no sites but provided condition as precaution.
Design Issues (18 + mentions in pro-formas)	
• courts too small	Presumably/understood court design based on appropriate standard court size for respective sports.
• not enough spectator space	Not a matter for the consent authority but presumably based on site area and parking available.
• needs to include squash court	Not a matter for the consent authority.
• facility unfairly caters for some sports (basketball & netball) and unfairly disadvantages other sporting groups (golf and tennis)	Not a matter for the consent authority but presumably/understood to be based on demand (or shortages in courts) for particular sports and result of pre-DA consultation.
• design and facilities based on out of statistics	Nothing to quantify this claim and composition of facilities not a decision for consent authority.
• netball courts inadequate (no reason)	No details and nothing to quantify this claim.
• should maintain outdoor courts	Composition of facilities not a decision for consent authority. However, outdoor courts still being provided but agreed 1 less (5 to 4). New courts have better surface and lighting and should provide greater utility in conjunction with other new facilities on site.
• facility should be staged and grow	Not a decision for consent authority but obviously providing

progressively	all facilities upfront provides greater/maximum utility for residents/users and limits construction period to one initial phase and hence impact on adjoining residents rather than multiple construction periods over subsequent years.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> includes too many activities 	Not a decision for consent authority but facility specifically designed to be multi-use, presumably to benefit as many user groups and residents as possible and provide as much utility as possible.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> should've included cultural hall/centre 	Not a decision for consent authority.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> not a green design 	Ecologically Sustainable Development report submitted with DA identifying various energy efficient and environmentally sensitive aspects of development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> doesn't need a stage (one provided at the Canopy in Lane Cove town centre) 	Not a decision for consent authority but facility specifically designed to be multi-use.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> don't need another gym 	Gym not proposed as part of the DA. This would require separate approval (unless Exempt Development).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> can roof collect stormwater and be used for irrigation 	Yes. Details in stormwater report and discussion in ESD report.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no Shared User Path (SUP) provided to golf course from beyond site 	SUP beyond site not part of this project. Rather, footpaths and/or SUP will be provided from site to River Road as part of external roadworks to ensure satisfactory pedestrian and bicycle access in place upon facility opening. Accessible access pathways and lifts provided from development site to the golf course.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> generally unsuitable design 	No details of and nothing to quantify this claim.
Notification process (49)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> insufficient notification time limited access to documents pushing DA through in unreasonable time pushing DA through COVID poor consultation incorrect/misleading images during concept stage 	These issues addressed by extension of notification period, plus late submissions still taken throughout DA assessment anyway to ensure all issues considered. Access to documents satisfactory as submissions seemed to be quoting info lodged with DA which has been (and still is) available on Council's website since lodgement of the DA.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> current design not considered in consultation 	Not an issue for the DA assessment. Presumably the design has been adjusted as result of consultation but ultimately the design submitted with the DA is an issue for the applicant.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> should be Integrated Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council should be model applicant and not avoid responsibility 	Despite not technically being Integrated Development for bushfire, DA referred to RFS anyway as if it were Integrated (see report) and has adopted RFS conditions of consent. Also referred to TfNSW, NSW Police and Aboriginal Heritage Office.
