

Submission Summary Table
Planning Proposal and Draft Site-Specific DCP
45-47 Tennyson Avenue and 105 Eastern Road, Turramurra

Matters raised in submission	Council Comment	Recommendation	
Support for Planning Proposal			
Rezoning	<p>Support for rezoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezoning makes a lot of sense • Has full support • Should go ahead • Welcome the rezoning • Cannot see why this dilapidated site should not be rezoned • Support of the rezoning from R2 to B1 • Support rezoning for supermarket • Existing land uses are commercial 	Support noted.	No amendment to Planning Proposal
	<p>Benefits of rezoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will provide decentralised local business infrastructure, for family convenience • Rezoning will bring more vibrant lift to that sector • Support the notion of expanding or improving the local shopping area • Will provide an appropriate retail opportunity for local community • Bring progress and improvement to area • Extending an existing retail precinct • Keen to keep the use of these sites commercial and to support business 	<p>Comments noted and agreed.</p> <p>The rezoning of the sites to B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone demonstrates both strategic and site specific merit. The objective of the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone is to provide for small-scale retail, commercial and business uses to serve the needs of the people who live and work in the surrounding area. The rezoning to B1 Neighbourhood Centre will allow future for development on the site which will improve the range, quantity and quality of services for local residents.</p> <p>The sites have long term established commercial uses, and the rezoning to B1 Neighbourhood Centre will formalise and rationalise the existing commercial use of the land. In addition, the rezoning of the sites will provide a natural extension to the existing B1 Neighbourhood Centre zoning of the adjoining Eastern Road shops.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal
General Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with Planning Proposal • Proposal is a great idea • Support the proposal by Harris Farm • Please approve 	Support noted.	No amendment to Planning Proposal.

Matters raised in submission		Council Comment	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be approved to go to the next stage • Ok with proposal the alternative of more units won't be a good idea. • About time something was done on this site 		
Growth and development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inevitable that development should happened – area is growing which provides opportunities for better and more cosmopolitan services • Continue to support progressive development in the local area • Local community needs this additional shopping precinct to ensure the continued growth of the area • In favour of commercial and economic development • Important to move forward given the expanding population • Need development urgently • Recent increases in medium density housing development which have increased size and diversity of population – retail sector has not responded to the change in demographics • The area is growing in population and as a community we need to accept new projects that blend into the area • At some stage there will be a development of some kind – would rather it be Harris Farm – something we can utilise. • Progress where it enhances the community must be allowed to take place • Every proposal to redevelop station precinct has been rejected for decades, 	<p>Comments noted and agreed.</p> <p>It is important that as the population grows, there are sufficient services and facilities to support the community. The Ku-ring-gai Local Strategic Planning Statement was adopted by Council in March 2020, and plans for Ku-ring-gai's economic, social and environmental land use needs for the next 20 years (2016-2036).</p> <p>Ku-ring-gai currently has an undersupply of retail floorspace, and this is expected to increase with future population increases. Unfortunately, with some recent developments in centres such as Lindfield there has resulted in a loss of existing retail floor space. All Ku-ring-gai's centre play a vital role in the local economy. The Ku-ring-gai LSPS sets out the Local Planning Priority of K25. <i>Providing for the retail and commercial needs of the local community within Ku-ring-gai's centres.</i> Council will be undertaking further strategic planning work to ensure future provision of retail, and other facilities, services, infrastructure, open space and housing to meet the needs of the growing and changing population.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal

Matters raised in submission		Council Comment	Recommendation
	<p>and unhappy that proposal for aquatic centre at Turrumurra Park was opposed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not want to live in a local area which opposes development of any kind There has been no extension to Eastern Road shops for 45 years – cannot continue to deny any development at all Need to provide services and support growing community 		
Aldi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support for Aldi proposal 	Support for Aldi noted. However, this is a Planning Proposal, and not a Development Application. The Planning Proposal only considers amendments to the LEP (zoning and development standards) applying to the site. A Planning Proposal cannot be tied to a particular development outcome on the site – such as the development of a Aldi store	No amendment to Planning Proposal.
Development Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support DA Allow this development to take place DA should be conditioned to ensure the use will be fresh food, café and additional parking 	This is not a Development Application. This is a Planning Proposal relating to an amendment to the zoning of the site under KLEP 2015. Once the site is rezoned there are a number of land uses that are permitted with consent. A Planning Proposal does not give development approval.	No amendment to Planning Proposal
Harris Farm	<p>Support for Harris Farm development on site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strong support for Harris Farms proposal 'The Farm' at Turrumurra Objected to Aldi development but support development of Harris Farm Ok with Harris Farm – the land will be re-used for something. This is the best solution to use the land, the current service station and nursery are useless. Understand concerns of those opposed, however of the view that once the development is in place most people will regard it as an improvement in public amenity Proposal is a great idea Very interested in having a local Harris Farm in Turrumurra if it ensures fresh affordable produce, ample parking, built to keep with sustainable eco-friendly practices. 	<p>The support for the development of a Harris Farm store on the site is noted. However, this is a Planning Proposal, and not a Development Application. The Planning Proposal only considers the amendments to the LEP, in this case amendment to zoning from R2 Low Density Residential to B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone, and removal of minimum lot size development standard.</p> <p>A Planning Proposal cannot be tied to a particular development outcome on the site – such as the development of a Harris Farm store - as the proposed amendments could result in a range of potential future land uses on the site. It is through a Development Application that the specific use of the site would be assessed and granted approval.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal

Matters raised in submission		Council Comment	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for HFM proposal proceeding to the detailed development planning stages for consideration by Council. • Fully support the new Harris Farm shop at the proposed place • Support for Harris Farm due to number of apartments and growing population in area • Looking forward to a fantastic and relaxing environment in local vicinity • Support for local success story – refreshing to see local business growing and competing effectively with larger businesses and giving back to local community • Welcome addition to neighbourhood • Logical site – on a main road near existing shops • Perfect business for this site • Would love a local Harris Farm • Eastern Road is an arterial road and therefore suitable • Something like this is well overdue for Turramurra • The site size is suitable for the project • Excellent location • Appropriate scale for site • Would prefer Harris Farm on site to Coles or Woolworths or Aldi 		
	<p>Benefits of Harris Farm Development</p> <p>Local Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harris Farm is an incredible opportunity for Turramurra – so many benefits • Asset and drawcard to area • Change landscape of Turramurra – positive impact • Harris Farm will upgrade and enhance the area 	<p>Support noted.</p> <p>It needs to be reinforced that this is a Planning Proposal to change the zoning of the site – which once rezoned may be used for a number of retail or commercial uses. This is not a development application for a Harris Farm store.</p> <p>The B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone permits the land use '<i>neighbourhood supermarkets</i>' with maximum gross floor area of 1,000sqm, which would provide convenient daily shopping for local residents, rejuvenate the whole Eastern Road neighbourhood centre, and encourage people to walk rather than use their car, consistent</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal</p>

Matters raised in submission	Council Comment	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add value to neighbourhoods and retain Ku-ring-gai as a special place to live • Enhance local area, and precinct and ensure upper north shore remains attractive area to live, work, dine out and raise family. • Positive for Turramurra • Area will benefit from additional supermarket/fresh food outlet <p>Community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will add value to community • Serve local community well • Bring community together – community meeting place • Vibrant new development – benefit all community • Potential to create a local/ community hub via conservatory for people to meet and shop • Caters to changing demographic of the area • Social benefits to local area • Would add value to the community – high quality shopping and consumer choice • Fantastic for elderly in community – won't have to travel so far to get groceries • Advantage for families in the area • Relative impact is low, while the lift in community wellbeing is high <p>Amenity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide amenity for locals • Will provide food and other daily and weekly shopping needs at improved prices within walking distance to many • Will bring a high quality retailer into an area that is devoid of good retail environments • Offer a range of attractive services and increase choice - not currently available. 	<p>with the benefits identified in the submissions specific to a Harris Farm.</p>	

Matters raised in submission	Council Comment	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give people a reason to move to and socialise in the area • Need more family orientated establishments where parents can relax and children be entertained. • Will allow shopping without the need to enter a large or medium sized shopping centre – important with Covid19 • Provide residents a modern shopping precinct. • This development will enhance the area and the lifestyle of residents • Significant modernisation and increase in standard of living • Offer accessibility to alternative shopping experience • Improve amenity for local residents who have to go to Hornsby, St Ives or outside of Ku-ring-gai to do shopping. • Great amenity – everything needed is only short walk away. • European lifestyle where people only buy enough for the day – less food waste and consume more fresh food. • Vibrancy and convenient shopping • Cater for increased population • Do not believe that the proposal is in any way detrimental to the amenity of the local neighbourhood • Has been designed with minimal noise and disruption for locals and traffic • Will not impact on adjoining residential properties <p>Harris Farm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harris Farm supports local growers and providores in NSW. • Sells fresh food that aids assisting obesity and promoting healthy food choices • Give back to local community • Great alternative to major supermarket 		

Matters raised in submission		Council Comment	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Family owned Australian owned company construct a modern fresh food outlet. Fresh food – variety of food <p>Property Price and Desirability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will increase the value of houses around the area Elevate prestige of neighbourhood – people wanted to buy apartments in Lindfield because of Harris Farm store there. 		
	<p>Plans – Harris Farm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plans look fantastic – tremendous effort into the design The design of the buildings and landscape will enhance the local character of the area through addition of trees and green spaces with appropriately scaled buildings under the tree canopy. Support for proposal – will result in improved aesthetics to area. Would add value to the community through the design Innovative and well thought out Will provide wonderful asset for the broader Turramurra community, particularly the native garden and orchard. Improve areas visual impact with improved landscape and amenity Low rise development Proposed layout provides a unique venue, distinct from shopping centres and the orchard and garden reinforce education for kids about gardening, produce and sustainability. Proposal offers a community hub that is not currently available and provides and meeting place for coffee Designs are sympathetic to neighbourhood and surrounding houses 	<p>Support for Harris Farm and the concept plans are noted.</p> <p>However, this is a Planning Proposal, and not a Development Application. The Planning Proposal only considers amendments to the LEP (zoning and development standards) applying to the site.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal cannot be tied to a particular development outcome on the site.</p> <p>The concept plans attached to the Planning Proposal provide an indicative indication of the possible type and scale of built form outcomes enabled by the Planning Proposal.</p> <p>The proposed amendments to the LEP need to be acceptable as an outcome, regardless of the approval of any future development application.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal</p>

Matters raised in submission		Council Comment	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for café, conservatory, orchard, nursery, florist – additional to Harris Farm • Allowed greenspace which encourages families to get out and get active • Open plan concept is wonderful • Support if final plans are based on the concept drawings shown – single storey, nursery, conservatory, barn and play ground and café, landscaped gardens • Well thought out in terms of basement parking, green spaces 		
Traffic	<p>Support – No Impacts on Traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing road network is underutilised and can easily accommodate the extra traffic • Do not see traffic as an issue • If most people can walk or drive a short distance to shops, traffic will decrease not increase • Support for the proposal as the traffic impact will keep local intersection at an A or B level of service while probably taking local traffic to St Ives off Killeaton St in peak period. • Support proposal because it will result in a reduction in our vehicle travel to obtain equivalent produce • Traffic impacts will be minimal noting that most of the customers are locals, and are already using local roads. • Additional business brought to area would not necessarily be car traffic and more than likely would be foot traffic • Would reduce traffic to Hornsby and St Ives • Traffic is a red herring - most people already drive by site on their way to Hornsby anyway • Traffic arguments comparing Harris Farm Lindfield hold little water – the Harris Farm store opening coincided with the 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The proposal is expected to generate additional vehicle traffic, and the supporting analysis indicates the traffic impact would not cause a significant deterioration in the performance of the surrounding road network.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

Matters raised in submission	Council Comment	Recommendation
<p>construction of apartment building of 150 units</p> <p>Existing Traffic – Will not be any worse</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic will be no worse than it is today – already a busy road which operates as a main feeder into the area • There is already commuter traffic and traffic from North Turrumurra on Eastern Road, and do not think there would be significant increases in traffic • New café on Eastern Road has increased the traffic and no complaints • Hoping proposed development can change the traffic flow around the shopping area • Already being impacted by traffic as Sydney expands • Harris Farm would not result in any real increase in traffic, when you consider the effect caused by the development of multi storey (up to 5 storey) developments in the area <p>Increase in traffic – can be mitigated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Benefits of development far exceed the impacts of any increased traffic • Infrastructure can be built to support traffic – Council and State government need to manage traffic situation • Traffic impacts could be mitigated by traffic planning • Plans show great consideration for traffic and parking mitigation 		
<p>Traffic – Turrumurra and St Ives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic around Turrumurra station is very restrictive, making it impossible to go to Coles or Kissing Point IGA. Development on site will provide a positive alternative to being forced to drive to the highway. • Will take traffic away from St Ives 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The proposal provides a local alternative to other similar uses in nearby centres, and while it has not been specifically assessed, this proposal may redirect some existing trips away from those centres.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

Matters raised in submission		Council Comment	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rohini Street is a bottle neck and cannot handle any more traffic – please don't force us to go to Coles at Turramurra unless you plan to build a tunnel under the rail line. 		
	<p>Support – Assurance of Traffic + Parking Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like assurance that traffic impacts will be actively managed, given sites proximity to homes and existing traffic on Eastern Road. Don't have issue with Harris Farm on the site but have concerns regarding traffic management. Definitely approve provided there is plenty of parking Support proposal but think it needs a bit more parking Support on provision that the increased traffic can be properly managed. Ensure entry and exit arrangement is well thought out Trust plans will be put in place for an oversupply of car parking as this is currently downside of shopping area. 	<p>While the proposal is expected to generate additional vehicle traffic, the supporting analysis indicates the traffic impact would not cause a significant deterioration in the performance of the surrounding road network and trigger the need for major interventions such as new intersection controls. The supporting public domain plan for the proposal would assist in providing improved amenity and traffic calming.</p> <p>Parking provision and access point location will be considered at the development application stage and would need to be consistent with the draft site-specific DCP.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal.
Parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The fact that Harris Farm will have additional parking (above that existing in the centre) will make it user friendly for all residents New shop will release more parking, improving ease of access Assume that Harris Farm will build parking under the main building with entrances off side road. Do not shop at current Eastern Road shops due to hard to find parking – Harris Farm will alleviate this problem The incorporation of thought-out parking will assist the current shambles 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Parking provision will be considered at the development application stage and would need to be consistent with the draft site-specific DCP.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal.

Matters raised in submission		Council Comment	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Great opportunity for underground parking in Turramurra • Adequate parking facilities • Proposed car park design will alleviate parking problems. • Already a shopping hub – so spill over traffic into streets and existing car park will likely be adequate • Proposed underground parking will ensure manageable traffic and parking impacts • Harris Farm should build more parking on their own site (e.g. a few stories) to ease congestion on surrounding streets 		
Loading Dock	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location of loading dock in underground carpark is much better than what exists at Eastern Road Shops. Any concerns about the dock are ill informed. 	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The draft site specific DCP includes requirements for all service and loading areas to be located within the basement in order to minimise amenity impacts to adjoining residential properties.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal.
Provision of Jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the proposal as it will provide a variety of local jobs including part time jobs that are attractive to many • Will provide for more local employment in a struggling market • Drive local economy and bring jobs to community • Opportunity for local residents to work in the area they live – both for current workforce and children as they grow up. • Lindfield Harris Farm store hired kids from community • Harris Farm has a policy of employment people with disabilities • Create 80 jobs for local community • If local IGA has to shed jobs, these could be replaced in greater numbers by Harris Farm. 	<p>The rezoning of the site would allow for future retail, business or commercial development on the sites which would provide for employment opportunities, both during the construction phase, and once completed.</p> <p>The Hill PDA Economic Impact Assessment Review (Feb 2019) outlines that a total of 70 jobs could be provided, depending on the type of future retail store or commercial use</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal.
Environment and Sustainability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for the various sustainability initiatives to be incorporated in the development, which can act as an 	Comments noted.	No amendment to Planning Proposal.

Matters raised in submission		Council Comment	Recommendation
	<p>exemplar for other smaller centres in Kuring-gai</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmentally better option • Harris Farm operate with corporate responsibility with regard to environmental impact and local considerations. • Locally grown produce therefore reducing carbon emissions from transport • Harris Farm are leaders in environmental practices of no bag policy, offering of imperfect fruit • Bringing latest technology and equipment to support recycling and energy saving • Sustainable organisation – encourage good social citizens • Reduce carbon emission by driving less 	<p>However, this is a Planning Proposal, and not a Development Application. The Planning Proposal only considers amendments to the LEP (zoning and development standards) applying to the site.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal cannot be tied to a particular development outcome –such as a Harris Farm store- on the site.</p> <p>Part 23 General Building Design and Sustainability of Councils DCP requires all new non residential developments to include Ecologically Sustainable Design (ESD) measures for water efficiency, energy generation, heating and cooling and lighting.</p>	
Existing Shops	<p>Eastern Road Neighbourhood Centre</p> <p>Location</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Location is highly suitable – alongside an existing long term retail precinct and on land that has been used for commercial purposes for decades • Sensible renewal of commercial area which needs enhancement <p>Benefits to neighbourhood centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considered development has been shown in numerous instances to progress neighbourhoods • Add to diversity and options available • Please allow area to grow and modernise • Will attract more business to precinct • Urgent need for additional retail outlets away from main retail areas of Turrumurra and Wahroonga. • Need vibrant economic zones in suburbs for them to survive big monopolies such as Westfield. • Area needs more service offerings 	<p>Comments noted and agreed.</p> <p>The location of the sites is suitable for the proposed B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone, noting that the current and historic uses are of a commercial nature, and the sites will form a natural extension to the existing B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone of the adjoining Eastern Road shops. The objective of the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone is to provide a range of small-scale retail, business and community uses that serve the needs of the people who live or work in the surrounding neighbourhood. The rezoning of the sites to B1 Neighbourhood Centre would allow for future development on the sites which would improve the retail and commercial offer in the locality and improve the quantity and quality of services for local residents. The draft site-specific DCP includes a public domain plan which seeks to improve pedestrian connectivity and streetscape amenity for the Eastern Road Neighbourhood Centre as a whole.</p> <p>A permitted land use within the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone is '<i>neighbourhood supermarket</i>' which would provide for the convenient daily shopping, and be of a size and scale that is compatible with the surrounding predominantly residential area.</p> <p>Economic competition between individual trade competitors is not an environmental or planning consideration, and the planning assessment is not about undermining the operation of a free market. Competition is dealt with via other legislation such as <i>Trade</i></p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal.

