

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<b>Planning Proposal Documents</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provided documentation appears to be steeped in legalese and designed "not to inform" the average resident</li> </ul>	<p>All planning proposals are required to comply with the format and content as outlined in the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment's <i>A Guide to Preparing Planning Proposals</i>. A key requirement is that planning proposals are written in plain English to ensure the average person reading and understand what is being proposed, and why.</p> <p>FAQs and other supporting information were made available during the public exhibition to help provide residents with further information. Additionally, planning staff were available to take resident enquiries during the exhibition.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal needs some artistic concept plans in order to gain a visual impression of what is currently proposed as FSRs</li> </ul>	<p>The planning proposal is supported by an Urban Design Study (Appendix A) which contains indicative built form diagrams which provide a visual representation of the proposed height and floor space ratio.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No noise studies have been provided, associated with either construction or under occupation.</li> <li>No timetable over which the works and disruption will occur</li> </ul>	<p>This is a planning proposal – not a Development Application. A planning proposal only considers the amendment to the LEP, such as zoning and development standards (height, floor space ratio). It does not given approval for any construction or development on the site. It is through a future Development Application that detailed issues such as noise would be considered.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Proposed Amendment to Schedule 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagrees with proposed amendment to Schedule 1 to permit residential flat buildings across the entire site.</li> </ul>	<p>Clause 85 in Schedule 1 of the KLEP 2015 currently allows residential flat buildings to be developed across the majority of the site (being 1B Beaconsfield Parade, Drovers Way Road Reserve and 19 Drovers Way) as an additional permitted use. The planning proposal seeks to modify Clause 85 to enable the additional permitted use to apply across the whole site – being 1 Woodford Lane, 2-10 Bent Street and part of 12 Bent Street, in addition to the existing sites. The expansion of the additional permitted use across the whole site will enable for a co-ordinated and orderly use of the land and provide for greater flexibility in determining the final detailed design outcome of the site.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Explanation of Provisions (Page 11)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Planning proposal notes that the final composition of buildings and mix of uses in each building is yet to be finally decided, and will occur at DA stage.</li> <li>With all the expense undertaken to date it is astounding that the composition of the buildings between uses to allow councillors and community to realistically view what will be delivered in terms of facilities vs residential, is not shown.</li> </ul>	<p>This is a planning proposal – not a Development Application. A planning proposal only considers the proposed amendments to the LEP (zoning, height, floorspace ratio, etc). A planning proposal cannot be tied to a particular development outcome on the site. The amendments sought by the planning proposal may result in range of development outcomes and options for the site. The planning proposal is supported by an Urban Design Study which provides an indication of the possible type, footprint and scale of the built form outcomes enabled by the Planning Proposal. Additionally, a site specific DCP has been prepared, and any future development on the site would be required to comply with the site specific DCP controls.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
	It is at the Development Application stage that detailed designs would be finalised, showing the site layout, building design and land use mix.	
<b>Project Intention</b>		
<p><b>Benefits of the Hub</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Lindfield Village Hub is a great opportunity for Council to show its commitment to community wishes for a development that considers both current &amp; future ratepayers needs, and is sympathetic to a more 'community inclusive' facility.</li> </ul> <p><b>Project has changed for worse</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Project started as a NSW transport commuter carpark, with a plan for large community open space, cafes and shops with enlarged Library, senior and community centre and morphed into an overbearing and unwieldy commercial business complex and high density residential project involving major infrastructure issues and with ever reduced benefits for residents. Council should step back from or rescind the project and determine what is best for the community and to meet our revised housing targets.</li> <li>Failed completely in its objectives 'to provide a high quality community asset within a vibrant, activated and economically successful mixed use setting, that will provide for the existing and emerging population of residents and visitors to the Lindfield Local Centre.'</li> <li>Fail to adequately reference the primary role of the land in providing access to Lindfield station and the 2012 initiative of the State Government in providing funding for additional commuter parking.</li> <li>The proposal is for a town centre with new apartment buildings of a scale and bulk that bears little resemblance to the original vision developed by the community.</li> <li>simplify the project as a underground carpark with community facilities and minimal residential development.</li> <li>major concerns about the suitability of the proposed multi-use development for the site, given the massive intensification of use</li> </ul> <p><b>Revert to design resolved by community input (2015)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current proposed amendments to planning controls and suggested design [July 2021] for the Lindfield Village Hub should be aborted. The previously zoned site and design resolved by democratic community polling and resolved by Council in October 2015 be reinstated.</li> <li>Lindfield needs a village hub, not an overdeveloped town centre</li> </ul>	<p>The planning proposal only considers the proposed amendments to the LEP (zoning, height, floorspace ratio, etc). This report assesses the required strategic planning merits of the Planning Proposal as submitted and not the merits of previous proposals for Lindfield Village Hub put before Council.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal has been prepared in accordance with the Council resolution of 20 August 2019 and was endorsed by Council for public exhibition in its current form on 28 April 2020.</p> <p>The development option presented in the planning proposal and Urban design report is considered to satisfy the planning project objectives for the Lindfield Village Hub adopted by Council (OMC 14 August 2018)</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The changes being proposed are unacceptable and inconsistent with the leafy community of Lindfield and the development principals of Ku-ring-gai.</li> <li>Council needs to get back to the original Master Plan which had community support and get on with the project.</li> <li>The new proposal is nothing like the earlier, acceptable proposal. This new proposal is NOT acceptable</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Need for community benefits to be favoured over commercial benefits</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Valuable community owned land is usurped for private commercial and residential property development and lack of community benefits from the proposed planning proposal.</li> <li>Council's plans have become completely unbalanced to favour development and property interests over community interests and outcomes.</li> <li>Need to review the financial assumptions, reduce the height and bulk and return to the village concept whilst also negotiating with the parties for inclusion of the bridge. In particular the proposal for residential floor space of 14,460m<sup>2</sup> is excessive.</li> <li>The initial impetus was the desire of Transport NSW to provide more commuter car parking for Lindfield station. At the same time the relocation of the library and community centre was under consideration and a major company was interested in constructing a new supermarket for Lindfield. For long term residents this seemed a wonderful opportunity to create a general purpose commercial/community hub on the Western side of the Pacific Highway, on land that was woefully under-utilised. Nine years later, where are we? We have a Planning Proposal whose emphasis is on housing above all else</li> </ul>	<p>As a separate process and reporting matter Ku-ring-gai Council has adopted project objectives for the Lindfield Village Hub which included the requirement for the project to be 'self-funding' (OMC 14 August 2018). Moreover, Council considered and adopted a separate report on 20 August 2019 to prepare the planning proposal to deliver the community infrastructure and services identified in Council's adopted masterplan.</p> <p>There is a clear separation between commercial decisions of Council on this matter and planning decision of Council. This report assesses the required strategic planning merits of the Planning Proposal as submitted and not the commercial or financial viability of this proposal or the merits of previous proposals put before Council.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Objectives of Planning Proposal</b></p>		
<p><b>Support for objectives of Planning Proposal</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective 6 PP - <i>To better provide for the orderly and economic development of the site.</i></li> <li>Objective 7 PP - <i>To enhance the public open space within the Lindfield Village Hub -</i></li> <li>Objective 8 PP - <i>To enable the delivery of the planned public infrastructure including multifaceted community facilities and public open space within the Lindfield Village Hub in accordance with Council's vision, in a cost-effective way</i></li> <li>Objective 10 PP - <i>To contribute to the economy and provide additional employment opportunities for the community</i></li> </ul>	<p>The support for the objective of the planning proposal is noted</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objective 11 PP - <i>To ensure that development within the Ku-ring-gai LGA appropriately supports the objectives of planning policies and plans, namely Council's Community Strategic Plan, the Greater Sydney Regional Plan A Metropolis of Three Cities, and the North District Plan.</i></li> </ul>		
<b>Whole of centre redevelopment</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any development should be done in conjunction with the redevelopment of the privately owned shops on the western side of the Pacific Highway between Beaconsfield Parade and Bent Street. Would require exchange of land between Council and developer.</li> <li>A new development on the Highway could include shops, supermarket, offices, specialised facilities e.g. medical diagnostic, dental surgeries, day surgery, serviced apartments for short stays, as well as residential apartments.</li> <li>Including this proposed development within the scope of the Lindfield Village Hub would allow better planning for open space, shading and siting of dwellings and other structures, and the overall demand for and location of car parking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The properties on the western side of the Pacific Highway between Beaconsfield Parade and Bent Street are all privately-owned properties and as such, the timing of redevelopment of these properties is not within Council's control.</li> <li>A potential developer may consider incorporating some of the properties on the Pacific Highway with the Lindfield Hub however this would be a commercial decision that Council does not control.</li> <li>Experience has shown that the community is very unwilling to accept building above 5 storeys in the centres. Development feasibility models undertaken by Council in the past indicate heights exceeding 9 storeys would be required to trigger redevelopment of these shops due to the very high land values.</li> </ul>	No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP
<b>Existing Community Facilities</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing library is fine – should be no hurry to replace</li> <li>Recommendation to retain and improve the current facilities on the Lindfield Library site</li> <li>There is no demand for a new community facility</li> </ul>	<p>Council's <i>Community Facilities Strategy, 2018</i> undertook a review of existing Council-owned and operated community facilities. The review identified the following issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The majority of existing facilities in Ku-ring-gai are old, out-dated and no longer fit-for-purpose.</li> <li>There are significant inadequacies in the current provision of library facilities in the LGA, impacting on the Council's capacity to provide modern library services.</li> <li>The Lindfield Branch Library is identified as the poorest facility in terms of floor area, condition, layout, and functionality.</li> <li>The majority of community halls and centres have small spaces that are not flexible and limited in their capability to accommodate a range of users.</li> <li>There is a high and growing demand for community facility space for larger meetings and group activities (including space for functions, events and performances). Council's existing facilities do not cater for this demand.</li> </ul>	No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<b>Proposed land uses – Community Facilities, Retail, Childcare</b>		
<p><b>Childcare Centres</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Too many childcare facilities already</li> <li>• Remove Childcare facilities. There are now 3 Childcare Centres on the western side of the Highway within 800m of the Hub.</li> <li>• Do we really need more childcare facilities? There's one every second street here in West Lindfield/Killara.</li> <li>• Exclude the proposed child care centre, it is not the best location because it would add a huge site traffic burden.</li> </ul>	<p>Centre-based child care facilities are a land use is that is permitted with consent within the B2 Local Centre zone. The inclusion of a child care centre in the final development will be a commercial decision, based on a review of market conditions to ensure a child care centre would be financially feasible.</p> <p>The <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Educational Establishments and Child Care Facilities) 2017</i> includes non-discretionary development standards, which means a development application for a centre-based child care facility cannot be refused on these grounds. One non-discretionary development standard is location, with the SEPP outlining that the development of a centre-based child care facility may be located at any distance from an existing or proposed early education and care facility.</p> <p>As the population increases, the demand for child care centres also grows. Historically, in Ku-ring-gai the majority of people using long day care centres have been local residents who live in close proximity to the centres.</p> <p>The Traffic Impact Assessment (Appendix B) prepared for the planning proposal includes consideration of the traffic generation a child care centre would have on the surrounding road network. In addition, should a Development Application be lodged for a child care centre on the site, then a further detailed traffic study would be required and assessed as part of that specific application.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>General Comments – Community Facilities and Retail</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will greatly enhance the western side of Lindfield with the provision of community facilities</li> <li>• All community facilities identified in the previous plans for the Hub (ie. a library, child care centre, multipurpose community building, public car park, commuter carpark and public plaza and park) must be retained with no loss of Public amenity.</li> <li>• Strong desire for retail incl. major supermarket, cafes/restaurant, library and open green spaces.</li> <li>• Good for Lindfield and Ku-ring-gai by providing shopping, restaurants, entertainment, open space, and community facilities</li> <li>• Local community is in need of community facilities that are well overdue.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for new community facilities noted</li> <li>• Support for retail floorspace noted</li> <li>• Quantifying demand for community and library floorspace was undertaken as part of the preparation of the <i>Ku-ring-gai Community Facilities Strategy – Part 1 – Libraries and Community Centres, 2018</i></li> <li>• The study was prepared by independent consultants Elton Consulting who have Australia-wide experience in this field</li> <li>• Public libraries have a well-developed and accepted set of standards directing required levels of provision. These standards have been developed by the State Library of New South Wales and are outlined in <i>People Places: A guide for Public Library Buildings in New South Wales – third edition</i> (State Library of New South Wales, 2012).</li> <li>• The proposed level of provision for community centres is based on a review of a range of standards for social infrastructure adopted in other jurisdictions across Australia. The standards have been analysed, tested and adapted to the Ku-ring-gai LGA context.</li> </ul>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An external review should be conducted of the scale of the library and community facilities to examine whether they exceed what is actually in demand and if so, what cost savings can be achieved.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The review provides a robust framework that is transparent and open to review.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Covid Impacts on Land Uses</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>COVID lockdowns with no reliable indication that life will ever return to what was considered a normal way of life again, the planning proposal is adverse to planning for pandemic times. There is now considerably more on-line shopping</li> <li>The planning proposal is contrary to sensible place making planning for pandemic times in developing more shopping precincts and high-rise apartment blocks which have been shown to be super spreader environments.</li> <li>During the 2020/21 pandemic workers have been obliged to change their work and travel behaviour. The extent to which any of this results in longer term change is unknown but there is previous experience to indicate it will be less than might be imagined.</li> <li>Demand for office space is not forecast to reduce. Council should not second guess future demand from commuters at a time when we are in the middle of the crisis and should base its decision making on previous trends and 2019 data.</li> </ul> <p><b>Covid Pandemic – Economic Impacts</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Understand and agree with the resolved decision of Council in December 2020 which resolved  <i>“a. the LVH tender and subsequent negotiation period has coincided with the Covid-19 pandemic, creating a global economic downturn, uncertainty in the property market and impacting on project viability and competitive tension.                      b. that an offer has not yet been received that is financially viable.                      c. continue to negotiate with any possible providers, while undertaking a review of Council’s project assumptions and objectives.”</i> </li> <li>Why is the Planning Proposal is proceeding while current social and economic circumstances, have not changed.</li> <li>If the project is unviable then the project should not be proceeding at this time particularly as council has already spent millions of dollars of ratepayer’s funds on the project with no viable or achievable result. It is clear the project is not in the public interest.</li> <li>We believe the Planning Proposal should be rescinded and the plans for the community car park be completely scaled back in the public interest.</li> </ul>	<p>The implications of the covid pandemic are varied with changes to work, recreational and travel behaviours.</p> <p>The Planning proposal subject of this assessment proposes a range of land uses and activities for the site including retail, housing, open space and community facilities, aligned with the place making and urban design principles.</p> <p>Ultimately it will be a market decision on the final design and to what extent any modifications are made to respond to the implications of covid and the layout and delivery at the which time will be subject to more assessment and consultation at the Development Application stage (if the planning proposal proceeds).</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>