Open space/golf course issues (19 + mentions in pro-formas)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> impact on open space and community access 	The proposed development is a permissible use in the RE1 Public Recreation zone and augments, or adds to, the existing open space function of the site. Community access of the site will be retained and improved via the new road being constructed as a separate project prior to the development, as well as a SUP into the site from River Road, a new arrival plaza for private vehicles and public transport and a network of pathways in and around the site being provided as part of the development.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> need to maintain golf course <ul style="list-style-type: none"> loss of good facility/valuable asset 	Golf course is remaining.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no premises to replace golf clubhouse and pro shop 	Actual composition of new facilities in development a decision for the land-owner. However, for clarification, the applicant has advised that space allocation for a pro shop has been incorporated into the new facility, whilst the licenced functions of the golf club will be assumed by the new facilities covered by the Liquor Licence.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> encroaches on golf course <ul style="list-style-type: none"> footprint encroaches on 7th and 9th fairway losing tee for 1st hole due to excessive building size 	<p>Only encroachment off/adjustment to the golf course is a shortened first hole, with golf course redesigned around this aspect. These changes were reviewed and supported by Golfing NSW and Greg Norman Design.</p> <p>Protective fencing to be erected along facade of new building facing golf course to protect it from the impact of balls from the golf course.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DA probably includes golf driving range/ site not suitable for this use 	A golf driving range does not form part of the submitted DA.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> loss of bar and club and by replacing with café and no dining facilities 	Actual composition of new facilities in development a decision for the applicant/land-owner. However, for clarification, a restaurant and bistro is proposed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> unnecessary privatisation of golf course 	The golf course is a public facility owned by the Council and classified as "Community Land" under the LGA, with no change proposed as part of this DA.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> needs to stay as community land in perpetuity 	No change proposed to classification of land under LGA as "Community Land" as part of DA.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> specific issues raised by Country Club 	(see responses under separate heading below)
Issues Raised by Lane Cove Country Club	Specific Responses provided by Applicant
<p>1. The Club does not oppose the new sports facility on the site of our existing clubhouse. However, LCGC is disappointed it will be losing about a third of our 1st hole which is our index 1 and a signature hole of the course. We are concerned at the scale of the proposed design and footprint it will occupy on the land.</p>	<p><i>"The proposed scale and size of the development is required to accommodate much needed recreational activities and programs, as identified after extensive review and assessment, consistent with the Lane Cove Local Strategic Planning Statement 2020.</i></p> <p><i>A number of alternative design proposals have been considered, however the proposed scale and mass of the final design is deemed the most appropriate and best utilises the existing facility to support the current deficit and future sporting needs of the LGA.</i></p> <p><i>Furthermore, the shortening of the 1st hole was discussed with the LCGC and its redesign further improves the golfing experience i.e. time efficiencies/ improved golf round times and better accommodates players of varying abilities. Industry experts including Greg Norman Golf Course Design and Golf NSW support the proposed changes over the existing configuration, noting the vast majority of social and member players cannot reach this long par 3rd hole with their tee shot."</i></p>
<p>2. The proposed facility will result in the loss of the practice green, practice nets and teaching zone, all of which are essential elements of a golf course. There would be nowhere for the teaching professional to</p>	<p><i>"The practice putting green will be integrated with the first tee to enable seamless practice opportunity and start of play solution. The practice net location is not fixed, and its final position can be changed if required. However, it is likely to be located between the putting green and 7th fairway as it provides opportunities for golfers to hit practice balls before</i></p>

deliver lessons, so that entire business will be lost.	<p>moving to the first tee for start of play. The teaching zone will remain around or within its current location and accommodate junior and chipping lessons.</p> <p>It is further emphasised that the existing practice green, nets and teaching zone are considered inadequate and do not satisfy industry standard. Therefore, the proposal will result in a significant improvement to the current amenities.”</p>
3. The arrival plaza is consuming a lot of space. If it were eliminated or moved underground into the car park, the tennis courts could be moved back and the golf course impacts could be lessened.	<p>“The proposed development is code compliant and fit for purpose to best utilise the site area. The arrival plaza has been purposefully designed to facilitate all levels of accessibility, seamless drop-off and pick-up activities busses, private vehicles, ride share and taxis. This will also ensure the safety of number of anticipated children using the facility. The arrival plaza is also required to provide a turning path to accommodate vehicles entering and exiting the site. Further, the car park does not have clearance to support busses and raising the building to accommodate such height of larger vehicles would result in a greater scale of development.”</p>
