

## Attachment 4 - Summary Table of Submissions – draft Georges River Local Environmental Plan 2020

### 1. Received via Council Mail / Email

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
1	D20/80488	Objects	Objects to the removal of their property from the FSPA due to: change in low density streetscape, increased densities and overdevelopment with duplexes and villas, loss in property value, and increased traffic preventing kids from playing in the street and resulting in the loss of a close community atmosphere.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
2	D20/80638	Supports	Supports the removal of the FSPA on the southern side of Johnstone Street, Peakhurst because: only one side of the street is currently within the FSPA and the street is located a significant distance from the creek, has no view of the river and no foreshore features.	Supports the removal of properties from the FSPA		
3	D20/81923	Supports	Supports the upzoning of the Hillcrest Avenue Housing Investigation Area from R2 Residential Low Density to R4 Residential High Density under draft LEP 2020. Submission also supports long term planning for growth and accessibility to the local area.	Supports the Hillcrest Avenue - Hurstville HIA		
4	D20/81925	Supports	Supports the removal of properties from the FSPA which will allow dual occupancy developments on reduced lots. The increased housing will provide for housing needs for the future generations with development in proximity to public amenities. Increased dwellings in residential areas will result in less need for high density development in the town centre thereby minimising traffic movement and congestion in the area. Contributions generated from additional housing in the area will enable additional funds for maintenance of infrastructure.	Supports the removal of properties from the FSPA		
5	D20/82212	Objects	Objects to the removal of FSPA on the western side of Johnstone Street due to: change in low density streetscape, increased densities and overdevelopment with duplexes and villas, loss in property value, and increased traffic preventing kids from playing in the street and resulting in the loss of a close community atmosphere.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
6	D20/82441	Objects	Objection to public exhibition period of draft LEP 2020 during COVID 19 and usual Council community engagement approach not occurring such as information sessions not held, Council closed to public and only website access to information.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
7	D20/82482	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: reduced lot sizes resulting in increased developer lead subdivisions and dual occupancies, increased driveways and impermeable surfaces. These changes will undermine character of the area.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
8	D20/85053	Objects	Raises concerns in relation to the 'permitted uses' in the R4, B6 and RE1 zones including:R4 zone: objects to the permitted uses being introduced to R4 permitting zone cafes, restaurants and bars as it will adversely affect the residential amenity of the dwelling in R4 zone. Majority of the R4 zones are within walking distance to shopping centres, this is where restaurants, cafes and small bars should be encouraged. Suggests Councils could instead introduce new strategies to encourage restaurants, cafes and small bars in the business zones, such as 'fast track approvals, guidelines for change of use to these activities, low rentals for leasing footpath space' and should prioritise more open space in R4 zone.B6 Zones – Enterprise Corridor Zone: objects to the permissibility of function centres and small bars in the B6 Enterprise corridor which will have adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoin residents in R2 zone in terms of noise, function centre or small bar does not meet the objectives of the B6 zoning, recommends deletion of Function Centres and small bars from the 'permitted uses' in the B6 –Enterprise Corridor zone.Kogarah Park which would allow a theatre, cinema, music hall, concert hall, dance hall and the like. Most of these activities will impact the surrounding residential dwelling in terms of excessive noise and the loss of open green space, no change should be made until a masterplan has been exhibited and adopted by Council, recommends deletion of 'Entertainment Facilities' from Schedule 1 – 'Additional Permitted uses' for Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park.	Objects to the permissibility of restaurants, cafes and small bars in the R4 zone Objects to the permissibility of small bars and function centres in the B6 zone Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
9	D20/87246	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA in West Oaltes due to: lack of transparency in the consultation process, increased density from reduced lot sizes, increased traffic, loss of investment and loss of lifestyle currently enjoyed by residents.	Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
10	D20/87608	Objects	Objects to the rezoning of the properties to the west of Peakhurst Park from R2 to R3. Suggests this area	Requests amendments to the North and West of Peakhurst Park -		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			should be rezoned to R4 and allow residential flat buildings given its proximity to the Riverwood train station and plaza.	Peakhurst HIA		
11	D20/88432	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that public exhibition of draft LEP 2020 during COVID 19 , Council community engagement approach not occurring such as information sessions not held, Council closed to public and only website access to information.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
12	D20/88740	Objects	Objects to: Insufficient time to provide submission, information was provided late to the public, incorrect maps need to be rectified. Council procedures contravene Principles of the Community Engagement Strategy. Requests for consultation close date to be extended for two months after the lifting of the current restrictions.	Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
13	D20/88979	Objects	Objects to the timing for the public exhibition of the draft LEP and the two draft housing strategies and request they be put on hold and to consider the sequence of exhibition. Objects to the amount of material to review without face-to-face consultation.	Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Requests for the housing strategies to be placed on exhibition prior to the draft LEP		
14	D20/89308	Objects	Objects to public exhibition of draft LEP 2020 during COVID 19 and usual Council community engagement approach not occurring such as information sessions not held, residential without computer have no access to hard copy of materials to review. Objects to the amount of information to review without face-to-face consultation, material provided were recently published and were not easy to read. Requests for consultation close date to be extended for two months after the lifting of the current restrictions. Suggests a two-stage process to initially obtained feedback on two housing strategies and subsequently the Draft LEP.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Requests for the housing strategies to be placed on exhibition prior to the draft LEP		
15	D20/90023	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA in Oatley due to: lack of transparency about the true impact of the changes to our local area (in particular its very deceptive mapping which included areas under water), increased densities and overdevelopment impacting on biodiversity and bushland resulting in loss of existing habitat for native animals and additional stormwater run-off, lack of consideration for open space due to overdevelopment which negatively impacts the neighbouring properties.	Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
16	D20/90033	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.			
17	D20/90069	Supports	Supports removal of FSPA as the scenic quality of the area has changed over the years due to removal of native flora and development within foreshore area.	Supports the removal of properties from the FSPA		
18	D20/90405	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
19	D20/90443	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of places of public worship in the R2 zone		
20	D20/90452	Neutral	Raises concerns in relation to the recently undesirable RFB approvals. Hopes to see more clever and innovative designs which will enhance the streetscape and the character of the area.	Requests for better designed developments Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
21	D20/90513	Objects	Objects to the permitted use of function centres and small bars in the B6 Enterprise Corridor zone and entertainment facility under Schedule 1 additional permitted uses at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park due to increased traffic and noise impacts on the surrounding low density residential areas particularly during the evening.  Raises concerns green space will be replaced with structures. Suggests, entertainment facilities should be located in the City Centre to preserve the residential amenity of the locals.	Objects to the permissibility of small bars and function centres in the B6 zone		
22	D20/90622	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
23	D20/90726	Objects	Objects to the reduction of FSPA due to: increased densities and overdevelopment with duplexes, loss of foreshore views, loss of vegetation and increased congestion on local roads. Also, objects to changes not being highlighted in sessions with each ward individually during the LSPS consultation period and	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			public exhibition of draft LEP 2020 during COVID 19 as such the usual Council community engagement approach not occurring, information sessions not held, Council closed to public and only website access to information.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Raises concerns that the community were not notified of the proposed changes in the draft LEP during the LSPS consultation		
24	D20/90747	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas of POPW provided the site is capable of accommodating the demands of additional traffic, noise and results in minimal residential amenity impacts.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
25	D20/90769	Objects	Objects to the changes to the FSPA due to: unclear communication being provided to the residents as Factsheet 10 only identifies areas proposed in the FSPA and not the full extent of change i.e. areas proposed to be removed from the FSPA has not been shown on Factsheet 10, changes to the current provision will have negative impacts on conservation, traffic and parking, bushland and other amenities. Raises further concerns regarding appropriateness of deadline for submissions and consultation given the freedom of movement effects of the current COVID 19 pandemic. Suggests the process be extended to ensure good governance and transparency.	Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Raises concerns that the number of properties proposed to be removed from the FSPA was not provided in the fact sheet		
26	D20/91093	Objects	Objects to permitted use of entertainment facilities at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park under clause 2 of Schedule 1 Additional permitted uses.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
27	D20/91157	Objects	Objects to the reduction of FSPA due to: traffic flow along Forest Road is high due to the location of primary school which is in addition to traffic generated by residents south of Evatt Park, rail is the main means of transportation with little public parking of which majority is situated on the northern side of the station to service high density development, the bus services are used mainly by school children and is not the primary choice of transportation, all street in the FSPA are designed for low traffic use and are cul-de-sacs, increased risk of bush fire as a result of increased density, loss of vegetation resulting from increase in density with dual occupancies.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Raises concerns regarding the feasibility of development in the FSPA		
28	D20/91222	Objects	Objects to the permitted use of function centres and small bars in the B6 Enterprise Corridor zone and entertainment facility under Schedule 1 additional permitted uses at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park due to increased traffic and noise impacts on the surrounding low density residential areas particularly during the evening.	Objects to the permissibility of small bars and function centres in the B6 zone Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Kogarah Park is frequently used by local residents for exercise and relaxation. Given there are only a few parks in the locality, Kogarah Park should not be developed to accommodate large, traffic generating use. Entertainment facilities should be located in the City Centre to preserve the residential amenity of the locals.			
29	D20/91335	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
30	D20/91337	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
31	D20/91476	Objects	Objects to permitted use of entertainment facilities at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park due to: increase in traffic and congestion, increase in noise.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
32	D20/91505	Objects	Objects to permitted use of entertainment facilities at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park due to: increase in traffic and congestion, lack of parking available parking, increase in noise causing stress.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
33	D20/91506	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to permit Entertainment Facility at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park due to: unsuitable road infrastructure and lack of available parking, increase in traffic. Suggests that Council's current recreational asset at Kogarah Park and Jubilee Oval must be allowed to continue in it's current state and must not be varied without public scrutiny of the plans and alternatives.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
34	D20/91508	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to permit Entertainment Facility at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park and requests deletion of "Entertainment facilities from Schedule 1 – Additional Permitted Uses' for Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park" due to: impacts on the amenity of of the surrounding residential dwellings in terms of noise, parking , loss of green space, general congestion.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
35	D20/91721	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.			
36	D20/91740	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: - increase in dwelling density with dual occupancies. - increased traffic and parking congestion. - Pressure on recreational spaces with no plans to expand these locally. - Loss of landscaping, shade and private open space. - Loss of bushy views from the river and lookouts. - Objective 28, of the Greater Sydney Commission (GRC) is not met due to lack of protection scenic landscapes. -Removal of trees. - FSPA is the protection buffer zone around the reserves, parks and wetland, therefore the existing FSPA should be retained and provisions strengthened to minimise the impact on downstream water quality. -Increased urban runoff. - Stormwater and climate change impacts. - Reduction of the FSPA impacts sensitive environmental assets and resident liveability. -Lack of transparency in the community consultation process. - Data and mapping is selective and missing information. - FSPA is misrepresented on the maps as it includes areas on the water.	Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Raises concerns regarding the feasibility of development in the FSPA		
37	D20/91747	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to permit Entertainment Facility at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park and requests deletion of “Entertainment facilities from Schedule 1 – Additional Permitted Uses’ for Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park” due to: insufficient local parking particularly during events at Jubilee Oval, increased traffic congestion, added pressure on expanded food and beverage retailers to support the entertainment activities impacting security and public order, anticipated apartment developments along Princes Highway corridor and changes to allow entertainment will cause overdevelopment and exacerbate issues outlined.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
38	D20/91778	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
39	D20/91848	Objects	Objects to the LEP process due to: LPP being the decision makers.	Raises concerns that the Planning Proposal Authority is the LPP rather than Council		
40	D20/91857	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.			
41	D20/91863	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
42	D20/91865	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
43	D20/91868	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
44	D20/91880	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
45	D20/91975	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to permit Entertainment Facility at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park and requests deletion of "Entertainment facilities from Schedule 1 – Additional Permitted Uses" for Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park" due to: impacts on the amenity of the surrounding low density residential area in terms of increased noise and traffic congestion.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
46	D20/92456	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley West parts of Mortdale Heights, Peakhurst Heights, Lugarno and Riverwood due to: no discussion of removal of FSPA in the LSPA. -Reduction of FSPA in accordance with the principles of 'equity and consistency' over-rides the objectives of the FSPA as identified in the Hurstville LEP 2012. - change the neighbourhood character and diminished quality of bushland, wetlands and the river. -Impact on critical habitat, threatened species, populations of ecological	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Raises concerns that the community were not notified of the proposed changes in the draft LEP during the LSPS consultation		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			communities or their habitats. - Removal of buffer zones around Myles Dunphy Reserve, Oatley Park and the Lime Kiln Bay wetlands (each reserves either fringe or drain into the Georges River) resulting in polluted urban run-off entering the River. -inclusion of only one side of the street that adjoins the FSPA.			
47	D20/92693	Objects	Objects to the removal of their property from the FSPA due to: increased densities and overdevelopment with oversized and medium density housing, increased traffic exacerbated by lack of available parking at local train station, change in low density character and streetscape.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided		
48	D20/92716	Objects	Objects to public exhibition of draft LEP 2020 during COVID 19.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
49	D20/92926	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
50	D20/93091	Objects	Objects to public exhibition of draft LEP 2020 during COVID 19 given restrictions relating to gathering and cancellation of information sessions. Suggests community consultation be postponed.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
51	D20/93572	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
52	D20/93580	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
53	D20/94126	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.			
54	D20/94130	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
55	D20/94131	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
56	D20/94132	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
57	D20/94811	Objects	Owner of property identified for acquisition for open space in Culwulla Street objects to the proposed rezoning of land from R2 Low Density Residential to RE1 Public Recreation due to: financial and emotional costs.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Culwulla Street, South Hurstville		
58	D20/95829	Objects	Objects to the removal of their property from the FSPA due to: increased densities and overdevelopment with oversized and medium density housing, increased traffic, loss of vegetation, native wild life and general ambience. Also suggests that due to COVID 19, exhibition should be deferred until information sessions could be held again.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
59	D20/95912	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to permit Entertainment Facility at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park and requests deletion of "Entertainment facilities from Schedule 1 – Additional Permitted Uses' for Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park" due to: increased noise and loss of open green space.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
60	D20/96754	Objects	Objects to the objectives of the LEP 2020 due to increase in density, LEP 2020 does not identify improved garbage collection/recycling, and paths/footpath renewal/repair and street/road	Objects to overdevelopment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			improvements and better street drainage and street curbs and gutters. Would like to know what cost benefit analysis were undertaken to arrive at the objectives and what priorities have been allocated in terms of funds/budgets and what direct value is added in the objectives for ratepayers.			
61	D20/97091	Objects	Objects to the changes to the FSPA due to: - Overdevelopment with dual occupancies (Duplex) resulting in additional onstreet parking and traffic congestion on narrow roads. -Loss of peaceful atmosphere. -Upkeep of the area will be costly and rates will be escalated to cope with the demand. - Erosion caused by overdevelopment. -Removal of soil, rock and vegetation -Destruction of native life.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
62	D20/97222	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that public exhibition period of draft LEP 2020 is during COVID 19. Raised concerns that the planning proposal is being exhibited when social distancing rules affect the communities ability to have their say.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
63	D20/97458	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident to put public exhibition of draft LEP2020, LHS , HIS on hold until after the COVID-19 pandemic and until members of the public are able to effectively engage with the process including access to hard copies of the documents and attending public forums.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
64	D20/97473	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident to put public exhibition of draft LEP2020, LHS , HIS on hold until after the COVID-19 pandemic and until members of the public are able to effectively engage with the process including access hard copies of the documents and attending public forums. Also requests that the community be consulted about the draft housing strategies first and then use those findings to amend the draft LEP if necessary. Raises concerns in relation to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley West resulting in increase in density with dual occupancies, adverse impact on the character of waterfront area, loss of trees and vegetation and increase in traffic and congestion.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests for the housing strategies to be placed on exhibition prior to the draft LEP		
65	D20/97636	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to permit Entertainment Facility at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park due to: -Increase in parking issue in surrounding streets, which is already an issue during the week and on days the oval is used. -Increases in venue related traffic with even more potential for local street closures due planned events. -Increase in entertainment venue anti-social related behaviours (hooliganism, drunkenness, associated malicious damage, other petty crime, gang crime). -Loss of green space area. -No known need (nor community request) for such facilities. -More suitable location being larger shopping centres with infrastructure to cater for large crowds parking and	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			transport facilities -there is a proposal for facilities similar to those that are not even 100 metres away already which already have several of the proposed elements. -Supports smaller scale redevelopment-Area does not need the cinemas, restaurants, bars and cafes facilities being proposed at that location as there are plenty within a few minutes' drive.			
66	D20/97888	Objects	Objects to the reduction of FSPA due to: reduction in dwelling to land ratio resulting in less trees and increased traffic causing undesirable and unhealthy outcomes.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
67	D20/97906	Objects	Objects to the removal of their property in Oatley from the FSPA.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided		
68	D20/98152	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: overdevelopment, removal of trees and environmental benefits that they provide, loss of privacy and shade, increase in traffic resulting in lack of safety for pedestrian and cyclist, loss of parking due to increase in density and would like community consultation instead of rushing the consultation during COVID 19 pandemic.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
69	D20/98796	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to FSPA due to loss of trees, landscaping and vegetation, increase in population in the area and increase in traffic as a result, increase in density from dual occupancies resulting in reduced backyards and inadequate recreational areas.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
70	D20/99263	Objects	Objects to the reduction in the FSPA due to: -removal of the headlands from the FSPA. – No protection of bushy views from the river and lookouts. – No recognition of the value of the vegetation behind that on visible ridge tops. –Objective 28, of the Greater Sydney Commission (GRC) is not met in that the scenic landscapes are not adequately protected. -Impact on biodiversity due increased density causing removal of trees. – Questions what the motivation behind the change is?	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
71	D20/99307	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Suggests increased density and height of 12m/15m in Apsley Estate. Suggests traffic lights to be at the Cambridge St and Forest Road intersection.	Requests amendments to the Apsley Estate – HIA		
72	D20/99429	Objects	Objects to the exclusion of significant trees from the FSPA at Oatley point and north of Outlook Reserve.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
				environment		
73	D20/99807	Supports	Supports the resources Council has provided in responding to community enquiries.	Supports Council's community engagement program for the draft LEP		
74	D20/100023	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to Oatley West due to: loss of trees and open space and increase in density resulting in adverse impacts on safety and security for the local kids.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
75	D20/100199	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to permit Entertainment Facility at Jubilee Oval due to: overdevelopment and increase in traffic.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
76	D20/100279	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: increased density with dual occupancies resulting in increased people, cars, pollution and impact on the bushland environment.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
77	D20/100286	Objects	Objects to the rezoning of properties 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove from R2 to RE1 zone due to: no prior warning or consultation, lack of time allowed to organise meeting with Council to raise concerns, additional ongoing and stressful situation in addition to COVID-19, McGregor Street being proposed to offer off-street parking as it is narrow and offers no footpath, poor investment of Councils funds, location of Monaro Ave away from high density residential flat buildings or new housing.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
78	D20/100428	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that objects to removal of properties from the	Objects to the removal of properties in		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			FSPA due to: loss of trees, pollution by sewer and stormwater, impact on traffic and parking, overcrowding of schools devaluing of properties, lacks of transparency: -Contraction that FSPA was not foreshadowed in Council's LSPS 2040, -Approval is in the hands of the unelected Local Planning Panel, - Councillors have delegated their responsibility, -fact sheets were not added to the draft document until 15th April. -Council claims (fact sheet 10) to "extend FSPA across the foreshore's localities" when it's actually decimating it by over 2200 properties (net loss with former Kogarah and Hurstville combined). -No mention has been made that 3,881 properties will be deleted from the FSPA in Oatley West, Lugarno, Peakhurst and Riverwood and no map has been provided to highlight this. - Maps are inaccurate, e.g. part of the river is contained in the foreshore area. - No information sessions will be held, though the deadline for the final version LEP is not required by the state government until December. - Those without internet access are being discriminated against, as they have no say whatsoever with current restrictions in place.	the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns that the Planning Proposal Authority is the LPP rather than Council Raises concerns that the community were not notified of the proposed changes in the draft LEP during the LSPS consultation Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Raises concerns that the number of properties proposed to be removed from the FSPA was not provided in the fact sheet		
79	D20/100573	Objects	Object to the rezoning of the Rowe Street, South Hurstville HIA from R2 to R3 due to: negatively affect wellbeing, encourage realtors to approach owner to sell property.	Objects to the Rowe Street – South Hurstville HIA		
80	D20/100574	Objects	Objects to the change to the leafy character of the suburb. Requests a public hearing.	Objects to overdevelopment Requests a public hearing		
81	D20/101014	Objects	Objects to the removal of their property from the FSPA due to: increase in density resulting on loss of pressure in privacy and increased pressure on local infrastructure, loss of trees and gardens.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
82	D20/101027	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: increase in density resulting in loss of mature trees, increased traffic and parking and reduced recreation space; reduced landscaped area leading to greater volumes of polluted urban runoff entering waterways, shade and privacy; reduced property values; impact on biodiversity, impact on critical habitats and threatened	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			species; threat to water quality; lack of transparency in the information provided and community consultation.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
83	D20/101046	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: increase in density, reduction in landscaped area resulting in loss of natural habitat for wild life, loss of scenic value when viewed from the river, increase in stormwater runoff, insufficient time to prepare submission especially during COVID-19 pandemic. Suggest foreshore protection zone needs a buffer zone, between it and higher density housing areas.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
84	D20/101053	Objects	Objects to the removal of their property in Oatley from the FSPA due to: loss of green space and trees, increase in density causing run off and natural habitat for wild life.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
85	D20/101077	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to permit Entertainment Facility at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park and requests deletion of “Entertainment facilities from Schedule 1 – Additional Permitted Uses’ for Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park” due to: increased traffic and impacts the peacefulness of the area.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
86	D20/101087	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: impact on the character and nature of the area, overdevelopment with dual occupancies (duplexes), loss of trees.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
87	D20/101101	Objects	Objects to removal their properties from the FSPA due to: overdevelopment with dual occupancies (duplexes), reduced landscaping, and lack of public consultation during a pandemic situation and suggests decision should be delayed until the public are able to respond appropriately. Does not support removal of this zoning. Requests a public hearing.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Requests a public hearing Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
				the exhibition		
88	D20/101209	Objects	Objects to the rezoning of properties 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove from R2 to RE1 zone due to: expansion of the park will encourage more visitors to the park, increase in vandalism, increase in anti-social behaviour, kids damaging their property fence while playing, park used for fireworks on Guy Fawkes, increased robbery and dogs off leash.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
89	D20/101212	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: increase in density causing increase in traffic congestion, loss of trees and habitat of native flora and fauna, impact on drainage and increased run-off, adverse impact on sewer infrastructure and increase in pollution and health risk.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
90	D20/101291	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties in Oatley West from the FSPA due to: negative impact on the quality of life and loss of natural character. Suggest Council delay proceeding with the proposals until next year's Council elections.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
91	D20/101297	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to permit Entertainment Facility at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park and requests deletion of "Entertainment facilities from Schedule 1 – Additional Permitted Uses' for Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park" due to: increased noise and loss of open green space. Suggests no change should take place after the Master Plan for this precinct has been placed on public exhibition and adopted by Council.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
92	D20/101305	Objects	Objects to the removal of the propoerties in the FSPA due to: increase in density with dual occupancies resulting in over population, loss of trees, devaluing of properties, introduction of mass and low quality buildings, impact on vegetation and natural landscape, impact on the character of the area, impact of urbanisation on biodiversity and including loss of habitat and degradation, native wide life and flora and fauna.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
93	D20/101313	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to permit			



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Entertainment Facility at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
94	D20/101326	Objects	Owner of one of the properties identified for acquisition in Culwulla Street, South Hurstville objects to the proposed changes in the draft LEP 2020 due to: - Increasing cost associated with the acquisition from delays in the project causing and financial stress in the current economic situation. - Increase in population density will impact schools and quality of local education. - Increase in noise, waste and pollution. - Increase in traffic causing safety risk for pedestrians and impact on parking. – Due to proximity to other parks there is no need for the expansion. –increased risk of accidents due to proximity to King Georges Rd and 7-Eleven petrol station	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Culwulla Street, South Hurstville		
95	D20/101329	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: increase in density, area should be protected for future generation.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
96	D20/101333	Objects	Objects to the removal of the properties in the FSPA due to: increase in density due to reduced lot size and landscaped areas, increased sediment run-off in waterways, impact on trees reducing amenity and scenic quality of the area from the waterways.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
97	D20/101337	Objects	Due to COVID-19 requests the exhibition process for LEP 2020 be postponed to a time when residents are able to properly review the submission.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
98	D20/101347	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: impact of increase in population on the character of garden suburbs and the quality of life enjoyed, impact on tree, wildlife, shade and privacy, increased traffic and congestion, increased pressure on infrastructure.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
99	D20/101408	Objects	Due to COVID-19 suggests that draft LEP 2020	Requests amendments to the timing of		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			shouldn't be going ahead at the current time to the same timeline and should be postponed due to some residents having limited access to technology. Objects to the removal of properties in the Lugarno, Peakhurst Heights, Oatley and Mortdale in the FSPA due to increase in density, impact on trees and shade leading to increased temperatures, less oxygen and more pollution.	the exhibition Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
100	D20/101489	Neutral	<p>Identifies two legal deficiencies that could lead to Class 4 proceedings:</p> <p>1. The perception that dual key dwellings would be a permissible in the R2 Low Density Residential zone was a principle theme of the draft instrument, however, the draft LEP prohibits dual key dwelling; and</p> <p>2. The Planning Proposal hides the down zoning of R2 properties as the removal of clause 4.1B(2)(b) under the Kogarah LEP, which provides a significant subdivision uplift potential to properties that have two street frontages, has not been highlighted as a change made by the Georges River LEP.</p>	N/A	<p>1. The perception that dual key dwellings would be a permissible in the R2 Low Density Residential zone was a principle theme of the draft instrument, however, the draft LEP prohibits dual key dwelling.</p> <p>2. Removal of clause 4.1B(2)(b) under the Kogarah LEP 2012 has not been addressed.</p>	<p>1. Dual key dwellings are not defined in the Standard Instrument LEP and therefore are not listed in the land use table. However, the draft LEP proposes <i>Clause 6.14 Development for the purposes of dual key dwellings in Zones R2 and R3</i>. Clause 6.14 allows self-contained dual key dwellings of up to 75sqm within the principal dwelling to increase housing supply and diversity.</p> <p>2. Clause 4.1B(2)(b) of the Kogarah LEP 2012 specifies that development consent must not be granted for the erection of a dual occupancy on a lot unless the minimum lot size is met and for detached dual occupancies, the lot has at least 2 road frontages and each dwelling has a frontage to a road.</p> <p>On the contrary, the draft LEP removes the onerous requirement specified by the Kogarah LEP 2012 which requires detached dual occupancies to be located on sites with 2 road frontages. Under the proposed <i>Clause 4.1B Minimum lot sizes and special provisions for certain dwellings</i>, only the minimum lot size and lot width requirements are specified for all dual occupancies and there is no requirement for detached dual occupancies to have 2 road frontages.</p>

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
101	D20/101605	Objects	Objects to the changes to the FSPA due to the impact on character of the area. Suggests review of increase in traffic also needs to be considered before proceeding.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
102	D20/101719	Objects	Objects to HIA Culwulla Street for their property and wants land to remain as R2 not R3.	Objects to the Culwulla Street –South Hurstville HIA		
103	D20/101725	Objects	Objects to the rezoning of properties 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove from R2 to RE1 zone due to: no prior warning or consultation, lack of time allowed to organise meeting with Council to raise concerns, additional ongoing and stressful situation in addition to COVID-19, McGregor Street being proposed to offer off-street parking as it is narrow and offers no footpath, poor investment of Councils funds, location of Monaro Ave away from high density residential flat buildings or new housing.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
104	D20/101915	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley due to: - increased dwelling density will result in removal of trees, impact on privacy, overshadowing impacts, reduced yards for children and increased traffic. – suggest nature to be protected for future generations and to maintain flora and fauna, the village and character of the area.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
105	D20/101936	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: increased density with dual occupancies and medium density developments, existing overdevelopment, increased street parking from increased traffic.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
106	D20/101937	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: impact on quality of life, impact on the character of the area, increased pressure on infrastructure, the overload on the sewerage and storm water systems will impact the river.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
107	D20/101998	Supports	Supports the removal of the FSPA on Johnstone Street, Peakhurst because: the street is located a significant	Supports the removal of properties from		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			distance from the river, has no view of the river and no foreshore features.	the FSPA		
108	D20/102012	Supports	Supports the removal of their property from the FSPA.	Supports the removal of properties from the FSPA		
109	D20/102015	Objects	Object to the changes to the FSPA without full and proper community consultation. Suggest consultation should wait until the restrictions of COVID are eased and the usual channels of information exchange between Council and The Georges River residents are again available.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided		
110	D20/102018	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: provision of lack of information in Factsheet 10 which does not include number of properties being removed from the FSPA. – Unsure if the subject site is within the FSPA. – does not provide a clear understanding of impacts to the environment, biodiversity and social improvements. - Impacts relating to noise, parking, traffic, water quality, scenic landscapes and ecology. – Inappropriate timing to the exhibition of the draft LEP 2020 during a global pandemic, -Lack of transparency.	Raises concerns that the number of properties proposed to be removed from the FSPA was not provided in the fact sheet Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
111	D20/102107	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition) of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove to expand Peter Low Reserve due to: - Exhibition period of the proposal during COVID-19. - Council's failure to notify residents in writing and in good time causing a rush to submit concerns by the unfair deadline date of 15 May. – Lack of appropriate communication and transparency regarding the proposal and has resulted in the residents of Monaro Avenue, being 'left in the dark' and worried about the unknown future of our neighbourhood. – Lack of detailed plans and other important information that should have been made available regarding the proposed expansion. – Failure to provide residents the opportunity to engage in an open and fair discussion	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			regarding the proposal. - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. – Increased on-street parking will occur in Monaro Avenue, McGregor Street, St Elmo Parade, Kinsel Avenue and New England Parade affecting existing residents.- Increased traffic and parking congestion on Glenwall St and Kingsway St. – Will change a quiet neighbourhood into a busy, hazardous and crowded thoroughfare. –There is no future concept plans available to indicate the future use of the Reserve. – Expansion of open space is identified for areas of high/medium density residential/apartment whereas Monaro Ave is not identified as high/medium density residential area. –will have adverse impact on property prices. – Requests Council to delay the proposal until the COVID-19 restrictions are lifted after which all affects resident can meet and discuss and organise an open, community consultation with all those directly impacted by this untimely development.			
112	D20/102126	Objects	Objects to the length of public consultation and suggests due to COVID restrictions and requests for two months extension after the restrictions have been lifted.- additional factsheets were made available late and maps are inaccurate. -Environmental reports such as the Kogarah Council 2012 Flora & Fauna Study, Hurstville Council's 2014 Biodiversity Study or the current council's Vegetation Mapping Report have not been made available. -Draft makes no reference to the number of properties being removed from the FSPA.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns that the number of properties proposed to be removed from the FSPA was not provided in the fact sheet Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
113	D20/102204	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove to expand Peter Low Reserve. This will significantly impact the properties in question and also affect other residents in the immediate neighbourhood, including increased traffic congestion and parking issues, already existing in this street. - Concerned that the community was not provided with prior warning of such a proposal and are expected to comment within a very limited timeframe. -During a period in Australia's history when the average person is undergoing a difficult time due to the pandemic, Council is compounding their dilemmas by initiating this proposal. -Submitter stands behind the affected residents in Monaro Avenue and concurs with all issues that have been raised and documented in the petition referenced as SF20/881. -Submitter requests for member of parliament to intervene in this matter to defend the rights of citizens.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
114	D20/102277	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: loss of local character, increase in traffic, noise and pollution, loss of village atmosphere and childrens	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			losing their freedom to play outside, existing parks are over capacity, removal of trees.	environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
115	D20/102281	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: increase in density with dual occupancies (duplexes), reduced landscaping resulting in fewer gardens, trees, wildlife, lack of privacy and overshadowing, increase in traffic and congestion, loss of leafy out look and character of the area, increased demand on infrastructure on trains, schools, parking etc.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
116	D20/102286	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley and Peakhurst due to: - increase in housing density with larger house and duplexes on smaller blocks. -Reduced landscaping requirement from 25% to 20%, resulting in fewer gardens, trees, wildlife, lack of privacy and overshadowing. – Increase in traffic and congestion and noise. - Loss of leafy out look and character. – Increased impact on infrastructure on trains, schools, parking etc.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
117	D20/102289	Objects	Objects to the changes proposed to the FSPA and believes the changes will undermine their quality of life and the character of the local area.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
118	D20/102300	Objects	Objects to the changes proposed to the FSPA and believes the changes will undermine their quality of life and the character of the local area. Concerned about loss of trees, private open spaces and privacy.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
119	D20/102313	Objects	Objects to the removal of their property in Oatley from the FSPA due to: increase in dwelling density in Oatley West, Mortdale and Peakhurst, adverse impact on the communities standard of living, including loss of nature and privacy , increase in traffic and noise.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
				the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
120	D20/102418	Objects	Objects to the removal of their property in Oatley from the FSPA due to: loss of space and leafy surrounds, loss of the character of Oatley due to increase in density and loss of greenery. Calls for a public meeting. Is concerned the exhibition close date of 15 May 2020 does not allow sufficient time for community consultation. Suggests Council should consider COVID-19 restriction during the exhibition period.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests a public hearing		
121	D20/102438	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley due to: - increase in housing density, loss of trees and vegetation, impact on the character of Oatley. - Due to COVID-19 restriction, the period consultation period is limited. - Requests a public meeting.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests a public hearing		
122	D20/102441	Objects	Objects to the proposed zoning changes in Oatley. Council has not provided sufficient time for consultation with the community and the date for submissions should be extended. I value the space and leafy environment in which I live. Council's fact sheets are misleading and an extension of time should be provided to discuss the proposed changes further.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Raises concerns that the number of properties proposed to be removed from the FSPA was not provided in the fact sheet		
123	D20/102473	Objects	Objects to the proposed 'Entertainment facilities from Schedule 1 - Additional permitted uses' for Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park. This change which would permit a theatre, cinema, music hall, concert hall, dance hall or similar by commercialising Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park. The proposed activities would generate excess noise for the surrounding low density residential area and risk losing the use of Kogarah Park as passive open space.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
124	D20/102485	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove. - Opposes proposed rezoning of sites from R2 to RE1 and expansion of Peter Low Reserve. - Unhappy with Council's approach in notifying owners and limited time to organise meeting. - Increased stress during COVID-19 period.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- McGregor Street parking for the reserve is inappropriate due to the design of the street.</li> <li>- Propose that Council invest in open space in an area of proposed higher density development, such as Kingsgrove Village/Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Rd.</li> <li>- A person with a disability where the house has been adjusted to their needs.</li> </ul>			
125	D20/102559	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed LEP and changes to FSPA, due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promoting poor development and over population of areas around the Georges River.</li> <li>- Concerned about 110 year old tree being threatened by the implementation of Council's proposed LEP.</li> <li>- Council has not considered the wishes of residents and providing a more liveable environment under the "Our Objectives" clause.</li> <li>- There being no consultation with residents on their opinion of the changing FSPA.</li> <li>- An increase in dwelling density and handsurfaces, with Council not considering how this will increase run-off.</li> <li>- A decrease in FSPA properties in the Peakhurst Ward while the Kogarah Ward is getting an increase.</li> <li>- A decrease in natural landscaped areas of properties in the Peakhurst Ward.</li> <li>- Council has not considered traffic flow or off-street parking with the proposed increase in residences.</li> <li>- No consideration has been given to bird life in the Jewfish Point area.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Raises concerns that the community were not notified of the proposed changes in the draft LEP during the LSPS consultation</p>		
126	D20/102561	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A lack of consultation with the community is unacceptable and Council is using COVID-19 as an excuse to avoid not holding community engagement events.</li> <li>- Provides a detailed list of 30 instances where the FSPA has not been informed by the Foreshore Strategic Directions Paper and the changes proposes the opposite.</li> <li>- Questions the 25% of site area required for landscaping and a reduction in minimum lot sizes outside of the FSPA.</li> <li>- Dual occupancies should not be permitted in the FSPA.</li> </ul>	<p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Requests increasing the landscaping requirements</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– inadequate justification for the boundary amendment</li> <li>– no reason provided</li> </ul> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
127	D20/102612	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed LEP. The proposal will degrade Oatley's quality of life and village-like feel of the suburb for both visitors and its residents.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p>		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An increase in traffic, which this proposal will promote, will create more noise and pollution on streets which are not designed for such heavy flows.</li> <li>- There is concern over the removal of trees, which are an attraction to the area, as well as providing protection from noise and heat.</li> </ul>	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
128	D20/102619	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed 'Entertainment facilities from Schedule 1 - Additional permitted uses' for Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does not believe that the current use of Kogarah Park was intended when it was sold to the NSW State Government.</li> <li>- Proposes that the aquatic centre be moved to redevelop the Carss Park swimming pool or an expansion of the Sans Souci Aquatic Centre.</li> <li>- There is already a deficit of green space in Kogarah and that further development will only remove more green space.</li> <li>- Concerns over proposed developments around schools, due to issues with overlooking, removal of heritage, green spaces and resident welfare.</li> <li>- Proposes that the Kogarah Park area be redeveloped as green space to reflect Sydney Park in St Peters.</li> <li>- That it is socially irresponsible to push development during the COVID-19 shutdown.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
129	D20/102632	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove to expand Peter Low Reserve due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Exhibition period of the proposal during COVID-19.</li> <li>- Council's failure to notify residents in writing and in good time causing a rush to submit concerns by the unfair deadline date of 15 May. – Lack of appropriate communication and transparency regarding the proposal and has resulted in the residents of Monaro Avenue, being 'left in the dark' and worried about the unknown future of our neighbourhood. – Lack of detailed plans and other important information that should have been made available regarding the proposed expansion. – Failure to provide residents the opportunity to engage in an open and fair discussion regarding the proposal. - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. – Increased on-street parking will occur in Monaro Avenue, McGregor Street, St Elmo Parade, Kinsel Avenue and New England Parade affecting existing residents.- Increased traffic and parking</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			congestion on Glenwall St and Kingsway St. – Will change a quiet neighbourhood into a busy, hazardous and crowded thoroughfare. –There is no future concept plans available to indicate the future use of the Reserve. – Expansion of open space is identified for areas of high/medium density residential/apartment whereas Monaro Ave is not identified as high/medium density residential area. –will have adverse impact on property prices. – Requests Council to delay the proposal until the COVID-19 restrictions are lifted after which all affects resident can meet and discuss and organise an open, community consultation with all those directly impacted by this untimely development.			
130	D20/102661	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposal due to its negative impacts on environmental protection, at a time where this should be increased.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is difficult for residents to understand the reasons behind properties being removed from the FSPA.</li> <li>- It is unacceptable that Council state that there may be errors in the mapping.</li> <li>- An increase in density and reducing block sizes will negatively impact the liveable quality of Oatley/Mortdale.</li> <li>- A reduction in landscaping requirements will result in the removal of trees in areas where landscaping areas are already below requirement.</li> <li>- Concerns regarding traffic flow in streets where they are not designed for such high influxes in traffic.</li> <li>-Concern that the LEP is feeding the development cycle.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– inadequate justification for the boundary amendment</li> <li>– no reason provided</li> </ul> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p>		
131	D20/102663	Objects	<p>Objects to proposed rezoning in Lugarno in an area which is FSPA affected.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerned about the threat of density increase in Lugarno.</li> <li>- Risk of demolition of older properties in area.</li> <li>- Concern over an increase in traffic in an area which already has significant traffic issues.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p>		
132	D20/102666	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed draft LEP and recommends the current LEP remains the same.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed LEP will have a significant impact on the environment in Oatley due to increased density, smaller lot sizes, an increase in traffic removal of trees and pressure on current infrastructure.</li> <li>- Considers the proposed LEP unnecessary.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to overdevelopment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
133	D20/102675	Objects	Objects to the proposal for Council to acquire properties 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove. - Opening the reserve will lead to an increase in visitors to the park. - The park has already had a large amount of anti-social behaviour, which will likely increase if the park is opened up. - It is unfair to force families out of the park in the current COVID-19 period.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
134	D20/102679	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
135	D20/102682	Objects	Objects to the acquisition and rezoning of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove. - There has been a lack of communication between residents and Council regarding the rezoning. - Insists that the proposal is delayed due to current COVID-19 restrictions. - That Council host a specific consultation with Monaro Ave, St Elmo Parade, New England Drive, Kinsel Ave, and McGregor St. - Funds for this project could be used more efficiently elsewhere in the LGA. - The provision of additional open space should be reserved for areas of higher density, such as Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road. - McGregor Street is not sufficiently designed for an increase in traffic congestion and parking, with an increase in traffic increasing the risk of danger. - Further opening the park will result in an increase in anti-social behaviour.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
136	D20/102683	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue,		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Owner of one of the properties proposed for acquisition who opposes the acquisition and rezoning of properties from R2 to RE1.</li> <li>- Given the circumstances surrounding COVID-19 and a declining property market and economy, it is unfair to force residents to have to move.</li> <li>- Proposal reduces the property value.</li> <li>- There has been a lack of communication between Council and the owners of the properties listed for acquisition and there has not been significant time to prepare significant responses.</li> <li>- No timeline has been provided to the owners of affected properties regarding potential acquisition dates.</li> <li>- Neighbour with disability uncertain of relocation.</li> </ul>	<p>Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)  Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition  Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p>		
137	D20/102693	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition and rezoning of properties on Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Owner's land value lowered by \$224,000.</li> <li>- Unclear of the proposed use of recreation or facilities provided.</li> <li>- McGregor Street is too narrow for traffic or parking.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		
138	D20/102708	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed LEP and changes to FSPA, due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promoting poor development and over population of areas around the Georges River.</li> <li>- Concerned about 110 year old tree being threatened by the implementation of Council's proposed LEP.</li> <li>- Council has not considered the wishes of residents and providing a more liveable environment under the "Our Objectives" clause.</li> <li>- There being no consultation with residents on their opinion of the changing FSPA.</li> <li>- An increase in dwelling density and hand surfaces, with Council not considering how this will increase run-off.</li> <li>- A decrease in FSPA properties in the Peakhurst Ward while the Kogarah Ward is getting an increase.</li> <li>- A decrease in natural landscaped areas of properties in the Peakhurst Ward.</li> <li>- Council has not considered traffic flow or off-street parking with the proposed increase in residences.</li> <li>- No consideration has been given to bird life in the Jewfish Point area.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment  Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment  Raises concerns that the community were not notified of the proposed changes in the draft LEP during the LSPS consultation</p>		
139	D20/102711	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition and rezoning of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposing open space in an area proposed for high density residential, such as Kingsgrove Village/Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road.</li> <li>- McGregor street is not appropriate to be used for on-</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>street parking due to its narrow design and also extend to Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Drive</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Opening the reserve will increase anti-social behaviour and increase insurance premiums for residents.</li> <li>- This proposal will result in an increase in traffic and parking congestion in the area of Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St.</li> <li>- Property values will be affected by this proposal.</li> </ul>			
140	D20/102715	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road).</li> <li>- Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents.</li> <li>- The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress.</li> <li>- Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St.</li> <li>- Adversely affect property values.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		
141	D20/102716	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed LEP and changes to FSPA, due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Promoting poor development and over population of areas around the Georges River.</li> <li>- Concerned about 110 year old tree being threatened by the implementation of Council's proposed LEP.</li> <li>- Council has not considered the wishes of residents and providing a more liveable environment under the "Our Objectives" clause.</li> <li>- There being no consultation with residents on their opinion of the changing FSPA.</li> <li>- An increase in dwelling density and handsurfaces, with Council not considering how this will increase run-off.</li> <li>- A decrease in FSPA properties in the Peakhurst Ward while the Kogarah Ward is getting an increase.</li> </ul>	<p>Raises concerns that the community were not notified of the proposed changes in the draft LEP during the LSPS consultation</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A decrease in natural landscaped areas of properties in the Peakhurst Ward.</li> <li>- Council has not considered traffic flow or off-street parking with the proposed increase in residences.</li> <li>- No consideration has been given to bird life in the Jewfish Point area.</li> </ul>			
142	D20/102720	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed 'Entertainment facilities from Schedule 1 - Additional permitted uses' for Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Does not believe that the current use of Kogarah Park was intended when it was sold to the NSW State Government.</li> <li>- Proposes that the aquatic centre be moved to redevelop the Carss Park swimming pool or an expansion of the Sans Souci Aquatic Centre.</li> <li>- There is already a deficit of green space in Kogarah and that further development will only remove more green space.</li> <li>- Concerns over proposed developments around schools, due to issues with overlooking, removal of heritage, green spaces and resident welfare.</li> <li>- Proposes that the Kogarah Park area be redeveloped as green space to reflect Sydney Park in St Peters.</li> <li>- That it is socially irresponsible to push development during the COVID-19 shutdown.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
143	D20/102726	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road).</li> <li>- Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents.</li> <li>- The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress.</li> <li>- Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St.</li> <li>- Adversely affect property values.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
144	D20/102733	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed removal of FSPA from many properties within former Hurstville LGA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- An offset of almost 2200 properties from the FSPA goes against the draft LEP's directions on protecting the natural area of the LGA.</li> <li>- Concern over reduced minimum lot size being affected by proposed changes.</li> <li>- Concern over how changes to the FSPA will impact tree cover and linkages throughout the zones, particularly Myles Dunphy Reserve.</li> <li>- With a decrease in landscaping requirements, there will likely be a decrease in residential bushland.</li> <li>- Increased urban development with a reduction in open space will result in less area for bushfire buffer.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
145	D20/102753	Objects	<p>Provides a direct link to an online petition hosted on Change.org which Objects to the acquisition and rezoning of 28 Culwulla Street, South Hurstville for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Council does not acknowledge the concerns and wishes of its residents</li> <li>- Concern over RFB at end of Culwulla Street which will increase density and how this will impact surrounding infrastructure and facilities.</li> <li>- Against the proposed increase in public open space as it will result in more people from outside the area visiting the reserve.</li> <li>- The street cannot currently provide for an increase in traffic and parking, with increased risk to pedestrians.</li> <li>- There are already 5 parks in close proximity to the street.</li> <li>- The proposed area for the park is not ideal due to its proximity to King Georges Road.</li> <li>- Concern over construction and noise which will arise as of acquisition.</li> <li>- The amount of money spent to acquire properties is unreasonable and could be distributed more efficiently.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Culwulla Street, South Hurstville</p>		
146	D20/102785	Objects	<p>Objects to the acquisition and rezoning of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There has been a lack of communication between</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>residents and Council regarding the rezoning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Insists that the proposal is delayed due to current COVID-19 restrictions.</li> <li>- That Council host a specific consultation with Monaro Ave, St Elmo Parade, New England Drive, Kinsel Ave, and McGregor St.</li> <li>- Funds for this project could be used more efficiently elsewhere in the LGA.</li> <li>- The provision of additional open space should be reserved for areas of higher density, such as Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road.</li> <li>- McGregor Street is not sufficiently designed for an increase in traffic congestion and parking, with an increase in traffic increasing the risk of danger.</li> <li>- Further opening the park will result in an increase in anti-social behaviour.</li> </ul>	<p>Reserve)</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p>		
147	D20/102787	Objects	<p>Objects to the up-zoning of Culwulla Street, South Hurstville from R2 to R3.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There are already traffic concerns in this area, with Culwulla Street already experiencing a significant increase in traffic. Considering this, an increase in development will only promote this further. There is concern for how an increase in traffic will impact the safety of vulnerable members of the street.</li> <li>- Without an increase in green space and improvements to current infrastructure, this area is not prepared for an increase in population.</li> <li>- Unsure how the rezoning will affect prices and local infrastructure.</li> <li>- Urge for the street to remain zoned R2.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the Culwulla Street –South Hurstville HIA</p>		
148	D20/102802	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition and rezoning of properties on Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Owner's land value lowered by \$224,000.</li> <li>- Unclear of the proposed use of recreation or facilities provided.</li> <li>- McGregor Street is too narrow for traffic or parking.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		
149	D20/102809	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition and rezoning of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There has been a lack of communication between residents and Council regarding the rezoning.</li> <li>- Insists that the proposal is delayed due to current COVID-19 restrictions.</li> <li>- That Council host a specific consultation with Monaro Ave, St Elmo Parade, New England Drive, Kinsel Ave,</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of</p>		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>and McGregor St.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Funds for this project could be used more efficiently elsewhere in the LGA.</li> <li>- The provision of additional open space should be reserved for areas of higher density, such as Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road.</li> <li>- McGregor Street is not sufficiently designed for an increase in traffic congestion and parking, with an increase in traffic increasing the risk of danger.</li> <li>- Further opening the park will result in an increase in anti-social behaviour.</li> </ul>	information		
150	D20/102855	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA in Oatley, threatening to change the Oatley forever.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Most residents of Oatley prefer Oatley left the way it is.</li> <li>- The proposed FSPA change will have a negative impact on the roads, the environment, the pollution from the runoff, crowded schools, loss of privacy.</li> <li>- Council will see an increase in revenue from taxes, rates etc.</li> <li>- The proposal should be postponed until the Council elections, so voting residents can decide.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
151	D20/102861	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed removal of their property in Oatley from the FSPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concern over current development outside of the FSPA removing natural environmental features and replacing them with "concrete/brick boxes".</li> <li>- The removal of trees and landscaping from the area will result in an increase in hard surfaces and increase run-off. A lack of trees will also increase temperatures.</li> <li>- It is unsafe to increase density too far, as this does not allow for distancing according to COVID-19 restrictions.</li> <li>- Residents of Oatley do not wish for the suburbs to reflect development in Hurstville or Kogarah and issues with traffic and parking.</li> <li>- Request for a public hearing on proposed changes.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests a public hearing</p>		
152	D20/102910	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition and rezoning of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Peter Low Reserve provides sufficient open space for the area. Any extension would be out of place for the area.</li> <li>- A proposed car park may invite people out of the area</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>to the park and encourage loitering and potentially decrease safety.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monaro Avenue, McGregor Street and St Elmo are used as thoroughfares and the proposal would only increase traffic further.</li> <li>- McGregor Street is already narrow, not being able to handle such an increase in parking without decreasing residents' access to properties.</li> <li>- If there were to be future acquisition and development in the area, residents would lose their street carparking places.</li> <li>- There is already sufficient open space in the surrounding area.</li> <li>- Upgrades to Peter Low Reserve would come at significant cost to Council due to its shape and topography.</li> </ul>			
153	D20/103069	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road).</li> <li>- Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents.</li> <li>- The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress.</li> <li>- Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St.</li> <li>- Adversely affect property values.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		
154	D20/103516	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road).</li> <li>- Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents.</li> <li>- The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress.</li> <li>- Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.			
155	D20/103522	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition and rezoning of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There has been a lack of communication between residents and Council regarding the rezoning.</li> <li>- Insists that the proposal is delayed due to current COVID-19 restrictions.</li> <li>- That Council host a specific consultation with Monaro Ave, St Elmo Parade, New England Drive, Kinsel Ave, and McGregor St.</li> <li>- Funds for this project could be used more efficiently elsewhere in the LGA.</li> <li>- The provision of additional open space should be reserved for areas of higher density, such as Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road.</li> <li>- McGregor Street is not sufficiently designed for an increase in traffic congestion and parking, with an increase in traffic increasing the risk of danger.</li> <li>- Further opening the park will result in an increase in anti-social behaviour.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p>		
156	D20/103540	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road).</li> <li>- Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents.</li> <li>- The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress.</li> <li>- Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St.</li> <li>- Adversely affect property values.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		
157	D20/103549	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposal for Council to acquire properties 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Opening the reserve will lead to an increase in visitors to the park.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The park has already had a large amount of anti-social behaviour, which will likely increase if the park is opened up.</li> <li>- It is unfair to force families out of the park in the current COVID-19 period.</li> </ul>	Reserve)		
158	D20/103733	Objects	<p>Objects to the acquisition and rezoning of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There has been a lack of communication between residents and Council regarding the rezoning.</li> <li>- Insists that the proposal is delayed due to current COVID-19 restrictions.</li> <li>- That Council host a specific consultation with Monaro Ave, St Elmo Parade, New England Drive, Kinsel Ave, and McGregor St.</li> <li>- Funds for this project could be used more efficiently elsewhere in the LGA.</li> <li>- The provision of additional open space should be reserved for areas of higher density, such as Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road.</li> <li>- McGregor Street is not sufficiently designed for an increase in traffic congestion and parking, with an increase in traffic increasing the risk of danger.</li> <li>- Further opening the park will result in an increase in anti-social behaviour.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p>		
159	D20/103930	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed implementation of the Draft LEP and all changes within it.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The number of trees in the area of the Georges River has been significantly reduced as planning requirements change.</li> <li>- Concern that houses are too large for their blocks and limit landscaping opportunities.</li> <li>- Request to defer the proposed LEP until it is safe to hold a public discussion after COVID-19 restrictions have eased.</li> <li>- All changes in the Draft LEP should not be adopted.</li> <li>- Objector is prepared to protest the proposed Draft LEP.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to overdevelopment</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
160	D20/103932	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition and rezoning of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove.</p>	Objects to the proposed open space		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposing open space in an area proposed for high density residential, such as Kingsgrove Village/Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road.</li> <li>- McGregor street is not appropriate to be used for on-street parking due to its narrow design and also extend to Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Drive</li> <li>- Opening the reserve will increase anti-social behaviour and increase insurance premiums for residents.</li> <li>- This proposal will result in an increase in traffic and parking congestion in the area of Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St.</li> <li>- Property values will be affected by this proposal.</li> </ul>	acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
161	D20/103933	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The removal of properties from the FSPA may result in an increase in building density and traffic congestion, straining recreation areas.</li> <li>- Minimising properties from the FSPA goes against objectives within A Metropolis of Three Cities Objective 27 - 'Biodiversity is protected, urban bushland and remnant vegetation is enhanced' and Objective 28 of - 'Scenic and cultural landscapes are protected'.</li> <li>- The proposal threatens the water quality of the Georges River, in particular Oatley Park's swimming baths.</li> <li>- The proposed removal of properties from the FSPA will remove the diversity of housing in the LGA and liveability.</li> <li>- The protection of environmentally sensitive assets will be threatened.</li> <li>- There is no map within the Planning Proposal or Fact Sheet which clearly identifies the properties being removed from the FSPA.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p>		
162	D20/103934	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition and rezoning of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposing open space in an area proposed for high density residential, such as Kingsgrove Village/Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road.</li> </ul>	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- McGregor street is not appropriate to be used for on-street parking due to its narrow design and also extend to Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Drive</li> <li>- Opening the reserve will increase anti-social behaviour and increase insurance premiums for residents.</li> <li>- This proposal will result in an increase in traffic and parking congestion in the area of Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St.</li> <li>- Property values will be affected by this proposal.</li> </ul>			
163	D20/103936	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to FSPA.	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– inadequate justification for the boundary amendment</li> <li>– no reason provided</li> </ul>		
164	D20/103939	Objects	<p>Objects to the changes involved in the Draft LEP as it will promote over-development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The LGA has already experienced a significant increase in density, with a lack of parking on street and little to no greenery.</li> <li>- With a decrease in lot size, landscaping requirements will also be reduced. This will result in a reduction in trees, birdlife, privacy and an increase in overshadowing.</li> <li>- Traffic will continue to increase. For areas such as Mortdale Heights, access to Roberts Avenue is already unsafe and parking will also become less available.</li> <li>- The leafy character of the LGA will decrease due to development. With this occurring, there will be a loss of natural wildlife.</li> <li>- Current infrastructure will be placed under further pressure and run-off of pollution will also increase.</li> <li>- There will likely be an increase in rates, which the residents to not approve of.</li> </ul>	Objects to overdevelopment		
165	D20/103943	Objects	Objects to proposed removal of properties from the			

