

# **APPENDIX 10**

## **SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)**

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
Philippa Clark	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the proposed NCP</li> <li>▪ Represents a free kick for greedy developers and not much else</li> <li>▪ The plan is a high rise rezoning spree and results in the loss of environmental and foreshore protection controls</li> <li>▪ The vast majority opposed to the plan are not opposed to redevelopment.</li> <li>▪ Public infrastructure needs to be in place to deal with the 30% rise in the population.</li> <li>▪ Plan will put increased strain on current infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Roads will become more congested with more pollution, more wasted time and less parking</li> <li>▪ Ageing sewerage system, inadequate and infrequent train services</li> <li>▪ Current infrastructure capacity is not adequate to deal with another 17,000 people</li> <li>▪ Lack of preparation of a number of studies - No Social Impact Study, Traffic Impact Study, Wind Impact Study, Solar Access Study, Parking Study, Environmental Study Biodiversity Study</li> <li>▪ Proposed development will put increased strain on schools, hospitals and public transport</li> <li>▪ Trains and train services are inadequate to deal with increased population</li> <li>▪ Ageing sewerage system will see raw sewerage flowing into the Georges River</li> <li>▪ Kogarah Council has failed to meet the legislative requirements and obligations under the LGA – the plan should be withdrawn and taken back to the drawing board for consultation with the community along with experts in best practice town planning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inadequate infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Lack of supporting studies</li> <li>▪ Inadequate public transport</li> <li>▪ Due process and legislative requirements</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
Chris Minns MP Member for Kogarah	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the proposed NCP</li> <li>▪ Major concerns with the plan</li> <li>▪ The distribution of height and density as proposed by the plan is not appropriate</li> <li>▪ Kogarah Town Centre – accepted that policy pressures from both parties within the State Government to increase densities in and around the Kogarah Town Centre but there are issues with infrastructure and public transport.</li> <li>▪ 45% of rail services to Kogarah have been cut.</li> <li>▪ 1 million visitors to the hospital – Kogarah is at capacity in terms of parking and traffic. It is difficult to find parking now – the situation will worsen</li> <li>▪ Princes Highway Corridor – massive increases in density, some of which are 2km away from the nearest railway station</li> <li>▪ These increases which will allow buildings between 5-7 storeys are just too high and are not located within a public transport corridor</li> <li>▪ Impact of this is more cars and greater congestion issues</li> <li>▪ Issue of 7 storey development backing directly onto single dwelling houses, overlooking backyards and having an adverse impact on the privacy of dwellings.</li> <li>▪ Council should reconsider the plan</li> <li>▪ Message is clear - Stop the plan, go back to the drawing board and start again</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inadequate public transport</li> <li>▪ Proposed changes along Princes Highway corridor - object</li> <li>▪ Increased traffic and congestion</li> <li>▪ Adverse amenity impacts</li> </ul>
Ross Barone	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the proposed NCP</li> <li>▪ Number of submissions indicate a lack of support for the plan by the community</li> <li>▪ Some sites are being given favourable planning outcomes, while others are not</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Due process and Legislative requirements</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Why has the area around Oatley Station only been given a height increase of 12m and the Princes Highway is proposed to have 21m high buildings?</li> <li>▪ The process is being rushed through</li> <li>▪ Residents requested a copy of all of the submissions and to date we have not been given a copy of the submissions</li> <li>▪ Councillors are elected to serve the people – they should listen to the residents and not Council officers’ bias.</li> </ul>	
Michael Vine	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supports the NCP</li> <li>▪ Planning consultant acting on behalf of the owner of No 5 Denman Street, Hurstville.</li> <li>▪ Supports that No 5 Denman Street be retained in Schedule 1 as recommended in the Council report.</li> </ul>	
Brett Daintry Daintry Associates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Reiterated the concerns raised in written submission on behalf of UKCRA objecting to the NCP</li> <li>▪ The focus on increased densities should be accessible to the railway station and jobs - Transit Oriented Development (TOD), close to the Railway line.</li> <li>▪ State Government has identified that increased residential density should be within walking distance to railway stations</li> <li>▪ The NCP has generated an unhealthy amount of developer speculating and purchasing of properties based on the uplift proposed</li> <li>▪ Some areas along the Princes Highway which are proposed for uplift are at least 2km away from a railway station – inconsistent with the principles of TOD.</li> <li>▪ Inadequate infrastructure – serious concerns as to whether existing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Transit Orientated Development</li> <li>▪ Developer speculation</li> <li>▪ Inadequate infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Jobs and journey to work(JTW)</li> <li>▪ Loss of public open space</li> <li>▪ Rezoning of E4 – Environmental Living zone</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<p>infrastructure will be able to cope with the increases in population.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Jobs and Journey to Work (JTW) – weight should be placed on encouraging development close to job opportunities to reduce JTW – not appropriate to be pushing development and increased densities into the suburbs</li> <li>▪ Corridors may need some uplift but not the extent proposed.</li> <li>▪ Reclassification of public land and the loss of public open space.</li> <li>▪ Rezoning of environmentally sensitive land particularly on the foreshore is not supported</li> </ul>	
<p>Heidi Breeze – representing Parents and Citizens, Carlton South Public School</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the proposed uplift along the Princes Highway</li> <li>▪ NCP is not at all neighbourly and Council has not considered how redevelopment in this area would impact on our school</li> <li>▪ The Carlton/Princes Highway Precinct is within the school catchment and the school is already at capacity – how will the existing school cope with significant increases in population.</li> <li>▪ School has already experienced an increase in student numbers through natural growth</li> <li>▪ School is already at capacity – school is limited in terms of space, including playgrounds</li> <li>▪ Neighbouring schools are also already at capacity and are the two largest schools in the state (Hurstville Public School)</li> <li>▪ Concerns relating to road and traffic safety around the school – has been raised with Council on numerous occasions - Ecole Lane, Ecole Street,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposed changes along the Princes Highway corridor - object</li> <li>▪ Inadequate infrastructure – educational establishments</li> <li>▪ Traffic safety and parking</li> <li>▪ Increased traffic and congestion</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<p>Wheeler Street and Jubilee Avenue – no action has been taken by Council to date.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The NCP will further compromise these issues and worsen the situation.</li> </ul>	