**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p><b>Community Facilities – Need for more</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Community Facilities need to increase the combined seating capacity of the interconnected meeting space to 200 people</li> <li>Community and commercial objectives are only around 30% of the total floorspace allocated to this project.</li> <li>The community facilities on offer should not be compromised for more development that does not classify as true community space and in my definition should not include private day care which I deem a commercial enterprise.</li> <li>The Lindfield community is losing the equivalent of approximately 6000 sqm community space and a range of community facilities that Lindfield Library site currently provides (e.g. Lindfield Branch Library, KYDS youth development facility, 14 Self-contained affordable residential units (Arrunga), Lindfield Seniors Centre, Lindfield Seniors Resource Centre, Lindfield Community Centre Tennis Courts, Toilet facilities, car park, landscaped areas and historic well.) The Hub proposal only allows a minimum of 3000sqm for community facilities. Increase of residential units proposed for the Hub site and the Library Site the Lindfield community will need more community facilities not less.</li> <li>Designated community space including at least one indoor, multi-purpose sporting court (primarily basketball). Our LGA significantly lags other councils in greater Sydney in the provision of indoor sporting facilities, despite the recent and very modest investment in the courts at St Ives High.</li> <li>The Hub was promoted as a community-based project to improve local community facilities and open space for residents. However, the provision of a major 5000 sqm retail and commercial space and multi-unit high density housing proposed for the site has now become the main focus of the planning proposal.</li> <li>The balance of the planning is inconsistent with the objectives as presented to the community with only of increased and improved facilities with combined major and specialty retail (at 7,180 sqm), three times the size compared to community facilities (at 2,450sqm) for the 'state of the art' Library building and community rooms.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provision of community facilities is based on best-practice standards from across Australia.</li> <li>Quantifying demand for community and library floorspace was undertaken as part of the preparation of the <i>Ku-ring-gai Community Facilities Strategy – Part 1 – Libraries and Community Centres, 2018</i></li> <li>The proposed community centre has a total floor area of 1200sqm which has potential to provide space for larger meetings and group activities (including space for functions and events).</li> <li>There has been no change or reduction in the amount of community infrastructure proposed as part of the LVH proposal.</li> <li>The Planning Proposal includes a total of 6,900m<sup>2</sup> of community infrastructure including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A community park with a minimum area of 3,000m<sup>2</sup>;</li> <li>A civic plaza with an approximate area of 900m<sup>2</sup>; and</li> <li>Community facilities comprising not less than a total of 3,000m</li> </ul> </li> <li>Council is working with the Department of Education to deliver the St Ives Indoor Sports Centre at St Ives High School which will include a total of four indoor basketball courts. Council is funding two of the indoor basketball courts at substantial cost. The total project will cost \$19.6 million.</li> <li>Noted. The submissions do not support the quantum of retail and commercial floor space in relation to the quantum of social infrastructure. However, this is not a matter for consideration as part of the assessment of a Planning Proposal</li> </ul>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Library</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Library should have space to accommodate study &amp; research</li> <li>Place conducive to thinking &amp; imagining</li> </ul>	<p>This is a planning proposal – not a Development Application. A planning proposal is only concerned about amendments to the LEP and cannot considered the detailed design of Library space.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p><b>Supermarket</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove the need for another supermarket and replace it with more, higher paying, residential GFA.</li> <li>The Lindfield community does not need another major supermarket. Currently we have a Harris Farm, Super IGA and Coles, with Coles planning a large expansion on its site. We do not need another one.</li> </ul>	<p>The draft Ku-ring-gai Retail and Commercial Centres Strategy 2020 notes that there is an existing undersupply of 35,000sqm of retail floorspace within Ku-ring-gai, and this undersupply is expected to increase with population increases. The undersupply of retail floorspace is mainly due to the undersupply of supermarkets and lack of regional and sub-regional shopping centres, which results in residents leaving Ku-ring-gai to shop in neighbouring centres. The existing provision of supermarket floorspace within Ku-ring-gai is lower than the metropolitan Sydney and Australian benchmark. One full line supermarket typically requires a catchment population of 8,000-10,000 people in order to be sustainable, which indicates that 13 full line supermarkets are currently supportable in the LGA, potentially increasing to 15 by 2036.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Proposed Land Use - Residential Apartments and Housing</b></p>		
<p><b>Apartment Sizes</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Apartment size is too small. Given the area, it should be enforced to developers to have large sized apartments. 2 bedroom apartments should be around 100sqm, to provide decent living spaces and enough space for working from home environments.</li> </ul>	<p>The reference scheme included in the Urban Design Report shows an indicative design solution for the site. Any future development of the site would be subject to detailed design and a development application (DA). The residential component of any development application would need to comply with <i>State Environmental Planning Policy No 65 – Design Quality of Residential Apartment Development (SEPP 65)</i> and the associated NSW Apartment Design Guide (ADG). It applies to all residential flat developments and sets minimum design standards including minimum unit size and amenity requirements..</p> <p>The KDCP also makes reference that all such developments must comply with the SEPP and the ADG.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Housing typology mix</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed total residential floor space equates to 231.1% of the total land of the hub site</li> <li>Delete attached villa houses. The community does not want this to be a housing or residential complex. Community originally wanted no residential but settled for 2 blocks of 7 storeys</li> <li>The additional block of units is a significant blow to the benefits touted for this project, in particular the green space.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The overall FSR proposed for the site is 2.31:1 (or 231% of site area) This covers all proposed uses on the site including retail, commercial community facilities and residential uses. The planning proposal caps the residential floor space ratio at 1.35:1 or approximately 14 950 sqm.</li> <li>Attached villa houses do not form part of the proposal. All residential development on the site will be in the form of residential units. The quantity of residential development in the Planning Proposal is in line with the Council's resolution on August 20 2019.</li> <li>The additional residential development proposed on the site will not affect the quantity of green space under the existing planning controls. The proposal includes a community park with a minimum area of 3000m<sup>2</sup>; and civic a plaza with an approximate area of 900m<sup>2</sup>.</li> </ul>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Affordable/Social Housing</b></p>	<p>The Ku-ring-gai LSPS includes the planning priority K5. Providing affordable housing that retains and strengthens the local residential and business community. There is also an accompanying</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include an objective and associated control in the DCP that requires any</li> </ul>



**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need allocation for low cost housing in the mix.</li> <li>• 37 meter solution agreed in the hope that affordable housing will help to diversify the KRG council population and does the right thing by people that cannot afford high housing prices. Going higher up also helps with best practise of land use. The Pacific Highway corridor is the perfect place to do so.</li> <li>• Heightening the building at a later date to create so called “social housing” was not accepted in the recent rejection of the Housing Strategy [March 2020].</li> <li>• Attached dwellings could be replaced by one of the 7 floor residential blocks being ‘Built for Rent’ as social housing at affordable rents. Council could also retain ownership</li> </ul>	<p>action to prepare a SEPP 70 Affordable Housing Contribution Scheme for Ku-ring-gai to enable a mechanism for the delivery of local affordable housing. As Council is yet to establish its SEPP 70 Affordable Housing Scheme it is not possible to mandate the provision of affordable housing on the site.</p> <p>The proposal allows additional residential floor space over and above the cap of 1.35:1 for the purposes of affordable housing. The exclusion of affordable housing from the maximum permissible residential floor space will allow any retail/commercial floor space potential not taken up in a future development to be used as affordable housing provided the maximum FSR for the site is not exceeded. As Council is yet to establish a SEPP 70 Affordable Housing Scheme to require the provision of affordable housing on the site, the exclusion of affordable housing from the 1.35:1 FSR provision will offer an incentive for affordable housing in a future development. The provision of affordable housing on the site will be optional and is not intended to be a mandatory requirement.</p> <p>If Affordable housing is provided in the future development scheme, it should be equivalent in quality to market housing and should not have less amenity. A control should be included in the DCP to ensure this outcome.</p>	<p>affordable housing to have equal or greater amenity than market housing.</p>
<p><b>Aged Care and Seniors Housing</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Benefits of enabling seniors to live in centres of communities, close to amenities, retail, transport, health services and community spaces as library. Lindfield Hub meets this criteria, and is an attractive location</li> <li>• Opportunity to adjust planning controls to better support the provision of seniors housing and aged care. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ suggest that 20% of beds in the nursing home be dedicated to supported residents and that space for these beds (approx. 1,000m2) be allowed in excess of 1.35:1</li> <li>○ suggest that floor space utilised for aged care should be allowable as part of the retail/commercial floor space (up to 2,000m2) and community floor space (up to 1,000m2)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Unlike strata apartments, Montefiore would retain ownership of the seniors living apartments (retirement living). This avoids sterilising future uses of the Lindfield Hub location due to the practical impossibility of dealing with multiple freehold landowners - as is the case with strata buildings.</li> <li>• Would generate more than 100 full time jobs</li> </ul>	<p>The development of aged care and senior housing is largely government by <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing for Seniors and People with a Disability) 2004</i> (SEPP Seniors).</p> <p>‘Seniors housing’ is currently a permissible use in the B2 – local centre zone under the KLEP 2015. However, it would be inappropriate and undesirable to include mandatory site specific provisions relating the provision of seniors housing on the site.</p> <p>The future provision of seniors housing on the site will remain permissible but it will come down to a commercial decision as to whether that development option is pursued. This report assesses the required strategic planning merits of the Planning Proposal as submitted and not the commercial or financial viability of this proposal or the merits of previous proposals put before Council.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<b>Height and Density</b>		
<p><b>Opposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The intensity of the proposed development is not suitable for the area and detracts from the visual amenity of the area</li> <li>Strong opposition to the 37m, 9 storey height – which will be the tallest building in Lindfield</li> <li>Current limit should be retained and the maximum height of the three major buildings should kept as 26.5m</li> <li>No additional height or density should be allowed until infrastructure is improved, it is currently inadequate even for the existing population (traffic, transport, open space)</li> <li>The proposed changes to the planning controls aim to further increase the maximum building heights to 31.5m, 29.5m and 37m. These increases will be significantly over Council’s resolution on 20 August 2019 that the Lindfield Village Hub site is to be “[w]ith a height control of no higher than the highest building in Lindfield being 23–41 Lindfield Avenue (known as the Aqualand building) which equates to no more than a 9 storey building on the Lindfield Village Hub site”. The Aqualand building site (23–41 Lindfield Avenue) is also zoned B2 with a maximum building height of 26.5m. This demonstrates that the existing maximum building height of 26.5m for the Hub is appropriate, and it can achieve satisfactory planning outcomes.</li> <li>The community is strongly opposed to buildings higher than 7 storeys, as demonstrated by the rejection of the Housing Strategy in September 2020</li> <li>Current controls only allow for a 7 storey building, Council flaunting this regulation will only encourage others to flaunt Council regulations. Council needs to lead by example and act in the best interest of the community.</li> <li>Given that residents did not wish for 14 storeys, it is not understood why 3 of the 7 options are at 14 storeys and that 9 storeys are the only other options on offer which infers that Council preferences are being prioritised and residents continuous concerns are not being considered.</li> <li>References to the height above sea level of an existing building is surely not acceptable from a town planning perspective</li> <li>A Building height at 37metres or 9 stories, plus the associated density is a considerable increase (18%) over the current Development Control Plan. If the HUB is developed outside the planning controls, it will lead to future developments being given approvals that exceed the current development criteria. Council may believe it has the authority to control development, but developers will use the HUB to support increased</li> </ul>	<p><i>Height and Density</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The increase in intensity is considered appropriate from an urban design perspective given the location of the site and the public benefits of the proposal. The proposal will provide additional infrastructure including public open space, community facilities and commuter car parking.</li> <li>The intensity of the proposal at nine storeys and 2.31:1 is generally considered acceptable from an urban design perspective. It is noted that the overall height of the development (roof RL) is similar to the Aqualand building on the north-eastern side of Lindfield Station which is eight storeys in height. It is noted that the proposed density/‘intensity’ of the proposal is less than the Aqualand building which is 3.9:1 FSR (59%). It is noted that the Aqualand building had a stated building height of up to 28.5m.</li> <li>Whilst the land does slope more steeply towards the west, public domain views (for example from Lindfield Station or the Pacific Highway) do not enable comparative views of the ground plane. Overall building heights however can be appreciated and limiting the height of the proposal to the Aqualand building height will mean that the proposed buildings will appear to be similar in height from vantage points beyond the actual site</li> <li>It is noted that the proposed heights in metres in the planning proposal do not appear to be consistent with the reference scheme in the Urban Design report. For example, the Urban Design Report (p65) illustrates the 9 storeys as requiring 31m in height (RL127.5 - RL96.5), however the ground level does not appear to fall 6m from the highest to the lowest point within the building footprint of the northernmost building to substantiate the proposed height of 37m. The chosen heights may allow additional storeys to be accommodated above that intended</li> <li>To ensure consistency between the reference scheme and the proposed LEP amendments, the outlines on the height of buildings map should be adjusted to more closely reflect the heights intended in the reference scheme. An additional way to control the overall building height may be to include a maximum RL of 127.45 (Urban Design Report p65) in the proposed new Part 6 Additional Local Provisions clause. A provision phrased in this way would capture the intent of the Council Resolution 20 August 2019 to have a height ‘no higher than the highest building in Lindfield... (the Aqualand building)’.</li> <li>It is also noted that no storey control (similar to KDCP 7C.7 1) has been included in the draft site specific DCP.</li> <li>Overshadowing has been addressed in the Urban Design Report (p58) and the impact has been previously assessed as acceptable. See also discussion in Exhibited Planning</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Amend the height of building map in the planning proposal to more closely reflect the heights intended in the reference scheme.</li> <li>Include a maximum RL of 127.45 (Urban Design Report p65) in the proposed new Part 6 Additional Local Provisions clause</li> <li>Include a storey control within the DCP (similar to KDCP 7C.7 1) relating to the LEP maximum height of buildings to ensure that the number of storeys is limited to those shown in the Urban Design Report.</li> </ul>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>heights and densities, particularly when applications are processed through the Land &amp; Environment Court. There are several examples of this on the east side of the station.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The community has consistently rejected the 9 storeys proposed in favour of the 7 storeys agreed initially. The documents provided are misleading as the maps now show that the heights being proposed are higher than 9 stories (26.5m in T1), but now extend to 10 stories (31.5m in U) and 11 stories (37.0m in V1).</li> <li>Preference for the building to have a 7 storey limit, as established after earlier rounds of consultation</li> <li>The FSR for two 7 floor residential blocks should be calculated at <b>1.3:1</b></li> <li>Recommended FSR for buildings 6-7 storeys is FSR 2.1, with a maximum 3.1 for buildings 9-12 storeys according to NSW Planning Apartment Design Guide. Anything over this is unacceptable.</li> <li>The maximum floor space ratio should be kept at below 2.0:1.</li> <li>The height of the project should be no higher and preferably lower than the existing elevations on Lindfield Avenue developments. Given the slope of the development site to the west, the height impact would be exacerbated as the land falls away from the Pacific Hwy elevation.</li> <li>The current proposal should limit the use of 9 storey building heights to the lowest parts of the site to minimise the visual impact. Also there should be no protrusion of public space and building services above this level. A far more acceptable site layout with less visual impact would be to position the lowest height buildings at the highest parts of the site and the highest buildings at the lowest parts of the site</li> <li>Building heights should be left at the originally set height of 7 storey without any roof top plant above this height (26.5m).</li> <li>Question the need for the degree of density in the high rise plan and the height of the proposed structures. The current options (2 – 7) have overly tall structures at the North Western sector which would adversely impact my visual amenity, cause overshadowing, loss of privacy and potential noise impact as this corner is located closest to myself.</li> <li>Residential density and design need to be in the keeping with community expectations. Although reduced heights and FSR will result in lower development returns the priority should be the integrity of the project to maintain the future of a Lindfield Village atmosphere.</li> <li>The proposal is formulated as an overdevelopment of the site. The community vision was for a village hub.</li> </ul>	<p>Proposal (p52-53). More detailed assessment will also be required at development application stage with ADG provisions working to protect reasonable solar access.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visual privacy (building separation) has been addressed in the Urban Design Report (p55) and the impact has been previously assessed as acceptable. More detailed assessment will also be required at development application stage.</li> <li>With regard to rooftop machinery, Council will be able to deal with any height breaches and impacts thereof through Clause 4.6 contravention requests</li> </ul>	

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Council should not try to maximise the value of the site by allowing over development outside the current development controls.</li> <li>• Suggest that the benefits of open space on people's lives are self-evident. The benefits of limiting building heights might not be.</li> <li>• Tall buildings themselves become places of solitariness. Ideally, no building should be taller than four storeys, as is the case in much of Europe and was the case in much of Australia until recently, because that is the maximum height that allows people to walk up and down the stairs if needed. Buildings taller than four storeys need lifts, and thus depend on electricity supply and building maintenance. People become effectively trapped inside or outside tall buildings during outages or lift failures.</li> <li>• Proposed 9 storey height for hub are taken from Aqualand building, but this is misleading, as Aqualand is being stated as being 9 floors. Aqualand is currently the tallest building in Lindfield, and is 8 floors measured on the frontage to Lindfield Avenue.</li> <li>• Considering that this side of the town slopes more steeply towards west when compared to the east side, it doesn't seem to be appropriate to have its maximum height consistent to the current highest building in Lindfield being 23 - 41 Lindfield Avenue (known as the Aqualand building). The difference in steepness of West and East side slopes should be taken into account</li> <li>• Council's resolution on 20 August 2019 indicates the Lindfield Village Hub site will be "no higher than the highest building in Lindfield being 23 – 41 Lindfield Avenue (known as the Aqualand building)" and "no more than a 9 storey building on the Lindfield Village Hub site". The Aqualand site (23 – 41 Lindfield Avenue) is currently zoned B2 with the maximum height of building at 26.5m. This is similar to the Lindfield Village Hub's existing maximum height limit of 26.5m (T).</li> <li>• The proposed new height of building (31.5m, 29.5m, and 37m) will significantly exceed the maximum height of Acqualand site. Given the fact the east side of the Pacific Highway is much higher than the west side (over 10 meters), it is misinterpreting of Council's resolution and also misleading to use Australian Height Datum to match the Acqualand building's height.</li> <li>• Rooftop machinery is not desired as previously suggested by Councils Planning Panel</li> </ul> <p><i>Height controls specifically along the proposed new Drovers Way Road</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We are writing to express our wishes that the Council will keep the maximum height to 26.5m on the west part of the Hub, along the proposed new Drovers Way.</li> <li>• The maximum building height of the Lindfield Village Hub must be retained at its current 26.5m height limit along the proposed Drovers Way Road.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Height controls specifically along the proposed new Drovers Way Road</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A maximum height of 26.5m (formerly RL6) is proposed along the northern half of Drovers Way. This maintains the current LEP maximum height of building.</li> <li>• A maximum height of 29.5m is proposed along the southern half of Drovers Way. This exceeds the current LEP maximum height of building by 3m. A setback to the uppermost level could be introduced to maintain the 26.5m height at the building face. This would be</li> </ul>	<p><i>Height controls specifically along the proposed new Drovers Way Road</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Include an explicit setback control to require the top storey of <u>all</u> parts of the building to be setback a minimum of 3m (similar to KDCP 7C.8 2(i) (but not (ii))).</li> </ul>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current heights are unacceptable and do not respond to the current slope of the land but result in overbearing development on lower density residential properties on the western slope</li> <li>We strongly recommend the new planning proposal to consider its impact on the neighbouring properties and be sympatric to the local environment. We request this proposed planning proposal to keep its maximum height of building at its current 26.5m (T) along the new (proposed) Drovers Way road.</li> <li>The heights proposed will allow for not only nine (9) storeys which the community strongly opposed, but will allow due to the considerable downward slope of the car park land to Drover's Way, a further two (2) storeys of height to the residential apartment buildings which is completely unacceptable.</li> <li>We are especially concerned about the proposed increase of the maximum building heights to 31.5m and 29.5m along the proposed new Drovers Way Road. This will impose detrimental and irrevocable overshadowing effects to the neighbouring properties on the west of the Hub. Properties on the west of the Hub are zoned R4. Under the proposed changes to planning controls, future development (e.g. residential flat buildings) and existing retirement homes on the R4 zoned land to the west of the Hub will be deprived of proper solar access and permanently under shadow.</li> </ul> <p><i>Neighbourhood character</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amended heights are inconsistent with the existing built structures on the western side of the highway.</li> <li>The existing shops on the highway are all two storeys – the suggested 9 storeys on the hub would stand out as an eye sore</li> <li>The 9 storey building on the east side of the railway line was not approved by Council but used some other state government planning/approval pathway so should not be used as an example of the neighbourhood character, a 7 storey building height is far more acceptable.</li> </ul> <p><i>Privacy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The height at 37m means the development will overlook a lot of residents and will overpower the site and impact privacy.</li> <li>The privacy of residents much further away will be impacted: e.g. even the residents of the Highfield Rd Balfour Street Heritage Conservation Area. The community and comfort of homes suffer to have apartments overlooking them and their gardens, as we have now in parts of Ku-ring-gai.</li> </ul>	<p>consistent with what is indicated in the Urban Design Report (for example at p52 and p55) and what has been tested previously in the reference scheme in terms of GFA and achievement of amenity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The taller portions of the proposal with an additional two storeys of height are set back 23m from the boundary. This provides a 1:1 height to setback relationship with Drovers Way (Urban Design Report p65) which will reduce a sense of overbearing and visual impact and is considered acceptable from an urban design perspective.</li> <li>It is noted that sites to the west of the proposal are zoned R4 High Density Residential with the potential to redevelop.</li> </ul> <p><i>Neighbourhood character</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The intensity of the proposal at nine storeys and 2.31:1 is generally considered acceptable from an urban design perspective. It is noted that the overall height of the development (roof RL) is similar to the Aqualand building on the north-eastern side of Lindfield Station which is eight storeys in height. It is noted that the proposed density/'intensity' of the proposal is less than the Aqualand building which is 3.9:1 FSR (59%). It is noted that the Aqualand building had a stated building height of up to 28.5m.</li> </ul> <p><i>Privacy</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See comments with regard to height under <u>Height and Density</u> above</li> <li>See comments with regard to visual privacy and building separation under <u>Height and Density</u> above</li> <li>See comments with regard to overbearing under <u>Height controls specifically along the proposed new Drovers Way Road</u> above.</li> </ul>	