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>FSPA in Oatley West.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requests a public hearing by Council to address the issue.</li> <li>- Residents do not want change to the leafy character of the area.</li> <li>- Does not want Oatley West to reflect Hurstville.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests a public hearing</p>		
166	D20/103966	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Questions Council's reasoning behind the demolition of houses to "open up the park" and the consultation process with the owners.</li> <li>- Concern over Council funds being used to displace owners of the properties.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		
167	D20/103974	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA from Oatley West to Lugarno.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provides a submission made to the Sydney Morning Herald on the removal.</li> <li>- Disappointment that the figure of properties affected was not provided in the report and had to be requested from Council staff.</li> <li>- After speaking with member of the community, they have also shared their dissatisfaction and objection to the proposal.</li> <li>- Requests and explanation of the removal.</li> <li>- States that Council are "rezoning to medium density by stealth".</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– inadequate justification for the boundary amendment</li> <li>– no reason provided</li> </ul> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p>		
168	D20/103987	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition and rezoning of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposing open space in an area proposed for high density residential, such as Kingsgrove Village/Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road.</li> <li>- McGregor street is not appropriate to be used for on-street parking due to its narrow design and also extend to Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Drive</li> <li>- Opening the reserve will increase anti-social behaviour and increase insurance premiums for residents.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This proposal will result in an increase in traffic and parking congestion in the area of Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St.</li> <li>- Property values will be affected by this proposal.</li> </ul>			
169	D20/103994	Objects	<p>Objects to proposed removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley West.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Requests a public hearing by Council to address the issue.</li> <li>- Residents do not want change to the leafy character of the area.</li> <li>- Does not want Oatley West to reflect Hurstville.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests a public hearing</p>		
170	D20/104002	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA as it will ruin the character of the area by encouraging duplexes and general over-development.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p>		
171	D20/104025	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road).</li> <li>- Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents.</li> <li>- The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress.</li> <li>- Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St.</li> <li>- Adversely affect property values.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		
172	D20/104037	Objects	<p>Objects to Council's plan to remove properties in Oatley West from the FSPA as it will:- Reduce the leafy environment and minimal traffic and pollution. -Remove trees and introduce high density housing that will reduce the wildlife of the area.- Requests a public hearing.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests a public hearing</p>		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
173	D20/104103	Objects	Objection from Member of Parliament on behalf of the resident raising concerns in relation to: - substantial changes to the alterations to land zoning, dwelling sizes, building heights, heritage listings and foreshore protection. – Impact on the existing quality of life. - Concerns regarding increased road traffic and parking issues, the ability of local services such as schools to cope with an increased population. -Issues like loss of privacy and increased runoff into the Georges River. - Current COVID-19 circumstances make this an undemocratic time for Council to receive submissions. Many older residents may not have access to online petitions and prefer traditional methods like paper surveys, word of mouth, public forums and workshops. As these methods are not possible currently, this excludes a significant portion of the community from the consultation process. -Request public exhibition period be extended.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
174	D20/104111	Objects	Objects to Council's plan to remove properties in Oatley West from the FSPA due to: -change the leafy character of the suburb. -Decision being made by Councillors who don't live in the area. -requests a public hearing.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Raises concerns that the Planning Proposal Authority is the LPP rather than Council Requests a public hearing		
175	D20/104147	Objects	Objects to the Georges River LEP 2020 as it will destroy the area as they know it and their family will be affected in the following ways: -Increased density - leading to privacy concerns -Smaller block size - leading to decreased property value -Increased traffic noise and Congestion -Loss of leafy character - the reason many of us chose to live here -Increased Pressure on Infrastructure and Waterways from overcrowded stormwater and sewage systems	Objects to overdevelopment		
176	D20/104156	Objects	Objects to the Georges River LEP 2020 as this will destroy the area as they know it and their family will be affected in the following ways: -Increased density - leading to privacy concerns -Smaller block size - leading to decreased property value -Increased traffic noise and Congestion -Loss of leafy character - The reason many of us chose to live here -Increased Pressure on Infrastructure and Waterways from overcrowded stormwater and sewage systems	Objects to overdevelopment		
177	D20/104168	Objects	Objects to the Georges River LEP 2020 as this will destroy the area as they know it and their family will be affected in the following ways:	Objects to overdevelopment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Increased density - leading to privacy concerns</li> <li>-Smaller block size - leading to decreased property value</li> <li>-Increased traffic noise and Congestion</li> <li>-Loss of leafy character - The reason many of us chose to live here</li> <li>-Increased Pressure on Infrastructure and Waterways from overcrowded stormwater and sewage systems</li> </ul>			
178	D20/104192	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley. -Requests a public hearing. -believes the local councillors should be the ones making this decision.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Requests a public hearing		
179	D20/104203	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: increase in density from dramatic reduction in the minimum lot sizes of single dwellings and dual occupancies. - decreased landscaping requirements. - loss of large trees and all the environmental benefits they bring, such as a cooler urban landscape, protection against erosion, run off into the river and potential degradation of water quality. - Loss of private open space, and backyards with an outdoor play area for children. -Increased pressure on existing infrastructure such as schools, trains and water drainage systems. - increase in number of driveways.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
180	D20/104764	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA because of their negative impact on the amenity and character of the current and future residents; and the potentially devastating impact on the natural environment. Key changes include an increase in density / housing and therefore population density and the reduced landscaping requirements which will result in: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-lack of backyards for children to play in, people to garden in and the ability to grow one's own food - these amenities are even more important for the mental and physical health and wellbeing of the community during the current Covid-19 situation.</li> <li>-loss of habitat for the smaller creatures such as frogs, lizards, and insects</li> <li>-reduced habitat for bees</li> <li>-reducing the habitat for the many birds and possums - the trees provide shade and reduce temperature for humans.</li> <li>-reducing the ability to grow large trees that provide shade, privacy and a place for wildlife to shelter.</li> <li>-increased traffic in streets - when a duplex, replaces a single dwelling, street parking is reduced because of two driveways. Most households have two cars, so at least one and sometimes two will be parked on the</li> </ul>	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			street. -increased congestion on roads, e.g. because of duplexes in the area streets like Isaac Street between Lorraine Street and Peace Avenue are congested.			
181	D20/104772	Objects	Objects to the changes to the FSPA in Lugarno due to the following impacts: -An increase in density, with larger houses and duplexes on smaller blocks, less housing choice which we now enjoy, decimating our valued garden suburb with no backyards for children to play. -Reduction in the landscaping requirements from 25% to 20% will result in smaller gardens, fewer trees and wildlife, lack of privacy and overshadowing. - Increased traffic and congestion, noise and less street parking. Duplexes with two driveways take away 2 car spaces per block and there are parking problems around Lugarno shops and nearby streets. There are only 2 roads in and out of Lugarno, merging to one – increased traffic would be a significant problem in an evacuation/ emergency. Traffic jams as streets are too narrow for parking on both sides of the road. -Loss of leafy character, the reason many of us chose to live here, causing a decrease in property value. -Increased pressure on infrastructure due to population increase - there are no frequent buses to and from Lugarno, no buses to Oatley or Mortdale train stations; so more cars will be driving in and out of the suburb creating more traffic congestion. Sewerage and stormwater systems will be overloaded causing river and creek pollution.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
182	D20/104803	Objects	Raises concerns regarding the exhibition period for the Draft LEP 2020 in light of the Covid19 crisis and allows residents limited time to study and discuss. – Difficulty in obtaining hard copies of documents given the Council's face-to-face customer service centres have closed until further notice. - is aware that Council have received funding from the NSW Government to fast track the harmonisation of the two previous LEP's and a condition of that funding was the draft document being submitted to the state government by 30th June 2020 however hopes that the state government would grant a deferral on the request of GRC which will enable the community time to review and comment.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
183	D20/104804	Objects	Objects to Council plans to remove the FSPA in Oatley due to: -Change in the tranquil and leafy environment, more houses and people, increased traffic and loss in property value. – considers it unacceptable to uphold this proposed change as the decision is being made by people who do not live in the area. – Requests a public hearing and community consultation before any changes are done to this beautiful suburb.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests a public hearing Raises concerns that the Planning Proposal Authority is the LPP rather than Council		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
184	D20/105079	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road).</li> <li>- Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents.</li> <li>- The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress.</li> <li>- Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St.</li> <li>- Adversely affect property values.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		
185	D20/105081	Objects	<p>Objects to the reduction of existing FSPA due to:</p> <p>Residents in the Oatley west area, Parts of Mortdale Heights, Peakhurst Heights, Lugarno and Riverwood areas will not have the opportunity to attend Council workshops or hear from Council officers why certain properties have been removed from the FSPA and its implications. – Increased dwelling density and hard surfaces change in neighbourhood character and diminished quality of the Bushland, Wetlands and the River. – Threat to the water quality in Georges River. - Some of the most significant environmental assets of the Georges River Council LGA are Myles Dunphy Reserve, Oatley Park and Lime kiln Bay Wetlands and each of these reserves either fringe or drain into Georges River. – Increased polluted urban run-off entering the Georges River System.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p>		
186	D20/105250	Neutral	<p>Questions whether Council or LPP will be the determining authority – noted that gateway report states that Council should not be given plan making authority due to the extent of the amendments sought by the proposal which is at odds with the letter from the DPIE which states “I have determined not to condition the Gateway for the Panel to be the local plan-making authority in this case because the proposal affects the entire local government area.”</p>	N/A	<p>Questions whether Council or LPP will be the determining/plan-making authority.</p>	<p>The Planning Proposal Authority is the LPP and the determining/plan-making authority is the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment.</p>
187	D20/105266	Objects	<p>Objects (along with the Oatley West community) to the removal of their property from the FSPA in Oatley West due to: close proximity to the FSPA. – increased in population and dwelling density from duplexes resulting in increase in traffic. - Impact on charming character of the area and privacy, -increased impact on sewerage</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			and storm water systems. - Impact on already crowded schools.	environment		
188	D20/105272	Objects	Objection from Member of Parliament on behalf of resident raising concerns in relation to: -rezoning of Peter Low Reserve and requests that Council delay the proposal until Covid-19 restrictions are lifted. - requests that Council organise an open, community consultation with all those impacted by this development including residents of Monaro Ave, St Elmo Parade, New England Drive, Kinsel Ave and McGregor St. – The proposal is part of a LEP for high/medium density residential/apartment areas and Monaro Ave is not high/medium density residential/apartment areas.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
189	D20/105290	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to FSPA due to: increased traffic and parking on streets that can barely take one way traffic. – Loss of property value. -Loss of trees and shade. – Increased noise. –Houses on top of each other. – Overshadowing impacts. - Parks are overcrowded with users that are not local to the area. – Wants an opportunity to attend to express their feelings and requests a delay until later in the year to give the residents the opportunity to join an online forum.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
190	D20/105341	Objects	Submission from Member of Parliament on behalf of a resident raising concern in relation to removal of the foreshore protection zone around Peakhurst resulting in reduced allowable size of buildings, overdevelopment and environmental impacts.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
191	D20/105466	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St.</li> <li>- Adversely affect property values.</li> </ul>			
192	D20/105472	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road).</li> <li>- Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents.</li> <li>- The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress.</li> <li>- Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St.</li> <li>- Adversely affect property values.</li> </ul>	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
193	D20/105614	Objects	<p>Objects due to : Concerns are raised in relation to 145 Rocky Point Rd, Beverly Park for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Council's planning has isolated and devalued their property due to building bulk on surrounding properties.</li> <li>- 147 Rock Pt Rd, Beverley Park is a standalone corner site that should be given provisions to be developed on its own. - Will never be amalgamated with 2 Weeny Street. – The decision made by Council in relation to 147 Rock Pt Rd, Beverley Park made in the past 6 years has devalued and eroded the quality of life of residents of the property.</li> </ul>	Requests a spot rezoning (site specific)		
194	D20/105726	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road).</li> <li>- Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents.</li> <li>- The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance</li> </ul>	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.			
195	D20/105730	Objects	Objects to the Council's proposed changes to the FSPA and has attached a letter written to Member of Parliament. The reasons for the objection include: -increased densities and overdevelopment with duplexes and villas - reduction in lot size from 750 to 430 sqm, with only very few properties included in the FSPA -loss of the bushy nature of suburbs in the FSPA - no room for trees, native shrubs, refuge and food for the flora and fauna and loss of their habitat; leading to an urban desert -pressure on the infrastructure - leading to increase run-off and siltation of the river Requests the Member of Parliament to advocate for the retention of the FSPA.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
196	D20/105763	Objects	Objects to Council's plan to amend the FSPA around Peakhurst Heights as it will reduce property values, increase traffic noise and make the area change into a high rise area like Hurstville.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
197	D20/105816	Objects	Objects to street parking in residential areas due to the explosion in granny flats and medium and high density housing; which has led to increased boat trailers, trailers, and large trucks parking in residential areas, reducing available parking for residents and occasionally creating dangerous conditions in the dark. Has complained to Council about this issue previously – examples streets include Carlton Ave Kogarah and West Street South Hurstville.	Objects to overdevelopment		
198	D20/105843	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to FSPA in the leafy and tranquil suburb of Oatley West due to:- decrease in the value of our foreshore land. - potential loss of natural beauty, leafy streetscape and trees. -reduction in block size to allow more houses to built closer to each other. -potentially more traffic and noise.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
199	D20/105868	Objects	Objects to the rezoning of The Esplanade and The Mall (block bounded by Connell's Point Road/The Esplanade/Tavistock Road/The Mall and referred to as	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			the "Esplanade/Mall Block") in South Hurstville from R3 to R4 and raises the following concerns: – A few years ago Council opposed the rezoning of the Esplanade from R2 to R3 which was overruled by the Department. - The Draft LEP 2020 now seeks to again rezone the Esplanade/Mall Block from R3 to R4 which the resident oppose given it is well away from the King Georges Road/Connell's Point Road hub and since the Draft LEP 2020 proposes to achieve a hierarchy of residential density from R2 to R4. – If the Esplanade remains R3 then it will achieve stepped approach in zoning (from R2 to R4) and building height (9m to 12m). - Traffic impacts on Connells Point Road already impacted by the new Marist Catholic College in South Hurstville. – Questions whether traffic concerns have been taken into account in the rezoning to R4, especially when King Georges Road acts as a barrier to traffic flow to the nearest railway station.			
200	D20/105897	Objects	Objects to the proposal which plans to rezone of 11-21 Monaro Ave due to: -Non-consultative manner in which it has been managed and requests Council to delay the proposal until COVID-19 restrictions are lifted so that the households directly involved can have a fair go and freely meet to discuss the plans. - Requests Council to organise an open, community consultation with all those directly impacted by this proposal; including residents of Monaro Ave, St Elmo Parade, New England Drive, Kinsel Ave, and McGregor St. - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (e.g. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). -Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. -Plans to increase entry points and further open Peter Low Reserve will increase noise and vandalism risks. -Changes will lead to additional traffic and parking congestion, which will change the neighbourhood landscape and create further disruptions to residents.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
201	D20/106142	Objects	Objects to the proposed changed due to: reduction in the minimum lot size from 1000sqm to 650sqm. – Loss the quiet and relaxed atmosphere. –Increased population. –increase in congestion, lack of privacy, increased traffic and on-street parking on narrow streets. – Questions who stands to benefit from this proposal.	Objects to overdevelopment Requests amendments to the minimum lot size for dual occupancies		
202	D20/106148	Objects	Objects to Council's proposed changes to the FSPA in Oatley. Retaining the FSPA for only a narrow strip of	Objects to the removal of properties in		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			land and reducing a major part to the draft LEP zoning will lead to: -Spoiling the beauty of this area and quality of life. -Destruction of the habitat of possums and birds. -Smaller blocks will mean more overshadowing, smaller gardens and lack of privacy. -Increased traffic and congestion on narrow roads. -Overloaded sewerage systems and river pollution. -Request that Oatley is a gem and needs to be saved.	the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
203	D20/106253	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Increased pressure on parks such as Oatley Park and further deterioration of their quality. – Loss of the trees and wildlife. - More cars with parking congestion in streets, increased air pollution. - Loss of residents' privacy - Overshadowing of houses. - Pressure on infrastructure such as stormwater (which is now managed badly by council). Suggests the area must be preserved and kept away from rapacious property developers at all costs.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
204	D20/106294	Objects	Objection from Member of Parliament on behalf of a resident. Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove to expand Peter Low Reserve due to: -Concerned that the community was not provided with prior warning of such a proposal and its delivery made worse by its timing; during this already stressful period of COVID-19. - The council's failure to notify us (lives in the vicinity) about the proposed expansion and the limited timeframe to submit our concerns by 15 May. -Council has not provided any detailed plans plus other important information that we should have been made aware of regarding the proposed expansion. -Council has not provided the opportunity to engage in an open and fair discussion regarding the proposal. -The proposal has the following negative implications: -The council is proposing that the narrow McGregor Street will provide "on street" parking for this expanded park. McGregor Street is unsuitable as it is narrow and does not have footpaths. -There will be less "on street" parking for the residents in Monaro Avenue, McGregor Street, St Elmo Parade, Kinsel Avenue and New England Parade and a significant increase in traffic and congestion affecting neighbouring streets (Kingsway and Glenwall) affecting existing residents. -There is no understanding or reassurances about how the park will be used and what might be built within the park once the proposed access is expanded. This applies for the current timescale and for 15 years' time. -The proposal is part of a LEP for high/medium density residential/apartment areas. We do not classify as a high/medium density residential area. -The proposed changes are likely to have an adverse impact on the price of our house. Submitter strongly urges the council to delay the proposal until the COVID-19	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			restrictions are lifted so that all affected people, including the six households, can be given a 'fair go' to freely meet and discuss the plans for the future of the street and neighbourhood. We request that Council organise an open, community consultation with all those directly impacted and this should take place after the COVID-19 restrictions regarding social distancing are lifted. The consultation should include residents of Monaro Avenue, St Elmo Parade, New England Drive, Kinsel Avenue and McGregor Street.			
205	D20/106431	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove due to: - McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking due to its width and design. It is already on the verge of being a hazard (if not a hazard already) in current form and usage. -On-street parking currently occurs in the wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde and this acquisition will put pressure on the existing parking and hence affect existing residents. Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway and Orbell St turning a safe neighbourhood into hazardous for the elderly and also young families. - A lack of reassurance for how this park expansion will be used; now and in 20+ years time. - An understanding that this proposal is part of an LEP for high/medium density housing; however this area is not classified as high/medium density housing area. - Adversely affect property in the short and long term. -The in which Council has undertaken communication with the resident during the difficult situation prevailing because of COVID-19.- Questions the origin of the requests for expansion of the Peter Low Reserve. -Requests that Council organise an open consultation with the wider community including those directly impacted by this development including residents of Monaro Ave, St Elmo Parade, New England Drive, Kinsel Ave and McGregor St.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
206	D20/106605	Objects	Objects to the proposed rezoning of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove from R2 Low Density Housing to RE1 Local open space due to: -Lack of prior warning or consultation with property owners and affect neighbours. -All six households include families and senior citizens, including a family with a special needs child are opposed to this council proposal. – This is added stress on top of COVID-19 restrictions. -A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (e.g. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St.			
207	D20/106849	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
208	D20/106861	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
209	D20/106863	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Reserve)		
210	D20/106876	Neutral	Seeks update to Heritage Inventory Sheet for Heritage Item 83 - 30 Waratah Street, Oatley to: - Accurately reflect the history of development of the building and setting. - Requests that heritage items and their settings are protected from inappropriate development and subdivision e.g. 37 Woronora Parade set an unfortunate precedent.	Requests heritage inventory sheet to be amended		
211	D20/106877	Objects	Objects to proposed changes to FSPA due to: - loss of trees in Oatley due to dual occupancy development. - Increased hard surfaces are impacting on water quality of Georges River, sewerage and stormwater systems and global warming. Extra traffic congestion. -Loss of character of the area with overshadowing and lack of privacy like Hurstville and Kogarah. -Requests a public hearing	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests a public hearing		
212	D20/106902	Objects	Objects to proposed rezoning of Hillcrest Ave, Hurstville to R4 due to: - existing issues of drainage, traffic, parking and aesthetics would be exacerbated. -directly impact residents in area. -no infrastructure to support rezoning. -increase in hard surface and heights means stormwater run-off will cause damage to low lying dwellings on Greenbank St behind Hillcrest.-Granny flat at No.5 Hillcrest has contributed to flooding to No.6 Greenbank St backyard. - Privacy and amenity concerns due to topography/slope of Greenbank St below Hillcrest.	Objects to the Hillcrest Avenue – Hurstville HIA Objects to the Hillcrest Avenue – Hurstville HIA		
213	D20/106907	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from FSPA due to: - Contradicts aims of FSPA and will have a negative impact on the area -Reduced block sizes will result in environmental damage, destruction of trees and wildlife habitats. -Increasing opportunities for developers to make a quick dollar and redevelop sites will destroy the existing green and heritage character of the area. -New development will increase congestion on local	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			roads that are already at capacity.			
214	D20/106917	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed zoning and FSPA changes to Oatley West foreshore due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Increased traffic, parking and congestion issues. Access roads are few and narrow. Local traffic and parking especially to school and shops already difficult to access at peak times. Parking at Oatley station and surrounding streets is overcrowded and difficult to navigate.</li> <li>-Change to natural environment. Concerns for native wildlife and fauna. New development would destroy this valuable ecosystem.</li> <li>-Negative social impact with population increases will impact the family character of the area.</li> <li>-Requests Council reconsider proposal and give Oatley West residents additional time to respond during covid-19. Elderly residents do not have access to online petitions and community forums.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
215	D20/107002	Objects	<p>Objects to proposed changes to FSPA in Oatley due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- will adversely impact on the low density character of the area. -there are already many high density suburbs in the St George region including Hurstville, Kogarah, Mortdale, Penshurst, Riverwood etc.</li> <li>Requests to retain current zoning policy to retain Oatley's character as a premier suburb.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p>		
216	D20/107003	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to FSPA due to: - insufficient details on how traffic management will be addressed in the future. -Why is harmonisation necessary when suburbs have different needs, topography and traffic flows. -Concerned by potential safety hazards from increased traffic and parking surrounding Oatley Park through increased density and useage. -Council's inability to act or coordinate on hazard reduction is a potential serious risk for our whole community. Peakhurst is an example of failure by Council to address traffic, parking, safety and good design /construction standards.-Adversely affects amenity, existing character of the area and loss in property value. -Questions why Council area need to grow and objects to growth for growth's sake.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to overdevelopment</p>		
217	D20/107056	Objects	<p>Objects to proposed changes to FSPA due to: - ruin the character of area. -suspects proposal is for financial return for Council. Objects to the timing of the exhibition and requests proper consultation.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
218	D20/107179	Objects	<p>Objects to the changes to FSPA due to: - the importance of keeping the FSPA to continue to control</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			development on the foreshore. The zoning should not be changed.	environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
219	D20/107230	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
220	D20/107412	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: -Rezoning of Peter Low Reserve from RE1 to high density/medium density and the need to protect recreation space from development. - Suggests all areas should have a village feel, a community, a family, a place to shop, a place to eat, a place to be calm and at peace and lastly a place to share. -Generations of children have grown up in the area, parents have allowed the children to play and run around feeling assured they were safe, surrounded by families homes. - Access to the park has never been an issue, nor parking as its used predominantly by the local residents and local school for sports activity. - Objects to timing of exhibition during COVID 19 and lack of consultation and transparency. -Request proposal be delayed and proper consultation. - questions the purpose of the rezoning. -A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.			
221	D20/107414	Objects	(FB VIDEO SUBMISSION) Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: -increased parking and traffic congestion from park users resulting in lack of on-street parking for residents. -Change in character of area from quiet neighbourhood into busy, hazardous and crowded thoroughfare.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
222	D20/107635	Supports	Supports Council's decision to extend the Public Exhibition period that will give residents breathing space under these challenging conditions to better consider the implications of the LEP and to make informed submissions.	Supports Council's community engagement program for the draft LEP		
223	D20/107771	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: -adverse impact including stress on families living in the identified properties. -Consultation time frame is too short for serious consideration. -McGregor Street is inappropriate for off-street parking due to narrow street and lack of pedestrian footpaths. - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road).	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
224	D20/107775	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.			
225	D20/107777	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
226	D20/107779	Objects	Objects to proposed changes to FSPA: -houses will be closer together resulting in noise and privacy impacts. - less parking and more traffic. -loss of trees and shade and environmental benefits that trees provide for our suburbs.-loss of property value.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
227	D20/107823	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.			
228	D20/107875	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
229	D20/108354	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space: -requests delay due to covid 19 pandemic restrictions, so residents can meet to discuss without restrictions, consultation deadline is too short, Council should ask for LEP deadline extension.-this proposal has more pros (sic) for the neighbourhood and community in general.- the financial cost doesn't stack up - security concerns.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
230	D20/108356	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
231	D20/108389	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the re-zoning for Dual Occupancy in Peakhurst Heights due to:- no reliable public transport and narrow streets, existing lack of on-street parking.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
232	D20/108473	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to remove our property 4 Oatley Park Avenue and surrounding properties covered under the FSPA:- minimum lot size for new lots, minimum lot size for dual occupancy, minimum lot size for dual occupancy after subdivision, minimum landscaped area for dwelling houses and dual occupancies. due to:- reduced property values of existing houses, increasing pressure on local schools at capacity resulting in increased traffic congestion, lack of parking putting students, school staff and the community at risk of pedestrian and vehicular accidents.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
233	D20/108685	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that objects to the submission date of 15 May 2020 with no consultation during Covid-19 restrictions. Requests the Minister for Planning defer the submission date of the LEP to 1 November 2020.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
234	D20/108871	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
235	D20/108902	Objects	Objects to rezoning of Peter Low Reserve from RE1 to high density/medium density and the need to protect recreation space from development. -Objects to timing of exhibition during COVID 19 and lack of consultation and transparency. -Request proposal be delayed and proper consultation.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Also objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
236	D20/108930	Objects	Objects to the proposed planning controls relating to removal of FSPA, in particular Jewfish peninsula due to:- reduces the foreshore protection areas in former Hurstville LGA.-foreshore areas cannot be harmonised across former LGAs as they do not have the same topography and bushland setting. - areas in former Hurstville LGA are steep with preserved tree canopies. - areas in former Kogarah LGA are often on flatter blocks with less preserved bushland. -retaining tree coverage should be addressed and has not been reflected in draft LEP. -Jewfish peninsula has very steep land blocks radiating from a narrow road and:-no reference to topography and steepness.-all houses visible from waterways and the FSPA is necessary and appropriate.-blocks are generally not suitable for higher development given access and steepness. -drainage easement issues. Existing controls should be retained. Proposed amendments will weaken DCP controls , draft DCP abandons the concept of protecting and enhancing views and tree coverage for this area, the draft LEP reduces the foreshore protection area and will result in overdevelopment of natural environment. COVID-19 crisis shows how valuable the benefits of less dense development are and the value of bushland, parks and other recreation areas.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
237	D20/108940	Objects	Objects to the proposed planning controls relating to removal of properties within the existing FSPA, in particular Jewfish peninsula due to: -no appraisal of site suitability completed for proposed properties for increased density, especially steep headland areas. - houses which are visible from the river should remain in FSPA including areas west of the railway line	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided Objects to the removal of properties in		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>overlooking Gungah Bay, Peakhurst Peninsula and the Lugarno peninsular. - questions why the Lugarno headland remains in the FSPA which seems inconsistent. -reduction in tree cover due to vegetation removal for new development resulting in change of green character of area. -smaller backyards will result in no new replacement trees being planted. -less tree shade will result in more airconditioning and resulting electricity use. -less habitat for wildlife including threatened species. -has a biodiversity study been done on the effects of these changes? -stormwater drainage issues on steep blocks with less landscaping required. - water quality will be affected by polluted stormwater run-off. -increased pressure on sewerage system. - increased parking pressures. - Marine Drive is narrow and winding and cannot take increased density as on-street parking is an issue. -no provision made for extra open space and sporting fields for increased number of residents. -allowing smaller blocks will result in smaller backyards. -parks in the area are already over crowded. -landscaping requirement should not be reduced from 25% to 20%. -this plan suggests Council wants to massively increase housing density and rates revenue.</p> <p>Requests- extension of time for community consultation and public meetings. -re-think the areas intended to be removed from the FSPA. -increase FSPA to headlands of former Kogarah LGA. It is a poor reason to remove homes from protection of the FSPA just because the equivalent areas in former Kogarah LGA don't have them.</p>	<p>the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests increasing the landscaping requirements Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
238	D20/108943	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.</p>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		
239	D20/109461	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro</p>			

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: -distress, street and displacement of families living in houses listed for acquisition.-no plans to move from the area.-the compensation offered is not enough to ensure we aren't worse off.-park has never had safety issues raised, CCTV could solve any safety issues. The opening of park access will result in more theft due to increased visibility.-McGregor Street is too narrow for additional on-street parking and no paved footpaths. It is already unsafe to negotiate between parked cars. - Consultation time frame is too short for serious consideration. -Request the proposed rezoning be abandoned.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
240	D20/109513	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
241	D20/109584	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes and removal of their property from FSPA due to: -thought the zoned area would be permanent. -change the character of the area, like the trees, amount of space, traffic, sporting clubs, picnics, scouting, school activities in the playground and Oatley Park, and companionship..-proposal will sully the environment and wildlife.-impact on the health of the community.-requests no change to present FSPA.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
242	D20/109604	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of land for open space in Culwulla Street, South Hurstville due to: - intention to build 2 townhouses for children and under proposed rezoning this would not be possible. -Offers to sell their property to Council if Council would like to rezone and acquire their property for open space.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Culwulla Street, South Hurstville		
243	D20/109627	Objects	Objects to the removal of their property from the FSPA, as the removal could result in more development	Objects to the removal of properties in		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			applications in the area. Furthermore concern is raised that the timing of the LEP exhibition is inappropriate due to COVID-19 restrictions.	the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
244	D20/109648	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to controls in the FSPA due to -change to his property lot size from 550sqm to 700sqm. -New provisions will contradict the intent of the Draft LEP in order to protect the scenic amenity of the foreshore and provide more landscaping and trees. - For a battle-axe style subdivision if larger lot provisions are applied to the street facing lot, it will force any development of the rear lot closer to the foreshore thereby detracting from the scenic amenity from the waterway, contrary to what the DLEP is proposing to protect. - Removal of non-water fronted lots from the FSPA. - permitted lot size on a street fronted subdivided lot in a R2 -Low density residential should be no different from one side of the road to the other when their impact on the scenic amenity of the foreshore is no different.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
245	D20/109653	Objects	Objects to the description of heritage items to include "and setting" as concern is raised that the "setting" of items (i.e. gardens/plants) have undergone change over time. Further, notes that if the setting is intended to be protected, then those elements should be identified in the heritage inventory as significant.	Objects to amended description of heritage item		
246	D20/109660	Objects	Objects to their property being included as a Heritage Item in Schedule 5 of the LEP. Believes the property never met the criteria for inclusion on the Heritage Inventory, and further states that it no longer retains sufficient heritage value.	Requests heritage item to be removed		
247	D20/109665	Objects	Objects to the properties in Peakhurst Heights being removed from the FSPA due to: -removal from the FSPA will result in changes to the existing local streetscape and character, increase of noise and traffic, and impacts to local infrastructure. -The timing of the LEP exhibition is inadequate due to the COVID-19 pandemic, but acknowledges the extension of timeframe.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
248	D20/109744	Objects	Objects to the inappropriate timing of the LEP exhibition due to COVID-19 with related restrictions in place which presents constraints in reviewing the draft documents. Recommends the LEP 2020 should be postponed to a time when residents can properly review what is being exhibited.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
249	D20/109780	Objects	Objects to any further development in Lugarno, due to changes to local infrastructure and streetscape/chatacter as a result of recent development.	Objects to overdevelopment		
250	D20/109824	Objects	Objects the changes proposed to the FSPA due to: - detrimental impacts to the area, such as higher housing density, fewer trees, and constraints to traffic and noise.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
251	D20/109840	Objects	Objects to the re-zoning of “The esplanade / The Mall” block in South Hurstville which will exacerbate the existing traffic congestion and parking issues due to existing development.	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones		
252	D20/109847	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to FSPA due to: increased development that could endanger the local wildlife that inhabits in the vicinity of Lime Kiln Bay Wetlands.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
253	D20/109860	Objects	Objects to proposed changes to the draft LEP and raises the following concerns and suggestions: - the minimum lot width for dual occupancies under clause 4.1B are vague as properties when applied to lots that have varying lot widths. – Acquisition to connect Denman Street reserve in Hillcrest Ave and Quarry Reserve (Tennis Court) and Acquisition on foreshore on western side of Connells point to connect small existing reservation in Connells Point with Poulton Park in the vicinity of the Morshead Drive Causeway are still on the agenda for acquisition however are not referred to in the relevant section of the report i.e. Clause 5.1 Relevant Acquisition Authority Local Open Space. - Small clusters of post-war fibro dwellings should be preserved and included in the schedule of heritage items. - 25% landscaping requirement in the FSPA is insufficient and should be increased to 45% or ban dual occupancies in FSPA altogether. – Notes an error on table 9 of Clause 6.13 and suggests landscaped area should read 130sqm per lot or 65sqm per dwelling and	Requests increasing the landscaping requirements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The minimum lot width requirement for dual occupancies are vague as properties can have varying lot widths.</li> <li>2. Existing open space acquisitions in the former Kogarah LGA are not referred to in the draft LEP (Clause 5.1)</li> <li>3. Small clusters of post-war fibro dwellings should be preserved and included in the schedule of heritage items.</li> <li>4. There is an error in Table 9 of the Planning Proposal report regarding the landscaped area</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The lot width requirement for dual occupancies is measured from the front building line as specified in <i>Clause 4.1B Minimum lot sizes and special provisions for certain dwellings</i> in the draft LEP.</li> <li>2. Existing open space acquisitions that have not been acquired by the relevant authority have been translated into the draft LEP and are shown on the Land Reservation Acquisition Map. The draft LEP adopts the Standard Instrument LEP wording for <i>Clause 5.1 Relevant acquisition authority</i> which specifies the relevant acquisition authority and refers to the Land</li> </ol>

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			250sqm per lot or 125sqm per dwelling in FSPA. – seeks clarification on intent of the dual key dwellings provision, is it to create a small block of flats to be created in an R2 zones neighbourhood given a dual occupancy development could be transformed into a dual key dwelling?		for non-FSPA dual occupancies 5. Seeks clarification on the intent of the dual key dwellings provision.	Reservation Acquisition Map. 3. Additional heritage items for listing can be investigated in a future heritage review. 4. The landscaped area for non-FSPA dual occupancies in Table 9 of the Planning Proposal report does not contain an error. 5. The draft LEP proposes <i>Clause 6.14 Development for the purposes of dual key dwellings in Zones R2 and R3</i> . Clause 6.14 allows self-contained dual key dwellings of up to 75sqm within the principal dwelling to increase housing supply and diversity.
254	D20/109866	Objects	Objects to the draft LEP as the proposed changes will increase the density in the area, increase street parking, traffic, noise, and decrease in land valuation.	Objects to overdevelopment		
255	D20/109933	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided		
256	D20/109981	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: - Lack of justification and requests Council provide studies undertaken in relation to the FSPA.-impact Oatley's existing character. - increase traffic and parking congestion. -inadequate infrastructure to accommodate higher density development and increased population. - affect wildlife. Lack of consultation by Council on the draft LEP.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
257	D20/109984	Objects	Objects to the changes to the FSPA and rezoning of land due to: -Loss of quality of life and natural beauty as a result of rezoning. -Will create overcrowding, loss of streetscape character, infrastructure impacts, and less	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			space for natural habitat.	the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
258	D20/109995	Objects	Objects to the changes to the FSPA due to higher density, acoustic and visual privacy, traffic impacts such as less parking and congestion, loss of trees, and decrease of property value.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
259	D20/110006	Objects	Objects to their property being removed from the FSPA due to: -Increase in minimum lot size resulting in increase in density. -Amenity impacts including traffic, acoustic and visual privacy, fewer trees and impact on streetscape character.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
260	D20/110010	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - increase of density and its impact on existing infrastructure, increased traffic/parking, lack of privacy and overshadowing, reduced landscaping requirements. -Lack of transparency due to having the exhibition during the COVID-19 pandemic.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
261	D20/110013	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA resulting in an increase of larger houses and dual occupancy development which will result in amenity impacts such as fewer trees and wildlife, lack of privacy, overshadowing, traffic congestion, pressure on infrastructure and overloaded stormwater systems. Requests the decision should be delayed due to the lack of consultation during the COVID-19 pandemic.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
262	D20/110014	Objects	Objects to their property and surrounds being removed from the FSPA near Jewfish Point due to: -It forms part of a scenic landscape. -Increase in population will ultimately result in reduction of tree cover, less habitat for local native wildlife, storm water runoff issues,	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			increased parking pressures. -No provisions have been made for extra open space and sporting fields. Requests that Council allow for more time for community consultation, and delay the decision, due to the COVID-19 pandemic.	the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
263	D20/110017	Objects	Objects to the draft LEP for the following due to: -FSPA map is misleading as it does not clarify what is and is not being deducted from the FSPA. - Proposed changes will put pressure on infrastructure in Oatley Park and surrounds, such as stormwater, roads, footpaths. -Oatley West Public School will lose playground space and will become more congested. - Impacts to streetscape character due to the proposed lot size changes in Oatley. -Requests in writing, what donations or sponsorships have been made to support the draft LEP, and which Councillors that are part of the decision making process have interests as developers and real estate agents.	Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
264	D20/110068	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.  Also raises additional individual concerns with the proposed changes to Peter Low Reserve as follows: The opening of the reserve will encourage anti-social behaviour. Concern is also raised that properties will be affected. Also notes that the exhibition is being held during an unprecedented time, being the COVID-19 pandemic.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
265	D20/110074	Objects	Member of Parliament on behalf of an Oatley resident, requesting that the proposed changes to the FSPA be removed from the draft LEP to stop overdevelopment from occurring in the local area. The resident is concerned with the changes to the lot size changes in the FSPA, as it could create increased urban density	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			and will impact native flora and fauna.	environment		
266	D20/110146	Objects	Objects to the proposed FSPA changes, as it will increase the level of redevelopment. Concern is raised that design of new development is not being considered.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
267	D20/110284	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition and rezoning of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove due to: -Poor investment of ratepayer funds. -Adverse impact on the local community, as there will be traffic constraints. - The opening of the reserve will encourage anti-social behaviour. -Property prices will decrease. -Requests that the draft LEP is withdrawn or at the very least postponed until the COVID-19 restrictions are lifted.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
268	D20/110420	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Loss of privacy, more noise, less parking on the street, more traffic, loss of trees and shade, and loss of value in properties.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
269	D20/110464	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Impact on the flora and fauna of the area. -Increase in density along the foreshore and surrounds will have a negative impact on the area.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
270	D20/110472	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Increase in density resulting in traffic constraints as well as increased noise, and loss of streetscape character.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
271	D20/110508	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA in Oatley, Lugarno and Peakhurst - including the removal of properties, lot size changes and landscaping changes. -Reduction in low density housing, destruction of mature trees, reduction of native bird population, and severe impacts on aquatic habitat and water quality. - Greenhouse gas emissions may be increased as a result of more dwellings being built.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
272	D20/110895	Objects	Objects to the rezoning and acquisition concerning Peter Low Reserve. -The park will be subject to antisocial behaviour like other local parks. Traffic will be increased as a result of the park being easier to identify. The rezoning will eventually facilitate medium/high density development.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
273	D20/111108	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Changes will result in overdevelopment, loss of privacy, and overcapacity of infrastructure.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
274	D20/111191	Neutral	Requests their property in Oatley be rezoned from R2 Low Density Residential to R4 High Density Residential, and increase the FSR to 1:1 for the following reasons: need for low cost housing, close to public transport and town centre, located on a main road, large site that can accommodate parking, at the lowest end of the street so no or minimal overlooking and overshadowing impacts, location will allow the development to have little or no impact on adjoining properties, and adjoins a park.	Requests a spot rezoning (site specific)		
275	D20/111342	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - increase in housing density which will affect residents' amenity, loss of vegetation, lack of privacy, and overshadowing. -Local infrastructure such as roads and public transport will be affected due to more cars/ traffic, more congestion on trains and full schools. -The decision should be delayed due to the lack of consultation during the COVID-19 pandemic.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
276	D20/111358	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition and rezoning of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove. Concern is raised that the proposed acquisition represents a poor investment of ratepayer funds. The proposal will have an adverse	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			impact on the local community, as there will be traffic constraints. The opening of the reserve will encourage anti-social behaviour. Concern is also raised that property prices will decrease. Furthermore, it is requested that the draft LEP is withdrawn or at the very least postponed until the COVID-19 restrictions are lifted.	Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
277	D20/111369	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition and rezoning concerning Peter Low Reserve due to: Concerns are raised that the park will be subject to anti-social behaviour like other local parks, and that traffic will increase as a result of the park being easier to identify. Also concerned that the rezoning will eventually facilitate medium/high density development.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
278	D20/111411	Objects	Objects to the acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove. Concern is raised that the acquisition will be a waste of money. The park is inconveniently located and is out of sight, and will never be likely to attract the community.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
279	D20/111481	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the LEP due to: - Important reference in the supporting documents to the draft LEP which confirm the need for stronger foreshore protection is ignored. – based on the difference between the areas sought to be harmonized cannot and should not be made the same. – Previous planner and generations have made the area what it is to ensure the preservation of the iconic bushland and river settings of the area. –Jewfish point comprises very steep blocks radiating from a narrow road therefore to draw a line on the map without reference to the topography and steepness of the land is poor planning, almost all houses are visible from the waterways and the foreshore protection area is necessary and appropriate, blocks are generally not suitable for higher development given the topography and narrowness of roads, increased hardstand areas will cause water flow and drainage issues. –the proposed amendments to the foreshore protection area currently shown for the Jewfish Point will have adverse effects including weakening of provisions, abandonment of the concept of protecting and enhancing views and tree coverage for this area, reduction in rather than expansion in foreshore protection and abandons natural environment to overdevelop.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment and Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
280	D20/111522	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to reduction in FSPA and changes to its controls, natural	Objects to the removal of properties in		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			beauty will be destroyed as a result of overdevelopment. Specifically, concern is raised that overdevelopment will result in an increase of stormwater run off and pollution of the river, the loss of large trees will increase greenhouse gas emissions, an increase in urban heat island effect, loss of habitat and infrastructure constraints.	the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
281	D20/111819	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition and rezoning concerning Peter Low Reserve due to: - The park being subject to anti-social behaviour like other local parks, and that traffic will increase as a result of the park being easier to identify. -The rezoning will eventually facilitate medium/high density development.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
282	D20/111823	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: Adverse impact on residential amenity. -Increase in density in the suburb of Oatley, resulting in less landscaping, fewer vegetation and wildlife, lack of privacy and overshadowing, and increase in traffic.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
283	D20/111887	Objects	Objects to the description of heritage items to include "and setting" as concern is raised that the "setting" of items (i.e. gardens/plants) have undergone change over time. Also notes that if the setting is intended to be protected, then those elements should be identified in the heritage inventory as significant.	Objects to amended description of heritage item Objects to amended description of heritage item		
284	D20/111888	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: Increase in density will result in the loss of trees which will result in loss of privacy, shade and environmental benefit. -Threatened species will also be at risk due to changes to the FSPA and the water quality in the Georges River will be affected. -Numerous constraints to infrastructure, noise, and parking. Furthermore it was requested that proper consultation be done, rather than the changes be made during COVID-19 pandemic.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
285	D20/111897	Objects	Objects to the inclusion of their property as a Heritage Item in Schedule 5 of the LEP. Believes that their property never met the criteria for inclusion on the Heritage Inventory, and further states that it no longer retains sufficient heritage value.	Requests heritage item to be removed		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
286	D20/111934	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: increased density affecting the streetscape character of Oatley, Lugarno and Peakhurst. -Reduction of green space and tree planting. -Does not agree with the lack of information sessions and feels Council used the COVID-19 pandemic as a reason not to have them. suggests there should be a public hearing in respect to the proposed changes.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Requests a public hearing		
287	D20/111942	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Inadequate explanation or justification. -Change to the character of the area. -Suggests that more sites near arterial roads and railway stations be rezoned to higher density zones to accommodate housing targets set by the State Government. Suggests that Council not increase residential capacity at all until infrastructure has been adequately extended (especially public transport). -Less stringent Kogarah standards are proposed to be adopted throughout the LGA in relation to R3 (minimum lot sizes and floor space ratio) and the less stringent Hurstville standards regarding minimum lot sizes (450sqm instead of 550sqm) for R2 are proposed to be adopted which will compromise the character and amenity of the LGA. -Lack of transparency as the reduction in the FSPA was not mentioned in the information video and it was not easy to see via the mapping tool.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information	<p>1. Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA in the former Hurstville LGA and suggests that more sites near arterial roads and railway stations be rezoned to higher density zones to accommodate housing targets set by the State Government. Suggests that Council not increase residential capacity at all until infrastructure has been adequately extended (especially public transport).</p> <p>2. Concerns the less stringent Kogarah standards are proposed to be adopted throughout the LGA in relation to R3 (minimum lot sizes and floor space ratio) and the less stringent Hurstville standards regarding minimum lot sizes (450sqm instead of 550sqm) for R2 are proposed to be adopted which will compromise the character and amenity of the LGA.</p>	<p>1. The LSPS 2040 commits to supporting homes with safe, accessible, green, clean, creative and diverse facilities, services and spaces by establishing a Criteria to Guide Growth which was developed with the community and includes: - Growth supported by green open space, social and physical infrastructure - Growth areas are linked to transport corridors and frequent services</p> <p>The draft LEP proposes to upzone 5 Housing Investigation Areas for medium and high density residential development. These areas were selected based on the criteria above.</p> <p>This criteria will continue to influence ongoing decisions around managing growth within the LGA.</p> <p>2. The Planning Proposal for the draft LEP has been prepared in accordance with a number of overarching principles, including achieving equity across the LGA through the harmonisation process, particularly in respect to development potential.</p> <p>The draft LEP also introduces controls to protect the character and amenity of the LGA, including design excellence requirements for residential development to ensure that the</p>

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
						<p>highest standard of architectural and urban design is achieved within the LGA and to improve place making.</p> <p>A minimum landscaped area requirement has also been introduced into the draft LEP to ensure the protection of local landscape character, the provision of sufficient tree canopy cover, building separation and deep soil to enable water infiltration to lessen the extent of urban runoff.</p>
288	D20/111951	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA from the suburb of Oatley due to: -overdevelopment which will resemble Kogarah and Hurstville. -Concerned Council will develop Oatley Park.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
289	D20/112293	Objects	Requests to remove their property from the FSPA. Submitter urges Council to permit dual occupancy development in R2 zones on lots with a minimum area of 550sqm, with accompanying relevant controls, to potentially include: - Minimum lot size for each dual occupancy after subdivision 250sqm - Maximum floor area of 25% of lot area + 240sqm - Primary (front) setback – existing streetscape average - Maximum building height - 9m	Objects to the retention of their property within the FSPA Requests amendments to the minimum lot size for dual occupancies	Submitter urges Council to permit dual occupancy development in R2 zones on lots with a: - Minimum area of 550 sqm - Minimum lot size for each dual occupancy after subdivision 250 sqm - Maximum floor area of 25% of lot area + 240 sqm - Primary (front) setback – existing streetscape average - Maximum building height - 9m	<p>The Planning Proposal for the draft LEP has been prepared in accordance with a number of overarching principles, including achieving equity across the LGA through the harmonisation process, particularly in respect to development potential; and retaining existing controls where the status quo can be maintained.</p> <p>The key changes to the principal development standards and their detailed justification is provided in Appendix 3 of the Planning Proposal report for the draft LEP.</p> <p>It should be noted that the setback requirements will be contained in the Georges River Development Control Plan 2020 which will accompany the draft LEP with more detailed planning controls.</p>
290	D20/112410	Objects	Objects to the proposed draft LEP 2020 due to: - Concerns their area will be overdeveloped resulting in impact on streetscape character. -Notes that Roberts Avenue, Mortdale presents traffic constraints which will be heightened by an increase in density.	Objects to overdevelopment		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
291	D20/112419	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
292	D20/112441	Objects	Requests an extension to the LEP public exhibition until such time as social distancing rules are relaxed. Concerned that the current restrictions due to COVID-19 have significantly reduced the potential for residents to meet and discuss the proposed changes.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
293	D20/112445	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
294	D20/112465	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No understanding or reassurance about how the park will be used and what might be built within the park.</li> <li>- Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents.</li> <li>- The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress.</li> <li>- The houses marked for demolition impact long standing residents who will undergo unnecessary stress in relocating.</li> <li>- Demand a community meeting to discuss the proposal.</li> </ul>			
295	D20/112531	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of leafy character.- Increased density will result in smaller gardens, fewer trees and less habitat for birds and other fauna.- Increased pressure on infrastructure and overloaded sewerage and stormwater systems.</li> <li>- Increased traffic in local streets and parking difficulties. -Requests that the finalisation of the LEP be put on hold until proper community consultation can take place.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
296	D20/112543	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>reduced lot sizes will leave children with insufficient room to play in their backyards, that it will cause further parking problems and that it would mean a large amount of rock would have to be drilled.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
297	D20/112552	Objects	<p>Raises the following questions relating to the proposed rezoning of Monaro Ave, Kingsgrove and the expansion of Peter Low Reserve, and would like an opportunity to raise these questions at a Council meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Has there been a cost benefit analysis study completed on the rezoning and acquisition of the 6 properties?</li> <li>- How will this project increase usage of green space? Have alternatives been investigated?</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- What are the objectives for the reserve expansion?</li> <li>- What is the long term plan for the reserve?</li> <li>- Does Council know the current and future usage level of the reserve if expanded?</li> <li>- Has Council considered providing more signs to let people know of the reserve or include a notice in Council's newsletter?</li> <li>- Both ends of Monaro Avenue have narrow entry and provide restrictive access to the street. Does Council have plans to allow for easy access to the street and reserve?</li> <li>- There is no footpath on the side of the street where the reserve sits. Is there a plan to put a footpath in place? More footpaths will provide easy access to the reserve and an incentive for the local community to walk and exercise.</li> </ul>			
298	D20/112603	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Increased overdevelopment on smaller block areas resulting in more traffic. - Inappropriate exhibition period under the cover of COVID 19 with minimal public scrutiny.	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p>		
299	D20/112607	Objects	Objects to the LEP and FSPA and believes they contradict the LSPS document and Foreshore Strategic Directions Paper. -Concerned that the FSPA has failed to appreciate the foreshore scenery from the river, particularly from Gungah Bay, Jewfish Point and Lime Kiln Bay. -Explains that by removing lots from Marine Drive, Baker Street, Freeman Avenue, Raymond Street and Lansdowne Avenue which are visible from the river, it diminishes the scenic protection and beauty from the river. -Believes the LEP and FSPA will increase the amount of impermeable surfaces by reducing the area of landscaping. -Concerned that it will result in poor development and over population.	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA</p> <p>– inadequate justification for the boundary amendment</p> <p>– no reason provided</p>		
300	D20/112693	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that objects to the proposed removal of properties from the FSPA. Believes it will destroy the tranquility of our suburbs, increase traffic congestion, and remove and damage the local environment and habitats.	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
				environment		
301	D20/112697	Objects	Does not support the proposed rezoning in Oatley.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
302	D20/112709	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to:- No reference to Peter Low Reserve in Council's database and Generic Plan of Management in order to understand the objective to expand the Reserve. - In the Georges River Community Strategic Plan Community Engagement Summary dated 1/12/2017 there were 23 responses out of which 7 said, "Council should purchase houses and demolish them to create new parks." This was out of a population of 150,000. - In their opinion what the Council proposes to do will cost at least 15 million dollars. Such expenditure seems to be out of proportion to the benefit of gaining open access to a park that is underutilised. - It is not possible to support the proposal without knowing what Council proposes for the Reserve. There should be community consultation. - Council's Open Space, Recreation and Community Facilities Strategy 2019-2036 states "Investigate opportunities to develop separated walking and cycling tracks to provide recreational opportunities and connect key facilities in Kingsgrove. Detailed planning is required to estimate costs and inclusion". Questions whether this refers to Peter Low Reserve.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
303	D20/112723	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA and believes smaller blocks of land will result in: - Substantial increase in tree removal impacting the area's amenity, the availability of trees for native birds and wildlife, and completely change the character of the area. - Less green areas and more surface water run off into an already struggling stormwater system. - Increased number of vehicles on roads and parked on narrow streets causing congestion, and an increase in noise and pollution levels. - Increased number of residents packing into already crowded trains. - Increased number of vehicles parking on streets feeding onto Mulga Road shopping area further restricting parking availability.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
304	D20/112725	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA and believes smaller blocks of land will result in: - Substantial increase in tree removal impacting the area's amenity, the availability of trees for native birds	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			and wildlife, and completely change the character of the area. - Less green areas and more surface water run off into an already struggling stormwater system. - Increased number of vehicles on roads and parked on narrow streets causing congestion, and an increase in noise and pollution levels. - Increased number of residents packing into already crowded trains. - Increased number of vehicles parking on streets feeding onto Mulga Road shopping area further restricting parking availability.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
305	D20/112732	Objects	Objects to increase in dwelling density with dual occupancies in their street in Peakhurst Heights due to: -Vantage Lane being the only entrance. -Already no car spaces available for family and friends to park in the lane, and it is difficult for garbage and removal trucks to access the lane. -More dwellings will result in more congestion in the lane. -Explains that they are enjoying the work undertaken at Gannons Park.	Objects to overdevelopment		
306	D20/112739	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - It will remove properties from the FSPA undermining quality of life and the natural beauty of the area. - The reduction in land size will result in larger houses and duplexes on smaller blocks with reduced backyards, less gardens/trees, less privacy and more overshadowing. - There will be increased traffic and congestion, more noise and less street parking. - Loss of the leafy character of Oatley. - Increased pressure on infrastructure which will result in more crowded trains, schools at capacity, overloaded sewerage and stormwater systems and more strain on the electricity grid. - Continued social distancing will impact train capacity.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
307	D20/112784	Objects	Raises the following questions relating to the proposed rezoning of Monaro Ave, Kingsgrove and the expansion of Peter Low Reserve, and would like an opportunity to raise these questions at a Council meeting: - Has there been a cost benefit analysis study completed on the rezoning and acquisition of the 6 properties?- How will this project increase usage of green space? Is there an alternate park in Kingsgrove that would benefit more from the investment? - What are the objectives for the reserve expansion? - What is the long term plan for the reserve? - Does Council know the current and future usage level of the reserve if expanded? - Has Council considered providing more signs to let people know of the reserve or include a notice in Council's newsletter? - Both ends of Monaro Ave have narrow entry and provide restrictive access to the street. Does Council have plans to allow for easy access to the street and reserve? - There is no footpath on the side of the street where the reserve sits. Is there a plan to put a footpath in place? More footpaths will provide easy access to the	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			reserve and an incentive for the local community to walk and exercise.			
308	D20/112790	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space for the following reasons:- No reference to Peter Low Reserve in Council's database and Generic Plan of Management in order to understand the objective to expand the Reserve. - In the Georges River Community Strategic Plan Community Engagement Summary dated 1/12/2017 there were 23 responses out of which 7 said, "Council should purchase houses and demolish them to create new parks." This was out of a population of 150,000. - In their opinion what the Council proposes to do will cost at least 15 million dollars. Such expenditure seems to be out of proportion to the benefit of gaining open access to a park that is underutilised. - It is not possible to support the proposal without knowing what Council proposes for the Reserve. There should be community consultation.- Council's Open Space, Recreation and Community Facilities Strategy 2019-2036 states "Investigate opportunities to develop separated walking and cycling tracks to provide recreational opportunities and connect key facilities in Kingsgrove. Detailed planning is required to estimate costs and inclusion". Questions whether this refers to Peter Low Reserve.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
309	D20/112793	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). -No understanding or reassurance about how the park will be used and what might be built within the park. - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde and Kinsel Ave affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. -The houses marked for demolition impact long standing residents who will undergo unnecessary stress in relocating. - Demand a community meeting to discuss the proposal.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
310	D20/112821	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: -Change in the leafy charcater of the suburb. - Concerned the decision is being made by Councillors that do not live in the area. -Requests a public hearing.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests a public hearing Raises concerns that the Planning		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
				Proposal Authority is the LPP rather than Council		
311	D20/112825	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Increased density and smaller block size resulting in increased pressure on infrastructure and damage the leafy and spacious character of Oatley.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
312	D20/112977	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - The Reserve is not part of a green grid of connected parklands. - Not located in areas to be zoned for higher density. - Is located in a quiet low density residential area and is not suitable for expansion and redevelopment as an active open space for sporting activities. -Inconsistent with Council's Local Housing Strategy findings. -A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. -New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). -Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. -On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. -The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. -The additional traffic and parking congestion will change the whole amenity of the surrounding areas. - Adversely affect property values in the area.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
313	D20/113008	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA and the removal of properties due to: -Undue haste with which this process has proceeded in the middle of a global pandemic. - Impact on the area's aesthetic. -explains that there is currently trees/vegetation from the waterfront to the ridge along much of the waterways which is an essential habitat for many threatened species. -Lowering block size requirements will increase density, placing more demands on infrastructure. -Roads, playing fields, schools, public transport, water and drainage are already at maximum capacity.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
314	D20/113038	Objects	Member of Parliament raises objections on behalf of a			

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>resident to: -permitting restaurants, cafes and bars in the R4 zone due to increased noise, anti-social behaviour, parking and traffic. Area is more than adequately serviced by licenced premises.</p> <p>Also objects to permitting function centres and small bars in the B6 zone due to more noise and anti-social behaviour in quiet residential neighbourhoods. Adequate number of venues already provided.</p> <p>Further objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park as the site is at capacity, need to conserve parkland, exacerbate traffic and parking congestion, overdevelopment of a small area surrounded by residential, and St George Leagues is nearby so another facility is not required. Concerned there has been a lack of consultation.</p>	<p>Objects to the permissibility of restaurants, cafes and small bars in the R4 zone</p> <p>Objects to the permissibility of small bars and function centres in the B6 zone</p> <p>Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
315	D20/113062	Objects	<p>Objects to the changes proposed to Peter Low Reserve and the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove due to: Having over 10 reserves within minutes of Peter Low Reserve. -Suggests that should Council decide that Peter Low Reserve be opened up for more access, that Council considers relocating the access via New England Drive as Monaro Avenue is a narrower road. -Cars entering and leaving the proposed car park in Monaro Avenue will create a dangerous situation.</p>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		
316	D20/113101	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Change in lot size. -chnages will destroy the area. - Believes the proposed changes are contrary to Council's recommendations: -Point 12 of the Foreshore Strategic Directions Paper states that "zoning should be applied in the application of the Standards LEP to protect key habitat and environmental assets" , -Threats and Risks to Garden Suburban Larger Lots such as reduction of front and back setbacks, reduction of mature trees and other significant vegetation, incongruous contemporary styles of development, larger scale development – increased site coverage, tree clearing, and built form becoming the dominant physical feature. -Concerned that their narrow, winding street already has a number of cars and that this would be exacerbated by the doubling of households. Explains that the area is home to an array of fauna. Believes the current lot size of 1000sqm for subdivision will ensure that the area maintains its key characteristics.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
317	D20/113104	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due: - Increased density in our suburb, resulting in smaller gardens, fewer trees and wildlife, lack of privacy and overshadowing. - Increased traffic. -Changes will affect quality of life and change the suburb's character. - Concerned that the redevelopment of a property in their</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural</p>		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			street, resulting in two 5 bedroom homes and 1 bedroom cottages at the rear of each, has already had a profound effect on parking.	environment		
318	D20/113105	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA and the removal of properties. Requests that the exhibition deadline be delayed due to COVID-19. Believes the current FSPA has been abominably regulated and will get worse under the new proposal. Believes the proposed FSPA is too narrow and questions whatever happened to the Greater Sydney Commission's objectives of preserving landscapes. Concerned that the proposal will result in: - Loss of biodiversity: trees that are a habitat for native birds and animals will be cut to make way for buildings. - Loss of privacy and noise: every home maximises its size by building closer to the boundary and they will be even closer under the proposal. - Traffic: lives in Marine Drive which is already clogged by many cars, boats and boat trailers. - Water quality: it is more economical for Council to retain soft landscaping to maintain the absorption of polluted water. - Loss of green space: in comparing open public space per resident in Council areas (SMH 2-3 May 2020) Georges River came in at 27.3 square metres per person and the proportion of open space to total Council area is 11.2%. Council has not proposed any increase in public space to alleviate the now proposed increase in population density.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
319	D20/113382	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA and the removal of properties. Believes it will undermine the quality of life and the natural beauty of the area. Concerned that the proposal will decrease property values, and an increase in density with larger houses and duplexes on smaller blocks will decimate the garden suburb. Concerned that smaller block sizes will result in smaller gardens, fewer trees and wildlife, lack of privacy and overshadowing. Questions how infrastructure such as schools and the overloaded sewerage and stormwater systems will cope.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
320	D20/113401	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space on the following grounds: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area that is zoned low density and is already adequately serviced by the existing Reserve. - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. - Opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism and theft, resulting in increased insurance premiums and noise. - Adversely affect property values. - Demands that the proposal be delayed until COVID-19 restrictions are lifted. Requests community consultation for residents in Monaro Avenue, St Elmo Parade, New	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			England Drive, Kinsel Avenue and McGregor Street.			
321	D20/113421	Objects	Objects to the proposal to remove properties from the FSPA due to: Reduced minimum lot sizes to allow increased housing density. Stormwater system not being capable of handling existing building development and the proposed increase in housing density. Increased housing will place increased pressure on existing sewerage and road systems that are already struggling to cope.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
322	D20/113608	Objects	Objects due to: Concerns that the consultation process has been impacted by COVID 19, preventing resident's involvement in decision making, and requests that the decision making be delayed until residents can be fully involved. Believes a delay to the end of May is not a solution in this unprecedented time.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
323	D20/113675	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that the proposal will lead to increased housing density and cars parked on streets which are already quite narrow.	Objects to overdevelopment		
324	D20/113680	Objects	The draft LEP 2020 proposes to remove their property from the FSPA. Urges Council to permit dual occupancy development in R2 zones on lots with a minimum area of 550 sq. m, with following controls: - Minimum lot size for each dual occupancy after subdivision 250 sq. m. - Minimum lot width at building line of 14 m - Maximum floor area of 25% of lot area + 240 sqm - Primary (front) setback – existing streetscape average - Maximum building height – 9m	Requests amendments to the minimum lot size for dual occupancies		
325	D20/113685	Objects	Objects to the proposed change to zoning. Explains that traffic has already increased and that the reason people like Oatley is because of its open areas.	Objects to overdevelopment		
326	D20/113687	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Adversely affects on their quality of life and the value of their property. -Believes this proposal only benefits developers. -Believes any decision should be delayed until after COVID-19.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
327	D20/113738	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA and the downsizing of lots. Believes more people means more traffic and negative impacts including: - Increase travel time on roads, more time spent getting in/out of shopping centres, more cars parked on residential streets, increased robberies, increased demands on	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			health services, schools and other infrastructures such as trains, buses, local parks, medical centres, as well as affect sewerage and stormwater which will increase pollution levels to the Georges River and surrounding creeks. - Increases in population is a natural process with people living longer now due to advancements in technology and medical science. - Decrease in property value, negative impacts to wildlife and less trees. - Believes space is premium as a result of COVID-19 and does not believe social distancing can be effectively practised in higher density populated areas. Believes this can be avoided if the proposal excludes R2 residents from reducing current lot sizes.	environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
328	D20/113739	Objects	Objects to the proposed rezoning of dwellings at 11-21 Monaro Avenue and changes to Peter Low Reserve due to: -Area not being identified as high density residential. -No information has been offered to residents in regards to how the park will be used and what might be built, as any changes to the neighbourhood could result in a hazardous and crowded thoroughfare. -Proposal is exhibited during COVID-19.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
329	D20/113742	Objects	Opposed to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: -Increased density resulting from houses designed with a bigger footprint, and will result in duplexes being built on smaller blocks. -Duplexes result in more vehicles parked on the streets and less curb-side parking due to double driveways. -Reduction in landscaping requirements will see garden suburbs compromised and devalued due to overcrowding, reduction in garden space and backyards, fewer trees and wildlife, and lack of privacy. -Additional impacts of the proposed changes will include increased traffic, congestion and noise, loss of the suburb's leafy character, and additional pressure on existing infrastructures. Provides example of Oatley Heights Park's sewerage management which is often smelly, polluted, overflowing and full of rubbish.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
330	D20/113760	Objects	Objects to the proposed rezoning due to: -Change to the suburb's unique character and ambience. -Smaller blocks of land will lead to overcrowding, less parking and more traffic. -States that their area already has dual occupancy and large homes built which in most cases occupy most of the land and do not replace trees that were destroyed.	Objects to overdevelopment		
331	D20/113966	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - Will encourage more vandalism, graffiti, loitering, littering, more traffic congestions, it will also encourage people to hang out in the carpark and performing illegal activities. - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents.</li> <li>- The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress.</li> <li>- Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St.</li> <li>- Adversely affect property values.</li> </ul> <p>Believes funds should be used to improve the reserve, as well as the lighting, footpaths and roads.</p>			
332	D20/113968	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed rezoning of Peter Low Reserve due to: -Explains their family uses the reserve without any concern for safety, Concerns that the streets of Kinsel and New England are already narrow, and if rezoning or expanding of the Peter Low Reserve proceeds, this would cause additional traffic chaos and increase the risk of accidents as children weave in and out of the park. -changes will transform a quiet neighbourhood into a busy, hazardous and crowded area and put a strain on Glenwall and Monaro streets. - Concerns that opening the reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft, drugs etc, and increase insurance premiums, fear and distress.</p>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		
333	D20/114001	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Minimal notice, and during a pandemic. -Changes will alter the area's character and will increase pressure on infrastructure with crowded trains, packed schools, and overloaded sewerage and stormwater systems causing river and creek pollution. -Greater density resulting in less privacy, more traffic and noise, and less greenery. - Loss of trees which provide shade, green space and environmental benefits. -Believes no notice has been taken of Objective 28 of the Greater Sydney Commission by not adequately protecting scenic landscapes. -Concerned that Council ignored a map that shows the focal view points and bushy highspots throughout the area, and explains that many of these are not on the foreshore but background for it. - Reduction in recreational spaces will decrease, gardens will decrease, and residences will be overlooked. - Concerns that biodiversity will be undermined by the removal of FSPA area's in Oatley West, Mortdale</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Heights and Peakhurst West. - Increase in built densities will lead to tree removal and adversely affect critical habitat, threatened species, and populations or ecological communities on these habitats. -Threat to the water quality in the Georges River and is a critical threat to the swimming baths within Oatley Park.			
334	D20/114013	Objects	Objects to the proposed R4 rezoning of the residential block bounded by Connell's Point Road/The Esplanade/Tavistock Road/The Mall (i.e. Esplanade/Mall Block). Questions why this quiet residential block is again being proposed for rezoning. Believes the rezoning does not make sense for the following reasons: - It is well away from King Georges Road and Connells Point Road commercial hubs. - The Esplanade/Mall Block zoning doesn't result in a "stepped" approach to zoning density on the southern part of Connells Point Road as the zoning goes from low density R2 to high density R4 in one leap. - It is inconsistent with the northern side of Connells Point Road (opposite side to the Esplanade/Mall Block) where the zoning is R3. Keeping the Esplanade/Mall Block R3 is consistent with the stepped approach taken on the northern side of Connells Point Road. - Traffic on Connells Point Road is already impacted by the new Marist Catholic College in South Hurstville. Since the Esplanade/Mall Block is well away from a railway station, questions whether traffic concerns have been taken into account.	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones		
335	D20/114054	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to permitted use of Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park for the following reasons: - Excessive noise potentially continuing into late hours. - Proposed use is incompatible with the site's location as its in a crowded residential area and adjacent to a primary school. - Increases parking and traffic congestion in and around residential streets, which already have traffic and parking issues. - Potential for undesirable behaviour by crowds before and after the event. -Believes this type of facility or use should be permitted in an industrial or light commercial district.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
336	D20/114093	Objects	Objects to the LEP due to: Lugarno has only one road in and out. -Concerns that extra housing and traffic will bring chaos to the suburb.	Objects to overdevelopment		
337	D20/114212	Objects	Objects to the rezoning of the residential foreshore areas due to: - Increased traffic and parking on already narrow winding streets resulting in reduced vision and safety concerns for road users, - Smaller blocks will mean less open green space per dwelling. - New dwellings will be at least 2 storeys high resulting in	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			more overshadowing, privacy for neighbours. - Loss of habitat for plant and animal species which would disappear due to extra noise, light pollution and traffic deaths. - Increased pressure on urban green spaces. - Overcrowding will lead to disputes over noise and space. - Increased water run-off across paved areas will lead to more pollution in waterways. - Increased population will lead to increased sewerage. Inspection ports along the main sewer in Myles Dunphy Reserve already overflow and pour raw sewerage into Lime Kiln Bay. - The quiet leafy landscape will be destroyed. - Loss of property values. - Will change the character of the foreshore villages of Oatley, Lugarno, Hurstville Grove and Peakhurst/Riverwood. -Oatley has been impacted by the railway timetables which cause it to be parked out by commuters and the number of cafe patrons use up the 2 hour parking so other businesses lose customers.	environment		
338	D20/114268	Objects	Opposed to the proposed rezoning of Culwulla St, South Hurstville from R2 to R3, and the open space acquisitions for the following reasons: - An apartment at the end of Culwulla St will increase the population density and will affect the tranquillity and quality of life. The value of land and homes will reduce as it will no longer be a leafy, quiet suburban street. - Increasing the population density will impact schools and quality of local education. There is no proposal for additional school infrastructure. - A population increase will create more noise, rubbish and pollution. - Creating a public space for recreation will increase the number of people who visit the street, causing safety and security issues for residents. - More visitors will increase traffic and cause further parking issues. - Increase in traffic is dangerous as there are families with children who walk around. - There are 5 parks within 2-5mins walk from Culwulla St. An extra park is unnecessary. - The proposed public recreation site is close to King Georges Rd and 7-Eleven. This is an unpleasant area to create a park and increases the risk of accidents. - If homes on the street are acquired and developments are built, there will be construction, noise and disturbance for many years. - Acquiring homes and creating a recreational space is projected to cost \$20-30million, with the cost increasing if problems and extensions occur. Cost increases will be paid for by residents as increased tax and cause financial stress.	Objects to the Culwulla Street –South Hurstville HIA Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Culwulla Street, South Hurstville		
339	D20/114474	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space at Peter Low Reserve due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area that is zoned low density and is adequately serviced by the existing Reserve. - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. - Opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism and theft, and result in increased insurance premiums and a crowded thoroughfare. - Adversely affect property values. -Requests that the proposal be delayed until COVID-19 restrictions are lifted and that a community consultation be held for residents of Monaro Ave, St Elmo Parade, New England Drive, Kinsel Ave and McGregor St.			
340	D20/114479	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Removal of 2531 lots from the current FSPA in the Peakhurst Ward (including 1318 lots in Oatley West, 542 in Lugarno, 290 in Peakhurst Heights, 253 in Mortdale, 114 in Peakhurst and 14 in Riverwood). Council proposes to add 1649 lots to the former Kogarah LGA. However, this results in a net loss of 882 lots. It is a contraction, not an expansion of the FSPA as per a key action in Council's own Local Strategic Planning Statement. - massive reduction of the extent of the FSPA would allow less stringent development controls such as decreased lot size for dual occupancy developments (from 100sqm to only 650sqm) and weakened landscaping requirements (from 25% to only 20%), thereby significantly increasing the development potential of these suburbs. - This is at odds with the key values, key issues and key priorities of Council's staff representing a variety of backgrounds from across the planning, environmental, infrastructure and projects departments.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
341	D20/114480	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space at Peter Low Reserve due to: - The area not being identified as high density residential. -No information has been offered to residents as to how the park will be used and what might be built. -The proposed changes could result in a hazardous and crowded thoroughfare. Concerned that the proposal is being exhibited during COVID-19.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
342	D20/114481	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: -Funds could be better utilised in upgrading the park, not building a car park. -Existing ways to access the park are perfect for locals and that there are plenty of parks for kids and adults to exercise and play.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
343	D20/114484	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - Residents of Glenwall Street use Peter Low Reserve for recreation, health and fitness. -Explains that their family	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			use the reserve without any concern for safety. - Concerns that the streets of Kinsel and New England are already narrow, and if rezoning or expanding Peter Low Reserve proceeds, it would cause traffic chaos and increase the risk of accidents as children weave in and out of the park. -Change from a quiet neighbourhood into a busy, hazardous and crowded area and put a strain on Glenwall and Monaro streets. -Concerns that opening the reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft, drugs etc, and increase insurance premiums, fear and distress.	Reserve)		
344	D20/114488	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
345	D20/114534	Objects	Object to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Noise and privacy. - More dwellings, trees knocked down resulting in a lack of privacy and shade. - Exacerbate the growing traffic problems that we face in and around Oatley. -More cars parking on the street makes it difficult and dangerous entering and exiting driveways. - Serious doubts about the availability of sufficient stormwater infrastructure in Oatley to deal with the additional stormwater runoffs from new dwellings. -Requests a deferral until public discussion following COVID-19 can occur.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
346	D20/114553	Objects	Object to the proposed extent to the FSPA due to: - Increased impacts on the environment, existing amenity and infrastructure. -The FSPA was established using sensible and well researched principles.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
347	D20/114554	Objects	Objects to the change in minimum lot size due to: -			