Poppy Kostanpakis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the proposed rezoning of The Esplanade and The Mall, South Hurstville.</li> <li>▪ 90% of residents in The Esplanade and The Mall oppose the proposed rezoning</li> <li>▪ Never would we have thought our quiet residential street would be rezoned to allow flats</li> <li>▪ Residents of The Mall and The Esplanade are determined to protect our street and our community.</li> <li>▪ We have no objection to villas and duplexes but do not accept the scale of development proposed in The Esplanade</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposed changes in The Mall and The Esplanade, South Hurstville – object</li> <li>▪ Out of character with existing neighbourhood</li> </ul>
Theresa Kot	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP</li> <li>▪ Traffic congestion and car parking is already a problem in Kogarah</li> <li>▪ Inadequate visitor spots in new developments is further exacerbating the situation</li> <li>▪ Missing and deficient studies that should be incorporated into the NCP – Traffic Management Access Plan for Disaster Planning, traffic and parking study, transport network study, traffic impact study, social impact study, economic impact study, development standard assessment, biodiversity study.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increased traffic and congestion</li> <li>▪ Inadequate car parking</li> <li>▪ Lack of supporting studies</li> </ul>
Malcolm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposed changes along the</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
Lindley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Experience as a Local Government Engineer and Town Planner</li> <li>▪ NCP has a disregard for town planning principles</li> <li>▪ Avoid ribbon development along main roads – this plan goes against this principle</li> <li>▪ Putting high rise along Princes Highway limits future capacity of the road way - how do you widen the road in the future if required if there are units along the corridor</li> <li>▪ Blakehurst shops – Shops should be revitalised but consideration should be given to creating rear lane access behind the shops (from Stuart Street to Water Street)</li> <li>▪ Areas adjacent to the railway should accommodate higher densities and make provision for adequate parking</li> <li>▪ Requirements for on-site parking for apartments should be based on a per bedroom basis and not per unit.</li> </ul>	<p>Princes Highway corridor – object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inadequate car-parking</li> <li>▪ Specific development controls – rear lane access</li> </ul>
Erwin Heinrich	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Issues relating to parking and traffic congestion in Kogarah</li> <li>▪ Current developments have increased pressure for parking in the Kogarah Town Centre and added to traffic congestion. These include the hospitals, St George Bank, the expansion of the public hospital and the redevelopment of St Patrick’s Green</li> <li>▪ Sheer scope and size of the NCP will have an adverse impact on the area</li> <li>▪ NCP does not promote Environmentally Sustainable Development</li> <li>▪ Requests a public meeting is held with State Members to make representations to Minister</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increased traffic and congestion</li> <li>▪ Inadequate car parking</li> <li>▪ Environmentally Sustainable Development</li> </ul>
Bob Cantley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP and is specifically concerned with the B6 and B2 zones</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposed changes along the</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<p>along the Princes Highway</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ There have been insufficient studies prepared to inform the NCP</li> <li>▪ Traffic Report is inadequate and does not indicate what the impact of the proposed development will have on the road network</li> <li>▪ 85% of people have requested that Council reconsider the proposal</li> <li>▪ Councillors should be listening to the people</li> </ul>	<p>Princes Highway corridor – object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Lack of supporting studies</li> <li>▪ Increased traffic and congestion</li> </ul>
Stephen Bible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP and specifically the proposed changes to the South Hurstville Precinct</li> <li>▪ Specifically the heights proposed along King Georges Road (21m) and the proposed changes to The Mall and The Esplanade</li> <li>▪ Already congestion on the access roads linking the area to King Georges Road (Terry Street and Connells Point)</li> <li>▪ In peak periods there are already issues with the intersections from Terry Street and Connells Point Road, accessing King Georges Road</li> <li>▪ Increases in development would only increase traffic congestion and put more pressure on the intersections</li> <li>▪ Requests that existing heights and density be retained in South Hurstville</li> <li>▪ Bus services to Hurstville – as a result of increased population it is anticipated that the bus services will increase. Consideration needs to be given to the bus interchange and traffic in Ormonde Parade</li> <li>▪ Developments in and around Ormonde Parade should be made to contribute to the upgrade of the bus interchange</li> <li>▪ Height of buildings in R2 zone – proposed changes from 8.5m to 9m are not considered a minor amendment as the change will impact on all residential properties. Retain 8.5m height</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposed changes to South Hurstville Precinct – object</li> <li>▪ Increased traffic and congestion</li> <li>▪ Inadequate public transport</li> <li>▪ Inadequate infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Height of Buildings in R2 zone</li> </ul>



## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
Steve Kamper MP Member for Rockdale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Speaking on behalf of his constituents in his Electorate, and specifically the proposed rezoning and changes to the area around Beverley Park and Carlton, along the Princes Highway</li> <li>▪ Does not object to development and increased densities in middle ring suburbs and does not believe that the NCP is a negative because it will allow more people to move into our community</li> <li>▪ NCP does not promote the principles of good planning and the proposed changes to the Princes highway reflect this</li> <li>▪ 7 storey towers along the Princes Highway is out of character in Beverley Park and is not good planning</li> <li>▪ It is inappropriate for residents who have invested in a lifestyle and character and established their lives with the expectation that their homes would not be overshadowed by development</li> <li>▪ Lack of amenities in this Precinct – the area is a significant distance from rail corridors and railway stations (1.5km)</li> <li>▪ The rail corridors should be the focus of growth</li> <li>▪ Not is keeping with the character of Beverley Park which is one and two storey dwellings</li> <li>▪ Isolated rezoning – significant distance from other areas. Future provision of increases services and transport are unlikely to meet future demand because the area is isolated</li> <li>▪ Development will have a gun barrel effect - the Princes Highway will be overshadowed and detract from amenity of the area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposed changes along the Princes Highway corridor – object</li> <li>▪ Out of character with existing neighbourhood</li> <li>▪ Adverse amenity impacts</li> <li>▪ Increased traffic and congestion</li> </ul>