Matters raised in submission	Council Comment	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Eastern Road precinct is tired and has been undeveloped for many years • Welcome update to retail precinct • Will make area more desirable place of commerce and boost businesses around it • Will strengthen neighbourhood centre • Necessary for development of local area • Initial disruption, but will help revitalise the small shopping centre <p>Existing shops – Eastern Road Neighbourhood Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current shops are at capacity • Existing Eastern Road shops will benefit from Harris Farm in the long run • Existing shops are already heavily used by often there is no parking available • Can understand the existing shops would not like it but they are already quite overpriced for what they offer and this additional would provide better services to the community. • Whole Eastern Road Shop precinct is rundown and needs an upgrade - nothing has been uplifted expect for the coffee shops. Hopefully this development will inspire other shops to upgrade • Need for a high quality fruit and vegetable store in area. Have to make do with a limited range and relatively poor produce from supermarkets • Enjoy utilising a number of businesses in the same location • Suburb and community have higher expectation of retail than what is currently provided • Harris Farm will complement the Eastern Road shops • Footpath outside of existing Eastern Road shops is cluttered with sales junk and table and chairs – makes it hard to navigate. 	<p><i>Practices Act 1974 and Fair Trading Act 1987</i>, as well as market forces. The Hill PDA Economic Impact Assessment Review (Feb 2019) notes that the existing retailers on Eastern Road may experience some loss depending on how they adapt or change (in the range of 10-15%), however the impact on the whole expanded centre will be net positive as total retail sales are expected to increase by more than 80%. Local residents would have a larger and wider retail/commercial offer.</p>	

Matters raised in submission	Council Comment	Recommendation
<p>Current lack of shops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not have anywhere near the shops we need for the ever growing population in this area Area needs a new supermarket Need more local shops in Eastern Road Lack of grocers and cafes to cater for demand. <p>Compensation for existing shops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with the Planning Proposal so long as existing shops are given room or adequate compensation <p>Competition and impact on existing shops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Competition is good for community – allows fair pricing and consumer choice Unfortunate that current fruit and veg shop, butcher and the Wednesday farmers markets will be negatively impact Will not impact existing businesses – they are well (and over) patronised Will bring more people into area and a regular basis therefore increase patronage at existing shops Can't get everything at Harris Farm, so there will still be a need for the specialist shops on the strip. Will bring more foot traffic to surrounding shops. To block the proposal will be anti-competitive Busy enough shopping precinct for addition of Harris Farm 		
<p>Other Harris Farm Stores – Linfield, St Ives and Willoughby</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harris Farm Linfield is a great asset to the area, and gives confidence that they will undertake development in Turramurra with same level of sensitivity to the local environment. 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>This is a Planning Proposal to rezone the sites to B1 Neighbourhood Centre, which once rezoned may be used for a number of retail, commercial or business uses. This is not a Development Application for Harris Farm store.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal</p>

Matters raised in submission		Council Comment	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harris Farm as a concept has slotted into neighbourhood very well and each new development has been an advance on the previous one • This will reduce the traffic impacts at the Lindfield Harris Farm store • Already a Harris Farm at Lindfield, so why block this one? • Lindfield Harris Farm is very popular • New Lindfield store has added huge difference to quality in foot traffic and bringing life back to Lindfield – bringing locals back that previously shopped elsewhere • Currently shop at Lindfield and St Ives Harris Farm and the stores are well presented with good range of products and are aligned to needs of upper north shore. • Seen many benefits of Harris Farm to Lindfield residents – good community outcomes including convenience, not having to visit large shopping centre, no hassle parking • Look at Harris Farm Lindfield, IGA opened at same time and both are always full • Similar local sized shopping precinct at High St Willoughby with Harris Farm as major tenant. Works very well even though High Street is busier and with school across road, and less parking than proposed at Turramurra. • Works well at High Street Willoughby, and this location is comparable to Eastern Road – arterial road, residential area set amongst local shops, also includes an IGA. 		
	<p>Turramurra and Other Centres</p> <p>Turramurra Centre</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shopping in Turramurra is below what is should be. 	<p>Ku-ring-gai has an undersupply of retail floorspace based on the population, this was first identified in the Ku-ring-gai Retail Centres Strategy 2005, which outlined that approximately 40% escape expenditure being capture by surrounding retail centres such as Chatswood, Hornsby and Macquarie Park. There has been limited</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

Matters raised in submission	Council Comment	Recommendation
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turrumurra town centre is well overdue for a big overhaul – anything along those lines will help us all. • Turrumurra needs a refurbishment and this is a good start. • Turrumurra district amenity has deteriorated over past 6 years, with closing of shops, and activate Turrumurra project stalled. • Council's development of retail precincts has been slow/frozen for over 10 years • Due to highly fragmented ownership of land around the station, it will take years if not decades for redevelopment in this location • Turrumurra shopping precinct is fragmented by Highway with no green space • Turrumurra lacks good quality grocery shopping and cafes • Turrumurra increased population with all new units – but centre is dying and need more places to buy food and be socially interactive. • Turrumurra lacks attractive town centre that can provide sense of identity and community <p>Lack of retail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tired with lack of options and degraded shopping facilities available in Turrumurra and Ku-ring-gai. Residents have to drive to St Ives, Lindfield, Gordon, Macquarie Park or Hornsby for shopping. Can only imagine what it is like for elderly in the area. • Parking at Turrumurra and St Ives is difficult – another retail space will make life easier for people • Locals need somewhere else than Westfield to shop 	<p>additional retail floorspace developed in Ku-ring-gai since 2005 study was undertaken, and in some instances the redevelopment of existing retail and commercial sites within centres has actually resulted in a reduction of the amount of retail and commercial floorspace provided. The Ku-ring-gai LSPS sets out the Local Planning Priority K25. Providing for the retail and commercial needs of the local community within Ku-ring-gai centres, which highlights the importance of providing additional retail floorspace over the next 20years to meet the retail demands of a growing population.</p> <p>The LSPS also sets out the Local Planning Priority <i>K10. Promoting Turrumurra as a family-focused urban village</i> and associated Structure Plan outlining key opportunities and principles to support the growth and revitalisation of the Turrumurra Local Centre In addition, Council also has an adopted master plan for the Turrumurra Community Hub on Council owned sites adjoining the railway, to develop, in collaboration with private and government land owners, a community hub incorporating a library, community centre, park and public domain areas.</p> <p>The rezoning of the subject sites will allow for the future development of additional retail and commercial uses, in a suitable location noting the existing and historic commercial uses on the sites, and adjoining Eastern Road neighbourhood centre shops. The rezoning of the site could potentially result in a much improved neighbourhood centre, including more opportunity for wider and complementary range of goods and services.</p>	

Matters raised in submission		Council Comment	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will lessen pressure and ease congestion at St Ives • Ku-ring-gai has a shortage of commercial spaces and lacks competition between businesses – residents pay higher prices for food and goods, and often have to travel out of area to buy groceries. • All suburbs needs more retail outlets • Retail has not responded to increases in density and population in Turramurra 		
Existing – Service Station and nursery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Run down service station • Nursery is expensive and out of reach for a lot of people to shop at. • Current site is rundown and needs to be developed. • Better use of the site than the current garage and nursery • Visually more attractive and appealing compared to old garage 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The proposed rezoning to B1 Neighbourhood Centre would allow for future re-development of the site for a range of retail, commercial and business uses.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal.
Local Character	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low height proposal • Fits into the family setting of Turramurra, Warrawee, Wahroonga. • Has not been a ‘village’ atmosphere for years • Area is bereft of character • New development will be much more in keeping with regional area than the current uses • Sympathetic to surrounding area • Fit in with character and sympathetic to the surrounding area and suburb • Create a meaningful improvement to village atmosphere • Will enhance streetscape • Proposal will retain and add more trees and gardens, adding to the amenity and complimenting the character of the local area. • Maintain visual character of garden suburb with the Blue Gum High Forest 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal is not seeking to change the existing maximum 9.5m height of buildings or 0.3:1 floor space ratio applying to the sites. These are the same development standards applying to the surrounding residential properties, and will mean that future development on the site is a consistent height, bulk and scale as the surrounding area. Additionally, the draft site-specific DCP has been prepared with controls and objectives to ensure any future development on the sites will be cohesive with the surrounding streetscape character through controls relating to the building setbacks, built form, retention of trees, and public domain works.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal.

Matters raised in submission		Council Comment	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintain residential village character 		
Views of Local Residents - NIMBY	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NIMBY's should not be able to prevent improved amenity for the district Strong vocal minority that oppose the development. Their comments are based on misinformation and many have not even looked at the proposal. We are a younger family and feel that the elderly in this area stop us going ahead and veto everything. Community life must be supported in all aspects. Why would anyone obstruct commercial development in any suburb which is going to be beneficial to the local community? Council should make decisions that benefit majority of residents not just noisy few Well orchestrated program run by local businesses making statements which are untrue and misleading – not in the broader public interest and support anti-competitive behaviour Opposition campaign present themselves as speaking for the whole community – the community has a range of views on this proposal and are certainly not all opposed 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Consideration is given to the planning merits of the issues raised, rather than the number of submissions received.</p> <p>Submission writers are not required to disclose their address and submissions are not limited to local residents of Turramurra or Kuring-gai.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal.
Opposition/Objections to Planning Proposal			
Pedestrians	<p>Pedestrians – Existing safety issues crossing Eastern Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More cars parked on streets will block sight of the crossing Existing pedestrian crossing on Eastern Road is dangerous as vehicles frequently fail to stop for pedestrians due to poor visibility and distraction of cars turning in 	<p>While the most recent recorded crash around the pedestrian crossing in Eastern Road dates back to 2008, the draft public domain plan for the area around the site proposes a number of improvements to pedestrian accessibility and amenity, including road narrowings, improvements to the layout of the pedestrian crossing on Eastern Road and adjustments to angle parking outside the existing shops to improve visibility and safety.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal

Matters raised in submission		Council Comment	Recommendation
	<p>and out of Tennyson and the angled parking spaces.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area already a potential hazard for pedestrians • Nightmare to cross Eastern Road at present and will only get worse if development goes ahead 		
	<p>Pedestrian access to site and around surrounding area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To access site on foot from corner of Burns & Eastern Road you need to cross three roads (Trentino, Alice and Tennyson) or four roads (Glenwood, Water, Billyard, Worcester) without cross walks or lights • No pedestrian crossing at intersection of The Chase Road and Tennyson Avenue • Pedestrian access is already hazardous • Difficult to cross Alice Street and Tennyson Avenue when walking • Many pedestrians walk along the eastern side of Eastern Road to gain access to Turramurra Memorial Park and Karuah Oval. 	<p>A pedestrian crossing in Tennyson Avenue is proposed as part of the draft public domain plan for the area around the site. Alice Street, Glenwood Close and Worcester Place carry modest traffic volumes, and pedestrian crossing facilities would not be warranted.</p> <p>The draft public domain plan for the area around the site also proposes a number of improvements to pedestrian accessibility and amenity, including road narrowings, improvements to the layout of the pedestrian crossing on Eastern Road.</p> <p>Pedestrian facilities at other locations are outside the scope of the planning proposal but can be considered separately by the Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

<p>Traffic</p>	<p>Increased traffic – General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would increase traffic and congestion on local streets and area. • Increased customer traffic, as well as delivery vehicles • Add significant traffic pollution, and congestion to an area that is already full at peak hours. • Will create traffic chaos • Development of this scale will definitely bring significant increase in traffic to a residential area • Increase in traffic will place extra strain on emergency service vehicles, road work, garbage and street sweeping services. • Major impact to traffic on Eastern, Burns, Tennyson, Alice, Glendale, Trentino and Billyard – single lane residential streets • Traffic implications have not been adequately addressed. • New traffic levels average two cars per minute over a 24hour period – when this is converted to business hours only, the number is therefore roughly twice that. • Wait and see what impact the recently announced traffic changes around Turramurra Station will have on local traffic before approving another development which will increase traffic. <p>Increased traffic – customer catchment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wide customer catchment will result in increase in traffic volumes • Harris Farm will draw customers from Hornsby and suburbs further north – not just the local area – making the traffic in suburban streets worse. <p>Requirement for traffic mitigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turramurra urgently needs updated traffic flow and management plan in conjunction with RMS. • Council will not pay to ameliorate the traffic and other impacts of this proposal. Supporters needs to be aware that Council will not be able 	<p>While the proposal is expected to generate additional vehicle traffic, the supporting analysis indicates the traffic impact would not cause a significant deterioration in the performance of the surrounding road network and trigger the need for major interventions such as new intersection controls. A supporting public domain plan for the area around the proposal would assist in providing improved pedestrian amenity and traffic calming.</p> <p>Additional traffic generation was forecast to be approximately 2 vehicle trips per minute during the Thursday PM peak hour and 2.5 trips per minute during the Saturday peak hour.</p> <p>Traffic and transport conditions in the Turramurra local centre were assessed in 2015 and a transport scheme was adopted by Council.</p> <p>While it has not been specifically assessed, this proposal may redirect some trips away from the Turramurra local centre.</p> <p>The traffic generation has been assessed, as well as its impact on the surrounding road network. Traffic effects from the proposal are diluted as the distance from the site increases.</p> <p>Traffic and transport conditions in the Turramurra local centre were assessed in 2015 and a transport scheme was adopted by Council. Council is working with Transport for NSW to further refine the scheme.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal</p>
-----------------------	--	---	--

	<p>to upgrade the roads that will be adversely impacted</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harris Farm have admitted their development will adversely impact local traffic but they will help address traffic issued after they have already created a problem. • How does Ku-ring-gai co-ordinate with TfNSW with whole of suburb plan for the long term? <p>Increased Traffic – Rezoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doubling size of land zoned B1 will double traffic • Rezoning will only make existing conditions worse – diverting more traffic onto side streets – these are suburban streets not highways. <p>Roads – Won’t cope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will generate lots of traffic on a road and surrounds that were not built to accommodate this type of proposal. • How will local streets cope? • Road system is inadequate for the proposed use • Roads not built to receive the volume of cars and heavy vehicles • Increased traffic will force local residents to use small local streets which are not designed to carry any increases in traffic. <p>Increased traffic compared to existing uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nowhere near the same volume of customers attend the existing garage and nursery as opposed to high volume grocery store • Hugely increased traffic volumes compared with that generated by existing small commercial businesses in the area. <p>Tennyson Avenue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tennyson Avenue will be the main road used by customers who live east of Eastern Road, and will carry 50% of all traffic that will be going to and from the new development. • Intersection of Tennyson Avenue and Eastern Road will be a mess 	<p>The traffic generation has been assessed, as well as its impact on the surrounding road network. Traffic effects from the proposal are diluted as the distance from the site increases.</p> <p>Traffic volumes in Tennyson Avenue are forecast to increase by approximately 30 trips during Thursday afternoon and Saturday peak hours. This represents 20%-25% of the total forecast traffic generation of the proposal.</p> <p>There is no plan to reconstruct Tennyson Avenue. The proposed public domain treatments in Tennyson Avenue near Eastern Road may discourage existing trips along Tennyson Avenue that do not have an origin or destination at the Eastern Road neighbourhood shops.</p> <p>The traffic assessment found that the intersection Eastern Road and Tennyson Avenue would continue to operate at Level of Service A/B, which is good operation and space capacity.</p> <p>Additional traffic generation was forecast to be approximately 130 vehicle trips per hour during the Thursday PM peak hour and 150 trips per hour during the Saturday peak hour. Its</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic generated by proposal will require reconstruction of Tennyson Avenue include a new bridge – does Council proposed to do that? • Tennyson Avenue access to proposal in inadequate <p>Eastern Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Generate an unnecessary amount of traffic on Eastern Road. • Intersection of Tennyson Avenue and Eastern Road will be so much worse if Harris Farm is allowed. • Detrimental impact to traffic on Eastern Road and adjacent feeder streets. • Road not wide enough for parking, access, footpath safety, trees and passing road traffic <p>Traffic Impacts from entry/exit of site and parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Frequent turning traffic at the proposed site would severely impact existing traffic flows. • Additional traffic will result in more vehicles turning in and out of Wiltshire Place as shoppers try to find parking so they don't have to cross Eastern Road into the site. • Entrance to underground carpark is opposite Worcester Place making it difficult and dangerous – Wiltshire place also affected • Vehicle access to the car park is opposite 48 Tennyson Avenue and will result in danger to children and parents attending swim school. • Customers turning into parking area would cause traffic to bank up along Eastern Road. • Bottlenecks would be more frequent with customers having to turn into the parking area, which would increase the difficulty of merging onto the road for local residents • Two entry and exit driveways on Eastern Road will be too disruptive to traffic in Eastern Road. • Road is not wide enough to make a second lane/turning only lane into the proposed basement car park. 	<p>effects on Eastern Road were assessed and found to have only minimal additional impacts.</p> <p>The proposed public domain treatments around the site have regard to road widths, parking, while improving pedestrian safety and amenity.</p> <p>Clarification was sought from the applicant's traffic engineer. The analysis undertaken indicates that the site access would operate with average delays for all movements of less than 15 seconds per vehicle. This represents level of service A/B, a good level of service. As a result, additional turning lanes (such as additional left and right turn lanes on Eastern Road) are not required.</p> <p>The location of the entrance to the car park shown in the DCP is indicative only and will be subject to a future development application. Consideration will be given to the location of the driveway entrance during the assessment.</p> <p>The access arrangements will be assessed during the development application stage.</p> <p>This will be assessed during the development application stage.</p> <p>It is envisaged that departing vehicles will be able to turn left or right, but this will be assessed during the development application stage.</p> <p>Inspections of the Harris Farm Lindfield basement car park indicated space capacity for customers.</p> <p>Havilah Lane in Lindfield is signposted with parking restrictions, to maintain traffic flow.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What provisions are being made to ensure entry to the basement carpark is not going to affect traffic flow on Eastern Road? • When departing will vehicles be able to turn left and right onto Eastern Road? Turning right will cause safety issues. <p>Comparison to Lindfield + Willoughby Harris Farm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Similar developments at Lindfield and Willoughby have increased traffic congestion and parking difficulties • Harris Farm Lindfield the access road is continually blocked due to cars parking 		
	<p>Traffic Impacts on driveways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More congestion along Eastern Road and result in chaos for residents getting in and out of driveways on Eastern Road • Concern that location of Harris Farm entry driveway, and traffic queueing to enter will block entry/exit to double garage at 2 Worcester Place – why was this not included in the Environmental Impact Report? • Currently hard to exit driveway due to parked cars. • Already difficult to merge from driveway on Eastern Road in mornings • Steep driveway – currently hard to determine if vehicle is approaching and when to move. Increase in traffic will result in a much more difficult situation. • Between 8-10am it is impossible to back out of driveway on The Chase Road. 	<p>The location of the entrance to the car park shown in the DCP is indicative only and will be subject to a future development application. Consideration will be given to the location of the driveway entrances during the assessment, including position, visibility and capacity.</p> <p>The proposal is not expected to impact significantly on traffic volumes in The Chase Road. The peak times for the site would be during late afternoons on weekdays and around midday on Saturdays.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>
	<p>Existing traffic conditions – Eastern Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastern Road is already busy during the day • Eastern Road is popular thoroughfare to Hornsby • Eastern Road extensively used for buses, school and sport related travel • Friday afternoon traffic gets backed up through the traffic lights at Eastern Road/Burns Road • Currently intersection of The Chase Road and Eastern Road is extremely busy with cars 	<p>Eastern Road is a regional road, which has a higher order function and is therefore expected to carry more traffic than local or collector roads.</p> <p>The proposal is not expected to impact significantly on traffic volumes in The Chase Road. Conditions on Eastern Road at Bangalla Street and The Chase Road can be reviewed</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

	<p>feeding from Bangalla and Eastern Road and visibility is poor due to parked cars. This intersection is already challenging and this should be taken into consideration with increased traffic.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cars speed through 50km zone on Eastern Road. • Eastern Road already exceeds the traffic flow environmental goal • Already considerable traffic on Eastern Road and have significant wait times to exit property at 89 Eastern Road due to volume of cars and bottlenecks. • Difficult to turn onto Eastern Road from Alice Street and Tennyson Avenue or The Chase Road • Existing traffic in Eastern Road is busy enough – especially from 7am-9am and 1:30-4:30pm which are the peak school drop off and pick up times. <p>Existing traffic conditions – Tennyson Avenue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tennyson Avenue and Alice Street are very narrow. Tennyson Avenue measures 10m approx. in width – even less at some driveway entrances. Little clearance between passing cars. • Tennyson Avenue does not have any kerb or guttering. Does Council plan to rectify this? And who pays? • Both sides of Tennyson Avenue have cars parked all day – unrestricted parking allowed. The cars belong to both employees at Eastern Road Shops, and commuters using public transport to go north and south, and a small number of customers to Eastern Road shops. • Turning right out of Tennyson Avenue and Alice Street can be difficult at peak times • Tennyson Avenue currently relieves pressure of The Chase Road, and Burns Road. • Traffic already bottlenecks at intersection of Eastern Road and Tennyson Avenue, and Rohini Street. 	<p>separately and considered by the Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee.</p> <p>Due to their higher order function, regional roads (such as Eastern Road) do not have traffic flow environmental goals. However, compared to other regional roads in Ku-ring-gai (such as Burns Road/Junction Road) traffic volumes on Eastern Road near the site are much lower.</p> <p>The proposal is unlikely to add substantial additional traffic to Eastern Road during the morning peak period. The peak times for the site would be during late afternoons on weekdays and around midday on Saturdays</p> <p>There are currently no plans to construct kerb and gutter in Tennyson Avenue.</p> <p>The traffic assessment found that the intersection Eastern Road and Tennyson Avenue would continue to operate at Level of Service A/B, which is good operation and space capacity.</p> <p>Traffic volumes in Tennyson Avenue are forecast to increase by approximately 1 trip every 2 minutes during Thursday afternoon and Saturday peak hours. This is unlikely to impact on traffic flow in Tennyson Avenue.</p> <p>There is no plan to reconstruct Tennyson Avenue. The proposed public domain treatments in Tennyson Avenue near Eastern Road, including the raised pedestrian crossing and road narrowings, may discourage existing trips along Tennyson Avenue that do not have an origin or destination at the Eastern Road neighbourhood shops.</p>	
--	---	---	--

- Traffic report (2.4) notes that Tennyson Avenue provides one traffic lane in each direction with parking permitted on both sides – however if cars are parked the street is too narrow for cars to pass – impeding traffic flow.
- Bridge only allows one car at a time
- Tennyson Avenue road surface is poor
- KMC have refused to install traffic calming structure in Tennyson Avenue

Existing traffic conditions – General

- Area already a bottle neck for cars
- 50km speed limit is currently not observed
- Streets are narrow, and visibility from side streets is limited.
- Residents can't enter or exit their streets already at times
- Streets are already congested:
 - Young Street
 - Eastern Road
 - Burns Road
 - Bobbin Head Road
 - Boomerang
 - Pentecost
 - Turramurra Avenue
 - Billyard Avenue
 - Rohini
- Intersection are already busy:
 - Eastern Road and Tennyson Avenue intersection
 - Intersection of Bangalla and Eastern Road
- Roads are only equipped to deal with local traffic and can only cope with current volumes of traffic
- Afternoon peak period is increased by existence of four schools in the nearby vicinity
- Traffic in mornings is impacted by bus stops on 575 route and cars turning right into Chilton and Bangalla towards Wahroonga.
- Has Council monitored peak times for passenger drop off and pick up at Warrawee Station, monitored traffic flows, aggressive drivers and road width?