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The community and comfort of homes suffer to have apartments overlooking them and their gardens</li> </ul> <p><i>Resilience</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern with an excessively concentrated, high rise set of developments is that this fosters the spread of the SARS-Covid 19 virus and future variants by having pinch points in lifts and foyers. In Recent times the authorities have had to ring-fence and quarantine such accommodation blocks. Lower density in housing units should be preferred for the community's overall benefit.</li> <li>High density living is now far less attractive due to significantly increased health risks of infection transmission from multiple users of lifts and common residential space.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Resilience</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>With regard to pinch points, ADG 4F-1 4 requires that daylight and natural ventilation be provided in common circulation spaces. The proposed Design and Place SEPP has flagged that natural light and ventilation to common areas should be made 'mandatory'.</li> </ul>	
<p><i>Support for greater height</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To redevelop any property then you need to get the maximum return. Limiting the residential to 9 stories means that you are unable to maximise the greenspace.</li> <li>Nothing wrong with 15 stories or even 20.</li> </ul>	<p>The Planning Proposal has been prepared with attention to the Council resolution of 20 August 2019, which amongst other matters, resolved that the height control for the site be no higher than the highest building in Lindfield being 23 – 41 Lindfield Avenue (known as the Aqualand building). As such the Planning Proposal seeks to set the maximum building heights for the site reflective of the highest building at 23-41 Lindfield Avenue.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Site Layout and Options in Urban Design Study</b></p>		
<p><b>Site Layout</b></p> <p><i>Site layout – retail</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Retail ground floor needs to be moved where the action is</li> <li>Retail will not be required as it now in part of the central Hub and retail area.</li> <li>The plan should include the shopping precinct facing the Pacific Highway between Beaconsfield Road and Balfour St. The existing shops are of poor condition and should be demolished.</li> </ul> <p><i>Site layout – community facilities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Move the Community Facility to eliminate the possibility of noise pollution, shadows and disturbance to neighbours</li> <li>Move &amp; Reduce size of north-western Community Facility building</li> <li>Reduce the height of the facility to around 2-3 floors and position on and in part of the originally proposed central Hub.</li> </ul> <p><i>Site layout – concerns</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed buildings need to be reduced and grouped to not encroach on the Public Park and green space, or cover the whole site.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Site layout – retail</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The properties on the western side of the Pacific Highway between Beaconsfield Parade and Bent Street are all privately-owned properties and as such, the timing of redevelopment of these properties is not within Council's control.</li> <li>A potential developer may consider incorporating some of the properties on the Pacific Highway with the Lindfield Hub however this would be a commercial decision that Council does not control.</li> </ul> <p><i>Site layout – community facilities</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The location and form of the community facility is considered to be desirable from an urban design perspective as it will be an identifiable public building with its own public presence within the Lindfield Town Centre related to a public park. Reducing its height will reduce its floor space. Moving the community facility (ie incorporating it within another building) will reduce its identity.</li> </ul> <p><i>Site layout – concerns</i></p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>



**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The preferred option no. 5 does not successfully address concerns as there is intended to be a 5-6 storey building on the north western corner of the site, which is acknowledged as a weakness in the proposal.</li> <li>• The NW corner 5 -6 storey building will need to be contracted and set back further south away from Bent Street (currently a 3m setback) (as a minimum, I'd suggest 11-12m), together with a reduction in its height.</li> <li>• The relative scale and bulk shown in the view in Figure 50 from Bent Street clearly portrays the inappropriateness of that slab sided structure when viewed from the west looking east or from the north looking south. View Six in Figure 82 disguises the scale of the structure, which looks okay from afar, however if an additional view from say halfway up Bent Street was taken, the impact to any observer would be dreadful.</li> <li>• By example the relatively low height post-office / telephone exchange in Beaconsfield Pde when viewed from the north-west is hugely imposing for a low height structure. Figures 98-102 look even worse when view from the corner of Bent &amp; Balfour Streets. Halfway up Bent Street if such a view was presented would be catastrophic.</li> <li>• The public has been misled into believing that the hub would unite the West and East Lindfield communities. Claustrophobic space is provided surrounded by excessively high buildings relative to the rest of Lindfield on 3 sides with a high-rise rezoning proposed for the site on the north side of Bent Street being the fourth side.</li> <li>• The planning control must not allow building heights than 9 storeys including lifts and plant, and preferably no greater than 7 storeys. In addition, please ensure that the planning controls do not compromise the footprint of real green space on the site with another residential tower.</li> <li>• North-eastern residential block should be removed:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Robs park of 240sqm of park/green space</li> <li>○ Removal visual eyesore</li> <li>○ Retain community land from sale to developer</li> <li>○ Reduce residential floor space of 14,460sqm or 56.4% of total residential floor space</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Accept the need for nine storeys but I reject the proposal to create a northern tower. A northern tower would reduce the land set out as green open space in the 2015 master plan.</li> <li>• The community is opposed to a new residential tower</li> <li>• The almost magical appearance of an additional unit tower at this late date is just one more indication that this project has long since lost touch with the community it is meant to serve.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed buildings positively define the edge of the public park, provide active edges and are arranged so that they do not unreasonably overshadow the park. The proposed building arrangement and size are generally considered to be appropriate from an urban design perspective (however, see comments under <u>Height and Density</u> above).</li> <li>• A strong street address to the community building from Bent Street is desirable from an urban design point of view.</li> <li>• The building height of the northwest building (26.5m) is the same as currently permitted under KLEP2015.</li> <li>• With regard to green space, the amended draft DCP requires the deep soil planting to be in accordance with the ADG'. It is noted that proposed Design and Place SEPP has flagged that deep soil areas are likely to be increased (21-25% for sites greater than 3000m2).</li> <li>• With regard to compromising the footprint, the objectives and controls relating to the delivery of the park are considered to be strong. The intention of the reference scheme could be strengthened if the supermarket component was explicitly required to be located beneath the park as it is the only place it can fit.</li> </ul>	

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alternate to increase residential density; Option A – rather than another concrete tower, can the additional residential space be incorporated within the originally proposed commercial/retail spaces. It is clear to anyone who lives locally that there are many commercial/retail spaces untenanted on the highway; Option B – it seems a lost opportunity not to take advantage of the space of the existing library to accommodate a tower – given the proposed pedestrian crossing and lights at Beaconsfield Parade the residents would have access to the station as well as the capacity to enjoy the space at the Hub.</li> </ul> <p><b>Options in Urban Design Study</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Option 5 in the Urban Design Massing options shows an additional building which reminds me of CBD type of development making the space overcrowded and hardly reflects the type of "green and leafy" environment that I thought Ku-ring-gai prides itself on having, diminishing the value of the green space given its placement within the design</li> <li>Option 1 is preferred with these amendments:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Park and plaza are combined into a single combined public space on the same level, directly accessible from Woodford Lane and bounded on two sides by public streets. Additional floor area underneath the combined park/plaza allows for a more spatially feasible supermarket layout, and for a better balance between 'major' and 'specialty' retail.</li> </ul> </li> <li>Please amend the planning control to reject Option 5 which includes a new residential tower</li> </ul>	<p><i>Options in Urban Design Study</i></p> <p>The Urban Design Study investigated 7 massing options. Of the seven options, Option 5 has been used as the basis for this Planning Proposal for the reasons listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The park and plaza are amalgamated into a single combined public space on the same level, maximising their perceptual scale and use value.</li> <li>Park and plaza are directly accessible from Woodford Lane.</li> <li>The southern section of Drovers Way avoids an existing retaining wall to allow an existing Tallow-wood tree to be retained, subject to future design development.</li> <li>Additional floor area underneath the combined park/plaza allows for a more spatially feasible supermarket layout, and for a better balance between 'major' and 'specialty' retail.</li> <li>The additional building form is oriented north-south, allowing the overall development to meet ADG solar requirements.</li> <li>The fall of the site is used to create a two-storey height step from Woodford Lane down to the buildings along Drovers Way, creating a sense of transition between the Hub and its western neighbours.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, this option best satisfies the design principles as defined by the project team as well as the project objectives adopted by Council.</p> <p>Option 1 was rejected on the basis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Repeats the open space and retail weaknesses of the DCP Master Plan, being: vertically separated park and plaza, inaccessible entry routes, a compromised supermarket footprint, and a lack of specialty retail.</li> <li>The taller building along the western boundary causes significant overshadowing of western neighbours.</li> <li>The tallest section of building is oriented east-west, maximising its overshadowing.</li> <li>Increased building height on the prominent southern corner creates significant bulk visible from the south/south-western approach.</li> </ul>	

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<b>Overshadowing</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The excessive height will cause overshadowing of the Lindfield village.</li> <li>The increase to 31.5m and 29.5m will have severe and permanent overshadowing effects to the neighbouring properties west of the Hub.</li> <li>Current High-rise already causing overshadowing</li> <li>The buildings should be limited to the southern half of the site to limit overshadowing</li> <li>Gateway Determination stated that some of the proposed building envelopes need to be reduced in height to stop overshadowing western side neighbours. This can be achieved by discarding the proposed north-eastern residential block situated on one of the highest points of the site – it will cast shadow over park</li> <li>Overshadowing would be exacerbated by having the heights over 7 stores, more so as the developments would be on land sloping down from north to south, elongating any shadowing</li> <li>Shadowing is a real issue for the surrounding properties and the open space planning. Although this cannot be completely avoided a lower height limit and less residential building pods would assist.</li> <li>Please ensure that the planning controls do not compromise the footprint of real green space on the site with another residential tower that would cast shadows until noon over the green space, setting it up to fail before it is even built.</li> <li>Grateful if Council could give due consideration to this overshadowing issue and ensure that the neighbouring environment is not compromised.</li> <li>The proposed significant increases on height of building will cause irrevocable and detrimental overshadowing effects to the neighbouring properties on the west of the Lindfield Village Hub. Currently, properties on the west of the Lindfield Village Hub are zoned R4 and R3. Under the proposed new changes to the Lindfield Village Hub, any future residential flat buildings and existing retirement homes to the west of the Hub will be detrimentally affected. They will have insufficient access to solar light and be permanently placed under building shadow.</li> <li>Nine storey north east apartment building removes morning light and will dominate the space as has the over-height Aqualand building overshadowed the platforms at Lindfield station. The additional floors on the north-west building increase afternoon overshadowing of the park and reduce the sense of space otherwise achieved by the westerly aspect to the valley.</li> <li>Do not agree with the statement in the Planning Proposal that <i>'The largest impact is to the properties to the west in the morning, due to the site orientation and the slope of</i></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overshadowing has been addressed in the Urban Design Report (p58) and the impact has been previously assessed as acceptable. See also discussion in Exhibited Planning Proposal (p52-53). More detailed assessment will also be required at development application stage with ADG provisions working to protect reasonable solar access.</li> <li>A maximum height of 29.5m is proposed along the southern half of Drovers Way. This exceeds the current LEP maximum height of building by 3m. A setback to the uppermost level could be introduced to maintain the 26.5m height at the building face. This would be consistent with what is indicated in the Urban Design Report (for example at p52 and p55) and what has been tested previously in the reference scheme in terms of GFA and achievement of amenity.</li> <li>The taller portions of the proposal with an additional two storeys of height are set back 23m from the boundary. This provides a 1:1 height to setback relationship with Drovers Way (Urban Design Report p65) which will reduce a sense of overbearing and visual impact and is considered acceptable from an urban design perspective</li> <li>It is noted that sites to the west of the proposal are zoned R4 High Density Residential with the potential to redevelop.</li> </ul>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p><i>the land. Notwithstanding, all affected properties to the west are free of overshadowing by 12pm or 1pm and will receive a minimum of 2 hours solar access.'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The increased heights that will dominate and significantly overshadow the resident homes to the west of the site, as evidenced by the shadow diagrams in the Urban Design document.</li> <li>Two hours of solar access is not acceptable for the amenity of residents, their ability to minimize energy use, or to utilise solar panels, and is contradictory to Ku-ring-gai's vision as a Net Zero emissions community.</li> </ul>		
<b>Amenity</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no discussion of the way noise controls will be applied to the use of any rooftop areas.</li> <li>The amenity of the local area in terms of current noise impacts being very low is highly valued by the community.</li> </ul>	<p>The planning proposal itself does not result in any amenity impacts to the surrounding area. It is acknowledged that potential future uses of the site permitted under the zoning and development standards may have the potential to result in some noise and other amenity impacts. These matters would be considered in detail as part of Development Application where detailed design and studies can be provided and assessed for a specific development, and if appropriate conditions may be included which limit opening hours, delivery hours, noise and acoustic levels arising from the site.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<b>Accessibility</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The planning must incorporate pathways that are easy to use for the less mobile. The pathway outside the Aqualand development on Lindfield Ave is appalling; with undulations camouflaged by multi coloured pavers - what is considered "pretty" can be an absolute minefield for the visually and mobility impaired.</li> </ul>	<p>Accessibility is a matter for a future development application for the site. The will be subject to the Access requirements under part 22 of the KDCP as well as the requirements of Council's Public Domain Plan.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<b>Infrastructure</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No studies have been provided with detail capacity of the local infrastructure to deal with the increased demand in electricity, water and sewage services.</li> </ul>	<p>The planning proposal has been referred to State Infrastructure Agencies – Sydney Water and Ausgrid – who have reviewed the proposal and potential impacts on increased demand for electricity, water and sewage services.</p> <p>Ausgrid has advised they have no comment on the proposal.</p> <p>Sydney Water have advised that there is sufficient wastewater serving available to serve the proposal, and in terms of water servicing an amplification of the local network will be required, and detailed requirements will be provided through the s73 application phase (Development Application).</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<b>Local Character</b>		
<p><b>Positive Impact on Local Character</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will bring life back to a dying community</li> <li>Let's change the face of the community of Lindfield and make us a united front to be proud of - surely, it's time to move out of the dark ages and be part of the new world which is there waiting for us!</li> <li>Please be decisive as I would love to think I will still be young enough to enjoy what could be the most vibrant and creative community.</li> </ul>	<p>Support for Planning Proposal noted</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Adverse Impact on Local Character</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It will adversely alter the environment, atmosphere and culture of the suburb. It will permanently alter the nature and charm of the suburb and character of the area.</li> <li>There are various aspects that are at odds with the Lindfield village environment and the image of KLG, as a leafy/garden municipality</li> <li>Significant change in the community in a retrograde fashion due to the level of development and abundance of high rise now changing the character of the suburbs. Not against development, however it must be sympathetic with the character of the neighbourhood.</li> <li>Hub proposal combined with the redevelopment of the Coles site will alter the local amenity and increase local traffic and noise to the local residents, who chose to live here due to the character and nature of the suburb.</li> <li>We believe any new planning proposal should consider its impact to the neighbouring environment. The new changes to the Lindfield Village Hub has drifted away from its initial purpose, the community's preferences and its master plan, and has become a new development project that is substantially focused on high density residential apartments.</li> <li>It must be remembered that to take away all the individuality of our local areas, particularly of this 'village' type suburb is a huge mistake. To turn all of Sydney into a highrise nightmare of boring characterless buildings is to turn it into something similar to the featureless cities of China.</li> <li>People living in this area wish to retain the value of their homes and these highrise soulless developments do nothing, in fact detract from the value of these suburbs as a whole, rendering them less desirable in which to live and raise a family.</li> <li>The numerous new buildings are a blight on the character. It needs to suit the historic look of Lindfield and contain proportionate green space. It's not all about cramming more people into an already congested suburb. We seem to have a disproportionate number of home units and all with no character. They're ugly boxes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local character is created by a combination of land, people, the built environment, history, culture and tradition.</li> <li>Local character is also a personal experience and includes the sense of belonging a person feels to that place, the way people respond to the atmosphere, how it impacts their mood, their emotional response to that place. These differing points of view can be witnessed in submissions which have vastly differing opinions of this area. Submissions here refer to the "historic look of Lindfield", "village type suburb" "the nature and charm of the suburb"</li> <li>In contrast others state <i>"Lindfield strip' along the Pacific Highway is a disgrace and detracts from the image of Lindfield"</i> <i>"Lindfield, as it is now, is not a place to be proud of when we have friends and relatives from other States and rural areas visiting us"</i> <i>"The state of the carparks on the Western side of the Pacific Highway is appalling"</i></li> <li>It is acknowledged that Ku-ring-gai has extensive areas of low-density housing characterised by gardens and trees however Ku-ring-gai does not have a uniform character.</li> <li>Council has recently completed a Local Character Background Study of Ku-ring-gai. The study identifies eight Broad Local Character Areas that share similarities in their physical and measurable characteristic.</li> <li>The site for the subject Planning Proposal sits within the <b>Kur-ring-gai Ridge and Centres Character Area</b>. Extracts from the Local Character Statement follow: <i>"Formed around the rail/Pacific Highway corridor the area holds the main retail, commercial and residential intensity within the LGA. It is characterised by increased density and diversity of built form and land use. This character area has important social and economic value to Ku-ring-gai."</i>  <i>"...Accommodating diverse land uses, buildings in this area have larger footprints and greater height than built form across the rest of Ku-ring-gai. This character area features the majority of medium</i></li> </ul>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Residents of Lindfield and Ku-ring- gai want multi-storey developments to be sympathetic with the current environment and not exceed the current Development Controls. Residents do not want the hub to be the beginning of another St Leonards or Chatswood.</li> <li>Nos. 4 and 6 Bent Street should not be demolished for this development. No. 4 is a new build and 6 a historic house that has been immaculately kept. Both losses would be dreadful for the owners and the suburb.</li> </ul>	<p><i>and high-density housing within the LGA, leveraging amenity provided by proximity to arterial roads, public transport, shops and schools.”</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The properties no.4 and no.6 Bent Street were purchased a number of years ago by Council for the purposes of providing open space as part of the Lindfield Hub development.</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Existing Lindfield Local Centre – Neglected/Run down</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>'Lindfield strip' along the Pacific Highway is a disgrace and detracts from the image of Lindfield</li> <li>Lindfield, as it is now, is not a place to be proud of when we have friends and relatives from other States and rural areas visiting us. How can one answer their questions about the neglected state of our paths, roads and car parks? The state of the carparks on the Western side of the Pacific Highway is appalling. I had a really bad fall due to the unsafe state of the carpark behind the Commonwealth Bank and the Pharmacy. I am sure that many other people have had the same experience. The reason I mention our neglected infrastructure is that improvements to that cannot be made until the work on the Hub is commenced.</li> </ul>	<p>Submissions stating poor character of Lindfield. Noted.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Sustainability</b></p>		
<p><b>Building sustainability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmentally friendly and avoid future retrofitting, the building should have roof top solar panels and gardens, these should be made mandatory for all buildings in the council area.</li> <li>Two hours of solar access will minimize energy use, or to utilise solar panels, and is contradictory to Ku-ring-gai’s vision as a Net Zero emissions community.</li> <li>All the new structures (residential apartments, library etc) must have solar panels on the roof. Perhaps, a medium sized battery could be incorporated into car parking area. Solar will supply local power to the proposed development and enhance the green credentials of the development.</li> <li>Sydney needs facilities upgraded and adapting to carbon-neutral lifestyle</li> </ul>	<p>The future redevelopment of the site will be subject to the sustainability requirements of the KDCP. This includes a requirement that all non-residential buildings incorporate Ecologically Sustainable Design measures and to achieve Green Star rated buildings to Green Building Council of Australia (GBCA) standards.</p> <p>The residential component of the development will be required to meet the BASIX requirements for energy and water consumption and other building sustainability requirements of the ADG. The inclusion of solar panels and battery storage are one possible solution to achieving these standards.</p> <p>There is nothing preventing the final design of Lindfield Village hub exceeding the required green building and BASIX standards.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Electric Vehicle Charging</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The hub proposal should have EV (electric vehicle) charging infrastructure for each lot.</li> </ul>	<p>This would be considered as part of a future Development Application. The Ku-ring-gai DCP currently requires parking areas of residential flat building developments to be designed and constructed so that electric vehicle charging points can be installed.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>