Steve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP and specifically the rezoning of The Esplanade, South</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposed changes in The Mall</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
Varoutsos	<p>Hurstville.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Speaking on behalf of his family and a number of other residents in the street</li> <li>▪ The proposed 4 storey unit blocks cannot co-exist with the existing low density residential development and character</li> <li>▪ Will result in residents having to move out of the area to facilitate redevelopment</li> <li>▪ Recommendation in the Council report is inconsistent with the body of the report relating to the Precinct -“Overall potential yield and pursuit of this rezoning is not critical”.</li> <li>▪ The majority of residents in the Precinct objected to the proposed changes - 40 objection letters (13% of the total objections to the NCP).</li> <li>▪ Mark Coure made a submission on the residents behalf however this is not included in the report</li> </ul>	<p>and The Esplanade, South Hurstville – object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Out of character with existing neighbourhood</li> </ul>
Kevin Hackett	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP and the proposed changes to The Esplanade</li> <li>▪ Council report is inconsistent – area is not suitable but recommendation is to proceed with the changes</li> <li>▪ If the proposed changes were to go ahead the area would end up looking like the Dominelli Site in Hurstville</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposed changes in The Mall and The Esplanade, South Hurstville – object</li> <li>▪ Out of character with existing neighbourhood</li> </ul>
Peter Atanasov	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Public forum has been imposed on the residents by Council.</li> <li>▪ The community asked for a Public Hearing – (1874 submissions asked for a Public Hearing), not a Public Forum</li> <li>▪ Not in the Public Interest</li> <li>▪ 5 to 1 submissions against the NCP but the Council report says proceed with no changes to the NCP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Due process and Legislative requirements</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Public Forum is “smoke and mirrors” – not in the community’s interest</li> </ul>	
Anthony Soubris	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Represents the UKCRA</li> <li>▪ Whilst the group appreciates there is a need for development the group feels that there are inappropriate density and heights proposed by the NCP</li> <li>▪ Council should have consulted with the community prior to preparing the NCP</li> <li>▪ Gateway requirements – these are the minimum requirements and Council should have considered all the best planning principles</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Inappropriate heights and densities – general</li> <li>▪ Due process and legislative requirements</li> </ul>
John Totterdell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP and specifically the proposed changes along the Princes Highway, between Stubbs Street, to Wyuna and John Streets including the 21m height</li> <li>▪ Objects to Council’s recommendation to impose 21m height limit over the whole block. 9m height limit fronting John and Wyuna Street should be reinstated</li> <li>▪ Increased heights will result in adverse amenity impacts from overlooking and overshadowing</li> <li>▪ Inadequate to have controls in the Development Control Plan (DCP) – they should be in the LEP</li> <li>▪ Traffic access through the local streets (John and Wyuna Streets) should be restricted</li> <li>▪ Buildings in this precinct should be limited to 12m</li> <li>▪ Traffic congestion along the Princes Highway will be further worsened by increased development</li> <li>▪ Limited bus services along the Highway will add to the increase in traffic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposed changes to the zoning, height and FSR for the Princes Highway, between Stubbs Street and Park Road – object</li> <li>▪ DCP controls vs LEP standards</li> <li>▪ Traffic and congestion</li> <li>▪ Inadequate public transport</li> <li>▪ Request for a Public Hearing</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<p>congestion – increasing bus services will result in increased congestion issues at the Bus Interchanges at Kogarah and Hurstville Station</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Request for a further public hearing to be held prior to the NCP being finalised</li> </ul>	
David Waghorn	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supporting the proposed changes along the Princes Highway, and specifically in Wyuna and John Street</li> <li>▪ Speaking on behalf of 25 of the 28 properties within this block.</li> <li>▪ Request that Council consider an increase in density from 2:1 to 2.5:1</li> <li>▪ Agrees with Council’s staff recommendations with respect to the height proposed for the Precinct</li> <li>▪ Argument for the increase in FSR is to maintain a level of consistency with proposed scale of development on western side of Princes Highway</li> <li>▪ The western side directly adjoins low density development, whereas the eastern side has a separation of 20m (separated by street)</li> <li>▪ Does not believe increase in FSR will have adverse impact on traffic system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposed changes to the zoning, height and FSR for the Princes Highway, between Stubbs Street and Park Road – support</li> <li>▪ Request for increase in FSR</li> </ul>
Peter Wassenaar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supporting the proposed changes along the Princes Highway, and specifically in Wyuna and John Streets</li> <li>▪ Supports everything the previous speaker stated</li> <li>▪ Increase in FSR to 2.5:1 will result in a better design outcome</li> <li>▪ Amenity issues can be managed by implementing appropriate development controls and Council seeking excellence in design of new buildings</li> <li>▪ Amalgamation and larger sites will result in better design outcomes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposed changes to the zoning, height and FSR for the Princes Highway, between Stubbs Street and Park Road – support</li> <li>▪ Request for increase in FSR</li> </ul>
Suzanne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Residents love the existing character of Kogarah – they don’t want it to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Retain existing character of</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
O'Connor	<p>become like Hurstville or Rockdale</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ If the NCP goes ahead it will ruin lives</li> <li>▪ People are leaving Kogarah because they are terrified of living next to high rise - “the monstrosities”</li> <li>▪ Councillors have an obligation to make decisions on behalf of the residents who elect them</li> <li>▪ Overdevelopment is ruining our suburbs and many of the current Councillors were elected on a “no overdevelopment” platform</li> </ul>	<p>Kogarah</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Councillors role is to represent the community</li> <li>▪ NCP represents an overdevelopment of Kogarah</li> </ul>