The main traffic increases are forecast in Eastern Road and Tennyson Avenue. Traffic effects are diluted as the distance from the site increases, and would have minimal impact on other surrounding local roads.

The traffic assessment found that the intersection Eastern Road and Tennyson Avenue would continue to operate at Level of Service A/B, which is good operation and space capacity.

The proposal is unlikely to add substantial additional traffic to Eastern Road during the morning peak period. The peak times for the site would be during late afternoons on weekdays and around midday on Saturdays.

	<p>Reasons for increased traffic in area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic has increased due to increase in population • Currently suffer ever increasing traffic from increased number of medium density residences developed in the area. 		
	<p>'Rat runs'</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Barker and Knox school buses 'rat run' down Kintore and Braeside Streets from Eastern Road at speeds of 70km/hr to avoid traffic. • Following streets are identified as current 'rat runs': <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Trentino Road afternoon to avoid lights at corner of Burns and Eastern Road. ○ The Chase Road ○ Tennyson Avenue ○ Nambucca Street ○ Local streets to avoid Burns Road ○ Bangalla Road de facto route between Wahroonga and Eastern Road ○ Brentwood – shortcut from the Pacific Highway ○ Wahroonga to Burns Road - via Bangalla and The Chase – makes turning right from The Chase into Eastern Road difficult • Increased traffic in Eastern Road will motivate drivers to use roads such as Trentino, Water and Billyard • Wonga Wonga, James Lane and the carpark behind Turramurra shops will become option for impatient drivers looking for new route • Development will only make this worse, with more traffic diverting down side streets. 	<p>This is outside scope of the planning proposal. Parts of Kintore Street are designated bus routes, however Council can follow up separately with the bus operators on this matter.</p> <p>The Bangalla Street / Millewa Avenue route, The Chase Road and Cherry Street are designated collector roads.</p> <p>The proposed public domain treatments in Tennyson Avenue near Eastern Road, including the raised pedestrian crossing and road narrowings, may discourage existing trips along Tennyson Avenue that do not have an origin or destination at the Eastern Road neighbourhood shops.</p> <p>The traffic assessment found that the intersection Eastern Road and Tennyson Avenue and intersection of Eastern Road with Alice Street would continue to operate at Level of Service A/B, which is good operation and space capacity. This performance is unlikely to encourage users to use alternative routes.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>
	<p>Delivery Vehicles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A condition is required that all delivery vehicles use the underground unloading area and turntable and those waiting to unload do not park in Wiltshire or Worcester Place, Alice Street, Eastern Road or Tennyson Avenue. • Condition must be made to ensure delivery vehicles do not attend site before 7am on any 	<p>Management of the servicing and heavy vehicle access will be subject to a future development application. Rohini Street / Eastern Road will likely be the preferred truck route given that they are designated regional roads and provide the most direct access from Pacific Highway but this is subject to assessment of a development application</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

	<p>day to prevent noise pollution and disturbing residential amenity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weight restrictions on trucks are already ignored • Attract more delivery trucks further congesting Tennyson Avenue. • Will damage road • Huge number of truck movements • What time will delivery trucks be allowed? On weekends? • Concerns regarding access to site –several roundabouts along Eastern Road with large trucks not being capable of turning, also access from Hornsby and St Ives too many roundabouts and tight corners. • Access to the site will only be made via limited approved approaches, and needs to be policed and enforced. • Will take shortcuts through residential streets. 	<p>Load limits do not apply to trucks that have an origin or destination in the area. Council rangers regularly enforce load limits.</p> <p>Heavy vehicles are not expected to use Tennyson Avenue.</p> <p>The number of additional heavy vehicle movements will be assessed as part of a future development application.</p> <p>The roundabout at the intersection of Eastern Road and Brentwood Avenue has a mountable central island, which allows larger vehicles to cross over it.</p>	
	<p>Traffic Report – Concerns and Issues</p> <p>General</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report by Colston, Budd, Rogers and Kafes is superficial • Report gives no explanation as to its methodology • Report is out of date, as it was completed end of June 2018. • To assess traffic management plans for this proposal in isolation from overall traffic flow management plans for Turrumurra does not paint a true picture of the future traffic situation. • Not possible to assess the impact of the proposal based on the current report. • Traffic Report is misleading • Council should require a new traffic study to be produced, based on normal (not Covid19) peak hour traffic flows in 2020. <p>Omissions from Traffic Report / Not considered in Traffic Report</p>	<p>The traffic report provided the necessary information for assessment at this stage of the process. More detailed traffic information will be provided as supporting documentation to a development application.</p> <p>Traffic and transport conditions in the Turrumurra local centre were assessed in 2015 and a transport scheme was adopted by Council. Council is working with Transport for NSW to further refine the scheme.</p> <p>The traffic generation of this planning proposal has been assessed based on conditions pre-COVID19. Impact were assessed on the directly affected roads surrounding the site. Traffic effects from the proposal are diluted as the distance from the site increases.</p> <p>Traffic and transport conditions in the Turrumurra local centre were assessed in 2015 and a transport scheme was adopted by Council. Council is working with Transport for NSW to further refine the scheme.</p> <p>The traffic generation of this planning proposal has been assessed based on conditions pre-COVID19. Impact were assessed on the directly affected roads surrounding the site.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have the impact on the congested Pacific Highway intersections been considered? • Silent on impacts and analysis on major intersections near the site, including Burns and Eastern Road. • Does not take into consideration Childcare Centre and Learn to Swim School – parents dropping off and parking. • Traffic report does not take into consideration the chaotic period of construction • Does not consider the pedestrian crossing, parallel or angled parking or intersections • Fails to mention 50km/h speed limit on Eastern and Alice Streets. • No mention in the Traffic Report of the inclusion of the Eastern Road Shops, and the associated parking and traffic movements (e.g. angled parking) at those shops • Fails to recognise the impact on other local streets, parking and the problems of vehicles turning right into the site. • Ignores Billyard, Burns, Water and Chilton Parade – which all currently are congested. • Traffic report does not address a number of issues – issue of vehicles turning into site from Eastern Road and the tail back and blocking side streets • Tennyson Avenue and Alice Street – received little or no comments most likely on purpose. • Traffic report has not looked at Billyard avenue • Does not mention narrowness of Tennyson and Alice Street when cars are parked on each side. • No discussion on the origin destination of the vehicles attracted to the development • Was existing traffic in Billyard Avenue (which contains two schools) and Eastern Road on Friday afternoons considered in the traffic review? • The traffic report focuses on Tennyson Road and Alice Street – not The Chase Road. Likely that the Chase Road will be used as an alternate route to approach/leave Harris Farm. 	<p>Traffic effects from the proposal are diluted as the distance from the site increases.</p> <p>The applicant's traffic engineer confirmed that the existing pedestrian crossing on Eastern Road, south of Tennyson Avenue, is included in the SIDRA model, and also included a possible pedestrian crossing on Tennyson Avenue (as identified in the draft public domain plan) in the 'with development' scenarios.</p> <p>The applicant's traffic engineer confirmed that the speed limit used in the SIDRA intersection modelling is 50km/h for these roads</p> <p>Clarification was sought from the applicant's traffic engineer. The analysis undertaken indicates that the site access would operate with average delays for all movements of less than 15 seconds per vehicle. This represents level of service A/B, a good level of service. As a result, additional turning lanes (such as additional left and right turn lanes on Eastern Road) are not required.</p> <p>Traffic volumes in Tennyson Avenue are forecast to increase by approximately 1 trip every 2 minutes during Thursday afternoon and Saturday peak hours. This is unlikely to impact on traffic flow and access in Tennyson Avenue.</p> <p>The proposal is unlikely to add substantial additional traffic to the surrounding area during the morning peak period. The peak times for the site would be during late afternoons on weekdays (particularly Thursdays) and around midday on Saturdays</p> <p>The proposal is not expected to impact significantly on existing traffic volumes in The Chase Road.</p> <p>Additional traffic generation on Eastern Road was forecast to be approximately 130 vehicle trips per hour during the Thursday PM peak hour and 150 trips per hour during the Saturday peak hour. Its effects on Eastern Road were assessed and found to have only minimal additional delays to surrounding intersections, with operation continuing at Level of Service A/B, which is good operation and space capacity.</p> <p>Estimates of traffic generation are based on surveys of similar uses and provided a good indication of additional traffic expected from the proposal.</p>	
--	--	--	--

	<p>Traffic increase and impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report states increased between 120-150 cars per hour which is unacceptable. • Completely disagree with the analysis of traffic increase • Traffic report does not adequately take into account the additional traffic that will be generated by the proposed development. • Question assertion that <i>'the proposal can be accommodated utilising the existing road network'</i> – we are currently at the limit of congestion • Calculations of traffic impacts are a best guess. • Impact of traffic congestion is significantly underestimated. • Proposal notes that it can be accommodated by existing road network – no figures or detailed analysis presented to support this. • Statements made in section 3.19 and 3.20 are incorrect and misleading <p>Driveways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The three driveways depict a left in and out of the site – this will cause traffic to loop around the existing precinct to head back north. • Report notes removals of driveways/exits onto Eastern Road – however this is not true, where the two existing driveways for the service station will be replaced with 2 inward and 2 outward driveways <p>Comparison Boronia Park Harris Farm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Turrumurra location cannot be compared to Boronia Park Harris Farm, which is located on Pittwater Road, a thoroughfare road, located in 	<p>Environmental Capacity Performance Standards (and thresholds) on local and collector residential streets were developed by RMS (now Transport for NSW) and are based on concepts of good practice, safety and amenity. The impacts of the proposal on local and collector streets lie below the thresholds in the Standard.</p> <p>It is envisaged that departing vehicles will be able to turn left or right, but this will be assessed during the development application stage.</p> <p>Pittwater Road at Boronia Park is classified as a regional road, like Eastern Road is. As an indication, weekday traffic volumes on Pittwater Road (between Victoria Road and Ryde Road) are approximately 7,000 vehicles per day (from traffic impact assessment of Gladesville Shopping Village Planning Proposal). This is less than the weekday traffic volumes on Eastern Road (11,000 vehicles per day) outside the site.</p> <p>Records indicate Harris Farm Lindfield started trading in 2018, and it would be an unsuitable site to survey given it would not have reached full trading capacity at the time of the Planning Proposal.</p> <p>Environmental Capacity Performance Standards (and thresholds) on local and collector residential streets were developed by RMS (now Transport for NSW) and are based on concepts of good practice, safety and amenity. The impacts of the proposal on local and collector streets lie below the thresholds in the Standard.</p> <p>Traffic volumes in Tennyson Avenue are forecast to increase by approximately 30 trips during Thursday afternoon and Saturday peak hours, which is just below the maximum Environmental Capacity Performance Standard threshold for a local road. The proposed public domain treatments and new raised pedestrian crossing in Tennyson Avenue near Eastern Road may discourage existing trips along Tennyson Avenue</p>	
--	---	---	--

	<p>a shopping area and two lanes in each direction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boronia Park appears smaller – why was Harris Farm Lindfield not used as this is more comparable? <p>RMS Guidelines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic report refers to RMS traffic flows and admits it is virtually impossible to say what the impacts will be • Does not explain how the increased traffic flow still remains within the RMS guidelines • Traffic well in excess of RMS environmental goal for local road – the proposed development and year on year traffic increases from increasing population will push it past the maximum • Tennyson Avenue will breach the environmental goal of 200 vph in the peak (section 2.15) It will come in at 295 vehicles during the afternoon peak and 275 Saturday lunchtime (table 3.1). It will only be just below the 300 vehicle maximum flow count (2.15) which will lead to breaching the threshold shortly after due to growth in Ku-ring-gai local government area. • Includes statement regarding The Chase Road is already at maximum environmental flows, yet if development goes ahead it will increase traffic flows along Chase Road. 	<p>that do not have an origin or destination at the Eastern Road neighbourhood shops.</p> <p>The Chase Road has existing treatments (raised thresholds) to manage the impacts of the traffic flows at the maximum environmental flows</p> <p>The applicant's traffic engineer clarified that traffic counts were undertaken on 4 and 6 June 2015 and check observations were undertaken in 2018 which found similar flows. Electronic measurement devices were not used.</p> <p>The peak times for the proposed use would be during late afternoons on weekdays and around midday on Saturdays.</p>	
--	---	---	--

	<p>Traffic Survey – Day/Date/Time</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has documentation been given as to the dates and times the traffic movements were obtained? Were electronic measurement devices utilised? • Wonder when the weekday afternoon count was taken? 2:45-3:30p, when mums are doing school pickups and not passing Eastern Road? Harris Farm wouldn't want it done between 3:30pm-4:30pm when traffic is worst. • Commissioned traffic report only surveyed daytime traffic • Undercount of existing current traffic • Traffic counts taken on weekdays afternoons and Saturday lunch time when roads are quiet – rather than peak times. These figures were then compared to the RMS figures, which are based on peak times. • Study may note 'amended June 2019' but the traffic numbers cited are the same as those in the Aldi study dated August 2015 – traffic has noticeably increased in the last 4 years and this is not reflected in the report. • Concentrates on Harris Farm business peak times, but not the true morning and afternoon peak times. • No mention of morning peak between 7 and 8:30am • Interested how the AM peak was dismissed by the applicant – there is no discussion on flows at this time and while the flows existing the development may be lower, with higher flows towards Turrumurra station may actually make delays worse – was this considered? <p>Delay</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Report states intersection of Eastern Road and Tennyson Avenue is operating with average delays of less than 15 seconds per vehicle during peak times. Did not consider how long 	<p>The delays noted in the traffic report represent average delays for all vehicles. Some approaches may experience slightly less delays and others slightly more.</p> <p>The proposed public domain treatments and new raised pedestrian crossing in Tennyson Avenue near Eastern Road may discourage existing trips along Tennyson Avenue that do not have an origin or destination at the Eastern Road neighbourhood shops.</p> <p>The applicant's traffic engineer has confirmed that the modelled average delays for vehicles turning from Tennyson Avenue accord with site observations made during a number of weekday peak periods</p> <p>The applicant's traffic engineer has advised that the intersections of Eastern Road with Alice Street and Tennyson Avenue, as well as the proposed site access driveway, have been modelled in both isolated and network configuration. The levels of service at the intersections are the same for both models.</p> <p>Clarification was sought from the applicant's traffic engineer, who advised that the analysis undertaken indicates that the site access would operate with average delays for all movements of less than 15 seconds per vehicle. This represents level of service A/B, a good level of service. As a result, additional turning lanes (such as additional left and right turn lanes on Eastern Road) are not required.</p> <p>The applicant's traffic engineer has clarified that the parking which will be provided for the development is based on a rate per square metre of retail space, which therefore takes into account the size of the development. The traffic engineers noted that in their previous report, these rates were based on surveys of other developments. Similarly, the traffic generation</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>cars sit in line in Tennyson Avenue waiting to reach the intersection with Eastern Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 15 second delay is optimistic given large flow that appears to be turning right from Tennyson Avenue to Eastern Road • Takes more than 15seconds to turn right out of Tennyson Ave into Eastern Road • Bet this was taken at 3pm. Between 3:30-5pm you can wait 10mins to get onto Eastern Road. • Author of traffic study has not verified PM peak delays for Tennyson Avenue verse the modelled delay – it is common for the author to make some sort of validation statement around the modelled resulted based on site observations. <p>SIDRA Modelling</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned that the SIDRA modelling appears to be undertaken on a single intersection model setup only i.e. not a network model • makes no discussion around the assumptions of how traffic will enter the development site. E.g. if right turn of Eastern Road into the development was allowed and the major flow off Tennyson Avenue being a right hand turn – is there a risk that the right hand turn entry queue to the development in the PM peak will prevent vehicles existing Tennyson Avenue? • Modelling should consider a new intersection to Eastern Road as the shop entrance will operate as would require a SIDRA intersection network model. The spacing is too close to allow individual intersection models. <p>Trade Area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic report does not discuss the customer catchment area. Existing supermarkets in surrounding neighbourhood centres are nowhere near size of Harris Farm and therefore the actual effects of the proposal on traffic flows and parking needs are significantly higher than those used in the report. <p>Pedestrian Safety</p>	<p>assessed for the proposed store was based on a rate per square metre of retail space (based on surveys of other developments undertaken by TfNSW), which therefore takes into account the size of the store. Surveys were also undertaken of another Harris Farm, which found a lower traffic generation than adopted in their assessment.</p> <p>The report was likely referring to the key roads adjacent to the site, being Eastern Road and Tennyson Avenue.</p> <p>The location of the vehicle entrances to the car park is subject to a future development application and assessed against the site-specific DCP. Consideration will be given to the number and location of driveway entrances during the assessment.</p> <p>Alice Street is an adjacent side street and intersects with Eastern Road, so the intersection was assessed to determine the extent of impact of the proposal on the intersection.</p> <p>There is the potential for the shelter to be upgraded to current standard shelters, which have clear side panels. This will improve visibility through the shelter</p> <p>Clarification was sought from the applicant’s traffic engineer, who advised that the intersection analysis undertaken indicates that the site access would operate with average delays for all movements of less than 15 seconds per vehicle which is a good level of service. SIDRA modelling is based on a two-way driveway, with one entry lane and one exit lane and all turns permitted. With this arrangement, as noted above, turning movements at the driveway will operate at a good level of service.</p>	
--	---	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic report infers that there are footpaths on both sides of Alice Street, however there is only a footpath on the southern side. • 3.30 notes that conditions for pedestrians will be improved with removal of driveways – however this is not true for Eastern Road, where the two existing driveways for the service station will be replaced with 2 inward and 2 outbound driveways which will carry more traffic and trucks <p>Questions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alice Street is a no through road and has minimal traffic. The Proposal does not include access to Alice street so why was this data included? • How revised bus stop location will address problem of poor visibility entering and existing Tennyson Avenue? • Will this be a left in left out arrangement? If so – this is an important input into any Traffic Impact Assessment 		
	<p>Safety concerns resulting from increased traffic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development will put public at further risk to their safety • Attracting more retail traffic to area would be dangerous • Proposed rezoning will result in substantially increased vehicular traffic in an area where many people (including older people from nearby aged care facilities and children from nearby schools) walk daily • Someone will be badly injured or killed as a result of the increase in traffic • Increased traffic and speeding cars around schools – Bush School and Knox Prep • Preschool and swimming school on Tennyson Road opposite the proposed development. • No consideration has been made for the safety of residents in Tennyson Avenue – this is even more important now that a physically 	<p>Additional traffic generation on Eastern Road was forecast to be approximately 130 vehicle trips per hour during the Thursday PM peak hour and 150 trips per hour during the Saturday peak hour. Its effects on Eastern Road were assessed and found to have only minimal additional delays to surrounding intersections, with operation continuing at Level of Service A/B, which is good operation and space capacity.</p> <p>Traffic volumes in Tennyson Avenue are forecast to increase by approximately 30 trips during Thursday afternoon and Saturday peak hours, which is just below the maximum Environmental Capacity Performance Standard threshold for a local road.</p> <p>The proposed public domain treatments and new raised pedestrian crossing in Tennyson Avenue near Eastern Road would slow vehicle speeds, improve pedestrian safety and accessibility and may also discourage existing trips along Tennyson Avenue that do not have an origin or destination at the Eastern Road neighbourhood shops.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