**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<b>Green Space / Open space</b>		
<p><b>Original Masterplan – 3000sqm</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should not reduce greenspace from proposed 3000sqm under 2015 Master Plan</li> <li>• Planning controls need to includes a substantial park in line with the original Master Plan, i.e. 3000sqm contiguous space, covering the north east corner and excluding the new 'preferred' residential tower.</li> <li>• Provide 3000 sqm open space and maintaining 7 storeys at the cost of the flyover bridge if necessary (not critical infrastructure)</li> <li>• Preferred Option 5" involves a very substantial reduction in the open space compared with the contiguous 3,000 sqm of space as proposed in the Original Master Plan of 2015. This is extremely disturbing, as it greatly reduces the amenity to the community</li> <li>• The significant reduction in green space is not in accordance with the original Master Plan, where the open space connected to the street and to the community centre providing a definite public domain.</li> <li>• Reduction in open space is not in accordance with community expectations</li> <li>• The planning proposal has significantly altered the plans in that the large area set aside for a 3000sqm contiguous park and open space has been covered by yet another residential apartment building. Proves this project is not focused on delivering what the community needs but to satisfy development interests and the State Government to create additional residential and job creating commercial opportunities in the area.</li> <li>• The plans must ensure that an area greater than 3000sq metres in one substantial area be a required aspect of the plan. A pocket park is not acceptable. This must be in a position where the area will not be in shadow much of the day in winter or summer, otherwise it will be underutilised.</li> <li>• Having contiguous green space is absolutely critical for a "village hub" where residents can enjoy the mix of green space with cafe's and restaurants on the side. Who wants to gather in between 3 large apartment blocks? Keep green space in line with original masterplan.</li> <li>• The Council sold the idea of the Lindfield Village Hub to the residents with a promise of a large green contiguous space, to not honour this promise is unforgivable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Buildings should not encroach on green space</b></p>	<p>The Planning Proposal commits to the inclusion of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A community park with a minimum area of 3000m2; and</li> <li>• A civic plaza with an approximate area of 900m2; and</li> </ul> <p>This is consistent with council's current DCP requirements (which is based on Council's adopted master plan from 2015)</p> <p>The Urban Design Study appended to the Planning Proposal provides indicative building envelope diagrams and an open space plan. These diagrams show how the open space requirement could be achieved within a development with building heights and densities proposed in the Planning Proposal.</p> <p>The proposed buildings positively define the edge of the public park, provide active edges and are arranged so that they do not unreasonably overshadow the park. The proposed building arrangement and size are generally considered to be appropriate from an urban design perspective</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed building should be reduced to not encroach on public park land and green space</li> <li>• The original plan for the Hub provides for recreational and exercise in green park space. Therefore, we don't need buildings spread over the whole of the site</li> <li>• Current proposal does not cut it – original plan provided for recreation and exercise in a green park</li> <li>• Building over open space and blocking out the sky and shadowing the surrounds destroys our everyday green heart.</li> <li>• Erosion of greenspace for the sake of yet another residential tower has left me speechless</li> <li>• A northern tower would reduce the land set out as green open space in the 2015 master plan. A tower would also dominate any remaining open space. Green open space provides areas for residents to enjoy and mitigates the urbanisation of our environment</li> <li>• This is meant to be a community space, not a space for more residents. Please just keep the original plans and stop making substantial changes by erecting another residential block onto the community greenspace!</li> <li>• Proposed development, which show an additional building &amp; significant reduction in 'green space' available for community use</li> <li>• The green space has been substantially reduced and there appears to be another lower building taking up much of the original green space.</li> <li>• The new (extra) building included in the latest proposal removes considerable open and green space. Can council please inform as to why this has been included? If it is for economic reasons then could council please inform us on how this is derived in an open and transparent way? The economic impact assessment included with the proposal is not sufficient to answer this question</li> <li>• The current proposal is totally unacceptable as it incorporates some of the former open space between high rise buildings, effectively usurping public domain to provide residential amenity.</li> <li>• If this project goes ahead, it would mean that the centre of Lindfield will be dominated by large tower apartment blocks, with little open space</li> <li>• What a missed opportunity to alienate the green space of the Lindfield Hub and deny the new residents and children in nearby developments, the green space that they would otherwise have to go to Regimental Park or Lane Cove to enjoy the outdoors.</li> </ul> <p><b>Apartments require open space</b></p>		

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Open green space provides much needed ambience for the highrises and shopping complex, giving it some character, but also providing a little toward making up for the loss of green space and trees in order for the development to go ahead.</li> <li>• Given number of 7 storey buildings being built along the Pacific Highway and near railway station, we need all the recreation space that we can create</li> <li>• With apartments recreational space is required.</li> <li>• The greater the proportion of our region's residents our region are living in units, the more green space there should be for their access. Council needs to create more not less green space.</li> <li>• You cannot just keep adding residential towers without adding large areas of open spaces to support the increase in population numbers in Ku-ring-gai. These spaces are critical not only for our physical health but also our mental health.</li> <li>• There is a lack of parks and green space in that part of Lindfield. Already there is a population living in the new apartment blocks around the Pacific Highway who need a substantial park close by. Additional apartments are being built along the railway line opposite the future village hub. There will be further dwellings on the current Lindfield Library site when it is sold.</li> </ul> <p><b>Importance of Green / Open Space</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is absolutely paramount that the development provides a large usable space.</li> <li>• Given the community centre &amp; library facilities are included in this proposed development, the 'green space' requirement should not be changed - it's an important part of the 'village feel' that is supposed to be the objective of this development.</li> <li>• Key objective of the Hub remains the open space</li> <li>• Open space close to home is critical for people to be able to enjoy fresh air, exercise and maintain physical and mental health.</li> <li>• With the increasing developments in this area there is more need for green spaces for our health. We are breathing polluted air, trees and greenery help to 'clean' the air.</li> <li>• Less need for specialty local shops and greater need for open space and recreational activities which are paramount for families and individual's mental health and welfare in these times.</li> </ul> <p><b>Need for more green space</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If we want to maintain our community green space, we cannot simply add more people without more parks and open space.</li> </ul>		

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A large park or green space area is essential - you promised us a "beautiful new public park" and a "vibrant village green"</li> <li>The Lindfield Hub is a once in a century opportunity to transform a horrible car park into a green space for which there is no other opportunity anywhere nearby.</li> <li>Ku-ring-gai Council has been rezoning so much of our public open spaces, sporting and parks, at an alarming rate.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Amenity of Open Space</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerns over the park/ playground/ recreation area, where it gets winter sunshine so that residents of the whole area have a wonderful lively area to sit in the sunshine when many of their own homes/units do not receive winter sun.</li> <li>Does that open space really look like an inviting "public plaza"? How about overshadowed wind tunnel as a more appropriate description</li> <li>Under this proposal any remaining open space will be severely shadowed, provide an increased possibility of wind tunnelling, as well as general unsightly encroachment by residential buildings.</li> </ul>	<p>The Urban Design Report 4.11 - <i>Impact Analysis: Overshadowing</i> indicates the proposed park has no overshadowing on June 21 (mid-winter) between 12pm to 3pm) and overshadowing affects about 30% of the total park area between 9am and 12pm June 21 (mid-winter)</p>	<p>Include over-shadowing controls within the DCP to ensure future park receives a certain minimum of direct solar access</p>
<p><b>Suggestions for open space</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Incorporate a small child play area on the grass near a café. Like the <i>Lane Cove Canopy</i></li> <li>The ground space from the removed community facilities and attached dwelling should revert to park land or a free dog space</li> </ul>	<p>Suggestion supported.</p> <p>Page 40 of the Urban Design Report - <i>4.3 Indicative Public Open Space</i> shows a playground centrally located within the proposed park.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Covid and the need for open space</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>These spaces are becoming even more critical to keep as the Covid pandemic has shown us. During the lockdowns our parks and ovals are overcrowded, not just on the weekends, with residents desperate to get out of their apartments and houses. Hasn't council learnt by now that the green space is essential to the community during difficult times like these but at all times. People are using these spaces even more than ever having come to appreciate them in lock down times.</li> <li>During these pandemic times, it is more evident than ever how vital green space is for the health and wellbeing of our residents.</li> <li>As the pandemic should have by now clearly shown to everyone the vital importance of large open spaces to be provided for developments such as these units. The well being of the residents must be a priority as it means there is harmony in the community</li> </ul>	<p>Comments supported. The COVID Pandemic has highlighted the value of open space to health and well-being.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>instead of continual discord.so prevalent in areas where the socio dynamics and economics of high density living occurs.</p>		
<b>Environment</b>		
<p><b>Plant Species</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are at least 3 environmental weeds in the planting palette. Oppose dietes, rapheolepis and nadina please.</li> <li>• Documents refer to endemic planting and almost all the plant list isn't endemic to Ku-ring-Gai.</li> <li>• I am well sick of seeing the space shedding weed seeds into the surrounding gardens, street spaces and waste water.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Points regarding environmental weeds are noted</li> <li>• The planting palette is indicative at this stage. The actual species will be approved as part of a Development Application</li> <li>• Council's DCP has a range of requirements relating to preferred plant species</li> <li>• The planting of species listed in Council's Weed Management Policy will not be permitted.</li> </ul>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Endangered Ecological Community</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• planning proposal allows a construction footprint which will allow complete removal of all vegetation.</li> <li>• The BioNet Vegetation Classification lists PCT 1281 as comprising Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest which is listed as critically endangered under the Biodiversity Conservation Act and critically endangered under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act).</li> <li>• great concern that the proposal has not been designed in a way which avoids and minimises impacts on prescribed biodiversity values within the site and its core habitat which were found to be present on the site.</li> <li>• Trees are inhabited for seasonal foraging by the Barking Owl, the Powerful Owl, the Grey Headed Flying Fox and the Yellow Bellied Sheathtail Bat.</li> <li>• Council has a responsibility to protect endangered ecological communities and their habitat which are in council's care under the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016.</li> <li>• The proposal does not propose to revegetate the site with endemic species.</li> </ul>	<p>Council acknowledges that the building footprint as provided within the planning proposal for the Lindfield Village Hub, requires the removal of habitat and all Sydney Turpentine-Ironbark Forest (including a Critically Endangered Ecological Community [CEEC]) and other native / non-native vegetation on site.</p> <p>It is important to note that the planning proposed does not provide approval for the proposed building footprint, nor will it adjust the Biodiversity controls within the site. It does however provide for an amendment to the Floor Space Ratio and Height of Building Development Standards and to allow Residential Flat Buildings with consent on the subject land. It is considered that adjustment of these things does not prevent the creation of a site layout that further minimises impacts upon onsite remnant vegetation/habitat.</p> <p>Assessment and approval for building footprint (site layout), vegetation (and CEEC) removal and landscaping, is required to be addressed at future Development Application (DA) stage (via Part 4 <i>EP&amp;A Act</i>). This may include any building footprint (site layout) that meets the planning controls of the Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan (including any approved amendments from this Planning proposal; as outlined above).</p> <p>This would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A requirement to address / avoid potential impacts to vegetation / habitat, mapped within the biodiversity controls of Ku-ring-gai's LEP and Development Control Plan;</li> <li>• Assessment under the commonwealth <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> and <i>NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 (BC Act)</i>.</li> </ul>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• P 46 of the urban design document shows the character shot of Drovers Way (which is 4 lanes wide). This is a mistake as you have used a shot of Swain Gardens - a 1 metre wide sandstone pathway where it crosses a moist creek and heavily and gardenesquely vegetated. This is very unrealistic and quite misrepresenting the truth.</li> </ul>	<p>Point noted. The images on page 46 of the Urban Design Report are not consistent with the materials and elements shown in the plan and sections. However, it should be noted that the reference scheme in the urban design report is indicative only and dose not form part of the proposed planning controls. The final development outcome still needs to be subject to detailed design and a formal development assessment process.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<b>Parking, Transport and Traffic</b>		
<p><b>Parking</b></p> <p><i>Existing parking issues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of parking is another major issue for existing commercial properties and this development will make matters worse</li> <li>Parking is a significant issue. All of the local streets are currently clogged by commuter parking and the proposal is vague on how the extra parking demand that the Hub will generate will be adequately met. To suggest that local streets can be used to handle parking not adequately allowed for on-site appears naive in the extreme.</li> <li>Lindfield Avenue is parked out 7 days 18 hours a day due to the late closing hours of the supermarkets and insufficient car parking provided within the new multi storey buildings.</li> </ul> <p><i>Proposed parking</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is also little clarity on short term and accessible parking for people who have to access local services for relatively short periods of time. Although the Council pays lip service to providing a facility that reflects the needs for a broad spectrum of community age range the proposal is silent on how the older members of the community who currently use the existing carpark to access facilities along the Highway shopping strip will not be disadvantaged.</li> <li>What is the replacement of the current carpark</li> <li>Significant short-term parking needs to be accommodated for the Library, community facilities and shops in addition to those of the apartment residents. The current proposal does not appear to have this adequately incorporated as it cites the need for street parking to meet demand. Less than 1 car space per one or two bedroom unit is absurd and will lead to further parking chaos.</li> <li>Centralise convenient weatherproof parking for users of the Community Facilities in the general underground parking. A total of 740 grouped underground car parking spaces. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>135 Commuter Spaces paid for by Transport NSW [if construction is underway by Q3 2022]</li> <li>45 spaces from reduction of one residential block.</li> <li>31 Visitor Spaces</li> <li>61 Community Spaces and 6 Childcare Spaces,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><i>Existing parking issues</i></p> <p>Car parking will be provided in accordance with the Ku-ring-gai Development Control Plan and site specific Development Control Plan.</p> <p>The proposal itself is unlikely to create demand for additional commuter parking, since future residents of the proposal will be living less than 150m walk from Lindfield station and therefore have easy walking access. Access to car share vehicles would give residents access to additional vehicle/s when needed, without the ownership and storage requirements.</p> <p>The proposal plans to replace the 109 spaces in the existing surface car park either in the basement car park or along the new (or realigned) roads, in addition to the parking required for the new/proposed uses.</p> <p><i>Proposed parking</i></p> <p>Short stay parking and accessible parking would be provided as a component of the overall parking provision for the proposal. This would service the proposed retail and community uses in the site, as well as the existing retail uses on the western side of Pacific Highway. This would be assessed when a development application is submitted.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>