Dr Terrence O'Connor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Opposed to the high rise component of NCP</li> <li>▪ Residents are opposed to the monstrosities - the residents don't want Hurstville or Wolli Creek in Kogarah</li> <li>▪ Foreign and local investors – development sold off the plan mainly to China</li> <li>▪ Economic benefits for the State Government (stamp duty), Council (developer contributions and rates) and developers who are the “profiteers”</li> <li>▪ Residents are being forced out of the area because they don't want to be left behind</li> <li>▪ Council blames the State Government for having to increase densities – let the State Government step in and initiate the changes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Opposed to high rise component of the NCP</li> <li>▪ Foreign investors vs local residents</li> <li>▪ State Government should take the lead, not Council</li> </ul>
John Fildissis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Public Forum is not what the residents requested – we asked for a Public Hearing, with an independent arbiter, where residents could ask questions and get answers</li> <li>▪ Opposed to the removal of the E4 – Environmental Living zone (FSPA and WSPA)</li> <li>▪ Justification for the removal by Council is to allow people to age in place and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Requested a Public Hearing not a Public Forum</li> <li>▪ Removal of the E4 – Environmental zone</li> <li>▪ Daintry submission</li> <li>▪ 52 Waratah Street – zoning of</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<p>provide opportunities for young people to live in the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The NCP ignores the Daintry submitted on behalf of UKCRA</li> <li>▪ Kyle Bay Resident’s Association is concerned with the proposed zoning of a portion of 52 Waratah Street – why has Council proposed to zone a portion of the site as R2. The whole site should be zoned E2 – Environmental Conservation</li> <li>▪ Concern has been raised by residents as to what’s driving the changes proposed by the NCP</li> </ul>	<p>the property</p>
Glynn Pulling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Kogarah - the Garden Suburb</li> <li>▪ Statistics – s94 plans, CSP, Housing Strategy 2031, Transport and Population Data Centre, Housing Strategy Background Paper and ABS</li> <li>▪ Anticipated population growth – quote from Housing Strategy Background Paper</li> <li>▪ A Plan for Growing Sydney – 880 persons per year</li> <li>▪ State Government 17,300 persons – 880 persons per year and 7,350 additional dwellings</li> <li>▪ Statistics indicate that future natural population growth and ratio of persons per dwelling will decrease over time in the Kogarah LGA</li> <li>▪ Council sought the residents to support Council in opposing the proposed amalgamations. It is now Council’s turn to respond positively to the community - Council needs to halt the unnecessary and inappropriate NCP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Role of Councillors</li> <li>▪ Validity of statistics</li> </ul>
Emmanuel Comino	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supports the proposed changes for Nos 424 - 436 Princes Highway Blakehurst</li> <li>▪ The proposed rezoning of the Blakehurst waterfront provides housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Supports the changes to the Princes Highway – Waterfront</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<p>diversity for an ageing population</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Redevelopment for apartment style developments will allow older residents to stay in their community, close to family</li> <li>▪ Support the provision of public access to the waterfront and encouraging restaurants and café uses in the Precinct</li> <li>▪ Rezoning should be supported</li> </ul>	
Neil Scholsz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP and specifically the proposed changes to the South Hurstville Precinct</li> <li>▪ The proposed height of 21m is totally out of character with the village suburb</li> <li>▪ Inadequate public transport to support the increases in development</li> <li>▪ Development in South Hurstville should be restricted to 4/5 storeys, consistent with the existing height of buildings along King Georges Road.</li> <li>▪ The Esplanade and The Mall – should be retained for single dwellings</li> <li>▪ Former South Hurstville Bowling Club – site is not suitable for a school as it is surrounded by 4 roads, 36 houses and there is no on-site parking or drop off/pick up zones and vehicular access to the site is also constrained</li> <li>▪ Traffic issues – Connells Point Road and the intersection at King Georges Road are already congested at peak periods. Any further development in the area will only worsen the situation, particularly during school pick up and drop off</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to proposed changes in the South Hurstville Precinct</li> <li>▪ The Esplanade and The Mall</li> <li>▪ Rezoning of the South Hurstville Bowling Club</li> <li>▪ Connells Point Road - traffic</li> </ul>
Gary Ogden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP and specifically the proposed changes along the Princes Highway, adjacent to O'Meara &amp; Wheeler Street, Carlton</li> <li>▪ Safety – narrow streets running off the Princes Highway are not suitable to handle the additional traffic generated by the proposed development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Princes Highway, between O'Meara and Wheeler Street – objects</li> <li>▪ Traffic and safety issues</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ On street parking has further exacerbated the problem</li> <li>▪ The NCP does not address how the issues relating to traffic and safety will be addressed</li> <li>▪ Safety of children and traffic movements in and around Carlton South Public School is another issue</li> <li>▪ There is already limited on street parking in the area and particularly at school peak periods and additional development will further worsen the problem. Limited off street parking for existing dwellings</li> <li>▪ Report on NCP contains false and misleading information – report states a petition of support was submitted by owners who are objecting to the proposed NCP and 29 O’Meara Street has been identified as supporting the changes, which is incorrect</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Limited parking in the area</li> <li>▪ Report to Council – false and misleading information</li> </ul>
Paul Hoffmans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Resident of Beverley Park</li> <li>▪ Dual occupancy development – objects to the proposed changes to the requirements for dual occupancy development and specifically the 18m minimum frontage requirement. Any reduction of the 18m frontage will make duplex development unachievable and will detract from the existing character and streetscape of suburbs</li> <li>▪ Request to retain the minimum 18m frontage</li> <li>▪ Detached dual occupancy development – requests the incorporation of a requirement to have a 10m separation from the rear of proposed building to adjoining property boundaries</li> <li>▪ Controls should also ensure that dual occupancy development appears as a single dwelling</li> <li>▪ Height of dwellings – controls should be included to limit the height to no</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Concerns with respect to dual occupancy development</li> </ul>



## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<p>more than 2 levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The excavation of sites has resulted in 3 storey dwelling which are out of character and streetscape</li> <li>▪ Rocky Point Road –request that controls be included to ensure adequate residential off street parking is provided for new development and that it is not used for storage</li> <li>▪ Controls should also be included to prohibit residents living in apartment developments from using side streets for parking</li> <li>▪ The DCP should be prepared and exhibited with the NCP so that the community is able to provide comment on the detailed controls</li> </ul>	
Peter Chapman	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP</li> <li>▪ s451 of the Local Government Act relates to the disclosures of pecuniary interest for Councillors</li> <li>▪ The Minister for Local Government is currently proposing changes to the legislation</li> <li>▪ Given the proposed changes it is recommended that the Councillors wait until after the legislative changes come into force before voting on the finalisation of the plan</li> </ul> <p>Mayor read a statement – Council will not be making a decision on the draft until advice is received from the Department of Local Government regarding this issue.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pecuniary interests of Councillors</li> </ul>
Peter Martyn –	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Representing Kogarah Bay Progress Association and myself</li> <li>▪ Rocky Point Road Centre – proposed 4/5 storeys development would back</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the proposed changes – Sans Souci,</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
representing Kogarah Bay Progress Association	<p>onto 1-2 storey dwellings houses without appropriate setbacks and increase parking congestion in the area</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Sans Souci Centre – the proposed changes would be 3 times the size of the Jameson (SupaBarn Development on the Rockdale side of Rocky Point Road)</li> <li>▪ Traffic has intensified in this Precinct as a result of the development of the Jameson</li> <li>▪ Broughton Street – narrow street which currently has traffic and parking issues due to the location of the school (St Finbars)</li> <li>▪ Ramsgate Centre – dramatic increase in the population proposed with 6/7 storeys proposed under the NCP</li> <li>▪ Loss of 70 car parking spaces through the redevelopment of sites</li> <li>▪ Open space, childrens play areas and playing fields – the NCP does not address the provision of these spaces</li> </ul>	<p>Ramsgate</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Increased traffic – Broughton Street</li> <li>▪ Loss of public carparking</li> <li>▪ No provision for additional open space</li> </ul>
Dorothy Pawlukowski	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP</li> <li>▪ Questions the purpose of the Public Forum – will verbal issues be considered as submissions to the NCP and how does Council intend to address the oral submissions made tonight</li> <li>▪ Timeframe – Council officers have had 4 weeks to prepare the report on the review of submissions while the residents were only given 10 days to review the report – huge disparity</li> <li>▪ Building standards and certification – how does Council propose to address this issue and safeguarding residents of new developments against defective building practices</li> <li>▪ NSW has the worst record for building defects in new buildings – in the last 15 years 85% of all new strata buildings are defective upon completion</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Purpose of the Public Forum</li> <li>▪ Building standards and certification of new buildings</li> <li>▪ Staffing – Assessment officers</li> <li>▪ Impact on rates</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Staffing – If the NCP is adopted how will Council fund the additional staff that will be required to assess the increased number of DAs</li> <li>▪ Rates – How will the NCP impact on rates</li> </ul>	
David Penglase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP and specifically how it applies to the proposed changes in the Esplanade, South Hurstville</li> <li>▪ Recently moved into the area and had no knowledge of the proposed changes</li> <li>▪ The residents living in The Esplanade are happy with their area, their community and the current character of the area and are not supporting the proposed changes</li> <li>▪ The area already meets the needs of the community – the residents of The Esplanade are happy with the nature of development currently allowed</li> <li>▪ We are people who have formed community and we do not want these changes</li> <li>▪ Any changes will result in increased traffic congestion, reduction in on-street parking and negative amenity impacts.</li> <li>▪ Concerning that the Council officer’s report is still recommending to proceed with the changes to the zoning and the height when all of the residents have objected</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP – South Hurstville</li> <li>▪ Proposed changes will have an adverse impact on community and streetscape</li> <li>▪ Increased traffic and congestion</li> </ul>
Eric Solo	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP, and specifically how it relates to the Blakehurst waterfront</li> <li>▪ Concerning that developers are approaching residents to purchase their properties prior to the NCP being adopted</li> <li>▪ Traffic volumes during peak periods along the Princes Highway and the loop road will worsen</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP – Blakehurst Waterfront</li> <li>▪ Increased traffic</li> <li>▪ Contrary to Department of Planning Guidelines</li> <li>▪ Increased pollution, noise and</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Existing residents already have issues getting in and out of their properties during peak periods</li> <li>▪ The proposed increases ignore Department of Planning Guidelines which discourage increased densities on main roads due to increased pollution, noise and safety issues</li> <li>▪ The proposed changes do not take into account the safety and health risks associated with living on main roads</li> <li>▪ Adverse impacts of proposed developments - loss of views, impact on privacy and overshadowing and a decrease in property values</li> <li>▪ Justification is that the proposal will provide accommodation for an ageing population – older people will not be able to afford these units which will be in excess of \$1.5-\$2m</li> <li>▪ How will people cross the Highway – there is no pedestrian access to get across the Highway</li> <li>▪ Dual occupancy development is acceptable, but high rise is not!</li> <li>▪ The areas around the foreshore should be protected</li> <li>▪ Blakehurst should not be allowed to be redeveloped to become a concrete jungle like Hurstville.</li> </ul>	<p>impact on safety</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Pedestrian access across the Princes Highway</li> <li>▪ Loss of views</li> <li>▪ Foreshore areas should be protected</li> </ul>
Sylvia Woolley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP and specifically the proposed changes in the Carlton Precinct</li> <li>▪ Wheeler Street – congested particularly during school drop off/pick up</li> <li>▪ Safety issues around traffic movements in the street</li> <li>▪ On site car parking – new developments are being constructed with inadequate on-site parking which results in cars being parked on the street. Additional on-site parking should be provided in new developments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP – Carlton Precinct</li> <li>▪ Issues relating to Carlton South PS</li> <li>▪ Increased traffic and parking</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