	<p>challenged residence has been built and occupied at the far eastern end of the street.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in traffic will be dangerous – particularly turning right from Tennyson Avenue into Eastern Road. • Delivery trucks and forklifts and movement of goods on public streets will cause disruption and danger to local residents, cars and pedestrians • Especially dangerous driving west on Tennyson Avenue because of direct glare from afternoon sun in drivers eyes • Western side of Eastern Road heading north is dangerous for people entering and exiting parked cars. • Existing dangerous driving behaviour in Eastern Road. • Increased danger due to lack of pedestrian crossings and traffic lights in the vicinity • Will make already dangerous area worse <p>Accidents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic/pedestrian accident at site would block entry/exit from local area • Accidents reversing out of driveway • Increase traffic congestion and increase likelihood of traffic accidents and possible pedestrian accidents. 	<p>Servicing will be required to be undertaken on site.</p> <p>The proposed public domain treatments and new raised pedestrian crossing in Tennyson Avenue near Eastern Road would slow vehicle speeds, improve pedestrian safety and accessibility and may also discourage existing trips along Tennyson Avenue that do not have an origin or destination at the Eastern Road neighbourhood shops.</p> <p>Reversing out of the site would not be permitted. The location of the vehicle entrances to the car park is subject to a future development application and assessed against the site-specific DCP. Consideration will be given to the number and location of driveway entrances (and proximity to existing driveways) during the assessment.</p>	
<p>Parking</p>	<p>Street Parking and Existing Parking at Eastern Road Shops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chilton Parade used for parking on both sides, making it impossible to enter and exit driveway • Parking along Eastern Road and side streets is mayhem at busy times. • Already parking issues due to shops, child care, swim school. • Customer overflow and staff parking in street will prevent residents and their guests from parking in street. Driveways and garages will be blocked. • If customers of Harris Farm park in Alice Street, Tennyson Avenue and Worcester 	<p>Any development application would be required to provide parking in accordance with the site-specific DCP. The parking provided by the proposal would provide additional parking opportunities for customers visiting multiple shops, potentially reducing pressure on existing short stay parking.</p> <p>The existing parking restrictions on Eastern Road, Tennyson Avenue and in the car park at the rear of the shops could be</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

	<p>Place it will greatly impede local residents due to these streets being narrow.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents currently have to park on footpath in Tennyson Avenue to allow for vehicles to pass. • Double parking outside existing Eastern Road shops – dangerous for drivers and pedestrians • There is not sufficient parking currently for Eastern Road shops – how will this be improved by having a new supermarket? • Do not want to see parking get more difficult. • Lack of long term daily parking at three railway stations which then overflows in streets. • Staff would park in surrounding streets • Existing parking (angled street parking and council car park) is often full • Customers will look for on street parking rather than trying to navigate the basement carpark • Employees already use street for all day parking • Street parking makes access into driveways difficult 	<p>reviewed, and additional enforcement could be carried out, to improve turnover and opportunities for other shoppers.</p> <p>A basement car park would provide convenience for shoppers arriving by car, including shelter and lift access to the retail level.</p> <p>Parking would have to be provided on-site in the basement in accordance with the site-specific DCP. The proposal would not be relying on on-street parking.</p>	
	<p>Parking provided by development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 76 car spaces on the site is totally inadequate • Will there be underground parking? • Please ensure there is sufficient parking • Harris Farm will provide underground parking with any new development, but this will do nothing to improve the traffic flow of cars trying to access • Increase in parking will attract more vehicles • Understand proposed development includes parking but fear it will not be enough for all the extra vehicles the supermarket will bring to the area. • Even if the 91 spaces are sufficient at the beginning, over time it would become like Willoughby Harris Farm where customers park in the surrounding streets. • Insufficient parking for expected customers and staff – who will not be getting public transport 	<p>Parking would have to be provided on-site in the basement in accordance with the site-specific DCP.</p> <p>Customers of the proposal, like customers of the Eastern Road shops, will have access to short stay on-street parking and an off-street car park, particularly for customers visiting multiple shops in the Eastern Road neighbourhood shops.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The 91 parking spaces are not for the immediate community but for non-locals driving to the area – increasing traffic Traffic report does not specify number of on-site parking spaces. The plans propose a total of 76 spaces, having consideration for 15 staff and number of customers, this would lead cars to park in Alice Street and Tennyson Avenue Will still result in cars parking outside the site on neighbouring streets impacting these areas. 		
Public and Active Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirement for rezoning to address public transport. Eastern Road shops are not a destination for the current bus route. It is a route to service the railway and bus interchange at Turramurra station. The question to the use of public transport is irrelevant Ridiculous to suggest residents in nearby suburbs will ride their bicycle to the local shops. Increased traffic decreases the effectiveness of public transport such as buses People may walk to Harris Farm in more high density areas – but not here. The majority will drive and from much further afield. Site is not well served by public transport Traffic consultants have suggested a lot of walk in customers – this is not the case – most will drive and create a lot of extra traffic. No one is going to travel by public transport (trains and then bus) 	<p>Available Opal data usage patterns for the bus stops outside the site indicate they are currently being used by passengers to access Turramurra station/Turramurra local centre (or beyond to Macquarie Park). The proposed use of the site may encourage bus passenger use in the opposite direction (for access to/from the site).</p> <p>Some residents may choose to ride bicycles to the shops.</p> <p>Bus services provide an access alternative for customers who do not drive. This includes people younger than 17 years of age, people with mobility impairments as well as older people or people that generally do not have access to cars.</p> <p>Residents within 800m radius (approx. 10 minutes walk time) of the site may find walking an attractive and healthy travel option, particularly for small shopping trips or social gatherings. Indicatively, over 3,000 people live roughly within 800m radius of the site.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal.
Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure is inadequate and will not be able to cope Impact on road infrastructure via congestion is not considered Local infrastructure will not support the increase in road usage as a result of business activity 	Additional traffic generation on Eastern Road was forecast to be approximately 130 vehicle trips per hour during the Thursday PM peak hour and 150 trips per hour during the Saturday peak hour. Its effects on Eastern Road were assessed and found to have only minimal additional delays to surrounding intersections, with operation continuing at Level of Service A/B, which is good operation and space capacity.	No amendment to Planning Proposal.
Location	More appropriate locations	The suggestions are noted. This is a Planning Proposal to rezone sites which have historic and long term commercial uses to the B1 Neighbourhood	No amendment to Planning Proposal

	<p>Should be located in a more appropriate location. The following areas are suggested are more appropriate locations for a Harris Farm store:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rohini Street Shops, Turramurra ○ Renewal should be around Turramurra railway station ○ Should be sited near Coles Turramurra or somewhere in Turramurra Shopping Centre ○ Turramurra Community Hub ○ Westfield Hornsby ○ Town Centres on the Pacific Highway ○ Centralised shopping centres ○ Pymble ○ Gordon ○ Plaza's in main Turramurra centre where more retail shops could be built. ○ Roseville ○ carpark adjacent to Gilroy Lane ○ Edgeworth David Avenue Waitara ○ Hampden Avenue shops ○ Councils former works site on corner of Mona Vale Road and Pacific Highway <p>For the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Has existing infrastructure to cater for public safety. ○ This type of development suits a large central hub where there is transport and infrastructure to support them. ○ Built for large stores, have adequate parking, public transport and is consistent with State Government planning philosophy to place such developments in town centres. ○ Turramurra railway station precinct has sat inactive for many years, and this major retailer would have gladly located in this more appropriate location had various councils got act together and developed this plan ○ Turramurra hub already zoned B1 and more suited to Harris Farm – doesn't require rezoning ○ Planning Proposal states '<i>larger local centres have limited capacity or opportunity for expansion</i>' – this is open to dispute. 	<p>Centre zone, and not a development application for a Harris Farm store.</p> <p>The proposed B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone on the subject sites, is the same zone that the existing Eastern Road shops are zoned. The existing development standards applying to the site – FSR of 0.3:1 and HOB 9.5m – are to be retained. These development standards are the same as the adjoining low density residential zoned land, and will ensure that any future development on the site is of a bulk and scale that is compatible with the surrounding residential area.</p> <p>The objective of the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone is to <i>provide for small-scale retail, business and community uses</i>. Clause 6.9 of the KLEP 2015 quantifies what is considered an appropriate scale within neighbourhood centres by limiting development of commercial premises to 1,000sqm within the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone. This is also consistent with the recent amendment undertaken by the Department of Planning which makes '<i>neighbourhood supermarkets</i>' a mandatory land use that is permitted with consent within the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone, and is again limited to 1,000sqm. Any future development on the sites will be required to comply with these limits in gross floor area, ensuring that future development is of an appropriate scale for the neighbourhood centre.</p> <p>It is not for Council to find or offer alternative sites for proponents of Planning Proposals or Development Applications. Council's role is to assess the merits of the proposal.</p>	
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development of this scale belong in high density shopping area around station ○ Coles should be redeveloped in Turrumurra before any decentralisation of large retailers ○ Supportive of Harris Farm in Turrumurra centre with traffic and pedestrian considerations ○ more accessible close to railway station ○ Lots of properties already correctly zoned and available <p>Council to find alternative sites</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Council should offer alternatives to Harris Farm, and cooperate to create a site of 3000-5000sqm in one of the 6 centres along the transport corridor. 		
	<p>Location/Site unsuitable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Low rise residential locality – not near major public transport and on single narrow streets. ● Location is unsuitable and unsafe for increased density development ● Major retail development is unsuitable for an areas zoned residential and surrounded by residences. ● This type of development does not belong here. ● Proposal takes no consideration for the local environment and its impact on local residents ● Size of proposal is too large for a small neighbourhood centre ● Supermarket in the middle of a residential area is not compatible with surrounding area. ● Keep commercial buildings in areas zoned for commercial ● Eastern Road is a suburban back street ● Development here away from town centre will detract from future town centre development in Turrumurra ● Turrumurra already has 3 distinct business areas around the railway station and a fourth in a residential area is not needed. ● This area of Turrumurra is not geared for developments of this nature and size 	<p>The Planning Proposal does not seek to amend the existing 9.5m Height of Building or 0.3:1 Floor Space Ratio development standards applying to the site – these development standards are the same as the adjoining residential properties and the Floor Space Ratio less than the adjoining Easter Road neighbourhood shops, which have a Floor Space Ratio of 0.75:1. The development standards applying to the site will ensure that any future development on the site is consistent in terms of height, bulk and scale with the surrounding low density residential area. The controls and objectives within the draft site-specific DCP have been prepared to give greater assurance of the development outcomes on the site, and ensure that any future development is cohesive with the local character of the surrounding area through controls relating to building setbacks, built form and public domain.</p> <p>Clause 6.9 of the KLEP 2015 limits the future development of single commercial tenancy on land zoned B1 Neighbourhood Centre to 1,000sqm. Any future development application would be required to comply with this, ensuring that the scale of any future development on the site is compatible with the scale and function of the neighbourhood centre.</p> <p>Additionally, in August 2018, the NSW Department of Planning introduced a new definition of ‘neighbourhood supermarket’ into Councils LEPs, and made it a mandated use permitted within B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone. The size of a ‘neighbourhood supermarket’ is restricted to a maximum gross floor area of 1,000sqm. It was considered that by permitted</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Size and scope of project is at odds with quiet residential section of Eastern Road. • Argument is not against Harris Farm but the concept of development of this size in this particular location • Not suitable to the current strip shops on Eastern Road 	<p>small-scale supermarkets (up 1,000sqm) in the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone would serve the needs of the people who live and work in the surrounding neighbourhood. The size restricted to 1,000sqm is to ensure compatibility with the scale and nature of the surrounding predominantly residential area. The Department of Planning '<i>Planning Circular PS13-001</i>' notes that <i>by including a specific land term and definition it is clear to retailers, councils and communities that neighbourhood supermarkets can locate in these small centres.</i></p>	
	<p>Local Character</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal will alter the local character of the area to great detriment • Quality of neighbourhood downgraded • Important to ensure residential character of suburb is not destroyed by introduction of unsuitable business • Proposed development is out of character with the local environment • Proposed rezoning is an overdevelopment. • This stretch of Turramurra recognised for unique character • Don't want village atmosphere to be disturbed • Character of area could become semi industrial is the supermarket were to change plans at a later date • Ku-ring-gai has special place in Sydney – unique mix of businesses and residential properties in separate areas • Residents bought homes with the thought that they would have peace and security without additional retail development. • Local environment does not need renewal • Transformation of streetscape and community village feel of Eastern Road. • Visual impact • Why isn't time and money being used to figure out how to figure out how to enhance the quality of life in the area and capitalise on its existing assets, instead of drastically changing the strategy for the space? • Bulk and scale is outside of the local character of the area. 	<p>The Planning Proposal does not seek to amend the existing 9.5m Height of Building or 0.3:1 Floor Space Ratio development standards applying to the site – these development standards are the same as the adjoining residential properties and the Floor Space Ratio less than the adjoining Easter Road neighbourhood shops, which have a Floor Space Ratio of 0.75:1. The development standards applying to the site will ensure that any future development on the site is consistent in terms of height, bulk and scale with the surrounding low density residential area. The controls and objectives within the draft site-specific DCP have been prepared to give greater assurance of the development outcomes on the site, and ensure that any future development is cohesive with the local character of the surrounding area through controls relating to building setbacks, built form and public domain.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Double the size the current shopping village which is inconsistent with the current environment • Eastern Road is a unique shopping strip and retains special village atmosphere • Scale inappropriate for neighbourhood centre • Not low scale commercial enterprise – substantial development that will occupy in excess of 5000sqm • No guarantee that future development will be compatible in terms of built form and scale with the existing locality 		
	<p>Amenity Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will reduce amenity of area • Does nothing to improve amenity of area • Change ambience of local area and village atmosphere • Concerned regarding all the negative impacts of business zoning on residential neighbourhood and residential living in the area • Expanding shopping will detract from local residents quality of lives – unfair imposition on many for the commercial gain of a few • Negative change quiet ambience of surroundings • Currently enjoy a level of peace and quiet away from busy commercial precincts • Increase stress and pace of life in area <p>Traffic, Noise + Pollution</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise impacts from delivery trucks • Large trucks and regular deliveries – impact on local residents with increased noise, pollution and safety risks. • Local residents will hear trucks reversing (beeping), offloading trailers and constant flow of garbage trucks – impact on sleep as garbage, deliveries and restocking shelves will all be done at night and early hours of morning. • Increased road noise 	<p>It should be noted that the Planning Proposal itself (rezoning of the site) does not result in any amenity impacts to the surrounding residential properties, or surrounding area. It is acknowledged that potential future uses of the site permitted under the proposed B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone may have the potential to result in some noise and other amenity impacts. As part of any Development Application, these matters would be considered, and if appropriate, conditions of consent be included which may limit trading hours, delivery hours, noise/acoustic levels from the site, and management of trolleys.</p> <p>In order to ensure all future development outcomes on the site minimises amenity impacts on adjoining properties, the following controls have been included within the Draft site-specific DCP for the sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service/loading areas are to be located in the basement to minimise conflict between pedestrians and vehicles, and minimise amenity impacts to adjoining residential properties • Provision of setbacks for development to be provided from adjoining residential properties in order to protect the privacy and amenity of the residential land uses. • All plant and services are to be integrated into the built form and/or roof <p>The perceived impact on private property value is not a matter for consideration as part of the assessment of Planning Proposals or Development Applications.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

- Noise and exhaust pollution by increased traffic
- Loading and unloading would further exacerbate residents living standards at all hours of the day and evening.
- Noise from service vehicles
- How can we be assured that delivery trucks will not attend between 10pm and 7am? No report on noise.
- Increased air pollution from extra vehicles

Waste

- Nature of Harris Farm business will result in local residents seeing and smelling garbage waste. Smell of rotting food and attract rodents. The garbage would require trucks and semi-trailers on a nightly basis
- Adverse impact of odour
- Adverse impact of litter

Trolleys

- Nuisance and amenity impacts resulting from shopping trolleys being abandoned on roads, parks and reserves. Councils current abandoned trolley policy is not effective, not enforced and favours interests of supermarkets over public
- Streets are going to be full of trolleys

Impact Property Value

- Likely devalue property in the vicinity
- Amenity impacts (traffic, noise) will result in impact on home/property value

Trading Hours

- Long trading hours
- Harris Farm is a large retailer with extended trading hours and high demand, not just form locals, but would attract customers from surrounding suburbs.
- Harris Farm operate 24hrs a day, 7 days a week and are open for business 15 hrs a day.
- What are the proposed opening hours? From 6am as per the St Ives store? Closing time?