**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Should be provided all as part of centralised underground parking floors so as to augment public / community parking.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The parking study indicated a total of 788 car spaces are needed with the planning provision of just 544 car spaces for the residential, retail and community facilities and 135 for the provision of commuter car spaces for Transport NSW. Considering most of the transport movements to the site will be by car there is a considerable shortfall in the number of car spaces for the onsite delivery of 109 car spaces.</li> <li>Development has sufficient public access carpark for older &amp; young families to gain access</li> <li>The proposal must ensure that parking on site in the development is adequate for apartment residents and their visitors and the staff and patrons of the new commercial, retail and community activities.</li> <li>consultants may propose that parking for residents in apartments near public transport should be limited, if the consequence of that is that those residents then park out local streets then the interests of other residents who previously used those places for access to the station is compromised. A case study of this is North Epping where residential development at the station has caused the whole area to be parked out to a greater and greater distance.</li> <li>Increase the provision of vehicle car parking for residents. Since Covid, buyers and renters demand car parking spaces regardless of close proximity to rail.</li> <li>Parking provision proposed for the development is inadequate, due to the intentional limitation of parking provision to ostensibly encourage /promote use of use of bicycles, walking and ride or car-share arrangements. It is also based on an erroneous assumption that many of the new unit owners will not have cars, because they live near public transport. These assumptions are unrealistic and will result in more parking congestion in the surrounding streets due to the inadequacy of the carparking provision catered for and generated by the proposed development.</li> </ul> <p><i>On street parking</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be no street parking along either Drovers Way or Woodford Lane</li> <li>The Hub proposal has some direct and indirect impact on street parking</li> <li>Existing street parking- No to be lost on sth side of Bent Street 5 (exact number subject to confirmation)</li> <li>Reduced street parking - some new on street parking is to be provided within the Village Hub but it is not specified whether it will be unrestricted.</li> <li>a report by a suitably qualified person which quantifies the total commuter parking post development including the impact on the street parking. This analysis must also</li> </ul>	<p>Car share schemes generally reduce car ownership and usage, and can contribute to a reduction in the amount of parking required in new developments (hence improving affordability). The schemes result in lower car usage because participants generally use cars more efficiently by carefully planning trips and combining multiple trips. The availability of car share vehicles can also allow households to defer the purchase of second or third cars. Also, some owners/renters of residential units may choose not to own a car and would not want the cost of one or more car spaces included in their purchase or rental cost.</p> <p><i>On street parking</i></p> <p>On-street parking in Drovers Way and Woodford Lane would be in accordance with the site specific DCP, and would provide street level activation and access to very short stay or drop-off/pick up car spaces.</p>	

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>consider the approval for the Coles redevelopment in Balfour St and the loss of any street parking.</p> <p><i>Commuter parking</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The objectives of the Planning Proposal fail to adequately reference the primary role of the land in providing access to Lindfield station and the 2012 initiative of the State Government in providing funding for additional commuter parking.</li> <li>The proposal indicates commuter car parking envisaged is only 135 spaces though this was the original objective for the proposal.</li> <li>Lindfield Village Hub project started nine years ago in 2012 as an O'Farrell Government initiative for an additional 240 commuter parking bays on the west side.</li> <li>To incentivise train use by commuters and get people out of their cars on congested main roads is through the provision of commuter parking near railway stations is a key initiative.</li> <li>Getting more people out of their cars requires improved station access and more parking to supplement other means of reaching the station. It should be noted that in the case of non-commuters existing two and three hour time limited Council parking bays do not provide sufficient time for residents to visit the city who then crawl the streets looking for any commuter spaces which have become available.</li> <li>Original TfNSW proposal 240 additional parking bays on the west side, 105 transferred to the Village Green and 135 remaining as part of the Village Hub</li> <li>The DI&amp;E Gateway Determination dated 22.1.21 requires Council to: <i>Clearly indicate, in the proposal report, the quantity of commuter carparking spaces to be provided on-site, in relation to commuter car parking for the Lindfield local centre as a whole and how this relates to any commuter carparking agreements;</i> The planning proposal has not met this requirement. On 14 January 2014 the 416 Group provided Council a count of the west side commuter unrestricted parking spots within reasonable walking distance of the station. An update of this information is below             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drovers Lane carpark = 49</li> <li>Street parking                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bent Street 90</li> <li>Balfour St 45</li> <li>Wallace Pde 12</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><i>Commuter parking</i></p> <p>Since 2010, Council envisaged that the Woodford Lane car park site would be redeveloped into a community facility.</p> <p>During the early planning of the Lindfield Village Hub and Lindfield Village Green, it was agreed with Transport for NSW that the 240 commute parking spaces would serve Lindfield better if they were distributed across the 2 sites and would also accelerate the delivery of them (Lindfield Village Green nearly complete).</p> <p>In September 2020, Transport for NSW confirmed its commitment to deliver 240 commuter car parking spaces in Lindfield.</p> <p>Page 26 of the Transport and Traffic Impact Assessment indicates that 135 commuter parking spaces will be provided as part of the proposal.</p>	

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lindel Pl 10</li> <li>▪ Stokes Plc 9</li> <li>▪ Newark Crs 18</li> <li>▪ Frances St 19</li> <li>▪ Total Street Parking = 203</li> <li>○ Total 252</li> <li>• The FAQ attached to the proposal says: <i>Council has committed to providing 135 commuter parking spaces in the basement car park on behalf of Transport for NSW. The Council has also committed to replacing the existing 109 car spaces, either in the basement car park or along adjoining roads</i> These 109 spaces do not include the existing 49 commuter parking spaces. These 49 spaces must be provided in addition to the 135 and access linked to use of the Opal card so that the State Government’s objective of an additional 240 commuter spaces in Lindfield is met.</li> </ul>	<p>The State Government’s objective of an additional 240 commuter spaces in Lindfield will be met with the provision of 135 commuter parking spaces as part of this proposal (Lindfield Village Hub), and 105 commuter parking spaces currently being constructed as part of the Lindfield Village Green project.</p> <p>The 49 unrestricted spaces in the existing Woodford Lane car park are not specifically for commuters – they can be utilised by other long stay users such as retail employees, whereas the 135 commuter parking spaces funded by the State Government will be managed under the “Park n Ride” scheme, which highly incentivises use of the car park being linked to public transport trips.</p>	
<p><b>Car Use</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The suggestion that these people will not use a car is ludicrous given the hilly topography of the neighbourhood and the age of the population.</li> <li>• The area being populated mainly by young families and retirees, there is little prospect that cycling or walking to the shops will be preferred over cars</li> <li>• Ride- or car sharing is not generally common in the area, and is more relevant to a younger demographic rather than the family demographic in the Ku-ring-gai area.</li> <li>• It is fallacious to assume that the new unit owners will not want to own cars because they live near public transport. While this may be the case for a few, many will still want their own cars to travel outside of the centre for various reasons</li> </ul>	<p>Future residents of the proposed development will have a high number of retail, health, community and other basic services and facilities within walking distance.</p> <p>There are a relatively high number of members of car-sharing organisations in Ku-ring-gai. Car share schemes generally reduce car ownership and usage, and can contribute to a reduction in the amount of parking required in new developments (hence improving affordability). The schemes result in lower car usage because participants generally use cars more efficiently by carefully planning trips and combining multiple trips. The availability of car share schemes can also allow households to defer the purchase of second or third cars. Also, some owners/renters of residential units may choose not to own a car and would not want the cost of one or more car spaces included in their purchase or rental cost.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Cycle</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 64 bicycle spaces are required for the site</li> <li>• There is potential for more bicycle access to the station when storage is provided. Given the steepness of the hill up from Lindfield and Killara most cyclists don’t tackle it however the increased popularity of electric bikes is an opportunity subject to secure storage being available for these more valuable machines. End of trip facilities might also contribute.</li> <li>• There is no potential for installing bicycle lanes along the Highway or in the narrow surrounding streets.</li> </ul>	<p>Bicycle parking/storage (for residents, visitors and employees) and bicycle support facilities (showers/lockers/change rooms, where applicable) will be considered at the development application stage.</p> <p>While Transport for NSW is unlikely to support bicycle lanes on Pacific Highway, Council’s draft Public Domain Plan for Lindfield proposes separated cycling facilities in various local streets of Lindfield through the reallocation of road space, to improve cycling and pedestrian connectivity.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p><b>Traffic</b></p> <p><i>Proposal will result in adverse impacts on traffic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Development will adverse impact on the current road and public transport infrastructure increase traffic problems.</li> <li>The increase in traffic is another worry, most apartment blocks allow for 1 car but many require parking for 2 cars and some need space mini vans, even a bus!</li> <li>Traffic flow and access will be dangerous and overwhelming. The shape of the suburb will be impacted for ever.</li> <li>How construction traffic and worker parking will be addressed in the already congested local area.</li> <li>The peak traffic movement per hour travelling to the site on weekday peak AM times weekday peak PM times and peak Saturday times are indicated as ranging from 446 am and 667pm peak weekday movements per hour to 726 at peak times on Saturdays. These movements are a considerable increase in traffic movements in and around the current car park site. Local residential roads and narrow laneways in and around the Lindfield site were never proposed to take such volumes of constant traffic. There also still issues to be resolved around safe kiss and ride access at the rail station, Tryon Place and in Woodford Lane at peak times of the day.</li> <li>Proposed increased vehicle movements associated with the commercial, retail, residential and commuter components of the hub will be a huge challenge for the Lindfield community. A reduction in the number of residential units will greatly assist in reducing vehicle movements.</li> <li>Concerned with five primary schools (the only Ku-ring-gai suburb with as many schools within a short radius of the rail station and car park) within the local centre and of the considerable increase of traffic generation at peak travelling times that the Lindfield Hub will generate.</li> <li>detrimental traffic implications of the development, given the geographic constraints of the site and of the access roads, and the existing congested traffic conditions</li> </ul> <p><i>Existing Traffic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too much traffic already</li> <li>Lindfield is already experiencing traffic congestion.</li> <li>The experience of traffic both pedestrian and automobile traffic on Lindfield Ave from Havilah to Strickland Ave is terrible due to the congestion and poor traffic flow. This must not be replicated at this site</li> <li>We already have a congestion problem exiting the East Lindfield side onto the Pacific Highway on the 3 main entry point to the highway at Havilah, Strickland and onto</li> </ul>	<p><i>Proposal will result in adverse impacts on traffic</i></p> <p>Transport for NSW has reviewed the proposal and its impact on the surrounding road network, and through its in-principle concurrence of various road upgrades in the Lindfield local centre along Pacific Highway and key local roads, has deemed the impacts are acceptable.</p> <p>Construction traffic and construction employee parking will be assessed as part of a future development application.</p> <p>Proposed intersection upgrades and traffic management measures would assist in minimising the impacts. Public domain upgrades around the site are planned, to integrate it with the surrounding roads.</p> <p>The proposed parallel parking bays in Woodford Lane would incorporate future a drop-off/pick-up area, to formalise existing informal drop-off/pick-up area which currently occurs in Woodford Lane. Similarly, the arrangements in Tryon Place are proposed to be rationalised as part of the Draft Lindfield Public Domain Plan.</p> <p>When located close to transport and other services and facilities, residential units are not significant contributors to traffic generation compared to other land uses.</p> <p>Homes that are located relatively close to schools encourage school trips to be undertaken by walking and cycling, which help to reduce the traffic impacts of the development.</p> <p><i>Existing Traffic</i></p> <p>Traffic is growing across Sydney, but through the planned intersection upgrades/traffic management measures in the Lindfield local centre, as well as improvements to walking/cycling facilities and other travel options, this will help to manage traffic growth and provide residents/employees/visitors/shoppers with travel choices, other than the private vehicle, to access the site.</p> <p>Future intersection upgrades/traffic management measures on the eastern side of Lindfield include new traffic signals at the intersection of Lindfield Avenue and Tryon Road (planning</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Archbold Road from Hill St Roseville. It is complete gridlock on all vital exits during peak hours. Any traffic flow solutions should address these problem points without making the problem worse.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lindfield Ave IGA and Harris Farm and the 8-9 storey residential apartment blocks has generated significant additional traffic movements and parking problems in Lindfield. Traffic management issues on the east side of the rail line are still waiting to be addressed. The only change has been the installation of a temporary roundabout on Lindfield Avenue whilst the Lindfield Village Green is constructed.</li> </ul> <p><i>Traffic Management Plan</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The traffic management plan is ill considered and does not take into consideration the impact on traffic on the Pacific Hwy. We already have a set of traffic lights at Havilah Road that impedes traffic flow on the Pacific Hwy. A set of lights at Beaconsfield Parade will exacerbate this problem</li> <li>A realistic traffic management plan is essential for Lindfield.</li> <li>further review of the impact to the road traffic given current challenges such as the Havilah Bridge, and include the consequences of forcing traffic into back roads within the residential surrounds</li> <li>concerned that the traffic management plan will not be effective enough. Our concerns relate from recent experience that traffic and amelioration measures are usually not carried out in readiness for a development – usually much later.</li> </ul>	<p>underway), changes to the intersection of Pacific Highway and Balfour Street/Havilah Road and new traffic signals at the intersection of Pacific Highway and Strickland Avenue are expected to improve access to from the eastern side of Lindfield.</p> <p><i>Traffic Management Plan</i></p> <p>Transport for NSW has reviewed the proposal and its impact on the surrounding road network, and through its in-principle concurrence of various road upgrades in the Lindfield local centre along Pacific Highway and key local roads, has deemed the impacts are acceptable.</p>	
<p><b>Proposed Changes to Road Network and Traffic Signals</b></p> <p><i>Right turn from Havilah to Pacific Highway</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The removal of the right turn from Havilah Road to the Pacific Highway will essentially stop people from driving from one side of Lindfield to the other effectively creating a split suburb.</li> <li>Pacific Highway /Balfour street/ Havilah road Intersection no objection to this proposal but wish to point out that the proposed “No Right Turn” to the Pacific Highway from Havilah Rd presents some issues for traffic entering Balfour Street from Havilah Road with the intention of proceeding north to the Pacific Highway:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Balfour St turns into Bent St and then immediately a right turn is required in to Wallace Parade to access Highfield Road and so to the Pacific Highway. A route not appropriate for through traffic. Apart from the tight turns Balfour Street/Bent Street/Wallace Parade (two right turns against oncoming traffic in 40 metres). Wallace Parade is hardly suitable for through traffic being unusually narrow (6 metres wide) for two-way traffic, particularly as cars are</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p><i>Right turn from Havilah to Pacific Highway</i></p> <p>New traffic signals at the intersection of Pacific Highway and Strickland Avenue will provide managed right turn access onto Pacific Highway from the eastern part of Lindfield, to replace the right turn restriction from Havilah Road to Pacific Highway.</p> <p>In 2017, residents of Wallace Parade were consulted about an option developed by Council to change parking restrictions, in response to traffic flow issues raised by surrounding residents. Most residents in Wallace Parade disagreed with the proposal to implement full-time No Parking restrictions on the northern side of Wallace Parade and/or the proposal to implement short stay parking restrictions on the southern side of Wallace Parade. Residents also made the point that they did not want Wallace Parade to become a One-Way street.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>often parked there. Widening Wallace Parade may not be possible; the alternative would be perhaps to make Wallace Street a one-way street South to North.</p> <p>2. Has consideration been given to signage on Lindfield Avenue indicating to traffic travelling north to proceed on Lindfield Avenue to Powell Street or Gordon to access Pacific Highway?</p> <p>3. Traffic flow at Lindfield Avenue and Havilah Road intersection would be significantly improved if a round-about was constructed at that intersection. One has already been constructed at the Woodville Road intersection with Lindfield Avenue which would indicate that one would be possible at the junction of Havilah Rd and Lindfield Avenue. Perhaps a lozenge shaped round-about could be constructed to incorporate Lindfield Avenue/Havilah Rd East and West/ Woodville Road. Lindfield Avenue is 12 metres wide and the distance from Havilah Road to Woodfield Avenue is about 60 metres. This would allow a traffic flow of about 150 metres for the length of the lozenge with all vehicles accessing and exiting with a left turn to each of the roads concerned. At present at the junction of Havilah Road and Lindfield Avenue there are stop signs proceeding north and south on Lindfield Avenue causing confusion particularly on the right turn from Lindfield Avenue to Havilah Road west.</p> <p><i>Bent Street One-Way</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making Bent Lane a one-way southbound only creates an additional problem for car movements.</li> <li>• What is the recommended route for residents of west Lindfield and Killara to get to the highway now you are closing bent street connection. Alternate routes are narrow, more traffic, blind corner, chaotic intersection with no traffic lights and roads with no right turns.</li> </ul> <p><i>One-way Havilah Road and Lindfield Avenue</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the Transport NSW document, we are disturbed to see reference to the recommendation of the one-way Havilah Road and changes to Lindfield Avenue that were the subject of significant resident opposition when raised at Council with a recent decision to review and investigate this matter further agreed by Councillors.</li> <li>• The Lindfield Ave area is a traffic disaster and its unlikely to be sufficiently improved by the proposed changes and the parking under construction.</li> </ul> <p><i>Bent Street, Bent Lane and Balfour Streets</i></p>	<p>Any guide or directional signage will be considered as part of further planning and implementation of proposed intersection upgrades/modifications.</p> <p>A roundabout at this location was previously considered as part of the Lindfield Local Centre Transport Network Model study undertaken by Council. The analysis found that a roundabout would cause queuing of traffic in the Havilah Road underpass back through to Pacific Highway, and this is unlikely to be accepted by Transport for NSW.</p> <p><i>Bent Street One-Way</i></p> <p>Page 27 of the Traffic Impact Assessment proposes the conversion of Bent Street to one-way eastbound (north of Bent Lane), to allow left-turn out only onto Pacific Highway (also resulting in the prohibition of the left-turn from Pacific Highway into Bent Street). However, further work by Council in the draft Public Domain Plan for Lindfield proposes the closure of Bent Street (from Pacific Highway to Bent Lane) to vehicle traffic, to create a pedestrian plaza with tree planting and potential outdoor dining. Alternative routes from the western side of Lindfield would to Pacific Highway would be via Gladstone Parade, Beaconsfield Parade, Balfour Street or Highfield Road.</p> <p>Transport for NSW has given in-principle concurrence to restrict right turns from Havilah Road into Pacific Highway only, which is expected to reduce delays in Lindfield Avenue for northbound traffic. As a result, traffic flow in Havilah Road (at the railway underpass) will remain as two-way.</p>	