Charles Walsh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP and specifically proposed changes to The Esplanade, South Hurstville</li> <li>▪ Congestion along King Georges Road to Hurstville now – the situation will worsen with further development</li> <li>▪ Developers are offering significant amounts of money to purchase properties, however owners are not willing to sell</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP – South Hurstville</li> <li>▪ Increased congestion along King Georges Road</li> </ul>
Sophie Korkofias	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP and specifically the proposed changes to height and density around Bembridge Street, Carlton</li> <li>▪ Bembridge Street is a narrow street and the street has 3-4 residential flat buildings</li> <li>▪ Proposal for 15m will be out of context with the rest of the street and will have an adverse impact on the area.</li> <li>▪ The proposed changes are solely reliant on distance to the railway station as the main criteria for the uplift regardless of any other issues</li> <li>▪ Resulting impacts of higher buildings would be – loss of sunlight, overshadowing, loss of privacy, inadequate on-street parking and loss by residents of existing lifestyle</li> <li>▪ The consequence of the proposed changes will be significant as there are still a number of development sites remaining – the impact will be the greatest on those properties adjoining these sites.</li> <li>▪ Extreme and unnecessary changes proposed by the NCP – scale of the proposed changes should be reconsidered</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP – increases in height and FSR for Bembridge Street</li> <li>▪ Adverse amenity impacts – loss of sunlight, overshadowing, loss of privacy, inadequate on-site parking, loss of existing residents lifestyle</li> </ul>
Graham Butt	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Councillors are elected to represent the people</li> <li>▪ Kogarah is known for its neighbourhood and communities and the way they love the area, its sporting facilities and the schools</li> <li>▪ The proposed NCP reduces the amenity of the community by proposing high rise development</li> <li>▪ Blakehurst – traffic along King Georges Road and the Princes Highway is already at capacity</li> <li>▪ Insufficient traffic studies to support high rise – parking and transport studies are vital for a proposal of this nature</li> <li>▪ Increase in 30% population – question of how will infrastructure cope</li> <li>▪ The State Government has reduced rail services even though there is a major TAFE and 2 major hospitals</li> <li>▪ Congestion and capacity of existing schools</li> <li>▪ The NCP has nothing to do with an increased amenity for our community it does not enhance our lifestyle and is not sustainable – only thing driving the NCP is greed (maximised profit) with amenity for very few</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Role of Councillors</li> <li>▪ Insufficient studies to support the proposed changes</li> <li>▪ Congestion and capacity issues – infrastructure</li> </ul>
Robert Delli Priscoli	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Speaking on behalf of his parents who live adjacent to the proposed changes in Andover Street, Carlton</li> <li>▪ Object to the proposed 15m height in Andover Street</li> <li>▪ Will have an adverse impact on parents property – reduced safety, increased noise, increased traffic</li> <li>▪ Parking in the area is already challenging, particular during football games – this will only worsen</li> <li>▪ Redevelopment will result in overlooking to his parents backyard and a loss of privacy, increased noise and disruption and loss of the morning sunlight</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP – proposed changes around Andover Street</li> <li>▪ Adverse amenity impacts – reduced safety, increased noise, increased traffic, overlooking</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
Terry Hayes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP, and specifically with respect to the proposed changes in Sans Souci</li> <li>▪ Land fronting Rocky Point Road is proposed to be rezoned – new houses backing onto these areas proposed to be rezoned</li> <li>▪ Rezoning will result in devaluation to the properties which back onto them and will put an additional strain on existing infrastructure</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP – Rezoning fronting Rocky Point Road, Sans Souci</li> </ul>
Leesha Payor – representing Kogarah Residents’ Association Inc	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Speaking on behalf of the Kogarah Residents Association Inc who object to the NCP</li> <li>▪ Group supports Environmentally Sustainable Development (ESD) in accordance with the requirements of the LGA</li> <li>▪ Conserving the quality of all life in our environment</li> <li>▪ NCP proposes to change foreshore areas without the preparation of a biodiversity study</li> <li>▪ Loss of environmental protection will result in impacts to heritage, both aboriginal and built</li> <li>▪ Aboriginal &amp; built heritage – NCP proposes to upzone heritage listed properties and residents are already requesting that Council consider the delisting of their properties</li> <li>▪ Heritage office does not support rezoning of heritage properties – owners are already requesting that heritage items be delisted</li> <li>▪ State Government does not support the rezoning of heritage items</li> <li>▪ Proposed high rise development and the impact on school playgrounds – overlooking and overshadowing</li> <li>▪ Inconsistent with the Department of Education submission which states only</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP</li> <li>▪ NCP is contrary to the principles of ESD, heritage protection</li> <li>▪ Objects to the proposed rezoning around schools – inconsistent with Department of Education and Communities</li> <li>▪ State Government consultation – should have been done before NCP was exhibited</li> <li>▪ Traffic and parking issues</li> <li>▪ Land &amp; Environment Court Case – Validity of NCP</li> <li>▪ Request that the NCP be scaled back or withdrawn and</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<p>4 storeys adjacent to schools</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ State Government Agencies should have been consulted before the plan went on exhibition.</li> <li>▪ Transport for NSW submission requests that the NCP align with the next Sub-Regional Strategy which is yet to be released</li> <li>▪ Our community struggles with the current congestion with the traffic in the Local Government Area – King Georges Road and Princes Highway</li> <li>▪ Traffic – existing capacity and congestion of KGR and the Princes highway</li> <li>▪ Proposed changes identified in the report – legal principles already established by the Land &amp; Environment Court may result in a new court challenge if council and the Minister proceeds with the proposed changes</li> <li>▪ Rockdale Council will also increase height if Kogarah proceeds with the plan</li> <li>▪ Enough homes can be achieved through natural growth with existing zoning – request that the NCP be scaled back</li> <li>▪ Planning has become disconnected with the people it is meant to serve – beholden to the development industry - request that the NCP be withdrawn or that Council hold Public Hearings for independent assessment of the NCP</li> </ul>	<p>public hearings be held</p>