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opening hours will exceed the present hours of the small shops 		
	<p>Existing uses – suitable</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing uses on the site (Nursery and Service Station) are suitable for residential area – do not attract hundreds of cars or delivery trucks. Existing uses (nursery and service station) don't compete with Eastern Road shops Historic use of site is a commercial activity at a lesser scale than Harris Farm Supermarket 	<p>Comments regarding the suitability of the existing uses are noted.</p> <p>The additional traffic generated by the proposal will not cause a significant deterioration in the performance of the surrounding road network.</p>	<p>No Amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>
<p>Retail</p>	<p>Existing Provision of Retail – Surrounding Areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No demand for additional retail facilities Community is already well serviced by multiple retail locations nearby: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hornsby St Ives Rohini Street Shops Eastern Road Shops Turrumurra – New Coles to be developed Ray Street North Turrumurra Chatswood Gordon Hampden Avenue Wahroonga Existing retail facilities could be improved or made more attractive to shoppers Turrumurra shopping centre badly needs revamp and redevelopment. Many empty shops. Existing supermarkets – more than adequate to suit needs of all residents in Ku-ring-gai all within a 5km radius: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Turrumurra - Coles and IGA Eastern Road - IGA and Fita Fruita Hornsby – Coles, Woolworths, Aldi, Fresh Corp St Ives – Coles, Woolworths, Harris Farm Gordon – Woolworths 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Ku-ring-gai has an undersupply of retail floorspace, this was identified in the Ku-ring-gai Retail Centres Strategy 2005 with approximately 40% escape expenditure being captured by surrounding retail centres such as Chatswood, Hornsby and Macquarie Park. There has been limited additional retail floorspace developed in Ku-ring-gai since the 2005 study was undertaken, and in some instances the redevelopment of existing retail and commercial sites in centres has actually resulted in a reduction in the amount of retail and commercial floorspace provided. The Ku-ring-gai LSPS sets out the Local Planning Priority of <i>K25. Providing for the retail and commercial needs of the local community within Ku-ring-gai's centres</i> which highlights the importance of providing additional retail floor space over the next 20 years to meet the retail demands of a growing population.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the proposed B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone permits a range of business, commercial and retail uses – not just '<i>neighbourhood supermarkets</i>'.</p> <p>With regards to the submissions noting existing provision of Harris Farm stores in St Ives and Lindfield and another is not needed on this site, it needs to be reinforced that this is a Planning Proposal to change the zoning of the site – which once rezoned may be used for a number of retail or commercial uses. This is not a development application for a Harris Farm store. The number and locations of Harris Farm stores is a commercial consideration for Harris Farm and not a planning consideration.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Linfield – Coles and Harris Farm <p>Existing Provision of Retail – Eastern Road Shops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No need for this development, local residents are well served by existing Eastern road shops. • Eastern Road shops are perfect balance of low rise, accessible, community minded local shops – everything is catered for, and well patronised. • Do not need big store like Harris Farm – already have small independent stores such as IGA. Most people shop in Hornsby or St Ives for their ‘big’ shop and then just stock up on essential from IGA or green grocer • Existing small Eastern Road shopping precinct patronised by local customers • Do not want expansion to the existing precinct • This area of Turramurra hasn’t been consumed by ‘impersonal bigness’ of commercialism • Harris Farm will not meaningfully add to the types of retail available in Eastern Road. <p>Existing Provision of Retail – Harris Farm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harris Farm – there is already on 3.4km away at St Ives. • Love Harris Farm at Lindfield, also nice Harris Farm at St Ives – so we are very well serviced with Harris Farm in this area. 		
	<p>Retail Centre Hierarchy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is of a scale that is inappropriate for neighbourhood centre and is inconsistent with specific commercial hierarchy of the Eastern Road Centre. • Will detract activity away from higher order centres – where the proposal will be more suitable • Inconsistent with local service role and function of neighbourhood centre and should be located within Turramurra station area • Would expand and change the shopping centre from neighbourhood one to one 	<p>The Hill PDA independent peer review of the Economic Assessment submitted with the application, concludes that the increased size of the Eastern Road centre as a result of the proposed rezoning would not be sufficient enough to advance its status in the Ku-ring-gai commercial centre hierarchy, and would remain below Turramurra in the hierarchy. The rezoning of these sites to B1 Neighbourhood Centre does not undermine future development within Local Centres, such as Turramurra.</p> <p>The objective of the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone is to <i>provide for small-scale retail, business and community uses</i>. Clause 6.9 of the KLEP 2015 quantifies what is considered an appropriate scale within neighbourhood centres by limiting development of commercial premises to 1,000sqm within the</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal</p>

	<p>attracting customers from a much wider catchment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastern Road will become a de facto local centre by stealth <p>Size of Retail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concept of limited scale of neighbourhood centres. Proposal will increase commercial GFA of Eastern Road Neighbourhood Centre by more than 100% • Proponents attempt to include an additional 824sqm (existing nursery and service station) to existing Eastern Road Neighbourhood Centre Gross Floor Area should be rejected – the nursery and service station are physically separated from Eastern Road Neighbourhood Centre • Would result in the largest local centre in Ku-ring-gai by over 60% • Proposed increase in retail floor will double amount of retail space – there is no demand for this amount of retail space from the immediate neighbourhood. • Store of this size is not appropriate for any local neighbourhood shops 	<p>B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone. This is also consistent with the recent amendment undertaken by the Department of Planning which makes '<i>neighbourhood supermarkets</i>' a mandatory land use that is permitted with consent within the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone, and is again limited to 1,000sqm. Any future development on the sites will be required to comply with these limits in gross floor area, ensuring that future development is of an appropriate scale for the neighbourhood centre.</p>	
	<p>Impact on existing Eastern Road Shops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ruin existing businesses • Impact on small business in are would be extensive – self owned and operated. • Nonsense that the planning proposal states it will economically support the retail centre to the south – the IGA, fruit shop and butcher will be affected by development • It is Ku-ring-gai policy to support small businesses – unfair to allow the invasion of a large business • Arrival of Harris Farm will put many local shops out of business – this has been demonstrated at Lindfield. • We must protect small retailers • Great impact on butcher, green grocer, supermarket, café and liquor store if development goes ahead. 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Economic competition between individual trade competitors is not an environmental or planning consideration, and the planning assessment is not about undermining the operation of a free market. Competition is covered by other legislation such as <i>Trade Practices Act 1974</i> and <i>Fair Trading Act 1987</i>, as well as market forces.</p> <p>This has been well established in NSW case law - <i>Kentucky Fried Chicken Pty Ltd v Gantidis (1979)</i> and <i>Fabcot Pty Ltd v Hawkesbury City Council (1997)</i>. In <i>Kentucky Fried Chicken</i>, Justice Stephens noted: <i>If the shopping facilities presently enjoyed by a community or planned for it in the future are put in jeopardy by some proposed development, whether that jeopardy be due to physical or financial causes, and if the resultant community detriment will not be made good by the proposed development itself, that appears to me to be consideration proper to be taken into account as a matter of town planning...However, the mere threat of competition to</i></p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economies of scale that Harris Farm can obtain will cause the small traders to be disadvantaged. • Do not want nearby small shopping strip to become unviable, dangerous ghost town • Is the impact on existing shops an included consideration? • Harris Farm will force out small businesses, buy them out, rezone and built units for their further financial gain. • Duplicates existing services to the detriment of current businesses • Economic Impact Statement suggestions that Harris Farm will only effect total spend at the current shops by 5% is totally incorrect. Some shops (drycleaners, chemist, BSW) may experience no drop in sales and may have an increased due to increased visitation. However the café, IGA and Fruit and Vegetable Shop will suffer dramatically. • Will Harris Farm guarantee that the current shops will not suffer a reduction of sales greater than 5%? • Reduce competition and customer choice • Submission documents conveniently ignored impact on local businesses <p>Impact on other centres</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Harris Farm sell household products (like the Lindfield store) the impact will extend to Turrumurra, including Rohini Street and Wahroonga Centres. Turrumurra is already struggling. • Small local shopping centres like East Wahroonga, Hampden Avenue, North Turrumurra, Princes Street would be severely impacted by Harris Farm in Eastern Road. • Local produce market at Karuah Park would also be impacted • Will stall redevelopment of Coles in Turrumurra Centre near station – which would serve more people in a better location 	<p><i>existing businesses if not accompanied by a prospect of a resultant overall adverse effect upon the extent and adequacy of facilities available to the local community if the development proceeded with, will not be a relevant town planning consideration'</i></p> <p>The Court has stated that Councils should not be concerned about competition between individual stores, as this is a matter for Fair Trading. But, it should concern itself with impact on established retail centres, i.e. impacts the viability of the retail centre as a whole.</p> <p>The proposed rezoning to B1 Neighbourhood Centre would permit a range of land uses that would improve the retail and commercial offer of the Eastern Road Neighbourhood Centre, improving the services for residents in the locality, while not significantly or detrimentally impacting other centres in Ku-ring-gai.</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<p>Harris Farm – Lindfield and St Ives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Look at Harris Farm Supermarket at Lindfield – has not had positive impact on community • Revamp of Harris Farm at St Ives has been unsatisfactory. • Suggest that once Harris Farm Turramurra opens, then the St Ives store will be reduced in size to increase business in Turramurra and reduce rent to pay at St Ives shopping centre • Harris Farm Lindfield has forced local businesses to close due to uncompetitive practices. <p>Harris Farm – Trade Area and Customer Catchment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No Harris Farm further north at Hornsby – so people from Hornsby, Hornsby Heights, Asquith, Mt Colah will be attracted to area to shop. • Harris Farm customers from Turramurra and Wahroonga who previously shopped at St Ives store will now obviously drive to the closer store in Tennyson Avenue. • Attract customers from a wide catchment area – much wider than the current neighbourhood shops • Attract non-local residents • Service a much wider catchment than surrounding residential area, resulting in amenity impacts • Harris Farm leaflet drop to South Turramurra – 2.7km away from site – would suggest a larger catchment 	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>This is not a development application for a Harris Farm store on the site. This is a Planning Proposal to rezone the sites from R2 Low Density Residential to B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone. Once rezoned, there are a number of permitted land uses for which the sites could be used for, subject to development consent.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>
	<p>Nursery</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nursery patronised by people from local area – interesting and suitable venture in residential area – fits with garden suburb nature of area, and does not attract hundreds of cars or delivery trucks • Provides and essential service • Very few garden supply businesses in this region • Loss will be detrimental to local community 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p><i>'Garden Centres'</i> are a land use that is permitted under the proposed B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone. The current R2 Low Density Residential zone does not permit <i>'Garden Centres'</i>.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use more desirable than another supermarket • Important meeting hub for older residents • Keep nursery 		
	<p>Service Station</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Service station at 105 Eastern Road is valuable amenity. One of only a few that offers full service forecourt. Council should list which other service stations in the Neighbourhood offer this service. • Need the services of a petrol station in this area as there are very few for residents to go to. • Loss will be detrimental to local community • Use more desirable than another supermarket • Keep service station 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>'Service Stations' are a land use that is permitted under the proposed B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone. The current R2 Low Density Residential zone does not permit 'Service Stations'.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>
Future Development	<p>Construction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Proposal does not address the impact which will be created during construction. No information on amount of excavated material, size of trucks or truck movements each day. • Construction of development will add to traffic and parking issues. Road system is inadequate to handle cranes, supply trucks and equipment associated with construction project of this size in a residential suburb • Residents of Worcester Place will be affected and disrupted during building process • Impacts from trucks during construction and tradies parking vehicles • Traffic report does not take into consideration the traffic during construction 	<p>This is a Planning Proposal – not a Development Application. A Planning Proposal is only concerned with the amendments to the LEP (zoning, height, floor space ratio development standards) and does not give any development approval for construction of any development.</p> <p>The traffic and parking impacts of construction would be considered in a Construction Traffic Management Plan which is required to be submitted with a Development Application.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>
	<p>Development Application (DA)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not support the DA proposed by Harris Farm. Please reject DA application. • Council should reject the DA application • Against building development proposal for a Harris Farm store on Eastern Road • Nothing in current Planning Proposal requires the Harris Farm proposal to proceed in its 	<p>There is no Development Application for the sites.</p> <p>This is a Planning Proposal, which is only concerned with the amendments to the LEP and cannot be tied to any future development outcome on the site.</p> <p>Should the Planning Proposal be adopted, this would result in amending the zoning on the site, which would then allow a</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

	<p>current form or restricts the nature and extent of changes that can be made if the proposal proceeds to a DA</p>	<p>Development Application to be lodged to use the site in accordance with the new zoning.</p>	
	<p>Proposed Plans – Architectural Drawings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pictures are attractive, but are only conceptual • Artist impressions provided are misleading – the finished development will not look like this at all. • Concept plans do not comply with site specific DCP – so what is currently being advertised is not what will be built. • No control available to Council if rezoning passes to restrict it to the plans presented by Harris Farm. • Marketing spin about conservatory, orchard is simply obscuring the fact that this is a big box development in a residential area • Attractive design – but wrong location • Harris Farm use words such as ‘community or neighbourhood centre’ – this is deceptive as it would not be Council facility • Indicative only • Proposal for orchard is superficial – there are two well maintained parks within 1km for individual and family use • Harris Farm is promoting development as orchard and conservatory – not mentioning shop or supermarket – misrepresenting • Orchard – more details needs to be included on how many and size of trees to be planted. 	<p>Planning Proposals relate only to amendments to the LEP – such as zoning or development standards (height, floor space ratio, etc). A Planning Proposal cannot be tied to a particular development outcome on the site (i.e Harris Farm) or the indicative concept plans submitted with the Planning Proposal application. These indicative concept plans demonstrate one potential development and built form outcome on the sites under the proposed zoning and development standards for the sites.</p> <p>A site specific DCP has been prepared by Council to give greater assurance of the potential built form outcomes on the site. The controls and objectives in the draft site specific DCP have been designed to guide all and any possible future development on the subject site, and ensure that any future development is compatible with the surrounding local character.</p> <p>The proposed B1 Neighbourhood Centre zoning permits a range of land uses. The specific details regarding what the site is to be used for is to be established and assessment through the Development Application process.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>
<p>Contamination</p>	<p>Environmental Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expect that there will be far more hydrocarbons than predicted in report. • Most of boreholes (no. 10, 11, 12, 13) were drilled on the periphery of the service station. Boreholes closer to the tanks will give higher readings. • Large excavation would be required to remove fuel polluted ground 	<p>The Combined Phase 1 and Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment by Compaction & Soil Testing Services Pty Ltd (2018) states that the site would be suitable for the proposed use pending implementation of site decontamination and risk management such as removal of the Underground Petrol Storage Tanks, ‘tanking’ the proposed basement (to prevent people coming into contact with potentially contaminated groundwater) and importing clean soil for the proposed orchard.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to any evacuation commencing will Council require the site to be re-tested and updated reports submitted for review? 	<p>Additional reports will be required as part of the DA process, and proponents will be required to comply with State Environmental Planning Policy No.55 Remediation of Land.</p> <p>Any decommissioning of the site will also need to be done in line with <i>Protection of the Environment Operations (Underground Petroleum Storage Systems) Regulation 2014</i>.</p> <p>As per Council's Contaminated Land Policy, the required remediation needs to be done prior to development of the site, and a site audit statement is required to confirm the suitability of the site for the intended use.</p>	
	<p>Site Contaminated</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Proposal states that it will facilitate the remediation of contaminated land – this means that the garage owner and Council take no responsibility for the clean-up of the contaminated site. • Proposal ignores what needs to be done to decontaminate the site • Service station site will need to be remediated to eliminate public health risk from benzene and other toxic substances. • Problems with remediation of the garage site may result in delays and the sale of the site to Aldi or another developer • Remediation of the underground fuel tanks will take years – will the proposed greenery depend on that? • 105 Eastern Road has been service station for 50 year and is classed as contaminated – a fresh food outlet built on such a site would be a criminal act • Will local residents be advised when the underground fuel storage tanks are being moved? Will there be any arrangements made to relocate residents with health issues or alternative arrangements? • If site requires long term venting (e.g. site on corner of Bannockburn Rd and Pacific Highway Turrumurra and Commonwealth Rd and Pacific Highway, Killara) what are the Council plans for this situation? And what is Harris Farm Plan B is this is to occur? 	<p>Comments related to contamination are noted. Contamination is a significant consideration for the site considering past and present land uses.</p> <p>The Combined Phase 1 and Phase 2 Environmental Site Assessment by Compaction & Soil Testing Services Pty Ltd (2018) states that the site would be suitable for the proposed use pending implementation of site decontamination and risk management such as removal of the Underground Petrol Storage Tanks, 'tanking' the proposed basement (to prevent people coming into contact with potentially contaminated groundwater) and importing clean soil for the proposed orchard.</p> <p>Additional reports will be required as part of the DA process and the proponents will be required to comply with State Environmental Planning Policy No.55 Remediation of Land, and <i>Protection of the Environment Operations (Underground Petroleum Storage Systems) Regulation 2014</i>.</p> <p>As per Council's Contaminated Land Policy, the required remediation needs to be done prior to development of the site, and a site audit statement is required to confirm the suitability of the site for the intended use.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are the plans to safely remove and relocate the large volume of contaminated soil? Who will monitor movement and hold Harris Farm accountable? Will EPA monitor emissions? Who pays for monitoring? 		
Jobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning proposal states it will provide local employment opportunities – how many jobs will it additionally provide? Mechanics and workers at nursery will be laid off. • Will cause a loss of jobs • How many people do they propose to employ? • Benefits of creating new jobs will be offset with the job losses to existing locally owned businesses. Harris Farm is not locally owned. • Job opportunities will be filled by people outside of Ku-ring-gai • Planning Proposal states that it will provide an opportunity to expand and upgrade local employment opportunities. This implies that Harris Farm will expand and ‘upgrade’ suggesting they are not going to be happy with approval for current proposal, and will seek to expand the supermarket. 	<p>The rezoning of the site would allow for future retail or commercial development on the sites which would provide for employment opportunities, both during the construction phase, and once completed. The Hill PDA Economic Impact Assessment Review (Feb 2019) outlines that a total of 70 jobs could be provided, depending on the type of future retail store or commercial use.</p> <p>This is not a Development Application for a Harris Farm store. The Planning Proposal process only considers the amendment to the LEP (i.e. rezoning), once the sites are rezoned there are a number of permitted land uses within the B1 Neighbourhood Centre.</p>	No amendment to the Planning Proposal.
Trees and Significant vegetation	<p>Loss of trees</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yet to be seen how the Planning Proposal will protect and enhance existing native vegetation on the site. • Reduced extent of BGHF, a critical ecological community • Retaining two existing trees is hardly protecting or enhancing native vegetation on the site • Proposal will result in loss of numerous –if not all- existing mature native trees from site – further reducing stock within the local area • Trees contribute to the unique character and amenity of Ku-ring-gai • Loss of green tree canopy • No environmental values respecting the Ku-ring-gai bush 	<p>Comments related to the loss of trees are noted.</p> <p>The BGHF onsite is highly compromised and exists as canopy remnants with a predominantly exotic or concrete understorey. The site specific DCP seeks to retain a significant proportion of BGHF values onsite and promote plantings of BGHF species to enhance the community</p>	No amendment to the Planning Proposal.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Remove trees on only on private land, but also a large number of flourishing trees on public land in Alice Street. Needs to be follow up to ensure new trees are planted and kept 		
	<p>Ecological Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Map 4 shows area in question in the centre of Glenorie, with Lucas Heights to the north, and east of the area and Gymea to the east. If such a simple map is so poorly drawn, how can any of the recommendations be taken seriously 	Map 4 of the ecological report refers to soil landscapes. The site is located within then Glenorie soil landscape. Gymea and Lucas heights are also soil landscapes and not a reference to the suburbs of the same name.	No amendment to the Planning Proposal.
Water	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Harris Farm will use a lot of water to clean outdoors and indoors – if there is another drought need to consider how much water is needed 	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>This is not a matter for consideration as part of the Planning Proposal process. Future uses on the site would be subject to any water restrictions imposed by Sydney Water.</p> <p>Business uses can apply for exemptions to water restrictions.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal.
Zoning	<p>Residential Zoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previous agreement that these sites would be rezoned as Residential whenever Parkers Nursery and the Service Station were vacated. Land is currently zoned residential for the good reason is it is the middle of a residential neighbourhood. Current residential zoning will result in best environmental outcome for the site Zoning should be left residential Bought in Tennyson avenue knowing we were buying into low density residential area and would not have the inconvenience of business zoning – which is now being sought Council should never entertain the notion of turning residential land into commercial use When LEP was drafted in 2015, the site was determined to be zoned for residential in the event the use of the nursery and petrol station ceased. R2 Low density zone is not for large development 	<p>The sites have historically been zoned ‘residential’ despite being used for long term established commercial uses, including the service station, nursery, and bus depot.</p> <p>Under the 1971 Ku-ring-gai Planning Scheme Ordinance (KPSO) the sites were zoned Residential 2(c). When Council prepared the Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan 2015, the process for determining the zoning of sites was largely a translation of the KPSO into the format of the Standard Instrument LEP. The Residential 2(c) zone was translated to the comparable Standard Instrument LEP zone of R2 Low Density Residential. There was no agreement or resolution to return the sites to a residential zoning should the nursery or service station close.</p> <p>It should be noted that the existing Eastern Road shops are zoned B1 Neighbourhood Centre, which is the zoning proposed for the subject sites.</p> <p>The existing development standards applying to the site – FSR of 0.3:1 and HOB 9.5m – are to be retained. These development standards are the same as the adjoining low density residential zoned land, and will ensure that any future development on the site is of a bulk and scale that is compatible with the surrounding residential area.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current zoning put in place to keep developments in harmony with the residential surrounds. • Sudden change in zoning would undermine the zoning of other residential areas • Keep R2 zoning to keep area from becoming too commercial • Change from residential zone will be detrimental to surrounding environment • Site should be returned to residential as per current zoning to help Ku-ring-gai meet population growth obligations • Seeking to rezone the residential land to commercial defies all urban consolidation objectives in Sydney. Hypocrisy of Council which has fought to provide more housing in the area. 	<p>Retaining the residential zoning on the sites will not make a substantial impact on the additional housing required to support the population growth to 2036 within Ku-ring-gai. Additionally, the sites are contaminated due to past land uses, and would require remediation which is a significant cost which may make a low density residential land use unfeasible.</p>	
	<p>Precedent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Once this is permitted – big development in quiet backwater – the precedent will be set. Other large and inappropriate businesses can then be set up anywhere in the district. • Council will face years of legal challenges • Will set undesirable precedent of overdevelopment in Ku-ring-gai • Bad precedent to allow rezoning of land for a supermarket in middle of residential area. • Any move to allow variation to the 1000sqm floor space regulation for neighbourhood B1 centres could provide a major precedent for many other applications and put at risk the whole NSW Department of Planning - planning and centres policy 	<p>The EP&A Act 1979 contains provisions which allow for the lodgement of private Planning Proposals to amend the zoning or development standards applying to a particular site, and Council is required to assess these Planning Proposals. Every Planning Proposal is assessed on its individual merits.</p> <p>These sites have particular site specific merits, which are unique to the sites and would not result in setting a Ku-ring-gai wide precedent. Despite being zoned residential, sites have never been used for residential purposes and have always been used for commercial purposes. The planning proposal will formalise and rationalise the long term commercial use of the sites. Additionally the sites are located adjacent to the existing Eastern Road Neighbourhood Centre, and the proposed B1 zoning will form a natural extension of the existing B1 zoning of the centre.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal is not seeking to vary the 1,000sqm maximum floor space control for commercial development in the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone required by Clause 6.9 of the KLEP 2015, nor it seeking to vary the 1,000sqm maximum floor space permitted for the development of '<i>Neighbourhood Supermarket</i>' required by Clause 5.4 of the KLEP 2015. Any future development on the site would be required to comply with these maximum floor space requirements.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>
	<p>Rezoning has already occurred</p>	<p>This is incorrect. The sites have not already been zoned from residential to business. The purpose of this Planning Proposal</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appalled that there has been a rezoning of this site from residential zoning to business zoning 	<p>is to set out the justification for the proposed rezoning of the sites from R2 Low Density Residential to B1 Neighbourhood Centre. Council has not yet made a final decision on the Planning Proposal.</p>	
	<p>Rezone to B2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal to rezone Eastern Road to B2 will lead to zoning pressure on adjacent land and result in zoning creep. 	<p>This is incorrect. The Planning Proposal seeks to rezone the sites from R2 Low Density Residential to B1 Neighbourhood Centre. This is the same zoning as the existing shops on Eastern Road</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>
	<p>Proposed B1 Neighbourhood Centre Zone Rezoning Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ad hoc amendment to existing plan – what is the point of having a Town Plan if its provisions can be over ruled on an ad hoc basis This type of rezoning is contrary to Council's recent history of dealing with developers attempts to rezone residential areas Rezoning does not provide any safeguards for parents and children who attend Swim School or Preschool. B1 zoning was not identified during the making of the Ku-ring-gai LEP 2015 <p>Rezoning not needed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> So many empty shops at Turramurra near station – no reason to allow a new area for more shops Object to rezoning – don't need a neighbourhood centre This area of Turramurra must not be rezoned. Do not need more commercial development <p>Impacts of B1 Zoning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning to B1 will change area for the worse With impact of climate change, we should aim to restrict business zoning rather than increase what is an already well-facilitated area. B1 will be land half the size over and above the existing shops Impact on the suburb negatively by commercialising an area that people and 	<p>The EP&A Act 1979 contains provisions which allow for the lodgement of private Planning Proposals to amend the zoning or development standards applying to a particular site, and Council is required to assess these Planning Proposals. Every Planning Proposal is assessed on its individual merits.</p> <p>Under the 1971 Ku-ring-gai Planning Scheme Ordinance (KPSO) the sites were zoned Residential 2(c). When Council prepared the Ku-ring-gai Local Environmental Plan 2015, the process for determining the zoning of sites was largely a translation of the KPSO into the format of the Standard Instrument LEP. The Residential 2(c) zone was translated to the comparable Standard Instrument LEP zone of R2 Low Density Residential.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal seeks to formalise and rationalise the long term commercial uses on the site.</p> <p>The proposed B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone on the subject sites, is the same zone that the existing Eastern Road shops are zoned. The existing development standards applying to the site – FSR of 0.3:1 and HOB 9.5m – are to be retained. These development standards are the same as the adjoining low density residential zoned land, and will ensure that any future development on the site is of a bulk and scale that is compatible with the surrounding residential area.</p> <p>The objective of the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone is to <i>provide for small-scale retail, business and community uses</i>. Clause 6.9 of the KLEP 2015 quantifies what is considered an appropriate scale within neighbourhood centres by limiting development of commercial premises to 1,000sqm within the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone. This is also consistent with the recent amendment undertaken by the Department of Planning which makes '<i>neighbourhood supermarkets</i>' a mandatory land use that is permitted with consent within the</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

