

Submission summary table West Pymble and Orinoco Conservation Areas (C11A, C11B, C10A and C10B)

No	Issue/Concern	Comment
32, 37, 44, 47, 49, 51, 56, 80, 85, 92, 102, 143, 149, 158, 159, 204, 222, 225	<p>Supportive of both</p> <p>Values the early- to mid-20th century houses; subdivision patterns; gardens; vegetation; and streetscape. The recommendations in the Perumal Murphy Alessi and Jackson Stepowski reports are recognition of the heritage values that should be conserved and corresponds with National Trust UCAs. Supports wider Pymble HCA and supports Orinoco C10A and C10B.</p>	<p>Support is noted.</p> <p>Please see discussion on UCAs in the main report and the assessment of the draft West Pymble HCA and the Orinoco HCA in the attachments.</p> <p>The recommendation to not proceed with these areas is a reflection of the lack of representation of buildings from key historic development periods. The area is still rich in character and biodiversity, and the R2 (low residential density) zoning and protections in place for the environment will conserve this suburban character for years to come.</p>
102	<p>Supportive of both</p> <p>Same comments as submission above however also mentions Councils responsibility to protect heritage, but also to fully understand the rights and responsibilities of all citizens and human rights and how “such changes as suggested may be perceived by ordinary people as intruding upon their everyday life”</p>	<p>Support is noted.</p> <p>Please see comments above.</p> <p>The majority of submissions received were against the proposal citing loss of property rights and financial loss. These issues have been further elaborated upon in the main body of the report to further explain the costs and benefits of heritage listing.</p>
159	<p>Supportive of both</p> <p>Same comments as submission 32 however, also raises concern with high rise development and need for HCA to protect. Supports wider Pymble HCA and Orinoco C10A and C10B.</p>	<p>Support is noted.</p> <p>Please see comments for submission 32 above.</p> <p>It is agreed that Ku-ring-gai’s valued heritage should be protected, however, there is a need for robust assessment to ensure that these areas are intact and representative of Ku-ring-gai’s heritage, and as such are defensible when challenged.</p>

No	Issue/Concern	Comment
6	<p>Opposed</p> <p>Objects to the inclusion of Golfers Parade and Courallie Avenue. The area is neutral and the houses late 20th century or newer. Streetscape is not in the same league as houses along Pymble Avenue.</p>	<p>Opposition is noted.</p> <p>It is agreed that this area is mostly neutral and it is not recommended to proceed.</p>
8	<p>Opposed</p> <p>Lawley Crescent, Pymble does not show the integrity of a war period development, many houses are modern. The area should be removed.</p>	<p>Opposition is noted.</p> <p>Agreed. Lawley Crescent area is not recommended for inclusion within a heritage conservation area.</p>
24	<p>Opposed</p> <p>Puzzled by some of the classification – do you honestly think 56 Beechworth Road is worth keeping. A lovely renovated home would be better than what is there now.</p>	<p>Opposition is noted.</p> <p>56 Beechworth is not on an area recommended to proceed as a HCA and as such will not have the requirements of conservation.</p>
100	<p>Opposed</p> <p>Council allowed redevelopment near the Pacific Highway in Pymble. It would be a double standard to prevent change down the hill.</p> <p>No financial compensation for the loss of what is a huge investment.</p> <p>DAS will have time and monetary blowouts. Blanket listing will diminish the value. Existing codes and regulations are enough. Council should do everything in its power to prevent further medium and high density development in the area.</p>	<p>Opposition is noted.</p> <p>The high density zoning referred to in the submission was undertaken by the State Government. For comments on reduced house values and development restrictions please see the main body of the report. Most of this HCA is not recommended to proceed. As the submission did not provide an address this report cannot respond to the impact or not on the specific property. This report does not deal with rezoning.</p>
36	<p>Concerned about road safety.</p>	<p>Is not relevant to the current report. Submission has been forwarded to the relevant staff in Roads and Traffic.</p>