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is not dealt with is the anticipated volume of traffic that will be generated and its flow paths through Bent and Balfour streets for traffic wishing to exit and head south along the Pacific Hwy. Although an exit directly from Beaconsfield Pde is intended, there will be plenty of traffic that will still chose to utilise Bent and Balfour streets unless it is prevented from entering Bent Street which would be appropriate.</li> <li>Bent Street traffic is already busy and impacted via its narrow nature and to have two exits where minimal visibility is available will result in traffic incidents and decrease the safety of this street which I must use to access my property. This combined with the Coles redevelopment will cause immense local congestion, risk and noise to myself and my neighbours.</li> <li>It should be noted that the other residents to the west of the highway utilise Bent and Balfour streets to a level where additional traffic will cause issues not currently being faced.</li> <li>The increased amount of traffic turning right into Balfour Street from the Pacific Highway, for the many new uses on the Hub site and also for the major Coles retail/unit development approved will have a seriously congestive impact on Highway traffic in that location and will result in the same unsatisfactory bottleneck conditions that are experienced at the Turramurra shopping centre on the Pacific Highway.</li> <li>Proposed northern access to the hub site via Bent Lane from Balfour Street is a totally unsatisfactory and inappropriate access and entry route for such a major Community and Retail centre, given the lane's narrow width, its unattractive back-alley appearance, and the presence of unsightly garbage bins permanently lining the laneway. Given the need for shop tenants to access their car spaces and garages which front the laneway, and for waste and delivery trucks to stop to collect waste or unload goods, blocking the laneway, the fact that the lane will be restricted to one way southbound will not make the access any more satisfactory.</li> </ul> <p><i>Balfour Street – No Right Turn</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>proposal to prohibit right turns onto the Highway from at the Balfour Street intersection with the Highway for vehicles travelling from the east to the western side of Lindfield will have serious traffic implications for Wallace Parade , Lindfield Avenue and the Fiddens Wharf Road unsignalised Highway intersection ,and cause substantial inconvenience for residents who live on the north western side of the VH site or travel to school on that side of the Highway or simply wish to access suburbs to the west or north from the eastern side , for the following reasons:</li> </ul>	<p><i>Bent Street, Bent Lane and Balfour Streets</i></p> <p>The draft Public Domain Plan for Lindfield proposes the closure of Bent Street (from Pacific Highway to Bent Lane) to vehicle traffic, to create a pedestrian plaza with tree planting and potential outdoor dining. Traffic leaving the site and wishing to join Pacific Highway or travel east of the railway will be required to utilise Beaconsfield Parade or Balfour Street (depending on destination).</p> <p>Modifications to the intersection of Pacific Highway with Balfour Street and Havilah Road have received in-principle concurrence from Transport for NSW</p> <p>Improvements to Bent Lane are proposed as part of the draft Public Domain Plan for Lindfield, where the activation of Bent Lane is to be encouraged through the development of rear block areas as an alternative pedestrian corridor and to provide quieter retail areas from Pacific Highway. In the draft Public Domain Plan, Bent Lane is proposed to be a two-way, low speed environment street, and will form part of the transition from commercial centre to high density residential, with new footpaths and tree planting along frontage. The proposed upgrade and widening of Bent is proposed through additional land dedication to Council as part of the redevelopment of adjoining sites.</p> <p><i>Balfour Street – No Right Turn</i></p> <p>In 2017, residents of Wallace Parade were consulted about an option developed by Council to change parking restrictions, in response to traffic flow issues raised by surrounding residents. Most residents in Wallace Parade disagreed with the proposal to implement full-time No Parking restrictions on the northern side of Wallace Parade and/or the proposal to implement short stay parking restrictions on the southern side of Wallace Parade. Residents also made the point that they did not want Wallace Parade to become a One-Way street. Council will continue to work with the community to develop options to manage traffic flow and resident amenity in Wallace Parade.</p>	



**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Traffic Study assumes that residents who live on the western side of the Highway north of the hub site, and who presently can turn right at the highway to return to their homes, will instead cross over the Highway at the Balfour street intersection and travel down Balfour and then to Highfields to get home (p.33) . It omits to mention however, that to get to Highfields Road, cars must travel along the very narrow Wallace Parade which is only one lane wide, given the need for 24 hour visitor or school parking along the western side. The Study has also totally failed to take into account the fact that Wallace Parade is the main access route by which western side residents travel up to Coles and the Balfour Street intersection, rather than via Highfields Road. The fact that Wallace Parade is effectively only one lane wide for through traffic, means that cars must stop at one end of Bent or Highfields at the entrance to Wallace Parade, until the cars the other end have passed and they can then travel in the opposite direction. The additional traffic that would be generated, not only by the larger Coles development but by the hub development will increase the use of Wallace Parade and exacerbate the congestion at either end of Wallace Parade ,making it more dangerous for school and other traffic and children in the vicinity. Further, widening of Wallace Parade is not possible without wholesale acquisition of homes on the eastern side, due to the proximity of residences and Highfields school to the roadway.</li> <li>o no traffic lights at Fiddens Wharf Road where right turns onto the Highway are virtually impossible, the only alternative routes for residents living on the north-western side of the Highway to access Coles and the hub would be via the Highfields Road intersection which will already be congested due to narrowing of the highway by the extended right turn lane, and the amount of traffic that will be seeking to turn right into Balfour via that right turn lane. Alternatively, residents would have to negotiate the narrow and steep back routes via the western end of Bent Street to get to Coles or the hub, or via the winding, steep and narrow western end of Beaconsfield Parade to get to the hub. No impact of the increased traffic generation on these narrow, steep and quiet back streets has been assessed in the Traffic Study, nor has any consideration been given of the need for traffic lights at Fiddens Wharf Road to improve traffic circulation for residents in light of the congestion that will be caused in the Lindfield Centre by traffic seeking to access and depart from the hub and Coles development sites.</li> <li>o Traffic lights have been proposed at the Strickland Avenue/ Highway intersection to allow right turns onto the highway in lieu of right turns at Balfour</li> </ul>	<p>Residents that live on the western side would also be able to use the new traffic signals at the intersection Strickland Avenue and Pacific Highway to turn right onto Pacific Highway and proceed north to Highfield Road to return to the western side.</p> <p>For residents on the north-western side of Pacific Highway, Coles will still be accessible as they currently do, which is likely to be via Wallace Parade, Bent Street and Balfour Street. Similarly, the Woodford Lane car park (and the consequently the Lindfield Village Hub) will likely still be accessed via Wallace Parade and Bent Street.</p>	

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Street, no assessment of the impact of the additional traffic that will be generated along Lindfield Avenue as a result of this change has been undertaken in the Traffic Study, which is a surprising oversight , given the traffic congestion that now occurs along the Lindfield Avenue shopping strip as a result of the new Harris Farm/IGA /unit development . Nor has any assessment been made of the impact that these additional lights, as well as the proposed Beaconsfield Parade Lights will have on the movement of peak hour Highway traffic through the Lindfield Centre which, combined with the extended right turn lane into Balfour, and the new Coles/unit development, will undoubtedly become more congested and slower, adding to the bottleneck effect on the Highway in both directions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o No assessment has been made of the impact that preventing right turns onto the Highway at Balfour Street will have on other routes that residents who would normally turn there to either return home or to travel to the west, north or north west of the centre for some reason will have to use instead. Vehicles exiting the Harris Farm and IGA carparks onto Havilah, where there is no right turn onto Lindfield Avenue, will either have to travel south along Lindfield Avenue to Strickland, or north through the back winding back streets of Havilah and Nelson or Woodside and Lindfield Avenue to get to Stanhope Road and then access the west via Fiddens Wharf Road at the Highway, or at the Lorne Avenue lights if they still need to turn right. If they are simply travelling over to the western side or returning home via the eastern side shops, they will travel along Lindfield Avenue to Stanhope, again to access the west or north via Fiddens Wharf at the Highway way or via the Lorne Avenue Lights. Whatever route is taken, preventing the right turn onto the Highway at Balfour will be a major inconvenience to local residents, and the impact on the surrounding streets taken as alternative routes will be detrimental.</li> </ul> <p><i>Beaconsfield Road Traffic signals/Pedestrian Crossing adjacent Tryon Place</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Retain the pedestrian crossing in its present location, have no lights at Beaconsfield Parade, and require traffic exiting Beaconsfield Rd to turn left: that is no change to the present situation for the following reasons:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The existing Pedestrian crossing is ideally placed for access to and from the railway station for commuters walking from the west side of the highway and those using the proposed commuter carpark</li> <li>2. construction issues and costs of building a pedestrian bridge give it a very low priority</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p>Attachment B and C of the Transport Impact Assessment shows the projected traffic volumes at key intersections based on the proposed transport improvements, which includes consideration of redirected right turns (onto Pacific Highway) from Havilah Road to Strickland Avenue.</p> <p><i>Beaconsfield Road Traffic signals/Pedestrian Crossing adjacent Tryon Place</i></p> <p>To manage the traffic impacts from the proposal, new traffic signals are required at the intersection of Pacific Highway and Beaconsfield Parade. As a result, this necessitates relocation of the signalised pedestrian crossing on Pacific Highway (outside the station) approximately 15m north to maintain satisfactory separation from the new signals at Beaconsfield Parade. There is not enough capacity on Balfour Street at Pacific Highway to accommodate the demands for traffic</p>	

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>3. The car parking facility and additional traffic using the Hub clearly indicate an increase in traffic flow on Beaconsfield Parade, alternative routes are available to access the Pacific Hwy southern lanes without turning right at the junction of Beaconsfield Parade and the Pacific Hwy.</p> <p>a. Turn right out of the Hub on to Beaconsfield Parade and access the Pacific Hwy via Norwood Ave or Bent St, and Grosvenor Rd</p> <p>b. Turn left out of the Hub and left on to Pacific Hwy (as at present) traveling north to turn right at Havilah Rd or Treats Rd, then turning right onto Lindfield Avenue and joining the Pacific Highway via Strickland Avenue.</p> <p>This is no more onerous for traffic than the proposal to have no right turn on to the Pacific Highway from Havilah Rd, forcing traffic a considerable distance to the west before being able to regain the Pacific Highway Northbound.</p> <p><i>Balfour / Havilah Intersection</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic study shows an alarming situation at the Balfour/Havilah intersection with Pacific Hwy if this development proceeds with the increased residential.</li> <li>Intersection is already showing significant delays and these have been further exacerbated by the residential and retail increases by Aqualand/Harris Farm IGA etc.</li> <li>The proposed changes to alleviate congestion will make matters worse for residents on the east side of the highway.</li> </ul> <p><i>Extension of right hand turn to 90m</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic Study acknowledges that the 25 m right turn lane is already insufficient for the existing development that is accessed via that turn (Coles, local residences, two schools, Bent Lane driveways and waste services, commuter carpark) and so it is submitted that the proposed 65 metre extension of that right turn lane to 90 metres will not be sufficient to cater for the substantial increase in traffic generated by the larger Coles /unit development, as well as the traffic accessing the massive new Village Hub development from the north .</li> <li>As a result, right turn traffic that is not accommodated within the 90 m right turn lane in morning peak periods will block one south bound lane north of the Highfields Road traffic lights. It will not be possible to have any flexible lane adjustment to accommodate an even longer right turn lane, due to the position of the Highfields traffic signals.</li> <li>Extension of the right turn lane will require the removal of the median strip north of the Balfour intersection and dangerous bend in the highway, to enable one of the north bound lanes to be utilised for the southbound right turn lane in morning peak periods,</li> </ul>	<p>leaving the development, and service vehicles would not be able to return to Pacific Highway and travel south without the new signals at Beaconsfield Parade.</p> <p><i>Balfour / Havilah Intersection</i></p> <p>Transport for NSW has reviewed the proposal and its impact on the surrounding road network, and through its in-principle concurrence of various road upgrades in the Lindfield local centre along Pacific Highway and key local roads, has deemed the impacts are acceptable.</p> <p><i>Extension of right hand turn to 90m</i></p> <p>Transport for NSW has previously identified Pacific Highway for the implementation of Extended Clearways under the Sydney Clearways Strategy. Currently, the only section of Pacific Highway where Extended Clearways have not been implemented is the section between Boundary Street, Roseville and Mona Vale Road/Ryde Road, Pymble.</p> <p>The details the proposed intersection modifications will be considered during the development application stage, and will require concurrence/approval from Transport for NSW.</p> <p>Tidal flow arrangements are unlikely to be approved by Transport for NSW</p>	