	<p>residents have expressly chosen to live in to avoid.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not compatible with surrounding residential area • Will result in the scale of B1 zoning which is more suited to town centres • If site is rezoned it will give State Government reason to increase the zoning and density with R3 and R4 zones around the site – taking away control from Council • Rezoning to B1 will treble land value • Will encourage further concentrated residential housing nearby • B1 will allow significant overdevelopment which is not warranted away from major transport hubs. • Radical departure from R2 zone • Will result in overdevelopment and height issues <p>Future Uses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If rezoned, the site will not be confined to use as a Harris Farm which was advertised to the community. Many other business uses and configurations could take place. • Rezoning will mean the site could be developed into a number of uses that are unsuitable for this local area. • Changing zoning to allow for commercial development which we do not want • Shop top housing is a permitted use – dichotomy between the two uses • Rezoning opens the door to industrialisation of area if supermarket decides to change plans or sell at a later date. • Proposal does not stop Harris Farm selling and letting another business take over • B1 zone would not only allow Harris Farm, but Coles, Woolworth, Light Industry, Aldi operating 7 days a week 12-15hours a day. • Rezoning will mean land may be used for other business purpose – not just supermarket. 	<p>B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone, and is again limited to 1,000sqm. Any future development on the sites will be required to comply with these limits in gross floor area, ensuring that future development is of an appropriate scale for the neighbourhood centre.</p> <p>The submissions are correct in that if the sites are rezoned to B1 Neighbourhood Centre, they are not confined to be used solely for the purpose of a Harris Farm store. The concept plans and urban design statement submitted with the Planning Proposal provide an indication of possible type, footprint and scale of the built form outcomes enabled by the Planning Proposal. The B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone permits a range of permissible land uses for which a future development application could be lodged. The B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone does permit '<i>neighbourhood supermarkets</i>' as a land use permitted with consent. Any future development application lodged on the site, for a '<i>neighbourhood supermarket</i>' or any other permissible land use would require assessment and consideration of the requirements outlined in Section 4.15, which includes an assessment of the likely impacts of the proposed development including environmental impacts on both the natural and built environments, and social and economic impacts in the locality, and the public interest. Additionally, any future development on the sites would be required to comply with the site-specific DCP controls which have been prepared specifically for this site.</p>	
--	--	---	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worrying that if rezoned without any firm knowledge or details, the site could be used for many different business purposes which is unacceptable • Rezoning will result in offering identical services to the existing ones and is only in interest of present owners of site. • Other potential uses include boarding houses, business premises, child care centres, community facilities, medical centres, neighbourhood shops, neighbourhood supermarkets, respite day care centres, shop top housing • Don't understand reason for Planning Proposal – is it to facilitate Harris Farm? Or are there long term plans for the site which have not been disclosed to public. • Harris Farm proposal is called “The Farm”, includes ‘orchard, vegetable gardens and a barn’ – the KLEP 2015 B1 zone prohibits Agriculture, Farm Buildings, Recreation facilities (outdoor), rural industries and rural supplies • Do not need it, whatever future use may be 		
	<p>Rezoning Turramurra</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council should instead focus on the zoning of the business centres around the station • Rezone Kissing Point Road/Pacific Highway area for High Density Residential as this business area cannot expand easily • Increase height limits in business areas around Turramurra Station and let developers bring forward ideas • Need to create a vibrant modern business centre • Should not be rezoned as density in Turramurra has already been increased with recent apartment developments • Council has led to this outcome by the outdated FSR/usage ratios in the Turramurra node (centre) • Give Turramurra some planning vision and leadership be encouraging accelerated 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Council is undertaking a place –based approach for the future planning of centres. The Ku-ring-gai LSPS include the following Local Planning Priority <i>K10. Promoting Turramurra as a family-focused urban village</i> to support the growth and revitalisation of the Turramurra Local Centre as a community hub for local residents living in the north of Ku-ring-gai. It seeks to ensure Turramurra will become a well-connected and attractive place to live, work and shop. The LSPS includes statements relating to the character of Turramurra centre, parts of the centre that impact on character, amenity or reduce functionality; future opportunities and improvements and a Structure plan with principles to guide future planning. The LSPS includes actions to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare Structure Plans for 4 primary local centres – including Turramurra • Prepare revised Public Domain Plans • Prepare site-specific Development Control Plans 	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

	<p>redevelopment of the decaying shopping precinct around the station</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fix Turrumurra first • Turrumurra town centre development plan has been sitting around for years with nothing being done. Turrumurra centre should be given priority for development due to access to public transport. • Resolving issues at Turrumurra Shopping Centre must include the ease of access for cars from both sides of the Highway, plus bike and pedestrian paths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare Urban Design Excellence Policy <p>Council also has the Activate Ku-ring-gai revitalisation program. The Activate Turrumurra precinct is identified in the DCP, and is a revitalisation and beautification initiative focused on the land adjoining the rail station, and seeks to leverage Council owned sites in collaboration with private land holders to develop a community hub with library, community centre, park and public domain.</p> <p>Through the Housing Strategy, scenarios and potential locations for new housing within the Turrumurra Local Centre will be explored.</p>	
Social Impacts	<p>Social Impacts as a result of development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Instances of youth loitering and taking drugs mainly on Saturday and Sunday night after hours. • Rezoning and development will attract undesirable elements to the area – and increase problem of car burnouts, and drug dealing • Negatively impact the culture of the neighbourhood • Council needs to be reminded of social impact of this development • Substantial negative effects on the social amenity of the area • Destroy social fabric of the area • Responsible for people mental health problems and possible suicides • Increase in local crime rate 	<p>The comments are noted.</p> <p>There is no evidence to suggest that the proposed rezoning to B1 Neighbourhood Centre would result in detrimental social impacts, noting that the sites have always been used for commercial purposes and the proposed zoning – B1 Neighbourhood Centre - is the same as the adjoining Eastern Road shops.</p> <p>Depending on the proposed land use, a Social Impact Assessment may be required at the Development Application stage.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal.
Inconsistency with Planning Documents	<p>Inconsistent with Metropolitan Strategy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Urban renewal and growth is not directed within main transport corridor or strategic town centre <p>Inconsistent with Councils CSP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relating to revitalisation of local centres and managing impacts of new development <p>Inconsistency with Greater Sydney Commission</p>	<p>Metropolitan Strategy -The <i>Metropolitan Strategy: A Plan for Growing Sydney</i> is no longer in force or a matter for consideration. It has been superseded by the Greater Sydney Region Plan: A Metropolis of Three Cities. The Planning Proposal is consistent with the Directions and Objectives of the Region Plan, specifically D3, O6, O7, D6, O14, D7, O22, D8 and O27. The Proposal will enable future development and public domain works which will enhance the existing neighbourhood centre, the site has public transport accessibility in conjunction with walkable access from the surrounding residential area supports the objective of 30min</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This land does not meet the requirements for development of a local centre by Greater Sydney Commission • Eastern Road already meets criteria for walkability and local needs for goods and services • Not consistent with North District Plan <p>Inconsistent with KLEP 2015</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The size and scale of the proposed development is inconsistent with the LEP objectives for neighbourhood centre • Introduction of neighbourhood supermarket definition was to only support existing neighbourhood centres • Neighbourhood centre definition emphasis on convenience for people who live and work in surrounding neighbourhood and encourage people to walk no drive <p>Inconsistency with LSPS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In satisfying K6, K7, K10, K22, K25 Local Planning Priorities in LSPS council needs to direct attention to the revitalisation of Turramurra as a key local centre • District Plan and LSPS show future housing growth around Turramurra local centre – not in the vicinity of Eastern Road Shops. <p>Inconsistent with DCP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconsistent with objectives of DCP – does not support development which positively contributes to the existing character of residential areas <p>Inconsistent with Retail Centres Strategy 2005</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seeks to limit development capacity and encourage larger retail within higher order centres <p>Inconsistent with Ku-ring-gai Hornsby Subregional Employment Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastern Road already have an excess supply for the forecast employment demand for foreseeable future 	<p>cities, and future development on the site is required to protect and retain significant native vegetation on the site.</p> <p>Council CSP -It is considered that the Planning Proposal is consistent with the objectives of the Councils CSP, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E1 promoting Ku-ring-gai’s business and employment opportunities • E1.1 Ku-ring-gai is an attractive location for business investment • P1 Preserving the unique visual character of Ku-ring-gai • P3 Quality Urban Design and Development • P3.1 The built environment delivers attractive, interactive and sustainable living and working environments • P4 Revitalisation of our centres • P4.1 Our centres offer a broad range of shops and services and contain lively village spaces and places where people can live work, shop, meet and spend leisure time. <p>It should be noted that these objectives relating to revitalisation of centres apply to all local and neighbourhood centres – not just the local centres as suggested by the submission.</p> <p>GSC – The sites are not seeking to be rezoned to a Local Centre zoning. The Planning Proposal seeks to rezone the sites to B1 Neighbourhood Centre. The Planning Proposal is consistent with the broad GSC objectives and Directions relating to enabling the provision of additional and improve commercial facilities within walking distance of the surrounding residential neighbourhood, as well as designed great places that bring people together to be achieved through the public domain plan upgrades to the centre.</p> <p>KLEP 2015 - The objective of the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone is to <i>provide for small-scale retail, business and community uses</i>. Clause 6.9 of the KLEP 2015 quantifies what is considered an appropriate scale within neighbourhood centres by limiting development of commercial premises to 1,000sqm within the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone. This is also consistent with the recent amendment undertaken by the Department of Planning which makes ‘<i>neighbourhood supermarkets</i>’ a mandatory land use that is permitted with consent within the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone, and is again limited to 1,000sqm. Any future development on the sites</p>	
--	---	---	--

Review of Proposed Retail Definition for Neighbourhood Supermarkets – Leyshon Consulting July 2018

- Conclusion that any supermarket floorspace size greater than 1000sqm would impact on nearby local centres and other neighbourhood centres
- Existing Eastern Road Shops have combined GFA of 1521sqm, including IGA and Green Grocer. Harris Farm will put the overall size of supermarket businesses at 2000sqm – double the size of the recommended size for a neighbourhood B1 centre

will be required to comply with these limits in gross floor area, ensuring that future development is of an appropriate scale for the neighbourhood centre.

LSPS – The LSPS Local Planning Priorities K6 and K25 relating to revitalisation of centres and providing for retail needs of the community within centres – is not specific to local centres. The LSPS notes that all centres play a vital role in the local economy and provide a diverse mix of office, retail, services, community facilities and transport connections. The Proposed rezoning of the sites will not prevent the revitalisation of the Turrumurra Local Centre. The LSPS set out future opportunities and improvements for the Turrumurra Local Centre through a Structure plan with principles to guide future planning, and notes the following actions to be undertaken for Turrumurra (as well as St Ives, Gordon and Lindfield Local Centres):

- Prepare Structure Plans
- Prepare revised Public Domain Plans
- Prepare site-specific Development Control Plans
- Prepare Urban Design Excellence Policy

Council also has the Activate Ku-ring-gai revitalisation program. The Activate Turrumurra precinct is identified in the DCP, and is a revitalisation and beautification initiative focused on the land adjoining the rail station, and seeks to leverage Council owned sites in collaboration with private land holders to develop a community hub with library, community centre, park and public domain.

Through the Housing Strategy, scenarios and potential locations for new housing and mixed use developments (apartments and commercial/retail uses) within the Turrumurra Local Centre will be explored.

DCP - Site-Specific DCP controls and objectives have been prepared for this site, to support the proposed rezoning to B1 Neighbourhood Centre. The controls and objectives apply to any and all future development outcomes on the site, and seek to retain the significant features of the site – including native vegetation, and ensuring that any future development is compatible with the surrounding local character through controls relating to building setbacks and built form.

		<p>Retail Strategy + Employment Study – The independent review of the Economic Impact Assessment undertaken by Hill PDA for Council noted the following in regarding to consistency with Retail Strategy: <i>We have considered the proposal against Council’s adopted Retail Centres Strategy 2005. We don’t believe its inconsistent with the strategy. It does not undermine any of the objective and development principles of the strategy, and actively promotes two or three of them. The Strategy recognises the need or desire to expand Turrumurra by 4,000sqm and the subject proposal would not undermine the ability of this outcome.</i></p> <p>The Planning Proposal is consistent with the Employment Land Study which sets out the strategic direction ‘<i>Reinforce the Local Service Role of Villages , Small Villages and Neighbourhood Centres</i>’. In considering Neighbourhood Centres, the strategy identified centres which a very high level of excess and recommends consideration be given to reducing capacity. Eastern Road is not identified as one of these centres. The strategy recommends Eastern Road shops Turrumurra be zoned B1 Neighbourhood Centre – which is what is proposed by the Planning Proposal.</p> <p>Leyshon Review - The Leyshon review of proposed retail definitions for Neighbourhood Supermarkets in 2018 was undertaken for the Department of Planning, and led to an amendment to the Standard Instrument LEP which required ‘<i>Neighbourhood Supermarkets</i>’ as a mandatory permitted use within the B1 Neighbourhood Centre, and set the maximum gross floor area for this use at 1,000sqm. The size restricted to 1,000sqm is to ensure compatibility with the scale and nature of the surrounding predominantly residential area. The Department of Planning <i>Planning Circular PS13-001</i> notes that <i>by including a specific land term and definition it is clear to retailers, councils and communities that neighbourhood supermarkets can locate in these small centres.</i> Any future development on the site for a ‘<i>neighbourhood supermarket</i>’ would be required to comply with this requirement. It should be noted that the 1,000sqm maximum gross floor area is per ‘<i>neighbourhood supermarket</i>’ – it is not a maximum for the total combined floorspace of neighbourhood supermarkets in a particular centre.</p>	
<p>General Objection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to proposal. • No justification for change • Strongly oppose proposal 	<p>Objection is noted.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not meet any essential guidelines • Oppose changes to the KLEP 2015 • Oppose development plan 		
<p>Council should support views of local residents - objections</p>	<p>Views of Local Residents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Listen to views of people living within the vicinity of the proposed development • Elected representatives should respect the views of the community and vote no to the rezoning proposal. • This is a local development for the local residents of Turrumurra to decide. • Interests of residents above private business • Council should only take into account the opinions of those who live in the area. • How will Council ensure feedback is representative? No way to separate opinion of locals from those that have a vested benefit in the rezoning or are not local? • Alister Henskens contacted by 281 constituents, with 91% opposed. Encourage Council to note submission sent by residents. • Should be up to the residents who will be impacted by the proposal to make decision – not councillors <p>Harris Farm - Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harris Farm survey on change.org is not indicative of the wishes of local residents • Don't be swayed by petition where many signatures are not locals • Concern that the 'for' submissions are from another state and do not have vested interest in community • Note Harris Farm have engaged in attempts to get support which are not limited to local residents. Support from as far as Belrose, Hornsby, Kissing point Road and Pymble, Queensland and Inner West • Harris Farm have used Australia wide facebook posts • Harris Farm St Ives store handing out pamphlets asking people to support their submission to build a new supermarket in 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The public exhibition of the Planning Proposal is governed by the statutory requirements set out in the <i>EP&A Act 1979</i>, and the Gateway Determination.</p> <p>The public exhibition of the Planning Proposal cannot be restricted to local residents of Turrumurra or Ku-ring-gai. There is no requirement for people making a submission to disclose whether they are a local resident or their address.</p> <p>The outcome of the public exhibition and the final recommendation from Council officers is not based on a popularity vote for or against, but on the planning merits.</p> <p>There is nothing restricting the proponent of the Planning Proposal from soliciting support for the proposal, just like there is nothing restricting local community groups, or the Local MP from soliciting objections to the proposal.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>