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Blocks are already being decimated and stripped of native trees/flora to accommodate over-sized residences. - The ratio of landscaping to the size of new residences is already out of proportion and will only be further exacerbated by squeezing in additional housing on smaller blocks. -Geographical features such as sandstone escarpments are already being bulldozed to accommodate over-sized residences. -Native wildlife is already being shoved out of its natural habitat by over-development. -Squeezing in more housing on smaller blocks will lead to loss of privacy and potential overshadowing and lead to the creation of an urban ghetto. - Parking in and around Oatley shopping centre and railway station is already a major issue with little or no flexibility to expand on additional parking. – Impact on parking due to narrow width of streets. - will a limit be imposed on the number of vehicles per household if approval is granted to build more houses on smaller blocks.	Objects to overdevelopment		
348	D20/114908	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
349	D20/114914	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism,	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.			
350	D20/114986	Objects	Objects to overdevelopment of the area due to loss of trees and the risk of destroying the character of the area.	Objects to overdevelopment		
351	D20/115024	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values. Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
352	D20/115032	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values. Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			unsuitable for on-street parking.			
353	D20/115034	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: -No increase in housing density in the precinct surrounding Peter Low Reserve. -A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. McGregor St is not suitable for on street parking - No traffic study has been completed. community concerns about the safety of increasing car presence in this street. Lack of community consultation during this time and not notifying other families who will be affected by these changes.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
354	D20/115037	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values. Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
355	D20/115039	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. -	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Adversely affect property values. Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking.			
356	D20/115042	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values. Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
357	D20/115047	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values. Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
358	D20/115179	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: living in the area for so long and for council to come along and really give the no choice is unfair.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
359	D20/115271	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - The steep, rugged escarpment which has served as a protection for the river, the wildlife that inhabits these areas, and maintaining a continuous strip of vegetative land to keep populations of wildlife from becoming isolated and thereby endangered for survival. -These areas also serve to protect the river from excessive run-off and shore based pollution. Construction costs and damage to the environment from this proposal would be huge. -Other issues such as increase in traffic where the roads are inadequate already, increased overflow, which is common now would pollute the river.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
360	D20/115338	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: -No prior consultation to the effected residents and adjoining residents. -Does not provide adequate parking for visitors to the park. -The area is of low density and does not have the need for additional play and green spaces. -Loss of amenity thorough loss of privacy, light and noise pollution. -Opening up the park draws more attention to the area and provides a security issue to adjoining residence.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
361	D20/115357	Objects	Object to the proposed extent to the FSPA due to: - Increased impacts on the environment, existing amenity and infrastructure. -The FSPA was established using sensible and well researched principles.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
362	D20/115371	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. -	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Adversely affect property values. Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking.			
363	D20/115405	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: Smaller block sizes increase roof area , driveways and the hard surfaces therefore run off and pollutants into the river. -Reduce natural or sympathetic landscaping and will necessitate the removal of large trees. - Changes will increase traffic and reduce on street parking. -The scenic value of the river will be destroyed. -Unacceptable LEP consultation during this period of Covid-19 isolation when people are distracted and distressed.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
364	D20/115407	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: Smaller block sizes and the increased density will bring. - Increased traffic, loss of trees and vegetation and increased pressure on infrastructure in the area.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
365	D20/115429	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that objects to the Council's Draft LEP due to: threat to natural landscape, infrastructure and way of life.	Objects to overdevelopment		
366	D20/115437	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes due to: -Failure to meet the objectives Chapter 5 of the LSPS. -Targets will not be able to be met due to removal of trees for development. -Requiring only 20% of site space to be allocated to landscaping is highly unlikely to result in replacement of cleared trees. -Suggests a landscaped area of 35% in low density residential zone. -Foreshore Scenic must include all property developments which are clearly visible from the water. Council needs to establish and maintain more focus on protecting the existing tree coverage in Oatley and establishing large trees along nature strips.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Requests increasing the landscaping requirements		
367	D20/115450	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to allow Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park to become an Entertainment Facility due to: -Limited green space in the LGA. Residential areas not for bars, restaurants and entertainment. - Limited parking. -Increased traffic causing congestion and increase safety risk. -Nursing homes and schools located near the boundary to Jubilee Oval.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
368	D20/115454	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a			

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			resident that objects to the Council's Draft LEP due to: -Threat of our natural landscape, values the quality surroundings and doesn't want to see them destroyed.	Objects to overdevelopment		
369	D20/115457	Objects	Council's conduct breaches of the Georges River Community Engagement Policy.	Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
370	D20/115563	Objects	Objects to the proposed change of use to Kogarah Park & Jubilee Oval due to: - the loss of very valuable green space in the area which is already in very short supply. -Extra traffic in local streets, parking issues. - Incompatibility of proposed activities with the primary school and dense residential.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
371	D20/115583	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that objects to the Council's Draft LEP due to: Threat to natural landscape, quality surroundings. - Doesn't want to see them destroyed.	Objects to overdevelopment		
372	D20/115642	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Increased dwelling density, dwellings crowded close to side and back property boundaries and the increase of 2 storey and dual occupancy properties. -More noise and less privacy, with increased dwelling density comes increased population and the noise associated with more people. --Reduced visual and auditory privacy. - Traffic and Parking, streets near the station already have parking issues for visiting people. -Loss of Vegetation and trees, smaller block sizes are unlikely to be able to accommodate trees of any size, particularly spreading shade trees. -loss of property values due to impact on the ambience of the suburb. -Wide community consultation on this issue is necessary. While the current Coronavirus pandemic situation exists, it is not possible to hold public meetings and information sessions, so any proposals to make these changes should be postponed until it is possible for community consultations to proceed in the accepted manner.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
373	D20/115703	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: Population densities increasing, significant infrastructure is not provided for higher densities. More cars and buildings packed on to tiny blocks.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
374	D20/115710	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: Increased population on smaller blocks. -Removing more trees, less native flora and fauna. - Impact on traffic where streets are overflowing with parked cars from commuters. -The changes will destroy our way of living around the streets.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
375	D20/115718	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: draft LEP 2020 does not adequately consider the environment, especially the flora and fauna and remnant native vegetation and is concerned about removal of more than 2000 lots from the FSPA. Council should refer to OEH (2013, 2016) native vegetation mapping and data layers for threatened species, undertake a biodiversity assessment, not reduce the lot sizes to maintain the large garden areas, require minimum 50% landscape area, apply the “Georges River Strategic Directions Paper” to the entire LGA, expand Environmental Protective Zonings to include E3 Environmental Management and E4 Environmental Living to protect significant native vegetation and wildlife habitat on public and private land.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests increasing the landscaping requirements		
376	D20/115723	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: Do not destroy the villages of Oatley, Oatley West, Peakhurst, Lugarno and Riverwood.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided		
377	D20/115729	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Increase in traffic and more cars.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
378	D20/115786	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA in Oatley due to: -Removal of well established native gum trees. - New dual occupancies are being designed with only a single garage which means additional cars are parked on the street resulting in further congestion along the narrow streets.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
379	D20/115810	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Overcrowding, strain on roads and infrastructures, loss of habitats for birds and wild life and places for families. -We need more open space and parklands.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
380	D20/115817	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - Being inconsistent with South District Plan as it is not within the green grid of connected parklands and it is not within a high density area where additional open space should be prioritised. -Inconsistent with the draft Local Housing Strategy as it identifies insufficient open space generally in or near higher density areas. -Notes that existing supply of sports fields is insufficient. -Poor investment of ratepayer funds as ultimate cost \$10M.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
381	D20/115826	Neutral	Suggests to avoid a repeat of high rise development at Ellen Subway, Mortdale. High rise should have setbacks of 4m from the footpath and be landscaped with shrubs/trees to provide green streetscape.	Objects to overdevelopment Requests increasing the landscaping requirements		
382	D20/115832	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Further degradation of the environment, increase in GHG emissions, loss of native habitat and severe impact on the aquatic habitat and water quality in Georges River.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
383	D20/115835	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to being: - Inconsistent with South District Plan as it is not within the green grid of connected parklands and it is not within a high density area where additional open space should be prioritised. -Inconsistent with the draft Local Housing Strategy as it identifies insufficient open space generally in or near higher density areas. It also notes that existing supply of sports fields is insufficient. -Poor investment of ratepayer funds as ultimate cost \$10M.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
384	D20/115842	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Loss of attractiveness of the area. -Changes will result in destroying the architectural and natural balance of the area.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
				Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
385	D20/115919	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: -Poor and inappropriate investment of Council funds. -Adverse impact on the local community as streets are narrow and unsuitable for street parking. -Will increase noise and vandalism risks. -Additional traffic and parking congestion. -Requests a deferral until public discussion following COVID-19 and transparency.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
386	D20/115989	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - Increased density with larger houses on smaller blocks, less housing choice, reduction of landscaping, reduction of native trees and wildlife, lack of privacy, overshadowing and increased noise, increased traffic and congestion and increase pressure on infrastructure.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
387	D20/116068	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to:- 60 day engagement program. -The six affected property owners did not receive letters until April 22. -Suggests that due to COVID-19 and the cancellation of information sessions, Council should amend the consultation timeline and processes for the draft LEP as not all residents have access to gather more information and generate debate on the issues, such as a video conference.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
388	D20/116276	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: Peter Low Reserve is already large enough, unfair to make people relocate and a poor investment of Council funds.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
389	D20/116295	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue,		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
390	D20/116386	Objects	Objects to the removal of their Oatley property from the FSPA due to: change in density of housing, narrow roads will mean more vehicles parked on street, local drainage system won't cope, loss of village atmosphere and demise of character of Oatley suburb.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
391	D20/116436	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: increased density of housing, increased traffic and narrow roads, parking scarcity, increased rubbish in park and streets, environmental impact on parks, waterways, stormwater and infrastructure, hence council will need more council rangers to clean it all up.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
392	D20/116586	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: changes to permit housing and dual occupancy will change the liveability and character and destroy the villages of Oatley, Oatley West, Peakhurst, Lugarno and Riverwood.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
393	D20/116688	Objects	Objects to the proposed upzoning from R2 to R4 of the residential block bounded by Connell's Point Road/the Esplanade/Tavistock Road/the Mall, South Hurstville without a stepped approach to an R3 zone and also due to potential traffic impacts.	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
394	D20/116714	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: - Climate change, need for increased green space, certainty about living in a greener environment and garden suburb character of Oatley. -Increased density and duplexes on smaller blocks. -Less housing choice. - Smaller gardens and no backyards for children to play. - Reduced landscaping. - Loss of our renowned green and leafy character. - Increase in traffic causing congestion on narrow streets. -Increased pressure on infrastructure including crowded trains, inadequate school facilities for increased enrolments. - Lack of capacity in our storm water, drainage and sewerage systems.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
395	D20/116810	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: increased density of housing and dual occupancy, reduced area for vegetables, reduced landscaped area from 25% to 20%, lack of privacy, overshadowing, increased noise, traffic, congestion and insufficient parking, loss of garden character, increased pressure on infrastructure.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
396	D20/116829	Objects	Objects to the proposed upzoning of Jersey Ave, Mortdale to a higher density due to: drainage issues and lack of green space.	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones Objects to overdevelopment		
397	D20/116885	Objects	Objects to the removal of their Oatley property from the FSPA due to: increased density of housing and dual occupancy, reduced area for vegetables, reduced landscaped area from 25% to 20%, lack of privacy, overshadowing, increased noise, traffic, congestion and insufficient parking, loss of garden character, increased pressure on infrastructure.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
398	D20/117224	Objects	Objects to the removal of their Oatley property from the FSPA due to: more traffic noise and congestion, less wildlife, more sewerage and storm water putting more pressure in the river system, loss of gardens and trees, suburb is unique and loss of privacy.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
399	D20/117318	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: - Urban consolidation and increased housing density inappropriate on the river foreshore, increased road congestion, increased parking volume, reduction in trees, increased runoff, destroy the character of the foreshore which is already overdeveloped, upper part of peninsula should be included in the FSPA. -Supports urban consolidation on flat land and close to public transport. -Concerned that LEP consultation is happening during the COVID-19 Pandemic.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
400	D20/117322	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: houses will be closer together necessitating tree removal meaning loss of privacy, shade, environmental benefits from trees that help with climate change, houses lose value, impossible to protect biodiversity, threatens water quality of Georges River eg baths in Oatley Park, swimming risk of infections due to denser urban development, more traffic, not safe, less parking, more noise as houses closer together. Concerned that LEP consultation is happening during the COVID-19 Pandemic.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
401	D20/117330	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: removal of native trees/flora, to accommodate oversized houses, ratio of landscaping to size of new residences, squeezing additional housing on smaller blocks, Geographical features such as sandstone escarpments are already being bulldozed to accommodate over-sized residences, overdevelopment, loss of privacy, overshadowing, parking, narrow street and vehicles per household limit needed.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
402	D20/117684	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
403	D20/117729	Objects	Objects to permitted use of entertainment facilities at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park due to: English Family entrusted land never intended for football community for a few days, intended to be used as space for residents to enjoy, picnic and children to play, enough hotels and cafes with ample room for functions, Carrs Park is ideal place for redevelopment of such a facility, ample space, no parking issues and accessible.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
404	D20/117735	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: protection of the environment and existing amenity, housing density will increase.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
405	D20/117744	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
406	D20/117844	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: reduces the minimum lot size and landscaping requirements, dual occupancies are appalling, oversized developments on way too small blocks, which result in a total lack of privacy for existing neighbours. They result in overshadowing, reduced parking, ugly urban landscape, sewer and drainage facilities would not cope, impacting the river , increased density will alter character of garden suburbs, reduction of green space and planting which gives these areas their beauty and character, values living in an area of quiet, with lovely walks and bush land to enjoy.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
407	D20/118015	Objects	Objects to LEP 2020 due to: existing plan has a whole range of faults and this will exacerbate them, large dwellings with small garages means cars parking on the	Objects to overdevelopment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			road, water issues due to increased number of residences causing water restrictions, stormwater does not handle the situation in times of heavy rain and causes pollution of the river and ocean, parking an issue even without increasing density eg. around railway stations and village shopping centers, bush evaporating and loss of habitat and healthy living.			
408	D20/118115	Objects	Objects to the proposed upzoning from R2 to R4 of the residential block bounded by Connell's Point Road/the Esplanade/Tavistock Road/the Mall, South Hurstville without a stepped approach to an R3 zone and also due to potential traffic impacts.	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones		
409	D20/118140	Objects	Objects to the proposed upzoning from R2 to R4 of the residential block bounded by Connell's Point Road/the Esplanade/Tavistock Road/the Mall, South Hurstville without a stepped approach to an R3 zone and also due to potential traffic impacts.	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones		
410	D20/118163	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA due to: detrimental impacts on tree canopy, biodiversity, stormwater runoff, scenic views and a range of other environmental values in our beautiful area, removal of over 2,000 properties would result in smaller gardens, fewer trees and wildlife and general loss of the leafy character. Loss of tree canopy, impacts on biodiversity, local threatened species and ecological communities have not been properly considered. Other impacts include increased traffic, reduced street parking, increased pressure on infrastructure, including stormwater and sewerage systems, leading to more creek and river pollution, public transport system not equipped to meet further demands.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
411	D20/118674	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: destruction of an already fragile ecosystem, remnant native vegetation, council should use vegetation mapping (eg. OEH 2013 and 2016) to protect wildlife habitat and conserve wildlife, undertake a full biodiversity assessment, should not remove existing areas from FSPA and consider adding additional areas, not reduce minimum lot size, increase minimum landscaped area to 50% to maintain large garden areas character, apply Character Typology in "Georges River Strategic Directions Paper" to the entire LGA, loss of tree canopy, loss of old growth hollow bearing Eucalyptus, Corymbia and Angophora, increase in hard paved areas will increase storm runoff and	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests increasing the landscaping requirements		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			sedimentation of creeks, rivers and wetlands, pressure to increase housing density, lot sizes and small garden areas insufficient to protect old trees and reserves alone will be insufficient, council responsibilities under Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 not met in LEP eg Powerful Owl , Grey-headed Flying Fox, White-bellied Sea Eagle and Osprey perch, mature trees on the ridgeline lost if second dwelling is allowed on existing sites, narrow winding streets eg. Marine Drive will be choked with vehicles, greater population pressure on recreational spaces with no plans to expand these locally, quality of life will be reduced greatly: increased congestion, traffic noise, pollution, council responsibility to safeguard scenic landscapes and protect biodiversity and natural environment.			
412	D20/118893	Objects	Object to the LEP and removal of FSPA due to: Requests a copy of environmental studies to understand the effects of the changes proposed to the FSPA. Requests for the exhibition closing date to be extended to allow for the public to respond comprehensively. Raises concern regarding the impact of the changes to the FSPA on the environment.	Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
413	D20/119099	Objects	Object to the LEP due to: requests a further extension to the public exhibition period for the LEP.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
414	D20/119393	Supports	Supports the removal of the FSPA from Oatley West due to: shows council has a great vision for our community for years to come, council has done a great job providing detailed LEP information and background, some members of community fearful of change, understand the draft is harmonising LEPs across the area giving a fairer go to all residents of St George Area, believes there will be few, if any, dual occupancies developments in our area due to the fact Oatley is a well-established area (e.g. expensive) and will not be economical for "developers to rush in". Residents will have the opportunities to develop our land when needed. LEP 2020 will further modernise the area, provide more housing choices near amenities, employment hubs and Sydney CBD for younger generation for years to come (Vision 2040) and further improve liveability and lifestyle (e.g. DA specifications requirements and Tree Management). Attended FSPA webinar - detailed and well documented presentation.	Supports Council's community engagement program for the draft LEP		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
415	D20/119469	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA due to: the proposed FSPA does not fulfil its stated objective of 'Enhancing and Protecting' the natural environment, especially foreshore localities, as it reduces the previous Hurstville FSPA dwelling number by 54%. Suggests instead that council leave the Hurstville FSPA area as it is currently configured and add the proposed Kogarah area rezoned FSPA dwellings (while continuing to make the council's newly proposed adjustments to the FSPA building regulations) and that Council could allow an extra one or two higher density developments for a total of 15-20 new residences every 5 years in R3 or R2 areas which are already zoned specifically for such developments thereby continuing to achieve the stated Council objective of 14,000 extra residences. Attended FSPA webinar - allowed me to better understand the strategy, objectives and intent of the broader LEP, as well as the specific objectives of the FSPA section of the LEP.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Supports Council's community engagement program for the draft LEP		
416	D20/119472	Objects	Objects to the proposed removal of the FSPA due to: will result in dual occupancies being built and suggests removal of FSPA is inconsistent with the harmonisation of the Kogarah and Hurstville LEPs and also inconsistent with the South District Plan Action 65 to protect scenic land. Suggest that the SEPP enables a lower minimum frontage width for dual occupancies (12 metres rather than the proposed 15 metres in the draft LEP).	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
417	D20/119484	Objects	Requests upzoning of their land from R2 to R3 due to: rezone not for multi-dwelling housing but to permit development involving reduced setbacks of detached housing as a spot rezoning at their land. The submission notes that Council has previously suggested that an isolated spot rezoning would not be supported by Council.	Requests a spot rezoning (site specific)		
418	D20/119515	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: wish to see the natural beauty of the area conserved for future generations, would negatively impact the local environment and is against the best interests of the community.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
419	D20/119650	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Jewfish Point Oatley due to: increased population density, strain on the environment will ruin parks and waterways, local flora and fauna will die, fragile environment not suited to duplexes.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
420	D20/120265	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: Putting LEP ahead the lives of residents who call Monaro Avenue their home. Creating a car park, or adding a bit of extra grass in place of these homes is not serving the public, wants an alternative way to meet the LEP eg. factory conversion or lot nearby to a higher density part of GRC to a green space.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
421	D20/120269	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: massive over development of our suburban streets, significant increase in pollution running into the Georges River, do not want to see any reduction of foreshore protection or any environmental protections, short term greed for development would ultimately destroy all that is attractive and valuable within Oatley and the council area generally. Adding FSPA to Kogarah is a good thing but no justification for removing more than 2000 lots, with over 1100 lots, health of the Georges River will suffer, hoping council will amend the plan to eliminate any reductions to minimum lot sizes.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
422	D20/120347	Objects	Objects to LEP changes due to: voter's loss of democratic rights in LEP process eg. planning panel and DPIE, wants R2 Low Density to be included and retained not Medium and High Density.	Objects to overdevelopment Raises concerns that the Planning Proposal Authority is the Local Planning Panel rather than the Councillors		
423	D20/120413	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: reduction of minimum lot sizes will result in increased foreshore infrastructure which will impact on natural bushland along the Georges River, loss of trees and native plants will reduce animal habitat and food sources and affect the health of the river, vulnerable to rising waters due to climate change, council should be protecting fragile environment not encouraging more development, foreshore properties already subdivided, increased population impacting on sewerage, stormwater systems and local narrow streets, streets not suitable for more people living in the area, parking impossible, need to retain natural bushland and liveability not change foreshore minimum lot sizes.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
424	D20/120504	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: to keep the feature of Sydney in the future including our local area, lose character of Oatley, good environment with a lot of trees and more spaces for houses, more noise and more traffic in the street, boxes replacing pitched roof housing, privacy, overshadowing, loss of suburb's character, loss of amenity and loss of nature.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
425	D20/120571	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: beautiful landscape will be overrun by development and our local area will lose its character, does not accept that this is the time to be debating these issues and believes Council has used this time to process the proposal. Angry that council has used the time during the COVID 19 pandemic time to process the LEP proposal and feels the process could be stopped or a moratorium declared.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
426	D20/120572	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: increase in housing density in the local area and have a detrimental effect on the local environment particularly Jewfish Point, the topography and the bushland settings of the two former municipalities are entirely different – Hurstville steep waterside peninsulas with preserve tree canopies and Kogarah with flatter blocks with less preserved bushland, the current Foreshore Protection Policy in Hurstville Council has had a beneficial effect on the built environment and should be retained. LEP ignores Strategic directions due to: There is a weakening of controls rather than a strengthening of DCP controls, abandons concept of protecting and enhancing views and tree coverage, reduces than expands foreshore protection and abandons the natural environment consciously to overdevelopment.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
427	D20/120575	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that objects to the proposed upzoning from R2 to R4 of the residential block bounded by Connell's Point Road/the Esplanade/Tavistock Road/the Mall, South Hurstville without a stepped approach to an R3 zone and also due to potential traffic impacts.	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones		
428	D20/120576	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Lugarno due to: Smaller lot sizes enable more increased density, erode green open space and leafy environment of Lugarno, more vehicles parked in the streets, become driver and pedestrian safety hazards to residents of the Lugarno community, lack of privacy, overshadowing from second storey additions, car parking at Chivers Hill shops is already inadequate, congested and has reached saturation point, risk factors for residents having to evacuate the area with one road in & out when we have an emergency situation of a bushfire, noise pollution from one neighbouring property to another, reduced	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			landscaping with smaller or no garden space, fewer trees and have a huge impact on wildlife particularly our native birdlife and threatened species, wider impact on increased traffic, congestion, crowded trains, inadequate schools, stormwater systems causing pollution to the Georges River.			
429	D20/120593	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: wish to see the natural beauty of the area conserved for future generations, would negatively impact the local environment and is against the best interests of the community.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
430	D20/120880	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: massive overdevelopment of our suburban streets, significant increase in pollution running into the Georges River, do not want to see any reduction of foreshore protection or any environmental protections, short term greed for development would ultimately destroy all that is attractive and valuable within Oatley and the council area generally. Adding FSPA to Kogarah is a good thing but no justification for removing more than 2000 lots, with over 1100 lots, health of the Georges River will suffer, hoping council will amend the plan to eliminate any reductions to minimum lot sizes.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
431	D20/120918	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: undermining our quality of life and the natural beauty of this area, minimum sized blocks of 300sqm will destroy the character along the Georges River, destroy wildlife increase runoff further polluting our river system, increased density, smaller block size, increased traffic, loss of leafy character and increased pressure on infrastructure.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
432	D20/121031	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: Peter Low Reserve should not be altered, no one uses it now and family sizes are smaller now than when built, people who have houses surround the reserve need their house to live in.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
433	D20/121081	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA due to: important for all of us (individuals, families, communities groups, local government) to work together to care for our environment's health for future generations, LEP must cater for a growing population but at the same time, it must maintain or improve our natural environment as the panel stated, cannot see why GRC must harmonise	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			the FSPA with that of the previous Kogarah Council FSPA, the natural environment, especially foreshore is being systematically destroyed (not enhanced). Disappointed with webinar regarding concern of the residents regarding protection of foreshore and environment.			
434	D20/121367	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in West Oatley due to: Impacts on residents as there will be increased demands on infrastructure and services; soft landscaping requirement is being reduced from 25% to just 20% leading to the loss of neighbourhood leafiness and shady trees. The 2012 Hurstville LEP recognised the value of the vegetation behind that on visible ridge tops. This LEP does not meet Objective 28, GRC - protect scenic landscape, Objective 27, GSC – Biodiversity eg. threatened species are located within Oatley Park, Myles Dunphy Reserve, Oatley Park and the Lime Kiln Bay wetlands. There will be greater volumes of polluted urban runoff entering waterways, increased urban densities will diminish tree cover, including the amelioration of stormwater impacts and climate change impacts, contradiction to the GSC Objective 30. The removal of more than 1,300 dwellings from the FSPA removes the diversity of housing choice by not accommodating residents with preferences for gardens with large trees, nor families who want their own spacious private backyards. Nothing in the documentation makes cumulative social impacts, like traffic and resident satisfaction, and aforementioned environmental impacts of the altered FSPA clear. There is insufficient evidence presented to justify the removal of properties from the FSPA. Fact Sheet 10 and mapping is selective and misleading as does not record number of properties to be removed from our neighbourhoods, nor the spatial area that represents. The maps are poor in quality and misleading, the area denoted by the council as FSPA shaded pink, is an actual over representation as it includes areas of the actual Georges River, ie. under water.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Raises concerns that the number of properties proposed to be removed from the FSPA was not provided in the fact sheet Raises concerns that the waterways have been included in the FSPA		
435	D20/121368	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in West Oatley due to: We are concerned with the proposal to reduce in Foreshore protection area to be only properties directly on the waterfront. While the current FSPA is excessive the reduction to only include waterfront land is excessively small and makes the FSPA meaningless. The FSPA should include any area that has a waterfront character which is more than just the land on the waterfront. The proposed rezoning will lead to new subdivision of land and increased population and all that goes with that. Streets are narrow and with cars parked on both sides. The same issue will occur for all other services and amenities throughout these areas.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Impact of an increased population from the increase in housing density such as infrastructure in these areas cannot be expanded eg road (leading to traffic & safety issue), parks, etc. This will lead to a significant reduction in amenity of the area and destroy the community village atmosphere of the area.			
436	D20/121394	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: accuracy of FSPA maps, Oatley has by far the most properties being removed from the FSPA, yet has no remedy for the removal of trees, two trees would not remedy biodiversity, What controls are going to be in place to ensure that this percentage of tree cover is maintained? A lot of very old, large native trees down most of the street in areas which are marked as being removed from the FSPA. How did council come to the conclusions of areas with high tree coverage? How does council plan for tree coverage targets to be achieved if protections are reduced and large trees replaced with small trees (or fees). Two small tree canopies will have a much smaller coverage area than single, large, old tree. Additional traffic and parking cannot see that anywhere. What provisions have been made regarding the capacity of the local schools and day care centres? Generally cannot see any benefit to the area. Cramming more people into an area, reducing its liveability and destroying the environment. Concerned that FAQ forced people to drill into large amounts of information about FSPA changes and it seems to me the information is trying to be hidden. Webinar - the simple table of properties being removed from the FSPA was not presented, this seems pretty critical information.	Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
437	D20/121465	Objects	Objects to the FSPA the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: increase in density resulting in increase in traffic, impact on sewage, biodiversity, loss of tree canopy and general reduction in the quality and quantity of the natural vegetation. States that the proposed FSPA does not fulfil its stated objective of enhancing and protecting the natural environment, especially foreshore localities despite inclusion of the Kogarah FSPA. Suggests retaining the existing FSPA and adjusting the Kogarah provisions to minimise mentioned issues.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
438	D20/121473	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents.- Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values. -lack of reassurance on future use of expansion of park. Need a longer commitment beyond 20+ year timeframe. -LEP is for medium/high density housing and this area does not classify as high medium density area. -Poor communication during covid-19. Timeframe for submissions is unreasonable. Notification should have been for more than the 6 houses directly impacted. -Where has request for expansion of Peter Low Reserve come from? -Request consultation with wider neighbourhood to discuss proposal. – How can Council define Monaro Ave, and its surrounds as an area of “housing growth “? - How can Council justify the expenditure of at least \$8-10million when there is greater need for open space adjacent to high density and plan to increase rates when the community is dealing with impacts of the pandemic? - How does the lack of consultation and short notice reconcile with the community’s need for trust in its Council and its commitment to transparency and engagement? –Where and what are examples of overwhelming feedback from the community around the need to make such changes? - Has caused/driven this proposal? -How do the number of proposal for this change compare to the volume of feedback from the community around rejecting such ideas?			
439	D20/121493	Objects	Request to councillors related to suggested wording for a Mayoral Minute related to FSPA. Planning proposal report for GLEP 2020 (ENV043-19) and report for Gateway determination (LPP001-20) does not disclose the number of properties being removed from the FSPA.	Raises concerns that the number of properties proposed to be removed from the FSPA was not provided in the fact sheet		
440	D20/121507	Objects	Objects to the rezoning of 11-21 Monaro Avenue Kingsgrove from R2 to RE1 due to: -The community will not be able to comment on the proposed uses of the Reserve as part of the submissions on the draft LEP. - The reserve is not located in proximity to high density development and retains the existing R2 zone. - Opposition from community of the money to be laid out for the proposal. - Developer contribution may influence the type of development in the reserve and community will not be given a chance to comment on this in the future. -Council does not have funding for the proposal, why does the proposal need to be considered now? -	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Not enough space on McGregor Street and Monaro Street to provide sight lines. -Demolition of home does not provide sufficient surveillance. -Widened access will encourage unruly behaviour. -The reserve is already large and additional area made up of six lots represents a small addition in comparison. -Demolition of houses will result in removal of trees on those properties. - Distress and hardship caused to residents losing their homes -Lack of convincing reason and transparency.			
441	D20/121812	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: -Lack of transparency in the information made available to public e.g. removal of properties from the FSPA -Provision of inaccurate maps -Loss of tree and impact on biodiversity -What controls will Council put in place to ensure the rate of development is maintained (as presented in Webinar)? -Have provisions for additional traffic, parking, local school and day care centres been considered?	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
442	D20/121839	Objects	Objects to the rezoning of 11-21 Monaro Avenue Kingsgrove from R2 to RE1 due to: the existing zone is R2 and no plans for future rezoning, no consultation from Council prior to the proposed changes, increase in traffic, increased risk of accidents and pedestrian safety. Proposal makes no financial sense and does not provide improvement for the greater community. Questions the need for improved access and street parking as the reserve is used regularly by local schools and there is ample parking on Monaro Ave. Also states that homes backing onto the reserve provide sufficient level of public surveillance.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
443	D20/121984	Objects	Objects to LEP due to: Raises concerns that Webinar did not refer to impacts of COVID-19 on future housing requirements and suggests the proposal should be reviewed in light of changes COVID-19 will have on immigration rate and the need for high density housing.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to overdevelopment		
444	D20/122140	Objects	Objects to proposed changes to the FSPA at Oatley West due to: LEP 2020 consultation process, impact on affected areas in relation to conservation, traffic and parking, bushland and other amenities. Also raised concerns in relation to: - net loss of 1083 properties is not equitable in application across the Oatley suburb. - removal of properties that are visible from the river cannot be seen as enhancement of natural environment particularly when one side of the street remains within the FSPA and the other is removed. - Requirements for additional housing should consider river suburbs are located in natural peninsular areas	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			with limited access and egress. -States all garden suburbs should be deemed to have a higher sensitivity to change. -Webinar material did not address concerns over loss of habitat, vegetation, biodiversity and the environment. -It was unclear what historical trends were applied for Council to conclude in the webinar material that "3-4 developments per year will be taken up". - Suggests that if the dwelling target is 3-4 new dwelling per year then Council should support their statement and place mandatory limit of 4 annual subdivision approvals in the affected area.			
445	D20/122174	Objects	Objects to the future proposed use of Kogarah Park / Jubilee Oval due to : concern about use for the purpose of rock concerts and sale of alcohol outside the times of the football games.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
446	D20/122175	Objects	Objects to the rezoning of properties bound by The Esplanade, Tavistock Road, The Mall and Connells Point Road due to: lack of public transportation, existing traffic congestion along Connells Point Road during peak periods, small and narrow suburban streets, overshadowing from tall buildings, change of streetscape from two story housing to high rises without and consideration stepped approach to zoning in South Hurstville area (bounded by Resthaven Rd to King Georges Road with residential blocks, Resthaven Rd to The Esplanade being R2 and The Esplanade to Mall and Mall to King Georges Road being R4), loss of existing mature trees, lack of infrastructure services to support the increase in population.	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones Objects to overdevelopment		
447	D20/122179	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone due to: agrees to continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
448	D20/122361	Objects	Objects to the 'permitted uses' in the R4, B6 and RE1 zones and R4 zone as well as proposed changes to Jubilee to allow entertainment facilities due to: - Introduction of permitted uses in the R4 zone, restaurant, cafes and small bars which will result in increased noise, - Why are prohibited uses in the B1 zone, yet cafes, restaurants and bars are permitted within the R4 residential zone. - The proposed R4 zones are within walking distance to shopping centres, this is where restaurants, cafes and small bars should be encouraged. -Suggests Councils could instead	Objects to the permissibility of restaurants, cafes and small bars in the R4 zone Objects to the permissibility of small bars and function centres in the B6 zone Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			introduce new strategies to encourage restaurants, cafes and small bars in the business zones, such as 'fast track approvals, guidelines for change of use to these activities, low rentals for leasing footpath space'. - LEP 2020 should prioritise more open space in R4 high density zones which will improve livability. Also objects to the permissibility of function centres and small bars in the B6 Enterprise corridor which will have adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoin residents in R2 zone in terms of noise. -Function Centre or Small Bar does not meet the objectives of the B6 zoning. - Underutilisation of premises given George Leagues Club is right opposite which offers numerous function rooms. Also objects to the proposed change to permit an 'Entertainment Facility' at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park which would allow a theatre, cinema, music hall, concert hall, dance hall and the like. Most of these activities will impact the surrounding residential dwelling in terms of excessive noise and the loss of open green space. - No change to the permitted use of the Jubilee Oval or Kogarah Park in the RE1 zone should be made until the Master Plan has been placed on public exhibition and adopted by Councillors.			
449	D20/122419	Objects	Objects to the removal of propoerties from the FSPA in Oatley due to: overdevelopment and increase in pollution running into the Georges River, there is no justification for removing more than 2000 residential lots, with over 1100 lots in Oatley.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
450	D20/122447	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley due to: many foreshore areas have limited access points (there is only one exit point on the peninsula that includes Mimosa St, Yarran Rd, Boorara Ave, Victory Rd, Southern St and Llewellyn St) therefore increase in density could impact the safety of residence especially in an event of a bushfire with limited entry / exit points.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
451	D20/122450	Objects	Objects to the reduction of the FSPA in Oatley due to: increase in density, in areas with limited exit points could compromise the safety of residents in the case of an emergency such as bushfire.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
452	D20/122689	Objects	Objects to the public exhibition period for Council's draft LEP due to: is held during COVID-19 and suggests the period should be extended until social distancing laws are relaxed in NSW; maps provided are misleading as it does not reveal the number of properties being removed under the FSPA and includes land under water; impact on infrastructure including cleanliness of Oatley Park and surrounding water; increase in traffic and safety concerns for parents on prams and children on bike given the narrow nature of the roads and no footpaths on Glen Road, Waterfall road, Acacia street, Bay street (and others); Oatley West school should not have to lose more playground space due to these changes due to additional demountable; don't need Oatley to turn into a concrete jungle based on previous development approvals; would like to know in writing what donations, sponsorships or the like have been made to support the draft LEP work and how many councillors that are part of the decision making process are/or have interests as developers or real estate agents.	Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
453	D20/123056	Objects	Objects to the removal of the properties from the FSPA in Oatley due to: increase in density resulting in increase in stormwater volume due to reduced open space which will be exacerbated without capital investment in stormwater and increased maintenance of facilities; additional homes in the area will exacerbate existing problem with overloaded sewer system, recent development have indicated loss of vegetation, increased heights, and general overdevelopment and indication of mismanaged developments give confidence that future developments will be better managed and foreshore areas protected; infrastructure such as schools and transportation will be impacted due to increase in density; increased car parking will obstruct stormwater flow, increase noise and decrease road safety.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
454	D20/123303	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: -Peter Low Reserve being passive open space which is well patronised, is a good size, has adequate paths and security will not be achieved by removing six houses (locals will not provide constant surveillance) - expansion will encourage non-locals to use the park at night cause trouble. -Peter Low Reserve is not suitable for active open space use as it is not located adjacent to major roads, railways, public transport hubs, or light industry to facilitate ease of access for the general public and minimise amenity impacts such as high traffic volumes, high people movements, noise, vandalism -not situated in an area of housing growth. -	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			is not suitable to accommodate playing fields - Monaro Ave, Kinsel Ave, New England Drive & McGregor St are all essentially one-lane roads will not be able to manage increased traffic or on street parking. -poor investment of Council funds. -the Reserve will be funded by GRC and may benefit visiting residents from other LGAs. - questions the independence, transparency and objectivity of the LPP in reviewing the PP and suggest Councillors should make the decision on the final LEP. - questions the fairness of the submission review process by Council staff in that the submission are accurately and fairly summarised and objective recommendations made. -lack of consultation and transparency in communicating the proposal including short notification period given to affected properties owners and no notification to neighbouring properties in the area. -the absence of a master plan for the expanded the Reserve and its impact on the surrounding areas.			
455	D20/123351	Objects	Objects to the POPW at 19 Warrawee Place Beverly Hills being rezoned from SP2 to R2 as it is being utilised as a parish and school hall. Therefore it should be rezoned to SP2 Educational Establishments and Places of Public Worship like the other properties across the road (Lots 221, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 263, 302, 303, 304, 305, 306 DP 13496). 8 Tarrilli Street, Beverly Hills (lot 263 DP13496) is currently zoned R2 and should be rezoned to SP2.	N/A	Requests rezoning from existing SP2 Church to proposed SP2 Educational Establishments and Places of Public Worship	The existing parish hall located at 19 Warrawee Place, Beverly Hills (Lots 42, 43 and 44, DP 13496) is recommended to be removed from <i>Item 11 Use of certain land for a place of public worship</i> as these properties are currently being utilised by the adjacent Regina Coeli Catholic Primary School. Accordingly, the zoning of these properties will be amended to the proposed SP2 Educational Establishment & Place of Public Worship to reflect the existing use of the site as a school hall for the adjacent Regina Coeli Catholic Primary School.
456	D20/123369	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: -reduced lots sizes and loss in vegetation and foreshore vista –reduced lots sizes and higher density should be located closer to railway stations –to suggest that the gain in properties in the former Hurstville area compensates for removal of properties in former Hurstville area is misleading.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
457	D20/123386	Objects	Objects to the removal of the properties from the FSPA in Oatley due to: increase in housing and population density will result in increase in traffic and parking and the lack of ability for local shopping centres to cope with the change.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
458	D20/123601	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley due to: unsustainable reduction in lot sizes and increased traffic congestion, parking problems, loss of leafiness/tree canopy, loss of biodiversity, additional storm water run-off, and a general deterioration in the liveability of the area. Additionally, there will be insufficient infrastructure for green space and local facilities. Requests for retention of the existing FSPA as currently mapped under the HLEP 2012.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
459	D20/123652	Objects	Objects to the increase in density in the FSPA in Peakhurst and Oatley due to: removal of significant number of lots, reduction in lot size for lots outside of the FSPA, reduction in landscaping area on each lot, reduction in open space, increased stormwater runoff and pollution, sensitive nature of the steep banks on the foreshore.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
460	D20/123654	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: reduction in the number of lots which will change the character of Peakhurst ward and removal of properties from the eastern side of Marine Drive which consists of original Angophoras visible from the river and foreshore. Requests all lots on Marine Drive be retained in the FSPA.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
461	D20/123657	Objects	Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone from an existing POPW due to: - Ability to relocate or redevelop will be limited; -Implies Council does not welcome churches in R2 zones; - The change in policy is ill-conceived, inconsistent with comparable plans and not supported by evidence; - Churches contribute to the community in a way consistent with other land use taking place in residential zones; - Unlikely that churches would affect peak traffic, only generate noise during services (predominantly 1 day a week) or on a Friday night for youth activities, relatively low impact use, parking should be managed at DA stage; - No evidence that POPW cause an unacceptable risk to safety, security and privacy however can be readily mitigated by POM and CPTED in design; - POPW are a form of social infrastructure and play an important role within the community. LEP will prevent provision of key social infrastructure to support Georges River's growing communities. Recommends LEP 2020 include the Baptist churches in Georges River LGA in Schedule 1. Also refers to the	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone Requests additional sites containing POPW be included in Schedule 1		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
462	D20/123663	Neutral	<p>ACPT submission to GRC prepared by Ethos Urban.</p> <p>Requests Council consider amendment to the PP to rezone 143-149 Boundary Road, Peakhurst and 689 Forest Road, Peakhurst to B1 Neighbourhood Centre for the following reasons: - Rezone the subject site (B1 Neighbourhood Centre) to enable a range of uses that will complement and consolidate the existing Peakhurst Neighbourhood Centre. –Draft LEP proposal to increase the building height standard for the industrial land to the south from 10m to 12m and 16m which confirms the location and scale of the site being suitable for an increased height and density thus an increase in building height of part 12m and part 15m is recommended. -An increased FSR of 1.7:1 to enable the development of shop top housing of a suitable scale for a gateway entry point and local centre setting. – strategic merit for bringing the rezoning of this site forward and including it in Council's 2020 LEP: centre within walking distance from both residential and industrial uses; promoting an attractive Centre with greater amenity; -Contributing significantly to the public domain of the Neighbourhood Centre. -redevelopment of the site with support and incentivise the urban renewal of the Neighbourhood Centre; - site comprises residential zoned lots despite surrounded by commercial and industrial development. - Site adjoins B1 Neighbourhood Centre zoned lands, and will be a catalyst for the transformation of the Neighbourhood Centre. -rezoning of the site will provide a logical extension of the existing B1 Neighbourhood Centre Zone. -With recent residential intensification of lands to the north of the Peakhurst centre, this increase in local population serves to reinforce and consolidate the role of the Centre; - The expansion of the Centre will enable it to grow to provide the required goods, services and community facilities for the local community. - Unique gateway location that will complement the planning and urban renewal of the rest of the Neighbourhood Centre.</p>	Requests a spot rezoning (site specific)		
463	D20/123764	Objects	<p>Objects to the isolation of their property due to: the bulk of the developments that surround it. -The installation of new traffic light at the intersection nearby has reduced the value of the property and quality of life. -seeks special provisions (such as increase in FSR, setbacks and building height) to enable a development that would fit into the existing streetscape and improve the site. - Invites LPP to visit the site.</p>	Requests a spot rezoning (site specific)		
464	D20/123767	Objects	<p>Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA on the western side of Johnston Street due to: - increase in building density, loss of amenity such as privacy and lifestyle, increase in traffic congestion and noise. – Increased risk of safety with on street parking already at capacity –no justification has been provided for existing</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			infrastructure and roads will cope with the increased density.	environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided		
465	D20/123768	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - The proposal is inconsistent with the priorities of South District Plan and findings of the LHS. - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values. – Lack of consultation with affected properties and their neighbours prior to the community consultation process. - Such resumptions need to first be the subject of a Public Enquiry under the Local Government Act.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Requests a public hearing		
466	D20/123770	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley due to: - overdevelopment of suburban streets, polluted runoff into the river, loss of character and value within Oatley and the council area generally, lack of justification for the removal of properties from the FSPA.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
467	D20/123773	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St – Reserve	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			should be fitted with CCTV and better lighting to provide increased safety rather than reliance on surveillance from residents in a low density residential area. - Inconsistencies with the objectives of South District Plan and findings of the LHS. -A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned or near transport nodes– Lack of open and transparency community engagement process. –lack of consultation with affected home owners prior to formulating this proposal and during the COVID-19 pandemic. - Such resumptions need to first be the subject of a Public Enquiry under the Local Government Act. –A masterplan does not accompany the proposal.	Requests a public hearing		
468	D20/123791	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA in the Oatley area.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA  – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment  – no reason provided		
469	D20/123793	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley and Mortdale area due to: - the provision of unclear information and incorrect maps to the public, increase in density resulting from reduced lots size for properties removed from FSPA, reduction in landscaping and loss of trees, increase in traffic and congestion on narrow streets.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
470	D20/123973	Neutral	Requests the addition of Lugarno Anglican Church to Schedule 1 Additional permitted uses, clause 11 "Use of certain land for a place of public worship" including the following three lots: 3A Old Forest Road LUGARNO NSW 2210 (Lot 18 and Lot 19) and 1142 Forest Road LUGARNO NSW 2210 (Lot 9).	Requests additional sites containing POPW be included in Schedule 1		
471	D20/124005	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: -Timing and manner in which the community consultation was conducted e.g. insufficient time to prepare response, during COVID-19 which restricted communication among the community and the extent of neighbour notification. – Property owners being disadvantaged	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests a public hearing		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			with property value being at a decline. –No prior consultation with affected home owners was conducted. –individual personal circumstances were not considered. – Proposal lacks transparency. –The park has three adequate access from three separate street, the Reserve needs no additional access given there has been no significant growth in the last 20 years and none is forecast within a radius of 1 km from the reserve. – The draft LEP does not reference any studies (e.g. feasibility, cost-benefit, environmental impact, etc.) –There is no history or evidence of safety issues in the area. –Expansion of the reserve will compromise safety due to increased traffic in unlined, poorly light residential streets and given there is no off street parking for the users of Peter Low Reserve. – Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking and increased traffic. –Potential increased risk of violence to local residents and increased risk of vandalism and theft in the Monaro Ave precinct. – The proposed zoning serves no benefit to the local community as there is no new housing and growth proposed in the surrounding area. – The proposed acquisition should be subject to a Public Enquiry under the Local Government Act. - The properties will be effectively unsellable on the open market once rezoned, forcing owners to be at the mercy of the Council acquisition process – rezoning will prohibit further improve or development of the affected properties. – The current compensation offer are considered inadequate. – The proposal is inconsistent with the priorities of South District Plan and findings of the LHS.			
472	D20/124011	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - The proposal contradicts the priorities contained in the Council's own plans and the Greater Sydney Commission's South District Plan and findings of the LHS. –Monaro Ave is low density residential, open space should be provided where high density is planned or close to transport nodes. - Poor investment of Council funds. – Lack of community consideration. - Lack of consultation with affected properties and their neighbours prior to the community consultation process.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
473	D20/124296	Objects	Objects to the minimum 10% landscaped area requirement in a R4 zone due to: Requests an increased landscped area of at least 15% to ensure quality of life for resident living in apartments given the lack of open space in the LGA.	Requests increasing the landscaping requirements		
474	D20/125019	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove due to:	Objects to the proposed open space		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Owner of one of the properties proposed for acquisition who opposes the acquisition and rezoning of properties from R2 to RE1.</li> <li>- Given the circumstances surrounding COVID-19 and a declining property market and economy, it is unfair to force residents to have to move.</li> <li>- Proposal reduces the property value.</li> <li>- There has been a lack of communication between Council and the owners of the properties listed for acquisition and there has not been significant time to prepare significant responses.</li> <li>- No timeline has been provided to the owners of affected properties regarding potential acquisition dates.</li> <li>- concern for neighbour with disability - uncertain of relocation.</li> </ul>	acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
475	D20/125022	Objects	<p>Objects to the council not supporting development of their land and requiring amalgamation due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Relocating sewers is costly.</li> <li>- acquiring adjoining land is an overcapitalised development which exceeds provisions in the DCP and R2 zoning.</li> <li>- The market value of the amalgamation site would be less than stand alone homes.</li> <li>- The sewer in between the 2 properties is a deterrent to any developer to consider an amalgamated development due to the higher cost such a development will incur.</li> <li>- Their site can be improved with a development that is consistent with surrounding bulk, as long as council afford us the same generous planning provisions</li> <li>- Property will be isolated and land locked.</li> </ul>	Requests a spot rezoning (site specific)		
476	D20/125024	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove due to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Council's reasoning for proposed acquisition is at significant cost to the community and does not have strategic merit based on information in the Planning Proposal Report.</li> <li>- The proposal is inconsistent with the South District Plan as it cannot deliver on open space priorities within the plan, as the area is not in a higher density zone, the additional provision of open space is not warranted and should instead remain as passive open space as the District Plan outlines this lower density residential zone as not suitable for active open space. It is instead recommended that this be relocated to a higher density area, such as Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverley Park.</li> <li>- The proposal is inconsistent with Council's Local Housing Strategy, as the site is not located in an area which has been outlined as having insufficient open space and a better use of acquisition could be used for</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>active open space elsewhere, as Council area is short on this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- McGregor Street is not suitable in providing on-street parking for the park as its narrow design does not cater for an increase in traffic.</li> <li>- The proposal will increase the risk of anti-social behaviour to the area and create an unsafe space.</li> <li>- The amount of money required to acquire the land is not economically viable and should be better spent.</li> <li>- The current stresses on the community should extend the submission deadline further due to the COVID-19 restrictions and stresses.</li> </ul>			
477	D20/125031	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Can Council provide evidence of crimes and why should surveillance be increased? And why should accessibility be increased?</li> <li>- Has an interpreter been provided for owners affected who are from a non-English speaking background?</li> <li>- The background on the definition of Monaro Avenue as a "housing growth" area.</li> <li>- The justification behind spending \$8-\$10 million on the acquisition of properties.</li> <li>- It is unfair to place this burden on residents during COVID-19 restrictions and stresses and the deadline should be extended.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
478	D20/125037	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposal to rezone the Esplanade/Mall Block to R4 due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- After Council were overruled by the Minister for Planning to rezone the site to R3, why is it now being rezoned to R4?</li> <li>- There is concern over the one-two storey homes surrounding the site being overshadowed.</li> <li>- The possibility to reduce the maximum height of buildings on the site to 9m instead of the current 12m.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones</p>		
479	D20/125040	Objects	<p>Objects to the council not supporting development of their land and requiring amalgamation due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Relocating sewers is costly.</li> <li>- acquiring adjoining land is an overcapitalised development which exceeds provisions in the DCP and R2 zoning.</li> <li>- The market value of the amalgamation site would be less than stand alone homes.</li> <li>- The sewer in between the 2 properties is a deterrent to any developer to consider an amalgamated development due to the higher cost such a development will incur.</li> <li>- Their site can be improved with a development that is consistent with surrounding bulk, as long as council afford us the same generous planning provisions</li> <li>- Property will be isolated and land locked.</li> </ul>	<p>Requests a spot rezoning (site specific)</p>		
480	D20/125125	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro</p>			

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>Avenue, Kingsgrove. due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Council's reasoning for proposed acquisition is at significant cost to the community and does not have strategic merit based on information in the Planning Proposal Report.</li> <li>- The proposal is inconsistent with the South District Plan as it cannot deliver on open space priorities within the plan, as the area is not in a higher density zone, the additional provision of open space is not warranted and should instead remain as passive open space as the District Plan outlines this lower density residential zone as not suitable for active open space. It is instead recommended that this be relocated to a higher density area, such as Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverley Park.</li> <li>- The proposal is inconsistent with Council's Local Housing Strategy, as the site is not located in an area which has been outlined as having insufficient open space and a better use of acquisition could be used for active open space elsewhere, as Council area is short on this.</li> <li>- McGregor Street is not suitable in providing on-street parking for the park as its narrow design does not cater for an increase in traffic.</li> <li>- The proposal will increase the risk of anti-social behaviour to the area and create an unsafe space.</li> <li>- The amount of money required to acquire the land is not economically viable and should be better spent.</li> <li>- The current stresses on the community should extend the submission deadline further due to the COVID-19 restrictions and stresses.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
481	D20/125160	Objects	<p>Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley West due to :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Removing properties from the FSPA will threaten the garden suburb nature of the suburb.</li> <li>- Reducing lot sizes will increase density in and threaten natural bushland in the area.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
482	D20/125171	Objects	<p>Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley due to : - A reduction of minimum lot sizes will result in the current low density residential zone reflecting medium density within a decade.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There will be a reduction in trees and green space on properties.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
483	D20/125177	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties in Mortdale Heights			

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			from the FSPA due to: - Does not wish for Mortdale Heights to reflect surrounding suburbs where there are dual occupancy dwellings where trees and landscaping are absent from backyards. - Object that the area east of the Georges River has a lower sensitivity rate. - Properties which border Dairy Creek risk a loss of high ecological value with their removal from the FSPA.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
484	D20/125218	Objects	Objects to the acquisition and rezoning of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove due to: - There is no benefit in expanding Peter Low Reserve as it is already a large area of open space which is more than adequate for the community. - The reserve offers diverse bird life. - Further opening the reserve will remove a number of trees from the properties acquired and risk the biodiversity. - The park is stress relief.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
485	D20/125265	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: - The reduction of minimum lot sizes promotes dual occupancies and a lack of natural landscaping/trees. This will impact birdlife - Housing density will increase significantly on smaller blocks, resulting in a higher strain on infrastructure and services. - The proposal will result in a decline in property values in West Oatley, as there will be fewer trees.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
486	D20/125286	Objects	Objects to the changes in the LEP due to : - The LEP will damage the village atmosphere of Oatley and its residents don't want that. - the traffic in Oatley is too high for the current parking facilities, so no further houses should be developed or increase to the population.	Objects to overdevelopment		
487	D20/125289	Objects	Objects to the changes in the LEP due to: - No more people or traffic in the suburb of Oatley, as this will spoil its ambience and foreshore areas.	Objects to overdevelopment		
488	D20/125291	Objects	Objects to an increase in housing density in the Oatley area.	Objects to overdevelopment		
489	D20/125297	Objects	Objects to the implementation of the LEP.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
490	D20/125529	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposal of Kogarah Park to be redeveloped for bars, theatre, cinema and as an aquatic centre, and that the area between Jubilee Ave and Westbourne St Carlton be developed as an entertainment sector due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is a low density housing area with Primary School</li> <li>• There is no public transport to this area.</li> <li>• Will encourage drunkards and anti-social behaviour, keep all entertainment where it belongs, well away from residential areas.</li> </ul> <p>There are vacant shops and large venues in Kogarah shopping precinct that would be appropriate for entertainment venues and a theatre if that is deemed necessary for the area. Kogarah Park caters to the specific purpose of Passive Recreation for the people of Kogarah.</p>	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
491	D20/125539	Objects	<p>Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential zones and supports the attached submission made on behalf of the ACPT by Ethos Urban.</p> <p>The reasons for objection are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POPW have a positive impact on the local community and meet the objective of the R2 Low Density Residential zone.</li> <li>• The blanket prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone results in an inflexible assessment framework that will prevent the orderly redevelopment of existing POPW and new POPW that generate limited impacts on amenity but make significant contributions to the community.</li> <li>• Council's DLEP is not best planning practice as each site is different and needs to be assessed on a merits basis.</li> <li>• Prohibiting POPW will significantly impact on the existing churches to expand.</li> <li>• Likely to be a reduction in the value of the church land.</li> <li>• Existing churches will struggle to undertake building alterations.</li> <li>• No potential to acquire an adjoining site for expansion or amalgamation.</li> <li>• Churches must compete with the highest and best use of residential development.</li> <li>• The objective of the DLEP process is to transfer the planning controls across with minimal change and so it is most logical to permit POPW in R2 zones in accordance with the existing two LEPs for the former Hurstville and Kogarah Councils.</li> </ul> <p>Recommends LEP be amended such that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• POPW continue to be permissible with consent in the R2 zone; and</li> </ul>	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone Requests additional sites containing POPW be included in Schedule 1		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Development controls to be used to mitigate any amenity impacts (Part 5 of LEP)</li> </ul> Or <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule 1 of the LEP be amended to include all of ACPTs properties</li> </ul>			
492	D20/125541	Objects	<p>Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone from an existing POPW due to: - Ability to relocate or redevelop will be limited; -Implies Council does not welcome churches in R2 zones; - The change in policy is ill-conceived, inconsistent with comparable plans and not supported by evidence; - Churches contribute to the community in a way consistent with other land use taking place in residential zones; - Unlikely that churches would affect peak traffic, only generate noise during services (predominantly 1 day a week) or on a Friday night for youth activities, relatively low impact use, parking should be managed at DA stage; - No evidence that POPW cause an unacceptable risk to safety, security and privacy however can be readily mitigated by POM and CPTED in design; - POPW are a form of social infrastructure and play an important role within the community. LEP will prevent provision of key social infrastructure to support Georges River's growing communities. Recommends LEP 2020 include the Baptist churches in Georges River LGA in Schedule 1. Also refers to the ACPT submission to GRC prepared by Ethos Urban.</p>	<p>Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone Requests additional sites containing POPW be included in Schedule 1</p>		
493	D20/125551	Objects	<p>Strongly objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove due to : has no basis in sound strategic land use planning for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is inconsistent with Greater Sydney Commission's South District Plan (the Plan) as it:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cannot deliver on the priorities for open space contained in the Plan</li> <li>• does not support the objective of prioritising the provision of additional open space in areas to be zoned for higher density residential development.</li> <li>• is located in a quiet low-density residential area approximately one kilometre from the Kingsgrove centre and is not suitable for expansion and redevelopment as an active open space for sporting activities – another priority of the Plan.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. It is inconsistent with Council's Local Housing Strategy findings This strategy identifies areas where there is insufficient open space which are generally in or near higher density residential areas or transport nodes and includes areas near Kogarah, Carlton, Allawah and Hurstville station and Penshurst station.</li> <li>3. It is a poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential</li> </ol>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (e.g. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road).</p> <p>Concerns raised over the plight of community being ejected from their community without any consultation and notification to affected adjoining residents.</p> <p>Questions the legality of this proposal and the reason for its consideration.</p> <p>Requests that these plans must not go ahead as the affected people do not want the proposed changes.</p>			
494	D20/125559	Objects	<p>Objecting to Council's proposed reduction to the FSPA and does not appreciate that the grant of government funding should encourage such actions. Disagrees with the following LEP objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- identifying opportunities for additional housing – concerned that it is a green light for developers.</li> <li>- Encourage landscaping to be included – concerned that it alludes to landscaping as only being optional, whilst it should be non-negotiable. New developments lack in landscaping.</li> <li>- Encourage well designed and environmentally sustainable buildings – concerned that it is non-prescriptive and has no set benchmarks.</li> <li>- Identify, conserve and enhance local heritage – concerned this does not protect local amenity and preserve the local flora and fauna.</li> </ul> <p>Reiterates that this proposal will be a backward step for an area already struggling with accommodating the requirements for water/drainage infrastructure, schools, open space, playing fields, roads and public transport and must be rejected.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>	<p>Submitter questions the following LEP objectives derived from the community feedback on the LSPS2040:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Objective 2 - identifying opportunities for additional housing – concerned that it is a green light for developers.</li> <li>2. Objective 3 - Encourage landscaping to be included – concerned that it alludes to landscaping as only being optional, whilst it should be non-negotiable. New developments lack in landscaping.</li> <li>3. Objective 4 - Encourage well designed and environmentally sustainable buildings – concerned that it is non-prescriptive and has no set benchmarks.</li> <li>4. Objective 7 - Identify, conserve and enhance local heritage – concerned this does not protect local amenity and preserve the local flora and fauna.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The draft LEP identifies additional housing opportunities through the harmonisation of existing LEPs, such as the proposed development standards (eg. minimum lot sizes and maximum floor space ratios). The draft LEP also includes the upzoning of 5 Housing Investigation Areas for medium and high density residential development, and provisions for dual key dwellings, providing the community with housing choice and diversity.</li> <li>2. The draft LEP introduces minimum landscaped area requirements which provide greater legal weight to ensure the protection of local landscape character, the provision of sufficient tree canopy cover, building separation and deep soil to enable water infiltration to lessen the extent of urban runoff. The landscaped area requirement was placed in the draft LEP in response to feedback received from the community during the LSPS consultations to protect the leafy character of our suburbs.</li> </ol> <p>In response to submissions, to enhance the protection of the existing tree canopy and the landscaped characteristics of the LGA, it is recommended to the Local Planning Panel that the following amendments be made to the Planning Proposal:</p>