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>and the reverse to occur during evening peak periods and Saturday mornings. There appears to be no consideration in the Traffic Study of the fact that this twice-daily lane adjustment will be required, as it is in Turramurra, to accommodate the extended right turn lane into Balfour, or the dangerous traffic conditions it will create at this busy intersection as two lanes of traffic heading north in the mornings veer over to the western two northerly lanes, close to where pedestrians and shoppers may be crossing Balfour or walking along the footpath; and then in the afternoons, as the three lanes of southbound traffic merge to two as they traverse the Highfields Road intersection, and then diverge back to three lanes as they cross the Balfour intersection, all close to pedestrians and adjacent crossings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No consideration of the fact that extending the right turn lane into Balfour and the consequent reduction of one of the western highway lanes in morning peak periods will prevent any of the convenient shopper parking outside Coles which is presently possible in those periods, and which will increase the demand on the underground parking in the new Coles development.</li> <li>• While an extended 90m right turn lane is proposed, there is no discussion or assessment in the Traffic Study as to how the proposed additional right turn lane is to be accommodated, which is a serious omission given that extending the present right turn lane will necessitate taking up one of the highway lanes . Assuming it will have to be accommodated by a flexible lane adjustment system as is adopted in Turramurra, this will have serious consequences for Highway traffic and the safety of pedestrians</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Traffic Study</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The traffic study did not take into account the final destination of travel after being in the area, so the projected traffic levels are not accurate.</li> <li>• The study fails to address several key items, which include; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Actual number of vehicle movements per day / week.</li> <li>○ Traffic routing studies and current traffic flows, including impact of another traffic light controlled intersection at the top of Beaconsfield Pde. There will be a bottleneck on the highway to get through Lindfield with numerous intersections with traffic light controls, approaching that of Chatswood on the Pacific Hwy.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Traffic Study is out-of-date and seriously deficient, given its failure to assess: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the impact of the proposal having regard to the major development in the Centre that has taken place,</li> <li>○ proposed development that has been approved, since the study was undertaken,</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The study considered key roads leading to/from the site, which accounts for typical travel paths to the site from various destinations.</p> <p>Attachment B and C of the Transport Impact Assessment shows the projected traffic volumes at key intersections based on the proposed transport improvements, which includes consideration of redirected traffic movements.</p> <p>The AM and PM peaks represent the worst case scenarios in a typical weekday. The period between the AM and PM peaks is typically less intense. Also, Transport for NSW has previously identified Pacific Highway for the implementation of Extended Clearways under the Sydney</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ the impact of the development and the traffic management changes proposed on the Highway traffic and certain other access and departure routes,</li> <li>○ the extended peak hours experienced on the Highway during the clearway and other relevant busy periods, and not just in the narrow peak hour periods assessed in the study,</li> <li>○ traffic impact of the increased volume of traffic that will be generated by the increasing population density being brought about by increasing numbers of medium and high-rise unit developments not just in Ku-ring-gai, but in adjacent municipalities, and whose residents travel along the Highway to gain access to areas to the north and south of the Lindfield Centre.</li> <li>● It is also a serious failing of Traffic Study supporting the proposal that the impact of the approved Coles development and of the development on the eastern side of the railway have not been taken into account in the planning and assessment of the impact of this development on the Lindfield Centre, nor has the added traffic generation on the Highway that will be caused by the ballooning numbers of medium and high density developments that are occurring both in and surrounding the Municipality.</li> </ul>	<p>Clearways Strategy. Other sections of Pacific Highway have Extended Clearways operating from 6am-7pm on weekdays and from 9am-6pm on weekends.</p> <p>The 2034 scenario effectively factors in background traffic growth as a result of increasing population and development.</p>	
<p><b>Public Transport</b></p> <p><i>COVID-19</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● People feel a much greater exposure to risk in using public transport and there has been a big shift to driving as a safer method of commuting.</li> </ul> <p><i>Lindfield Station</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Almost 2/3 of the Lindfield Station's patronage is from the west side.</li> <li>○ There are 1830 pedestrian crossings over the Pacific Hwy during the peak hours.</li> <li>○ On 14 July 2019 the Minister for Transport said train usage in Sydney over the past five years had grown from 305 million trips to 420 million. An extra 115 million or 38% since just 2014.</li> <li>○ Lindfield train service is excellent and onward travel options will be further enhanced when the next stage of the Metro line opens from Chatswood in 2024.</li> </ul> <p><i>Access to station</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ensure easy access from the hub to public transport and the east side of the highway and rail line.</li> <li>○ Residents west of Lady Game Drive in Killara and Lindfield travel to Lindfield station and shops typically via Bent St and Highfield Rd. It should be noted that Residents of this part of Killara use Lindfield station over Killara station as it is more accessible and</li> </ul>	<p><i>COVID-19</i></p> <p>Public transport usage returned close to normal in the months after previous lockdown. It is expected that public transport will once again return to normal levels once movement restrictions are eased.</p> <p><i>Lindfield Station</i></p> <p>Comments noted. The proposal is well located to take advantage of its proximity to Lindfield station.</p> <p><i>Access to station</i></p> <p>Comments noted. The proposed parallel parking bays in Woodford Lane would incorporate future a drop-off/pick-up area, to formalise existing informal drop-off/pick-up area.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>does not involve crossing the Pacific Hwy from Fiddens Wharf Rd where there are no traffic lights. Due to distance and the topography, the journey is not generally walkable or easily cyclable unless an electric bike is used. Residents who commute by train from Lindfield station, use parking, kiss and ride and the 565 bus. The bus usage is constrained by service frequency, unreliability (delays due to congestion on main roads), slowness and distance from homes to nearest bus stop.</p>		
<p><b>Drop off/pick up zone</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Where is the kiss and ride</li> <li>• Our observation is that kiss and ride is not restricted primarily to school children as suggested by the traffic engineer. We have observed up to six cars meeting passengers off trains from the city arriving in Lindfield between 5.30pm and 6.30pm. Kiss and ride should be undercover, well-lit and for the evening pick up provide seating. Kiss and ride activity for adults is driven by commuter parking being parked out before 8.30am and one car families. It has its place, but its downside is that it generates twice as many vehicle movements and kilometres travelled as commuter parking.</li> <li>• Design of the Hub should include, a safe drop off/pick up zone,</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed parallel parking bays in Woodford Lane would incorporate a future drop-off/pick-up area, to formalise existing informal drop-off/pick-up area which currently occurs in Woodford Lane. This has also been identified in the Draft Public Domain Plan for Lindfield</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Scouts Hall</b> <i>Increased Traffic and Safety Issues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposal will dramatically increase vehicle movements.</li> <li>• The main southern access to the proposed development is next to hall.</li> <li>• Public car park will be transformed into a multistoried residential/commercial/retail/library development likely to generate a greatly increased amount of traffic</li> <li>• The repositioned Drover's Way is likely to become a busy alternative route to the Pacific Highway.</li> <li>• Concern for safety of youth members/children - children ranging from 5 to 18 years of age involved in activities throughout the week</li> <li>• The Scout hall is situated at one of the primary vehicular entry points of the proposed site. The consequential increase in traffic poses a risk to the safety of our children, parents and also other community members.</li> </ul>	<p><i>Increased Traffic and Safety Issues</i></p> <p>The access to the scout hall would be via a realigned Woodford Lane, which is also planned to operate with One Way traffic flow from Bent Street to the new/realigned Drovers Way. The only uses gaining access off the realigned Woodford Lane would be the rear of the existing strip shops on Pacific Highway, the Scout Hall and the new parallel parking spaces on Woodford Lane. No car parking for the development will be accessed from Woodford Lane, which minimises the vehicle movements at the rear of the Scout Hall.</p>	<p>Include an objective and specific development control with the DCP to ensure that appropriate levels of access and parking are maintained for the adjoining Lindfield scouts site.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Hall is regularly used for other community activities including martial art classes, and these activities would also be affected by the development.</li> <li>Planning of the precinct needs to consider the safety of our children and families as well as our Group's access requirements.</li> </ul> <p><i>Parking</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our leaders and parents can currently park in the public car park, but Council's plans do not provide for any, or at least not sufficient, conveniently located car parking spaces for our hall.</li> <li>The lack of parking will have an effect on parents' ability to do drop-off/pickup at the start and end of hall activities especially for the younger sections where the parent usually stays for the duration.</li> <li>The planning of this precinct should not deprive Scout members of parking.</li> <li>Joey parents need to be present for 2+ hours at a time at least weekly during term time. Older Scouts will need to be dropped off and collected. Some parents/leaders are present for children at all scouting ages. Scouts over the age of 16 often can drive themselves. Where will we all park?</li> </ul> <p><i>Ability to Access Storage/Garage</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We store our canoes and boats and much other equipment in and under our hall and in our garage. What Council proposes will make it much more difficult to load our trailers, to access our garage, to manoeuvre our vehicles.</li> <li>Lose the benefit of the space provided in the current public car park and the proposal's lack of parking directly outside the Scout hall increases the difficulty in accessing our large equipment from our basement and garage.</li> <li>The narrow one-way road on Woodfords Lane will make reversing the trailer into the garage very difficult, increasing the risk to safety of our leaders and parents.</li> <li>May result in multiple trips around Council's proposed development to load and unload our trailers and access our garage.</li> <li>No choice but to block traffic as we load and unload or move our canoes and boats.</li> <li>The Draft DCP does not address that part of Drovers Way next to Scout hall in the same way that it does with the other part of Drovers Way, Woodford Lane and Bent Street. This is of concern as no provision has been made for safe pedestrian access and given the relevant sight lines.</li> <li>Specifically, the DCP should provide for:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>an area in Beaconsfield Parade for a safe drop-off/pick up zone in front of Scout hall;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><i>Parking</i></p> <p>The upgraded Woodford Lane is planned to be a low speed environment with high pedestrian amenity and accessibility. For longer stays, visitors to the Scout Hall could park within the main public/retail car park of the development. For drop-offs and pick-ups and very short stays, the proposed parallel parking bays in Woodford Lane is proposed to incorporate a future drop-off/pick-up area as well as short stay parking, and a raised threshold/crossing at the southern end, connecting to Drovers Way and Beaconsfield Parade.</p> <p><i>Ability to Access Storage/Garage</i></p> <p>While these matters would be considered in detail as part of a future development application, in the vicinity of the Scout Hall the upgraded Woodford Lane is planned to be wider (section 5.2 of the Urban Design report indicates a road width of 6m) than the section further north, which still would give flexibility in terms of loading and manoeuvring.</p> <p>The ongoing traffic and access issues associated with the Lindfield Scout hall are considered to be a relevant planning consideration for the future development of the Lindfield village hub site. To ensure these considerations are included as part of any future development application, an objective and appropriate control need to be included in the site specific DCP address the issues.</p>	



**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>two-way traffic movements behind Scout hall, providing for sufficient space so that we retain our current standard of access to our garage even if this will entail pushing back the area earmarked for development;</li> <li>sufficient space where we can safely load our trailers and other vehicles.</li> </ul>		
<b>Pedestrian Bridge</b>		
<p><b>Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The pedestrian bridge is not included in the planning proposal. It is a mandatory requirement of the community to link the hub directly to the railway station</li> <li>It is essential to have a pedestrian bridge across the Highway to the Railway.</li> <li>The provision of a foot bridge over the Pacific Highway was a key element in the original Master Plan and should be reinstated.</li> <li>A pedestrian bridge from the station to the Hub is a “must have” to:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ensure safety</li> <li>improvements to traffic flow by removing traffic lights and pedestrian crossing</li> <li>practical entry to hub from Pacific Highway</li> <li>help make east and west Lindfield a cohesive community.</li> <li>Potential to remove current traffic lights to assist in traffic flow</li> </ul> </li> <li>Many elderly residents are frightened to cross the highway as it currently is</li> <li>A pedestrian bridge needs to be integrated with the cross rail platform at the station</li> <li>Support for the inclusion of a Pedestrian bridge at the Railway station or a tunnel to relieve pedestrian flow from the site.</li> <li>The Council has no plans to link a large community of people living in the new developments close to the station on the east side with community facilities on the west side, or residents of the new 150+ apartments on the west side with the supermarkets on the east side and the Village Green other than via the existing set of traffic lights near the railway station.</li> <li>This council owes it to all their constituents to keep them safe and confident to move in their own backyard - this is your job to provide us all with the certainty of a safe highway crossing both from combining the community perspective and general well being of safe passage around our area.</li> <li>Pedestrian bridge is paramount to ensure the safety of pedestrians and commuters, especially school children who have to cross the very busy Pacific Highway every day. A bridge would also help to link the commercial areas and growing communities east and west of the Pacific Highway</li> </ul>	<p>The installation of a pedestrian bridge has specific land requirements, to accommodate lift shafts and ramp or stair access:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no practical space on the western side of Pacific Highway within the footpath area to accommodate lift shafts and ramp or stair access. The only practicable option is to connect a bridge directly to adjoining buildings. This would require either land acquisition by council (unfunded) or site redevelopment (current planning controls do not allow feasible redevelopment) neither of which have any degree of certainty;</li> <li>A preliminary feasibility study undertaken by Council found that there were a substantial number of utilities on the western footpath of Pacific Highway, which were a constraint on any landing structure. A structure in the western footpath would severely limit pedestrian accessibility and amenity. This would also require TFNSW approval to connect to the concourse.</li> </ul> <p>The feasibility study also acknowledged that there was potential for a pedestrian bridge to divert some pedestrian movements away from the at-grade pedestrian crossing. It also concluded that a pedestrian bridge could potentially reduce the delays to general traffic on the Pacific Highway, although this is unlikely given that the constraints on the road network in Lindfield are at the boundaries of the local centre (i.e. intersection of Pacific Highway with Balfour Street and intersection with Grosvenor Road).</p> <p>Subsequent to its submission to the Planning Proposal, Transport for NSW advised that its investigations have shown that if the signals are relocated 15 metres north of their existing location, this will minimise any potential see-through effect. Transport for NSW also advised that when new traffic signals at the intersection of Pacific Highway and Beaconsfield Parade are installed, the mid-block crossing is to be relocated as part of those works.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A pedestrian footbridge is required to allow easy access to the new facilities given that they are being moved to the other side of the highway and therefore not as easily accessible from the rail transport and east side</li> <li>• Council has not given a satisfactory explanation as to why it has been excluded</li> <li>• Provision of a bridge will increase the value of both the retail and residential components of the development and nearby residential developments on both sides of the station with a commensurate increase in rates.</li> <li>• It will facilitate commuters walking to and from the hub car park, help to ameliorate the traffic congestion associated with the hub development, result in some additional car parking taking place at the Village Green site and improve safety including for children walking from the East side to Lindfield Primary School.</li> <li>• The pedestrian bridge, previously a mandatory requirement, is now a “costly item of infrastructure beyond the scope of local government funding or development contributions systems”.</li> <li>• Tenderers should work with Council to provide potential solutions to delivering a bridge. If Fabcot is the only developer still interested consultation should occur to amend what Council has proposed in light of the suggestions made in 2015.</li> <li>• The Mayor on 25 November 2019: “Regarding the pedestrian bridge, Council has consistently advised the community that the procurement process will involve consideration of a pedestrian bridge.”</li> <li>• Please include a pedestrian bridge over the Pacific Highway. Appendix A (the urban design report) calculates the walk to the station as 1-2 minutes, depending on the starting point (page 23). This calculation is misleading. It ignores the wait-time at the either set of pedestrian lights. The walk to the station would only be 1-2 minutes if a pedestrian bridge existed and pedestrians were not forced to wait for the lights to change.</li> <li>• Traffic is only going to get worse so the pedestrian bridge is essential and will be much cheaper and more efficient to build during the development rather than later down the track</li> <li>• The economic case for the bridge in adding value to the residential, retail and commercial development and so financial return to the project could be provided by an independent suitably qualified person.</li> <li>• Council's preferred option is to move the current pedestrian crossing to 130m north, a totally impractical solution.</li> <li>• The traffic engineer's has not adequately researched the opportunity and undervalues the option for a new pedestrian bridge over the Pacific Highway linking Lindfield station with the Lindfield Village Hub.</li> </ul>		

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The basis for the pedestrian bridge include:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Removal of existing pedestrian lights contributes to traffic flow especially with new lights required at the Beaconsfield Parade intersection</li> <li>○ Feeds train travellers into and out of the LVH development helping to drive the retail and activate the precinct</li> <li>○ Connects the east and west sides of Lindfield into a true hub and by providing safe all weather pedestrian access reduces vehicle movements through the bottlenecks across the railway line at Balfour Street and Strickland Avenue.</li> <li>○ Integrates the LVH with the Pacific Hwy and kick starts the redevelopment of the old, tired retail frontage</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Revenue from advertising on the bridge has been offered to Council by TfNSW</li> <li>• There are many other comparable locations in Sydney with comparable traffic and pedestrian loads which have pedestrian bridges</li> <li>• Lindfield Village Hub is a “once in a lifetime” opportunity to revitalise Lindfield’s commercial area, and with the inclusion of a pedestrian bridge over the Pacific Highway, to integrate the eastern and western sides of it into a unified, functional whole:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Improvement to the amenity of the Hub and the Lindfield commercial area as a whole,</li> <li>○ positively contribute to the economics of the project by improving ease of access for those coming from the east side of the Pacific Highway or from Lindfield railway station thus increasing foot traffic to the restaurants and supermarkets to be included in the Hub, making such businesses more commercially attractive.</li> <li>○ improve amenity for those living in the residential component of the development and be a positive selling point in marketing the residential component of the project.</li> <li>○ significantly improve access for the elderly and disabled and should therefore be incorporated into the project in the interests of diversity and inclusion.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Feasibility</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian bridge would be ideal only if feasible from a financial viewpoint and that more community land is not compromised with greater building heights and scale with additional inappropriate commercial and residential overdevelopment to fund the project. However, the impact on either side of the Highway for lift and stair access needs more consideration.</li> </ul>		