	<p>Turrumurra – of course those not living in the area or impacted would be fine with proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unfair campaign by Harris Farm 		
Removal of Minimum Lot Size	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site is double the area of current block of shops and proposal to delete the 940sqm minimum lot size would allow the whole area to be divided up into many small lots which could be sold if desired and the end result would be a large shopping centre – nothing like low key development that has been presented to public • Why do they need to remove lot size? • Subject site is 5.5x larger than the permitted minimum lot standard of 940sqm 	<p>The Planning Proposal seeks to remove the minimum lot size of 940sqm. This is the minimum lot size associated with R2 Low Density Residential zoning. The removal of the minimum lot size is consistent with other land zoned B1 Neighbourhood Centre throughout Ku-ring-gai. The minimum lot size development standard only applies to subdivision, and sets the minimum size of each new lot to be created. If the sites were to be subdivided in the future, the minimum lot size would be based on a merit assessment, consistent with other 'B' Business zoned land throughout Ku-ring-gai.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>
Floor Space Ratio and Gross Floor Area	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Misleading to suggest that the floor space ratio of a permitted development will be consistent with the local residential area. • High floor space ratio unsuitable in area • Rezoning would permit any future development to have a FSR of 0.75:1. Harris Farm proposes FSR of 0.3:1 but there is no legislation protecting the site from future undertaking of 0.75:1 development once it is rezoned. • GFA is capped at 1000sqm – Harris Farm asked Council to clarify ambiguity in interpretation relating to supermarket and retail tenancies GFA being capped at 1000sqm, Council indicated that it should relate to the entire GFA of all tenancies which total 1540sqm – there is no ambiguity • Proposal requires GFA of 150% of the maximum permitted under KLEP 2015 clause 6.9(2) 	<p>The Planning Proposal does not seek to amend the existing Floor Space Ratio development standard applying to the site of 0.3:1. This is the exact same floor space ratio that applies to the surrounding low density residential area, and is lower than the floor space ratio of the adjoining Eastern Road shops, which have a FSR of 0.75:1.</p> <p>Clause 6.9 of the KLEP 2015 sets a maximum gross floor area of 1,000sqm for commercial development within the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone. Clause 5.4 of the KLEP 2015 sets a maximum gross floor area of 1,000sqm for '<i>Neighbourhood Supermarket</i>' land use within the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone. Any future development on the site would be required to comply with these requirements.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal.</p>
Draft Site-Specific DCP			
Support for Site Specific DCP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with Site Specific Development Control Plan • Overall supportive of the draft site specific DCP as a mechanism to guide future 	<p>Support for site-specific DCP noted.</p>	<p>No amendment to site-specific DCP.</p>

	development of the subject site with a B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone		
Opposition for Site Specific DCP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strongly oppose the site-specific DCP to support the Planning Proposal Site-specific DCP does not address concerns regarding proposal The way the site specific DCP is written it will add nothing to the local centre The site specific DCP has been written for the Harris Farm Market proposal with the documentation being prepared by Harris Farm. The DCP would require minor adjustments to meet Harris Farm requirements, which would be permitted without community input. DCP does not go far enough to achieve its objectives 	<p>The objectives and controls included in the draft site-specific DCP have been prepared to guide all and any possible future development on the subject sites – not specifically for a Harris Farm.</p> <p>The controls and objectives seeks to ensure the integration of the subject sites into the existing Eastern Road Neighbourhood Centre, so that it forms an extension of the existing retail strip. The controls seek to retain the existing key features of the site (such as native vegetation) and ensure any future development is cohesive with the surrounding streetscape character.</p>	No amendment to site-specific DCP.
Traffic Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not address traffic management issues such as varying and narrow road pavement on Tennyson Avenue 	<p>Traffic volumes in Tennyson Avenue are forecast to increase by approximately 1 trip every 2 minutes during Thursday afternoon and Saturday peak hours. This is unlikely to impact on traffic flow and access in Tennyson Avenue.</p> <p>The proposed public domain treatments and new raised pedestrian crossing in Tennyson Avenue near Eastern Road would slow vehicle speeds, improve pedestrian safety and accessibility and may also discourage existing trips along Tennyson Avenue that do not have an origin or destination at the Eastern Road neighbourhood shops.</p>	No amendment to site specific DCP.
Public Domain – Road works	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed narrowing of Eastern Road along part of the western frontage of the site will lead to extra congestion in the morning peak – currently vehicles southbound on Eastern Road and turning into Tennyson Avenue use the additional kerbside road space to get out of the main stream of traffic before turning. 	Existing condition unchanged as road width remains the same to allow for bus stop layby.	No amendment to site specific DCP
Public Domain – On street parking	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed creation of 4 parallel parking spaces on the north side of Tennyson Avenue will create congestion as vehicles turning into Tennyson Avenue will have to wait for users of the parallel parking spaces to enter and exit them. This will be dangerous, as vehicles turn swiftly from Eastern Road. 	Parallel parking currently exists in this location. The only change is the indentation into the current verge. The proposed raised pedestrian crossing will slow vehicular speeds as they enter Tennyson Avenue.	No amendment to site specific DCP.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed creation of 4 angled spaces on the southern side of Tennyson Avenue will create congestion resulting in vehicles turning in and out of Eastern Road having to wait for them to exit the space. Additionally, only a single line of vehicles will be able to que to turn into Eastern Road. Currently vehicles turning into Eastern Road form two lines – one to turn north and one to turn south. Proposed angled parking on south side of Tennyson will result in more people doing U-turns in the end of Tennyson lane – adding to traffic flow problems The proposed removal of two parking spots directly outside of the fruit shop and butcher to create the small plaza will negatively impact these businesses 	<p>This will be an area with increased pedestrian activity so the reduced speeds will improve safety and amenity for pedestrians and drivers.</p> <p>Consideration will be given to Australia Post vehicles at this location to collect mail from post box.</p> <p>The new kerb alignments and narrowed carriageway will discourage the U-Turn manoeuvre in this location.</p> <p>The kerb extension has been installed to make the pedestrian crossing safer and to improve the amenity for shoppers, providing a space to meet and rest under trees.</p>	
<p>Public Domain – Pedestrian Crossing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed pedestrian crossing will cause delays to traffic moving in and out and has the potential to be dangerous to both vehicles and pedestrians. Extra pedestrian crossing on Tennyson Avenue will make it harder to exit on Eastern Road – traffic will have to queue behind and won't be able to see traffic flow in Eastern Road. Will lead to accidents. Not uncommon for vehicles to fail to give way to pedestrians on Eastern Road crossing. The proposed pedestrian crossing on Tennyson Avenue will make situation worse. Traffic is already unacceptable high with another crossing to increase congestion Concern for pedestrian safety The pedestrian crossing was not considered in the Traffic Report. 	<p>This will be an area with increased pedestrian activity so the reduced speeds will improve safety and amenity for pedestrians and drivers.</p> <p>The proposed pedestrian crossing in Tennyson Avenue is set back from Eastern Road, to allow one vehicle to queue at the intersection at the existing holding line.</p> <p>Both pedestrian crossings will be raised crossings, to reduce speeds and improve pedestrian safety. Pedestrians will cross Tennyson Road regardless, so formalising the crossing makes the area safer for all.</p> <p>The traffic report has made some allowance for pedestrians crossing roads and these delays have been factored into the assessment.</p>	<p>No amendment to site specific DCP.</p>
<p>Onsite and On-grade Parking</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Control Should at grade parking be justified it is to be located behind the building line, screened from view and not adversely impact on street activation, amenity or native trees and vegetation</i> – concern that 'justified' is vague. Acknowledge that DCP is to guide all and any possible future development on the subject 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>At grade parking located within the front setback area to Eastern Road would result in poor street amenity and street activation, as it does not encourage interaction or pedestrian movements. It is not consistent with Clause 6.7 of the KLEP 2015 which required active street frontages to be provided for developments within the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone. For</p>	<p>Amendment to 14D.2 Control 4:</p> <p><i>Where the provision of all required car parking within the basement is not feasible due to impacts on native trees</i></p>

	<p>site – however point out that the Concept Design submitted with Planning Proposal Application proposed all vehicle access off Eastern Road, with basement parking and at grade parking located at the front of the site to Eastern Road, to minimise impacts on neighbouring properties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should be noted that concept design would require a total of 91 spaces under the requirements of the DCP, and 66 spaces under the RMS guidelines for Traffic Generating Development. In order to satisfy car parking requirements it will require the utilisation of both basement and at grade parking • Recommended that proposed DCP control 4 be amended to delete the reference to provide parking behind the building line e.g. <i>Control 4 – Should at grade parking be justified, it is to be located behind the building line, screened from view and not adversely impact on street activation, amenity or native trees and vegetation</i> 	<p>these reasons, it is Council's preference that all car parking should be provided within the basement of new development.</p> <p>It is proposed to amend 14D.2 Control 4 to remove the word '<i>justified</i>' and instead quantify the circumstances in which a limited amount of at grade car parking would be considered, which is where the required car parking cannot be fully provided for within the basement due to impacts on native trees and vegetation, a limited amount may be provided at grade, provided it is located behind the building line, screened from view, not adversely impact on street activation, amenity or native trees and vegetation.</p> <p>Parking provision will be assessed in accordance with the site specific DCP once a development application is lodged.</p>	<p><i>and vegetation, a limited amount may be provided at-grade, as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>It is to be located behind the building line</i> • <i>Screened from view</i> • <i>Not adversely impact on street activation, amenity or native trees and vegetation</i> • <i>Access to be provided from Tennyson Avenue at the location of existing driveway crossover</i> • <i>Refer to 9B.2 for additional requirements for at-grade parking areas.</i> <p>Delete 14D.2 Control 5 – has been incorporated into revised control 4 (above).</p>
<p>Vehicle Entry Locations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Control which requires vehicle access for any at grade car parking to be provided from the existing cross over on Tennyson Avenue – this is already subject to heavy traffic including parked cars along Tennyson Avenue • Noted that the vehicle cross over in Figure 14D.5 – Public Domain Plan is different to that shown on Figure 14D.2 Pedestrian and Access Diagram, and the concept plan submitted with application. Request the Draft site specific DCP diagrams are revised to align with concept plans submitted with application, or alternatively include a note which indicates that the public domain works and driveway 	<p>Traffic volumes in Tennyson Avenue are forecast to increase by approximately 1 trip every 2 minutes during Thursday afternoon and Saturday peak hours. This is unlikely to impact on traffic flow and access in Tennyson Avenue.</p> <p>The proposed public domain treatments and new raised pedestrian crossing in Tennyson Avenue near Eastern Road would slow vehicle speeds, improve pedestrian safety and accessibility and may also discourage existing trips along Tennyson Avenue that do not have an origin or destination at the Eastern Road neighbourhood shops.</p> <p>The location of the vehicle access points as shown on the site specific DCP diagrams are indicative only, with the exact location of vehicle access points to be determined at the DA stage. It is proposed to amend the site specific DCP diagrams</p>	<p>Amendment to site specific DCP to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Indicative</i> access points – in Key at Figure 14D.2-1 • 14D.5 Public Domain - Control 4 <i>Indicative</i> vehicle crossover for basement parking <p>Amendment to Figure 14D.2-1 so location of vehicle access point is</p>

	access points are indicative only and subject to detailed design	to ensure the location of the vehicle access point is consistent, and to amend the controls and diagram keys to include the word ' <i>Indicative</i> '.	consistent with Figure 14D.5-1 Public Domain
Active Street Frontages	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Active street frontages do not mitigate traffic 	The purpose of requiring active street frontages is not to mitigate traffic, but to ensure the provision of continuous business or retail land uses that open directly to the footpath and provide active, people-orientated street frontages. It enhances public security and passive surveillance and improves the amenity of the public domain by encouraging pedestrian activity. It can also assist in supporting the economic viability of the centre.	No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP
Setbacks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council's proposed setback amendments mean that Harris Farm development cannot be built as presented – so designs presented to public will not be what is actually built 	<p>A Planning Proposal cannot be tied to a particular development outcome or design on the site.</p> <p>The controls in the site specific DCP have been prepared having regard to the future character, public domain, pedestrian and vehicle access, built form and protection of trees. The draft site specific DCP is designed to guide all and any possible future development on the subject site.</p>	No amendment to site specific DCP
Height	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Height restrictions for the development and neighbourhood centre should be consistent with local residences 	The Planning Proposal seeks to apply a maximum height of buildings development standard of 9.5m to the site. This is consistent with the maximum height of the surrounding low density residential dwellings. The maximum height of buildings development standard is included in the LEP, and not the DCP.	No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP
Trees and vegetation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree planting on the proposed plaza on corner of Eastern Road and Tennyson Avenue will obstruct the view of oncoming traffic for vehicles exiting Tennyson Avenue. 	The location of tree planting will be subject to the intersection sight line requirements of Austroads design guides, to maintain visibility. Careful tree species selection and placement will ensure sightlines are maintained.	No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cannot see how BGHF CEEC can be enhanced or even retained adequately within such small minimal offsets from boundaries? 	<p>The BGHF onsite exists as Single isolated trees or stands of trees, with a predominantly exotic or concrete understorey.</p> <p>The site Planning Proposal and site specific DCP retain the majority of the BGHF CEEC values onsite and seek to enhance through planting BGHF species. Canopy of Blue Gum High Forest even without a native understorey are considered important as biodiversity reservoirs with significant retention value.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP
General Comments			

Suggestions for Improvements & Requirements	No Standing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roads should be all zoned 'no standing' now 	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>This is not a matter for consideration as part of the Planning Proposal. Council allocates the parking on local roads based on safety and needs, and implementing a blanket No Stopping or No Parking on Eastern Road would not be desirable.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP</p>
	Post Box <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council should require post box to be re-instated – useful community asset. 	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>This is not a matter for consideration as part of the Planning Proposal.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP</p>
	No Right Hand Turn <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solve Trentino Road 'rat run' by placing set of permanent 'no right hand turn' traffic furniture at junction of Trentino and Eastern Road. 	<p>This is not a matter for consideration as part of the Planning Proposal. Conditions in Trentino Road could be considered separately by the Ku-ring-gai Traffic Committee.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP</p>
	Traffic Lights or Roundabout <ul style="list-style-type: none"> So many traffic and pedestrian issues that if it were to proceed traffic lights or roundabout would need to be installed in several locations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eastern Road and Tennyson Avenue intersection Eastern Road and Billyard Avenue intersection Eastern Road and The Chase Road intersection The Chase Road and Burns Road intersection Traffic lights would assist with traffic flow, congestion and safety for pedestrians. Concern traffic lights further compound congestion. Traffic lights might be necessary to ensure entry and exit and safe pedestrian accessibility Traffic lights would bring in even more out of area traffic. 	<p>Additional traffic generation on Eastern Road was forecast and its effects on Eastern Road were assessed and found to have only minimal additional delays to surrounding intersections, with operation continuing at Level of Service A/B, which is good operation and space capacity.</p> <p>The proposed public domain treatments, upgraded pedestrian crossing in Eastern Road to a raised crossing) and new raised pedestrian crossing in Tennyson Avenue near Eastern Road would slow vehicle speeds, improve pedestrian safety and accessibility and may also discourage existing trips along Tennyson Avenue that do not have an origin or destination at the Eastern Road neighbourhood shops.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP</p>
	Bus Stop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current bus stop outside of 105 Eastern Road – what will happen to this? Where will the bus stop be located? 	<p>A bus stop will be retained in close proximity to the existing bus stop.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site specific DCP.</p>

	<p>Entry and Exit Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If a one way system is proposed, then exit points on Tennyson and/or Alice Street would be better option to both entry and exit points of Eastern Road. 	<p>It is preferred to focus the main entry/exit point on Eastern Road, which is a regional road in the road hierarchy, and retain a minor access point on Tennyson Avenue. An exit point on Alice Street is not desirable given the low traffic volumes currently experienced there. Given the scale of potential development, locating the main entry/exit point on Eastern Road would not create significant additional traffic performance impacts to Eastern Road</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site specific DCP.</p>
	<p>Light Rail</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add light rail from eastern side of Turrumurra station to Hornsby shopping area and station, and from Turrumurra station to North Turrumurra and Bobbin Head. 	<p>These routes are currently serviced by public buses – it would not be feasible to implement light rail along these routes.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.</p>
	<p>Road Widening</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council needs to consider road widening for Tennyson Avenue and installing traffic calming measures Will require road widening If major activity was to occur – all fences in Tennyson Avenue would need to be setback and Council resume several meters on each side of the road, and the road widening would involve cutting, and rebuilding of bridge, and rerouting of water mains and sewage 	<p>Traffic volumes in Tennyson Avenue are forecast to increase by approximately 1 trip every 2 minutes during Thursday afternoon and Saturday peak hours. This is unlikely to impact significantly on traffic flow and access in Tennyson Avenue.</p> <p>The proposed public domain treatments and new raised pedestrian crossing in Tennyson Avenue near Eastern Road would slow vehicle speeds, improve pedestrian safety and accessibility and may also discourage existing trips along Tennyson Avenue that do not have an origin or destination at the Eastern Road neighbourhood shops.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.</p>
	<p>Parking</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Get rid of parking in front of the shops On southern side of Tennyson Avenue in the final block before the shops – make no parking zone to allow two lanes of traffic to flow into Eastern Road. Left lane dedicated to left only turn and other lane free to turn right. More effort should be made to improving parking for existing businesses. <p>EV Charging</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would love Harris Farm especially if they are planning to have dedicated EV charging parking spots. 	<p>With a proposed pedestrian crossing in Tennyson Avenue at Eastern Road, it will not be possible to provide 2 approach lanes at the intersection for safety reasons. 2 lanes at the intersection may also encourage further through traffic in Tennyson Road.</p> <p>The existing parking restrictions on Eastern Road, Tennyson Avenue and in the car park at the rear of the shops could be reviewed, and additional enforcement could be carried out, to improve turnover and opportunities for other shoppers.</p> <p>EV charging facilities are currently not part of the site-specific DCP. It is proposed to amend the site specific DCP to include a control and objective to provide for future transport and vehicle options such as electric vehicles and e-bicycles, and ensuring that parking areas are designed now so these charging points can be installed.</p>	<p>Amendment to DCP to include objective and control relating to the provision of Electric Vehicle charging:</p> <p>Objective – To provide for future transport and vehicle options including Electric Vehicle charging stations, e-bicycles and the like.</p> <p>Control – Parking areas are to be designed and constructed so that</p>