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone objectives of the R2 and R3 zones include a standalone objective that will emphasise the importance of housing in a landscaped setting as a desirable characteristic:</li> <li>- The minimum landscaped area requirement for dual occupancy developments be increased.</li> <li>- A new local provision <i>Clause 6.19 Tree protection and landscaping in zones R2 and R3</i> be introduced.</li> </ul> <p>3. The draft LEP also introduces design excellence and environmental sustainable provisions to ensure well-designed and environmentally sustainable developments. For each provision, the draft LEP identifies criteria that development applications are required to consider, such as building separation and water efficiency.</p> <p>In regards to the design excellence provision, the subject development will need to be peer-reviewed by an urban designer or a registered architect appointed from Council's panel of design experts against the heads of consideration listed in this clause.</p> <p>In regards to the environmental sustainability provision, a statement of verification is to be submitted with the development application by an Australian Building Sustainability Association accredited assessor confirming the proposed development satisfies the environmentally sustainable principles.</p> <p>4. Proposed amendments to heritage items have been informed by the <i>Heritage Review</i>. The purpose of many of these</p>

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
						amendments is to enhance the protection of heritage items, including amending their description to reflect their significance in relation to their built form and setting to include all components on the site with heritage significance, for example, the garden, fences, paths and driveways that are located on the same lot as the heritage item, because the setting equally contributes to the heritage significance of the property.
495	D20/125600	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA and has provided two pictures:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Lugarno Headland-ridgetop that Council has retained in the FSPA</li> <li>2. Jewfish Pt headland- ridgetop that Council proposes should be taken out.</li> </ol> <p>Both pictures have significant ridgetop trees and are within the view shed of both Oatley Park and river. Suggests that Council should revisit their methodology of the Foreshore study and reevaluate and include the Jewfish ridgetop and other areas that exhibit similar qualities.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA</p> <p>– inadequate justification for the boundary amendment</p> <p>– no reason provided</p>		
496	D20/125604	Objects	<p>Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone from an existing POPW due to: - Ability to relocate or redevelop will be limited; -Implies Council does not welcome churches in R2 zones; - The change in policy is ill-conceived, inconsistent with comparable plans and not supported by evidence; - Churches contribute to the community in a way consistent with other land use taking place in residential zones; - Unlikely that churches would affect peak traffic, only generate noise during services (predominantly 1 day a week) or on a Friday night for youth activities, relatively low impact use, parking should be managed at DA stage; - No evidence that POPW cause an unacceptable risk to safety, security and privacy however can be readily mitigated by POM and CPTED in design; - POPW are a form of social infrastructure and play an important role within the community. LEP will prevent provision of key social infrastructure to support Georges River's growing communities. Recommends LEP 2020 include the Baptist churches in Georges River LGA in Schedule 1. Also refers to the ACPT submission to GRC prepared by Ethos Urban.</p>	<p>Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone</p> <p>Requests additional sites containing POPW be included in Schedule 1</p>		
497	D20/125607	Objects	Objects to the draft LEP 2020 due to: it will destroy the	Objects to overdevelopment	1. Requests minimum lot size of	1. The Planning Proposal for the

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>character of Oatley West, especially evident through recent developments.</p> <p>Proposes minimum lot size of 600sqm for dwelling houses with 50% landscaping requirement, maximum 7m height and 0.5:1 FSR. Recommends prohibition of dual occupancies and medium density housing in Oatley, Oatley West and the FSPA. They must also have maximum 7m height, 0.5:1 FSR with 50% landscaping and 750sqm lot size for dual occupancies and 0.6:1 FSR with 40% landscaping and 1,000sqm lot size for medium density housing. All new developments must have solar panels and battery storage.</p>	<p>Requests amendments to the minimum lot size for dual occupancies</p> <p>Requests increasing the landscaping requirements</p>	<p>600sqm for dwelling houses with 50% landscaping requirement, maximum 7m height and 0.5:1 FSR. Recommends prohibition of dual occupancies and medium density housing in Oatley, Oatley West and the FSPA. They must also have maximum 7m height, 0.5:1 FSR with 50% landscaping and 750sqm lot size for dual occupancies and 0.6:1 FSR with 40% landscaping and 1,000sqm lot size for medium density housing.</p> <p>2. All new developments must have solar panels and battery storage.</p>	<p>draft LEP has been prepared in accordance with a number of overarching principles, including achieving equity across the LGA through the harmonisation process, particularly in respect to development potential; and retaining existing controls where the status quo can be maintained.</p> <p>The key changes to the principal development standards and their detailed justification is provided in Appendix 3 of the Planning Proposal report for the draft LEP.</p> <p>The draft LEP introduces minimum landscaped area requirements which provide greater legal weight to ensure the protection of local landscape character, the provision of sufficient tree canopy cover, building separation and deep soil to enable water infiltration to lessen the extent of urban runoff. The landscaped area requirement was placed in the draft LEP in response to feedback received from the community during the LSPS consultations to protect the leafy character of our suburbs.</p> <p>In response to submissions, to enhance the protection of the existing tree canopy and the landscaped characteristics of the LGA, it is recommended to the Local Planning Panel that the following amendments be made to the Planning Proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Zone objectives of the R2 and R3 zones include a standalone objective that will emphasise the importance of housing in a landscaped setting as a</li> </ul>

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
						<p>desirable characteristic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The minimum landscaped area requirement for dual occupancy developments be increased.</li> <li>○ A new local provision <i>Clause 6.19 Tree protection and landscaping in zones R2 and R3</i> be introduced.</li> </ul> <p>2. Council supports initiatives to promote quality design and environmental sustainability.</p> <p>A new local provision has been proposed in the draft LEP - <i>Clause 6.12 Environmental sustainability in certain business, industrial and residential zones</i>. This provision seeks to ensure that all development with a gross floor area of 1,500sqm or greater in industrial, business and high density residential zones embrace the best practice principles of environmentally sustainable development. This provision will require that development applications consider the principles of best practice environmentally sensitive design including water efficiency, energy demand reduction, urban heat island effect, indoor environmental quality, reducing new material consumption and use of sustainable materials, and transport initiatives.</p> <p>Additional planning provisions that promote quality design and environmental sustainability are being considered for inclusion in Council Development Control Plan 2020 which will accompany the draft LEP with more detailed planning controls.</p>
498	D20/125619	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a	Requests amendments to the timing of		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			resident that requests a further extension of the submission date for the Draft LEP 2020 due to the current COVID-19 pandemic as; reviewing the submission especially for parents; trying to work and educate children at the same time is unrealistic. Time restrictions and computing resources available demonstrates that the time allowed by Council is not reflecting the current circumstances faced by the general public.	the exhibition		
499	D20/125736	Objects	Strongly objects to the draft LEP due to : the decision makers do not live in the area. The reasons for objection include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase in congestion, traffic flow and street parking in the narrow streets and shopping centre, since the last 20 years</li> <li>• Overdevelopment and increase densities.</li> </ul>	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Raises concerns that the Planning Proposal Authority is the Local Planning Panel rather than the Councillors		
500	D20/125745	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road).</li> <li>- Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents.</li> <li>- The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress.</li> <li>- Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St.</li> <li>- Adversely affect property values.</li> </ul>	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
501	D20/125751	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road).</li> <li>- Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde</li> </ul>	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>affecting existing residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress.</li> <li>- Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St.</li> <li>- Adversely affect property values.</li> </ul>			
502	D20/125782	Objects	<p>Strongly objects to the draft LEP including the proposed changes to the FSPA due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The flawed timing of this process in one of the worst bush fire season in our history and the most critical international health crisis in a century.</li> <li>• Lack of consultation and notification regarding the changes to the FSPA</li> <li>• Urban consolidation and increased income for Council - duplex and villa developments are built where there were single dwelling before</li> </ul> <p>Requests Council to permanently shelve this proposal and protect this area that has beautiful vegetation, low traffic volumes and great amenity so that it may be enjoyed by future generations.</p>	<p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
503	D20/125790	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space and raises the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Insufficient time to prepare response during COVID-19.</li> <li>– Property owners being disadvantaged with property value being at a decline. – No prior consultation with affected home owners was conducted – Disability of affected resident not considered. - No growth in the last 20 years. - No growth forecasted within 1km radius. - No reference to studies e.g. feasibility, cost-benefit, environmental impact, etc. –No history or evidence of safety issues in the area. –Expansion of the reserve will compromise safety due to increased traffic in unlined, poorly light residential streets. – Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking and increased traffic. - Potential increased risk of violence to local residents and increased risk of vandalism and theft in the Monaro Ave precinct.</li> </ul> <p>The proposed acquisition should be subject to a Public Enquiry under the Local Government Act. The properties will be effectively unsellable on the open market once rezoned, forcing owners to be at the mercy of the Council acquisition process – rezoning will prohibit further improvement or development of the</p>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p> <p>Requests a public hearing</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			affected properties. The current compensation offer is considered inadequate.			
504	D20/126071	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: - lead to overdevelopment in the local area, putting pressure on local infrastructure and services. -Requests Council review plan to decrease size of FSPA.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
505	D20/126292	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to FSPA, land zoning, dwelling sizes, building heights, heritage listings, landscaping due to: - endangering natural landscape and increase run off into Georges River. - Increase in road traffic and parking issues and pressure on local services.-Loss of privacy and amenity. Object to undemocratic time for Council to receive submission and no public display and hosting community forums.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
506	D20/126302	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the LEP: - higher density decreases the balance in the community. -short sighted plan with no respect to the community. - LPP do not live in Georges River area.	Objects to overdevelopment Raises concerns that the Planning Proposal Authority is the Local Planning Panel rather than the Councillors		
507	D20/126310	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to FSPA due to: - over development impact on environment and safety of residents. - impact on existing amenity of area. - impact on wildlife habitat.-streets too narrow for two cars to pass beside parked cars. - Lack footpaths and pedestrian use the road to walk. - Riverside streets have no capacity to safely accommodate additional traffic.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
508	D20/126317	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes and removal of FSPA in Oatley West due to: - area is becoming crowded with traffic and population.- duplexes will further increase traffic in area. -loss of character of the area through duplex housing. -loss of privacy.- sewerage and storm water systems will be impacted.-parks and river will be impacted.- schools will become crowded.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
509	D20/126320	Objects	Objects to the draft LEP.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
510	D20/126322	Objects	Objects to the draft LEP.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
511	D20/126411	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to FSPA including removal of property from FSPA due to: adverse impacts on the existing amenity of the area including vegetation, traffic volumes. -urban consolidation and increased income for Council. Objects to the timing of the exhibition during pandemic and post bush fire season.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
512	D20/126418	Objects	Requests removal of their property from LEP Heritage List, supported by letter from a structural engineer.	Requests heritage item to be removed		
513	D20/126458	Objects	Objects to proposed prohibition of POPW from R2 zone due to: - existing POPW within R2 zones will be prohibited.-pose major challenges for potential development applications in future. - draft LEP doesn't recognise the valuable contribution our church makes to residents in our local community.-not in the best interests of residents in the LGA, noting that 51% identified as Christian in the 2016 census. - objections are also contained in the ACPT submission prepared by Ethos Urban.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
514	D20/126460	Objects	Objects to proposed prohibition of POPW from R2 zone due to: - existing PoPW within R2 zones will be prohibited.-pose major challenges for potential development applications in future. - draft LEP doesn't recognise the valuable contribution our church makes to residents in our local community.-not in the best interests of residents in the LGA, noting that 51% identified as Christian in the 2016 census. - objections are also contained in the ACPT submission prepared by Ethos Urban.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
515	D20/126612	Objects	Objects to the changes to FSPA due to: - does not harmonise the former Kogarah and Hurstville LEPs as it splits the zoning of Cypress Drive from single storey residential area at the saddle of the Lugarno Peninsula	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			into two residential zonings down the same street. - the elevated portion of the peninsula should be Chivers Hill. -the proposed FSPA boundary should be located more southerly from the centre of Cypress Drive to another revised boundary more geographically suitable for the purpose of the FSPA.	boundary amendment – no reason provided		
516	D20/126624	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
517	D20/126625	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.  Also raises individual concerns with the proposed changes to Peter Low Reserve, as follows: the reserve is not within a high density area, the proposal represents a poor investment of Council funds. The proposal will have an adverse impact on the local community, as there will be traffic constraints. The opening of the reserve will encourage anti-social	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			behaviour. Concern is also raised that properties will be affected. Furthermore, the exhibition is being held during the COVID-19 pandemic.			
518	D20/126686	Objects	<p>Objects to the following clauses of the draft LEP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 6.7 FSPA - due to potential overdevelopment, impacts on liveability and the amount of vegetation in the area.</li> <li>- 6.11 Design Excellence - developments are unappealing and Council should specify a schedule of colours and finishes.</li> <li>- 4.6 Exceptions to development standards - concerned that this would make the LEP lose meaning as applicants can be exempt from controls.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests for better designed developments</p>	<p>Objects to the following clauses of the draft LEP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 6.11 Design Excellence</li> <li>- 4.6 Exceptions to development standards.</li> </ul> <p>6.11: Concern is raised that the developments currently being erected are visually unappealing. The submission author suggests that a schedule of colours and finishes be developed showing schemes of low visual dominance to blend with the streetscape.</p> <p>4.6: Concerns raised that the Policy would lose its meaning as a result of this clause, as applicants can be exempt from particular controls.</p>	<p>The draft LEP introduces design excellence requirements to ensure that the highest standard of architectural and urban design is achieved within the LGA and to improve place making.</p> <p>Schedules of colours and finishes are not typically included in a LEP and are better suited to development control plans. Additional design requirements will be contained in the Georges River Development Control Plan 2020 which will accompany the draft LEP with more detailed planning controls.</p> <p>The draft LEP is required to contain <i>Clause 4.6 Exceptions to development standards</i> which is mandated by the Standard Instrument LEP. The clause provides flexibility in the application of planning controls, such as height and floor space ratio, where strict compliance with a development standard would, in any particular case, be unreasonable or unnecessary or tend to hinder the attainment of the objects of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>. Applicants must submit written justification with their development application that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case.</p>
519	D20/126689	Objects	<p>Objects to the changes to the FSPA in the former Hurstville LGA, and suggests the former Kogarah LGA FSPA is enhanced due to: loss of trees and residential blocks. Also objects to the rezoning at Rowe Street and Culwulla Street, South Hurstville. Concern is raised that the area is already heavily congested due to lack of walkability and lack of public transport services. Suggestions that rezoning occur closer to Hurstville.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Objects to the Rowe Street – South Hurstville HIA</p> <p>Objects to the Culwulla Street –South</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
				Hurstville HIA		
520	D20/126692	Objects	Objects to the draft LEP in relation to controls for POPW due to: Concern is raised that Council is taking away peoples' right to religious freedom by removing POPW from the R2 zone.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
521	D20/126693	Objects	Objects to the changes to the FSPA due to: Concern is raised that the changes will create traffic constraints. Concern is also raised that the increase of development will cause many trees to be taken down, decreasing the number of wildlife. Also concerned that extra dual occupancy development will increase Council rates.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
522	D20/126697	Objects	Objects due to proposed acquisition of land for public open space at Monaro Avenue due to: inconsistencies raised during the webinars during the public exhibition period, relating to Peter Low Reserve. Concern was raised regarding the amount of open space Council requires, the location of where open space is required in Kingsgrove, the reasoning behind the rezoning of the 6 lots on Monaro Avenue, the consultation with the 6 land owners, and the spelling of Peter Low Reserve.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
523	D20/126759	Objects	Objects - Does not support the proposed changes.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
524	D20/126764	Objects	Objects - Does not support the proposed changes.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
525	D20/126774	Neutral	Concerned with the contradictory statements of the proposal with regards to Council's actions. Noted that within the section titled Environment and open space, 'Green and open spaces are highly valued and should be protected and enhanced, with no loss of existing infrastructure'. Does not believe this statement is consistent with the recent events surrounding Carss Park War Memorial Pool. Questions how the cost-benefit ratio of destroying Carss Park Pool and Todd Park to construct a newer facility is greater than the	Not related to the LEP		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			cost-benefit ratio of using the existing infrastructure to renew the pool and ensure more environmentally friendly infrastructure. Believes the proposal of removing Carss Park Pool and constructing a 'regional aquatic facility' at Todd Park contradicts the key issues within 'Land use'. Believes a regional aquatic facility will further exacerbate existing traffic conditions on the Princes Highway and will not protect the 'amenity and character of low density residential areas from increased traffic and noise impacts'. Believes the statement 'Maintaining the character of the existing suburbs, particularly trees and green open space and walkability is important' raises opposition to the proposed plans. Believes constructing a pool at Todd Park does not preserve the existing green open space but rather eliminates it from the community.			
526	D20/126776	Objects	Objects due to: Concerns raised that increases in dual occupancies will create congested streets and increase problems to the area. Adverse impacts on flora and fauna.	Objects to overdevelopment		
527	D20/126779	Objects	Objects due to: LEP 2020 will increase traffic problems in the local area. Concerns raised that the natural leafy environment will be impacted, and infrastructure will not be able to cope with the changes.	Objects to overdevelopment		
528	D20/126781	Objects	Objects to proposed changes to FSPA due to: Concerns raised that it will affect the unique environment, including Jewfish Point area. Concerns also raised that local infrastructure will not handle increased traffic, and there would be a loss of trees.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
529	D20/126785	Objects	Objects - Does not support the proposed changes.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
530	D20/126786	Objects	Objects due to : believes overdevelopment will destroy the local area as it will increase traffic congestion on already crowded streets, waste/sewer systems will not accommodate increased population, and the local public school is already overcrowded. Believes public transport is already at full capacity with no plan for increase in off-street parking for commuters. Concerned	Objects to overdevelopment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			that the reduction of lot size will remove/reduce green space ratio, and increase local temperatures through the clearance of trees.			
531	D20/126788	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley due to: increase in population and dwelling density resulting from to reduced lot sizes. - Increase in traffic. -Impact on wildlife, plant biodiversity, water quality and peaceful atmosphere. -Unable to preserve the character of the area for the future generations.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
532	D20/126791	Objects	Objects to the changes to the FSPA in Oatley due to: loss of character and impacts on flora and fauna.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
533	D20/126792	Objects	Objects to the changes to the FSPA in Oatley due to: loss of trees, change in the outlook of the suburb, increase in density, increase in traffic, increased impact on existing infrastructure, poor community consultation process, suggests consultation should include councillors attending town halls and talking to the community and using online medium for consultation purposes.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
534	D20/126813	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes and wants Oatley to remain as is.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
535	D20/126819	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes due to: -Increase in density from multi- housing development and population resulting in additional vehicles and emissions, parking, water usage and drainage and overload with electricity. – Loss of property value. - overdevelopment	Objects to overdevelopment		
536	D20/126821	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes due to: -Increase in dwelling density and loss of green space which will adversely affect the local character. – Raises concerns that Council has already allowed high density development in Hurstville and Kogarah and requests not to do the same to surrounding suburbs.	Objects to overdevelopment		
537	D20/126823	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in			

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Oatley, Mortdale Heights, Lugarno, Riverwood and Peakhurst Heights due to: -material shift in the type of architecture, overdevelopment of lot sizes, increased privacy issues, loss of green space and leafy character of streets, increased traffic and stormwater/sewage congestion, damage to the foreshore flora and fauna, restricted use of various reserves in Oatley like Gungah Bay Reserve, loss in property value.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to overdevelopment		
538	D20/126825	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Supports the LEP however suggests all DAs approved should ensure that there is minimal increase in through road traffic and restricted roof line heights along ridge lines to avoid dominating the landscape with roofing material.	Requests for better designed developments		
539	D20/126826	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley due to: increase in dwelling density resulting from reduced lot sizes, privacy issues and overshadowing between properties, loss of green space and decent backyards for children to enjoy.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
540	D20/126827	Supports	Supports that there is no change to R2 zone and the upzoning of areas from R2 to R3 and R2 to R4.	N/A	Supports the upzoning of the housing investigation areas.	The draft LEP proposes to upzone 5 Housing Investigation Areas. The rezoning creates the opportunity to deliver an additional 650 dwellings in the form of medium density and high density dwellings in accessible locations across the LGA, assisting Council in meeting the housing needs of the community with additional dwellings and greater housing choice.
541	D20/126828	Objects	No reason for objection given	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
542	D20/126829	Objects	Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone from an existing POPW due to: - Ability to relocate or redevelop will be limited; -Implies Council does not welcome churches in R2 zones; - The change in policy is ill-conceived, inconsistent with comparable plans and not supported by evidence; - Churches contribute to the community in a way consistent with other land use taking place in residential	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone Requests additional sites containing POPW be included in Schedule 1		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			zones; - Unlikely that churches would affect peak traffic, only generate noise during services (predominantly 1 day a week) or on a Friday night for youth activities, relatively low impact use, parking should be managed at DA stage; - No evidence that POPW cause an unacceptable risk to safety, security and privacy however can be readily mitigated by POM and CPTED in design; - POPW are a form of social infrastructure and play an important role within the community. LEP will prevent provision of key social infrastructure to support Georges River's growing communities. Recommends LEP 2020 include the Baptist churches in Georges River LGA in Schedule 1. Also refers to the ACPT submission to GRC prepared by Ethos Urban.			
543	D20/126831	Objects	No reason for objection given	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
544	D20/126854	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA from Oately due to: lead to an unsustainable reduction in lot sizes, increased traffic congestion, parking problems, loss of trees and biodiversity, create additional storm water run off with further damage to our river system. Existing infrastructure and sewage system will be put under more pressure. Not to mention the stress on green space and local facilities.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
545	D20/126856	Objects	No reason for objection given	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
546	D20/126865	Objects	Objects to the proposed upzoning of the residential block bounded by Connell's Point Road/the Esplanade/Tavistock Road/the Mall, South Hurstville without a stepped approach to an R3 zone and also due to potential traffic impacts. The current draft LEP proposal is the most appropriate mechanism for rezoning The Esplanade/Mall Block downwards to its original R2 zoning	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones		
547	D20/126866	Objects	Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone from an existing POPW due to: - Ability to relocate or redevelop will be limited; -Implies Council does not welcome churches in R2 zones; - The change in policy is ill-conceived, inconsistent with comparable plans and not supported by evidence; -	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone Requests additional sites containing POPW be included in Schedule 1		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Churches contribute to the community in a way consistent with other land use taking place in residential zones; - Unlikely that churches would affect peak traffic, only generate noise during services (predominantly 1 day a week) or on a Friday night for youth activities, relatively low impact use, parking should be managed at DA stage; - No evidence that POPW cause an unacceptable risk to safety, security and privacy however can be readily mitigated by POM and CPTED in design; - POPW are a form of social infrastructure and play an important role within the community. LEP will prevent provision of key social infrastructure to support Georges River's growing communities. Recommends LEP 2020 include the Baptist churches in Georges River LGA in Schedule 1. Also refers to the ACPT submission to GRC prepared by Ethos Urban.			
548	D20/127017	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of their home within 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: Council has not had to acquire homes to create other parks like Mortdale Bowling Club, Hurstville Aquatic Centre and Kempt Field. Monaro is not in close proximity to any high density areas.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
549	D20/127049	Objects	Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone from an existing POPW due to: - Ability to relocate or redevelop will be limited; -Implies Council does not welcome churches in R2 zones; - The change in policy is ill-conceived, inconsistent with comparable plans and not supported by evidence; - Churches contribute to the community in a way consistent with other land use taking place in residential zones; - Unlikely that churches would affect peak traffic, only generate noise during services (predominantly 1 day a week) or on a Friday night for youth activities, relatively low impact use, parking should be managed at DA stage; - No evidence that POPW cause an unacceptable risk to safety, security and privacy however can be readily mitigated by POM and CPTED in design; - POPW are a form of social infrastructure and play an important role within the community. LEP will prevent provision of key social infrastructure to support Georges River's growing communities. Recommends LEP 2020 include the Baptist churches in Georges River LGA in Schedule 1. Also refers to the ACPT submission to GRC prepared by Ethos Urban.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone Requests additional sites containing POPW be included in Schedule 1		
550	D20/127051	Objects	Objects to the removal of their Oatley property from the FSPA due to: increased noise, traffic, congestion and insufficient parking, dual occupancy will result in tree removal, loss of garden character, biodiversity and threatens water quality.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
				the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
551	D20/127054	Objects	Submission notes that Council has previously suggested that an isolated spot rezoning would not be supported by Council.	Requests a spot rezoning (site specific)		
552	D20/127055	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of their client's home within 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: -No genuine engagement, -No targeted consultations, -No planning evidence, not adjacent to high density residential developments, -No consideration of client's disability, -This is not an innovation solution which is inconsistent with the LSPS, -There are no concept plans. Urges Council to pursue an alternative and more innovative proposal to increase public open space in the community, which would not involve or require the acquisition of the client's property.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
553	D20/127059	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: -LEP consultation timeframe is inadequate in light of COVID, - Only the 6 impacted houses were notified of the draft proposal, - Will decrease value of property due to RE1 zoning, -Detrimental to mental health given this uncertainty over timing of acquisition and compensation, - Webinar questions were not adequately answered, -Alternative of locating footpaths and signage to improve visibility to the reserve is proposed, -The actual increase in public space will be minimal and not worth the cost, -The re-zonings will not provide open space for any residents who currently do not have open space close to their homes, -Acquisition is not an innovative or creative approach to increasing public space, - This is not located within a high density area, - This area already enjoys a large amount of open space, -No merit to the "public surveillance" justification and no systemic issue of anti-social behaviour or crime has been identified by the Council, -McGregor Street cannot provide additional parking or direct view into the park, - Properties on Kinsel Avenue would provide better sight lines (for example if 8-22 Kinsel Avenue were acquired), -The Reserve already has a number of play apparatus for children, -The Proposal has been rushed through without providing the residents sufficient notice and consultation.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
554	D20/127068	Objects	Objects to proposed Halstead St, South Hurstville changes and objects to the increase in height for sites in the IN2 zone in South Hurstville. Concerned about	Objects to changes to IN2 zone Objects to changes to IN2 zone		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			impacts from noise, traffic, parking and general access and safety issues.			
555	D20/127075	Objects	Objects to the acquisition of six properties in Monaro Ave to expand Peter Low Reserve due to traffic impacts and no traffic study being undertaken and questioning the need and cost to expand the existing reserve in light of the distance from the Kingsgrove Centre.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
556	D20/127093	Objects	Objects to the proposal to allow more dual occupancies and proposed minimum lot sizes in areas zoned R2 due to impacts on the character of the local neighbourhood, and specific impacts of higher density on stormwater run-off. Suggests that localised analysis of topography and infrastructure capacity be undertaken to fully understand flooding risks.	Objects to overdevelopment	Suggests that localised analysis of topography and infrastructure capacity be undertaken to fully understand flooding risks.	Council is currently preparing a Floodplain Risk Management Study and Plan ("the Plan") for the Hurstville, Mortdale and Peakhurst Wards. The Plan will include a flood risk assessment of properties identified by the overland flow flood studies. The Plan will also identify strategies to reduce flood risk through both structural and non-structural measures.
557	D20/127097	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: drastically change the character of the area over time and also additional pressure on already overloaded schools, hospitals, transport and other public services. Urban heritage and character is dismantled based purely on increasing population to seek further economic growth.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
558	D20/127099	Objects	Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone from an existing POPW due to: - Ability to relocate or redevelop will be limited; -Implies Council does not welcome churches in R2 zones; - The change in policy is ill-conceived, inconsistent with comparable plans and not supported by evidence; - Churches contribute to the community in a way consistent with other land use taking place in residential zones; - Unlikely that churches would affect peak traffic, only generate noise during services (predominantly 1 day a week) or on a Friday night for youth activities, relatively low impact use, parking should be managed at DA stage; - No evidence that POPW cause an unacceptable risk to safety, security and privacy however can be readily mitigated by POM and CPTED in design; - POPW are a form of social infrastructure and play an important role within the community. LEP will prevent provision of key social infrastructure to support Georges River's growing communities. Recommends LEP 2020 include the Baptist churches in Georges River LGA in Schedule 1. Also refers to the ACPT submission to GRC prepared by Ethos Urban.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
559	D20/127102	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the South Hurstville Industrial Estate due to : proposal to increase the density of this precinct as it does not function well and surrounded by residential. This will increase traffic flow and increased heavy vehicles. Trucks parking on the road for days present safety issues. creative industries in the zone IN2 is worth consideration, as uses such as media, advertising, fine arts and craft, design, film and television, music, publishing, performing arts and cultural heritage institutions will have a reduced impact on the surrounding residential area as they are cleaner use in comparison to your historic light industrial uses.	Objects to changes to IN2 zone Objects to changes to IN2 zone		
560	D20/127104	Objects	Objects to the rezoning of Culwulla Street from R2 to R3 due to:- additional traffic, no increase in green space and infrastructure. Stresses on parking and safety concerns for the older residents of the street due to increased traffic.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Culwulla Street, South Hurstville		
561	D20/127106	Objects	Objects to the rezoning of Culwulla Street from R2 to R3 due to: current traffic congestion in and around Culwulla street cannot absorb increased number of cars. Parking issues on Culwulla street already an issue. Providing green space as a result of forced acquisition is unacceptable.	Objects to the Culwulla Street –South Hurstville HIA		
562	D20/127108	Objects	Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone from an existing POPW due to: - positive impact churches have on the local community. - inflexible assessment framework that will prevent the orderly redevelopment of existing POPW and new POPW that generate limited impacts on amenity but make significant contributions to the community. -there will be no potential to acquire an adjoining site to allow expansion or amalgamation of new facilities.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
563	D20/127111	Objects	Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone from an existing POPW due to: - Ability to relocate or redevelop will be limited; -Implies Council does not welcome churches in R2 zones; - The change in policy is ill-conceived, inconsistent with comparable plans and not supported by evidence; - Churches contribute to the community in a way consistent with other land use taking place in residential zones; - Unlikely that churches would affect peak traffic, only generate noise during services (predominantly 1 day a week) or on a Friday night for youth activities, relatively low impact use, parking should be managed at DA stage; - No evidence that POPW cause an unacceptable risk to safety, security and privacy however can be readily mitigated by POM and CPTED in design; - POPW are a form of social infrastructure	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			and play an important role within the community. LEP will prevent provision of key social infrastructure to support Georges River's growing communities. Recommends LEP 2020 include the Baptist churches in Georges River LGA in Schedule 1. Also refers to the ACPT submission to GRC prepared by Ethos Urban.			
564	D20/127117	Objects	Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone from an existing POPW due to: - Ability to relocate or redevelop will be limited; -Implies Council does not welcome churches in R2 zones; - The change in policy is ill-conceived, inconsistent with comparable plans and not supported by evidence; - Churches contribute to the community in a way consistent with other land use taking place in residential zones; - Unlikely that churches would affect peak traffic, only generate noise during services (predominantly 1 day a week) or on a Friday night for youth activities, relatively low impact use, parking should be managed at DA stage; - No evidence that POPW cause an unacceptable risk to safety, security and privacy however can be readily mitigated by POM and CPTED in design; - POPW are a form of social infrastructure and play an important role within the community. LEP will prevent provision of key social infrastructure to support Georges River's growing communities. Recommends LEP 2020 include the Baptist churches in Georges River LGA in Schedule 1. Also refers to the ACPT submission to GRC prepared by Ethos Urban.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
565	D20/127120	Objects	Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone from an existing POPW due to: - Ability to relocate or redevelop will be limited; -Implies Council does not welcome churches in R2 zones; - The change in policy is ill-conceived, inconsistent with comparable plans and not supported by evidence; - Churches contribute to the community in a way consistent with other land use taking place in residential zones; - Unlikely that churches would affect peak traffic, only generate noise during services (predominantly 1 day a week) or on a Friday night for youth activities, relatively low impact use, parking should be managed at DA stage; - No evidence that POPW cause an unacceptable risk to safety, security and privacy however can be readily mitigated by POM and CPTED in design; - POPW are a form of social infrastructure and play an important role within the community. LEP will prevent provision of key social infrastructure to support Georges River's growing communities. Recommends LEP 2020 include the Baptist churches in Georges River LGA in Schedule 1. Also refers to the ACPT submission to GRC prepared by Ethos Urban.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
566	D20/127125	Objects	OBO owners of 39 Bridge St, Hurstville. Objects to application of 1:1 non-residential FSR for the site on the	Objects to the minimum non-residential FSR requirement in commercial centres		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			basis of development viability of the site, questioning of the economic assessments undertaken to date and the suggestion that more economic analysis needs to be undertaken in the context of the Hurstville City Centres Urban Design Study and light of more recent COVID-19 economic impacts.			
567	D20/127148	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that objects to the removal of the FSPA due to: will have a detrimental impact on the local biodiversity and amenity and lead to denser urban development with subsequent impacts on traffic, parking and local health and safety.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
568	D20/127162	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that the FSPA as proposed will have a detrimental impact on the local character and amenity of the Oatley area and lead to additional traffic and parking issues, with particular reference to the middle and upper part of the Oatley West peninsula being excluded.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
569	D20/127170	Objects	Objects to draft LEP due to : consultation has been insufficient and that further discussion should take place via 'town hall' type community meetings. Submits that draft LEP will 'affect Oatley forever'.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
570	D20/127184	Objects	Member of Parliament raises concerns on behalf of a resident that objects to the draft LEP due to: community consultation program in light of the changes made in response to COVID 19 social distancing and in particular the impacts on older members of the community. Particularly concerned about impacts of the proposed FSPA on the Oatley area.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
571	D20/127213	Objects	Objects to the draft LEP due to: perceived impacts to the local character of Oatley in terms of increased traffic, parking and privacy issues 'endangering' the natural landscape.	Objects to overdevelopment		
572	D20/127227	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley due to: based on perceived impacts on the 'garden' like local character, traffic, parking and views. Also object to revised community engagement program deadlines in light of COVID-19 pandemic.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
				the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
573	D20/127250	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley West due to: Suggests deletion of properties from the FSPA area will result in impacts in terms of reduced tree canopy, loss of biodiversity, increased storm water runoff, pollution of creek lines , increased traffic volumes, reduced street parking and an overall increased pressure on infrastructure.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
574	D20/127268	Supports	Supports the draft LEP as is without any change.	Supports draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
575	D20/127271	Objects	Objects to proposal to acquire the six properties on Monaro Avenue to expand Peter Low Reserve due to: will have a negative impact on traffic and parking and subsequent safety issues, particularly in light of vehicular movements from Stoney Creek Rd, down Monaro and into Mc Gregor St, suggests there is insufficient evidence and justification to support the expenditure on the acquisition.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
576	D20/127278	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: Opposition based on an anticipated increase in building densities close to the foreshore and subsequent impacts on the scenic character, vegetation, wildlife, sewerage infrastructure and car-parking.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
577	D20/127280	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for open space due to: - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. New open space should be provided where high density is planned (eg. Kingsgrove Village/Kingsgrove Road or Beverly Hills near King Georges Road). - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking. On-street parking will occur in the slightly	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>wider Monaro Ave, St Elmo Pde, Kinsel Ave and New England Pde affecting existing residents. - The 3 existing accesses to the Reserve are adequate and opening the Reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft etc, resulting in increased insurance premiums, fear and distress. - Amenity issues will result from traffic and parking congestion within the area bounded by Glenwall St, Kingsway, Margaret St and Morgan St. - Adversely affect property values.</p> <p>Also raises an additional reference to keeping the park 'secluded and private'. Suggests adding a bike track to the Reserve.</p>			
578	D20/127283	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of the properties at 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for the purpose of expanding Peter Low Reserve due to: Requests their property be removed from rezoning as part of the expansion of Peter Low Reserve. Contends that the expansion of Peter Low Reserve is not an 'innovative' approach and results in a 'negligible increase' to open space in the LGA. Also criticises the methodology of the webinars.</p>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		
579	D20/127287	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of the properties at 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for the purpose of expanding Peter Low Reserve due to: increased traffic, parking and safety concerns. Also suggest that there is insufficient data to justify the acquisition in light of population growth, crime, surveillance, cost and access. Also objects to the lack of notification and information provided to surrounding residents.</p>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		
580	D20/127291	Objects	<p>Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: an anticipated increase in building density on the basis of loss of tree canopy, additional on street parking, loss of public land, impacts to biodiversity, stormwater run-off and pollution view impacts.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
581	D20/127295	Objects	<p>Objects to the removal of their properties from the existing FSPA due to impacts on lifestyle, property value - particularly in light of views from the property, parking, traffic and parking and capacity of local infrastructure. Also objects to the consultation program in light of COVID-19 restrictions.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
582	D20/127298	Objects	<p>Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: suggests should be extended to ridgelines, changes</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			to minimum lot lots sizes and landscaping requirements. Objections based on reduction to tree canopy, traffic, parking and local character impacts. Also raises concerns regarding impacts on local infrastructure and the DLEP being finalised amid the COVID-19 pandemic.	the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
583	D20/127302	Objects	Objects to the area on the northern side of Kyle Williams Estate being zoned R2, suggest should be zoned E2 based on the history and use of the area and surrounds. Broadly opposes changes to the FSPA and any E2 zonings and raises concerns re the capacity of local infrastructure.	N/A Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment	Objects to the area on the northern side of Kyle Williams Estate being zoned R2, suggest should be zoned E2 based on the history and use of the area and surrounds.	Kyle Williams Estate currently has a split zone of R2 and E2 in the Kogarah LEP 2012. The draft LEP does not seek to amend the zoning of the site.  The draft LEP introduces minimum landscaped area requirements in the residential and E2 zones which provide greater legal weight to ensure the protection of local landscape character, the provision of sufficient tree canopy cover, building separation and deep soil areas to enable water infiltration to lessen the extent of urban runoff. The site zoned E2 will be required to have a minimum landscaped area covering 70% of the site area, which is approximately 16,520sqm of the 23,600sqm site. It should be noted that the current Kogarah LEP and DCP do not contain minimum landscaping requirements for the E2 zone.
584	D20/127305	Objects	Objects to LEP 2020 due to: - The community wants more greenspace, overdevelopment reduces tree canopy which contributes to global climate change. - Overdevelopment has removed more trees than necessary.	Objects to overdevelopment		
585	D20/127310	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: - There has been over-development in recent years. Allowing conversion of dwellings into dual occupancies in the FSPA will adversely impact the environment and community. - Overdevelopment has also affected traffic and parking. Draft LEP 2020 must be abolished as it will result in increased density, increased traffic and congestion, noise and street parking, loss of leafy character and more pressure on infrastructure (eg	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to overdevelopment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			transport system, schools, hospitals, sewerage and stormwater systems. - Council has not appropriately sought input from members of the community regarding the preparation of the Draft LEP. - There is absolutely no evidence to suggest that building more properties will make housing more affordable.			
586	D20/127312	Objects	Object to proposed removal of properties from the FSPA due to: - Chose to live in Oatley because these controls were in place. - The plan to remove the FSPA from almost 4000 properties will destroy the reasons why people moved to the area. - There has been a lack of community consultation and the COVID lockdown should not be used to push the change through. - The planning control changes will destroy the community and make it like the rest of Sydney. - COVID-19 restrictions are being taken advantage of to underhandedly rush the consultation process.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to overdevelopment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
587	D20/127313	Objects	Object to proposed removal of properties from the FSPA due to: - There will be a reduction in trees and bird life. This will result in a higher amount of run-off from properties into the Georges River, impacting its health. - Will affect the quality of the location. Residents have located in this area for the tranquil lifestyle and to avoid overcrowding, particularly through the development of apartments. - Standardising zoning controls throughout the LGA is misguided in the Oatley area which has a distinct character. - Concern over the future of development in areas where the FSPA has been removed, following the redevelopment of a property surrounding.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
588	D20/127318	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes of the Draft LEP due to: - Impact on the health of the Georges River. - There is concern that number of properties along the river's foreshore could more than double. - Proposal would significantly downgrade the area. Will cause worsening of water quality in Georges River, flooding, loss of tree canopy and cause safety issues due to stresses on existing roads. - Will cause a loss of vegetation along the River which will contribute to flooding and poor water quality. - There is concern over an increase in population resulting in an increase in unintended sewage overflow into the river. - There will likely be a negative impact on the habitat of	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			native fauna. - Pressure on already narrow roads will increase with additional traffic and further lack of street parking.			
589	D20/127320	Objects	Objects to the proposed removal of properties from the FSPA due to: - Draft LEP will reduce foreshore protection areas which is inconsistent with the aims of the LEP. - Will cause overdevelopment, loss of trees, overcrowding, more traffic, sewer outflows. - Will result in more duplex developments built boundary to boundary, and overdeveloping sites.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
590	D20/127324	Objects	Objects to the LEP 2020 due to: - proposed reduction of lot sizes. - Will cause increased density by reduction of lot sizes, reduction in amenity, reducing essential landscaping requirements. - Communities require adequate lot sizes to avoid overcrowding, retain acoustic separation, visual amenity and social wellness.	Objects to overdevelopment		
591	D20/127326	Objects	Objects to the proposed removal of properties from the FSPA due to: - Draft LEP will result in increased housing density, increased building footprints and reduction in garden areas. In summary, the issues of objection are: - Loss of Visual Amenity - Cumulative effect of changed FSPA zoning will destroy the Garden Bushland Character - Loss of tree Canopy - Loss of FSPA in LGA to harmonise Hurstville & Kogarah is flawed - LEP is inconsistent with NSW Planning instruments - Failure to provide biodiversity considerations - Insufficient planning of required infrastructure - Council housing targets have already been achieved in other areas - LEP process has failed to appropriately consult the community during the COVID-19 restrictions.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
592	D20/127328	Objects	Objects to the proposed Draft LEP due to: - The significant overdevelopment permitted by the Georges River Council in recent years has occurred with no approval or collaboration with local communities and environments significantly affected by such changes.	Objects to overdevelopment		
593	D20/127329	Objects	Objects to the proposed removal of properties from the FSPA due to: - All areas which view the river should be included in the FSPA. - Ethos Urban's Foreshore Strategic Directions Paper fails to recognise some bushy areas of the 'garden suburban' typology are valued and highly sensitive to change. - Streets/roads which should be included in the bush	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			suburban category: Bay, Riley, Waterfall, Marine, Freeman, Landsdowne, and Macken, Myall, Myrtle, MiMi, Waratah and Woronora south of Mulga Rd in Oatley West. Then Mimosa, Yarran, Boorara and Llewellyn. - In the interests of harmonisation, we recommend that the leafier streets east of the railway line are added back to the FSPA. - Other areas needing serious review include Jewfish Point and the foreshore of Salt Pan Creek.			
594	D20/127331	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley due to: - There has been a decline in trees and greenery in Oatley as block sizes are reduced and oversized properties are becoming more prevalent. - Please leave Oatley as it is.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
595	D20/127332	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: - Councillors who have declared a conflict of interest are using to their advantage to say that there are issues they "didn't vote for". - It is a disgrace that the draft LEP has been prepared by people who don't live in the GRC LGA and being finalised during COVID-19. - Council have failed to address the Minister for Planning's reasoning for additional open space. - Housing targets have already been met. - Harmonisation needed between former Hurstville and Kogarah regarding FSPA. - Council are seeking to destroy the natural beauty and bush-like features of every area. - Loss of tree canopy and leafy character. - Increased traffic congestion and pressure on current infrastructure.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
596	D20/127335	Objects	Objects to the lack of extension of time during the COVID-19 restrictions. More time should be allocated for community consultation.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
597	D20/127337	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: - The proposed changes to the foreshore protection zone would likely lead to a material shift in the type of architecture, the overdevelopment of lot sizes, privacy issues between properties crammed into one lot, loss of green space and leafy character of streets, increased	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			traffic and storm water/sewage congestion, damage the foreshore flora and fauna and prevent residents from accessing the various reserves in Oatley. - There is concern that property values will be impacted.			
598	D20/127460	Objects	Objects to the finalisation of the draft LEP during the COVID-19 period due to: - There is no transparency as to why this is being finalised when there are more pressing concerns of the community. - Integrated systems analysis of sufficient and sustainable end-to-end management of key infrastructure, facilities and services within the council area that are closely related to installation and delivery of items. - Council should instead invest in the following: *Supply, distribution recycling and redistribution of clean, grey, dirty, sewage and stormwaters; *Providing electricity and gas; *Bushfire mitigation and emergency response; *Ensuring mobile and internet access; *Managing waste and recycling services; *Providing key infrastructure like hospitals, aged care, palliative care, disability care, child care centres, schools and universities; *Policing law and order; *Managing pets, animals, parks, flora and fauna; *Employment and business management and development services; *Sporting fields and clubs, facilities; *Libraries, cultural, arts and event spaces.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
599	D20/127492	Objects	Objects to the rezoning of their property in Oatley. - Council are sitting on the fence in supporting the residents. - Council did not allow for free speech by muting attendees to webinars.	Objects to overdevelopment Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
600	D20/127497	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	No objections to the proposed translation of existing R3 zone to proposed R4 zone, provided the following conditions are met: 1. The existing use rights of properties will be preserved. 2. That the rating levies will be based on existing rights and not the higher land value as determined by the proposed rezoning. 3. Council to commit to providing additional on-street car parking.	N/A	No objections to the proposed translation of existing R3 zone to proposed R4 zone, provided the following conditions are met: 1. The existing use rights of properties will be preserved. 2. That the rating levies will be based on existing rights and not the higher land value as determined by the proposed rezoning. 3. Council to commit to providing additional on-street car parking.	1. Existing use rights will apply under the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i> if the existing use operates for a continuous period of 12 months. 2. Council rates are not a matter for the draft LEP. 3. Parking requirements are contained in the development control plan and will be reviewed in the development of the Georges River Development Control Plan 2020 which will accompany the draft LEP with more detailed planning controls.
601	D20/127498	Objects	Objects to the acquisition and rezoning of 26-30 Culwulla Street, South Hurstville and provides a direct link to an online petition at Change.org with over 300	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Culwulla Street, South Hurstville		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>signatures.</p> <p>Also expresses the following concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Apartments at end of Culwulla Street will increase density and impact surrounding infrastructure and facilities.</li> <li>- More traffic will be generated by more people visiting the proposed park.</li> <li>- The street cannot currently provide for an increase in traffic and parking, with increased risk to pedestrians.</li> <li>- There are already 5 parks in close proximity to the street.</li> <li>- The proposed area for the park is not ideal due to its proximity to King Georges Road.</li> <li>- Concern over construction and noise which will arise as of acquisition.</li> <li>- The amount of money spent to acquire properties is unreasonable and could be distributed more efficiently.</li> </ul>			
602	D20/127500	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA in Oatley, Lugarno and Peakhurst due to impact on the environment and requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No change to the existing FSPA.</li> <li>- Include additional areas in the FSPA.</li> <li>- No change to recommended minimum lot sizes in R2 zones.</li> <li>- 40% landscaped area requirement for lots in R2 zones.</li> <li>- Permanent protection for all remaining parks and reserves and include 'green corridors' in the draft LEP.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests increasing the landscaping requirements</p>	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA in Oatley, Lugarno and Peakhurst due to impact on the environment and requests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Permanent protection for all remaining parks and reserves and include 'green corridors' in the draft LEP.</li> </ul>	<p>Council's <i>Open Space, Recreation and Community Facilities Strategy 2019-2036</i> provides a direction for open space, recreation and community facilities in the Georges River area. The Strategy states that no rezonings should result in the loss of land used for public open space.</p> <p>Council is developing the Foreshore Access Improvement Plan which may inform future amendments to the LEP, such as open space acquisitions to provide 'green corridors' and linkages along the foreshore.</p>
603	D20/127504	Objects	<p>Objects to the draft LEP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Upzoning higher density development in areas which are not within 400m of railway stations should not be approved.</li> <li>- The removal of properties from the FSPA is an issue which should not be completed.</li> <li>- E2 zones along the foreshore should not be rezoned to R2 as this threatens development on acid sulfate soil affected land.</li> <li>- A biodiversity study should be completed to protect the endangered species, native flora and fauna.</li> <li>- There is a lack of evidence-based support for proposed increases in traffic and parking demand in the Kogarah Town Centre, Hurstville Civic Centre and Beverly Hills.</li> <li>- Kyle Williams Estate is listed on the National Trust and should be zoned as E2.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to overdevelopment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- inadequate justification for the boundary amendment</li> <li>- no reason provided</li> </ul>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Upzoning higher density development in areas which are not within 400m of railway stations should not be approved.</li> <li>2. E2 zones along the foreshore should not be rezoned to R2 as this threatens development on acid sulfate soil affected land. Kyle Williams Estate is listed on the National Trust and should be zoned as E2.</li> <li>3. A biodiversity study should be completed to protect the endangered species, native flora and fauna.</li> <li>4. There is a lack of evidence-</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The draft LEP proposes to upzone 5 Housing Investigation Areas for medium and high density residential development in areas selected based on the Criteria to Guide Growth, developed with the community for LSPS 2040. This criteria includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Growth supported by green open space, social and physical infrastructure</li> <li>- Growth areas are linked to transport corridors and frequent services</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>Existing R3 Medium Density</p>

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
					<p>based support for proposed increases in traffic and parking demand in the Kogarah Town Centre, Hurstville Civic Centre and Beverly Hills.</p>	<p>Residential zoned areas with permissible heights of 12 metres or greater are also proposed to be translated to the R4 High Density Residential zone in accordance with the principle of creating a hierarchy of residential zones. This approach is not an upzoning and does not increase the height and FSR to any of these areas.</p> <p>2. Kyle Williams Estate currently has a split zone of R2 and E2 in the Kogarah LEP 2012. The draft LEP does not seek to amend the zoning of the site.</p> <p>The draft LEP introduces minimum landscaped area requirements in the residential and E2 zones which provide greater legal weight to ensure the protection of local landscape character, the provision of sufficient tree canopy cover, building separation and deep soil areas to enable water infiltration to lessen the extent of urban runoff. The site zoned E2 will be required to have a minimum landscaped area covering 70% of the site area, which is approximately 16,520sqm of the 23,600sqm site. It should be noted that the current Kogarah LEP and DCP do not contain minimum landscaping requirements for the E2 zone.</p> <p>3. Council will be undertaking a biodiversity study for the LGA as part of its broader strategic program relating to the natural environment. The findings of this study may inform a future amendment to the LEP, including a biodiversity provision.</p> <p>4. No changes are proposed in the draft LEP that would increase traffic and parking demand in the Kogarah Town Centre, Hurstville</p>