<p>Susan Trenear</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP on the basis of overdevelopment</li> <li>▪ Report to Council has dismissed the resident’s concerns or lays blame to the State Government</li> <li>▪ The NCP still proposes overdevelopment, overshadowing, increased traffic congestion, major parking problems in all areas and no new open space – only extra money for developers</li> <li>▪ Just because other council areas are increasing density and height – not a sufficient excuse for Kogarah to do the same</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP – overdevelopment</li> <li>▪ Adverse impact on the amenity of residents</li> <li>▪ Capacity of schools</li> <li>▪ Loss of natural foreshore areas</li> </ul>



## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Development under the NCP will result in a concrete jungle with no green space</li> <li>▪ Schools in the area are already at capacity and there is no opportunity for recreational facilities in existing school grounds – Carlton Public School has absolutely no green space</li> <li>▪ Rezoning of foreshore areas will lead to foreshore areas being destroyed</li> <li>▪ The NCP represents a depressing outlook for future residents – there will be more overshadowing, more overlooking, people will feel confined and stressed and there will nowhere to park</li> <li>▪ We don't want this overdevelopment plan for our suburb</li> </ul>	
Hipesh Sanghvi	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP and specifically the proposed changes for The Esplanade and The Mall</li> <li>▪ 18 letters of objection for the same street – objecting to the proposed rezoning of The Mall and The Esplanade</li> <li>▪ The proposed changes will not only have an adverse impact on the streetscape in the area, it will also destroy the strong community and neighbour interaction that exists in the street</li> <li>▪ Will also result in additional problems such as increase traffic and parking</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP – South Hurstville</li> <li>▪ Adverse impact on amenity of existing residents</li> <li>▪ Traffic and parking problems</li> </ul>
Peter Sangster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Residents are angry – not been informed adequately</li> <li>▪ The supporting documentation for the NCP and the reviews that have been undertaken are not supported by the appropriate infrastructure - no evidence exists for the so called evidence based planning undertaken to prepare the NCP</li> <li>▪ The NCP will affect everyone while they live in Kogarah and it abandons the</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consultation process – inadequate</li> <li>▪ Inappropriate infrastructure to support the NCP</li> <li>▪ Role of Councillors</li> <li>▪ Request to revoke and</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<p>broader goals of good planning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Majority of Councillors were elected on a platform of no over development and no high rise</li> <li>▪ Request that the NCP be revoked and withdrawn</li> <li>▪ Lack of interest by the Councillors - 3 Community meetings held by the community, to which all Councillors where invited but the majority of Councillors did not attend these meeting. Only one Councillor attended the meeting</li> <li>▪ Elected councillors are not doing their job in representing the people who elected them</li> <li>▪ Change of zoning in the FSPA is excessive</li> <li>▪ Proposed changes in the foreshore and waterfront areas is excessive</li> <li>▪ 3 Requests for Council to consider: (i) Revoke the Gateway Determination; (ii) Require KCC to provide adequate supporting information; and (iii) Review the NSW Planning Guide to Preparing LEPs ensuring adequate explanation of infrastructure and public consultation</li> </ul>	<p>withdraw NCP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rezoning of foreshore areas</li> </ul>
John Rodger	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Shame that Councillors and Council staff will not respond to questions</li> <li>▪ Also timeframe of 3 minutes is inadequate</li> <li>▪ I am unbiased as I have no financial interest in the NCP</li> <li>▪ I also call for an open Public Hearing, giving residents plenty of notice</li> <li>▪ Understand that development is required, but not unsustainable development – infrastructure requirements</li> <li>▪ Council’s response in relation to infrastructure is to the State Government.</li> <li>▪ Waterways – remove the FSPA</li> <li>▪ Aim is to increase affordable housing – developers are paying a premium and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Public Forum – inadequate</li> <li>▪ Request for a Public Hearing</li> <li>▪ NCP is unsustainable</li> <li>▪ Inadequate infrastructure to meet future needs under the NCP</li> <li>▪ Affordable housing – NCP does not achieve this outcome</li> <li>▪ Loss of trees and open space</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<p>what incentives are there to provide affordable housing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Foreshore areas – are inappropriate for higher density housing as they are constrained by access issues and traffic, will result in visual and noise pollution</li> <li>▪ Removal of trees and the reduction of green spaces</li> <li>▪ Water runoff – how will the existing infrastructure cope with the increase in development and stormwater runoff</li> <li>▪ Increases in development should be matched with an increase in trees and green spaces to maintain a happy and healthy population</li> <li>▪ St George Hospital – it has been reported that the hospital is at capacity and patients are having to be transferred elsewhere</li> <li>▪ Additional people = more cars = more pollution</li> <li>▪ Noise and air pollution have an impact on the health of residents</li> <li>▪ Council has made evident its shortcomings with the approval of a number of developments in the Kogarah Town Centre</li> <li>▪ Council has an understanding and an obligation to look after the lifestyle and amenities of its current residents</li> <li>▪ The majority of Councillor campaigned on a platform of no overdevelopment – councillors are now deserting the people</li> <li>▪ What happens if the Council is amalgamated – is the NCP being rushed through?</li> <li>▪ Why does Council ignore the numbers - the majority are against the plan</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Capacity of existing infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Increased amenity impacts on residents</li> <li>▪ Councillors role is to listen to the ratepayers</li> </ul>
Shireen Chua	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Speaking in relation to 83 Railway Parade, Mortdale</li> <li>▪ Request for Council to reconsider the officer's recommendation and rezone the subject property from R2 to B2.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Request for reconsideration of rezoning – 83 Railway Parade</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposed B2 zoning is consistent with the Mortdale Centre and is a unique property in that it is close to the Mortdale Centre and Railway, yet separated from the surrounding low density residential development (island site)</li> <li>▪ Considered that future redevelopment of the site will not impact on surrounding neighbours, has good access to facilities, is within 100m walking distance from Mortdale centre and directly adjacent to the Mortdale centre.</li> </ul>	