4. The proposed facility will be a major presence on River Road, extending higher and brighter at night than the existing tennis courts and low key club building. The Club has empathy for our Northwood and Osborne Park neighbours who are concerned at the noise and lights of the facility.	<p>“The scale of the premises to the River Road frontage is not significant given the level change because of the fall of the land, setbacks and proximity to the existing escarpment. Noise emissions and light pollution were considered potential impacts that may arise from the proposed development. Detailed acoustic and light spillage assessments analysing the impact on neighbouring sensitive receivers including those at Northwood and Osborne Park were submitted with the SEE. The Noise Impact Assessment concluded that the noise levels generated achieves the required noise levels and is consistent with the existing use. The proposed development has been designed to better mitigate noise emissions than what is currently provided. The light spillage report concluded that the proposed spill light reaching nearby residences is considered to be very minimal with the existing and proposed tree coverage providing an appropriate buffer. Further, a number of design recommendations will be adopted to ensure appropriate programming and minimise light glare. Further, noise and light will be managed through a future operational management plan.”</p>

<p>5. At its last meeting the Precinct Committee were informed that the golf pro shop could be located in the area marked as Storage at the western end of the car park level. However, the West Elevation diagram does not show the external face of this storage area and nothing in any of the views indicates the storage area has access to the 1st tee. At minimum, this storage area would need a large window looking out at the 1st tee to function as a pro shop. This is pertinent for the Lane Cove golf course, as it is a known issue that the high level of unpaid usage of the course is linked to the inability of the current tennis operator to supervise the 1st tee.</p> <p>A pro shop requires not only space for golfing equipment and clothing sales but also storage areas for hire of clubs and trolleys. In addition, the Golf Professional will require space to also house equipment.</p>	<p><i>"The storage at the western end of the car park is not intended for a future golf pro-shop but rather while its use is flexible, it will likely accommodate house equipment such as clubs, trolleys and other plant and equipment. It is highlighted that the provided storage is significantly larger than what is currently available.</i></p> <p><i>Multipurpose areas are included on the eastern side at carpark level to provide the opportunity to cater a future pro-shop or retail use adjacent to amenities serving the outdoor areas. The space includes a glass façade to provide visual outlook to the golf course, as shown on the plans. The use of these rooms will be determined through a future operational management plan. It is also highlighted, that all key amenities and requirements identified from community consultation has been allocated for where it is deemed necessary.</i></p> <p><i>Further, Council does not foresee illegal play on the golf course as an issue, nonetheless CCTV and safety measures will be integrated to alleviate such concerns. A CPTED lodged with the SEE confirms this."</i></p>
<p>6. The Council have always told the Club there would be an area available in the building for use as clubhouse space in which to meet, store our major trophies, achievement boards, other club artefacts and administration. The only possible spaces we can see for this are the "multi-purpose spaces" which are shown to have walls that are either glass or retractable, neither of which are compatible with our needs.</p>	<p><i>"There is opportunity throughout the layout to accommodate such requests as several flexible spaces are available on the ground floor such as the reception area, along the hallway and between the bistro and multi-purpose rooms which can accommodate storage for trophies, achievement boards and other club artefacts as deemed necessary. Multipurpose rooms will be available for the club and other users to host meetings and events.</i></p> <p><i>More importantly, all space requirements derived from the space analysis developed with the committee have been considered in this design and accommodated for in the proposed layout accordingly."</i></p>
<p>7. Where will the grounds maintenance equipment be stored? The existing equipment sheds are being demolished. If it is intended that the equipment is stored near the Pro Shop, how will the vehicles get in and out to the course? The plan shows no exit except at the eastern end of the driveway to River Road.</p>	<p><i>"There is sufficient space for grounds keeping that will be confirmed through a future operation plan and detailed design."</i></p>
<p>8. Currently there are outdoor toilet facilities located near the 7th green which can be mandatory for those playing 18 holes.</p>	<p><i>"Male and female changing rooms and bathrooms including an accessible changing room on the carpark level will cater to golfers transitioning from the ninth green and first tee. The proposal performs well above the existing facilities."</i></p>

Justification for & cost of development/financial & probity issues (45 + mentions in pro-formas)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • impact on ratepayers/excessive cost • no business case/poor business model • not viable/no financial return <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ needs large rental income • not sound financial management • impact of increased interest rates • costs hidden • no cost benefit analysis • cost to adjoining residents to do upgrade works to mitigate impacts • failure of democracy • potential “white elephant” • no need for facility 	<p>These issues are considered to fall outside of the parameters of Section 4.15 of the EPA Act and hence the scope of the assessment of the application. See further comments in relation to these issues in summary of submissions in assessment report.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • loss of property values 	<p>No evidence to suggest this is likely from other facilities in LGA and hard to quantify until development undertaken. In any event, development has been sited and designed to minimise impact on amenity of adjoining properties, with mitigation measures identified in conditions of consent to further reduce or manage any impacts.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • lack of transparency by doing both projects separately (or not combining) 	<p>Applicant’s decision as to what to include in DA. Separate roadwork projects being undertaken under Part 5 of EPA Act and don’t require development consent.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • cost of land acquisition for roadworks 	<p>Roadworks and any land acquisition required for same not part of this DA.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • doesn’t meet Local Government Act requirements (LGA) 	<p>Council as land-owner, proponent and applicant would be required to follow all appropriate processes and requirements identified under the LGA in relation to the preparation and lodgement of the DA. Ultimately this is an issue for Council to be satisfied of prior to lodgement. DA assessment to ensure relevant issues and requirements under EP and A Act addressed.</p>