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
						<p>Civic Centre and Beverly Hills.</p> <p>The roles and functions of all 48 commercial centres, including centre-specific objectives, built form controls and guidelines and the investigation of the potential expansion of appropriate centres will be conducted in <i>Part 2 of the Commercial Centres Strategy</i> to inform the future LEP 2022 (Jobs and Activation).</p> <p>Furthermore, the draft Beverly Hills Master Plan will be placed on exhibition in June/July for 60 days and includes recommendations for amendments to land use zones, height of building and floor space ratio within the study area. The Master Plan may inform a future amendment to the Georges River LEP.</p>
604	D20/127506	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: over 2000 properties from former Hurstville and rezoning from R3 to R4 with higher permissible heights and motive is not harmonisation but maximises population. Mentions minimal tree cover, traffic and pollution.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided Objects to overdevelopment		
605	D20/127508	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes in the FSPA in Oatley due to: increased parking and traffic in the area, limited access points in Oatley specifically around Yarran Road and Boorara Road. Area is already under pressure from subdivision and commuters. It is an insufficient reason to change the FSPA to homogenise zonings and achieve population density. Inconsistencies with the reduction of the FSPA in Oatley when compared to Lugarno.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided		
606	D20/127509	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to : reduction in size of the environmental and scenic areas. Concerned about overcrowding and overdevelopment with resulting in impacts on parking, overlooking and overshadowing. Does not see any provisions for single floor villas suitable for older people	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to overdevelopment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			just profit maximising two floor dual occupancies.			
607	D20/127510	Objects	Objects to the proposal at 11 to 21 Monaro Avenue for the following reasons: - no evidence of anti-social issues, -no demand from community to expand, -does not make good environmental or financial sense to acquire lots, -the space is unsuitable for sports fields due to size and grade, -Council has not provided any alternative options analyses for the north of the LGA, - Peter Low Reserve is 800 metres from the Kingsgrove town centre, -more open space should be provided in high density areas, -there is adequate surveillance of the Reserve from surrounding houses; -no incidents or systemic issue of anti-social behaviour or crime have been identified by the Council, -the increased park area will be negligible compared to the size of the LGA, -will cause severe displacement and disruption to the residents of the properties, -McGregor St offers very few options in regard to parking and Council had undertaken no traffic analysis, -the Reserve already has a playground for children, -the local community is happy to assist with identifying 'innovative solutions' to make the park more accessible as Council should upgrade the current Reserve in its current dimensions, -the proposal appears to be a very poorly considered use of ratepayers/community funds	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
608	D20/127511	Objects	Objects to the changes in relation to POPW and them being prohibited in R2 zones. States that there are over 40 POPW within R2 zones currently and the draft LEP will prohibit this use on these sites. The planning controls are saying that POPW are not favoured uses in these zones. Will create issues for future DA's and doesn't recognise the valuable contribution to residents as majority are Christian (Census data). Have previously submitted a detailed submission on this issue.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
609	D20/127513	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of land for public open space at 11-21 Monaro Ave. Rejects proposed acquisition as the aims and justification by Council cannot be met. The proposal has strong community objection and the widespread information has been unprofessional and caused anxiety amongst elderly and residents with a disability. The approach has been unsatisfactory for the following reasons; - letter arrived 3 weeks after it was dated (wants explanation) which cut consultation period in half - acknowledges extension to exhibition but still too short. - No prior consultation and surrounding properties should have been informed. - Suggests that COVID-19 has made it difficult for residents to obtain information and talk to each other.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Changes are meant to be 'improving the community' but difficult to understand when threatening them with compulsory acquisition.</li> <li>- Concerned regarding the impact on property owners.</li> <li>- Aim and justification inconsistent with the South District Plan.</li> <li>- The draft LEP is inconsistent with Council's Local Housing Strategy (area not included in area less than 200m from open space and only provides passive space).</li> <li>- If a future use rezoning is being considered it should be a part of this LEP. Concerned with lack of long term planning decision for area.</li> <li>- No personal experience that the park is unsafe.</li> <li>- No evidence of research provided.</li> <li>- Not the location for the best visual sight lines.</li> <li>- No future plans for the Reserve are available.</li> </ul>			
610	D20/127514	Objects	<p>Objects to the draft LEP due to: focus is on increasing housing, population and traffic. Concerns regarding the exhibition of the draft LEP during COVID-19 and inadequate time to participate in community consultation. pandemic demonstrates Council is out of touch and minimal time regarding the consultation. Concerned about increased runoff from hard surfaces contaminating waterways, loss of trees and wildlife, traffic and parking issues. Wants access to technical studies regarding the LGA-wide foreshore planning and policy.</p>	<p>Objects to overdevelopment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p>		
611	D20/127524	Objects	<p>Objects regarding the proposed changes to FSPA in Oatley due to: Want to retain leafy character and doesn't want additional density, traffic and congestion. Council responsible for preservation and overdevelopment impacting on character.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
612	D20/127525	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposal for 11-21 Monaro Avenue Kingsgrove: - Future Housing Growth at Kingsgrove Town Centre does not justify expansion of Peter Low Reserve as it is 1km distance from centre and there are 3 nearby parks within 200-300m walking distance. Developers should incorporate a small grassy area adjacent to the new apartment blocks. -Will lose the unique character of Peter Low Reserve by opening up access and currently private, peaceful and quiet without passing cars. If LPP approves the proposal and ignores strong community objection, then residents have the right to demand a democratic vote (referendum style) at the next Council elections (as elected Council</p>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Raises concerns that the Planning Proposal Authority is the LPP rather than Council</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			representatives cannot vote). Suggestion to increase amount of green space by opening up space at Kingsgrove High School - grassy fields backing on to houses in Margaret St outside of school hours.			
613	D20/127526	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Supports but suggestions for changes. Reservations about high rise development as existing high rise has impacted on traffic and congestion mainly towards Hurstville Station and impacts on off-street parking. Extra traffic around Hillcrest Ave and Woniora Rd, and Ormonde Pde needs to be planned for and managed. Traffic lights to be better phased and intersection widened. Provided multiple examples of continued breaking of road rules and accident potential due to increased pedestrians. Infrastructure, bike lanes, signage, education to be included in all plans. Understands traffic committees etc to deal with these matter but thinking early will result in a better outcome. Thanks Council for the webinars and video options.	Supports Council's community engagement program for the draft LEP Objects to overdevelopment		
614	D20/127532	Objects	Objects regarding the changes in the FSPA due to: - Only developers will benefit. - The change will result in more traffic and congestion. - Decrease in landscaped area and trees. - Contrary to the principles of protecting the existing environment as outlined by the Foreshore Strategic Directions Paper. - The increased density from R3 to R4 is contrary to the values of the community. - State Government housing targets is placing pressure to reduce the FSPA.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
615	D20/127534	Objects	Objects to the changes in relation to POPW and them being prohibited in R2 zones. States that there are over 40 POPW within R2 zones currently and this will prohibit this use on these sites. The planning controls are saying that POPW are not favoured uses in these zones. Will create issues for future DA's and doesn't recognise the valuable contribution to residents as majority are Christian (Census data). Have detailed submissions directed to the Strategic Team and ACPT submission to GRC prepared by Ethos.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
616	D20/127536	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Supports the proposed rezoning of land for open space at Peter Low Reserve (11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove) due to: - deliver on LSPS vision for additional open space across the LGA and supported by Council's Open Space, Recreation and Community Facilities Strategy 2019-2036. -expansion of public open space is 35% increase in size of Reserve - aligns with Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles and improves access, safety direct visual sight lines and passive surveillance.-Reserve has no direct surveillance which leads to unsocial behaviour, vandalism, theft, graffiti and undesirable characters being present. The remaining dark corner	Supports the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>behind six properties at 23-33 Monaro Avenue will continue to have negative urban design outcomes and suggests CCTV and increased law enforcement surveillance as a solution.</p> <p>Requests when expansion of open space is realised, master plan for the Reserve be publicly exhibited.</p> <p>Suggestions for master plan - native flora and fauna gardens, upgraded playground, cycling and walking paths and extension of paperbark trees lining Monaro Ave, accessible public open space. - Does not want community structures, scout halls or public toilets. - Beautify existing three lanes leading to the Reserve - improvements and beautification of shared boundaries/fences of dwellings and the Reserve.</p> <p>Wants greater certainty and detail in regard to the future acquisition of land and expansion of the Reserve. In relation to acquisition process. -What is the proposed funding source? Is this part of a new Georges River contributions plan? What is the proposed timing for acquisition, will this be demand or market driven? What is the proposed timing for the gazettal of the LEP amendment and subsequent master planning? Will the proposed expansion of the public open space form part of an amendment to Council's DCP or Community Plan? Recommends: 1.Beautification of the three (3) existing laneways which lead into the Reserve to make these more inviting through plantings and vegetation and provide a greater perception of safety. 2. Installation of CCTV cameras and increased law enforcement/security surveillance to deter crime and undesirable activities. 3. Overall improvements within the Reserve to improve presentation. 4. More clarity around funding and timing for delivery of the proposed expanded Reserve. 5. Greater certainty and detail with regard to the future acquisition of land and expansion of the Reserve. 6. Community consultation of any future masterplanning of the expanded Reserve.</p>			
617	D20/127539	Objects	<p>Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: overdevelopment due to reduction in lot sizes and increased density, negative impact on flora and fauna, increased runoff of polluted waterways, and impact on beautiful natural landscape and the serenity . - Undemocratic to do while public attendance has been suspended to meetings due to COVID- 19 and trying to push through policies that will have significant impacts. -Suggests using video conferencing and if public attendance cannot be arranged suspend decision making until this can commence for debate and discussion.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
618	D20/127541	Objects	<p>Object to changes in the FSPA due to legal and procedural contraventions. Breaches in DPIE 'A guide to preparing planning proposals' (no environmental</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>constraints), if the land is identified as critical habitat etc., no environmental reports and no public transport investigation. Violates Ministerial direction by not 'extending' FSPA and does not assist to protect environmentally sensitive areas and does not address planning for bushfire to encourage management and protect life by discouraging the establishment.</p> <p>Wants a public hearing and to investigate above and deficiencies in Councils processes.</p>	<p>– inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided Requests a public hearing</p>		
619	D20/127544	Objects	<p>Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: inconsistencies with Council's verbal answers in the webinar in relation to the reasoning behind why it has been excluded as these areas have a higher sensitivity to change. Believes inconsistency clearly shows that the change is to increase density and is not accepted and wants to retain current character of the area.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p>		
620	D20/127545	Objects	<p>Objects due to the proposed acquisition of land for open space at 11 – 21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove due to: - lack of notification for the exhibition of the LEP, -lack of accessibility for the elderly community,</p> <p>-no evidence of anti-social issues, -no demand from community to expand, -does not make good environmental or financial sense to acquire lots, -the space is unsuitable for sports fields due to size and grade, -Council has not provided any alternative options analyses for the north of the LGA, -Peter Low Reserve is 800 metres from the Kingsgrove town centre, -more open space should be provided in high density areas, - there is adequate surveillance of the Reserve from surrounding houses; -no incidents or systemic issue of anti-social behaviour or crime have been identified by the Council, -the increased park area will be negligible compared to the size of the LGA, -will cause severe displacement and disruption to the residents of the properties, -McGregor St offers very few options in regard to parking and Council had undertaken no traffic analysis, -the Reserve already has a playground for children, -the local community is happy to assist with identifying 'innovative solutions' to make the park more accessible as Council should upgrade the current Reserve in its current dimensions, -the proposal appears to be a very poorly considered use of ratepayers/community funds, -Peter Low Reserve is incorrectly spelt by Council as "Peter Lowe Reserve".</p>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Makes reference to an online petition on Change.org which has gathered over 1,200 signatures.			
621	D20/127546	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA due to: Raised concerns regarding the inconsistent justification provided for the removal of properties in the FSPA in the Webinar presentation and the planning proposal report in that the Webinar presentation suggested the FSPA is not based on achieving additional population growth whereas the planning proposal report states increased lot size for dual occupancy developments, thereby significantly reducing the development potential of this area which will reduce the LGA's capacity to meet the projected housing targets.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided		
622	D20/127549	Objects	Objects to the proposed removal of properties from the FSPA: - The proposed changes will reduce the minimum lot sizes for dual occupancy in many areas of Peakhurst Heights, Mortdale and Oatley and change their character.- Many houses on Roberts Road have already changed to dual occupancies.- Peakhurst Heights does not have the infrastructure or services to support such an increase in density and traffic.- Runoff into the Georges River will put additional stress on the environment, including bird life.- Questions why Lugarno is classified 'bush suburban' but Peakhurst Heights is 'garden suburban'. - Asks whether this is revenue raising.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
623	D20/127555	Objects	Objects to the proposed removal of properties in Oatley West, Peakhurst and Lugarno from the FSPA. - This proposal will increase housing density, building footprints and reduce garden areas/vegetation throughout the LGA. - There will be a decrease in wildlife habitat and the LGA's liveability. - The character of 'garden suburban' in Oatley West should have a higher sensitivity. - Council should review the draft LEP in respect to the presence of remnant native vegetation cover mapped in the OEH (2013) report and revised vegetation data layers (2016). - Identify, protect and enhance native vegetation cover throughout the LGA in the new LEP, especially rare and threatened communities. - Conserve native habitat. - Council undertake a full biodiversity assessment of the LGA to inform the development of the new LEP. - Amend affected minimum lot sizes. - Minimum landscaped areas of 50% should also apply to lots in areas identified as Bush Suburban, Garden Suburban, Garden Suburban-larger lots, Naturalist	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided Requests increasing the landscaping requirements		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Edge, Semi-naturalist edge, Naturalist Headland.			
624	D20/127561	Objects	<p>Objects to the limited timeframe residents have been given to provide a response due COVID-19 and acquisition of land throughout the LGA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- It is unreasonable to keep the timeframe given the current social distancing rules which have limited opportunities for community consultation and should be extended.</li> <li>- Overdevelopment and Kogarah War Memorial Pool at Carss Park are two areas which require more time for submissions.</li> <li>- Concern raised over the acquisition of certain lands for Local Open Space, particularly: 26-30 Culwulla St, South Hurstville; 11-21 Monaro Ave, Kingsgrove; 7 Hedley St, Riverwood and 13-15 Keith St, Peakhurst.</li> <li>- The removal of Todd Park for a new 25m pool should be reconsidered.</li> <li>- The changes in the Draft LEP as a whole should be rejected.</li> <li>- The proposed planning controls threaten the recreational infrastructure of the LGA free from overdevelopment and traffic congestion.</li> </ul>	<p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p> <p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Culwulla Street, South Hurstville</p> <p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Hedley Street and Keith Street, Peakhurst (adjacent to Peakhurst Park)</p> <p>Objects to overdevelopment</p> <p>Not related to the LEP</p>		
625	D20/127562	Objects	Objects to irreparable changes being made under the cover of COVID-19.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
626	D20/127563	Objects	Objects to dual occupancies being allowed in the FSPA and shouldn't be considered as complying development.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
627	D20/127569	Objects	<p>Objects to the reduction in minimum lot sizes and removal of properties from FSPA in Oatley.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A decrease in minimum lot size will result in an increase in dual occupancies and subdivisions, threatening the character of Oatley.</li> <li>- More measures need to be put in place to preserve the green streetscape.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
628	D20/127574	Objects	Objects to the proposed draft LEP.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
629	D20/127575	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed removal of sites from the FSPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This proposal will increase density within the LGA.</li> <li>- This should not be used to meet the housing targets set by the NSW State Government.</li> <li>- The proposal will have negative impacts on facilities and infrastructure, such as fewer trees, smaller gardens, less green space, increased traffic &amp; parking problems.</li> <li>- Storm water run-off will also negatively impact an already fragile ecosystem.</li> <li>- This proposal will threaten the already shrinking bushland and threatened species.</li> <li>- Maintain and support green space.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
630	D20/127576	Supports	Supports draft LEP2020 - no details provided.	Supports draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
631	D20/127577	Objects	Objects to the proposed draft LEP.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
632	D20/127578	Objects	Objects to the limited timeframe residents have been given to provide a response due COVID-19.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
633	D20/127580	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	<p>Questions whether this LEP will be enforceable in the Land and Environment Court. LEP criteria should be enforceable and not varied under Clause 4.6 as it gives power to approve DAs that are contrary to the LEP. Duplexes should be restricted to 3 bedrooms or considered an overdevelopment if it has more than 3 bedrooms. Insufficient on-site parking for 5 bedroom duplexes. Otherwise creates traffic and parking congestion. Supports open space acquisitions but consideration should be given to the situation of property owners and timeframe.</p>	Objects to overdevelopment		
634	D20/127583	Objects	<p>Objects to dual occupancies being allowed in the FSPA due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The reduction of properties from the FSPA will permit</li> </ul>	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			740 dual occupancies. 48-64 additional dwellings in the next 16 years. - Dual occupancies shouldn't be considered as complying development.	environment		
635	D20/127586	Neutral	Objects to the development of a new pool at Todd Park and to rebuild Carss Park pool.	Not related to the LEP		
636	D20/127588	Objects	Objects to the proposed removal of properties in Oatley from the FSPA due to: - This will invite opportunity for an increase in population density. - In the case of a fire or emergency more residents would struggle to escape the area as there is only one safe exit point by road or foot via the Mimosa St bridge. - Consider the impact of the current and future pandemics should they occur. COVID-19 has made us rethink the current strategy of just cramming more people into Sydney and its suburbs. - Despite reasoning that the FSPA rezoning be consistent with other surrounding areas, the rezoning is not consistent with the FSPA rezoning of Lugarno which has avoided the drastic reduction of the FSPA. - Oatley's unique bush scape and vista will disappear.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
637	D20/127591	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA from Oatley West due to: - A reduction in minimum lot sizes in unacceptable and should be amended. - A reduction in minimum landscaping requirements will reduce the tree coverage in the suburb. This will result in higher temperatures and less biological diversity. - A reduction of the FSPA will result in overdevelopment and negatively impact the health of the Georges River, particularly Oatley Swimming Baths. - There will be greater strain on the infrastructure such as sewerage, water supply, drainage, street parking and business area parking.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
638	D20/127592	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA from Oatley West due to: - should not adopt the definition - area visible from the river. - Tree coverage will be lost to higher density developments, resulting in smaller gardens, fewer trees, smaller trees and lower environmental value. - Keep the current foreshore protection areas and seek to increase them through the appropriate parts of Kogarah.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
639	D20/127593	Objects	Objects to the proposed draft LEP.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
640	D20/127596	Objects	Objects to the proposed draft LEP.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
641	D20/127597	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes in the draft LEP 2020 in regard to POPW. POPW should not be removed from the list of permissible uses in R2 zones as there is no evidence offered in the LEP that church use adversely affects amenity and no sound reasons are provided for their removal from the residential areas.</p> <p>Church is a local institution that contributes greatly to the fabric of the community. In their view, POPW belong in residential zones. They enhance the amenity of their location. Their prohibition from R2 zones will make it more difficult to operate churches, which are a key element of local community.</p>	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
642	D20/127599	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes in the draft LEP 2020 with regard to POPW. POPW should not be removed from the list of permissible uses in R2 zones as there is no evidence offered in the LEP that church use adversely affects amenity and no sound reasons are provided for their removal from the residential areas.</p> <p>Church is a local institution that contributes greatly to the fabric of the community. In their view, POPW belong with the people; in residential zones. They enhance the amenity of their location. Their prohibition from R2 zones will make it more difficult to operate churches, which are a key element of local community.</p>	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
643	D20/127600	Objects	<p>Hierarchy of Residential Zones: -a more realistic medium density height would be 9-12m which will provide a transition from 9m (low density) to 12m (high density) thus creating more housing choice and diversity.</p> <p>FSPA: - objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA which would result in an increase in densities that will spoil the natural beauty of the area, result in a loss in greenery of the headlands and increased run-off which would have adverse impacts on the biodiversity of the Georges River. Georges River Tidal Inundation Study: -The Georges River Tidal Inundation Study needs to clearly identify all areas at risk to prevent future development occurring in potentially exposed areas.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA</p> <p>– inadequate justification for the boundary amendment</p> <p>– no reason provided</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Suggests medium density development to have a height of 9-12m to provide a transition from 9m (low density) to 12m (high density) thus creating more housing choice and diversity.</li> <li>2. The Georges River Tidal Inundation Study needs to clearly identify all areas at risk to prevent future development occurring in potentially exposed areas.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The draft LEP proposes the retention of the existing 9m height for multi-dwelling housing as this is consistent across both existing LEPs. This is consistent with the overarching principle of the Planning Proposal for the draft LEP to retain existing controls where the status quo can be maintained.</li> <li>2. The Georges River Tidal Inundation Study has informed the Coastal Hazard and Risk Map proposed in the draft LEP.</li> </ol>

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
						The Coastal Hazard Risk Map identifies areas subject to the highest level of risk from future tidal inundation. Developments in these areas are required to comply with <i>Clause 6.5 Foreshore area and coastal hazards and risks</i> which requires applicants to consider the impact of sea level rise and tidal inundation as a result of climate change, impacts on the water quality of the Georges River, and other coastal hazards.
644	D20/127602	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes in the draft LEP 2020 with regard to POPW. POPW should not be removed from the list of permissible uses in R2 zones as there is no evidence offered in the LEP that church use adversely affects amenity and no sound reasons are provided for their removal from the residential areas.</p> <p>Church is a local institution that has contributed greatly to the fabric of the community for over 70 years. In their view, POPW belong with the people; in residential zones. They enhance the amenity of their location. Their prohibition from R2 zones will make it more difficult to operate churches, which are a key element of local community providing community activities like Play Groups, support to the poor and disadvantaged, the widows and everyone that needs a helping hand.</p>	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
645	D20/127605	Objects	<p>Objects to Council's proposed changes to the FSPA in Oatley West. The increase in density in the draft LEP will lead to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spoiling the beauty of this area and quality of life</li> <li>• Destruction of the wildlife habitat, e.g. lorikeets, cockatoos, galahs, kookaburras, magpies and other birds</li> <li>• Smaller blocks will mean more overshadowing, smaller gardens, lack of privacy, increased noise levels</li> <li>• Increased traffic and congestion on narrow roads, leading to pedestrian safety issues for kids, elderly and people with a disability.</li> <li>• Stormwater pollution</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
646	D20/127606	Neutral	<p>Objects to the knocking down of the Carss Park pool and building an indoor aquatic facility at Todd Park as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Todd Park is a community park attracting local residents, local schools, sporting clubs, bike riders, and sports lovers including cricket, basketball, football and</li> </ul>	Not related to the LEP		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>soccer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bike track is also popular for dog walking, jogging and learn to ride purposes.</li> <li>• The already tight and narrow roads of Bunyala St and Miowera Ave will be subject to extra traffic.</li> </ul> <p>This proposal is a shock to residents in the area who were unaware of these plans.</p>			
647	D20/127609	Objects	<p>Objects to the draft LEP due to: Single dwelling lot size will reduce by 36% and dual occupancy lot size will reduce by 30%. These significantly smaller lot sizes, along with soft landscaping reduced to just 20%, mean many more buildings can be crammed in, with barely room for a proper tree. Reasons for objection include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Negative impacts on residents, and society in general The removal of hundreds of properties from the FSPA determined in 2012, would lead to large increase in built and population density, without a concurrent increase in infrastructure, such as sewerage, water supply, drainage, street parking and business area parking. This would lead to overcrowding of parks/recreational spaces, increased local traffic, parking congestion and further overcrowding of public transport, and loss of privacy. Many people from outside the area use the parks, recreational areas and business areas. Their usage would increase by the increased density.</li> <li>2. Negative impacts on the environment and biodiversity Significant reduction in landscaping reduces the leafy character of the suburb. The loss of space in which to plant larger trees results in increases in summer temperatures. This also would lead to less biological diversity, as critical habitats and continuity of adjoining habitats will be reduced.</li> <li>3. Negative impacts on water quality in the Georges River There are already occasional significant sewage overflows and leaks from the sewerage system into the creeks and the Georges River. These are both from nearby industry as well as the residential sources. Denser urban development with less landscaping means more hard surfaces, leading to runoff entering the waterways. This would further impact river water quality and affect spots like Oatley swimming baths.</li> <li>4. Negative impacts on the amenity of the foreshore area The reason many people moved into the area was for the attractive amenity of the area, the scenic landscape, both from the land, and when viewed from the river. This increased urbanisation will further diminish tree cover and therefore reduce this amenity.</li> </ol>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
648	D20/127620	Objects	<p>Objects to Council's proposed changes for FSPA in Oatley West, Mortdale Heights, Peakhurst, Lugarno and Riverwood in the draft LEP for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. Council has infringed Ministerial Direction 4.4 (Planning for Bushfire Protection) as it has not addressed the requirement to "protect life, property and the environment from bush fire hazards, by discouraging the establishment of incompatible land uses in bush fire prone areas", or (b) "to encourage sound management of bush fire prone areas". Council has failed to take into account its bushfire map at <a href="https://www.georgesriver.nsw.gov.au/StGeorge/media/Documents/Environment/Bushfire-Prone-Land-Map.pdf">https://www.georgesriver.nsw.gov.au/StGeorge/media/Documents/Environment/Bushfire-Prone-Land-Map.pdf</a>.</p> <p>2. Council has breached the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE)'s "A guide to preparing planning proposals" dated December 2018 as its planning proposal does not:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• include essential environmental reports, i.e. HCC 2014 Biodiversity Study or KCC 2012 Flora &amp; Fauna Study or its own Vegetation Mapping Report,</li> <li>• identify that the land identified contains "critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats", or</li> <li>• investigate public transport and traffic needs.</li> </ul> <p>3. Council has also broken Ministerial Direction 2.1 (Environment Protection), which aims to "protect and conserve environmentally sensitive areas", evidenced by the following errors in its planning proposal:</p> <p>(a) Though Council states it will "extend the FSPA across the LGA", it is in fact contradicting it by deleting 2381 properties from the former Hurstville LGA (west of the rail line). Council intends to add properties from the former Kogarah LGA (east of the line) but a loss of 1,083 properties will be the net result.</p> <p>(b) Its claim that the proposal seeks "to protect environmentally sensitive areas, increase the tree canopy and enhance biodiversity" is false as it has not utilised the data contained in its own ecological studies.</p> <p>(c) Council has not documented any evidence whatsoever in support of its contention that its FSPA provisions "will strengthen the environmental controls applicable to new development across the LGA and mitigate or prevent any adverse environmental impacts of development."</p> <p>Submitter requests that a public hearing should be held (under section 57 (5) of the EP&amp;A Act) to investigate the above aspects and deficiencies in Council's processes, e.g. the misrepresentation that the current FSPA safeguards only scenery, and not the environment, appropriate notification to the public over</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests a public hearing</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			the course of the exhibition period and ability to answer residents' questions at the 'webinars'.			
649	D20/127636	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA in Mortdale Heights and Oatley Park areas as these areas are unique and not overdeveloped as are areas like Hurstville. The reasons for objections include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The streets are narrow, congested and with parking problems - increasing the density will increase these issues.</li> <li>2. Traffic congestion will increase noise and emissions and dangers to children within the area.</li> <li>3. Smaller blocks of land and high density dwellings will reduce the area for the trees and gardens.</li> <li>4. Our local group of residents has concluded that Council has reduced the FSPA in contradiction to the findings of research in the Foreshore Strategic Directions Paper.</li> <li>5. The proposed increase in dwelling density (R3 to R4) and reduction in the FSPA is in contrast to stakeholders' values found during the consultation.</li> <li>6. The FSPA was put in place originally to protect and control the foreshore and its environment. Nothing has changed other than the pressure from the NSW Government to meet their housing targets.</li> </ol>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
650	D20/127637	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes in the draft LEP 2020 with regard to POPW. POPW should not be removed from the list of permissible uses in R2 zones as there is no evidence offered in the LEP that church use adversely affects amenity and no sound reasons are provided for their removal from the residential areas.</p> <p>Church is a local institution that has contributed greatly to the fabric of the community for over 70 years. In their view, POPW belong with the people; in residential zones. They enhance the amenity and their prohibition from R2 zones will make it more difficult to operate churches, which are a key element of local community providing community activities like Play Groups, support to the poor and disadvantaged, funerals and weddings.</p>	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
651	D20/127638	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes in the draft LEP 2020 with regard to POPW. POPW should not be removed from the list of permissible uses in R2 zones as there is no evidence offered in the LEP that church use adversely affects amenity and no sound reasons are provided for their removal from the residential areas.</p> <p>Church is a local institution that has contributed greatly to the fabric of the community for over 70 years. In their view, POPW belong with the people; in residential zones. They enhance the amenity and their prohibition from R2 zones will make it more difficult to operate</p>	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			churches, which are a key element of local community providing community activities like Play Groups, Seniors Groups, Youth Groups and ESL Classes.			
652	D20/127640	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes in the draft LEP 2020 with regard to POPW. POPW should not be removed from the list of permissible uses in R2 zones as there is no evidence offered in the LEP that church use adversely affects amenity and no sound reasons are provided for their removal from the residential areas.</p> <p>Church has contributed greatly to the fabric of the community for over 70 years. In their view, POPW belong with the people; in residential zones. They enhance the amenity and their prohibition from R2 zones will make it more difficult to operate churches, which are a key element of local community providing community activities like Play Groups, weddings, funerals, Memorial Services and the needy in the society.</p>	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
653	D20/127641	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes in the draft LEP 2020 with regard to POPW. POPW should not be removed from the list of permissible uses in R2 zones as no sound reasons are provided for their removal from the residential areas.</p> <p>The submitter believes churches belong with the people; in residential zones. They enhance the amenity and their prohibition from R2 zones will make it more difficult to operate churches, which are a key element of local community; providing to religious life, community support, care and welfare.</p>	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
654	D20/127642	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	<p>Supports the general direction Council is taking in relation to the draft LEP 2020; with suggestions to amend the minimum lot size and density proposals to be further amended to allow for more affordable housing. The draft LEP, which proposes denser housing, is positive for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Firstly it addresses the housing needs of elderly LGA residents who wish to downsize in the local area, particularly in R2 zones with outdoor garden space.</li> <li>• Secondly it creates more affordable housing for young people - for those who grew up in the area who wish to raise their family and for those that wish to move into the area, particularly in R2 zones with outdoor garden space.</li> </ul> <p>Given the above needs, the draft LEP would put further downward pressure on housing costs if modified as follows in line with many other LGAs to bear some more housing load and create more affordable housing by introducing denser housing controls across the R2</p>	N/A	Suggests the minimum lot size and floor space ratio controls be amended for dwelling houses and dual occupancies to allow for more affordable housing.	The LSPS 2040 proposes a staged approach to preparing the principal Georges River LEP due to the detailed investigations required to support the full suite of changes proposed. This approach includes Stage 2 – Housing Choice (scheduled for 2021) which seeks to promote inclusive and affordable housing. The provisions in the draft LEP will be amended in LEP 2021 to provide more inclusive and affordable housing.

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed lot sizes for subdivision in R2 zones should be 400 sqm for houses (not 450sqm as proposed) and 600 sqm for duplexes (not 650sqm as proposed)</li> <li>• Duplexes (attached and detached) should continue to be permitted on battle axe blocks that don't have direct street frontage.</li> <li>• The FSR for houses in R2 zones should be 0.65 (not 0.55 as proposed) and duplexes in R2 zones should be 0.7 (not 0.6 as proposed).</li> </ul>			
655	D20/127643	Objects	<p>Objects to Council's proposed changes to the FSPA in Oatley West. The increase in density in the draft LEP will lead to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stormwater pollution</li> <li>• Spoiling the beauty of this area and quality of life</li> <li>• Destruction of the wildlife habitat, e.g. lorikeets, cockatoos, galahs, kookaburras, magpies and other birds</li> <li>• Smaller blocks will mean more overshadowing, smaller gardens, lack of privacy, increased noise levels</li> <li>• Increased traffic and congestion on narrow roads, leading to pedestrian safety issues for kids, elderly and people with a disability.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
656	D20/127644	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes in the draft LEP 2020 with regard to POPW. POPW should not be removed from the list of permissible uses in R2 zones as there is no evidence offered in the LEP that church use adversely affects amenity and no sound reasons are provided for their removal from the residential areas.</p> <p>Church is a local institution that has contributed greatly to the fabric of the community for over 70 years. In their view, POPW belong with the people; in residential zones. They enhance the amenity and their prohibition from R2 zones will make it more difficult to operate churches, which are a key element of local community providing community activities like Play Groups and support to the needy in the society.</p>	<p>Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone</p>		
657	D20/127646	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes in the draft LEP 2020 with regard to POPW. POPW should not be removed from the list of permissible uses in R2 zones as there is no evidence offered in the LEP that church use adversely affects amenity and no sound reasons are provided for their removal from the residential areas.</p> <p>Church is a local institution that has contributed greatly to the fabric of the community for over 70 years. In their view, POPW belong with the people; in residential zones. They enhance the amenity and their prohibition</p>	<p>Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			from R2 zones will make it more difficult to operate churches, which are a key element of local community providing community activities like Play Groups and support to the needy in the society.			
658	D20/127647	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes in the draft LEP 2020 with regard to POPW. POPW should not be removed from the list of permissible uses in R2 zones as there is no evidence offered in the LEP that church use adversely affects amenity and no sound reasons are provided for their removal from the residential areas.</p> <p>Church is a local institution that has contributed greatly to the fabric of the community. In their view, POPW belong with the people; in residential zones. They enhance the amenity and their prohibition from R2 zones will make it more difficult to operate churches, which are a key element of local community.</p>	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
659	D20/127649	Objects	Objects to prohibiting POPW in R2 zones due to: -no evidence in LEP that church uses adversely affects amenity.-will make it more difficult to operate churches which are key element of my community.-POPW belong with people in residential zones.-such infrastructure enhances the amenity of their location.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
660	D20/127650	Objects	<p>Objects to the exhibition period during COVID-19, the extension of 16 days is still insufficient. -The need to rush critical decisions that affects the entire population is deeply disturbing. -Council lack of vision for the future by throwing money at expensive and costly consultation documents to mislead the public and continue rampant overdevelopment of the St George area.eg. Kogarah War Memorial Pool at Carss Park. -Older and less mobile residents are denied opportunity to engage in submission process under COVID restrictions.</p> <p>Objects to the proposed Local Open Space acquisitions due to: - GRC attempting to acquire land under pretext of increasing green space ratio to accomodate ongoing overdevelopment for more parking, access (and on-sell to greedy developers).</p> <p>Objects to the Todd Park pool proposal is inadequate to service the population and hypocritical to being an environmentally sustainable Council.</p> <p>Proposed changes in LEP will adversely impact existing amenity for future generations.-Recreational infrastructure is important for amenity that is free from overdevelopment and traffic congestion. Proposal needs to be reviewed as the changes proposed will change the St George area permanently.</p>	<p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p> <p>Objects to overdevelopment</p> <p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p> <p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Culwulla Street, South Hurstville</p> <p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Hedley Street and Keith Street, Peakhurst (adjacent to Peakhurst Park)</p> <p>Not related to the LEP</p>		
661	D20/127652	Objects	Objects to the proposed FSPA changes in former Hurstville LGA due to: - does not comply with Ministerial Direction 4.4 (Planning for bushfire protection) to discourage incompatible land uses in bushfire prone	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>areas or to encourage sound management of bush fire prone areas. LEP doesn't take bushfire map into account. -LEP does not follow DPIE's "A Guide to preparing planning proposals" as it does not include essential environmental reports eg. HCC 2014 Biodiversity Study or KCC 2012 Flora &amp; Fauna Study or its Vegetation Mapping Report or identified land containing critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities and habitats or investigate public transport and traffic needs. -The proposal does not comply with Ministerial Direction 2.1 Environmental Protection which aims to protect and conserve environmentally sensitive areas, as it results in 1083 net loss of properties. -No evidence to support its FSPA provisions 'strengthen environmental controls applicable to new development across LGA'. -Disagrees that current FSPA controls protects only scenery, and not the environment.</p> <p>Requests a public hearing be held to investigate the above issues, as well the process of preparing proposal, and information during exhibition period and ability to answer residents' questions at the webinars.</p>	<p>boundary amendment – no reason provided Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Requests a public hearing</p>		
662	D20/127653	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed FSPA changes in former Hurstville LGA due to: -LEP does not follow DPIE's "A Guide to preparing planning proposals" as it does not include essential environmental reports eg. HCC 2014 Biodiversity Study or KCC 2012 Flora &amp; Fauna Study or its Vegetation Mapping Report or identified land containing critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities and habitats or investigate public transport and traffic needs. -The Proposal does not comply with Ministerial Direction 2.1 Environmental Protection which aims to protect and conserve environmentally sensitive areas, as it results in 1083 net loss of properties. -No evidence to support its FSPA provisions 'strengthen environmental controls applicable to new development across LGA'. -Disagrees that current FSPA controls protects only scenery, and not the environment. - Does not comply with Ministerial Direction 4.4 (Planning for bushfire protection) to discourage incompatible land uses in bushfire prone areas or to encourage sound management of bush fire prone areas. LEP doesn't take bushfire map into account.</p> <p>Requests a public hearing be held to investigate the above issues, as well the process of preparing proposal.- Inaccurate mapping provided.- discrimination against those without the Internet or from a NESB who were unable to access any documents.- Inability to answer residents questions at the webinars. - Disregarding residents' questions on Facebook page.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Requests a public hearing</p>		
663	D20/127654	Supports, but	Supports proposed rezoning of land for open space at	Supports the proposed open space		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		with suggestions for changes	<p>Peter Low Reserve (11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove) due to: - deliver on LSPS vision for additional open space across LGA and supported by Council's Open Space, Recreation and Community Facilities Strategy 2019-2036. -expansion of public open space is 35% increase in size of reserve - aligns with CPTED, -Reserve has no direct surveillance which leads to unsociable behaviour, vandalism, theft, graffiti and undesirable characters being present.</p> <p>Requests that when expansion of open space is realised, masterplan for the reserve be publicly exhibited. Suggestions for masterplan include native gardens, upgraded playground, cycling and walking paths and extension of paper park trees lining Monaro Ave, accessible public open space.</p> <p>Greater clarity regarding the acquisition process is requested.</p>	acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
664	D20/127659	Objects	Objects to prohibiting POPW in R2 zones due to: - no evidence in LEP that church uses adversely affects amenity. - will make it more difficult to operate churches which are key element of my community and for community activities. - POPW belong with people in residential zones. - POPW enhances the amenity of their location.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
665	D20/127661	Objects	Objects to prohibiting POPW in R2 zones due to: - no evidence in LEP that church uses adversely affects amenity. - will make it more difficult to operate churches which are key element of my community. - POPW belong with people in residential zones. - such infrastructure enhances the amenity of their location. - attacking people's religious freedom.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
666	D20/127662	Objects	<p>Objects to the changes to FSPA due to:-removing FSPA properties will increase densities and change the low density character of Oatley West and is contrary to the objectives of the LSPS.</p> <p>Proposed FSPA controls:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Inconsistent with LEP aims in relation to environment with overall reduction in number of FSPA properties, potential increase in dual occupancies, and reduction in landscaped area requirements.</li> <li>2. Will result in loss of tree canopy, impact on biodiversity, increase urban stormwater run-off and water pollution in Georges River, adversely impact garden character of local neighbourhood, impact on scenic views to and from the river, infrastructure including sewerage and stormwater drainage networks, traffic congestion due to limited public transport, air and noise pollution, emergency access issues on Yarran Road and Forest Road in event of a bushfire evacuation, adverse impact on amenity and character</li> </ol>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p> <p>Raises concerns that the number of properties proposed to be removed from the FSPA was not provided in the fact sheet</p> <p>Requests increasing the landscaping requirements</p> <p>Requests a public hearing</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>of neighbourhood.</p> <p>3. Not informed by Council's biodiversity and vegetation studies, Hurstville 2014 Biodiversity Study or Kogarah 2012 Flora and Fauna Study, or 2018 Vegetation Mapping report.</p> <p>4. Did not include Garden Suburban (Large Lots) in the proposed FSPA and other key principles identified by Foreshore Strategic Directions Paper were ignored.</p> <p>5. Harmonisation of LEPs has descended to lowest common denominator. Instead of protecting the existing amenity and character of the neighbourhood and natural environment in foreshore areas, the draft LEP enables more dual occupancy development on our foreshore and our neighbourhoods.</p> <p>6. Weakened landscaping requirements, removal of properties from FSPA to require only 20% instead of current 25%. New requirements do not include minimum dimensions or deep soil requirements.</p> <p>7. Does not agree with Council's claim that "FSPA clause is not an environmental protection or biodiversity provision".</p> <p>8. Failures to address bushfire risks. No reference to risk areas.</p> <p>9. Proposed inclusion of dual occupancy in low density zone with dwelling houses.</p> <p>LEP process</p> <p>10. Undue haste in LEP process. Council may not lose funding if it extends the public exhibition period until COVID-19 restrictions are lifted to allow face to face public information sessions for residents.</p> <p>11. Failure to provide information on number of properties removed from FSPA to community representative on LPP and to the public.</p> <p>12. Failure to comply process of preparing Planning Proposal and Ministerial Directions in relation to environmental protection, transport and traffic impacts, planning for bushfire protection.</p> <p>13. Inconsistency with Council and State Government plans in relation to FSPA, bushland, biodiversity, tree canopy and vegetation.</p> <p>14. Failure to use Council's biodiversity and vegetation studies to inform LEP.</p> <p>15. Problems with public exhibition of draft LEP. Website was not user friendly, key information not provided in timely manner, Facebook page problematic, and no access to documents for those without Internet access.</p> <p>16. Concerns about developer speculation and weight to be given to developer submissions. Post exhibition report to acknowledge whether there has been speculative buying by developers whilst draft LEP remain uncertain and not imminent.</p> <p>17. Councillors with pecuniary interests allowed to</p>			

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>attend workshops to shape the LEP is ludicrous.            18. Council unable to get a quorum because too many Councillors have pecuniary interests is problematic.            19. LEP project team's apparent lack of knowledge about Oatley West , unaware that local residents refer to their area as Oatley West.</p> <p>Requests:            1. Existing extent of FSPA under HLEP2012 to remain, that 'Garden Suburban (large lots)' in Oatley West and former E4 zone in Kogarah LGA be included in new FSPA map. Consider increasing extent of FSPA to support remnant native vegetation and view sheds.            2. Retain minimum lot size of 550sqm in R2 zones outside of FSPA and increase landscaping requirement on R2 to 40% outside of FSPA and at least 50% within the FSPA in order to maintain garden character of the area and contribute to conserving remnant native vegetation and wildlife habitat. Minimum 50% landscaped requirement for areas identified as Bush Suburban, Garden Suburban, Garden Suburban (larger lots), Naturalist Edge, Semi-naturalist edge, Naturalist Headland.            3. Character typology assessment applied to foreshore should be applied to entire LGA to protect gardens, remnant bushland and street trees.            4. Review LEP to include consideration of: remnant native vegetation mapping, native wildlife and habitats, full biodiversity assessment of LGA and include controls to identify, protect and enhance native vegetation and habitats including rare and threatened communities and species.            5. A public hearing to address the issue that the number of properties to be removed from existing FSPA was withheld from the public and the LPP members.</p>			
667	D20/127664	Objects	<p>Objects to the changes to FSPA due to:-removing FSPA properties will increase densities and change the low density character of Oatley West and is contrary to the objectives of the LSPS.            Proposed FSPA controls:            1. Inconsistent with LEP aims in relation to environment with overall reduction in number of FSPA properties, potential increase in dual occupancies, reduction in landscaped area requirements.            2. Will result in loss of tree canopy, impact on biodiversity, increase urban stormwater run-off and water pollution in Georges River, adversely impact garden character of local neighbourhood, impact on scenic views to and from the river, infrastructure including sewerage and stormwater drainage networks, traffic congestion due to limited public transport, air and noise pollution, emergency access issues on Yarran Road and Forest Road in event of a bushfire</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment            Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition            Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information            Raises concerns that the number of properties proposed to be removed from the FSPA was not provided in the fact sheet            Requests increasing the landscaping requirements            Requests a public hearing</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>evacuation, adverse impact on amenity and character of neighbourhood.</p> <p>3. Not informed by Council's biodiversity and vegetation studies, Hurstville 2014 biodiversity study or Kogarah 2012 Flora and Fauna Study, or 2018 Vegetation Mapping report.</p> <p>4. Did not include Garden Suburban (Large Lots) in the proposed FSPA and other key principles identified by Foreshore Strategic Directions Paper were ignored.</p> <p>5. Harmonisation of LEPs has descended to lowest common denominator. Instead of protecting the existing amenity and character of the neighbourhood and natural environment in foreshore areas, the draft LEP enables more dual occupancy development on our foreshore and our neighbourhoods.</p> <p>6. Weakened landscaping requirements, removal of properties from FSPA to require only 20% instead of current 25%. New requirements do not include minimum dimensions or deep soil requirements.</p> <p>7. Does not agree with Council's claim that "FSPA clause is not an environmental protection or biodiversity provision".</p> <p>8. Failures to address bushfire risks. No reference to risk areas.</p> <p>9. Proposed inclusion of dual occupancy in low density zone with dwelling houses.</p> <p>LEP process</p> <p>10. Undue haste in LEP process. Council may not lose funding if it extends the Public Exhibition period until covid-19 restrictions are lifted to allow face to face public information sessions for residents.</p> <p>11. Failure to provide information on number of properties removed from FSPA to community representative on LPP and to the public</p> <p>12. Failure to comply process of preparing Planning Proposal and Ministerial Directions in relation to environmental protection, transport and traffic impacts, planning for bushfire protection.</p> <p>13. Inconsistency with Council and State Government plans in relation to FSPA, bushland, biodiversity, tree canopy and vegetation.</p> <p>14. Failure to use Council's biodiversity and vegetation studies to inform LEP.</p> <p>15. Problems with public exhibition of draft LEP. Website was not user friendly, key information not provided in timely manner, facebook page problematic, no access to documents for those without internet access.</p> <p>16. Concerns about developer speculation and weight to be given to developer submissions. Post exhibition report to acknowledge whether there has been speculative buying by developers whilst draft LEP remain uncertain and not imminent.</p>			

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>17. Councillors with pecuniary interests allowed to attend workshops to shape the LEP is ludicrous.</p> <p>18. Council unable to get a quorum because too many Councillors have pecuniary interests is problematic.</p> <p>19. LEP project team's apparent lack of knowledge about Oatley West , unaware that local residents refer to their area as Oatley West.</p> <p>Requests:</p> <p>1. Existing extent of FSPA under HLEP2012 to remain, that 'Garden Suburban (large lots)' in Oatley West and former E4 zone in Kogarah LGA be included in new FSPA map. Consider increasing extent of FSPA to support remnant native vegetation and view sheds.</p> <p>2. Retain minimum lot size of 550sqm in R2 zones outside of FSPA and increase landscaping requirement on R2 to 40% outside of FSPA and at least 50% within the FSPA in order to maintain garden character of the area and contribute to conserving remnant native vegetation and wildlife habitat. Minimum 50% landscaped requirement for areas identified as Bush Suburban, Garden Suburban, Garden Suburban (larger lots), Naturalist Edge, Semi-naturalist edge, Naturalist Headland.</p> <p>3. Character typology assessment applied to foreshore should be applied to entire LGA to protect gardens, remnant bushland and street trees.</p> <p>4. Review LEP to include consideration of: remnant native vegetation mapping, native wildlife and habitats, full biodiversity assessment of LGA and include controls to identify, protect and enhance native vegetation and habitats including rare and threatened communities and species.</p> <p>5. A public hearing to address the issue that the number of properties to be removed from existing FSPA was withheld from the public and the LPP members.</p>			
668	D20/127665	Objects	<p>Objects to prohibiting POPW in R2 zones due to: - no evidence in LEP that church uses adversely affects amenity. - will make it more difficult to operate churches which are key element of my community. - POPW belong with people in residential zones. - such infrastructure enhances the amenity of their location. - attacking people's religious freedom.</p>	<p>Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone</p>		
669	D20/127666	Objects	<p>Objects to the removal properties from the FSPA area :- reduction in minimum lot size for single dwelling and dual occupancies will significantly increase densities, increase traffic and parking congestion, and increase pressure on recreational spaces with no plans to expand these locally. -reduction in landscaping requirement to 20% and smaller lot size results in loss of neighbourhood leafiness and shady trees and less private outside space for trees. -community and social</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA  – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment  – no reason provided  Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>impacts from detrimental impacts on tree canopy, biodiversity values, scenic views, stormwater runoff pollution and climate change impacts. -inconsistent with LSPS and South District Planning Priority S15 as it will result in loss of tree canopy.-ignores obligation to protect biodiversity under South District Planning Priority S14. Future biodiversity controls from LGA-wide biodiversity strategy may be too late to implement to counter the impact on biodiversity from changes to FSPA. Proposal does not use mapping of native vegetation or consider threatened species habitats.- increased density will threaten the water quality of Georges River through increased stormwater run-off and pollution. -scenic views will not be protected. - Harmonisation using lowest common denominator and are not equitable or consistent. Inconsistency would remain in FSPA e.g. stormwater controls remain inconsistent across LGA.</p> <p>Recommends:- the existing FSPA and controls under HLEP2012 be retained and carried forward to the proposed GRLEP2020.-the proposed FSPA in the former Kogarah LGA be expanded using information shown in Fig. 31 of the Foreshore Strategic Directions Paper to include the focal view points and busy highspots behind the immediate foreshore strip to a greater extent in the FSPA. It is expected that the area covered would be closer to that which existed in the E4 zone in LEP prior to 2016. -Requests a public hearing based on Council's failure to consider the full impacts on the reduction of the FSPA on tree canopy, biodiversity, scenic views and stormwater pollution of the Georges River as well as its failure to provide and consider key information for the LEP.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests a public hearing</p>		
670	D20/127667	Objects	<p>Objects to prohibiting POPW in R2 zones due to: - no evidence in LEP that church uses adversely affects amenity. - will make it more difficult to operate churches which are key element of my community. - POPW belong with people in residential zones. - such infrastructure enhances the amenity of their location. - attacking people's religious freedom.</p>	<p>Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone</p>		
671	D20/127668	Objects	<p>The following FSPA changes are supported:- an increase in foreshore lot size, landscaping numerical controls in the LEP and inclusion of local provisions on earthworks and stormwater management.</p> <p>Objects to reduction of FSPA where terrain is steep will result in deterioration in scenic nature, the liveability and river health. Inconsistent with Council objectives to enhance and protect the natural environment, enhancing the character and amenity of the area and the wishes of the community.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
672	D20/127670	Objects	<p>Objects to FSPA proposal:- planning for already crowded places makes no sense. - State Government</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			bullies councils and regions into submission. - Does GRC owe a duty of care to its existing residents or future residents who don't live there? - Councils with population pressures should challenge State Government instead of rolling over. -Georges River foreshore and its surrounds are at risk of becoming ordinary.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- inadequate justification for the boundary amendment</li> <li>- no reason provided</li> </ul>		
673	D20/127671	Objects	<p>Objects to the changes to the FSPA as it serves as a protection for the river, the flora and the wildlife. Any changes will increase densities, increase traffic, promote overdevelopment, put pressure on the sewerage services, increase overflow, degrade the river, devalue properties and destroy the flora and fauna. This area is also a bushfire-prone area.</p> <p>Requests that the community be allowed to speak on this proposal as there is much community angst over it.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
674	D20/127672	Neutral	Requests a rezoning review of 70-80 Victoria Avenue, Mortdale due to: - bordered by proposed R4 zoning to the north and north-east, and Marist College Penshurst to the east and south-east. - we have existing terrace development to the south of 82-86 Victoria Avenue within R2 zoning. - DA for 2 storey boarding house on Newman St. - Marist College Penshurst attempting to purchase all lots along the southside of Victoria Avenue (No.71-93) for expansion. - properties 72 and 74 are for sale and marketed for investment potential.	Requests a spot rezoning (site specific)		
675	D20/127673	Objects	Objects to rezoning of properties 209-225 Princes Highway from R3 to R4 due to: - impact on houses located in Kogarah South heritage conservation area (HCA). - rezoning would permit high density apartments and result in loss of privacy on Bowns Road and Garden St. - no transition between R2 and R4 with no R3 zone or physical boundary such as a street. - planned increase in setback would not be sufficient separation. -modifications to maintain privacy for dwellings within HCA may be restricted due to heritage controls. - diminish the value of the HCA and setting of houses. Requests 209-225 Princes Highway remain as R3 zone. Still increase the number of dwellings in areas whilst minimising intrusion on the neighbourhood and the HCA.	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones		
676	D20/127674	Objects	Objects to the change of controls in the IN2 Light Industrial zone in the draft LEP due to: the increase of height form 10m to 12m, and a FSR of 1:1 will increase industrial density in the IN2 zone, specifically South Hurstville Industrial Estate. This will further create constraints relating to traffic/parking. Also raises concerns in relation to the Creative Industries clause, that it conflicts with what was in the Industrial Land Review 2018.	Objects to changes to IN2 zone		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
677	D20/127675	Supports	Supports the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: the FSPA is not currently a protected area, and believes the changes will enhance the current protection policies for the FSPA, and also notes that the lots that will qualify for dual occupancy development are minimal and will not affect the character and amenity of the area.	Supports the removal of properties from the FSPA		
678	D20/127677	Objects	Objects to the proposed amendments to the FSPA. Concerns raised that the changes will result in an increase in built area, and decrease in soft landscaping, stormwater run off and tree cover which will affect the streetscape of the suburb and affect the native wildlife. Concerns also raised that the LEP will conflict with Greater Sydney Commission documents relating to biodiversity and urban tree cover.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
679	D20/127679	Objects	Objects to the proposed removal of POPW from the R2 Low Density Residential zone. Concerns are raised that by removing the permissibility, it will be difficult to operate churches. Believes that a church in the R2 zone does not impact the amenity of the neighbourhood, and believes that a church enhances the community.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
680	D20/127680	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: will result in detrimental impacts on the tree canopy and biodiversity values, and increase stormwater runoff and pollution of nearby waterways. Concern is raised that it will also reduce equity.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
681	D20/127681	Objects	Objects to the proposed removal of POPW from the R2 Low Density Residential zone due to: by removing the permissibility, it will be difficult to operate churches. Believes that a church in the R2 zone does not impact the amenity of the neighbourhood, and believes that a church enhances the community.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
682	D20/127682	Objects	Objects to the changes to the FSPA, and refers to a number of reasons, as follows: - lack of biodiversity controls - increase of density - loss of privacy - increased traffic and congestion - loss of trees - increased pressure on infrastructure - loss of property value	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sloping sites in the area</li> <li>- loss of scenic qualities/treescape from the river</li> <li>- conflicts of interest among Councillors and Council staff</li> </ul>			
683	D20/127683	Objects	Objects to the proposed removal of POPW from the R2 Low Density Residential zone due to: by removing the permissibility, it will be difficult to operate churches. Believes that a church in the R2 zone does not impact the amenity of the neighbourhood, and believes that a church enhances the community.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
684	D20/127684	Objects	Supports some changes, however raises concern that existing POPW in the R2 zone will not be able to be granted DA approval for alterations and additions. Churches should not be prohibited from making improvements to their structure.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
685	D20/127685	Objects	Objects to the proposed removal of POPW from the R2 Low Density Residential zone due to: by removing the permissibility, it will be difficult to operate churches. Believes that a church in the R2 zone does not impact the amenity of the neighbourhood, and believes that a church enhances the community.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
686	D20/127686	Objects	<p>Objects due to: concerns with the process of the draft LEP. The following feedback was received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the letter sent to residents dated 1 April 2020 provided minimal information about the intended changes</li> <li>- The letter seemed to have been disregarded by many residents due to lack of information</li> <li>- Council continued to hold the exhibition during the COVID-19 world pandemic.</li> <li>- There was difficulty navigating Intramap</li> <li>- The webinar, whilst acknowledging it was an attempt to speak with residents, was difficult in that there was limited time, limited number of characters to write questions, no opportunity for discussion only questions. Also difficult for the elderly community.</li> </ul> <p>Raises concerns that the draft LEP proposes to remove parts of the FSPA and the reduced lot sizes, which will have a negative financial impact upon the sale of properties. Lastly it was noted that Council has rushed the process in order to receive funding from the State Government.</p>	<p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p>		
687	D20/127687	Objects	Objects to the draft LEP. Concern is raised that the changes will have a detrimental effect on Oatley and its tree canopy, biodiversity, habitat, scenic views, and the increase of stormwater run off and pollution.	Objects to overdevelopment		
688	D20/127689	Objects	Objects the draft LEP - in particular, the changes to the	Objects to the removal of properties in		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			FSPA, changes to R2 low density residential land, and the rezoning of land from R3 medium density residential to R4 high density residential.	the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided		
689	D20/127690	Objects	Objects to the proposed reduction of the FSPA in the former Hurstville LGA. Concern is raised that there will be overdevelopment of the local area, presenting privacy and overshadowing constraints, as well as an increase of traffic, loss of habitat and greater pollution contributing to a loss of streetscape character and aesthetic appeal.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
690	D20/127691	Objects	Objects to the draft LEP due to: Concern is raised that the changes will have an adverse impact on the amenity of Oatley for residents and visitors, as well as impact on the flora and fauna in the area.	Objects to overdevelopment		
691	D20/127692	Objects	Object to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: Concern is raised that the changes to the FSPA will create overdevelopment in the local area, causing a number of constraints including run-off of polluted water, and impacts to vegetation and wildlife. Also strongly objects to the public exhibition being held during the COVID-19 pandemic.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
692	D20/127694	Objects	Objects to the proposed removal of POPW from the R2 Low Density Residential zone due to: by removing the permissibility, it will be difficult to operate churches. Believes that a church in the R2 zone does not impact the amenity of the neighbourhood, and believes that a church enhances the community.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
693	D20/127695	Objects	Objects to: -The reduction of the FSPA in the Oatley and Lugarno and limited inclusion of FSPA in the former Kogarah area and the encouragement of stepped development by the new Earthworks Provision due to the visual and environmental effects on our local environment. -Reduction in the minimum lot size. – Increase in population and traffic. –increased impact on schools and traffic congestion on local street. -Impact on outdoor activities for future generation due to busier streets and reduced yards and will contribute to the	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			obesity epidemic. -Council has placed further uncertainty in addition to COVID-19.			
694	D20/127696	Objects	Objects to the removal of churches from the list of permissible uses in R2 zones due to: - lack of evidence that church use adversely affects amenity. – The proposal will make it difficult to operate churches which are a key element in the community which also provides other community activities including Play Groups.- Church is a local institution that contributes greatly to the fabric of our community– Place of worship belongs in the residential zones (with the people) as it enhances the amenity of the location. – No sound reason has been provided to remove POPW from residential areas.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
695	D20/127697	Objects	Objects to the removal of churches from the list of permissible uses in R2 zones due to: - lack of evidence that church use adversely affects amenity. – The proposal will make it difficult to operate churches which are a key element in the community.- Church is a local institution that contributes greatly to the fabric of our community and will impact associated activities the church offers. - Place of worship belongs in the residential zones (with the people) as it enhances the amenity of the location. – No sound reason has been provided to remove POPW from residential areas.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
696	D20/127698	Objects	Objects to the reduction of the FSPA and raises the following concerns: -The FSPA in the former Hurstville area will be reduced to the inadequate standard as the former Kogarah standard. –The reduction of FSPA will result in a downgrade to the degree of protection the area receives. - Reduction in scenic amenity from the river. –Reduction in landscaped areas and substantial trees, tree removal, existing values of the areas affected. –Increase in density with dual occupancies. – Impact on biodiversity resulting in loss native vegetation, and habitats. – Increased heat for the residents and the local area. – Reduction in landscaped area requirements and increase in FSR requirements. – No current biodiversity study was undertaken. – Increase in hard surfaces and reduced infiltration into the soil, resulting in more water run-off, affecting the local hydrology. –Increased noise and air pollution. – More vehicles and driveways will increase congestion and on-street parking on narrow streets resulting in safety concerns for pedestrians and cyclists.-increased pressure on parking at local railway station. – Increased pressure on local recreational areas, increased pressure on other infrastructure such as sewerage system and local schools. – Lack of information provided during consultation and public consultation due to COVID. –Requests that the FSPA in the former Hurstville LEP be retained as well as areas in the former Kogarah area being added to the FSPA. –	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
697	D20/127699	Objects	<p>Requests submission period be extended.</p> <p>Objects to the rezoning 11-21 Monaro Ave, Kingsgrove from R2 to RE1 due to: no high density residential flat buildings on the area nor is there proposal to increase housing density in the vicinity. - Acquiring these homes will not alleviate the shortage of quality open space nor ameliorate the lack of open space as identified in the LHS.–Misinterpretation and representation of open space and sports field playing surface area and shortages. – Rezoning of six homes do not fulfil the identified need for more sporting fields. - Safety and public surveillance justification has no merit as Peter Low Reserve is in direct line of sight of 52 properties to the rear which provide adequate public surveillance. – No anti-social behaviour or crime has been identified. – Rezoning of 6 properties will result in negligible increase not worth the cost to the Council or the severe displacement and disruption to the residents of the properties. –No explanation has been given in terms of what improved access means. – Opening up the park affects the peaceful domain away from roads and noise. - Increased risk to motorists and pedestrians as McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking.- No traffic study conducted. - A poor investment of Council funds to provide open space in an area where no high density residential or new housing is proposed. –No future concept plan is available so cost/benefit study is not possible. – Lack of community consultation and late addition of the Webinars, including a Q &amp; A session was unsatisfactory and inadequate and is at odds with Community Engagement Policy.</p>	<p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p>		
698	D20/127700	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposal to POPW in all R2 zones and raises the following concerns: - POPW have a positive impact on the local community in that provide facilities or services to meet the day to day needs of residents. – provides social and cultural infrastructure in the communities. –Church buildings offer other community uses such as play groups, children and youth groups, seniors groups, and welfare activities etc. which will be denied. -Blanket prohibition of POPW in R2 zone results in inflexible assessment framework that prevents the orderly redevelopment of existing POPW and new POPW. – Each development may vary and amenity impacts would be best addressed in the DA process. – The prohibition will significantly impact the expansion of existing churches. –Churches will not be able to recommence if cease operations for a 12 month period. – Loss of land value. –Restricts building alterations. – There will be no potential to acquire adjoining sites to allow expansion or amalgamation or rationalisation of new facilities.-Land cost dictates where the church is located and are by necessity located in R2 zones. –</p>	<p>Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone</p> <p>Requests additional sites containing POPW be included in Schedule 1</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>Does not achieve the principles of Guidelines for Merged Council's on Planning Functions. – Inconsistent with surrounding LEPs that permit PoPW. –Lack of engagement with the church. –Requests to retain PoPW as a permissible use in the R2 zone and that development controls be used to examine amenity impacts. – Requests in the event that Council does not amend its DLEP then 'Additional Permitted Uses' Schedule be amended to incorporate existing church properties. – Requests Council to approach the owners and occupiers of all POPW to confirm that the addresses listed under Schedule 1 are correct prior to adopting an amended LEP. - Council implements a review of its public consultation principles.</p>			
699	D20/127704	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The maps supplied are misleading. On closer inspection, the proposed new FSPA only includes lots which directly back onto the river.</li> <li>2) The existing FSPA includes all areas from the waterline to the ridge. All water flows to the river and, by retaining all properties to the ridgeline, will ensure the quality of the Georges River remains healthy.</li> <li>3) When on the river, the existing FSPA includes all areas from the waterline to the ridge. It is important to include all of this area for the visual aspect.</li> <li>4) The proposal neglects the importance of all wildlife and habitat corridors. Many species use the greenspace within dwellings to travel.</li> <li>5) Many species of fauna need a corridor greater than 20m to migrate through, with a buffer zone of 20m on either side.</li> </ol> <p>Believes the language used in the proposal is very subjective. Explains that the proposal states, "Encourage well designed and environmentally sustainable buildings", and in the existing DCP, Section 4.1 a "creation of high quality built form", however believes buildings don't require anything more than the minimum standards outlined by the Building Council of Australia, and to minimum NatHERS and BASIX ratings. Believes stricter measures beyond the minimum standards should be put in place.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment  Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment  Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information  Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>Provides the following comments in regards to decreasing lot size and reducing landscaping requirements:</p> <p>1) Thermal pollution and Heat Island Effects. Questions how this has been considered.</p> <p>2) Evidence of thermal pollution. Lives in a house designed to heat and cool passively. Neighbours have 2 x 2 story black houses and the radiant heat, along with the continuous air conditioners, has raised the temperature of their home to a point where it has now become impossible to passively cool it.</p> <p>3) Stormwater runoff. Questions how this is being monitored. The increased footprint of built environment on each new property is putting pressure on the stormwater system in the area.</p> <p>4) Loss of mature tree canopy. Questions how this has been considered. Trees shade the road and shade houses which helps keep the summer temperature moderated within an area. It reduces the demand for air conditioners which create thermal pollution.</p> <p>5) Increase fines for removing mature/significant trees. The fines are much too low.</p> <p>6) Parking (Resident Cars). Questions what plans Council has in place for maintaining the flow of traffic in the suburban streets.</p> <p>Objects to the way Council has put this proposal together without any community consultation due to COVID-19. Would like to see a more proactive approach for community consultation.</p>			
700	D20/127706	Supports	<p>Supports the zoning of properties from R3 to R4 for the following reasons: -it is important that the intention of the original zoning remain. -RFBs have already commenced on surrounding properties. - The up-zoning to R4 will allow for the development that will assist in meeting the South District Plan housing targets. -Will give remaining single dwelling owners' confidence regarding their future planning.</p>	N/A	Supports the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones	<p>The draft LEP updates the existing residential zones so an appropriate residential hierarchy is developed to ensure development typologies reflect the objectives of the respective zone.</p> <p>Residential flat buildings are currently permitted as the prevailing type of development in the R3 Medium Density zones under the existing LEPs due to the generous building height and FSR applied. This is often misleading and confusing for the community as</p>

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
						residential flat buildings are not considered to be medium density development. Introducing this hierarchy will ensure a true R3 Medium Density zone to allow developments like townhouses and villas.  It should be noted that this principle of creating a hierarchy of residential zones consistently across the LGA was supported by the community throughout the LSPS consultation and has been endorsed in the LSPS as a Planning Priority (Action 47) and as part of the development of the draft LEP.
701	D20/127709	Objects	Objects to the heritage listing of numbers 85, 87, 89 The Avenue, Hurstville due to: -Heritage listing being an impediment for the school to realise the primary purpose of their acquisition and is restrictive in achieving a building design that will provide contemporary educational facility for the students. – It is requested that the listings be removed. – Modifications diminish the historical significance of the interior of the building. – Building has deteriorated and a practical and feasible restoration is questionable. –Exterior setting and surrounding streetscape has dramatically changed since the building was constructed. – The surrounding area has transformed from rural to being on the city fringe bringing with it requirements for providing essential services and facilities associated with a city. – The recognition of Indigenous use with the existing buildings remaining in their current form is not achieved. –The removal of the Listings will allow the School to expand and provide appropriate modern educational accommodation whilst allowing the new scheme for the site. - Welcomes further dialogue.	Requests heritage item to be removed		
702	D20/127710	Supports	Supports the proposed prohibition of POPW in R2 zone and the continued use of POPW in the R2 zone to be permitted under Schedule 1 - additional permitted uses in the draft LEP 2020. Also supports development of areas for POPW provided the site can suitably accommodate the demand of traffic generated by the use and result in minimal residential amenity impacts including noise.	Supports the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
703	D20/127711	Objects	Objects to the proposed planning controls relating to removal of the FSPA, in particular Jewfish peninsula due to:-no appraisal of site suitability completed for proposed properties for increased density, especially steep headland areas. -houses which are visible from	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>the river should remain in the FSPA including areas west of the railway line overlooking Gungah Bay, Peakhurst Peninsula and the Lugarno peninsular. Questions why Lugarno remains in the FSPA which seems inconsistent. -reduction in tree cover due to vegetation removal for new development resulting in change of green character of area. -smaller backyards will result in no new replacement trees being planted.- less tree shade will result in more airconditioning and resulting electricity use.-less habitat for wildlife including threatened species.-has a biodiversity study been done on the effects of these changes?-stormwater drainage issues on steep blocks with less landscaping required.- water quality will be affected by polluted stormwater run-off.-increased pressure on sewerage system.- increased parking pressures. Marine Drive is narrow and winding and cannot take increased density as on-street parking is an issue. -no provision made for extra open space and sporting fields for increased number of residents. -landscaping requirement should not be reduced as children will have small backyards. Parks in the area are already over crowded. -this plan suggests Council wants to massively increase housing density and rates revenue.</p> <p>Requests- extension of time for community consultation and public meetings. -re-think the areas you intend to remove from FSPA. -Increase FSPA to headlands of former Kogarah LGA. It is a poor reason to remove homes from protection by the FSPA just because the equivalent areas in former Kogarah areas don't have them.</p>	<p>the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided</p>		
704	D20/127712	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	<p>Response to the draft LEP: Community Housing and Industry Association (CHIA) NSW supports Council's commitment to identify the need for affordable housing and developing a strategic approach to delivering affordable housing by outlining a clear plan with timeframes for the introduction of affordable housing contributions and complementary mechanisms that will over time facilitate local affordable housing needs.</p> <p>Response to the Draft Local Housing Strategy: CHIA NSW welcomes that DLHS includes a core objective to provide affordable and inclusive housing and Council's commitment to address the lack of affordable housing and the higher than average rental housing stress in the local area. CHIA NSW recommends that the DLHS and the DIHS identify the high proportions of very low and low income households in stress and the long term trends in increasing housing costs and diminishing stock of housing that is affordable for these households.</p> <p>Response to the Draft Inclusive Housing Strategy: CHIA NSW supports the DIHS which outlines Council's commitment and plans to supporting the delivery of</p>	N/A	Supports Council's commitment to identify the need for affordable housing and developing a strategic approach to delivering affordable housing by outlining a clear plan with timeframes for the introduction of affordable housing contributions and complementary mechanisms that will over time facilitate local affordable housing needs.	<p>The LSPS 2040 proposes a staged approach to preparing the principal Georges River LEP due to the detailed investigations required to support the full suite of changes proposed. This approach includes Stage 2 – Housing Choice (scheduled for 2021) which seeks to promote inclusive and affordable housing. The provisions in the draft LEP will be amended in LEP 2021 to provide more inclusive and affordable housing.</p> <p>A report on the submissions to the draft <i>Local Housing Strategy</i> and draft <i>Inclusive Housing Strategy</i> will be considered by Council at a future meeting.</p>