Jian Franco Baccucu	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objecting to the NCP and specifically the changes proposed within the South Kogarah Precinct</li> <li>▪ Not against development – but against overdevelopment</li> <li>▪ Strongly objects to the proposed split zoning of streets in Kogarah South</li> <li>▪ No guarantee that the proposed development controls will address the resident’s concerns or that they will even be prepared by Council</li> <li>▪ Council should apply rezonings to the whole block and not one side of the street</li> <li>▪ Impacts of increased development on the supply of electricity and the grid – no comments have been provided with the respect of the impact of increased development on the grid</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP – South Kogarah Precinct</li> <li>▪ Objects to the split zoning between streets</li> <li>▪ Overdevelopment</li> <li>▪ Impact on electricity infrastructure</li> </ul>
Colin Wright	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Liberal councillors were elected on a platform of opposing any increase in development – previous subregional plan proposed to increase development – Councillors pledged to oppose the plan to accept 2,500 dwellings as it was considered to have serious consequences on the quality of life – oppose new rezonings in residential areas – reason why councillors were elected, every Liberal member campaigned on this basis</li> <li>▪ Labor councillors vowed to fight overdevelopment and its consequences</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Role of Councillors</li> <li>▪ Increased development on arterial roads – increased congestion, pollution and noise</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ All were elected because they opposed overdevelopment in Kogarah and excessive high rise in Kogarah</li> <li>▪ Mayor – protect our lifestyle and fight overdevelopment</li> <li>▪ Councillors are “rolling over”.</li> <li>▪ Councillors promised to fight on the resident’s behalf - Councillors should be acting on behalf of the interests of the residents and not blaming the State Government</li> <li>▪ Development along main road corridors – number of vehicles travelling on the Princes Highway and King Georges Road is excessive (75,000 – 85,000 cars per day). World Health Organisation state that increased development should not be situated on main roads</li> </ul>	
Ben Rumble	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A detailed, comprehensive submission was made by Daintry Associates on behalf of the residents which highlighted a number of issues with the NCP and undertook an analysis based on data supplied by the NSW Bureau of Transport and the Department of Planning</li> <li>▪ Council advised the residents of the proposed amalgamation of Councils – Council was willing to inform the residents of data around the proposed amalgamations but failed to highlight to the community the submission made by Daintry. Why?</li> <li>▪ Officers report focuses on household and Government submissions – submission made by Daintry is not mentioned anywhere in the report.</li> <li>▪ Questions why the submission by Daintry was not disclosed to the public and addressed in the report – questions whether Council is biased against the submission.</li> <li>▪ Submission from Daintry has been emailed to all of the Councillors (9am on</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Information provided to residents – inconsistent and not transparent</li> <li>▪ Daintry submission</li> <li>▪ Disclosure of all submissions</li> <li>▪ Role of Councillors</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<p>31/8)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Large numbers of submissions (more than 1800) have been received opposing the proposed changes in the plan – despite this the recommendation by Council officers is to still proceed, as exhibited. What are the Councillors going to do?</li> <li>▪ Give the community development by all means but give us thorough, researched, responsible and sustainable development</li> </ul>	
Roslyn Barlow	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Speaking on behalf of herself and a group of residents in Carlton</li> <li>▪ Objects to the proposed changes around the Carlton precinct, and specifically oppose the proposed changes to Nos 39-45 Jubilee Avenue from R2 to B1 and increased FSR.</li> <li>▪ Increased traffic and congestion – getting in and out of Prince Edward Street is already difficult – increased development will only worsen the situation</li> <li>▪ Parking will become more difficult – already difficult due to the hospitals</li> <li>▪ Difficult to get to the hospital in Kogarah – no parking anywhere near the hospital</li> <li>▪ Opposed to high rise development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP – changes to Carlton Precinct</li> <li>▪ Increased traffic congestion and parking</li> </ul>
Brad Buffoni	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Kogarah will become an area full of high rise buildings</li> <li>▪ Council’s justification for the proposed changes is to allow extended families to continue to live in the area, while providing more affordable housing options – Council thinks that high rise is an answer to this problem</li> <li>▪ High rise development is not the solution to the problem</li> <li>▪ Development around the library precinct – 80% of units were sold off the plan to foreign investors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ High rise development</li> <li>▪ High rise development adjacent to schools</li> <li>▪ Traffic and parking issues</li> <li>▪ State Government vs Council responsibilities</li> <li>▪ Role of the Councillors</li> </ul>

## APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)

Name	Issues/Comments	Key Words/Phrases
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Unique and real concerns with allowing high rise overlooking school playgrounds – secure and uninterrupted viewing platforms for the predators in our community</li> <li>▪ Council has a duty of care to our children – 11 storeys surrounding schools is not appropriate and contradicts the Department of Education and Communities (DEC) submission which states that development adjacent to schools should be limited in height</li> <li>▪ The NCP does not address the concerns raised by DEC</li> <li>▪ Kogarah town centre is currently grid locked with traffic in peak periods – the situation will only worsen</li> <li>▪ State Government issue – problems that have been identified but needs to also be addressed by Council</li> <li>▪ The LEP has the most direct impact on the ratepayers</li> <li>▪ Council needs to step back from this plan and listen to the residents of Kogarah</li> </ul>	
Constanstine Christopher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Torrens Street, Blakehurst – objects to the proposed rezoning of the northern side of Torrens Street from R2 to R3, (height of 15m and FSR of 1.5:1) which if implemented will adversely impact on the amenity of our property</li> <li>▪ Property is situated on the southern side of Torrens Street, which is not proposed to be rezoned</li> <li>▪ Although the submissions appear to have been reviewed by staff, there is still concern that if the proposed changes are implemented will result in an adverse impact to the properties situated on the southern side of Torrens Street</li> <li>▪ Would change the character of Torrens Street</li> <li>▪ Not appropriate – maximum height should be limited to 9m (3 storeys) and</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Objects to the NCP – Torrens Street, Blakehurst</li> <li>▪ Impacts on the existing character of the street</li> </ul>

**APPENDIX 10 – SUMMARY OF ORAL SUBMISSIONS (PUBLIC FORUM 31 AUGUST 2015)**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Issues/Comments</b>	<b>Key Words/Phrases</b>
	there should be detailed design controls put in place to protect the amenity of adjoining residents	