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The design of the Hub needs pedestrian bridge, it can utilise the proceeds of the sale of the current library in Lindfield</li> </ul> <p><b>Opposition</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The pedestrian bridge idea over the Pacific Highway should not be considered. Use this money into the development of quality open space</li> </ul>		
<p><b>TfNSW – Advertising Rights on Bridge</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport for NSW will allow advertising rights on the bridge to recover upfront capital costs of construction of the bridge there is no excuse for not building the bridge. The other options are totally impractical.</li> <li>Council has always said there's no money for a bridge. Transport for NSWs (TfNSW) letter states (Section 11) that they would allow the Council temporary advertising rights on the bridge to recover the upfront capital costs of constructing the bridge. Council's "no money" excuse never stacked up given the size of this project which is estimated to be over \$300m and the clear safety and other benefits from a bridge. But now the Council can't even try to hide behind that.</li> </ul>	<p>The installation of the pedestrian bridge is not considered a practical or feasible option (refer to comments above). Transport for NSW has also advised that its investigations have shown that if the signals are relocated 15 metres north of their existing location, this will minimise any potential see-through effect and would be a viable alternative to the pedestrian bridge.</p> <p>While the TfNSW submission indicates that they would support advertising rights on any future pedestrian bridge, the approval of such advertising would be subject to formal approval under <i>State Environmental Planning Policy No 64—Advertising and Signage (2001 EPI 199)</i> (SEPP 64). One of the key assessment considerations under SEPP 64 is the provisions of the relevant local DCP applying to the land. The relevant DCP is the KDCP, which does not allow illuminated third party advertising due to adverse visual amenity impact of such advertising. Vehicle safety impacts is another key consideration. Therefore the approval of advertising on any bridge to offset the cost of the bridge construction cannot be assumed as guaranteed.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Timeframe, Cost and Funding</b></p>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Preferable to wait decade for a new version of redevelopment, rather than spending public money on unsatisfactory scheme</li> <li>There has been unexplored offers to fund the hub at minimal costs to the ratepayers.</li> </ul>	<p>There is a clear separation between commercial decisions of Council on this matter and planning decision of Council. This report assesses the required strategic planning merits of the Planning Proposal as submitted and not the commercial or financial viability of this proposal or the merits of previous proposals put before Council.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Funds from sale of Lindfield Library Site</b></p> <p><i>Support</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the Hub will include a new library of the future to replace the current library a substantial portion of the funds from the sale of that site must go towards the Hub development.</li> <li>Proceeds of current library need to be utilised for community facilities including the new library</li> </ul>	<p>As a separate process and reporting matter Ku-ring-gai Council has adopted project objectives for the Lindfield Village Hub which included the requirement for the project to be 'self-funding' (OMC 14 August 2018). Moreover, Council considered and adopted a separate report on 20 August 2019 to prepare the planning proposal to deliver the community infrastructure and services identified in Council's adopted masterplan.</p> <p>There is a clear separation between commercial decisions of Council on this matter and Planning decision of Council.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There should be no issue then that the funds be used for the new library and community centre that will be replacing the old, and also in funding a pedestrian footbridge</li> <li>Utilisation of the proceeds of the sale of the current library in Lindfield would provide a much needed benefit to the project, as it would allow you to garner more community support because there would be less need for dependencies on developers who are more interested in their financial viability than community outcomes, therefore this should be of further consideration.</li> <li>Council's financial goals for the Lindfield Village Hub could be met without the intensified development of the site implicit in the proposed changes to the planning controls if proceeds of the sale of the current Lindfield library site are utilised. As Council's Housing Strategy to deliver additional housing and housing choice currently proposes concentrating that additional housing in just four suburbs, one of which is Lindfield, Lindfield is bearing a vastly disproportionate share of the increased housing density this involves compared to the many other suburbs of Ku-ring-gai unaffected by the proposed Housing Strategy. In recognition of this disproportionate burden and to mitigate its adverse affect on Lindfield, some or all of the proceeds of the sale of the current Lindfield library site should be applied towards the Lindfield Village Hub project - thus removing or minimising the need to intensify development of the Hub site in order to meet Council's financial goals for it. This is especially the case as the Lindfield Village Hub itself and the likely high density development that will replace the current Lindfield Library are important parts of the Council's Housing Strategy.</li> <li>The development of a new library allows the existing Lindfield library site to be sold. The proceeds from the library sale should be applied to the project as logic dictates and the community expects.</li> </ul> <p><i>Opposition</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council has a conflict of interest and is acting negligently and in bad faith in pursuing this ill-considered and inappropriate proposal, in order to facilitate its money- making agenda of selling off the Lindfield Library site and releasing the funds it has expended on this site for its operations elsewhere, at the expense of and to the detriment of Lindfield residents and the Lindfield Centre, and generally of all users of the Pacific Highway</li> </ul>	<p>This report assesses the required strategic planning merits of the Planning Proposal as submitted and not the commercial or financial viability of this proposal or the merits of previous proposals put before Council.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>After 9 long years and more than \$9m of expenses, construction of the Hub must start no later than Q3 2022. Too much time and money has been spent on this project and</li> </ul>	<p>As a separate process and reporting matter, Ku-ring-gai Council has adopted project objectives for the Lindfield Village Hub which included the requirement for the project to be 'self-funding' (OMC 14 August 2018). Moreover, Council considered and adopted a separate report on 20 August</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>it's time Council published a timeline to the community and got a serious move on with this project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As we understand there is only one developer waiting in the wings, it's time to negotiate with them and sign a contract.</li> <li>• Lengthy delay is a concern, need to start as soon as possible</li> <li>• This planning proposal comes after nine years of discussions with the community.</li> <li>• Where is the timeline? There is nothing in this planning proposal beyond November 2021. To not give the community any kind of idea of when the development might even start is such an insult to ratepayers who have already spent (unwillingly) large sums of money. We need commitment and accountability from those we elect and those we pay. There is none, absolutely none, at present.</li> <li>• Please progress the development in a more timely manner. The length of time taken on this project and the money spent has been wasteful and a failure to serve the best interests of the community.</li> <li>• It is a tragedy to see such a waste of money and time.</li> <li>• Please move on this project. I moved into the area 8 years ago and was excited to hear that this area was being developed. I understand some of the community is unhappy with the size however if good quality community facilities can be provided it would go along way to appease some of the objectors.</li> <li>• Please do not delay this to also lose the state government funding allocations otherwise I would hate to think how council would try push the FSR up even more.</li> <li>• This project has been in the pipeline for an extremely long time, exceeding a timeframe that could be deemed reasonable, and conclude that its duration is unacceptable to the community generally.</li> <li>• Please endeavour to make the planning process more efficient and expedient.</li> <li>• Given the community has maintained the same request for the hub in terms of maximum height, green space, facilities and accessibility - it is ridiculous that council has squandered 9 years and 9 million dollars on this project to date and done little more than alienate itself from the local community</li> <li>• As a general comment I am appalled at council's general handling of the tenders for development, the wasted monies that I as a rate payer have seen frittered away and the inordinate amount of time it has taken to reach a point where there is still no firm arrangements in place.</li> <li>• There's a thing called the Dead Hand of Development where the process of development becomes so mired in endless planning, bureaucracy, politics and consultation that the creativity is sucked out of it and often replaced, as is the case with the Lindfield Village Hub, with a master class in Parkinson's Law (work in</li> </ul>	<p>2019 to prepare the planning proposal to deliver the community infrastructure and services identified in Council's adopted masterplan.</p> <p>There is a clear separation between commercial decisions of Council on this matter and Planning decision of Council.</p> <p>This report assesses the required strategic planning merits of the Planning Proposal as submitted and not the commercial or financial viability of this proposal or the merits of previous proposals put before Council.</p>	

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>bureaucracies expands to fill the time allotted to it), reports that use 10 words where three will suffice, and trickle down economics. In this case to the tune of \$6 million dollars, though some of it in the time of COVID when so many people are out of work!</p>		
<p><b>Self-Funding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The disquiet is reinforced by the overturning of the initial approval for a 7-storey development, the references to the nebulous and misleading “self-funding” notion, the manner in which the pedestrian bridge is being addressed, and the submitting of the 14-storey proposal, which was a waste of time and money and suggests Council is acting based on financial considerations and ignoring the town planning consequences.</li> <li>It would be appropriate for Council to take account in determining “self-funding” of the provisions it has made or ought to have made to provide for Lindfield residents a park and a library.</li> </ul>	<p>This report assesses the required strategic planning merits of the Planning Proposal as submitted and not the commercial or financial viability of this proposal or the merits of previous proposals put before Council.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Funding</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wouldn't long-term borrowings, at a low interest rate, facilitate a solution which also increases the value and usefulness of the hub?</li> <li>By its size and location, the Lindfield Hub site is an attractive site for development. There will be financially viable projects whatever Council decides.</li> <li>Council need not have regard to the financial viability of projects. That is a matter for developers. Market forces will adjust accordingly.</li> <li>Council can facilitate development best by setting clear rules and guidelines and being open and transparent in setting and administering those rules and guidelines. Those rules and guidelines should serve the community's interests, facilitating a good quality of life for people, now and into the future.</li> <li>When local governments own land they wish to sell or otherwise draw income from, there is a conflict of interests between councils' interests as landowners and their role as regulators, whenever their role as regulator of that land or nearby land impacts upon their financial returns from the land, as is the case at Lindfield. I submit that Kuring-gai Council must make its role as regulator paramount. It should set the rules for development and land use first, according to community interests, without regard for the impact on the sale value of its landholdings as owner.</li> <li>Having set those rules in the community interest, Council can then maximize its financial returns, with one exception. Council should not take on the risks of development. It should not presume that it has any expertise in that area, but nor should it defer to developers lecturing Council upon what developers want without</li> </ul>	<p>This report assesses the required strategic planning merits of the Planning Proposal as submitted and not the commercial or financial viability of this proposal or the merits of previous proposals put before Council.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>



**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>questioning. Council can require public use in other buildings, like the library and other facilities we see at the St Ives Shopping Village, without taking on such risks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale of the project has grown to a budget now estimated at over \$350 million. This level of expenditure will stress Council's resources in terms of governance and management, and we believe will have significant detrimental consequences with likely potential cost overruns.</li> <li>Council has not shared the financial feasibility due to commercial in confidence. The December 2020 Council minute records that the tender process had not achieved a result. It now appears that there is an absence of competitive pressure in the continuing process. We also note that property values in the area have grown rapidly in 2020-21 making apartments on completion significantly more valuable than when the tender process began and so improving the return to the developer. Developers are good at bargaining long and hard and persuading Councils that more FSR is necessary. There is opportunity for Council to revisit the benchmarks set for the project to see how they can be lowered.</li> </ul>		
<b>Tender</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Failed Request for Tender (RFT). From 5 selected tenders, 3 declined to submit a tender and 2 submitted non-conforming tenders. One has since withdrawn.</li> <li>Remaining tenderer Fabcot/Woolworths has submitted 2 unsolicited proposals, to build the hub with x2 residential blocks at 7 storeys and highway footbridge in accordance with Council and Community desired plan. This proposal was at minimal cost to council, with community buildings handed over, and Council retaining ownership of land for ongoing revenue.</li> <li>Unsolicited proposals rejected by Council without costing or consultation</li> <li>We believe that Council is in danger of progressing a development that has no strong rationale to proceed. As we understand, the list of tenderers has decreased to the point that only one or two remain. This would not ensure the best value for money for the community for such a significant project.</li> </ul>	<p>As a separate process and reporting matter, Ku-ring-gai Council has adopted project objectives for the Lindfield Village Hub which included the requirement for the project to be 'self-funding' (OMC 14 August 2018). Moreover, Council considered and adopted a separate report on 20 August 2019 to prepare the planning proposal to deliver the community infrastructure and services identified in Council's adopted masterplan.</p> <p>There is a clear separation between commercial decisions of Council on this matter and Planning decision of Council.</p> <p>This report assesses the required strategic planning merits of the Planning Proposal as submitted and not the commercial or financial viability of this proposal or the merits of previous proposals put before Council.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<b>Site Specific Concerns</b>		
<p><b>Nearby retirement village</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is no assessment for the impact on or consideration of the retirement village directly opposite to the proposed development either during construction or when completed.</li> </ul>	<p>This is a planning proposal – not a Development Application. A planning proposal is only concerned with the amendments to the LEP (zoning, height, floorspace, etc) and does not give any development approval for construction of any development.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<b>Development Control Plan</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modify the DCP so that residential development reflects the excellent work done along Tryon Road, where the apartment heights and density suit the existing built structures &amp; offer an aesthetic compliment to the streetscape.</li> </ul>	<p>A future Development application for the Lindfield village hub will not only be subject to the proposed site specific DCP controls but also the general development controls under the KDCP and the requirements of the NSW Apartment Design Guide (ADG). It is considered that the combination of these planning controls will deliver a positive design outcome for the site.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<b>Council Land Ownership</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council retains ownership to all land, with the exception previously agreed two blocks of 7 floor residential buildings.</li> </ul>	<p>This is not a planning proposal issue for consideration within context in this report.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<b>Population</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Advocate for 20yr moratorium on migration. Sydney needs facilities upgraded and adapting to carbon-neutral lifestyle will be easier if the pressure caused by an increasing population is reduced.</li> <li>Lindfield is already too populated for the existing infrastructure</li> <li>Range of social issues that comes with too many people in a limited space.</li> </ul>	<p>This is beyond the scope of the planning proposal. Australian migration law is regulated by Commonwealth law, this is a matter for the Federal Government.</p> <p>The need for infrastructure to align with new development and forecast population growth is a key component of the Greater Sydney Commission's Greater Sydney Region Plan: A Metropolis of Three Cities and the North District Plan. The Ku-ring-gai Local Strategic Planning statement highlights the importance of infrastructure provision to support new development, with Planning Priorities and Actions setting out how local infrastructure will be planned for to support growth and change in the Ku-ring-gai Community. Land continues to be acquired for new parks under the Open Space Acquisition Strategy, in a rolling works programme and this programme will be extended into the reviewed contributions plan to continue to support new growth concurrent with development. Council's <i>Community Facilities Strategy 2038</i> sets out how council will deliver a network of community facilities across Ku-ring-gai. Council's Contributions Plan provides partial funding for new community facilities in target locations.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<b>Project Process</b>		
<b>Staff and Councillors</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposal has been dictated by the personal biases of senior staff with requirements for 'self funding' and 'not giving woolworths a leg up'</li> <li>Personnel at Council dealing with the decision making process are out of their depth given the size of this project compared with projects more commonly dealt with by Council.</li> <li>Council should hire experienced advisers from a qualified investment bank to assist with the financial decision making and contract negotiations. Having looked at the</li> </ul>	<p>This is not a matter for consideration in Council's assessment of this Planning Proposal. These are separate matters considered via a totally independent separate process of Council under the Council's Major Projects Advisory Committee.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>biographies of the current councillors it is apparent that qualified financial advisors are needed to act as counsellors to the councillors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lack of public commitment and action before the forthcoming local government elections will likely result in adverse electoral consequences for councillors who are known to be lacking in their capacity and willingness to push this project forward. There is no room for “dead wood” councillors in Ku-ring-gai.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Transparency and accountability</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Despite the numerous requests by Council for community comment at different stages of the project as it has evolved, it is very clear that members of the local community are prevented from making any sophisticated analysis of the project for the purpose of providing comment given the financial parameters of the project are denied to the public. The Council's policy of hiding information from the public on the pretext project related financial information is commercially confidential is disappointing and seen for what it really is; as a strategy to avoid scrutiny and accountability on what is admitted by the Council to be the largest and most consequential development project undertaken by your Council.</li> <li>One of the downsides of so much information being withheld from the public on the ground of commercial-in-confidence is that it can cause disquiet among the public as to whether the project is being progressed in the manner the Community has expected.</li> </ul>	<p>This is not a matter for consideration in Councils assessment of this Planning Proposal. These are separate matters considered via a totally independent separate process of Council under the Council's Major Projects Advisory Committee.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
<p><b>Community Consultation and engagement</b></p>		
<p><b>Community Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If it were not for Support Lindfield, we would have heard little to nothing more about this project.</li> <li>The only communication we have had from the Council since the last Council election was one document</li> <li>It would help community engagement greatly if there were a short summary in clear English. There are lots of documents, many written in planning-speak. The authors of the Urban Design Report attached at appendix A should be commended for their use of simple language, understandable by the layperson.</li> <li>As a general comment when Council uses its' funds to engage consultants, then it seems reasonable to expect that the consultants' brief should include to read, learn from and respond to the input the community has previously provided. The consultant reports will then be prepared not based just on a limited observation of the site and</li> </ul>	<p>In accordance with the requirements of the Gateway Determination and relevant regulations the Planning Proposal and Site Specific DCP were placed on public formal exhibition from <b>29 July 2021 to 27 August 2021</b>.</p> <p>Notification was made on Councils website and notification letters were sent to 5,179 properties within the precinct surrounding the subject site.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION	COMMENT	RECOMMENDATION
<p>technical knowledge but also on the information and considered judgement of those who live and work in the area.</p>		
<p><b>Scouts Consultation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scouts request direct meaningful consultation to ensure that concerns will be adequately addressed and incorporated in both the LEP amendment and the final version of the DCP if the planning proposal proceeds.</li> </ul>	<p>The Scouts have been provide their statutory requirement to make a submission on the exhibited planning proposal and draft DCP provisions. The issues that have been raised in their submission have been acknowledged and addressed (refer to comments above).</p> <p>The ongoing traffic and access issues associated with the Lindfield Scout hall are considered to be a relevant planning consideration for the future development of the Lindfield village hub site. To insure these considerations are included as part of any future development application, an objective and appropriate control is recommended to be included in the site specific DCP address the issues.</p>	<p>Include an objective and specific development control with the DCP to ensure that appropriate levels of access and parking is maintained for the adjoining Lindfield scouts site.</p>
<p><b>Need for Council to listen to the community</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is beyond frustrating that council, despite repeatedly asking for community feedback and the community taking the time to respond, then continues to propose plans that go against the feedback they have received. The community is more than a tick box on the planning process. The actual point of consultation is to LISTEN to the community's wishes and needs and incorporate that in planning</li> <li>We keep getting told that the views of the community have been sought, but there is growing evidence they are not being listened to. It would be better not to seek the communities views than to do so and then ignore them.</li> <li>Once again Council has mislead the rate payers and residents and I can assure you that an adverse residents reaction will have to follow.</li> <li>Diversion from the original plan brings nothing of benefit to the current residents of Lindfield, and creates significant precedent for further erosions into our green spaces.</li> <li>Please listen to the community who you are elected to serve</li> <li>The Lindfield Village Hub site and the various Council proposals for that site have been the cause of considerable community angst for some years now with multiple presentations, attempts at surveys and changes of mind by Council. This has generated a high degree of cynicism and significant distrust of both Council and the Council planners.</li> <li>We felt as if it we were engaged in a project that would help to develop a community spirit and make Lindfield a pleasant and welcoming place for its residents, new settlers and visitors as well as providing access to better amenities for all in a pleasant and hospitable environment. It is now 9 years since this process commenced, and if anything emerges from it, it will not be of much use to us or any other residents who</li> </ul>	<p>In accordance with the requirements of the Gateway Determination and relevant regulations the Planning Proposal and Site Specific DCP were placed on public formal exhibition from 29 July 2021 to 27 August 2021.</p> <p>Notification was made on Councils website and notification letters were sent to 5,179 properties within the precinct surrounding the subject site. This report provides an assessment of all submissions received during the exhibition period to allow Council to make a decision on the Planning Proposal and Development Control Plan.</p>	<p>No amendment to planning proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

**SUBMISSION SUMMARY TABLE**

**Planning Proposal and Site Specific Development Control Plan for Lindfield Village Hub Site at 1 Woodford Lane, 2-12 Bent Street, 1B Beaconsfield Parade, 19 Drovers Way, Lindfield  
30 July 2021 to 27 August 2021**

<b>MATTERS RAISED IN THE SUBMISSION</b>	<b>COMMENT</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATION</b>
<p>were healthy and well but approaching their older years when the process commenced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• We are apprehensive that our concerns will be effectively dismissed by Council saying that they can be addressed at the development application stage; that they are matters of detail. We submit that this is not so. They are fundamental issues. If nothing else, they should be addressed in the DCP.</li><li>• You don't read this far, and you couldn't care less what the community wants. You'd all do well on some city дума in Russia</li></ul>		