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			affordable housing. CHIA recommends that DIHS could be strengthened by highlighting the challenges very low and low income households face. CHIA also recommends that Figure 36 in Section 4.4.1 be removed or amended to represent the significantly higher proportions of lower income households in rental housing stress. CHIA NSW welcomes the opportunity to work with Council to build a sustainable affordable housing program and practices.			
705	D20/127713	Objects	Objects to the removal of their property from the FSPA due to: -increase in dwelling density with duplexes, and smaller lots. – Reduction in the size of backyards. – Loss of trees and wildlife. – Lack of privacy and overshadowing. – Impact on safety especially in the event of an evacuation due to Yarran Road being only road out of the peninsula. – Increase in the number of vehicles will result in increased traffic, congestion and parking issues. - Increased pressure on infrastructure such as trains, schools & overloaded sewerage & stormwater systems causing river and creek pollution. – Suggests decision should be delayed due to the lack of consultation during COVID-19.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
706	D20/127714	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA and process of the LEP/PP due to: *approximately 2,380 properties will be removed from the proposed FSPA from Oatley to Lugarno * inadequate soft landscaping provisions for both the FSPA and R2 zones *Supports the addition of 1,297 properties to the FSPA. *Provides 10 x recommendations to find a satisfactory and constructive alternative proposition. *Believes the LEP and the Planning Proposal are flawed and fail in terms of statutory requirements and community expectations. *10 x RECOMMENDATIONS : 1. That GRC abandons its proposal to remove properties from the FSPA, so as to continue to include ridgetop vegetation and significant remnant native trees that form habitat and movement corridors for significant and threatened fauna, or rezone the FSPA to E3 or E4, to retain effectively the same protection.2. The LEP needs amendment to consider the landslip hazard and risk, and represent it in another mapping layer, and in an LEP clause that reflects the risk and standards for human safe and environmentally sensitive management. That may involve the imposition of zones of undevelopable land on such sites, or placing the onus on the developer to choose the building footprint of least impact, and require that softer slope stability measures (ie the protection and re-instating of natural features) be mandated.3. The 2014 Hurstville LEP recognised implicitly the importance of maintaining a low density FSPA buffer zone around creek lines and	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests increasing the landscaping requirements Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>waterways to maximise infiltration rather than runoff. This justifies the retention for the FSPA as it exists around them. Also there needs to be a strengthening of development controls, so as to require a 40% soft landscaping standard, so as to maximise the slowing and filtering of stormwater.4. The context here is the lack of control that GRC has over the delivery of sewerage infrastructure, the lack of any assurances from Sydney Water that system upgrades can manage the cumulative, rather than the incremental loads on a DA by DA basis, the high frequency of overflows around Lime Kiln Bay and Myles Dunphy Reserves, and the nearness of Jewfish Bay baths. We thus recommend GRC do not proceed with property removal from the FSPA nor reduced lot sizes in these vicinities, in order to avoid increased pressure on the system.5. In order to protect biodiversity on private land, properties that are within the current FSPA remain, rather than be removed (as proposed) between Oatley and Lugarno, where canopy cover on private land is arguably greatest. (re-iterates Recommendation One). 6. Re-set development controls, but also incentives to keep trees on private properties rather than resort to off-set plantings elsewhere, in order to support biodiversity across the landscape and also to mitigate the heat island effect more equitably across suburban areas. Again, pursue in the LEP the target of 40% soft landscaping in the FSPA and R2 zone to achieve this. (re-iterates Recommendation Four). 7. Biodiversity mapping and an Environmental Strategy be prioritised, and done before any other LEP changes or Strategies are finalised. 8. Redraw the boundaries of the FSPA to better reflect the viewsheds as defined by the Strategic Directions Paper Figure 31 (Ethos Urban) and to largely reflect the status quo in terms of the extent of the FSPA in the old Hurstville LGA. Extend the FSPA into Kogarah as proposed and with extra properties added on the ridgetops where bushland occurs. 9. Council explores urban renewal and density possibilities in areas that will benefit from re-vitalisation, rather than ‘damage’ foreshore areas. Council looks at ways of extending foreshore access through arrangements made on the National Trust listed estate ‘Glenlee’ and keeping Jubilee/Kogarah Park in a manner consistent with its past historical and cultural character. 10. In the interests of reputation management, Council should evaluate its performance around the LEP process in terms of community trust and organisational transparency.</p> <p>*EXAMPLES: - Clause 6.2 allows minor earthworks however do not define ‘minor’. – LEP proposes adoption of Clause 6.2 from the KLEP 2012 however this provision has demonstrably not prevented disfiguring foreshore impacts and is at odds with the</p>			

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>maintenance of both visual amenity and ecological functions. – Clause 6.6 - 40 m buffer to river for 'sensitive lands' does not sufficiently protect ecological processes and should prohibit any development and onus should be on the developer to prove suitability of the low scale development (eg jetty, access stairs boatsheds). – Clauses 6.6, 6.2 do not address slope instability, manifest as erosion, landslip and risk and hazards present to the built form, human safety, ecological processes and the scenic character of the river foreshores. – The LEP does not include a strong enough clause to ensure built asset and human safety and an environmentally sensitive management response to landslip and erosion risks. – increased density will exacerbate risk to water quality and ecological integrity of the river and volumes and velocities of polluted urban runoff, particularly impacting on the tributaries of Dairy Creek-Lime Kiln Bay wetlands and the creek lines of Myles Dunphy Reserve, that drain into the George's River. - Clause 6.4 is contradicted by the Council proposal to reduce lot size and require only 20% of soft landscaping per dwelling or dual occupancy. -If changes are being made a strategic level to increase dwelling and population density and put more pressure of ailing system then Council is part of the cause of the increase in sewer overflow. – Given the net loss of 1,083 properties from the FSPA which will be subjected to reduced lot sizes, the retention of the same number of trees will be incompatible with the increased number and density of dwellings, -40% landscaped area provision would be more likely to achieve the current tree canopy coverage. - Off-set plantings elsewhere on public land is not 'like-for like' and does not maintain the interlinked and dispersed habitat corridors needed for biodiversity across the landscape. - visual assessment of the Jewfish Pt headland and hinterland, reveals it has the same visual qualities and bushland cover as the Lugarno Headland and its hinterland, it must be the failing of the foreshore study not to recognise this and as a result remove Jewfish Pt from the FSPA.-LSPS Key action 84 explicitly states to expand the FSPA across the LGA however rather than expand the FSPA, only 1,297 properties have been added in the old Kogarah LGA and approximately 2,380 properties removed from the old Hurstville LGA resulting in a net loss of 1,083 properties. – LEP does not recognise importance of protecting vegetation on the immediate foreshore vegetation on the steep slopes behind it, and the important stands of trees framing it, on the headlands and ridgelines which are inconsistent with the objectives of the FSPA. –there are urban renewal opportunities in the Beverley Hills, Narwee, Riverwood</p>			

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			and Hurstville town centres to achieve extra 740 housing lots that council seeks. -GREA supports the submissions to this process by Oatley Flora and Fauna, Friends of Oatley, Kogarah Residents Association. - GREA does not support the compulsory acquisition of properties for open space. – Raised concerns that the data and mapping released as part of the public consultation are poor quality, selective and misleading eg the only map included shows the area representing the FSPA (shaded pink). It implies this is all ‘the foreshore’ ie land.. – Some information was provided too late in the consultative process. *LEP and PP does not meet statutory guidelines under Section 3.33(3) EP& A Act for example: -failure to recognise or ignored the outstanding natural values of the LGA (pp9-10), - lack of acknowledgement or provision of information on the presence of Threatened Ecological Communities and impact on the survival of these vegetation communities as a result of the proposal– Lack of consideration of adverse impacts on the critical habitat, threatened species, populations or ecological communities (p15) –eg. the reduction in lot size will result in the overall reduction in the space for tree retention and soft landscaping and will inevitably require the clearing of large canopy trees therefore 20% landscape requirement is incompatible. – eg failure to provide a map of biodiversity within Appendix 7 whereas other councils within the Georges River catchment preparing their draft LEPs have included such a map.			
707	D20/127715	Objects	Objects to the draft LEP2020 due to: *request Council further extend the consultation period for the LEP and substantially review the plan in its current form. *If passed, the LEP will endanger our beautiful natural landscape and increase runoff into the Georges River. * The changes are also certain to increase road traffic and create parking issues, as well as place pressure on local services. This is not to mention a loss of the privacy and serenity that we currently enjoy.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
708	D20/127716	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA from Lugarno due to: *While the current FSPA is excessive, the reduction to only include waterfront land is excessively small and makes the FSPA meaningless. *The proposal rezoning will lead to many streets being able to be subdivided. Streets that are narrow and with cars parked on both sides. An increase to the housing density will only exacerbate the issue. *The impact of an increased population from the increase in housing density. Some infrastructure in these areas cannot be expanded such as road (leading to traffic & safety issues), parks, etc.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Further this will lead to a significant reduction in amenity of the area and destroy the community village atmosphere of the area.			
709	D20/127717	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA due to: *The removal of thousands of properties from the FSPA will likely lead to significant increases in built densities, traffic, parking congestion and pressure on recreational spaces. The proposal risks radically changing the neighbourhood character and diminishing the quality of local bushland. *There will be consequences for biodiversity, including threatened species and ecological communities, on the Georges River as a result of the proposed reduction of the FSPA. Nature Conservation Council therefore supports the submission presented to Council by Oatley Flora and Fauna Conservation Society, which catalogues the biodiversity impacts of the proposed LEP. *Suggests carrying forward the existing FSPA and associated development conditions as currently mapped under the HLEP 2012 into the proposed GRLEP 2020.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
710	D20/127718	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA from Peakhurst Ward due to: *Timing (COVID-19) and manner of consultation - request for further extension. *Method of submission of objections (PO BOX Post very slow) and suggestion for alternatives - Alternative on-line, or physical premises, must be made available for lodging objections.*FSPA - will reduce open space (already under pressure) which is much needed for both physical and mental health, reduction in garden areas. *Foreshore Strategic Directions Paper mentions protecting urban vegetation, protecting water quality and river health, and ensuring that new developments adhere to the local character and reflect community values. The draft LEP, in particular the draft FSPA, is contrary to these principles. *Changes to R2 zoning – suggests containing the high density within 1km of the railway stations, more parking must be provided at shopping precincts, local streets are already overcrowded, polluting effects of up-stream development without proper investment in infrastructure. The Council must reconsider the current LEP2020, assuring protection of the natural environment while maintaining a diversity of housing, protecting amenity, access, privacy and limiting noise. It is imperative that Council work with the State Government to assure the availability of necessary infrastructure such as arterial roads, water resources, and schools before any proposal is made to accommodate a higher population number.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
711	D20/127719	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA from the suburb of Oatley due to: increased development will impact Oatley's existing character, increase traffic congestion,	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			allow for higher density development and affect wildlife.	environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
712	D20/127721	Objects	<p>Objects to the removal of the FSPA from Oatley due to:  *concerned about Councillors delegating their decision-making role on LEP2020 * a draft LEP put together by people who do not live in the Georges River area - how can the LEP take into consideration "local" aspects of our area * draft LEP is being finalised during the COVID-19 pandemic, prevents elderly residents and those without Internet access an opportunity to review and comment on the LEP * Webinar - did not answer questions, LEP put together without regard for the negative impact on our roads, parking, schools, sewerage and water, and reduced tree cover, animal habitats and scenic beauty. * NSW Planning Minister has argued that Sydney needs more green, open spaces - completely at odds with the impact of the draft LEP. * Council housing targets have already been achieved * Harmonisation needed between former Kogarah and Hurstville Council Areas - The ridges are also seen from the river and all these areas should be protected. * More suitable areas - other areas, such as Narwee and Riverwood, benefit from modern urban renewal, tree canopies and natural bush vegetation is already non-existent/at very low levels. *Loss of tree canopy - The removal of 2,000 properties from the FSPA with their gardens and many mature trees, would result in a further reduction of the tree canopy * Increased Traffic Congestion - Changes to building block size and increased duplex, an increase in traffic congestion, shortage of parking opportunities, lack of parking is already an issue. *Loss of leafy character - The current FSPA has allowed the preservation of a leafy character in our local area.* Increased pressure on Infrastructure. Trains to and from Oatley are already filled beyond stated capacity, local sewage system regularly overflows into the waterways, increase stormwater runoff into the waterways – impacting water quality in the Georges River and the swimming area at Jewfish Bay, decrease the quality of life of people already living in the area.* Landscaping requirement reduction - reduction of landscaping requirement to 20%, too low to allow for any meaningful garden, should be increased to 40% - as it used to be, building lot reduction to 450 square metres and 300 square metres for a duplex, would result in many mature trees being cut down and a significant loss of tree canopy, bird and wildlife habitat and an ability for urban cooling. There</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment  Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment  Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition  Raises concerns that the Planning Proposal Authority is the LPP rather than Council</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			have been insufficient biodiversity reports done.* Cannot see any benefit of the draft LEP for existing residents only for developers and real estate agents. Suggests Council institute a larger FSPA in the former Kogarah Council area and conduct further urban densities in areas already devoid of bush habitats.			
713	D20/127722	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: * urban consolidation and increased housing density is inappropriate on the river foreshore and Jewfish Point peninsula, increased road congestion winding roads which are not designed to accommodate volume of traffic or increased parking, reduction in trees and increased runoff and destroy the character of the foreshore which is already overdeveloped. * Consolidation in flat areas along designated corridors close to public transport makes sense. *COVID- 19 - must be able to wait for proper community consultation.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
714	D20/127723	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to:*change to minimum subdivision lot size requirements will increase dual occupancy and subdivision, will not 'retain and enhance the character' of the area , increase in driveways, traffic and a change in streetscape as a result of the increased housing density. * object to the removal of scenic protections, more measures need to preserve the green streetscape, character of the local area needs to be protected, changes do not protect but rather puts it in danger.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
715	D20/127724	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA in Oatley due to: *increased density with the FSPA, draconian measures to suit a housing target set by the NSW Government - fewer trees, smaller gardens, less green space, increased traffic and parking problems together with negative infrastructure effects, an increase in stormwater runoffs, environmental damage to an already fragile ecosystem.*Shrinking bushland around the Oatley area, threatened species within that bushland. *Green space is not just the front lawns adjacent to footpaths. Green space is parks, gardens and bushlands and must be maintained for health, amenity and well-being.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
716	D20/127725	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Partially supports the LEP change for rezoning from SP2 to R4 – High Density Residential at 23 Dalcassia Street and 22 Bond St, Hurstville, however, suggest that the proposed building height of 12m and FSR of 1:1 is not commensurate with the site attributes, location, amenity and surrounding height and density. Requests that a 23m maximum building height and 3:1 FSR be applied to the site. *Suggests this is supportable given the site size and that it has three street frontages, which provides the opportunity to	Requests a spot rezoning (site specific) Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			transition and mitigate negative impacts on the surrounding area whilst reflecting the existing amenity and infrastructure in the area. This will allow for the economic redevelopment of the site and buildings that are currently nearing the end of their useful life. A 1:1 FSR does not facilitate a feasible redevelopment of the existing site. The DA process will provide the further opportunity to refine the massing, design and mitigate impacts in accordance with State and Council planning policy.* Objects to the proposal to amend the R2 zone to prohibit POPW due to: blanket prohibition results an inflexible planning approach that will remove the positive social outcomes that this use can generate. Instead it is recommended that impacts are considered and managed through the development application and assessment process.			
717	D20/127726	Objects	Objects to the proposed upzoning from R2 to R4 of the residential block bounded by Connell's Point Road/the Esplanade/Tavistock Road/the Mall, South Hurstville without a stepped approach to an R3 zone and also due to potential traffic impacts. LEP 2020 could be used to down zone to R2.	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones		
718	D20/127727	Objects	*Objects to the proposed upzoning of Oatley East area bounded by Hurstville Road and Frederic Street from R3 to R4 due to: taking into account the existing infrastructure, it is considered that the highest zoning applicable to this area should be R3 which would also help to retain the 'village centre' atmosphere. *Objects to the proposed removal of the FSPA from Lugarno, Peakhurst Heights, Oatley, Connells Point, Kyle Bay and Blakehurst due to: A review of the above mentioned areas should be undertaken to correctly identify areas which should be included in the FSPA.	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided		
719	D20/127731	Supports	1. Supports the draft LEP 2020 and a staged approach to the LEP being updated over 5 years.  2. Supports the decision to defer the Westfield/ Hurstville Strategic Centre and retain the site under the Hurstville Local Environmental Plan 1994 (HLEP1994) and associated Hurstville Development Control Plan No. 2 – Amd No. 5. Supports Council's position to retain the Westfield site as Deferred Land. This action enables short term investment in Westfield, through such improvements as the expansion to the roof top dining, entertainment and leisure precinct. In the medium to long term, the deferral provides an opportunity for the landowner and Council to collaborate on a mixed-use outcome for the site.	N/A	1. Supports the draft LEP 2020 and a staged approach to the LEP being updated over 5 years. 2. Supports the decision to defer the Westfield/ Hurstville Strategic Centre and retain the site under the Hurstville Local Environmental Plan 1994 (HLEP1994) and associated Hurstville Development Control Plan No. 2 – Amd No. 5.	1. The LSPS 2040 proposes a staged approach to preparing the principal Georges River LEP due to the detailed investigations required to support the full suite of changes proposed. 2. The Hurstville Strategic Centre, including Westfield, will be investigated in <i>Part 2 of the Commercial Centres Strategy</i> to inform the future LEP 2022 (Jobs and Activation). Alternatively, a separate planning proposal may be lodged for the Westfield site.
720	D20/127732	Objects	Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone from an existing POPW due to: -	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			Ability to relocate or redevelop will be limited; -Implies Council does not welcome churches in R2 zones; - The change in policy is ill-conceived, inconsistent with comparable plans and not supported by evidence; - Churches contribute to the community in a way consistent with other land use taking place in residential zones; - Unlikely that churches would affect peak traffic, only generate noise during services (predominantly 1 day a week) or on a Friday night for youth activities, relatively low impact use, parking should be managed at DA stage; - No evidence that POPW cause an unacceptable risk to safety, security and privacy however can be readily mitigated by POM and CPTED in design; - POPW are a form of social infrastructure and play an important role within the community. LEP will prevent provision of key social infrastructure to support Georges River's growing communities. Recommends LEP 2020 include the Baptist churches in Georges River LGA in Schedule 1. Also refers to the ACPT submission to GRC prepared by Ethos Urban.	Requests additional sites containing POPW be included in Schedule 1		
721	D20/127733	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA from Oatley due to: Smaller lot sizes, along with landscaping being reduced to 20%, mean many more buildings can be crammed in, with barely room for a proper tree. Negative impacts on: 1. Residents and society in general - Large increase in built and population density, without a concurrent increase in infrastructure - Overcrowding of parks/recreational spaces, increased local traffic, increased parking congestion and further overcrowding of public transport, and loss of privacy. 2. On the environment and biodiversity - reduces the leafiness and shadiness of the suburb - loss of existing large native trees, and loss of space in which to plant more large shade trees - less biological diversity and poorer ecological function - critical habitats and continuity of adjoining habitats would have been reduced. 3. On water quality in the Georges River - denser urban development with less soft landscaping, means more hard surfaces, which leads to reduced absorptive capacity for runoff, and thus more polluted urban runoff entering the waterways .4. On the amenity of the foreshore area - Tree removal that this increased urbanisation would allow, will reduce this amenity.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
722	D20/127735	Objects	Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone due to: *Found no evidence in the LEP that church use adversely affects amenity in the local area and so a revision of planning rules will inevitably make it more difficult to operate churches, which in my view are a key element of my community. *Church is a local institution that contributes greatly to the fabric of our community. *POPW belong with the people, in residential zones as their presence enhances	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			the amenity of their location. *There are no sound reasons presented in the LEP to remove POPW from residential areas.			
723	D20/127737	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Partially supports the LEP change for rezoning for the area surrounded by Short Street, Gray Street and Chapel Street, Kogarah ('the Precinct') from R3 to R4 however requests that the land be rezoned preferably to mixed uses (B4) and that a 34/36 m maximum building height (or 8 stories) be applied to the precinct due to: *The current height restriction is a block to almost any potential redevelopment of the Precinct.*Reasons presented in Draft Planning Proposal March 2017 *Reasons presented in Draft Master Plan. In this context, St Patrick's Green across Chapel Street from The Precinct exceeds this limit- 12 stories and 36 metres. Hospital buildings including the South Wing of St George Public old ward block are eight stories, the Pitney Building St George Hospital is now approximately 7 stories high, the old nurses home now used as an administrative centre and STD clinic is six stories high, the parking lot on the corner of Gray Street and Short St is six stories high. The Precinct is therefore surrounded by a number of taller structures, sitting, as it were, as a hollow between a forest of taller structures. *Arguments for Rezoning to Mixed Use and raising Height Limit to 34 metres - Fulfilment of LEP aims of increasing residential density in a zone close to public transport and local facilities 2.Allows realistic redevelopment of The Precinct, makes The Precinct attractive to development 2a. Without which development will not occur 2b Redevelopment will create employment opportunities in the construction and create jobs in business after construction 2c. Redevelopment is long overdue, will remove the eyesore of littering, trolley dumping, eliminate the dilapidated nature of some poorly maintained premises and modernise the area in front of one of Sydney's premiere teaching hospitals 2d.The Precinct is an enclave that could be the Jewell in the belly of St George Hospital instead of the hotch-potch eyesore that it is. 3. Brings the Precinct into sync with surrounding properties with respect to height. 4. The Precinct will not and cannot remain in its current state, eventually height restrictions will be lifted to enable natural development of the area 5.The rezoning and height increase is consistent with the main aims of the draft LEP and the GSC 6.Allows residents to sell, capitalise and move on with dignity and without expending large sums on structural repairs to units in Short St. 7. May assist with parking issues in the Kogarah with the creation of shared underground parking connecting and utilising space under Short Street.* Arguments against the submission proposal – 1. South Eastern area may want	Requests a spot rezoning (site specific)		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			to acquire or develop the area as part of the hospital. 2. An argument for holding the height of buildings to 15 m that existed up until stage 3 of the hospital redevelopment was the existence of the heliport on top of the carpark. The heliport has now been moved to the acute care building which is much higher at approximately 10 stories and is located on Gray Street some 150 metres distance away from the nearest point in The Precinct.			
724	D20/127738	Objects	Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone due to: *Found no evidence in the LEP that church use adversely affects amenity in the local area and so a revision of planning rules will inevitably make it more difficult to operate churches, which in my view are a key element of my community. *Church is a local institution that contributes greatly to the fabric of our community. *POPW belong with the people, in residential zones as their presence enhances the amenity of their location. *There are no sound reasons presented in the LEP to remove POPW from residential areas.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
725	D20/127739	Objects	Objects to the building height limit of 12m for the R4 High Density zone due to: R4 high density zoning refers to RFBs over 3 storeys - how is it possible to build over 3 storeys with 12m height limit with FSR of 1:1? More consideration should be given to the zoning of higher height limits and FSR for land within the vicinity of say 200 metres of main railway stations such as Riverwood.	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones		
726	D20/127740	Objects	Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone due to: *Found no evidence in the LEP that church use adversely affects amenity in the local area and so a revision of planning rules will inevitably make it more difficult to operate churches, which in my view are a key element of my community. *Church is a local institution that contributes greatly to the fabric of our community. *POPW belong with the people, in residential zones as their presence enhances the amenity of their location. *There are no sound reasons presented in the LEP to remove POPW from residential areas.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
727	D20/127741	Objects	Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 Low Density Residential Zone due to: *Found no evidence in the LEP that church use adversely affects amenity in the local area and so a revision of planning rules will inevitably make it more difficult to operate churches, which in my view are a key element of my community. *Church is a local institution that contributes greatly to the fabric of our community. *POPW belong with the people, in residential zones as their presence enhances the amenity of their location. *There are no sound reasons presented in the LEP to remove POPW from	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			residential areas.			
728	D20/127742	Objects	Objects to removing POPW from list of permissible uses in the R2 zone as it reduces the status of churches and will make it more difficult for these to operate in local areas.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
729	D20/127744	Objects	Objects to removing POPW from list of permissible uses in the R2 zone as it reduces the status of churches and will make it more difficult for these to operate in local areas.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
730	D20/127745	Objects	Objects to removing POPW from list of permissible uses in residential zones due to the suggested considerable community benefits of churches and the need remain close to where people live.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
731	D20/127746	Objects	Objects to taller buildings being permissible on Penshurst St between Penshurst Station and Forest Rd, any changes to development capacity at McRae Estate and main shopping streets at Mortdale and Oatley and any changes to the FSPA. Concerned about sunlight access, local character and vibrancy of centres and loss of green space and views.	Objects to overdevelopment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA  – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment  – no reason provided		
732	D20/127747	Objects	Objects to removing POPW from list of permissible uses in residential zones due to the suggested considerable community benefits of churches and the need remain close to where people live.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
733	D20/127749	Objects	Objects to removing POPW from permissible uses in the R2 zone as it reduces the status of churches and will make it more difficult for these to operate in local areas. States local church makes a positive contribution to the local community. Suggest that finalising LEP during COVID-19 was done in "stealth".	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
734	D20/127750	Objects	Objects to proposed removal of FSPA across the LGA and specifically the reduction at Oatley West and Lugarno. Concerned about impacts on bushland cover	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			and other environmental impacts.	environment		
735	D20/127751	Objects	Objects to removing POPW from list of permissible uses in the R2 zone as it will make it more difficult for these to operate in local areas, contrary to the value of churches to a local community.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
736	D20/127752	Objects	Objects to removing POPW from permissible uses in the R2 zone as it reduces the status of churches and will make it more difficult for these to operate in local areas. States local church makes a positive contribution to the local community with no impacts on local amenity.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
737	D20/127753	Objects	Objects to the removed of the FSPA due to: impacts on biodiversity, stormwater issues and water quality and lack of green passive space in the former Hurstville area.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
738	D20/127754	Objects	Objects to removing POPW from list of permissible uses in R2 residential zones due to the suggested considerable community benefits of churches and the need remain close to where people live.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
739	D20/127755	Objects	Objects to removing POPW from list of permissible uses in R2 residential zones due to the suggested considerable community benefits of churches and the need remain close to where people live.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
740	D20/127756	Objects	Objects to their property and others in the Oatley area being removed from the FSPA. Concerns relate to increased density, impacts on biodiversity, local character, increased water run-off and traffic and parking issues. Object to draft LEP 2020 being finalised during COVID-19 pandemic.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
741	D20/127757	Objects	Objects to the reduction to the FSPA in the former Hurstville LGA area. Concerned about impacts on the tree canopy, biodiversity, stormwater run-off and water pollution and views.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
742	D20/127759	Objects	Objects to the reduction to the FSPA in the former Hurstville LGA area. Concerned about impacts on the tree canopy, biodiversity, stormwater runoff and water pollution and views.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
743	D20/127761	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties between Oatley West and Lugarno from the FSPA due to: Specific concerns relate to impacts on local character, views, biodiversity, loss of trees and habitat. Suggests additional housing should be provided via 'high-rise' in areas such as Narwee, Riverwood and Beverly Hills.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
744	D20/127762	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA due to: on the basis of impacts relating to tree canopy, biodiversity, stormwater runoff and pollution of waterways.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
745	D20/127777	Objects	Objects to draft LEP2020 due to: Objects to additional permissible uses in the R4, B6 and RE1 zones. R4 - objects to restaurants, cafes and small bars being permissible due amenity concerns, in particular noise. B6 - objects to addition of function centre and small bars due to impacts on adjoining residential areas and is contrary to zone objectives. RE1 - objects to an entertainment facility being permissible at Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park, suggesting subsequent noise impacts and loss of passive green space. Also objects to FSPA as proposed due to impacts on biodiversity,	Objects to the permissibility of restaurants, cafes and small bars in the R4 zone Objects to the permissibility of small bars and function centres in the B6 zone Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			water quality and broadly from increased residential densities.	environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
746	D20/127786	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: that it is necessary to extend the foreshore away from the water's edge and up to the ridge line in order to achieve the scenic protection initially desired. More smaller blocks will see more traffic congestion and runoff into the Georges River.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
747	D20/127830	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: change of character of Oatley. Changing heritage regulations, dividing up blocks, increasing housing density and increasing traffic. Don't want to lose the privacy of residents. Other issues such as parking in Oatley village struggle to cope with existing population.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
748	D20/127832	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: Safety in case of an emergency more residents would struggle to escape. Impact of COVID-19 on population density planning. Increased traffic and street parking, more residents means more congestion. Consistency, reducing the FSPA in Oatley West is not consistent with Lugarno. Loss of Oatley West bushscape.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
749	D20/127839	Objects	Objects to removing POPW from R2 zones due to: make it more difficult to operate churches that contribute to the fabric of the community. Churches add to the amenity of the area.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
750	D20/127863	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA due to: lack of recognition of climate change in the Draft LEP. - Reducing lot sizes and removing scenic protection must be rejected. - Removing trees will increase the urban heat and remove natural habitats of wildlife. - It will affect the value of properties and change the character of the area. - The housing targets set by NSW Government are unfair and inequitable. - Leave FSPA in place.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
751	D20/127868	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Supports draft LEP 2020 and has suggestions for Low Density and High Density Areas: Low Density Areas 1. Do not reduce the landscaping proportion requirements – nature is good for mental and physical health 2. Improve the amenity for pedestrians and cyclists High Density Areas 1. Improve bike parking lots - increase them in size and make them safe and easy to use 2. Improve high density residential areas based on the Barcelona superblock model; where inner roads are narrowed, slowed, only allowing local traffic, space given back to pedestrians and cyclists and through traffic is separated.	N/A	Supports draft LEP 2020 and has suggestions for Low Density and High Density Areas:  Low Density Areas - Do not reduce the landscaping proportion requirements. - Improve the amenity for pedestrians and cyclists.  High Density Areas - Improve bike parking lots. - Improve high density residential areas based on the Barcelona superblock model; where inner roads are narrowed, slowed, only allowing local traffic, space given back to pedestrians and cyclists and through traffic is separated.	The draft LEP introduces minimum landscaped area requirements which provide greater legal weight to ensure the protection of local landscape character, the provision of sufficient tree canopy cover, building separation and deep soil areas to enable water infiltration to lessen the extent of urban runoff. The landscaped area requirement was placed in the draft LEP in response to feedback received from the community during the LSPP consultations to protect the leafy character of our suburbs.  In response to submissions, to enhance the protection of the existing tree canopy and the landscaped characteristics of the LGA, it is recommended that the minimum landscaped area requirement for dual occupancy developments be increased.  The Georges River Development Control Plan 2020 which will accompany the draft LEP with more detailed planning controls will provide controls for developments to consider the amenity and safety of pedestrians and cyclists in their design.
752	D20/127880	Objects	Objects to the removal of POPW from the R2 Low Density zone due to: -no evidence in LEP that church uses adversely affects amenity -will make it more difficult to operate churches which are key element of my community -POPW belong with people in residential zones -such infrastructure enhances the amenity of their location.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
753	D20/127901	Objects	Objects to the draft LEP 2020 due to: concerns raised that Oatley will have an increase of density, smaller block sizes, inevitable increased traffic, and infrastructure constraints causing river and creek pollution.	Objects to overdevelopment		
754	D20/127910	Objects	Objects to the removal of POPW from the R2 Low Density zone due to: -Doesn't want Council to shut down religious gatherings/places of worship in residential areas.-These places form a key part of the community, and the impact these places of worship and	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			their members have on the wider community around them is significant and positive. The LEP could lead to churches being shut down and no longer able to meet. Compromising these places will compromise the community.			
755	D20/127926	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA from Oatley due to: Minimum lot size for dual occupancy will change the character of these areas, allowing similar development in Peakhurst Heights will increase traffic in this areas without infrastructure to support it, and increase pressure on local services including schools, stores and public transport. *Impact on the local environment in particular due to runoff into the Georges River. Detrimental effect on the quality of the water running into Georges River and the bird life (in particular water birds) that inhabit this area. *Lugarno is classified as Bush suburban whilst Peakhurst Heights is classified as Garden Suburban (larger lots) when both have very similar characteristics. Council has not adequately explained the reasons for these characterisations or for removing almost 2400 dwellings from the FSPA.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
756	D20/127929	Supports	Supports LEP 2020 if zoning stays as R2 Low Density Residential with no changes.	N/A	Supports LEP 2020 if zoning stays as R2 Low Density Residential with no changes	Rezoning in the draft LEP are generally limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- upzoning of 5 Housing Investigation Areas for medium and high density residential development</li> <li>- rezoning some of the existing SP2 Infrastructure zones to harmonise them</li> <li>- land acquisitions are proposed for local road widening and the provision of open space</li> </ul> <p>Further information is detailed in the Planning Proposal report for the draft LEP.</p>
757	D20/127936	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA due to: increased development and impacts on scenic and local character, views, traffic, parking, privacy, local infrastructure and the natural environment.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
758	D20/127945	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA due to: Broadly suggests LEP does not adequately consider the environment, and specifically that the reduction of the FSPA will have detrimental impacts on the natural	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			environment and local character. A number of suggestions made as to 're-design' the draft LEP, including the need to use vegetation mapping and to demonstrate how vegetation can be increased across the LGA.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
759	D20/127949	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: overdevelopment in the local area and putting increased pressure on local infrastructure and services.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
760	D20/128205	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: Overdevelopment in the Lugarno. Added pressure on amenities such as water, sewerage as well as over crowding in schools and transport. Parking concerns at the shops and on the side of the road.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
761	D20/128207	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA due to: erosion and pollution due to building sites and overflow of sewage. Protection of vulnerable foreshore areas is needed by limiting the size of development and ensuring adequate planting. Too many streetscapes have been destroyed by development and have no character.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
762	D20/128408	Objects	- Objects to more R4 zones, and the planning controls in new R3 zones not being strong enough to prevent apartments. - Objects to the proposed changes to allow Jubilee Oval and Kogarah Park to become an Entertainment Facility due to: traffic will increase. Carlton station does not adequately service the park - Heritage areas should be extended, 3 is insufficient. - Objects to changes to the FSPA due to: more has to be done to protect foreshore areas.	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided	Requests for more heritage conservation areas as three is insufficient.	Council has prepared a review of the heritage items listed in Schedule 5 Environmental Heritage of the Hurstville LEP 2012. The <i>Heritage Review</i> has informed the proposed amendments to heritage items in the draft LEP. Additional heritage conservation areas for listing can be investigated in a future heritage review.
763	D20/128419	Objects	Objects to prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone due to: no sound reasons presented in the LEP that justifies the removal of churches in an R2 zone. Goes on to say churches enhance the local community and are very important to the residents living there.	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
764	D20/128434	Objects	Objects to draft LEP 2020 due to: changing the current	Objects to overdevelopment		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			residential zoning to accommodate the Inclusive Housing Strategy will put a lot of pressure on the environment and the surrounding area.			
765	D20/128711	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA: The discussion via webinar that there was no scenic protection area in the old Kogarah Council Area is untrue. It was actually larger than the area now proposed. The reduction in scenic protection areas in both the old Hurstville and the old Kogarah areas will allow changes in land use that will cause congestion and disadvantage future generations.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
766	D20/128712	Objects	<p>Objects to proposed acquisition of their relative's property in Peakhurst Park for open space - Letter dated 1 April 2020 was not received until 29 April 2020.</p> <p>Concerned for the health and well-being of elderly relative who has become increasingly stressed since aware of proposed LEP changes.</p> <p>Does not understand why council is acquiring the property itself when there is a significant amount of open space behind the current property (Peakhurst Park).</p> <p>Would like to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Request time frames of the proposed processes and what alternatives are available for deferring the processes to a future date.</li> <li>• Should the proposal go ahead, what compensation options are available for a fair and rational compensation amount and the timing and process that need to be put in place for an amicable outcome</li> </ul>	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Hedley Street and Keith Street, Peakhurst (adjacent to Peakhurst Park)		
767	D20/128714	Objects	<p>Objects to the LEP public consultation due to : the current COVID-19 situation, would like to push for a suspension of decision making on any changes to Council rules, regulations and environmental plans until public attendance can commence again.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is already a vast overdevelopment of land within the GRC LGA.</li> <li>• Lurgano, Oatley and Mortdale are known as leafy green suburbs and as an area of trees and gardens. Concerned that these areas are already being traded for development as larger dwellings, swimming pools and impervious surfaces such as driveways and paved areas, that nearly fill the blocks of land, leaving very little deep soil areas which are necessary to absorb rainwater and support the growth of medium to large canopy trees.</li> <li>• Very concerned that change to the FSPA will only have a negative impact on the flora and fauna of the</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to overdevelopment</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			area. • The proposal to remove thousands of properties from the FSPA thereby reducing the minimum subdivision lot size requirement for dwelling houses from 700m <sup>2</sup> to 450m <sup>2</sup> and the lot size required for dual occupancy development from 1000m <sup>2</sup> to 650m <sup>2</sup> , has the potential to vastly increase in housing density in the area. This increase will lead to increased hard surfaces, promoting increased runoff of polluted water into the Georges River which is detrimental to this waterway.			
768	D20/130696	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA from the Oatley area and objects to the inclusion of a design excellence clause due to:  *FSPA- A potential higher density in this area which will threaten the serenity and natural landscape.  *Design Excellence - a peer review by a `design expert` would be onerous and expensive and should already be a consideration by Council under this clause, not just for waterfront properties but all development.  *Requests extension of consultation due to COVID.	N/A Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests for better designed developments Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition	Objects to the inclusion of a design excellence clause as a peer review by a `design expert` would be onerous and expensive and should already be a consideration by Council under this clause, not just for waterfront properties but all development.	Design excellence is already a consideration by Council in the assessment of development applications. However, in response to the LSPS vision for well-designed developments, a design excellence clause has been introduced to deliver a high standard of architecture and urban design across the LGA. It applies to new developments and substantial redevelopments of 12m or taller in the business, industrial and high density residential zones, as well as developments in the FSPA such as dwelling houses, dual occupancies, bed and breakfast accommodation, health services facilities and marinas. The clause only applies to certain developments of a scale or in a location that require particular consideration of design excellence.  However, all developments must comply with the design requirements that will also be contained in the Georges River Development Control Plan 2020 which will accompany the draft LEP with more detailed planning controls.
769	D20/131908	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of land for open space for the following reasons: The guiding principles for the proposed acquisitions at Peakhurst, Kingsgrove and South Hurstville need to be more defined. The following reasons for objections are raised: - Acquisitions need to occur in high density areas and there is little value in providing more green space near homes that already have backyards - Only residential lands are proposed to be acquired, which seems inequitable as no other land zones are represented in this acquisition proposal (e.g. industrial)	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve) Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Culwulla Street, South Hurstville Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Hedley Street and Keith Street, Peakhurst (adjacent to Peakhurst Park)	Objects to the proposed acquisition of land for open space for the following reasons: - Acquisitions need to occur in high density areas. - Non-residential lands should be proposed to be acquired (e.g. industrial). - Council should try to acquire open space by purchasing properties that are going on	Council's <i>Open Space, Recreation and Community Facilities Strategy 2019-2036</i> provides a direction for open space, recreation and community facilities in the Georges River area. The directions will guide how Council provides open space, including: - Investigating opportunities to provide additional passive open space in higher density areas as

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Acquisitions in these areas may be expensive and not value-for-money compared to making open space available near high density areas</li> <li>- More open space should be made available near high density areas to meet Greater Sydney Commission's targets</li> <li>- Council should try to acquire open space by purchasing properties that are going on sale or current vacant as priority (e.g. vacant lots on the western side of Connelly Street, Penshurst)</li> <li>- Existing under-utilised parks and poorly maintained parks should be upgraded as priority, e.g. the 'Pigeon Park' near Hurstville Train Station.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- sale or current vacant as priority.</li> <li>- Existing under-utilised parks and poorly maintained parks should be upgraded as priority.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- part of master planning for town centres.</li> <li>- In dense urban areas with no or limited access to open spaces within 200m, include requirements for access to green space as a priority in future planning agreements such as Voluntary Planning Agreements and s94/7.11 developer contributions.</li> <li>- Continue to deliver the rolling program of playground upgrades and sports field upgrades.</li> <li>- Develop a Georges River Council open space acquisition plan.</li> <li>- Develop an Open Space Expansion Plan to understand opportunities to expand existing green spaces, provide new open space, and provide open space in innovative ways.</li> <li>- Develop a five year embellishment program for Council's smaller and pocket parks.</li> </ul> <p>The draft LEP proposes open space acquisitions in three areas. Two of these areas (Culwulla Street and Peakhurst Park) are located within or adjacent to housing investigation areas which are proposed to be rezoned from R2 Low Density Residential to R3 Medium Density Residential. The subject sites have been selected for acquisition for the purpose of expanding existing parks, which will enable additional activities to be provided in the existing park and improve access to the park. This is considered to be consistent with the LSPS 2040 Criteria to guide growth which requires growth to be supported by green open space, social and physical infrastructure.</p> <p>The <i>Georges River Industrial Land Review</i> highlights the need for industrial land to be retained and managed across the Georges River LGA. The <i>Review</i> provides a clear</p>

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
						<p>strategic direction for the development of employment lands across the LGA to ensure that sufficient land is zoned to accommodate future employment growth, particularly in light of pressure from landowners to rezone industrial land.</p> <p>Council will investigate the upgrading and expansion of existing under-utilised parks in accordance with the directions of the <i>Open Space, Recreation and Community Facilities Strategy 2019-2036</i>.</p>
770	D20/131913	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed acquisition of 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Not part of the green grid</li> <li>- Does not support the objective of prioritising additional open space in areas zoned for higher density</li> <li>- Located in a quiet, low density area and is not suitable for redevelopment as active open space</li> <li>- Inconsistent with Council's Local Housing Strategy findings as this area is not in or near high density residential areas</li> <li>- Involves the likely cost of \$10 million which is a poor investment of ratepayer funds</li> </ul>	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
771	D20/131916	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed FSPA changes in Oatley, Lugarno and Peakhurst including removal of properties from the existing FSPA, reduction in lot size for lots outside of the FSPA and the reduction in landscaping area on each lot. Recommends including additional areas in the FSPA to protect trees and wildlife habitat, ensure minimum 40% landscaping for lots in R2 zones, and permanent protection for parks and reserves.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests increasing the landscaping requirements</p>		
772	D20/131918	Objects	<p>Objects to the removal of churches as a permissible use in the R2 zone. Believes this will make churches more difficult to operate and there is no evidence of churches adversely affecting amenity.</p>	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
773	D20/131920	Objects	<p>Objects to the removal of churches as a permissible use in the R2 zone. Believes this will make churches more difficult to operate and there is no evidence of churches adversely affecting amenity.</p>	Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone		
774	D20/131921	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	<p>Supports the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed minimum lot size and lot width controls proposed for dual occupancies.</li> <li>- Addition of FSPA in the former Kogarah LGA.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones</p> <p>Requests increasing the landscaping</p>	<p>Supports the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The proposed minimum lot size and lot width controls proposed for dual</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The minimum dual occupancy lot size of 650sqm is proposed for the whole LGA in accordance with the <i>Georges River Local</i></li> </ol>

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>Objects to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Concerned that single dwellings will be prohibited in the R3 and R4 zones due to the creation of the hierarchy of residential zones.</li> <li>- Concerned that the rezoning of all existing residential flat areas to R4 will mean high rise apartments will be allowed in areas that have 3 storey walk ups. There should be a different zone for lower level block of flats.</li> <li>- Bars should not be allowed in apartment buildings.</li> <li>- The proposed minimum landscaped area requirement should be increased to 30% because 20% is not enough to retain large trees.</li> <li>- Granny flats should be supported by 2 car parking spaces on site because local streets are becoming parking lots. Manor houses will also need additional onsite parking spaces.</li> <li>- Removal of over 2,000 properties from the existing FSPA as this will result in vegetation clearing and affect the scenic characteristics of these areas.</li> <li>- Any references that allow developments to vary or exceed the LEP controls in any way should be removed.</li> <li>- Council should not be forcefully acquiring people's houses for open space. Council should wait for people to voluntarily sell their houses.</li> <li>- While it is good to refer the LEP to the LPP for expert advice, the final assessment of the LEP should be made by Councillors.</li> </ul>	<p>requirements</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Raises concerns that the Planning Proposal Authority is the LPP rather than Council</p>	<p>occupancies.</p> <p>2. Addition of FSPA in the former Kogarah LGA.</p> <p>Objects to the following:</p> <p>3. Concerned that single dwellings will be prohibited in the R3 and R4 zones due to the creation of the hierarchy of residential zones.</p> <p>4. Granny flats should be supported by 2 car parking spaces on site because local streets are becoming parking lots. Manor houses will also need additional onsite parking spaces.</p> <p>5. Any references that allow developments to vary or exceed the LEP controls in any way should be removed.</p> <p>6. Council should not be forcefully acquiring people's houses for open space. Council should wait for people to voluntarily sell their houses.</p>	<p><i>Environmental Plan Amendment (Miscellaneous) 2019</i> (Low Rise Medium Density Housing Planning Proposal) which was finalised by the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment and gazetted on 6 December 2019.</p> <p>2. The FSPA currently only applies to land in the former Hurstville LGA. The draft LEP 2020 proposes to expand the FSPA into the former Kogarah LGA. Approximately 1,297 lots are proposed to be included in the FSPA located across a range of suburbs located along the foreshore in the former Kogarah LGA.</p> <p>3. Dwelling houses will continue to be permissible in the R3 and R4 zones as per the Land Use Tables in the draft LEP.</p> <p>4. Granny flats/secondary dwellings are permitted under the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Affordable Rental Housing) 2009</i>. Manor houses are not a permitted development in the draft LEP.</p> <p>5. The draft LEP is required to contain <i>Clause 4.6 Exceptions to development standards</i> which is mandated by the Standard Instrument LEP. The clause provides flexibility in the application of planning controls, such as height and floor space ratio, where strict compliance with a development standard would, in any particular case, be unreasonable or unnecessary or tend to hinder the attainment of the objects of the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979</i>. Applicants must submit written justification with their development application that compliance with the development</p>



No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
						<p>standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case.</p> <p>6. When acquisition is required, negotiation between Council and the property owner will be conducted in accordance with the <i>Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991</i> which includes compensation and hardship provisions. If owners can show that they will suffer hardship if Council does not purchase their property without delay, Council will be obliged to purchase their property or remove the designation to purchase the property within 90 days. Alternatively, property owners may approach Council at any time and request Council to purchase the property.</p>
775	D20/131922	Objects	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- reduction in lot sizes and landscaping requirements. This will have a significant impact on the habitats of flora and fauna. - Council has not considered biodiversity, vegetation and protection of the environment. - Critical habitat must extend beyond the proposed FSPA as this area is frequented by threatened species like the Powerful Owl. Council needs to ensure wildlife corridors are provided by trees.</li> <li>- The increase in dwellings under the draft LEP will result in the loss of trees and the reduction in green space will not result in planting of new ones. Increased development will result in additional stormwater runoff into the river. - The proposed stormwater management provision will be difficult to achieve. - Council's own stormwater infrastructure is inadequate and ageing. Increasing the number of dwellings in the area will exacerbate existing stormwater issues. - Road traffic and parking issues will be increased for Oatley. - The impact on local schools and public transport network should be addressed first. The LEP process should be postponed until it is safe for people to travel and Council offices reopen.</li> </ul>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
776	D20/131935	Objects	<p>Objects to the removal of churches as permissible land uses in the R2 zone. Churches need to be able to apply for DA approval to improve their facilities when needed.</p>	<p>Objects to the prohibition of POPW in the R2 zone</p>		

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
777	D20/132043	Objects	Objects to any development of Kogarah Park (Netstrata Jubilee Stadium), especially any licensed premises. This will cause increased traffic in the local area, which is an issue caused by the recent developments along Princes Highway and Railway Parade.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
778	D20/130268	Objects	Objects to draft LEP2020 and the subsequent increase in density and would like Council to: -plant shady trees to combat climate change and global warming -put power lines underground in the longer term and -give rates discounts to Council residents who plant large trees	Objects to overdevelopment	Objects to draft LEP2020 and the subsequent increase in density and would like Council to: 1. Plant shady trees to combat climate change and global warming 2. Put power lines underground in the longer term 3. Give rates discounts to Council residents who plant large trees	1. The draft LEP introduces minimum landscaped area requirements which provide greater legal weight to ensure the protection of local landscape character, the provision of sufficient tree canopy cover, building separation and deep soil to enable water infiltration to lessen the extent of urban runoff. The landscaped area requirement was placed in the draft LEP in response to feedback received from the community during the LSPS consultations to protect the leafy character of our suburbs.  In response to submissions, to enhance the protection of the existing tree canopy and the landscaped characteristics of the LGA, it is recommended to the Local Planning Panel that the following amendments be made to the Planning Proposal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Zone objectives of the R2 and R3 zones include a standalone objective that will emphasise the importance of housing in a landscaped setting as a desirable characteristic:</li> <li>o The minimum landscaped area requirement for dual occupancy developments be increased.</li> <li>o A new local provision <i>Clause 6.19 Tree protection and landscaping in zones R2 and R3</i> be introduced.</li> </ul>

No.	CM9 No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
						<p>2. The undergrounding of powerlines is often a condition of consent imposed on new developments, rather than a provision in a LEP.</p> <p>3. Council rates are not a matter for the draft LEP.</p>
779	D20/130393	Objects	Objects to draft LEP2020 as it will lead to overdevelopment, harm the river and degrade the area.	Objects to overdevelopment		

## 2. Received via Your Say – under the draft LEP 2020 feedback form

Note: The “Objects or Supports” indicated in this Table is extracted from the response provided by the Your Say feedback form and does not represent Council's analysis of the content of the submission.

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
1	No response	Concerned that Narwee (Broadarrow Road) centre lacks residential building infrastructure and states that more development is required to increase the suburb's liveability and growth. Suggests raising the FSR to 2.5 to 1 and height to 25m as it would be effective for shop top housing located on Broadarrow Road.	Requests rezoning/uplift in commercial centres		
2	Objects	Requests that zoning and height restrictions be changed for 2-2A Lancelot Street Allawah from B2 to the adjacent residential zoning for consistency with the rest of Lancelot Street (removing mixed use and reducing height limit) and to preserve the unique characteristics of the street. Explains that the current zoning of the property was done without community consultation and the property is part of numerous disputes and applications to Council for development. Comments that the property's 'commercial elements' are currently used illegally as residential boarding housing.	Requests for rezoning (non-Housing Investigation Area)		
3	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	No reason for supporting was given and no suggestion for changes was provided	Supports draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
4	Objects	Explains that Shenstone Road Riverwood is narrow, congested with cars at peak times and parking is difficult on weekdays due to close proximity to the train station. Concerned that adding more cars to the street as a result of the proposed dwellings will increase this problem.	Objects to the North and West of Peakhurst Park – Peakhurst HIA		
5	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Advises that implementing changes to the FSPA will be almost impossible as the average block slopes over 45 degrees and many blocks provide support for existing dwellings or roads. Concerned that the new changes will be uneconomical due to heavy engineering and construction expenses, and that bulk development will result.	Raises concerns regarding the feasibility of development in the FSPA		
6	Objects	Does not support dual occupancy dwellings in Lugarno.	Objects to overdevelopment		
7	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Provides the following feedback: 1) Too many acronyms with limited explanation and that they should be grouped together up front; 2) A site to find out which residential zone you live in.	Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
8	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Suggests that no information sessions take place but rather introduce a different format in light of COVID-19 so that the community can still have their say. Suggests that Council adjust its processes and timeline as not all residents have access to gather more information and generate debate on the issues.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
9	Objects	Explains that Shenstone Road Riverwood is narrow and congested with cars, making it difficult for bus and garbage trucks to navigate. Concerned more housing will escalate this problem.	Objects to the North and West of Peakhurst Park – Peakhurst HIA		
10	Objects	Does not want overcrowding, and the amenity and character of Peakhurst Heights to change.	Objects to overdevelopment		
11	Objects	Does not support the FSPA proposal and requests that the current FSPA in Peakhurst Heights does not change.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA - no reason provided		
12	Supports	Reasons for support include: 1) Better use of land. Many houses are on large blocks of land, but only have 1-2 people living in them. 2) More housing results in more opportunities for the younger generation to own homes 3) Increase in funds for Council and government to improve the area, schools, infrastructure and amenities 4) Dual occupancy increases the number of housing available resulting in fewer apartments and congestion.		Supports the draft LEP 2020 for the following reasons: - Better use of land. Many houses are on large blocks of land but only have 1-2 people living in them. - More housing results in more opportunities for the younger generation to own homes. - Increase in funds for Council and government to improve the area, schools, infrastructure and amenities. - More dual occupancies increase the amount of housing available, requiring fewer apartments and reducing congestion.	The draft LEP proposes to upzone 5 Housing Investigation Areas. The rezoning creates the opportunity to deliver an additional 650 dwellings in the form of medium density and high density dwellings in accessible locations across the LGA, assisting Council in meeting the housing needs of the community with additional dwellings and greater housing choice. The reduction of the existing FSPA will enable 742 lots to gain the potential to develop dual occupancies as result of the reduction in the minimum dual occupancy lot size requirement from 1,000sqm for lots within the FSPA to 650sqm for lots outside of the FSPA. This variation in

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
					the FSPA will allow for housing choice and the rate of redevelopment is unlikely to place pressure on existing infrastructure.
13	Objects	Concerned that the proposed FSPA changes will result in duplexes being built on small blocks of land, and that this is the wrong time to exhibit.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
14	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	This submission relates to the proposed upzoning of the North and West of Peakhurst Park – Peakhurst HIA. Property is on the existing R2 part of Shenstone Road, opposite the proposed R3 side of the street. Requests that the property's side of the street also fall under R3. Believes that properties between Shenstone Road, Belmore Road, Short Road and a line drawn across Keppel Avenue to Shenstone Road be rezoned to R3 (map provided). Explains that Shenstone Road is close to shops, the train station and part of a bus route to Hurstville, and that it be widened to make more space for buses and to alleviate parking issues.	Requests amendments to the North and West of Peakhurst Park – Peakhurst HIA		
15	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Questions why their property is proposed to be removed from the FSPA when the house opposite in the street is proposed to remain. Suggests that the entire street, and streets in a similar location in close proximity to parklands or with similar topography, remain in the FSPA.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA - inadequate justification for the boundary amendment.		
16	Objects	Concerned about the change to height allowances proposed in foreshore protected areas and that the impact on current homeowners would be tremendous. Concerned that residents don't have the wherewithal to make this proposal a concern as a result of COVID-19.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition	Concerned about the change to height allowances proposed in foreshore protected areas and the impact on current homeowners.	The draft LEP translates the height controls from the existing Hurstville LEP 2012 and Kogarah LEP 2012 and does not seek to amend the height provisions for residential development.
17	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Explains that COVID-19 has influenced the practicality and tolerability of different residential accommodation, amenities/services, infrastructure and transport, and suggests that it would be more difficult for those living in high density areas to practise social distancing measures.	Objects to overdevelopment		
18	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Requests R4 instead of R3 West of Peakhurst Park. Questions why R4 exists on the south side of Peakhurst Park but the north and west of Belmore Road is only proposed for R3 when they are closer to the shopping centre and train station. Concerned that a minimum width of 2 blocks to build a Manor house is a misuse of prime real	Requests amendments to the North and West of Peakhurst Park – Peakhurst HIA		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		estate.			
19	Supports (refer to Comments)	Supports the proposed change to their area from FSPA to Non-FSPA.	Supports the removal of properties from the FSPA		
20	Objects	Suggests increasing the landscape area to 50%.	Requests increasing the landscaping requirements		
21	Objects	Suggests increasing the landscape area of a site to 50%, as per Hurstville Council Residential Code 1994.	Requests increasing the landscaping requirements		
22	Objects	Concerned that the removal of a large part of Oatley from the FSPA will decrease trees and vegetation which they believe is a large factor in why residents have moved to Oatley.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
23	Objects	Objects to living in a high density area. Explains they bought in the area as it was not crammed.	Objects to overdevelopment		
24	Objects	Concerned that the proposal will result in a loss of trees and greenery, increase in traffic and alter the suburb's character.	Objects to overdevelopment		
25	Objects	Concerned that the proposal will take away Oatley's uniqueness, beauty, leafyness, peacefulness and large blocks of land.	Objects to overdevelopment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
26	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Suggests converting all existing R3 zones to R4 and amending FSR in R4 zones to 1.25 : 1.	Requests a spot rezoning (zone specific)		
27	Supports	No reason for supporting was given.	Supports draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
28	Objects	Requests that no changes be made to Oatley.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
29	Objects	Requests that no changes be made to Oatley and surrounding suburbs.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
30	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Objects to the rezoning of R2 to medium or high density, particularly in smaller and quieter suburbs such as Mortdale and Oatley. Suggests that infrastructure be considered before any additional apartments are allowed as the T4 train line is above capacity during peak hours. Suggests more open plazas, community spaces, and green spaces and trees in City centres due to the growing population. Suggests that Councillors make decisions on DA's and building and development, instead of the Local Planning Panel.	Objects to overdevelopment		
31	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Objects to expanding the minimum commercial floor space area requirement in commercial centres as there is already a surplus of retail space in the Hurstville City Centre. Resident's apartment complex has several large ground-floor retail spaces unoccupied and suggests that these spaces could be put to better use, including for residential space. Concerned about increasing rental space when many retail spaces have difficulty in finding tenants.	Objects to the minimum-non residential FSR requirement in commercial centres		



No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		Concerned that increasing retail space will not be an effective way of ensuring access to retail, service and employment opportunities in the Hurstville City Centre.			
32	Objects	Concerned that there is overdevelopment in the Georges River Area, particularly on Princes Highway, causing traffic congestion. Provides an example of single blocks being used for multiple dwellings such as granny flats which are leased out as short term residences with no control over how many people live in them.	Objects to overdevelopment		
33	Objects	Concerned that this is not reflective of the Beverly Hills Masterplan community consultations. Explains that there is no provision of high density residential with 12m height and 1:1 RFS and no provision of retail or services. Has been informed that town centre plans are normally released prior to these LEPs.	Requests that the draft LEP reflects the Beverly Hills Masterplan		
34	Objects	Prefers that no changes allowing additional development be made as it will impact the environment and suburb's atmosphere. Concerned that increased density will increase pollution and waste water into Lime Kiln Bay.	Objects to overdevelopment		
35	Objects	Concerned that this will negatively change the character of Oatley.	Objects to overdevelopment		
36	Objects	Believes the proposal will reduce their gross floor area potential which will lead to a reduction in the value of their property.	Requests amendments to the FSR for dwelling houses		
37	Supports	Supports the removal of restrictions on the Foreshore zoning at Peakhurst and surrounding areas as it will make it easier to build and increase the use of land.	Supports the removal of properties from the FSPA		
38	Objects	Opposes the proposed changes to the FSPA. Concerned that the proposal will destroy the character and charm of Oatley - its natural beauty, abundance of trees and natural vegetation. Concerned that dual occupancies will cause overdevelopment, crowding, more	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		noise, neighbour disputes, and loss of privacy, trees and vegetation. Concerned that neighbour disputes, as a result of people living too close together, will cause social and emotional issues. Concerned that proper community consultation has not been given as a result of COVID-19, and has requested an extension to the timeline.	the exhibition Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
39	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Provides recommendations to protect the natural environment and promote quality design and environmental sustainability:  1) Introduce mandatory installation of solar panels (PV cells) and storage batteries for all new residential, commercial and industrial building construction. 2) Promote the provision of interest free loans for all rate payers to install solar panels on existing properties. 3) Install solar panels on all Council owned buildings to set an example for the wider community. 4) Provide templates for building designs which maximise the use of the natural environment to improve sustainability.	Requests for better designed developments	Provides recommendations to protect the natural environment and promote quality design and environmental sustainability, such as mandating and incentivising the installation of solar panels, and providing templates for sustainable building designs.	Council supports initiatives to promote quality design and environmental sustainability.  A new local provision has been proposed in the draft LEP - "Clause 6.12 Environmental sustainability in certain business, industrial and residential zones". This provision seeks to ensure that all development with a gross floor area of 1,500sqm or greater in industrial, business and high density residential zones embrace the best practice principles of environmentally sustainable development. This provision will require that development applications consider the principles of best practice environmentally sensitive design including water efficiency, energy demand reduction, urban heat island effect, indoor environmental quality, reducing new material consumption and use of sustainable materials, and transport initiatives.  Additional planning provisions that promote quality design and environmental sustainability are being considered for inclusion in Council Development Control Plan 2020 which will accompany the draft LEP with more detailed planning controls.
40	Objects	Objects to an increase in housing density. Concerned that there is not enough land to grow large trees to provide shade and to help mitigate climate issues, and that an increase in buildings will further exacerbate the problem. Suggests shifting the focus by	Objects to overdevelopment	Suggests encouraging renewable energy sources.	Council supports initiatives to promote quality design and environmental sustainability.