			<i>electric vehicle charging points can be installed.</i>
	<p>Reduce Speed Limit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council should reduce speed limit to 50km/hr from Karuah Oval to Burns Road for additional road and pedestrian safety on Eastern Road. 	<p>The proposed public domain treatments, upgraded pedestrian crossing in Eastern Road (to a raised crossing) and new raised pedestrian crossing in Tennyson Avenue near Eastern Road would slow vehicle speeds, improve pedestrian safety and accessibility and help to reinforce the 50km/h sign posted speed limit in the Eastern Road neighbourhood shops area.</p> <p>The most recent traffic counts undertaken by Council in Eastern Road outside the service station recorded 85% vehicle speeds of 54km/h. This indicates the majority of motorists are driving to the speed limit and conditions.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.
	<p>Pedestrian Crossing – Eastern Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian crossing will have to be replaced as it is barely fit for purpose Current pedestrian crossing should suffice to support pedestrian traffic for both shopping areas <p>Pedestrian Crossing – Tennyson Avenue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to increase in people it is essential to add a pedestrian crossing from site to existing shops across Tennyson Avenue. Enhance safety to pedestrians <p>Pedestrian Crossing – The Chase Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Crossing Chase Road is a minefield, and with increased traffic it is essential to have a pedestrian crossing there <p>Pedestrian Crossing – Wiltshire Place and Trentino Avenue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian crossing between Wiltshire Place and Trentino Avenue is very dangerous and requires re-design. Cars do not stop. 	<p>The pedestrian crossing will be upgraded to a raised crossing, which will make it more effective.</p> <p>Both pedestrian crossings will be raised crossings, to reduce vehicle speeds and improve pedestrian safety. Pedestrians will cross Tennyson Avenue regardless, so formalising the crossing makes the area safer for all improving access to both shopping areas.</p> <p>Agreed. Already incorporated in the public domain controls.</p> <p>The Chase Road is outside the scope for this project, however pedestrian facilities may be considered by the Traffic Committee.</p> <p>The existing pedestrian crossing across Eastern Road at Wiltshire Place will be upgraded to a raised crossing that will make it more effective in slowing traffic and further encouraging pedestrians to cross at this location.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal or site specific DCP.
Alternative uses	<p>Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site would be suitable for housing development Best solution for site is town houses - providing accommodation and improving appeal of area. 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The current zoning of the site (R2 Low Density Residential) permits dwelling houses. Townhouses (multi dwelling housing) is not a permitted land use under the current zoning or the proposed B1 Neighbourhood Centre zoning.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appropriate development is medium density housing – which is lacking for residents who are seeking to downsize within the area. • Residential proposal would fit in with surrounding landscape – would be far more acceptable • If the owners of the land want to ‘cash in’ – they could develop the land for housing as the current zoning allows 	<p>It is up to the owner of the site to determine how they wish to use the site, and to seek the relevant approvals. Council cannot force a land owner to develop or use their site for a particular purpose</p>	
	<p>Seniors Housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area lends itself to residential living for over 55's in low density villas and townhouses, which are needed in ageing community and will not impact on local residents • Ideal location as it is close to local shops and transport. • Better suited for retirement home and we support that. 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Development of housing for seniors is currently permitted on the site under the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004</i>.</p> <p>It is up to the owner of the site to determine how they wish to use the site, and to seek the relevant approvals. Council cannot force a land owner to develop or use their site for a particular purpose.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.</p>
	<p>Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sites would better serve the community as parkland, rather than benefit financial interests of a few • Turn space into beautiful parklands with more accessible playgrounds 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The site is within a 550m walk of the Turramurra Memorial Park which is a well-equipped district park providing a range of recreational facilities.</p> <p>Council collects development contributions from new medium and high density residential developments to fund the purchase of land for open space. Under the s7.11 Council is required to purchase land for new parks within close proximity to new development (nexus). As the closest high/medium density residential development are over 1km away, the site would not meet the nexus requirements.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.</p>
	<p>Smaller shops</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shame the site could not be kept to smaller scale small shops 	<p>The proposed amendments to the LEP do restrict the future development of smaller shops on the sites. The FSR control sets a maximum, not minimum of gross floor area permitted on the site.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP</p>
	<p>Apartments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Harris Farm will have the ability to build flats above the shop which is out of character for the area. They have a record of doing this at Lindfield – which was approved by Council. 	<p><i>‘Shop top housing’</i> which is defined as <i>‘one or more dwellings located above ground floor retail premises or business premises’</i> is a use permitted with consent within the B1 Neighbourhood Centre zone.</p> <p>However, any future development would also need to comply with the development standards applying to the site. The Planning Proposal is not seeking to change the existing</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Under local centre planning rules Harris Farm could put shop top housing, up to 5 storey apartments and a shop underneath – have a track record of doing this at Lindfield. • If the application is rejected then it is possible the site could become an apartment block which is not desirable • Harris Farm may vary the proposal after approval to add stories of residential units or more shops – who know what could eventuate 	<p>maximum height of buildings development standard of 9.5m – which is equivalent to 2 storeys – the same as the surrounding low density residential area.</p> <p>It is incorrect that 5 storey mixed use building comprising of Harris Farm on the ground floor, and apartments above could be constructed on the site as a result of the amendments sought by this Planning Proposal.</p> <p>Additionally, it should also be noted that Harris Farm is a tenant within the mixed use building at Lindfield. Harris Farm was not the developer.</p>	
<p>Purchase of Sites</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appalled that the property developer who owns Harris Farm was allowed to purchase sites even though Honeysuckle Nursery wanted to buy and was outbid 	<p>This is not a matter for consideration in the Planning Proposal. The sale of private property is not matter for Council.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP</p>
<p>Process</p>	<p>Aldi Proposal vs Harris Farm Proposal</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council denied Aldi in 2015, however it now appears Council is making every effort to support Harris Farm. • Concern whether Aldi was offered the opportunity to amend their application to make them more acceptable? • This proposal was rejected by Council in 2016 unanimously – What has changed? • Reasons that Council denied Aldi the right to move into Turramurra should be used with this application • Council rejected Aldi proposal – yet this proposal is cleverly dressed up in ‘smoke and mirrors’ proposed even high density • Subtle differences between Aldi and Harris Farm proposals – in all practicalities the two proposals are similar, the issues are the same, and the impacts on the local community are the same • After the 2016 Aldi debate and opposition – why is Harris Farm allowed to present its plan to Council? • Both Harris Farm and Aldi came to Council with the same rezoning proposal, and should be dealt with in the same manner 	<p>The subject sites were part of previous Planning Proposal in 2015-2016 which sought the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezone to B1 Neighbourhood Centre • Amend FSR to 0.75:1 • Amend Schedule 1 Additional Permitted Uses for a Aldi Store with GFA of 1955sqm <p>The current Planning Proposal seeks to make the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezone to B1 Neighbourhood centre • Retain existing FSR to 0.3:1 <p>The differences between the two applications are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FSR – the previous application could have resulted in a maximum 3,850sqm of gross floor area across the sites. The current proposal seeks a lower FSR, which will result in a maximum of 1,540sqm floor space. This is 60% less than the previous application sought. • Schedule 1 – Additional Permitted Use – the previous proposal sought to specify Aldi with a gross floor area of 1,955sqm as a use on the site. The current proposal remains flexible in terms of future uses on the site. <p>Council must assess each application on its individual planning merits.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP</p>

	<p>Local Plan Making Authority</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council resolution to be authorised as the local plan-making authority to exercise the functions under Section 3.36(2) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 for this Planning Proposal - affirms the need for local Councils to represent local residents and maintain security and amenity in its own Local Government area. This is what ratepayers/voters expect of Councillors and Council staff 	<p>Local plan making functions are now largely carried out by Councils. The Gateway Determination issued by the Department of Planning routinely authorises Council to act as the local plan-making authority. A council who is a local plan-making authority will exercise the plan making functions including the decision whether to make or not make a plan.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.</p>
	<p>Councillors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Controversial local issue. Council is divided with the Mayor having to use casting vote. Both local ward members are opposed. This is a situation where those who are unaffected will impose their will on those who are affected. No justice. • Cr Greenfield voted for rezoning and Mayor used casting vote. They should protect Kuring-gai not destroy the amenity the area. • Councillors seem to be going out of their way to help Harris Farm achieve the rezoning despite there being so much local opposition. • Assume that Councillors who voted to allow the rezoning do not intend to stand for re-election. • Disappointed that Council have failed on numerous occasions to support local constituents • Councillors should have consulted with residents to get a greater understanding • Councillors who voted to support the proposal don't live in the area and won't have to deal with the traffic problem. • Councillors who voted for rezoning/Harris Farm don't realise the full ramifications of their vote. • Role of Council and individual members of each ward to consider impact of local residents • Council process a concern 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Councillors need to make difficult decisions that do not always have unanimous support of the community. Councillors are obligated to comply with Councils Code of Conduct, which requires that decisions are made in an ethical and impartial manner. Each Councillor has individual discretion to determine matters on their merits.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General practice is to use a casting vote to maintain the status quo. If this is not the accepted practice of Ku-ring-gai is should be. • Councillors placing commercial interests at the expense of constituents • Concerned that something is amiss with how Council is making its decisions – intent to report suspicions of corruption to relevant minister • Request full disclosure of all conflicts of interest from councillors who voted for the proposal (and their families) 		
	<p>Local MP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with points in Alister Henskens email to community • Thank you to Local MP for alerting community • Why is the local MP opposing the rezoning? • Surprised at Alister sending out emails, texts and circulars opposing the development. He has every right to do this a member of the public but not as an elected member of parliament. • Who paid Alister’s campaign against the development? If this was done with public funds it should be referred to the Auditor General for investigation. • Not elected to promote or oppose individual businesses. • Why is Alister Henskens involved? He should stick to state matters and leave this to Council to decide 	Comments noted.	No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.
	<p>Community Engagement and Public Exhibition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much is made of the efforts by Harris Farm to communicate with those affected. As local residents we were hardly aware of their existence. • How many times do we have to object to these rezoning proposals? • This development has seemed lacking in the process of speaking with local residents – I didn’t hear anything about it. 	<p>The process and requirements for the public exhibition of the Planning Proposal are governed by statutory requirements set out in the <i>EP&A Act 1979</i>, and the Gateway Determination.</p> <p>This is the first time a Planning Proposal for this site has been formally publically exhibited. The Aldi Planning Proposal in 2015/2016 never proceeded to formal public exhibition.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal was publically exhibition from 5 March 2020 – 3 April 2020. The public exhibition was advertised in the North Shore Times 5 March 2020 edition, and letters were sent from Council to all residents within a 500m radius of the</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owner of 48 Tennyson Avenue has not been contacted by Council or proponents to seek input on this rezoning. • Residents have not been informed by Council of the problems that Harris Farm Lindfield has caused – it is essential that council inform residents of these problems and the steps taken to ensure they do not occur at Lindfield. • Submission and consultation process has been very concerning from the view point of transparency. • Suggestion for survey monkey survey to tally votes from registered members in the community as a more efficient way to gather number and information 	<p>site, plus additional letters were sent to ensure that all properties within Alice Street and Tennyson Avenue were notified.</p> <p>Council records indicate that a notification letter was sent to the resident and to the owner of 48 Tennyson Avenue.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal documents are available were made available on Council website, and hard copies available at Turrumurra and Gordon Libraries, and Customer Service. It is up to residents to review the documentation, and form an independent view/opinion on the proposal.</p> <p>The suggestion for survey monkey is noted. However, the outcome of the public exhibition and the recommendation made by Council officers is not based on a popularity vote for or against a proposal – but on the planning merits.</p>	
	<p>Covid19 – Delay Exhibition</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to disruption caused by Covid19 pandemic the project should be delayed to ensure residents can have their say • Decision should be delayed because of the limited review options due to Covid19 • If proposal proceeds there will always be feeling in the community that proper process as to community consultation did not take place • Suspect this will be pushed through when the populations priorities are elsewhere • Majority of surrounding community is senior, and at severe risk of pandemic infection. A delay in the process was requested, and rejected. This is a failure in the democratic process. 	<p>The Planning Proposal was on public exhibition from 5 March – 3 April 2020. The public exhibition material was available online, and in hard copies at Turrumurra and Gordon Libraries, and Customer Service. The public exhibition and the ability of the community to review the documents and provide feedback has not been affected:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • documents available online for the entirety of the exhibition • only two days (2 and 3 April) where access to hard copies was not possible due to closure of Customer Service and libraries. If people could not view the documents online, they were advised to contact Council to make other suitable arrangements to access the documents. <p>Additionally, nearly 1300 submissions have been received in response to the public exhibition. This amount of submissions is unprecedented for a Planning Proposal in Ku-ring-gai. It cannot be said that the community have not been able to provide feedback on the proposal.</p> <p>The Department of Planning has identified planning as an essential function during the Covid-19 pandemic, and has made changes to the planning legislation to ensure planning functions will still be carried out – such as removing the requirements for hard copy exhibition documents and advertising in local papers. It is essential and expected that Councils will continue both DA assessment and strategic planning to ensure the economy is supported.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.</p>

	<p>Planning Proposal - Documents</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposal is written from view point of developer and presents biased set of studies to justify private interests • Documents produced by development – not independent and cannot be relied upon. • Executive summary of Planning Proposal is full of subjective statements none of which can be quantified, vague statements, exaggeration. The fact that this can be put forward to justify the project does more harm than good. • No decision can be made – the reports to date are not comprehensive in their lack of consultation and rigour <p>Traffic Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second opinion on traffic report required. • Request a neutral traffic report by a third part to balance the documentation • Traffic Report and Planning Report have not sought input from owner of swim school, who will be impacted. <p>Community Consultation Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Report is two years old and out of date • Community consultation report by Straight Talk on behalf of Harris Farm cannot be taken as support for the rezoning. Flawed – it gives no indication as to where people who commented live in relation to the site. Questions asked on open days were not open ended, constrained comment and didn't allow frank and open discussion of alternative land uses. <p>Economic Impact Statement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Figures can be interpreted in many ways, and made to give any result required. E.g. if average spend in \$50, then needs to be approx. 878 customers per day to match projected sales – not the additional 30 projected vehicle movements 	<p>This is a privately initiated Planning Proposal, and accordingly the applicant prepares and pays for the documentation to justify and support the proposal. In Council's role as the Relevant Planning Authority (RPA) it needs to ensure that the level of detail in the planning proposal is sufficient to respond the statutory requirements of the Act and the requirements set out the Department of Planning <i>A Guide to Preparing Planning Proposals</i>. The Council resolution of 26 March 2019 require amendments to be made to the Planning Proposal and supporting document prior to it being submitted to the Department of Planning for a Gateway Determination.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal and supporting documents such as the Traffic Report, have been assessed and reviewed by Council Officers. Where Council Officers do not have the appropriate knowledge, the reports, such as the Economic Impact Statement have been peer reviewed externally by consultants on behalf of Council.</p> <p>The comments regarding the Community Consultation Report are noted. Council has undertaken its own public exhibition of the Planning Proposal from March – April 2020 as required under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> and the Gateway Determination.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.</p>
--	---	---	--

	<p>Access Information</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community struggles to access information on how traffic will be managed and impact on nearby businesses on Eastern Road. More information should be provided transparently via the North Shore Times – not buried on Councils website. 	<p>Council only advertises the public exhibition within the North Shore Times. The detailed Planning Proposal documentation is made available on Council website and hard copies in Council libraries.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.</p>
	<p>Suggested Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggest process with business consultant/service designer to define core strength of area with design research workshops, define strategy, milestones, solutions, and validation through public forum Appropriate to widen the terms of reference and scope of study to encompass the locality – including Turramurra, Warrawee, and Wahroonga. Whole of entity planning and resourcing. Rezoning a small site simplifies what is not a simple assessment and needs to plan for long term. Council should be managing development by inviting compatible participation rather than reactively allowing ongoing procession of developments – absence of strong town planning leading to fragmentation of city 	<p>The process for the preparation, assessment and finalisation of Planning Proposals is governed by Division 3.4 of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>. The <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> permits Planning Proposals to be lodged by landowners or developers seeking to change the planning controls relating to a particular site.</p> <p>As part of the justification and assessment of the Planning Proposal, consideration is given to the broader strategic merit and individual site specific merits of the proposed amendments. Consideration of the broad strategic merits includes assessment of the proposal against Councils Local Strategic Planning Statement, Community Strategic Plan, as well as the North District Plan, and Greater Sydney Region Plan. These documents consider the long term planning for the whole of Ku-ring-gai, the north district and Sydney.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.</p>
	<p>Council support - Financial</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council only supports the development due to money (\$) Are there financial gains for Council to allow this to occur? 	<p>There are no financial benefits to Council in supporting the Planning Proposal.</p> <p>Being a privately initiated Planning Proposal, it was subject to an assessment fee, as per Council's Schedule of Fees and Charges.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.</p>
	<p>Planning Proposal Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appalled it has progressed to this level Council should withdraw support Council have been underhand in all negotiations Proposal is being rushed through Council Surprised why this has been proposed by Council? 	<p>This is a privately initiated Planning Proposal that has been submitted to Council. The <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> permits Planning Proposals to be lodged by landowners or developers seeking to change the planning controls relating to a particular site.</p> <p>It is Council's responsibility as the Planning Proposal Authority (PPA) and local-plan making authority to review, assess and make a final determination on whether the Planning Proposal should proceed.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Who or why such a zoning change is being proposed. • Surprised Council is even considering this proposal? • Process of rezoning for development reeks of an agenda of those pushing for the rezoning. • Assume another open meeting will be held to finally decide on proposal • Council resolution of 26 March 2019 where Council endorsed the Planning Proposal was only three days after NSW State Election when attention of many people was elsewhere. Council Paper and Minute do not reveal that it concerned a large retail development. • Spot rezoning for commercial benefit should be denounced by all Council members. Spot rezoning corrupts the LEP and leads to corruption 	<p>The process for the preparation, assessment and finalisation of Planning Proposals is governed by Division 3.4 of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>.</p> <p>Following the close public exhibition of the Planning Proposal, a report will be prepared to Council for the consideration of submissions, and to make a final decision about whether the Planning Proposal should proceed or not. Everyone who made a submission will be notified when this occurs.</p> <p>Regarding the Council resolution of 26 March 2019, this resolution was to submit the Planning Proposal to the Department of Planning for a Gateway Determination. The Council Agenda of 26 March 2019 contains report GB.7 which sets out a detailed assessment of the Planning Proposal and advice from the Ku-ring-gai Local Planning Panel.</p>	
<p>Development</p>	<p>Development of apartments in area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ruined area with allowing apartments to be built • Significant increase in apartments in area • Does Ku-ring-gai support continued apartment development in Turramurra, Wahroonga, Warrawee? • Not happy with the continued approval of applications to construct high rise apartments in Ku-ring-gai • Shocked by development allowed and reduction of quality in living in Turramurra, Wahroonga and St Ives. • Enough havoc is being wrought on district with multiple high rises. • Recent development in Turramurra and Wahroonga have failed to properly take into account the views of local residents and have not provided appropriate infrastructure – affecting the character and quality of life for residents. • Council has already destroyed the area by allowing so much apartment development • Null Nulla Street Turramurra rezoned and built out with townhouses and units. Hopeless 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Like all parts of Sydney, the growth of Ku-ring-gai is inevitable. Ku-ring-gai has good road and rail links, and proximity to the CBD. Through Council's Local Strategic Planning Statement, and associated strategies, such as the Housing Strategy, Council can deliver the required housing in a considered manner that conserves the area's valued assets such as heritage, local character and bushland.</p>	<p>No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.</p>

	managed by KMC. Endure years of construction. More to come.		
Blank Submissions	<p>Note – a number of blank submissions have been received with no comments either in support or opposition of Planning Proposal.</p> <p><i>Dear Council and Councillors,</i></p> <p><i>I am emailing to provide my feedback in relation to the above proposal:</i></p> <p><i>My feedback is as follows...</i></p> <p><i><Name></i></p>	Noted.	No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.
Auto Generated Email – Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email generated by clicking supposed support for rezoning of sites • Fraudulent process – Harris Farm Development is not the subject of the consultation S12120 • Misleading and dishonest on part of Harris Farm • Council is complicit if any emails generated this way are taken into account in the consultation process • Open to misleading data as out of area people can comment and fraudulent comments could be generated. • Pre-canned emails from the proponent 	<p>The emails generated from Harris Farm website (http://www.thefarmturramurra.com.au/about-us/) contained the following generic text:</p> <p><i>Dear Council and Councillors,</i></p> <p><i>I am emailing to provide my feedback in relation to the above proposal:</i></p> <p><i>My feedback is as follows...</i></p> <p><i><Name></i></p> <p>It was up to the individual respondent to include their own comments and feedback – which could have been either in support or opposition to the Planning Proposal.</p> <p>A number of submissions generated this way were blank – and have been noted above.</p> <p>The public exhibition of the Planning Proposal and draft site-specific DCP is not restricted to local residents of Turramurra, or Ku-ring-gai.</p>	No amendment to Planning Proposal or site-specific DCP.