Miscellaneous Issues (44 + mentions in pro-formas)	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternate locations suggested and/or deemed to be better as follows (and could be done as joint venture with adjoining Councils): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Willoughby ○ St Leonards ○ Gore Hill ○ Blackman Park ○ vacant bowling green at 266 Longueville Rd ○ behind industrial estate 	<p>Other sites suggested do not form part of the DA and hence cannot be assessed. The DA assessment can only assess the suitability of the site for which the DA is lodged over. Presumably the location was chosen by the applicant following consultation and is the most suitable for the applicant for a range of reasons (e.g. some are located outside of the Lane Cove LGA).</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • no benefit for uses outside of LGA • people from outside LGA shouldn’t be using facility 	<p>The development would be accessible/available to users from both within and outside of the Lane Cove LGA but presumably is aimed primarily at addressing a shortfall of facilities for residents of the Lane Cove LGA</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • meteorological impact (fog and pollution) and impact on micro-climate. 	<p>No concerns in this regard raised by Council’s EHO and nothing to suggest that the proposed development will have excessive impacts on (or be significantly affected by) meteorological factors and. Difficult to quantify in any event.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • duty of care to environment 	<p>Council’s duty of care to the environment has been carefully and thoroughly considered, with additional information requested</p>

	where required, a peer review of the BDAR undertaken and appropriate conditions of consent proposed to address/mitigate any impacts identified.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> not in Council's strategic plans 	The proposed development is consistent with a number of Council and wider metropolitan strategies and plans as discussed in the report.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> development needs to wait for golf course review 	The timing for the lodgement of the DA is a decision for Council as the applicant/land owner of the site.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> inconsistencies in SoEE 	A number of minor inconsistencies in the SoEE have been clarified/addressed during the assessment of the DA and via the lodgement of additional information by the applicant.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> site not suitable for development (run-off and access) 	Council's Engineer and Traffic Co-ordinator have both reviewed the documentation provided with the DA (e.g. stormwater and traffic impact assessment) and have advised the site is suitable for the proposed development subject to conditions of consent (requiring such things as minor adjustments to the stormwater management plan and provision of the access road and roundabout prior to the development opening).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> development should be considered Special Fire Protection Purpose (SPFF) under <i>Planning for Bushfire Protection (PFBP)</i>. site is bushfire prone and shouldn't be built on 	As indicated in the assessment report, the development has been both designed and assessed as if it were a SFPP. On this basis, the DA was referred to the RFS who advised the development can comply with the relevant bushfire requirements (which are attached as conditions of consent).
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> poor access for firefighters 	The RFS has confirmed that the access into the site meets the access requirements of PFBP.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> development doesn't meet RE1 zone objectives 	Discussed in report where it was demonstrated development consistent with RE1 zone objectives as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provides additional, accessible sporting and recreational facilities on the site; and involves planting of 180 replacement trees at 2:1 replacement ratio to compensate for the loss of the 84 trees, resulting in a net gain of over 90 trees and a doubling of the tree canopy at full maturity, thereby enhancing the natural environment.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> no community benefits. Impact outweighs any benefit. 	Development deemed to provide significant public benefit across the LGA and therefore in public interest as discussed in report.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> development appears to be part of bigger development proposed for the site 	Assessment can only cover the components lodged under the DA. no indication there is any further stages beyond the current however any additional development on the site would be subject to a separate DA.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> demolition of existing structures a waste tennis courts and other facilities are fine 	Ultimately land-owners' decision as to viability of retaining buildings and structures, but obviously more difficult to design around retention of some components such as existing tennis courts. Proposed development provides updated and additional facilities constructed to modern standards. Demolition also provides opportunity for contamination of site to be remediated.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> not appropriate for Council to be acting as landlord for bars, restaurants and competing with local shops 	Not an issue for assessment under the DA but presumably Council as land-owner has the same right and will be subject to same requirements for leasing of facilities as other businesses. Essentially just replacing the previous restaurant, bar and café facilities that are currently on site anyway.