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		encouraging enterprise in the direction of renewable energy sources.			<p>A new local provision has been proposed in the draft LEP - "Clause 6.12 Environmental sustainability in certain business, industrial and residential zones". This provision seeks to ensure that all development with a gross floor area of 1,500sqm or greater in industrial, business and high density residential zones embrace the best practice principles of environmentally sustainable development. This provision will require that development applications consider the principles of best practice environmentally sensitive design including water efficiency, energy demand reduction, urban heat island effect, indoor environmental quality, reducing new material consumption and use of sustainable materials, and transport initiatives.</p> <p>Additional planning provisions that promote quality design and environmental sustainability are being considered for inclusion in Council Development Control Plan 2020 which will accompany the draft LEP with more detailed planning controls.</p>
41	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
42	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
43	Objects	Concerned that there is a lack of transparency and information in	Raises concerns regarding the		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		relation to the social and local environmental impacts such as traffic, community and resident satisfaction. Concerned that the proposal will impact the reasons they love Oatley.	availability and transparency of information Objects to overdevelopment		
44	Objects	Would like to see plans for Oatley West LEP on exhibition, rather than an internet-based map of the potential changes. Requests an extension to the consultation dates.	Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
45	Objects	<p>Opposes the draft LEP due to the following reasons:</p> <p>1) An increase in housing density will result in more people and cars which the local streets can't cope with. 2) There is already a lack of on-street parking.</p> <p>3) Lead to the loss of biodiversity and greenery in Oatley.</p> <p>4) Purchased their home as it was inside the FSPA. Removing their home from the FSPA will reduce quality of life and devalue their home.</p> <p>5) The consultation process is during COVID-19 and most people are distracted.</p> <p>Believes that the FSPA maps are misleading as the shaded areas showing the FSPA have been misrepresented to show a smaller area will be removed from the FSPA, and that it doesn't state how many homes will be removed.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p> <p>Raises concerns that the number of properties proposed to be removed from the Foreshore Scenic Protection Area was not provided in the fact sheet</p>		
46	Objects	Requests that Oatley be left alone.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
47	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Suggests that zoning in Beverly Hills be approved so that the construction and building sectors can continue to grow and build the economy.	Requests that the draft LEP reflects the Beverly Hills Masterplan		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
48	Objects	Opposes changes to the FSPA. Concerned that reducing lot size requirements will impact Oatley by increasing residents, reducing green space, increasing parking demand, reducing the value of homes and putting further strain on a fragile ecosystem.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
49	Objects	Believes that the foreshore protection zones have shrunk largely to public reserves, and that the foreshore is the responsibility of both government and private landholders. Believes this proposal will significantly alter the character of the Georges River and that it's the wrong time to be doing this.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
50	Objects	Believes the proposed LEP and FSPA are not in the best interest of Peakhurst Ward residents, as it allows for blocks to be only 450sqm, only requires 25% to be landscaped and allows development of duplexes with no consideration of additional traffic or parking. Concerned that the proposed FSPA will encourage foreshore destruction and that there is no consultation with residents.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
51	Objects	Opposes the removal of houses in Oatley West from the FSPA. Concerned that parking for bushwalkers will decrease, there will be more noise and cars, there will be fewer trees, the views will not be as pleasant, and it will increase air and noise pollution which will be detrimental to wildlife.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
52	Objects	Opposes the removal of foreshore zoning in Oatley West as it will put at risk the suburb's character. Believes it will result in the destruction of the natural environment as a result of subdivision and dual occupancy housing.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
53	Objects	Opposes overdevelopment without increasing or upgrading infrastructure. Believes there are too many duplexes with single garages, that the population has increased without allowing for more parking on the streets and that the streets have become too busy. Concerned that the community feeling is going and that large developments be left for Hurstville and Kogarah.	Objects to overdevelopment		
54	Objects	Believes that a comprehensive study into impacts of these changes is required as the environment will be impacted and there will be more crowded streets. Believes it will favour those who would rather overdevelopment on our foreshores.	Objects to overdevelopment		
55	Objects	Believes that houses in the area would lose value, there would be less parking and more traffic in the streets, and more noise and less privacy as a result of houses being closer together. Believes that people move to Oatley for the quiet, tree-lined streets and this proposal would result in loss of trees and shade.	Objects to overdevelopment		
56	Objects	Concerned dual occupancies will result in loss of trees and vegetation, loss of privacy, an increase in traffic, overdevelopment and overcrowding in suburban streets. Believes that people live in Oatley for its natural beauty, vegetation and bushland appeal and that the proposal will result in loss of character. Believes that housing density should not be increased due to COVID-19 as more people will be crammed into smaller land areas and loss of privacy will create tension, anxiety and social issues between neighbours. Requests an extension to the exhibition deadline.	Objects to overdevelopment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
57	Objects	Believes the proposal would negatively alter the character of the suburb and that trees and traffic would be affected.	Objects to overdevelopment		
58	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
59	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
60	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
61	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
62	Objects	Does not want an increase in density and traffic, or larger duplexes and homes. Believes the leafy character of the suburb will be lost.	Objects to overdevelopment		
63	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Suggests that the minimum lot size for a dual occupancy should be 490sqm like the new duplexes on Boundary Street Mortdale.	Requests amendments to the minimum lot size for dual occupancies		
64	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Suggests that the minimum lot size for dual occupancies be less than 500sqm.	Requests amendments to the minimum lot size for dual occupancies		
65	Objects	Concerned that an increase in density will overload the small streets in which most of the current FSPA properties reside. Explains that their dead end street has had two properties subdivided to make 4x 5 bedroom houses and, as a result, cars are overcrowding the street and residents are unable to park in front of their own house.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
66	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
67	Objects	Explains that an increase in density and smaller block sizes is not conducive to why they chose to live in Mortdale - they chose to be surrounded by nature, to be close to bushland, to have more space and privacy, and to enjoy the natural leafy character and tree-lined streets. Explains that COVID-19 illustrates the importance of space. Explains that the traffic on Roberts Avenue, Mortdale since the development of Woolworths has resulted in an increase in traffic. Concerned that current infrastructure such as roads, trains and schools is already not coping and that there is no street parking available. Does not believe the proposed changes support future sustainability.	Objects to overdevelopment		
68	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
69	Objects	Concerned that quality of life will reduce as a result of: 1) Population density. 2) No parking available outside their home. 3) An increase in air pollution. 4) An increase in noise and traffic. 5) Chose to live in the suburb for low density housing and greenery, but now there's fewer trees and less privacy. 6) Reduction in housing size and space. 7) Potential reduction of parks and other green spaces. 8) Concern that families, long-time residents and smaller businesses will leave. 9) Environmental impacts to native flora and fauna. 10) Concern that Oatley's green spaces and larger blocks of land will be compromised.	Objects to overdevelopment		
70	Objects	Believes that the FSPA should not change and that the proposed changes provide no benefit to local residents. Explains that people move to Oatley because of its current character, and that there will be increased pressure on infrastructure as a result of increasing development and reducing property sizes.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		



No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
71	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Suggests that the draft LEP consider developing Riverwood's shopping strip into a major retail and residential centre due to its location, proximity to the M5 and express trains to the City and airport. Suggests that the proposed plan allows properties within 150 meters from the station to have a minimum height limit of 8 to 10 storeys if there is frontage of 20 meters, and that the FSR increase to 3 to 3.5. Believes this would enhance the centre's vibrancy, and create employment and residential opportunities. Provides 7-9 Webb Street, Riverwood as an example to consider rezoning to allow commercial/retail and residential development - the properties are opposite Riverwood Plaza, are land locked by unit developments to the South and West, and is adjacent to the Council carpark to the East. Suggests rezoning will permit a development that provides services especially for the elderly, such as pharmacies and medical facilities, and offer residential units and/or boarding houses above.	Requests that the draft LEP plans for the development of Riverwood centre Requests rezoning/uplift in commercial centres		
72	Objects	Believes there will be negative impacts such as: 1) Increased density with larger houses and duplexes on smaller blocks, decimating Oatley as a garden suburb. 2) Smaller block sizes and reduced landscape requirements will result in smaller gardens, fewer trees and wildlife, lack of privacy and overshadowing. 3) Increased traffic, more noise and less street parking. 4) Loss of the leafy character - the main reason they chose to live in Oatley - resulting in lower property values. 5) Increased pressure on infrastructure - more crowded trains, packed schools, and overloaded sewerage and stormwater systems resulting in river, creek and mangrove pollution.	Objects to overdevelopment		
73	Objects	Concerned about the proposed changes to the FSPA. Does not believe the exhibition period allows for enough time for discussion and feedback. Objects to the proposed lot size and landscaping requirements as they would have detrimental outcomes on the environment. With regards to a consistent approach to foreshore planning, believes each area/suburb has to be considered in relation to its present character, rather than what the average is across the whole Council area. Concerned that a reduction of lot sizes for properties being removed from the current FSPA will lead to increased hard surface areas, and that a reduction in soft surfaces where rainfall can infiltrate to the soil will lead to increased stormwater runoff and the problems associated with that.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
74	Objects	Does not want to lose the Oatley West village feel. Concerned that houses will be much closer, there'll be more noise and traffic, less parking, loss of trees, and house values will depreciate.	Objects to overdevelopment		
75	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Concerned that the proposed changes may weaken the strong community and preservation of nature and tree coverage. Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley West, Mortdale Heights and Peakhurst West. Believes a better approach would be to take the strengths of the FSPA and have this applied to other sensitive areas in Hurstville Grove, Connells Point and Blakehurst. Believes the removal of these properties opens these sensitive areas to housing densities, leading to loss of neighbourhood leafiness and shade at a time when tree coverage should be increased to reduce climate change impacts.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
76	Objects	Does not support the proposed changes to the FSPA. Believes that large blocks and old solid homes are what make Oatley appealing, and that leafy quiet streets will be lost if the proposal proceeds.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
77	Objects	Opposes changes to the FSPA. Believes that traffic has significantly increased with Woolworths on Roberts Avenue. Explains that parking on their street is difficult and that an increase in population density will accelerate this issue. Explains they bought in the area for the bush, quietness and open space. Believes property value will be detrimentally impacted. Concerned that buses and trains are already overcrowded, and that schools will become overloaded.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
78	Objects	Opposes the proposed changes to the FSPA. Believes that Oatley is becoming more crowded, that the suburb is losing its leafiness and that the river should be protected from overdevelopment.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
79	Objects	Opposes the removal of properties from the FSPA. Explains that they chose to live in Oatley for its leafy and riverside character, the lack of duplexes, the large blocks and homes, the suburban charm	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		and village atmosphere.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– inadequate justification for the boundary amendment</li> <li>– no reason provided</li> </ul>		
80	Objects	Believes the proposed changes will devalue properties in Oatley, Mortdale and Mortdale Heights, and that the leafiness and quietness will be lost.	Objects to overdevelopment		
81	Objects	Opposes the draft LEP due to closer houses, increased noise, loss of privacy, less parking and more traffic. Believes there will be a loss of space, flora and fauna.	Objects to overdevelopment		
82	Objects	Concerned about dual occupancy in foreshore areas. Believes that Oatley West is losing its 'village' feel and that leafy suburbs with water access are losing land along foreshore areas. Requests protection of wildlife, foreshore areas and the suburb's way of life. Believes there is overpopulation already in Oatley, Mortdale, Hurstville Grove and Penshurst.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</li> <li>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</li> </ul>		
83	Objects	Concerned that there is limited road access to/from Oatley and increasing density will add to traffic congestion, noise in local streets and alter the face of Oatley. Explains that street parking is currently limited, particularly at Oatley Village. Believes that current infrastructure won't support the proposal.	Objects to overdevelopment		
84	Objects	Believes that infrastructure (trains, roads and schools) and public services (police and health clinics) have not kept up with overdevelopment of new apartments in Mortdale.	Objects to overdevelopment		
85	Objects	Believes the suburb's lifestyle will be altered if there is no longer a FSPA.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</li> <li>Objects to the removal of properties in</li> </ul>		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
86	Objects	Objects to the rezoning of Oatley. Believes that removing the FSPA zone will be detrimental to Oatley's village atmosphere and result in overcrowded blocks and streets, less parking and will spoil the natural environment.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
87	Objects	<p>Concerned about the proposed changes to the FSPA as well as the safety of those who live past the railway bridge at Mimosa Street, bounded by Llewellyn Street, Southern Street and Yarran Road. Explains that there is only one exit from this area - via the railway bridge on Mimosa Street and fire in that area could result in loss of property and life, as the only exit point is Mimosa Street. Provides an example of a situation which nearly occurred late-2019 when a fire started on the walkway which commences at Myra Place and runs contiguous to the railway line to Como. Explains that increased population and traffic would increase the difficulties for emergency services to access and contain fires and limit the ability of locals to leave safely.</p> <p>Concerned that the proposed changes will affect local wildlife, amenity by reduced block size, increased traffic and narrow streets, and loss of street parking. Concerned about the pressure on infrastructure such as additional pressure on already crowded trains, packed schools, and overloaded sewerage and stormwater systems and the impact on the local environment.</p>	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
88	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Explains that residents living in high density residential developments park on the street as there is limited parking in their buildings, making it difficult for the community to find parking. Suggests that a car spot is made available for every bedroom in the unit. Concerned that parking for granny flats is not considered, resulting in parking on the street. Suggests that consideration be given to noise and smell, especially where developments are less than a metre from the boundary. Concerned about the limited parking in South Hurstville and Connells Point Road's shopping areas.	Requests for better designed developments	Concerned about inadequate parking requirements for development.	Parking requirements are contained in the development control plan and will be reviewed in the development of the Georges River Development Control Plan 2020 which will accompany the draft LEP with more detailed planning controls.

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
89	Objects	Opposes the removal of properties - including their own - from the FSPA as they believe it will affect quality of life and the value of their property. Explains that they chose to live in an area with space, room and nature, and believes this proposal will jeopardise this.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
90	Objects	Concerned that there will be a loss of the area's character (natural landscape and leafiness) and it will become an overdeveloped suburb with increased demands on infrastructure. Requests further research into the environmental impact, particularly to the foreshore zoned areas. Believes that there is no 'one size fits all' in the harmonisation of the LEP.  Concerned about the loss of trees, with the proposed increased density and smaller block sizes, and the threat to fauna. Concerned that stormwater run-off will increase as a result of more dwellings, that there will be an increase in traffic as a result of a population increase, that there will be a loss of recreation space as a result of smaller block sizes, and limited street parking.	Objects to overdevelopment		
91	Objects	Believes the proposal to remove properties from the FSPA will undermine the natural beauty of the municipality, particularly from the waterfront.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
92	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
93	Supports	Supports the proposed changes to the FSPA. Wishes to retain the area of land to its original condition. Concerned that there have been changes such as removal of native flora and structures being built in the foreshore area.	Supports the removal of properties from the FSPA		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
94	Objects	Concerned about the proposed reductions to minimum lot sizes and the removal of properties from the FSPA. Believes the proposed changes will result in an increase in residents in areas where local amenities (such as guttering and street parking) have been designed for lower population densities. Believes this will reduce quality of life and property values.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
95	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Objects to reducing the minimum lot sizes for dual occupancies and reducing the landscaping requirements as it will threaten the suburb's leafy character. Believes removing properties in Oatley West from the FSPA will increase development potential and result in an increase in traffic, concrete, congestion and overshadowing. Believes COVID-19 has demonstrated the importance of having larger landscaped areas rather than a reduction in landscaped areas.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
96	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA for the following reasons: 1) Exhibition be deferred until information sessions can be held safely. 2) Potential density increase as a result of decreased lot sizes will result in further traffic and parking congestion and population pressure on recreational spaces. 3). Environmental threat including loss of trees, water quality and biodiversity as a result of increased density. 4. Questions how the transport system and Oatley Station will cope with the increased usage as it already appears to be close to capacity.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
97	Objects	Believes it will result in profit at the expense of residents.			
98	Objects	Objects to the proposed acquisition of land for open space in relation to 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove for the following reasons: 1) Precinct of Monaro Avenue and surrounding areas has neither high-density residential or new housing proposed, and represents a poor investment of Council funds. 2) There is no understanding or reassurances about how the park will be used. 3) McGregor Street is unsuitable for on-street parking and will	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		<p>increase risk to traffic and pedestrians given the narrow nature of the street and lack of footpaths. Concerned this will result in on-street parking on Monaro Avenue, St Elmo Parade and Kinsel Avenue.</p> <p>4) Opening the reserve will increase the risk of vandalism, theft and loitering, resulting in an increase in insurance premiums, fear and distress to residents.</p> <p>5) Local residents are opposed to this and residents will undergo unnecessary stress in relocating. Suggests putting resources into the area's existing parks.</p> <p>6) Requests for a community meeting to discuss.</p>			
99	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
100	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA and believes it is detrimental to the area. Believes Council's LEP video is misleading as it makes no reference to the FSPA boundary. Comments that Fact Sheet 10 does not mention that the FSPA boundary is proposed to be moved. Only the letter dated 1st April mentions the proposed boundary change. Believes the proposed change will result in a loss of amenity, parking, property value and a positive environment. Believes it will also increase traffic, noise, crime and demand on local services.</p>	<p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Raises concerns that the number of properties proposed to be removed from the FSPA was not provided in the fact sheet</p>		
101	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the foreshore protection zones. Reasons include:</p> <p>1) Purchased property in Oatley because the property was located in the foreshore protection zone.</p> <p>2) Believes the purpose of the foreshore protection zone is to prevent overdevelopment along the river and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Maintain the tree line on the foreshore and up to the ridge line</li> <li>- Help prevent run off into the river through the maintenance of vegetation</li> <li>- Help maintain the health of the river</li> <li>- Maintain the natural beauty of the waterways</li> <li>- Enable native wildlife to continue to exist and flourish.</li> </ul>	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		Explains that their property forms part of a possum link from Oatley Pleasure Grounds to Moore Reserve and if duplexes are built in Neville and Kitchener Streets then such linkages could not continue as trees will be removed. Believes objectives for increasing density can be achieved without changing foreshore protection zones.			
102	Objects	Concerned that the proposal will put at risk the local environment and wildlife, as a result of overcrowding and overdevelopment, and will change the suburb's nature.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
103	Objects	Objects to all proposed changes. Comments that the number of trees in river front areas has reduced dramatically over 50 years as a result of amendments to planning requirements, and believes that houses are too large for the blocks and that trees are unable to grow. Requests a deferral until public discussion following COVID-19 can occur.	Objects to overdevelopment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
104	Objects	Opposes changes to their suburb. Concerned that the proposal lacks transparency, has insufficient evidence and is detrimental to the local environment.	Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Objects to overdevelopment		
105	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes for the following reasons: 1) Lack of consultation with the community. 2) Need to maintain local flora and fauna. Concerned that there is already trees removed and by allowing smaller blocks it will preclude planting of large native trees which will affect the local environment, contribute to poor air quality and accelerate climate change. 3) Will exacerbate a rural jungle of houses without gardens, native trees and plants. 4) Exacerbate crowded main roads resulting in more cars parked on suburban roads that are not built for traffic. 5) Alter the nature of the suburb.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to overdevelopment		
106	Objects	Opposed to harmonising the Oatley foreshore area with Kogarah or other areas of Sydney, but rather encourages local community identities and conventions instead. Believes that the current allotment sizes in Oatley foreshore areas are appropriate to the	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		



No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		natural landscape and amenity, and are enjoyed by residents.			
107	Objects	Opposes change to the FSPA. Concerned it will lead to increased housing density and loss of native trees.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
108	Objects	Objects to the proposed removal of properties from the FSPA. Concerned this would damage the amenity and liveability of the affected area by: 1) Increasing housing density. 2) Increasing road traffic and parking congestion. 3) Degrading the scenic and environmental values of a sensitive zone adjacent to the Georges River.  Explains that many roads in the area are steeply graded and often become narrower as they approach the river, until they form a cul de sac. Provides Myall Street as an example. Believes there is increasing pressure on the natural environment and that it is more important than ever to maintain the FSPA as it now exists.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
109	Objects	Explains that they moved to Oatley from the Inner West to move away from congestion. Does not want to see dramatic changes to the area.	Objects to overdevelopment		
110	Objects	Does not want an increase in density and duplexes. Concerned that there is already too much traffic as a result of the units in Mortdale. Believes current infrastructure will not support this development.	Objects to overdevelopment		
111	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
112	Objects	Objects to more housing on smaller blocks with less green space. Concerned that there will be loss of trees and parking, and an increase in traffic, congestion and noise. Chose to live in the area for the trees and gardens.	Objects to overdevelopment		
113	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
114	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
115	Objects	Against overdevelopment in the area.	Objects to overdevelopment		
116	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA as it will change the character of the area. Concerned that the increase in density will result in no backyards and that COVID-19 has demonstrated the importance of these amenities for the wellbeing and mental and physical health of the community. Believes an increase in density with reduced landscaping requirements will result in loss of trees and habitat.</p> <p>Believes an increase in housing and population density will increase traffic in streets that were not designed to take the volume of vehicles. Explains that many smaller dwellings have a single car garage but many households have two cars resulting in cars being parked on the street. Explains that there is congestion on Isaac Street between Lorraine Street and Peace Avenue, as a result of duplexes that have been built.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
117	Objects	Explains that residents bought their properties for the quietness, ease of parking, trees, birds and the general lifestyle. Concerned that this will be lost and does not want to see reduced landscaping percentages. Concerned that there isn't enough parks.	Objects to overdevelopment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
118	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
119	Objects	Opposes the proposed changes to land zoning, dwelling sizes, building heights, heritage listings, landscaping and foreshore protection. Concerned that the removal of properties from the FSPA will affect quality of life and the natural beauty of Oatley. Concerned that the proposed changes will result in increased density, smaller block sizes, increased traffic, loss of leafy character and increased pressure on infrastructure. Believes that Council's documents appear inaccurate in regards to the number of properties affected and that the maps are misleading.	Objects to overdevelopment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Raises concerns that the number of properties proposed to be removed from the FSPA was not provided in the fact sheet		
120	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Suggests keeping the minimum housing block to at least 500sqm land, that transport infrastructure be supported, particularly frequent trains and buses, and that Council rate increases be kept to a minimum.		1. Suggests keeping the minimum housing block to at least 500m2 land, that transport infrastructure be supported, particularly frequent trains and buses.  2. Suggests Council rate increases be kept to a minimum.	1. The draft LEP proposes a 450sqm minimum subdivision lot size in the R2 zone (as per the Hurstville LEP 2012). Properties in the R2 zone in the former Kogarah LGA will have their minimum subdivision lot size reduced from 550sqm, resulting in approximately 598 lots in the former Kogarah LGA gaining development potential to subdivide.  The 450sqm minimum subdivision lot size in the R2 zone has been adopted to ensure that no lot, irrespective of lot size will lose development potential due to the harmonisation of the LEPs. Due to the low density nature of development in the R2 zone, development is unlikely to place pressure on existing infrastructure.  2. Council rates are not a matter for the draft LEP.

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
121	Objects	Opposes the proposed changes to remove Oatley West properties from the FSPA and requests a public hearing. Believes that local Councillors should be making the final decision.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided Requests a public hearing Raises concerns that the Planning Proposal Authority is the Local Planning Panel rather than Councillors		
122	Objects	Concerned that the impacts of the proposed changes will be larger houses, more duplexes, increased traffic and loss of leafy character. Concerned that there is already a shortage of on street parking and that trains from Oatley are already crowded. Explains that there is existing pressure on sewerage which has been blocked on a number of occasions.	Objects to overdevelopment		
123	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA. Explains that moving to the area was a result of low density housing, low traffic, extensive tree cover and wildlife, and large lot sizes. Concerned that the proposed changes will reduce lot sizes leading to congestion, noise, traffic and loss of amenity. Provides statistics that loss of the low density nature of Oatley West, Mortdale and Peakhurst will drive house prices down by an average of \$50,000. Will consider leaving the suburb should the proposal pass.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
124	Objects	Questions why the reduction in the FSPA was not included in the Local Strategic Planning Statement 2040, and why an environmental study has not been conducted, as the increase in housing and reduced landscaping requirements will affect local biodiversity. Opposes the proposal as the more scenic areas of the St George basin do not require additional housing.	Raises concerns that the community were not notified of the proposed changes in the draft LEP during the LSPS consultation Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
125	Objects	Chose to live in Lugarno for the greenery, minimal traffic, singular domestic housing per block and local community shopping village at Chivers Hill. Concerned that the proposed changes to the FSPA will destroy the areas peaceful heritage.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
126	Objects	<p>Concerned about the destruction of an already fragile ecosystem. Suggests that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Council review the draft LEP in respect to the presence of remnant native vegetation cover mapped in the OEH (2013) report and revised vegetation data layers (2016) to develop mechanisms to protect and enhance native vegetation cover.</li> <li>2) Council review the draft LEP in respect to the presence of native wildlife and its habitat, especially rare and threatened fauna, to address the need to identify and protect wildlife habitat and identify mechanisms in the LEP to protect important wildlife habitat and encourage the community to appreciate and help conserve wildlife.</li> <li>3) Council undertake a full biodiversity assessment of the LGA to inform the development of the new LEP.</li> <li>4) Council should not remove existing areas from the FSPA and consider adding additional areas, which support significant remnant native vegetation and important view sheds from the Georges River and Sutherland Shire.</li> <li>5) Council review the recommended minimum lot sizes in the R2 Low Density Residential zone so that lots outside the FSPA remain at 550 sqm and not reduced to 450 sqm and that the proportion of landscaped areas for lots on R2 are at least 40% for areas outside the FSPA and at least 50% within the FSPA in order to maintain large garden areas currently characteristic of the area which makes a significant contribution to conserving remnant native vegetation and wildlife habitat in the LGA.</li> <li>6) Minimum landscaped areas of 50% should also apply to lots in areas identified as Bush Suburban, Garden Suburban, Garden Suburban-larger lots, Naturalist Edge, Semi-naturalist edge, Naturalist Headland in Council's "Georges River Strategic Directions Paper".</li> <li>7) Character Typology assessment applied to the foreshore areas of the LGA in the "Georges River Strategic Directions Paper" should be applied to the entire LGA so that a comprehensive assessment of the LGA can be made in order to apply appropriate zonings and provisions to protect gardens, remnant bushland and street trees in the new LEP.</li> </ol> <p>Concerned about the proposed changes to the FSPA, the impacts on native vegetation and the impacts on the threatened Powerful Owl, the Grey-headed Flying Fox, the White-bellied Sea Eagle and</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests increasing the landscaping requirements</p>	<p>Suggests that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Council review the draft LEP in respect to native vegetation, wildlife, habitats and biodiversity.</li> <li>2. Council review the recommended minimum lot sizes in the R2 Low Density Residential zone so that lots outside the FSPA remain at 550 sqm and not reduced to 450 sqm.</li> <li>3. Character Typology assessment applied to the foreshore areas of the LGA in the "Georges River Strategic Directions Paper" should be applied to the entire LGA so that a comprehensive assessment of the LGA can be made in order to apply appropriate zonings and provisions to protect gardens, remnant bushland and street trees in the new LEP.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Council will be undertaking a biodiversity study for the LGA as part of its broader strategic program relating to the natural environment. The findings of this study may inform a future amendment to the LEP, including a biodiversity provision.</li> <li>2. The draft LEP proposes a 450sqm minimum subdivision lot size in the R2 zone (as per the Hurstville LEP 2012). The 450sqm minimum subdivision lot size in the R2 zone has been adopted to ensure that no lot, irrespective of lot size will lose development potential due to the harmonisation of the LEPs.</li> </ol> <p>Due to the low density nature of development in the R2 zone, development is unlikely to place pressure on existing infrastructure.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Council will investigate the inclusion of character areas as part of the development of the Georges River Development Control Plan.</li> </ol>

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		the Osprey.			
127	Objects	Opposes the proposal as they're concerned it will result in: 1) An increase in housing density. 2) A higher volume of traffic. 3) An increase in run-off into the Georges River, as a result of more structures and hard surfaces. 4) Developers taking precedence over the interests of the community.	Objects to overdevelopment		
128	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
129	Objects	Opposes the proposal for the following reasons: 1) It will destroy the 'green suburbs'. 2) Questions influence from developers. 3) Questions what has happened to the additional revenue from Hurstville high rise development. 4) It will impact on current infrastructure - clogged roads, overcrowded public transport and schools, insufficient capacity on existing sewerage and water services. 5) Loss of reasonable block sizes would impact on people's wellbeing and mental health, and higher crime rates. 6) Australia's lower residential density has contributed to the success in the fight against COVID-19. 7) Council should benefit rate payers.	Objects to overdevelopment		
130	Objects	Believes the proposal would irreversibly change the whole fragile fabric of the suburb. Concerned that the foreshore area and infrastructure would suffer from an increase in population, and that there is a need for better transportation.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
131	Objects	Chose to live in the FSPA because its 'green' - trees in front and backyards which brings native animals. Concerned that duplexes will result in no trees. Chose to live in the area as it is a quiet neighbourhood, but concerned that the proposal will result in more people, traffic and infrastructure. Concerned that more people that live in the area will cause damage to the natural surroundings and stormwater; that local schools will no longer have the natural bushland setting as more classes will be built; and that an increase	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		in traffic will mean less safety for parents and children when walking and cycling. Believes the proposal will make parking near Oatley station even worse and that the suburb is not suited to mass development of larger houses and duplexes on smaller blocks.			
132	Objects	Opposes the reduction in the minimum lot size for low density residential zone to 450sqm and any other measures that aid an increase in the number of dwellings and reduction in open space. Concerned that it will result in increased traffic, more noise, less privacy, fewer trees and less 'ownership'. Explains that they have already seen a reduction in amenity that has come with increasing housing density. Suggests the LEP be deferred until after the next Council elections.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
133	Objects	Believes this will change the landscape and overall feel of the suburb as it will result in overpopulation and damage nature. Explains that schools are already full and does not want to live in a high density area.	Objects to overdevelopment		
134	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
135	Objects	Questions how housing mix will contribute to a greener environment and the affect it will have on traffic. Believes harmonisation isn't necessary as suburbs have different needs, geographies and traffic flows. Concerned that traffic and parking on roads leading to and surrounding Oatley Park is already very heavy. Believes an increase in density will create safety hazards in and around Oatley Park. Believes Peakhurst already has dangerous traffic, lack of parking and poor design. Concerned that the proposal will affect their living conditions, the appeal of the area and the value of their property. Objects to the proposal and the proposed changes to the FSPA and questions why the LGA needs to grow.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
136	Objects	Explains that they moved to Oatley for the large backyards, greenery and leafy streets.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
137	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
138	Objects	Opposes the proposed changes as they feel they are not in the best interests of Oatley West residents. Concerned that there will be more cars, congestion, noise and overcrowding as a result of more dwellings. Explains that they moved to Oatley because of its village feel, leafy ambience and good family size blocks. Believes that Oatley West, through the development of the shopping strip on Mulga Road, has received a major increase in vehicular and pedestrian traffic which has created parking issues especially on the weekends. Understands the need for progress within communities but comments that reducing the required land size for new dwellings is not progress and does not receive their support.	Objects to overdevelopment		
139	Objects	Believes this will impact the environment, lead to an increase in population density, and put extra strain on infrastructure such as roads, schools and hospitals. Questions why native vegetation needs to be reduced.	Objects to overdevelopment		
140	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
141	Objects	Opposes reducing land size required for subdivisions, especially in areas away from public transport hubs. Explains that Peakhurst Heights and Lugarno are only serviced by buses. Concerned about the loss of gardens, trees and shrubs for wildlife and insects - one of the main reasons they bought in this area.	Objects to overdevelopment		
142	Objects	Disagrees with the proposal to remove properties from the FSPA. Concerned that: 1) There will be negative impact on environmental sustainability, and the natural and leafy environment of Oatley West. 2) Changing the FSPA zoning will result in busier streets, and will have a negative impact on the environment due to more noise and traffic, and less parking and trees.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		



No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		<p>3) Oatley West has a village atmosphere and people choose to walk, run or ride in the streets as they are quiet and attractive. Believes the proposal will change this.</p> <p>4) Land values will be negatively impacted and there will be smaller gardens, less privacy and more overshadowing.</p> <p>5) Loss of leafy trees will have a negative impact on privacy, shade and environmental benefits.</p> <p>6) Oatley West Public School does not have sufficient space to expand any further.</p> <p>7) Impacts on infrastructure such as demand on trains, and overloaded sewerage and stormwater systems.</p>			
143	Objects	Objects to the proposal, as they believe it does not support the natural environment, and that it will devalue properties and land value.	Objects to overdevelopment		
144	Objects	Reasons for opposing include increased housing density, decrease in parking due to an increase in residents, narrowing of streets due to increased vehicle parking, increased traffic flow on local streets, no increase in local infrastructure, higher demand on local schools, decrease in housing prices, and housing will be closer together.	Objects to overdevelopment		
145	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
146	Objects	Opposes the removal of properties from the FSPA. Explains that increased density, extra traffic and less street parking is already noticeable in the suburb.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
147	Objects	Concerned that houses will be closer together, more noise and traffic, and less privacy and parking as a result of the proposal. Concerned that more buildings per less land size will create a loss of trees.	Objects to overdevelopment		
148	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
149	Objects	Concerned about the rezoning of the residential block bounded by Connells Point Road/The Esplanade/Tavistock Road/The Mall which is being rezoned to R4. Believes there are concerns already for traffic and congestion in the area and streets off King Georges Road and Connells Point Road, and that high density R4 will increase the dangers and traffic conditions. Explains that traffic congestion has significantly increased due to St Marist High School on Greenacre Road, South Hurstville. Does not support high density R4.	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones		
150	Objects	Believes the changes will have impacts including increased density, smaller block sizes, increased traffic, loss of leafy character and increased pressure on infrastructure.	Objects to overdevelopment		
151	Objects	Against the proposal as it will increase traffic, noise and congestion in Mortdale, and believes this has already increased with Woolworths at Roberts Avenue and will worsen with the proposal. Believes it will result in loss of leafy character, which is what drew the family to the area. Concerned that a reduction of block sizes will result in a reduction of landscaping, smaller gardens, fewer trees and wildlife, and less parking on streets. Concerned that there are already too many cars parked on the streets, and they are unable to park in front of their house. Concerned that there will be increased pressure on infrastructure - packed schools, and overloading sewage and stormwater systems causing river and creek pollution.	Objects to overdevelopment		
152	Objects	Concerned that the proposal will 'debeautify' the suburb. Concerned that there is already congestion on the roads at peak times and does not want to see more cars, pollution, rubbish and sewage as a result of dense residential properties. Explains that property size matters to them and requests that the area be left as is.	Objects to overdevelopment		
153	Objects	Opposes the proposed changes to the FSPA. Chose to live in the FSPA for its low density housing, extensive tree coverage, wildlife and large lot sizes. Explains that the community put a strong emphasis on retaining and planting trees, and extra bushland. Concerned that the proposal will lead to congestion, noise, more traffic, loss of amenities and will change the nature of the	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		neighbourhood. Explains that statistics show that a loss of the low density nature of Oatley West, Mortdale and Peakhurst will drive house prices down by an average of \$50,000. Will consider leaving the suburb if the proposal is passed.			
154	Objects	Opposed to the proposed removal of their property from the FSPA. Believes the proposal will lead to a loss of tree canopy cover and an increase in building density. Explains that the area is known for its environmental sensitivity and the changes will diminish the amount of quality habitat to sustain flora and fauna.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
155	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA. Explains that trees, gardens, amenity, large parks, quietness, privacy and parking are the reasons they chose to live in the area and believes these will be affected should the proposal go ahead. Believes the proposal is in the best interest of developers.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
156	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Suggests reducing the houses acquired for Peter Low Reserve on Monaro Ave to 4 - 2 either side of McGregor Street in order to lessen the impact to loss of housing quality. Suggests investing the remaining budget allocated for acquisition into CCTV, basketball courts and a shaded area with a level playfield.	Supports the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
157	Objects	Concerned that the proposal will negatively impact the character of Oatley and does not support the FSPA proposal. Lists the reasons as to why they purchased their home - leafy streets, low rise homes, stillness, community spirit, quiet streets, and no major roads or traffic streams running through cul-de-sac suburbs. Concerned that the proposal will result in less green and gardens, more brick, more concrete, more people, busier streets, busier trains, busier schools, busier shopping areas, less parking, and polluted creeks and waterways.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
158	Objects	Against the proposed changes to the FSPA. Concerned that many blocks will be split into duplexes leading to increased traffic congestion, loss of vegetation and garden areas, and more	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		pressure on infrastructure. Believes it will be detrimental to the suburb's character. Concerned that there doesn't seem to be a plan for increased spend on infrastructure and that the main beneficiaries of the change will be developers.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
159	Objects	Concerned about the proposed changes to the FSPA. Explains that a key attraction to the area is the quiet nature and lack of duplexes, and that easing restrictions will speed up development, population density and not make it as pleasant a place to live. Explains that they enjoy the wildlife and the leafy nature of the area.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
160	Objects	Against the new draft LEP.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
161	Objects	Believes increased housing density will result in increased traffic, decreased vegetation, increased load on infrastructure, and social issues such as increased noise and excessive street parking.	Objects to overdevelopment		
162	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
163	Objects	Concerned that zoning changes are made to allow compulsory acquisition of properties in Kingsgrove.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
164	Objects	<p>Does not believe the proposed changes are positive measures for Lugarno. Believes the proposal does not show enough measures being put in place to protect the environment, wildlife or current landscape. Concerned that trees are being removed without further trees planted. Believes the proposed land sizes, including for dual occupancy, need to be larger. Opposes the changes to the FSPA and suggests that the land currently covered be increased and protected against development.</p> <p>Concerned that the proposal will remove the natural beauty of Lugarno and believes the nature reserves and parks are not being regenerated or cared for sufficiently at the moment. Believes that the current development of lower Gannons is taking too long, is crowded and dirty, and that trees that have been removed have not been planted elsewhere.</p> <p>Raises further concerns about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Increased density with larger houses and duplexes on smaller blocks.</li> <li>2) Larger development not allowing for any greenery or gardens around the complex.</li> <li>3) Increased traffic to an already heavy traffic area - can no longer park in front of own property.</li> <li>4) Loss of leafy character.</li> <li>5) Increased pressure on infrastructure - crowded trains, insufficient buses and overloaded sewerage and stormwater causing further river and creek pollution.</li> </ol>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
165	Objects	<p>Believes overdevelopment has already eroded the amenity of the suburbs and that reducing the extent of the FSPA will destroy the beauty and peacefulness of the environment.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
166	Objects	<p>Does not agree with the reduced building block regulations as it will increase the population and increase the number of cars parked on streets. Concerned that there is no provision for any more parks or green space.</p>	<p>Objects to overdevelopment</p>		
167	Objects	<p>Objects to the FSPA proposal due to the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Environment will be impacted by subdividing land with less trees, green area and less native wildlife.</li> <li>2) Streets are currently choked with traffic due to insufficient off-</li> </ol>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in</p>		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		street parking and will be exacerbated by dual occupancies. 3) Noise levels will increase with increased population. 4) Residents bought in the area knowing the area would not be impacted by planning changes. 5) Would like Peakhurst Heights to remain a peaceful quiet suburb to be enjoyed.	the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
168	Objects	Opposes the proposal as Lugarno has only one road going in and out. Concerned that high density housing would bring chaos as a result of extra housing and traffic.	Objects to overdevelopment		
169	Objects	Opposes the proposal as Lugarno is on a peninsular and is concerned that an increase in population will negatively impact the suburb. Requests that Lugarno be left as is - leafy suburb with natural beauty.	Objects to overdevelopment		
170	Objects	Does not support the proposal due to environmental concerns. Concerned that higher density will impact negatively on what makes the local area so attractive. Explains that sewer overflows are a common occurrence in the Lime Kiln Bay Wetlands which are also subject to a lot of pollution due to stormwater. Concerned that higher density housing will reduce the number of trees which are vital to many birds, animals and wildlife, and that more hard surfaces will result in more run off into the river.	Objects to overdevelopment		
171	Objects	Does not support the proposed FSPA changes.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA  – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment  – no reason provided		
172	Objects	Does not support the proposal as it will destroy the amenity of Lugarno and will lead to overcrowded streets, ugly residences, loss of privacy in backyards, increased construction disruption, noise and traffic along Forest Road.	Objects to overdevelopment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
173	Objects	<p>Does not support the proposed FSPA changes for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) Houses will be much closer to each other - more noise, less privacy and increased psychological stress on the community.</p> <p>2) Traffic will increase - current roads will not be able to sustain increased traffic usage and will increase traffic congestion during peak hours and weekends, increased risk of traffic accidents, and less public and residential parking available.</p> <p>3) Impact on the environment - greater fire risk, loss of trees, endangers existing wildlife and increased pollution.</p> <p>4) Loss of value to existing properties.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
174	Objects	<p>Disagrees with the proposal. Believes Oatley is renowned for its leafy nature and this proposal will threaten the existence of many large trees. Concerned that smaller block sizes will result in loss of privacy and potential overshadowing. Concerned that increased density will lead to increased traffic congestion, increased noise levels and less street parking. Comments that the Council documents provide no explanation as to why the FSPA should be reduced in size. Believes the FSPA should be increased. Calls for Council to have a public meeting regarding this proposal.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the Foreshore Scenic Protection Area – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment or no reason provided</p>		
175	Objects	<p>No reason for not supporting was given.</p>	<p>Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided</p>		
176	Objects	<p>Opposes the proposed FSPA changes. Concerned that the proposal does not accurately assess the impacts that the changes will have on those living in the area. Concerned that the changes will see increased density resulting from houses designed with a bigger footprint and will see duplexes being built on smaller blocks. Believes duplexes are already problematic as they result in more vehicles parked on the streets and less curb-side parking due to double driveways. Concerned that the reduction in landscaping requirements will see garden suburbs compromised and devalued due to overcrowding and the loss of garden space, backyards, trees, green property margins between each dwelling, wildlife and privacy.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		Concerned that additional impacts will include increased traffic and congestion, noise and loss of the leafy character. Believes there will be additional pressure on the existing infrastructure that can barely cope with the current population. Provides Oatley Heights Park's sewerage management as an example -often smelly, polluted, overflowing and full of rubbish.			
177	Objects	Does not support the draft LEP 2020 proposed changes.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
178	Objects	Opposes the proposed changes as they reduce minimum lot sizes and landscaping requirements. Purchased property within the FSPA to ensure that the area is not overdeveloped. Believes dual occupancies result in lack of privacy, overshadowing and reduced parking. Concerned that increased density will alter the character of Lugarno, Oatley and Peakhurst. Disagrees with the reduction of green space and tree planting and is concerned that there doesn't appear to be any mention of protecting existing flora.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
179	Objects	Believes the proposed changes will ruin the current environment of Oatley and put extra pressure on infrastructure and schools.	Objects to overdevelopment		
180	Objects	Opposed to the proposed FSPA changes. Reasons include:  1) Noise and privacy - moved to West Oatley for its beautiful foreshore scenic area, peaceful environment and friendly community. Concerned that trees will be knocked down, and a loss of privacy and shade as a result of dwellings built. Concerned that people living closer together will create more noise. Concerned that all these changes will impact the value of their property. 2) Traffic - proposed changes will exacerbate the growing traffic problems. Explains that there's long queues of traffic trying to exit from Hillcrest to King Georges and in their street there has been a substantial increase in the volume of traffic which starts before 6:00am and at times can go into midnight. Concerned of the impact if no new roads are built. 3) Parking - an increase in dwellings brings more residents and visitors. Explains that people park their cars on the street instead of their garage and there is less parking available on the kerb side, making it difficult and dangerous to reverse from the driveway into the street.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		



No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		<p>4) Stormwater drainage - more dwellings would mean more built-up area resulting in more stormwater runoffs. Concerned about the availability of sufficient stormwater infrastructure in Oatley to deal with the additional stormwater runoffs from new dwellings. Explains that they planned to knock down their house to rebuild a single dwelling and was stopped by Council due to stormwater drainage issues. Believes the proposed FSPA changes and the minimum lot size requirements are at odds with Council's new stormwater management policy. Does not believe Council will have sufficient resources and infrastructure to deal with the problem.</p> <p>Concerned why the proposal is proceeding during COVID-19 and suggests suspending the proposal until the lockdown is fully lifted so a public consultation can be held.</p>			
181	Objects	<p>Opposes the proposed FSPA changes and the relaxation of the minimum lot size for new dwellings, dual occupancy and subdivisions. Concerned that the proposed changes will permanently destroy the scenic foreshore area and result in substantial increase in residential density. Believes more dwellings and people will mean more noise and traffic, and less trees and privacy. Concerned that this will have a detrimental effect on the peaceful community and the value of their property. Doubts that Council will have sufficient resources and infrastructure to deal with traffic and stormwater issues accompanied with the rise in population.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
182	Objects	<p>Opposes the proposed removal of properties from the FSPA. Believes that many of the streets do not have footpaths or space for them, that pedestrians use the road to walk, and that the roads are typically only 3 lanes wide and too narrow for 2 cars to pass parked cars. Concerned that the proposed changes to lot size will lead to an even greater number of parked cars, and increased traffic that cannot pass safely. Explains that these areas are bound by the foreshore and do not have significant through roads. Explains that all traffic must go through the small local streets and that this is increasingly dangerous, particularly around school start and finish times. Concerned that a greater number of dual occupancy dwellings in the area have already led to a deterioration. Explains that they chose this area for its quiet leafy nature and the proposed reduction in lot sizes will have an unreasonable impact on this character.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p>		
183	Objects	<p>Opposes the proposed removal of properties from the FSPA as per reasons below: 1) Council is proposing a huge change during a pandemic that</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p>		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		<p>does not give residents the ability to properly voice their concerns on the proposal.</p> <p>2) The map showing the proposed new FSPA:  - Is misleading and deceptive as it includes the actual river/water as being part of the FSPA. The map in the current LEP does not include the water.  - Was only available online and was not part of the notification letter sent. Not all residents would have the ability to look online.</p> <p>3) The proposal takes almost 4000 properties out of the FSPA and this will have significant impact on the value of those properties. Explains there is research to suggest that house values will reduce by \$50,000.</p> <p>4) Those who bought properties in the FSPA bought on the basis that they were located in the FSPA and paid a premium to be located in an area that could not be overdeveloped and with lots of greenery.</p> <p>5) The proposal would see increased density with larger houses and duplexes on smaller blocks. These areas do not have the capacity or infrastructure to cope - streets are narrow, crowded trains, there is limited parking, schools are already at capacity, and it will result in overloaded sewerage and stormwater systems causing river and creek pollution.</p> <p>6) Increased density means increased traffic, less parking and noise. Provides current example of Oatley Park Avenue during school times.</p> <p>7) Reducing the landscaping requirement and allowing a smaller block size results in fewer trees, wildlife, lack of privacy and overshadowing.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Raises concerns that the waterways have been included in the FSPA</p>		
184	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
185	Objects	Concerned that allowing changes to the low and medium density zoning will ruin the character and charm of the area. Believes the services and road ways are already mismanaged and more residents and cars will only add to the frustration. Explains that the changes to the previous LEP resulted in the removal of high schools without consideration to the demographic and is concerned that there is now not enough schools in the immediate area.	Objects to overdevelopment		
186	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
187	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
188	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
189	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
190	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
191	Objects	Explains they moved to Lugarno because it is green, inviting, beautiful, spacious and has a sense of community and wants the neighbourhood to remain as is. Believes the community does not want overcrowding and loss of identity.	Objects to overdevelopment		
192	Objects	Concerned that the proposal will result in increased noise and traffic, more cars, and reduction in tranquility. Explains they bought in the area because these developments weren't allowed.	Objects to overdevelopment		
193	Supports, but with suggestions for	Objects to the FSPA planning control for 'lot size required to permit dual occupancy development' that has to be a minimum of	Requests amendments to the minimum lot size for dual occupancies		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
	changes	1000sqm. Explains their property is 920sqm and finds it unfair that they can't develop their land into a dual occupancy that would meet all regulatory and environmental requirements if it was outside of the FSPA.			
194	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
195	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
196	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA as it serves to retain green space and ensures some protection for the natural environment.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
197	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Supportive of the proposed LEP changes to set a higher minimum lot size, including for dual occupancy. Concerned by the reduction in the FSPA in Lugarno under the proposal as it is harmful to the overall bushland character. Believes there are inconsistencies with some areas in Lugarno being removed and some not. Concerned that there isn't significant public transport infrastructure. Explains that the Inclusive Housing Strategy Assessment reveals Lugarno to be a suburb likely to see demographic change over the coming years as older residents with larger houses downsize and new families move in. Concerned that no consideration has been given to how this trend will increase the suburb's population and reinforces the need for continuing control of development and maintenance of bushland character. Believes relaxing constraints will harm the character of the affected areas and the suburb overall. Believes that, whilst the proposal preserves significant parts, the carve-out of other presently protected areas harms the entire suburb's character. Concerned that insufficient recognition has been given as to how to preserve the character of this unique area. Believes this is inconsistent with the imperatives of the Local	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		Strategic Planning Statement - to maintain the character of existing suburbs with their trees, and both maintenance and increase of tree canopy. Believes there should be no changes to Lugarno which have the benefit of FSPA status.			
198	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley, Lugarno and Peakhurst and the reduction in lot size for lots outside of the FSPA and the reduction in soft landscaping area. Provides recommendations below:</p> <p>1) That Council review the draft LEP in respect to the presence of remnant native vegetation cover mapped in the OEH (2013) report and revised vegetation data layers (2016) to develop mechanisms to identify, protect and enhance native vegetation cover throughout the LGA in the new LEP, especially rare and threatened communities.</p> <p>2) That Council review the draft LEP in respect to the presence of native wildlife and its habitat, especially rare and threatened fauna, to address the need to identify and protect wildlife habitat throughout the LGA and identify mechanisms in the LEP to protect important wildlife habitat and encourage the community to appreciate and help conserve wildlife.</p> <p>3) That Council undertake a full biodiversity assessment of the LGA to inform the development of the new LEP.</p> <p>4) That Council not remove existing areas from the FSPA and consider adding additional areas which support significant remnant native vegetation and important view sheds from the Georges River and Sutherland Shire, further to what has been proposed.</p> <p>5) That Council maintain the Foreshore Building Line and the protective measures in it to protect foreshore habitat.</p> <p>6) That Council review the recommended minimum lot sizes in R2 Low Density Residential so that lots outside the FSPA remain at 550 sqm and not reduced to 450 sqm or 300 sqm and that the proportion of landscaped areas for lots on R2 are at least 40% for areas outside the FSPA and at least 50% within the FSPA in order to maintain large garden areas currently characteristic of the area which makes a significant contribution to conserving remnant native vegetation and wildlife habitat in the LGA.</p> <p>7) Minimum landscaped areas of 50% should also apply to lots in areas identified as Bush Suburban, Garden Suburban, Garden Suburban-larger lots, Naturalist Edge, Semi-naturalist edge, Naturalist Headland identified in Council's "Georges River Strategic Directions Paper".</p> <p>8) The Character Typology assessment applied to the foreshore areas of the LGA in the "Georges River Strategic Directions Paper" should be applied to the entire LGA so that a comprehensive assessment of the LGA can be made in order to apply appropriate</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests increasing the landscaping requirements</p>	<p>Suggests that:</p> <p>1. Council review the draft LEP in respect to native vegetation, wildlife, habitats, biodiversity and the expansion of environmental protection zones.</p> <p>2. Council maintain the Foreshore Building Line and the protective measures in it to protect foreshore habitat.</p> <p>3. Council review the recommended minimum lot sizes in R2 Low Density Residential so that lots outside the FSPA remain at 550 sqm and not reduced to 450 sqm or 300 sqm.</p> <p>4. Character Typology assessment applied to the foreshore areas of the LGA in the "Georges River Strategic Directions Paper" should be applied to the entire LGA so that a comprehensive assessment of the LGA can be made in order to apply appropriate zonings and provisions to protect gardens, remnant bushland and street trees in the new LEP.</p>	<p>1. Council will be undertaking a biodiversity study for the LGA as part of its broader strategic program relating to the natural environment. The findings of this study may inform a future amendment to the LEP, including a biodiversity provision and the expansion of environmental protection zones.</p> <p>2. The Foreshore Building Line has been translated from the existing Hurstville and Kogarah LEPs into the draft LEP. The draft LEP also introduces additional foreshore provisions, including Clause 6.5 Foreshore area and coastal hazards and risks. The intent of this clause is to enhance the protection of the natural environment along the LGA's foreshore in line with the overarching principles of this LEP.</p> <p>3. The draft LEP proposes a 450sqm minimum subdivision lot size in the R2 zone (as per the Hurstville LEP 2012). The 450sqm minimum subdivision lot size in the R2 zone has been adopted to ensure that no lot, irrespective of lot size will lose development potential due to the harmonisation of the LEPs.</p> <p>Due to the low density nature of development in the R2 zone, development is unlikely to place pressure on existing infrastructure.</p> <p>4. Council will investigate the inclusion of character areas as part of the development of the Georges</p>

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		<p>zonings and provisions to protect gardens, remnant bushland and street trees in the new LEP.</p> <p>9) That Council look to further expanding Environmental Protective Zonings to include E3 Environmental Management and E4 Environmental Living to better protect significant native vegetation and wildlife habitat on public and private land.</p> <p>Concerned that the proposal will impact the character of the area, impact native vegetation and wildlife, and will lead to a decline in the natural environment to the detriment of the community and native wildlife.</p>			River Development Control Plan.
199	Objects	Believes this proposal would be detrimental to the natural landscape and community of Oatley by overdeveloping and populating the suburb.	Objects to overdevelopment		
200	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Objects to the proposal to acquire the properties at 11-21 Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove. Concerned about rezoning land in a quiet low-density residential area. Believes the park, even with expanded boundaries, is unsuitable for development as it will still fall short of the required area to build sports fields. Believes it is unfair to the families who currently occupy those houses.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		
201	Objects	Concerned that changing planning and development rules for areas in or near the existing protection areas will invite higher density living and consequential effects on the local bushland and ecosystem environment. Concerned that increased housing will impact local mangroves and marshlands and impact wildlife breeding grounds. Believes Oatley does not have scope for increased traffic - no main roads and streets are designed for suburban local use. Concerned this will result in parking congestion in suburban streets and local shopping areas.	Objects to overdevelopment		
202	Objects	Concerned that filling Oatley with more people due to development changes will put pressure on infrastructure and the vibrant village atmosphere will be lost. Believes it is already difficult to drive safely with all the cars parked on the road and more people will result in more parked cars, increasing the danger.	Objects to overdevelopment		
203	Objects	Concerned that this is a developer driven proposal and does not take into account local residents' wishes.		Concerned that this is a developer driven proposal and does not take into account local	The provisions of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 specify the matters for consideration in determining development

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
				residents' wishes.	applications, including the likely impacts of the development, the suitability of the site for development, any submissions received and the public interest.
204	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
205	Objects	Opposes the proposed changes to the FSPA for the following reasons: -Increased density and smaller block sizes will change the area's character and streetscape, resulting in less gardens, fewer trees and wildlife, lack of privacy and overshadowing. -Increase traffic and less street parking. -Loss of large leafy trees and bushland. Smaller blocks with less gardens would decrease property value. -Pressure on infrastructure including crowded trains, lack of station parking, and overloaded sewerage and stormwater systems resulting in pollution into creeks and rivers. - Increase the number of properties at risk in the event of bushfires.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
206	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
207	Objects	Has environmental concerns surrounding less greenery and increased traffic. Does not agree with changing the character as suburbs demographically evolve over time.	Objects to overdevelopment		
208	Objects	Objects to any areas currently within the foreshore being removed. Disappointed that the factsheet did not clearly indicate the existing area and that it was not readily apparent that some areas were to be removed from the foreshore. Concerned that duplexes and granny flats and the associated loss of vegetation will degrade the quality of the local environment and will have a long term impact on the qualities that make the area so highly appreciated.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Raises concerns that the number of properties proposed to be removed from the FSPA was not provided in the fact sheet		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
209	Objects	Opposed to the proposed amendments to the FSPA for the following reasons: -Increased density will erode Lugarno's green open space and leafy environment, and increase traffic. - Carpark at Chivers Hill shops is inadequate and congested and its capacity will be increased. -Streets such as Blackbutt, Renway, Linden, Valentia and Hillcrest have already become driver and pedestrian safety hazards. -Will result in lack of privacy and overshadowing. - Increased risk for residents having to evacuate the area with one road in and out in the event of a bushfire. -Decreased lot sizes will result in noise pollution, reduced landscaping with smaller or no garden space, fewer trees and will impact on wildlife, particularly native birdlife and threatened species. - Increased impact on crowded trains, inadequate schools, and stormwater systems causing damage and pollution to the Georges River.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
210	Supports	Supports this initiative.	Supports draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
211	Objects	Opposes this proposal.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
212	Objects	Wants to maintain the suburb's leafy, friendly and serene character. Concerned that too much development will result in a lack of trees and too much traffic. Believes the new playground in Oatley Park has resulted in a plethora of cars making it unpleasant for walkers, cyclists and native wildlife in the park.	Objects to overdevelopment		
213	Objects	Does not want to see overdevelopment. Explains they moved to Lugarno for space and reprieve from overdevelopment. Concerned that Lugarno cannot support multiple occupancy dwellings as it has one road in and out. Concerned that there is already overcrowding on the trains to the city at Riverwood and Oatley and that there is traffic through Riverwood coming on/off the M5.	Objects to overdevelopment		
214	Objects	Does not support the proposal for the following reasons: increase in dwelling and population density with duplexes with minimal	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built		



No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		infrastructure to support, traffic congestion, impact on public transport (including overcrowded trains) which cannot cope now and will be worse with additional people, parking at local railway stations is at a premium now, change in leafy character of the area, loss of property value, additional pollution caused by overloaded stormwater and sewerage systems, and increased usage of sporting and recreation areas that are at capacity now.	environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
215	Objects	Does not want more development on smaller blocks and less green space. Requests that the boundaries in Oatley do not change.	Objects to overdevelopment		
216	Objects	Removal of their property from FSPA results in more traffic without the ability to commensurately increase accessibility; increased number of dwellings will mean a reduction in trees which will enable higher summertime temperatures; and that increased population will put pressure on local infrastructure such as schools, sewerage and stormwater.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
217	Objects	Concerned that the proposal will lead to higher population density, more traffic, fewer trees, drop in land value, and damage to the environment and critical wet areas. Explains they chose to live in Oatley for its greenery, quietness and low traffic. Concerned that more housing will lead to more waste water into Georges River, affect water quality and damage the flora and fauna.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
218	Objects	Does not support the proposal for the following reasons: increases the potential of multi story houses with an increase in population which is conducive to an increase in cars, traffic and pollution, and a decrease in physical and mental health. Their house is situated in a specific 'pocket' in South Hurstville marked under the plan to be changed from R2 to R3, developer orientated changes.	Objects to the Rowe Street – South Hurstville HIA		
219	Objects	Opposes the proposal for the following reasons: - Increase in population density without providing any increase in road capacity or an alternative route will decrease the safety of residents. - Increased housing density will result in the loss of trees and green areas. - Additional residences will result in higher demand for access to Chivers Hill shopping centre and increase the need for	Objects to overdevelopment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		parking.- Increase in traffic will increase risk to pedestrians. -The closer people live together, the higher the annoyance level and the shorter the tempers - a recipe for domestic violence. -Increased demands for water, gas, electricity, sewerage and stormwater systems. - Less land to absorb rainfall with increased runoff and localised flooding. - Loss of privacy and house values will fall.			
220	Objects	Does not want to see the proposal go ahead.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
221	Objects	Objects to the proposal for the following reasons: -Change to the character and atmosphere of the area. -Area is built on solid sandstone with blue stone. A diamond drill would be required to excavate increasing the chance of neighbouring property damage. - Surrounding neighbours have no stormwater in place. As all properties are on solid sandstone this would be a costly undertaking.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Raises concerns regarding the feasibility of development in the FSPA		
222	Objects	Objects to the change to the area for the following reasons: - existing issues of traffic, parking and overcrowded trains will increase with housing density.	Objects to overdevelopment		
223	Objects	Objects to the proposal to remove properties from the FSPA due to: -increased density with dual occupancies and less trees. - increased traffic, congestion and concrete structures, and reduction in landscaping requirements will mean the removal of the once leafy suburb.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
224	Objects	Concerned that the only beneficiaries of these proposed changes will be property developers.		Concerned that the only beneficiaries of these proposed changes will be property developers.	The provisions of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 specify the matters for consideration in determining development applications, including the likely impacts of the development, the

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
					suitability of the site for development, any submissions received and the public interest.
225	Objects	Concerned that the proposal will mean increased population density and decreased green areas, and the destruction of the natural environment.	Objects to overdevelopment		
226	Objects	Concerned about the proposed changes to the FSPA boundaries, specifically the number of properties being removed and the potential for overdevelopment. Concerned that the removal of lots from the FSPA to allow a reduced lot size for dual occupancies will result in increased housing density, cars, traffic and noise.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
227	Objects	Against the removal of properties from the FSPA. Explains they bought their house as it was located in the FSPA. Explains that the nature of Oatley is that of a garden suburb: larger lot sizes, less dense housing, and gardens and trees. Concerned that an increase in density by reducing lot sizes will negatively impact the scenic quality and value of the area.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
228	Objects	Opposed to the proposed changes to the FSPA. Explains they bought in the area because of its bushland and garden character. Concerned that smaller lot sizes will mean the loss of its character and the loss of trees and green space.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
229	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Objects to the plan to rezone and acquire the six properties at 11-21 Monaro Ave, Kingsgrove, to enable the expansion of Peter Low Reserve. Believes there is no benefit in expanding the Reserve which already occupies a large area of open space and provides a pleasant natural oasis in the middle of a low density residential area. Concerned that opening this space by removing the residences on the eastern boundary, and all the trees in the front and backyards of these properties, would destroy the ambience of this natural oasis and remove bird habitats. Believes we must	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Monaro Avenue, Kingsgrove (adjacent to Peter Low Reserve)		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		maintain the existing habitats for the wide-ranging species of birds.			
230	Objects	Concerned that Oatley has a village atmosphere and this proposal would damage that, and that there is already too much traffic for the amount of parking.	Objects to overdevelopment		
231	Objects	Does not support an increase in density housing in Oatley.	Objects to overdevelopment		
232	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
233	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	<p>Writes in regards to the heritage listing of 85, 87 and 89 The Avenue, Hurstville. Explains that the proposal lists each item as having a 'Local' level of significance. Requests that listing the properties as items of heritage significance within "Schedule 5 - Environmental heritage" be removed for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) Since the change of ownership to the School, the interiors of 87 and 89 The Avenue have been modified to provide ancillary service areas. For the future, the original plan is impractical to adapt to modern teaching facilities.</p> <p>2) The exterior setting and streetscape of the buildings has changed since originally constructed.</p> <p>3) The buildings within The Avenue have transformed in both building types, usages and planning, and includes institutional buildings, businesses, multi residential home units, separate single and two storey contemporary dwellings as well as a remnant of the earlier homes.</p> <p>4) The buildings that were constructed and remain within the current streetscape are now not used as homes, but rather for businesses including child care centres, and legal and accounting practices.</p> <p>5) Buildings designed as a family residence cannot be repurposed for contemporary educational facilities.</p> <p>6) Stewardship and care of the properties streetscape would continue with any future development.</p>	Requests heritage item to be removed		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		<p>7) In the redevelopment, recognition of past uses and history of the land and surrounding area could be integrated into the design. This recognition should include both Indigenous and European inhabitants.</p> <p>8) Recognition of the Indigenous use of the land with the existing buildings remaining in their current form is not achieved.</p> <p>9) A contemporary design could incorporate elements of the existing buildings and the surrounding area to reflect and recognise the history of the area.</p>			
234	Objects	<p>Concerned that the proposal will alter land zoning, dwelling sizes, building heights, heritage listings, landscaping, foreshore protection, endanger the natural landscape and increase runoff into the Georges River. Believes the proposed changes will increase road traffic, create parking issues, result in loss of privacy and place pressure on local services. Notes that the COVID-19 pandemic makes this an undemocratic time for Council to receive submissions as the plans can't be publicly displayed and community forums can't take place.</p>	<p>Objects to overdevelopment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
235	Objects	<p>Against the proposed changes. Concerned that higher density will decrease the balance in the community.</p>	<p>Objects to overdevelopment</p>		
236	Objects	<p>Objects to the the reduction in the FSPA as it will result in overdevelopment, impact on safety due to increased traffic and parking on narrow roads, and impact on the environment.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
237	Objects	<p>Opposed to the proposed FSPA changes in Oatley West. Concerned that their property may be removed from the FSPA. Believes the area has already become crowded and is concerned about further increases in traffic if duplexes are allowed. Concerned that the charming character of the streets will be diminished if duplexes are allowed. Believes privacy will be reduced, overloaded sewerage and stormwater systems will be impacted, the park and river will suffer, and schools will become more crowded. Explains they are close to the foreshore and Oatley National Park and requests that their street and surrounding streets be left in the</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		FSPA.			
238	Objects	Does not support the proposal.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
239	Objects	Does not support the proposal.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
240	Objects	Against the proposed amendments to the LEP. Concerned that adding more duplexes on congested streets will add more problems and believes this will have an adverse effect on the flora and fauna in the area.	Objects to overdevelopment		
241	Objects	Concerned that traffic and parking in parts of their area is already a problem and that it will become more problematic with the proposal. Believes the natural, leafy environment will drastically change and that existing infrastructure will not cope.	Objects to overdevelopment		
242	Objects	Objects to the proposed FSPA changes. Concerned it will ruin the unique environment of Jewfish Point and privacy. Believes the streets are not suitable for increased traffic and loss of trees.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
243	Objects	Does not support the proposed changes.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
244	Objects	Concerned about overdevelopment destroying the local area. Believes it will increase traffic congestion on already crowded	Objects to overdevelopment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		streets, waste/sewer systems cannot accommodate the increased population, and that the local public school is already overcrowded. Believes public transport is already at full capacity with no plan for an increase in off street parking for commuters. Concerned that the reduction in lot size will remove/reduce green space ratio, and increase local temperatures through clearance of trees.			
245	Objects	Objects to increasing the population density of Oatley. Notes that the loss of trees and shade will lead to increased global warming and climate change. Concerned that tree cover is already diminishing. Concerned about the increase in population and dwellings as a result of reduced lot sizes; increased traffic; impact on wildlife, plant biodiversity, water quality, and peace and quiet.	Objects to overdevelopment		
246	Objects	Objects to the changes to the FSPA in Oatley due to loss of character and impacts on flora and fauna.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
247	Objects	Objects to the changes to the FSPA in Oatley due to: loss of trees, change in the outlook of the suburb, increase in density, increase in traffic, increased impact on existing infrastructure, and poor community consultation process. Suggests consultation should include counsellors attending town halls and talking to the community, and using online medium for consultation purposes.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
248	Objects	Requests that reference be made to their letter previously sent to Council regarding their objection.			
249	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Raises concerns in relation to the rezoning of places of public worship from SP2 to R2. Concerned this will impact future maintenance, development or improvements to properties owned by churches in Beverly Hills and Kingsgrove.	Objects to the prohibition of places of public worship in the R2 zone		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
250	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	<p>Refers to 2-24 Princes Highway, Kogarah - Considers that the site has potential to provide accommodation for people receiving treatment and their families and international visitors, as well as medical professionals, through the provision of serviced apartments. Considers that Council should begin a review of the existing development controls sooner than Stage 3 of the LEP and undertake a staged approach to uplift, particularly for priority sites which are able to provide a diversity of housing sooner. No issues with the proposed changes to permissibility proposed in the B4 zone. Considers that as part of Stage 2 of the LEP, the height and FSR controls which currently apply to the site be reviewed.</p> <p>Provides a table that demonstrates that all B4 zones are subject to higher FSR controls than the 2:1 FSR control that currently exists on the site. Explains that height controls vary across the B4 zones from 12m to 39m in Kogarah and 15m to 60m in Hurstville, and that these maximum height controls are substantially greater than the 21m height control that applies to the site. Considers that increased height and FSR controls for the site would be in keeping with those in place for other B4 Mixed Use areas within Hurstville and Kogarah. Believes an uplift in the height and FSR controls could result in the provision of up to 70 additional units of new, affordable housing for professional and key workers. Considers that additional housing variety is required sooner rather than later and that certain sites should be identified by Council to provide a diversity of housing in the short term. Considers that housing should be close to amenities, services, support networks and public transport when located within centres and believes the site offers an ideal opportunity for higher density development within a centre.</p> <p>Believes the site offers an ideal opportunity to provide a variety of higher density housing, catering for the health and education precinct and the Kogarah Strategic Centre. Submission encourages a review of the planning controls. Aim of this submission is to ensure that urban regeneration within Kogarah is actively encouraged and a diversity of housing is established for the LGA. Submission attaches 7 submissions from members of the community who are in support of this submission.</p>	Requests rezoning/uplift in commercial centres		
251	Objects	<p>Objects to the changes to Peakhurst Heights. Purchased in the area because it is quiet and tree lined. Concerned that an increase in dwelling density with dual occupancies (duplexes), high density development and multi-use developments will further increase traffic and congestion on narrow and winding roads. Concerned that multi-use developments will impact the local character and put</p>	Objects to overdevelopment		



No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		increased pressure on water and sewerage.			
252	Objects	Does not support the proposed changes, particularly the rezoning to remove a large section of Peakhurst Heights and Lugarno from the FSPA. Explains they chose to live in Peakhurst Heights as it is a semi-bushland area, has low-density housing, provides an excellent lifestyle and an oasis from higher density living. Explains that the suburb has an abundance of bird life and native wildlife. Concerned that higher density housing will result in a considerable loss of trees. Believes there is no need to increase the volume of affordable housing in NSW as house prices are expected to fall as a result of COVID-19 and rental vacancies are at the highest level in four years. Believes that duplexes and other medium density housing are not good for the environment, native animals and bird life, and existing residents.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
253	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes due to: - Increase in density from multi- housing development and population resulting in additional vehicles and emissions, parking, water usage and drainage and overload with electricity. -Loss of property value.	Objects to overdevelopment		
254	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA, particularly the proposed removal of a large number of properties, for the following reasons:-Proposal has been put together without regard for the negative impact on roads, parking, schools, sewerage and water, tree cover, animal habitats and scenic beauty. -Proposal is at odds with the need for more green, open spaces. -Council housing targets have already been achieved. -Harmonisation of the former Kogarah and Hurstville areas should not remove the good features of the existing FSPA in the old Hurstville Council area. The same level of wider FSPA should be provided to the former Kogarah Council area, as well as be maintained in the Hurstville Council area. The proposed FSPA shouldn't just cover immediate waterfront properties. -Other areas such as Narwee and Riverwood should benefit from modern urban renewal. -Loss of tree canopy and loss of leafy character. -Increased traffic congestion and shortage of parking. - Increased pressure on infrastructure such as trains, schools, sewage and stormwater. -Reduction of the soft landscaping requirement is too low to allow for any meaningful gardens. The proposed building lot reduction for duplexes would result in the loss of mature trees, tree canopy, bird and wildlife habitat, and an ability for urban cooling. -Insufficient biodiversity reports done to measure the true impact of this proposed change. - The potential benefits appear confined to developers and real estate agents. -Concerned that the proposal is being finalised	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		during COVID.			
255	Supports	Concerned with the contradictory statements of the proposal with regards to Council's actions. Noted that within the section titled Environment and open space, 'Green and open spaces are highly valued and should be protected and enhanced, with no loss of existing infrastructure'. Does not believe this statement is consistent with the recent events surrounding Carss Park War Memorial Pool. Questions how the cost-benefit ratio of destroying Carss Park Pool and Todd Park to construct a newer facility is greater than the cost-benefit ratio of using the existing infrastructure to renew the pool and ensure more environmentally friendly infrastructure. Believes the proposal of removing Carss Park Pool and constructing a 'regional aquatic facility' at Todd Park contradicts the key issues within 'Land use'. Believes a regional aquatic facility will further exacerbate existing traffic conditions on the Princes Highway and will not protect the 'amenity and character of low density residential areas from increased traffic and noise impacts'. Believes the statement 'Maintaining the character of the existing suburbs, particularly trees and green open space and walkability is important' raises opposition to the proposed plans. Believes constructing a pool at Todd Park does not preserve the existing green open space but rather eliminates it from the community.	Not related to the LEP		
256	Objects	Opposed to the proposed changes due to: -Increase in dwelling density and loss of green space which will adversely affect the local character. -Council has already allowed high density development in Hurstville and Kogarah and requests not to do the same to surrounding suburbs.	Objects to overdevelopment		
257	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley, Mortdale Heights, Lugarno, Riverwood and Peakhurst Heights due to material shift in the type of architecture, overdevelopment of lot sizes, increased privacy issues, loss of green space and leafy character of streets, increased traffic and stormwater/sewage congestion, damage to the foreshore flora and fauna, restricted use of various reserves in Oatley like Gungah Bay Reserve, and loss in property value.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
258	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Suggests all DAs approved should ensure that there is minimal increase in road traffic and restricted roof line heights along ridge lines to avoid dominating the landscape with roofing material.	Requests for better designed developments		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
259	Objects	Objects to the removal of properties from the FSPA in Oatley due to increase in dwelling density resulting from reduced lot sizes, privacy issues and overshadowing between properties, and loss of green space and decent backyards for children to enjoy.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
260	Supports	Supports that there is no change to R2 zones and supports the upzoning of areas from R2 to R3 and R2 to R4.		Supports the upzoning of the housing investigation areas.	The draft LEP proposes to upzone 5 Housing Investigation Areas. The rezoning creates the opportunity to deliver an additional 650 dwellings in the form of medium density and high density dwellings in accessible locations across the LGA, assisting Council in meeting the housing needs of the community with additional dwellings and greater housing choice.
261	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
262	Objects	Opposed to the draft LEP 2020.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
263	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Writes on behalf of St Marks Anglican Church South Hurstville that there are two issues they expect Council to adopt if the proposal is approved. 1) Church occupies 8-10 The Mall, South Hurstville which is proposed to be rezoned to R4 High Density Residential. They do not object to the zoning but expect Council to levy the rates for this property based on its existing use as Special Purposes Churches and not on the higher land value of R4 High Density Residential. 2) With the area bounded by King Georges Road, Connells Point	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones	Requests Council levy the rates for their property based on its existing use as SP2 Church rather than the higher land value of R4 the site is being rezoned to.	Council rates are not a matter for the draft LEP.

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		Road, The Esplanade and Tavistock Road being proposed as R4 High Density Residential, Council should recognise that The Mall which passes through the centre of this proposed precinct is narrow and already accommodates high traffic use and excessive parking issues. There is South Hurstville RSL, two preschools, the church and community hall, and Mary Andrews Village. Should the proposal be approved, Council needs to address the parking issues and create rear to kerb angle parking on the eastern side of The Mall between Connells Point Road and Tavistock Road, and change the traffic in The Mall to one-way traffic, if necessary.			
264	Supports	Supports the current zoning and the proposed zoning to stay at R2 Low Density Residential.	Supports draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
265	Objects	Opposed to the proposed changes. Believes the information sheets are misleading. Concerned that there will be a loss of habitat for a variety of fauna, as well as increased traffic in streets not designed for heavier traffic.	Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Objects to overdevelopment		
266	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to remove their property and their neighbour's from the FSPA due to: -increase in dwelling density will increase traffic and parking congestion, and result in added pressure to recreational spaces; reduction of the landscaping requirement; loss of neighbourhood leafiness and shady trees; and privacy. -Concerned that these proposed changes will result in detrimental impacts on tree canopy, biodiversity values, scenic views, and stormwater runoff and pollution. Suggests more 'real' green space is needed.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
267	Objects	Objects to the proposal due to the following concerns: - The removal of properties from the FSPA would lead to an increase in built and population density, without a concurrent increase in infrastructure such as sewerage, water supply, drainage, street parking and business area parking. This would lead to overcrowding of parks/recreational spaces, increased local traffic, increased parking congestion and further overcrowding of public transport, and loss of privacy. -Negative impacts on the environment and biodiversity.-Reduces the leafiness and shadiness of the suburb. The loss of existing large native trees and loss of	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		space in which to plant large shade trees results in increases in summer temperatures resulting in less biological diversity and poorer ecological function. -Negative impacts on water quality in the Georges River. - Denser urban development with less soft landscaping means more hard surfaces, which leads to reduced absorptive capacity for runoff and more polluted urban runoff entering the waterways. -Negative impacts on the amenity of the foreshore area.			
268	Objects	Opposed to the proposed changes to the FSPA. Concerned that the natural environment will diminish.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
269	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes due to: increased density and population, busy streets and congestion; and ugly homes.	Objects to overdevelopment		
270	Objects	<p>Believes some aspects of the proposal are not harmonious and will not necessarily result in equity and consistency. Does not believe the two former areas should become homogeneous. Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA and the removal of properties in the former Hurstville LGA for a number of reasons:</p> <p>1) Scenic degradation. Recommends that instead of downgrading the FSPA in the former Hurstville LGA, the proposed FSPA in the former Kogarah LGA should be expanded to include vegetated and scenic areas behind the immediate foreshore strip, protecting those scenic values that still remain.</p> <p>2) Denser housing. Increased housing density will be accompanied by an increase in vehicles, leading to more traffic congestion and more competition for parking. Dual occupancy will result in two driveways, leaving little space for street trees, and increasing potential for damage to existing trees. Denser housing will mean a larger population which has less open space for outdoor recreation. Increased traffic and reduced open space will lead to more accidents. Denser housing will mean more pressure on sewerage systems that can't cope with the existing population, more hard surfaces that will increase stormwater runoff, and increased pollution of waterways.</p> <p>3) Loss of habitat: A reduction in the landscaping requirement,</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the Foreshore Scenic Protection Area – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment or no reason provided</p>		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		compounded by smaller lot sizes, will result in less space for sustainable gardens and fewer trees and shrubs. The remaining bushland along the Georges River provides a green corridor for fauna and flora which need continuity of vegetation for protection, food and reproduction. Concerned about the loss of mature trees that many local mammals and birds require for homes. The best tree canopies visible from the river are on blocks behind the immediate foreshore, on ridge tops that the proposal will remove from the FSPA.			
271	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Two properties in Hillcrest Avenue support the proposed changes to upzone from R2 to R4. Concerned about building heights. Due to the close proximity to Hurstville business centre, shopping and transport, they suggest that the heights be reviewed and looked further than the next 20 years as we need to be ready to accommodate a growing population.	Supports the Hillcrest Avenue – Hurstville HIA		
272	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA. Believes a reduction of the foreshore protection will increase density at the expense of the environment. Believes increased development will increase traffic and strain on existing services, and endanger children and the elderly. Concerned that the proposed changes will permanently change the safe, quiet, leafy character of the community, which will lead to a drop in property values.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
273	Objects	Explains that areas of Peakhurst were rezoned to R3 'Medium Density' in the previous LEP with the understanding that this encouraged 'mixed development'. Concerned that the proposal now seeks to rezone the area to R4 which takes away all options for 'mixed development' and corners any future development to 'apartments' only. Concerned for residents who still live on a single block as this decision could allow other single blocks to be overdeveloped into an apartment building.	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones		
274	Objects	Concerned that overcrowding of their leafy suburb will result from higher density. Concerned that the proposal encourages subdivision and more buildings.	Objects to overdevelopment		
275	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Supports some changes, but believes there should be no reduction in the FSPA. They also believe there are some Federation Houses in Culwulla Street, South Hurstville which should be protected and exempted from the rezoning.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA  – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
			<p>– no reason provided Objects to the Culwulla Street –South Hurstville HIA</p>		
276	Objects	<p>R2 zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 500 sqm minimum subdivision lot size in the R2 zone is an appropriate compromise.</li> <li>• Requests increasing the minimum subdivision lot size for dual occupancies.</li> <li>• Requests increasing the landscaping requirement by 5% for each type of block.</li> <li>• There should also be a much tighter definition of what is landscaping.</li> </ul> <p>R3 zone</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A 900sqm minimum subdivision lot size in the R3 zone is an appropriate compromise.</li> <li>• Disagrees with the 18m lot width control for multi dwelling housing.</li> </ul> <p>Hierarchy of residential zones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with the proposal to remove apartments from the R3 zone and place them in the R4 zone but these apartments should not be greater than 12m.</li> <li>• Supports the introduction of a R5 zone for apartments greater than 12m adjacent to the B2 areas in proximity to transport hubs.</li> </ul> <p>Restaurants, cafes and small bars</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Restaurants, cafes and small bars should be in the proposed B2 zone only.</li> </ul> <p>Business Zones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The maximum height limits for the B1 and B2 zones need to be incorporated into this plan.</li> <li>• There needs to be an additional business zone between B1 and B2 into which the Oatley West (Mulga Road) and similar sized neighbourhood centres are placed.</li> </ul> <p>FSPA</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agrees with the expansion of the FSPA into the old Kogarah LGA.</li> <li>• Objects to the number of lots being removed from the FSPA which will lead to an increase in dual occupancy developments.</li> </ul> <p>Existing road infrastructure cannot support the current motor car density and will not support the inevitable increase in traffic, parking and other infrastructure services required by the larger population. Parking in the narrow streets of Lugarno is already an issue with many residents parking in the street and this will be exacerbated.</p>	<p>Objects to overdevelopment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Requests amendments to the minimum lot size for dual occupancies Requests increasing the landscaping requirements Objects to the permissibility of restaurants, cafes and small bars in the R4 zone Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests for better designed developments</p>	<p>1. A minimum subdivision lot size of 500 sqm in the R2 zone and 900sqm in the R3 zone is an appropriate compromise. Disagrees with the 18m lot width control for multi dwelling housing.</p> <p>2. There should also be a much tighter definition of what is landscaping.</p> <p>3. Agrees with the proposal to remove apartments from the R3 zone and place them in the R4 zone but these apartments should not be greater than 12m. Supports the introduction of a R5 zone for apartments greater than 12m adjacent to the B2 areas in proximity to transport hubs.</p> <p>There needs to be an additional business zone between B1 and B2 into which the Oatley West (Mulga Road) and similar sized neighbourhood centres are placed.</p> <p>4. The maximum height limits for the B1 and B2 zones need to be incorporated into this plan.</p> <p>5. Agrees with the proposal to increase heights within the industrial zone but does not accept that the proposed zoning will address this issue satisfactorily.</p>	<p>1. The draft LEP proposes a 450sqm minimum subdivision lot size in the R2 zone (as per the Hurstville LEP 2012). Properties in the R2 zone in the former Kogarah LGA will have their minimum subdivision lot size reduced from 550sqm, resulting in approximately 598 lots in the former Kogarah LGA gaining development potential to subdivide.</p> <p>The 450sqm minimum subdivision lot size in the R2 zone has been adopted to ensure that no lot, irrespective of lot size will lose development potential due to the harmonisation of the LEPs.</p> <p>The draft LEP proposes to adopt the existing Kogarah LEP minimum lot size for multi dwelling housing as there has been no recorded Clause 4.6 variation to this development standard since Council's amalgamation which demonstrates the viability and feasibility of this requirement. Built form testing prepared for Council, comparing the potential outcome of adopting the 800sqm minimum lot size together with the minimum lot width of 18m shows that multi dwelling housing can be adequately accommodated on such lots.</p> <p>2. "Landscaped area" is a mandated definition in the Standard Instrument LEP.</p>

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		<p>• The proposal is inconsistent with Section C – Environmental, social and economic impact because the increased density in those areas of Lugarno, Peakhurst and West Oatley will, over time, adversely affect critical habitat, threatened species, populations or ecological communities or their habitats. The most significant and sensitive environmental assets in the Georges River LGA, including Myles Dunphy Reserve, Oatley Park and the Lime Kiln Bay wetlands will be impacted.</p> <p>Employment</p> <p>• Agrees with the proposal to increase heights within the industrial zone but does not accept that the proposed zoning will address this issue satisfactorily. Provides examples of the inability of commercial development to be viable in the LGA.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>• Planning proposal does not address the question of whether there is adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal. However, this is not the sole responsibility of Council. Trains are already at capacity in peak hours and major roads also have significant capacity bottlenecks. The proposed changes in this LEP will lead to more local traffic, more parking issues in all streets, further extensions to the definition of peak hour, more overcrowding on trains and eventually a lower quality of life.</p> <p>Infrastructure</p> <p>• No concrete evidence that any additional infrastructure needed will actually precede the increased housing density in the LGA. In the case of additional schools there is no additional land on which to build another school.</p> <p>Design Excellence</p> <p>• The process of achieving design excellence needs a lot of improvement and governance to be achieved. Councils do not appear to be adequately funded to enforce the standards, nor to litigate when needed.</p> <p>Believes that Council needs to reject this proposal and seek approval from the State to revamp this proposal to better address the deficiencies identified.</p>		<p>6. No concrete evidence that any additional infrastructure needed will actually precede the increased housing density in the LGA (eg. schools).</p>	<p>3. The draft LEP can only adopt land use zones specified in the Standard Instrument LEP. The R4 zone is the highest density residential zone in the Standard Instrument LEP. There is no zone between the B1 and B2 zone.</p> <p>4. The roles and functions of all 48 commercial centres, including centre-specific objectives, built form controls and guidelines and the investigation of the potential expansion of appropriate centres will be conducted in Part 2 of the Commercial Centres Strategy to inform the future LEP 2022 (Jobs and Activation).</p> <p>5. The draft LEP seeks to increase the maximum building height for the IN2 Light Industrial zone to improve development viability and encourage industrial development. The proposed controls provide for a flexibility of uses to assist in attracting investment and redevelopment of industrial lands. In addition, the increase in height controls will promote increased industrial floor space as the current FSR of 1:1 cannot be fully achieved within the existing height limit of 10m.</p> <p>The draft LEP also seeks to increase minimum subdivision lot sizes to prevent the fragmentation of industrial land and retain large lot sizes to provide employment opportunities and allow the operation of a diverse range of industrial uses, such as warehousing which requires large floor plates.</p> <p>It is also proposed to permit creative</p>



No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
					and innovative industries, food and drink premises, and restaurants and cafes within the IN2 zone to provide flexibility within the zone, promote job creation and to meet the needs of those who work within or visit the industrial precincts.  6. Any future developments will be subject to an assessment process at the DA stage to ensure adequate infrastructure is available to accommodate the anticipated growth in population.
277	Objects	Does not want to see an increase in occupancy density or decreased lot sizes allowing for overdevelopment in the foreshore areas of Oatley.	Objects to overdevelopment		
278	Objects	Objects to the proposed zoning changes of the R3 areas to R4. Concerned that an increase in density will adversely affect the LGA's character, increase congestion and decrease landscaping/green space. Does not believe that the allocation of R4 dwelling areas will have adequate services, parking and green space. Believes R4 must have a maximum height included in the proposal.	Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones		
279	Objects	Opposes the reduction in the FSPA. Concerned that the areas proposed to be removed could see a reduction in urban bushland over time. Explains that the natural environment in Lugarno is not only visible in parks and reserves but also in backyards and local streets. Would like the natural environment to be a key consideration in development and decision making.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
280	Objects	Objects to their property being removed from the FSPA. Feels that there is already an overdevelopment of land within the area. Explains that Oatley is a leafy suburb but in some areas this character is already being traded for larger dwellings, swimming pools and impervious surfaces, such as driveways and paved areas, that leave very little deep soil areas which are necessary to absorb rainwater and support the growth of medium to large canopy trees. Explains that trees and gardens are some of the area's most important assets as they provide habitats for plants	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		and wildlife. Concerned that removing properties from the FSPA will lead to increased hard surfaces, promoting increased runoff of polluted water into the Georges River. Concerned this proposed change will lead to increased road traffic and create further parking issues. Believes Council should be promoting more trees, improving native vegetation and habitats, and enhancing existing values of the foreshore. Requests that the process cease under the current COVID-19 circumstances.			
281	Objects	Concerned that the proposal removes churches from the list of permissible uses in R2 zones and believes this will make it more difficult to operate churches. Believes places of public worship belong in residential zones, and does not see any reason to remove them from residential areas.	Objects to the prohibition of places of public worship in the R2 zone		
282	Supports	No reason for supporting was given.	Supports draft LEP – no reason provided		
283	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	<p>Has several objections to the proposed LEP. Believes the draft LEP proposes methods that will incur drastic reductions to biomass in Oatley. Not opposed to changes in minimum lot sizes. Accepts the increased density in Oatley shops as this is a sustainable development also facilitating higher density living. Questions why the proposal will exclude residential dwellings in Oatley West, Peakhurst and Mortdale Heights from the FSPA. Opposes the proposed changes to required green space in the areas that will be removed from the FSPA for the following reasons:</p> <p>1) Oatley is a green suburb with parks, wetlands and green corridors, however in recent years greenery has been removed.  2) The immediate foreshore zones are not the only ecologically sensitive zones and the proposal neglects the importance of all wildlife and habitat corridors. Many species use the greenspace within lots to travel. By altering the areas which are to be excluded from the FSPA, this will be detriment to wildlife habitats and corridors. The subsequent reduction in biomass will have a significant impact on carbon sequestration and have carryon effects to local thermal comfort along with larger impacts towards global warming.  3) All of the areas which are proposed to be excluded are catchment areas for Lime Kiln Bay and the Georges River.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment  Objects to the removal of properties in the Foreshore Scenic Protection Area – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment or no reason provided</p>	<p>1. Concerned that developments aren't required to exceed the minimum standards outlined by the Building Council of Australia, and only to the minimum NatHERS and BASIX ratings. Believes stricter measures beyond the minimum standards should be put in place.  2. Believes many buildings in Oatley West with local history have been demolished for cheap new-build designs. Would like to see more initiative into identifying and protecting buildings that contain local history.</p>	<p>1. Council supports initiatives to promote quality design and environmental sustainability.   A new local provision has been proposed in the draft LEP - Clause 6.12 Environmental sustainability in certain business, industrial and residential zones. This provision seeks to ensure that all development with a gross floor area of 1,500sqm or greater in industrial, business and high density residential zones embrace the best practice principles of environmentally sustainable development. This provision will require that development applications consider the principles of best practice environmentally sensitive design including water efficiency, energy demand reduction, urban heat island effect, indoor environmental quality, reducing new material</p>

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		<p>Questions whether the new proposed FSPA zones account for the runoff effects that contribute to thermal pollution in Lime Kiln Bay. Explains that by decreasing the required greenspace by 5%, there will be a substantial increase in thermal pollution. Opposed to a decrease in greenspace as it will increase the urban heat island effect shown to have negative effects on human health.</p> <p>Explains that the LEP states “Encourage well designed and environmentally sustainable buildings”, and in the existing DCP, Section 4.1. a “creation of high quality built form”, however buildings aren’t required to be anything more than the minimum standards outlined by the Building Council of Australia, and only to the minimum NatHERS and BASIX ratings. Believes stricter measures beyond the minimum standards should be put in place. Explains that the fact sheet states the objective: “Identify, conserve and enhance local heritage”, however believes many buildings in Oatley West with local history have been demolished for cheap new-build designs. Would like to see more initiative into identifying and protecting buildings that contain local history.</p> <p>Concerned about a decrease in property value as a result of a decrease in required greenspace for smaller properties proposed to be excluded from the FSPA. Explains that studies show a reduction in biomass can have a negative effect on property value.</p>			<p>consumption and use of sustainable materials, and transport initiatives.</p> <p>Additional planning provisions that promote quality design and environmental sustainability are being considered for inclusion in Council Development Control Plan 2020 which will accompany the draft LEP with more detailed planning controls.</p> <p>2. Additional heritage items for listing can be investigated in a future heritage review.</p>
284	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The maps supplied are misleading. On closer inspection, the proposed new FSPA only includes lots which directly back onto the river.</li> <li>2) The existing FSPA includes all areas from the waterline to the ridge. All water flows to the river and, by retaining all properties to the ridgeline, will ensure the quality of the Georges River remains healthy.</li> <li>3) When on the river, the existing FSPA includes all areas from the waterline to the ridge. It is important to include all of this area for the visual aspect.</li> <li>4) The proposal neglects the importance of all wildlife and habitat corridors. Many species use the greenspace within dwellings to travel.</li> <li>5) Many species of fauna need a corridor greater than 20m to migrate through, with a buffer zone of 20m on either side.</li> </ol> <p>Believes the language used in the proposal is very subjective. Explains that the proposal states, “Encourage well designed and environmentally sustainable buildings”, and in the existing DCP, Section 4.1 a “creation of high quality built form”, however believes</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Concerned that developments aren’t required to exceed the minimum standards outlined by the Building Council of Australia, and only to the minimum NatHERS and BASIX ratings. Believes stricter measures beyond the minimum standards should be put in place.</li> <li>2. Questions Council’s consideration of the following in regards to decreasing lot size and reducing landscaping requirements: thermal pollution and heat island effects, stormwater runoff, loss of mature tree canopy, increasing fines for removing mature/significant trees, and Council plans for maintaining the flow of traffic in the suburban streets.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Council supports initiatives to promote quality design and environmental sustainability.</li> </ol> <p>A new local provision has been proposed in the draft LEP - Clause 6.12 Environmental sustainability in certain business, industrial and residential zones. This provision seeks to ensure that all development with a gross floor area of 1,500sqm or greater in industrial, business and high density residential zones embrace the best practice principles of environmentally sustainable development. This provision will require that development applications consider the principles of best practice environmentally sensitive design including water efficiency, energy demand reduction, urban heat</p>

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		<p>buildings don't require anything more than the minimum standards outlined by the Building Council of Australia, and to minimum NatHERS and BASIX ratings. Believes stricter measures beyond the minimum standards should be put in place.</p> <p>Provides the following comments in regards to decreasing lot size and reducing landscaping requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Thermal pollution and Heat Island Effects. Questions how this has been considered.</li> <li>2) Evidence of thermal pollution. Lives in a house designed to heat and cool passively. Neighbours have 2 x 2 story black houses and the radiant heat, along with the continuous air conditioners, has raised the temperature of their home to a point where it has now become impossible to passively cool it.</li> <li>3) Stormwater runoff. Questions how this is being monitored. The increased footprint of built environment on each new property is putting pressure on the stormwater system in the area.</li> <li>4) Loss of mature tree canopy. Questions how this has been considered. Trees shade the road and shade houses which helps keep the summer temperature moderated within an area. It reduces the demand for air conditioners which create thermal pollution.</li> <li>5) Increase fines for removing mature/significant trees. The fines are much too low.</li> <li>6) Parking (Resident Cars). Questions what plans Council has in place for maintaining the flow of traffic in the suburban streets.</li> </ol> <p>Objects to the way Council has put this proposal together without any community consultation due to COVID-19. Would like to see a more proactive approach for community consultation.</p>			<p>island effect, indoor environmental quality, reducing new material consumption and use of sustainable materials, and transport initiatives.</p> <p>Additional planning provisions that promote quality design and environmental sustainability are being considered for inclusion in Council Development Control Plan 2020 which will accompany the draft LEP with more detailed planning controls.</p> <p>2. The draft LEP introduces minimum landscaped area requirements which provide greater legal weight to ensure the protection of local landscape character, the provision of sufficient tree canopy cover, building separation and deep soil to enable water infiltration to lessen the extent of urban runoff. The landscaped area requirement was placed in the draft LEP in response to feedback received from the community during the LSPS consultations to protect the leafy character of our suburbs.</p> <p>In response to submissions, to enhance the protection of the existing tree canopy and the landscaped characteristics of the LGA, it is recommended to the Local Planning Panel that the following amendments be made to the Planning Proposal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Zone objectives of the R2 and R3 zones include a standalone objective that will emphasise the importance of housing in a landscaped setting as a desirable characteristic:</li> <li>- The minimum landscaped area requirement for dual occupancy developments be increased.</li> <li>- A new local provision Clause 6.19</li> </ul>

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
					<p>Tree protection and landscaping in zones R2 and R3 be introduced.</p> <p>The Planning Proposal for the draft LEP has been prepared in accordance with a number of overarching principles, including achieving equity across the LGA through the harmonisation process, particularly in respect to development potential; and retaining existing controls where the status quo can be maintained.</p> <p>The key changes to the principal development standards and their detailed justification is provided in Appendix 3 of the Planning Proposal report for the draft LEP.</p>
285	Objects	<p>Notes that during the Q&amp;A webinar, one of the residents mentioned that the housing quota for their area had been met. Believes that no rezoning and further development should occur if this is the case. Provides the following comments in regards to the proposed rezoning of Culwulla Street:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) King Georges Road is known to be one of the busiest roads in Sydney.</li> <li>2) Due to the heavy traffic on King Georges, there are clearways to help traffic flow which impact negatively on the shops and restaurants.</li> <li>3) The current traffic congestion in and around Culwulla Street cannot absorb an increase in the number of cars. Culwulla Street is becoming a thoroughfare between King Georges Road and Woniora Road.</li> <li>4) There's already R4 apartment blocks near the corner of King Georges and Connells Point Road, and another R4 apartment block being built on Connells Point Road near the South Hurstville Post Office. Woniora Road already experiences traffic because Connells Point Road is congested and this will get worse when the current building is finished and occupied.</li> <li>5) A school on Greenacre Road, currently being built, will impact traffic congestion on King Georges Road.</li> <li>6) Increasing dwellings will make traffic issues worse as people commute, shop and socialise locally.</li> <li>7) Commute to work is taking longer.</li> </ol>	<p>Objects to the Culwulla Street –South Hurstville HIA</p> <p>Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Culwulla Street, South Hurstville</p>		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		<p>8) Parking on Culwulla Street is already an issue and will only get worse.</p> <p>9) Increasing the number of dwellings will negatively impact the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Raises the following concerns:</p> <p>1) Traffic Impact Study: Timing of a traffic impact study is critical and should be conducted repeatedly. Finds it hard to believe that the Study suggested more traffic could be absorbed.</p> <p>2) Green Space: Providing green space, as a result of forced acquisition, is unacceptable. The cost involved in acquiring these properties and creating a green space would be in excess of \$20 million. There are a number of green spaces in and around Culwulla Street. Quality of life and quiet streets are more important.</p> <p>3) 7 Storey Apartment Block: Has been made aware of the possibility of a 7-storey apartment block at the King Georges Road end of Culwulla Street. Questions why this was not publicly discussed. This would have a catastrophic impact on the street, neighbouring streets, traffic congestion, commute times, local shopping etc.</p>			
286	Objects	Comments that Lugarno is known for its leafy, green and peaceful suburb, and that shouldn't be destroyed.	Objects to overdevelopment		
287	Objects	Does not agree with Jubilee becoming a regional sporting hub or entertainment area. Believes it should be used for pop up events only. Concerned that changing/building on this area will have a huge impact on the already congested traffic. Explains that traffic is congested, school traffic is terrible, there is limited parking, and there is pollution. Suggests that more green space is needed.	Objects to permitting entertainment facilities at Netstrata Jubilee Stadium Precinct		
288	Objects	Opposed to the proposed changes to remove properties in Oatley West from the FSPA. Believes the impacts will undermine quality of life and the natural beauty of the area. Believes negative effects will include increased density, smaller block sizes, increased traffic, loss of leafy character and increased pressure on infrastructure.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
289	Objects	Sees no benefit to removing the FSPA zoning for current residents	Objects to the removal of properties in		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		or the environment. Concerned that old trees that add character and reduce heat will be lost. Explains that delineation is obvious when looking at the FSPA compared with other parts of the area - less greenery and more hard surfaces which equates to more runoff into waterways and areas that the FSPA aims to protect.	the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
290	Objects	Explains they would live opposite an area that would potentially have increased development. Explains that the street currently has a high amount of traffic for a cul-de-sac. Concerned that this, combined with children riding bikes and playing, creates a dangerous situation. Concerned as to how public transport will cope. Explains that their son attends a high school in Oatley and there is no dedicated school bus 2 days per week, which means it takes more than one and a half hours to travel home from Oatley to Lugarno. Concerned that this would be even worse with more students travelling home. Believes increasing density will have a negative impact on wildlife as they will lose habitat. Concerned that the views of the river from their house will be impacted and that their property value and space will be negatively impacted by development.	Objects to overdevelopment		
291	Objects	Explains that they love Oatley's leafy surrounds, feeling of space and quiet streets. Concerned that increasing land occupancy would diminish this.	Objects to overdevelopment		
292	Objects	Lives in Culwulla Street and is opposed to their property being rezoned RE1 and subject to acquisition. Explains that they made an LSPS submission to support the rezoning of their property from R2 to R3, and received a letter from Council stating the outcome of the LSPS was that their property would be rezoned R2 to R3. Explains that their neighbour is not opposed to an acquisition, and suggests that Council rezones their neighbour's property and create a passageway through to Joffre Street RE1, providing better access to South Hurstville facilities while still maximising the number of dwellings.	Objects to the proposed open space acquisition at Culwulla Street, South Hurstville		
293	Objects	Concerned about an increase in population density, and notes that there is little off street parking for new dwellings.	Objects to overdevelopment		
294	Objects	Objects to the removal of the FSPA coverage from lots in Oatley for the following reasons:	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		<p>1) Incorrect categorisation of the typological character of some areas of Oatley West: In the 'Foreshore Scenic Directions Paper' most of Oatley West is categorised as 'Garden Suburban'. This is incorrect as the character of the suburb's area varies considerably. A large part of the area which is currently included in the FSPA coverage has a very different character that is more suited to the definition of the 'Bush Suburban' than those parts of the suburb which are outside the FSPA area and fit better to the 'Garden Suburban' definition. Council should define the areas that are included in the current FSPA as 'Bush Suburban'.</p> <p>2) A removal of the FSPA status without prior assessment of biodiversity poses a high risk that the existing ecosystem is negatively impacted. Council should delay any decisions until the impact on biodiversity has been assessed.</p> <p>3) Oatley West is a leafy, family friendly suburb with mainly lower density developments and lots of green space. There is a high risk that the removal of the FSPA status from lots in Oatley West will impact the suburb's character and threaten biodiversity. The difference in character can be seen when comparing areas within the current FSPA and other parts which are not covered by the FSPA as those ones have less tree cover and are more densely populated. A removal of the FSPA coverage will allow for a higher building density due to possible subdivisions and a smaller ratio of the required landscaped area. Subdivisions will make those properties more attractive to developers and the competition from developers is likely to reduce the housing affordability in the area.</p> <p>4) Interacting online or by phone cuts out a portion of the population that will be affected by the proposed changes, especially older and less computer literate members. Requests that Council delay any further progress until a comprehensive community consultation can be conducted.</p>	<p>environment  Objects to the removal of properties in the Foreshore Scenic Protection Area – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment or no reason provided  Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
295	Objects	Concerned that many bush tree animals and insects have already been lost due to natural occurrences, and does not want any further bushland removed and replaced with cars, pollution and rubbish.	Objects to overdevelopment		
296	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		



No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
297	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Concerned that if properties are removed from the FSPA, subdivision may occur which will increase traffic. Notes that traffic flow and parking has increased in Robyn Street and Vale Lane due to restricted access to the Boatwright Avenue carpark whilst the pond and board walk works continue. Submits that Robyn Street and Vale Lane be left in the FSPA as a way of mitigating any issues with increased traffic and parking.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
298	Objects	Explains that Oatley and surrounds have a unique suburb biodiversity and concerned that the proposal will affect this.	Objects to overdevelopment		
299	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
300	Objects	Concerned that the foreshore around Oatley is now less protected and future development will result in traffic issues with inadequate services to support the development.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
301	Objects	Concerned that the proposal to reduce lot sizes from the FSPA will result in the removal of trees. Concerned that, even when protection orders have been placed on trees during construction, the owners appeal to Council for removal. Believes all houses now take up the maximum area on a lot and there is no room to accommodate large trees. Concerned that making lot sizes smaller will result in the destruction of the leafy, green area of Oatley.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
302	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Opposed to the removal of properties from the FSPA as the river is extremely fragile and needs to be protected by: 1) Ensuring no loss of trees by the foreshore. 2) Supporting the endangered birds. 3) Spending resources to upgrade the treatment and disposal of waste water. The density near the foreshore should not be increased until the sewerage capacity and the capacity of the	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		<p>current infrastructure to treat the waste from their house is adequate.</p> <p>4) Infrastructure does not support increased density in the area - there is traffic congestion, and schools are already at capacity.</p> <p>Requests that any changes not be approved until there is evidence to show that the aquatic life, birds and wildlife will not be adversely affected and that infrastructure is in place to adequately cope with an increase in population.</p>			
303	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed amendments to the FSPA as it will increase built areas and other hard surfaces, and decrease soft landscaping and tree cover. Believes this will change the current leafy outlook of the suburb.</p> <p>Concerned that smaller lot sizes will mean a decrease in garden area, the loss of neighbourhood leafiness and the loss of tree canopy. Explains that loss of tree canopy and reduction in soft landscaping will have negative consequences for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The amelioration of stormwater impact from urban runoff resulting in increased siltation of the Georges river.</li> <li>2) Greater heat output from the increase in hard surfaces exacerbated by a reduction in the cooling effect afforded by tree canopy.</li> <li>3) A reduction in biodiversity and the ability of native species to move between green spaces.</li> </ol> <p>Concerns also raised that the proposal conflicts with Greater Sydney Commission documents relating to biodiversity, landscapes and urban tree cover.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
304	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposal and believes it is deceptive of Council to hold this public exhibition during COVID-19. Requests that the process be suspended until lockdown is over. Concerned that the proposed changes will drastically change the amenity of suburbs and cause wide scale environmental damage and pollution.</p> <p>Concerned increased housing density and commercial premises brings issues with decreased physical and mental wellbeing, increased traffic, inadequate roads and parking, inadequate community services, insufficient schools and insufficient public transport. Believes Oatley, Mortdale and Penshurst weren't designed for medium and high density living.</p>	<p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Objects to overdevelopment</p>		
305	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	<p>Submission on behalf of 426 and 428 Princes Highway, Blakehurst. Submission requests that the proposed Clause 6.5(3) of the proposal is amended to allow for the erection of a building which</p>	Requests a spot rezoning (site specific)		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		relies on interventions such as landscaped terraces, retaining walls and other structural protection works in the sea level rise area. Explains that such works are considered to be acceptable if they are based on sound engineering and environmental principles. Explains that if Clause 6.5 is not amended as requested, the site will not be able to achieve the uplift and use of the site anticipated by the recent zoning change and the proposed R4 High Density Residential zoning under the draft LEP 2020. As an alternative it is requested that the height limit on the site is increased such that there is potential for the permitted FSR of 2:1 to be achieved on the balance of the site outside of the sea rise level area.			
306	Objects	Believes any changes to the FSPA in Oatley will have a detrimental effect on the flora and fauna, and result in the loss of habitat and trees. Concerned that an increase in population density has already put pressure on public utilities such as water, sewer, power and gas. Explains they have already seen an increase in local traffic and parking difficulties due to parked cars clogging up narrow streets.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
307	Objects	Objects to the removal of churches from the list of permissible uses in R2 zones. Concerned that the proposed changes will make it more difficult to operate churches. Explains that churches contribute greatly to the fabric of their community. Believes places of public worship belong in residential zones.	Objects to the prohibition of places of public worship in the R2 zone		
308	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Opposed to the reduction in the FSPA particularly in Oatley West and on the peninsula bounded by Gungah Bay, Oatley Bay and the area south of Frederick St, Oatley. Believes, in this latter area, the FSPA should be retained west of the train line and replicated in the former Kogarah LGA east of the line. Explains these 2 areas are broadly similar, being for the most part classified as "Garden Suburban". Believes the FSPA has acted to some extent to protect the tree and vegetation cover. Supports an increase in the landscaping requirement to 25% and hopes that the proposed 'design review process' will reduce the number of cube-like dwellings with limited design merit.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided Requests for better designed developments	1. Supports an increase in the landscaping requirement to 25% in the FSPA.  2. Hopes that the proposed 'design review process' will reduce the number of cube-like dwellings with limited design merit.	1. In response to submissions, to enhance the protection of the existing tree canopy and the landscaped characteristics of the LGA, it is recommended to the Local Planning Panel that the minimum landscaped area requirement for dual occupancy developments in the FSPA be increased from minimum 25% to minimum 30% of the site area.  2. The aim of introducing the design excellence provision in the draft LEP is to ensure that the highest standard of architectural and urban design is achieved within the LGA and to improve place making.

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
309	Objects	Agrees with many of the proposed changes, but is concerned about the proposed changes to the zoning of residential area R2. Concerned that the proposed decrease in lot sizes and dual dwellings on even smaller lots will result in less space for trees and the character of the existing suburb being compromised. Concerned that an addition of a driveway to a second dwelling will cause problems to drainage during storms. Concerned that there is no provision for added green areas.	Objects to overdevelopment		
310	Objects	Does not support the idea of moving religious meetings outside of residential areas as they feel churches should be around people. Concerned that there are hardly any non-residential areas in Hurstville, and this would mean the church would have to move further away. Believes it's inconvenient, unfair and pointless.	Objects to the prohibition of places of public worship in the R2 zone		
311	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
312	Objects	Opposed to the following proposed changes: 1) Dual occupancy (FSPA) 2) Changes to R2 residential 3) Rezoning from R3 to R4.	Objects to the removal of properties in the Foreshore Scenic Protection Area – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment or no reason provided Objects to the rezoning of land from R3 to R4 to create a hierarchy of residential zones		
313	Objects	Concerned about loss of amenity, overparked streets, loss of tree cover, increased density, increased runoff to Georges River, impact to local wildlife, reduction in liveability and desirability, and loss of land value. Believes there is inadequate infrastructure to deal with increased residency, and suggests other opportunities to rezone along arterial roads such as Forest Rd and Stoney Creek Rd.	Objects to overdevelopment		
314	Objects	Opposed to the proposal to remove properties in Oatley West from the FSPA. Concerned that the impacts will undermine quality of life and the natural beauty of the area. Believes that negative effects will include increased density, smaller block sizes, increased traffic,	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		loss of leafy character and increased pressure on infrastructure.	environment		
315	Objects	<p>Opposed to the removal of lots from the FSPA, the reduction of lot sizes outside of the FSPA and the reduction of the landscaping requirement as they are problematic to the environment and vegetation. Believes the proposal is in contradiction to the community, the Greater Sydney Commission and Council's own goals. Supports the existing lot sizes in the HLEP FSPA being expanded to align with the existing lot sizes in the KLEP of 700sqm, and supports the addition of properties into the FSPA in the Kogarah foreshore area.</p> <p>Believes the proposed landscaping requirements and dual occupancies will lead to fewer trees, impacting ecological balance and biodiversity. Provides recommendations to protect trees and the LGA's future liveability. Urges that the 25% landscape minimum be raised to 40% to protect the natural heritage. Believes properties proposed to be removed from the FSPA create a critical buffer to absorb stormwater runoff into the Georges River, particularly Lime Kiln Bay and Myles Dunphy Reserve, and that there is no infrastructure strategy to deal with the runoff. Believes it is critical that houses are not removed from the FSPA in areas along Salt Pan Creek, as this has implications for the ecological health of the creek and the grant given to Council to enhance the creek will be undermined by the impact from the houses removed. Explains that there does not appear to be any concrete plans as to furthering the green space west of the train line in the LGA, and believes acquiring Lugarno's historic property of Glenlee would be recommended to accommodate the growth in population and reach Council's goal of 40% tree canopy by 2038. Recommends retaining public access through the grounds to the foreshore for the benefit of the locals.</p> <p>Concerned that there is no biodiversity impact assessment provided, that the proposal will negatively impact threatened species, will cause more congestion on roads, that the proposal does not address advancing climate change, and that the proposal is proceeding during COVID-19.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Requests increasing the landscaping requirements</p>	<p>1. Supports the existing lot sizes in the HLEP FSPA being expanded to align with the existing lot sizes in the KLEP of 700sqm, and supports the addition of properties into the FSPA in the Kogarah foreshore area.</p> <p>2. Recommends retaining and expanding public access along the foreshore.</p>	<p>1. Adoption of the 700sqm minimum lot size (as per KLEP 2012) for R2 zoned properties located within the FSPA ensures that the existing character of these areas can be retained.</p> <p>2. Council is developing the Foreshore Access Improvement Plan which may inform future amendments to the LEP, such as open space acquisitions to provide 'green corridors' and linkages along the foreshore.</p>
316	Objects	<p>Objects to the exhibition of the draft LEP during COVID-19 and the restrictions on consultation, including community meetings.</p> <p>Objects to the reduction in the FSPA.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in</p>		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		<p>Information provided to residents is misleading as the brochure does not acknowledge the overall reduction of landscaping across the LGA due to the removal of properties from the FSPA.</p> <p>The FSPA should be increased across the entire LGA, perhaps into 2 foreshore zones – those land areas located directly on the foreshore, with stricter development controls and those that provide scenic amenity and environmental protection to the waterway that are located on the upslopes, with minor variations in development controls.</p> <p>Concerns that an increase in development and hard surfaces increases runoff and sedimentation in the river system. A reduction in visual amenity and the increase in temperature is evident as the tree canopy in many parts has been destroyed. The protection of local amenity, scenic amenity, retaining tree canopy, protecting and creating wildlife corridors, maintaining biodiversity, protecting the Georges River ecosystem etc is shown to not be a consideration in land use planning, which is unrealistic and inappropriate.</p>	<p>the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Raises concerns that the number of properties proposed to be removed from the FSPA was not provided in the fact sheet</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the Foreshore Scenic Protection Area – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment or no reason provided</p> <p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
317	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	<p>Objects to the reduction of the FSPA due to the effects on tree canopy, water quality, habitat corridors and neighbourhood amenity resulting from increased housing density, increased hard surfaces and reduced lot sizes.</p> <p>In order to protect these areas, complying development should not be permitted in the FSPA.</p> <p>The foreshore building line should be consistent with the GREP No 2. especially in relation to distance from the upper bank of the Georges River and coastal wetlands.</p> <p>Increase in gross floor area limits can be expected to lead to vegetation loss.</p> <p>The draft LEP does not appear to meet the following recommendations of the Foreshore Strategic Directions Paper:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthen existing planning policies and objectives both within the LEP and DCP to require development within foreshore areas to consider and achieve the intended outcomes for each of these values.</li> <li>• Strengthen tree protection controls within the LEP and DCP and potentially consider reviewing Council's enforcement response to this issue.</li> </ul> <p>More needs to be done to provide open space in the more densely populated parts of the LGA.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The foreshore building line should be consistent with the GREP No 2. especially in relation to distance from the upper bank of the Georges River and coastal wetlands.</li> <li>2. The draft LEP does not appear to meet the following recommendations of the Foreshore Strategic Directions Paper: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthen existing planning policies and objectives both within the LEP and DCP to require development within foreshore areas to consider and achieve the intended outcomes for each of these values.</li> <li>• Strengthen tree protection controls within the LEP and DCP and potentially consider reviewing Council's enforcement response to this issue.</li> </ul> </li> <li>3. More needs to be done to provide open space in the more</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Foreshore Building Line has been translated from the existing Hurstville and Kogarah LEPs into the draft LEP.</li> <li>2. The draft LEP introduces additional foreshore provisions, including Clause 6.5 Foreshore area and coastal hazards and risks. The intent of this clause is to enhance the protection of the natural environment along the LGA's foreshore in line with the overarching principles of this LEP.</li> </ol> <p>The inclusion of the coastal hazard area based on the findings of the Tidal Inundation Study will ensure that there is a focus on addressing coastal hazards and risk through the development assessment process as the local provisions of the existing LEPs do not provide a clear link to policy on coastal hazard and risks.</p>

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
				densely populated parts of the LGA.	<p>If a proposed development falls within land to which this clause applies, consideration must be given towards the impacts of sea level rise and tidal inundation as a result of climate change, impacts on the water quality of the Georges River, and other coastal hazards.</p> <p>3. Council's Open Space, Recreation and Community Facilities Strategy 2019-2036 provides a direction for open space, recreation and community facilities in the Georges River area. The directions will guide how Council provides open space, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Investigating opportunities to provide additional passive open space in higher density areas as part of master planning for town centres.</li> </ul>
318	Objects	Opposed to the proposal to remove properties in Oatley West from the FSPA. Believes the impacts will undermine quality of life and the natural beauty of the area, increase density, result in smaller block sizes, increase traffic, result in loss of leafy character, and increase pressure on infrastructure.	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		
319	Objects	Concerned that the proposed changes will lead to the degradation of the river system, and that clearing of trees will cause erosion of the river banks and flooding.	Objects to overdevelopment		
320	Objects	Recommends that the FSPA of former Hurstville LGA should not be downgraded but instead, the proposed FSPA in the former Kogarah LGA should be expanded to include vegetated and scenic areas behind the immediate foreshore strip, protecting those scenic values that still remain. Has seen a decline in wildlife due to the loss of suburban habitat and clearance of vegetation. Concerned about the proposed reduction in the FSPA due to:	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the Foreshore Scenic Protection Area –</p>		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		<p>1) Scenic degradation: The proposed FSPA changes will change Oatley and Lugarno and result in wall to wall housing along the river.</p> <p>2) Denser housing accompanied by an increase in vehicles, traffic congestion and competition for parking. Dual occupancy will result in two driveways, leaving little space for street trees, and increase potential for damage to existing trees. Denser housing means a larger population which has less onsite open space for outdoor recreation. Denser housing means more pressure on a sewerage system that can't cope with the existing population, more hard surfaces that will increase stormwater runoff and local flooding.</p> <p>3) Loss of habitat: A reduction in the landscaping requirement, compounded by smaller lot size, will result in even less space for sustainable gardens and a lot fewer trees and shrubs. The bushland along the Georges River provides a green corridor for remnant populations of fauna and flora which need continuity of vegetation for protection, food and reproduction. Concerned about the loss of mature trees that provide homes to local mammals and birds. The Greater Sydney Commission's South District Planning Priority S15 is to increase urban tree canopy and deliver Green Grid connections. The best tree canopies visible from the river are on blocks behind the immediate foreshore, on ridge tops that the proposal will remove from the FSPA.</p>	<p>inadequate justification for the boundary amendment or no reason provided</p>		
321	Objects	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA due to overdevelopment of land. Character of the suburb is changing due to development of larger dwellings and little deep soil landscaping areas for larger trees which is important for providing habitats for wildlife. The changes will negatively impact the flora and fauna of the area. Smaller lot sizes will lead to an increase in hard surfaces promoting increased runoff polluting the water of Georges River. Principal role of Council is to promote awareness of threatened and protected species of the area. Requests that the process be ceased due to COVID-19.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment  Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment  Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		
322	Objects	<p>Explains that the reason Oatley is a desirable suburb is because of the community feeling brought about by lower density living, recreational areas with little thoroughfare and no major shopping centres. Concerned that increasing density will place further strain on already struggling road networks, and that Hillcrest Ave or the single lane bridge can't accommodate high density living.</p>	<p>Objects to overdevelopment</p>		
323	Objects	<p>These proposed changes during COVID-19 are concerning and will change the local area.</p>	<p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p>		



No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
324	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
325	Objects	Supports the extension of the proposed FSPA into the former Kogarah LGA. Objects to the removal of areas from the FSPA in Oatley West, Peakhurst and Lugarno. Believes the increase in housing density, increase in the size of building footprints and reduced garden areas will lead to a dramatic loss of vegetation and biodiversity. The de-greening of the area, with the resulting loss of wildlife habitat, and general amenity of the area is not considered to be in the best interest of the public, as it will erode the liveability of the LGA and value for its present and future residents.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
326	Objects	Believes the proposal conflicts with what Council is doing elsewhere; acquiring green space from one source and then, in the case of Todd Park, taking space. Does not agree and requests more consultation with the public before making decisions.	Raises concerns regarding the availability and transparency of information		
327	Objects	Concerned that the proposal will make churches illegal in residential areas. Notes that churches are an integral part of the community and play a significant role through community support, religious life, and welfare and social care. Concerned the proposal will force people to travel further to go to church.	Objects to the prohibition of places of public worship in the R2 zone		
328	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA. Concerned it will result in increased traffic, congestion, loss of trees, increased pressure on existing infrastructure, and impact the river and bushiness of the foreshore. Believes the proposed landscaping requirement of 20% is too low and requests that this be increased.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Requests increasing the landscaping requirements		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
329	Objects	Explains that Oatley and Lugarno are known and enjoyed for their leafy streets. Concerns raised that the rezoning of streets in these suburbs and reducing the requirements of trees and green spaces will increase development and result in the loss of trees.	Objects to overdevelopment		
330	Objects	Concerns raised in relation to the removal of places of public worship from the R2 zone, and the lack of consultation with the leaders from places of public worships, such as Ministers etc. Explains that these facilities are key to the social fabric of the community and their placement in residential areas underpins this.	Objects to the prohibition of places of public worship in the R2 zone		
331	Objects	Concerned that the community has not been adequately consulted due to COVID-19. Concerned that changing the density in Oatley will affect the population and community appeal. Believes roadworks in/around the area won't sustain the zoning changes, particularly the proposed Hillcrest zoning. Concerned that dual occupancies will devalue the area.	Objects to overdevelopment Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
332	Objects	Does not support the removal of properties from the FSPA.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA  – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment – no reason provided		
333	Objects	No reason for not supporting was given.	Objects to draft LEP 2020 - no reason provided		
334	Objects	Does not endorse the proposed changes to the FSPA. Concerned that increasing density by reducing block size for dual occupancies will result in: 1) Increased traffic congestion and further parking problems. 2) Loss of trees and vegetation and its impact on wildlife. 3) Effects of increased heat from reducing tree canopies and the shade they provide. 4) Extra pressure on stormwater and sewerage systems which already struggle to cope at times.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
335	Objects	Concerned that the community is already suffering with overdevelopment. Questions what the proposal's objective is, what it will deliver, and what the potential benefits and risks are. Concerned that there is already pressure on the environment and	Objects to overdevelopment		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		infrastructure such as sewage and local roads.			
336	Supports	Supports the proposal to rezone as it will upgrade the area.		Supports the proposal to rezone as it will upgrade the area.	The draft LEP proposes to upzone 5 Housing Investigation Areas. The rezoning creates the opportunity to deliver an additional 650 dwellings in the form of medium density and high density dwellings in accessible locations across the LGA, assisting Council in meeting the housing needs of the community with additional dwellings and greater housing choice.
337	Objects	Concerned that the proposal will destroy recreational parklands in Carss Park. Provides Todd Park as an example. Explains the park is used by local schools, sporting clubs and bike riders, and does not want it replaced by indoor dwellings. Concerned that it will result in extra traffic in the narrow roads of Bunyala St and Miowera Ave.	Not related to the LEP		
338	Objects	<p>Concerned about the proposed rezoning of some areas of Lugarno and the removal of these areas from the FSPA. Believes an increase in population will result in pressure on infrastructure, increase traffic issues, result in the degradation of local flora and fauna, and transform the Lugarno Peninsula's uniqueness. Does not believe a population increase is the best option for every suburb within the LGA, and questions how it's possible to apply a 'single consistent approach' without destroying the uniqueness of suburbs. Raises the following concerns in regards to an increase in population in Lugarno:</p> <p>1) Lugarno is a peninsula with one access road - Forest Road. There is already congestion especially in peak times. The only transport to and from the suburb is an infrequent (except in peak hours) bus service. There is one public primary school and a small shopping centre. Lugarno is a fire prone area, and a speedy evacuation in a dangerous situation would be impossible.</p> <p>2) The terrain of Lugarno is unsuitable for duplexes on smaller blocks. Lugarno has been built on sandstone cliffs. Many streets require residences to be constructed on steep seemingly inaccessible blocks and are unsuitable for duplex construction and higher density housing.</p> <p>3) The bushland of Lugarno must be preserved. Additional dwellings and increased population will threaten the environment and wildlife.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		4) Preserving the out-of-the-way atmosphere of the suburb is valued by Lugarno residents.			
339	Objects	Objects to the proposed changes to the FSPA and the removal of properties. Concerned this will lead to a significant increase in building density, increased traffic and parking congestion on local streets, create areas prone to becoming urban heat traps, and greater pressure on current recreational spaces. Believes Council would be failing to support the Greater Sydney Commission's (GSC) South District Planning Priority S14 "Protecting and enhancing bushland, biodiversity and scenic cultural landscapes". Concerned about the decrease in tree canopy, landscaped areas and wildlife. Concerned that increased paved areas and driveways will increase the potential of polluted urban runoff into the Georges River. Believes this contradicts the GSC's South District Planning Priority S15 "Increasing urban tree canopy cover and delivering Green Grid connections". Explains that the Georges Riverkeeper Health Card Report justifies the retention of the current FSPA as it exists to create a buffer zone around the river and wetlands which feed into the river.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
340	Objects	Requests that Carss Park Pool be rebuilt and Todd Park be left alone.	Not related to the LEP		
341	Objects	Objects to the proposed FSPA changes as it will lead to increased development and change the character of the area. Allowing more dual occupancies will increase traffic without infrastructure support and increase pressure on local services including schools and public transport. Stresses the impact on the local environment from runoff into the Georges River. Concerned that Council has not adequately explained the reasons for characterisations or removing almost 2400 dwellings from the FSPA. Concerned that the proposed changes are aimed at increasing housing and population density in these areas, and that this should not be done against the wishes of residents.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA  – inadequate justification for the boundary amendment  – no reason provided Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment		
342	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Questions whether the proposal will be enforceable in the Land and Environment Court, as they've read reports of DAs that were refused but are then argued in court and approved. Believes Clause 4.6 allows Councillors to approve a DA and weakens the purpose of having an LEP. Believes more consideration should be given to on-site parking in "duplex" and "villa" type housing. Explains that Clause 4.1 proposes a minimum lot size of 450 sqm	Objects to overdevelopment	1. Believes that Clause 4.6 weakens the purpose of having an LEP.  2. Believes more consideration should be given to on-site parking in "duplex" and "villa" type	1. The draft LEP is required to contain Clause 4.6 Exceptions to development standards which is mandated by the Standard Instrument LEP. The clause provides flexibility in the application of planning controls, such as height and

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		<p>for a single dwelling (non-foreshore) but clause 4.1A allows a 600sqm block to hold a duplex type dwelling. Concerned that this represents an overdevelopment unless the duplex is restricted i.e. in proportion to the smaller block size. Suggests proposed acquisitions should be made with consideration of residents.</p>		<p>housing.</p> <p>3. Explains that Clause 4.1 proposes a minimum lot size of 450 sqm for a single dwelling (non-foreshore) but clause 4.1A allows a 600sqm block to hold a duplex type dwelling. Concerned that this represents an overdevelopment unless the duplex is restricted i.e. in proportion to the smaller block size.</p> <p>4. Suggests proposed acquisitions should be made with consideration of residents.</p>	<p>floor space ratio, where strict compliance with a development standard would, in any particular case, be unreasonable or unnecessary or tend to hinder the attainment of the objects of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. Applicants must submit written justification with their development application that compliance with the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary in the circumstances of the case.</p> <p>2. Parking requirements are contained in the development control plan and will be reviewed in the development of the Georges River Development Control Plan 2020 which will accompany the draft LEP with more detailed planning controls.</p> <p>3. The draft LEP proposes a 450sqm minimum subdivision lot size in the R2 zone (as per the Hurstville LEP 2012).</p> <p>The minimum dual occupancy lot size of 650sqm is proposed for the whole LGA in accordance with the Georges River Local Environmental Plan Amendment (Miscellaneous) 2019 (Low Rise Medium Density Housing Planning Proposal) which was finalised by the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment and gazetted on 6 December 2019.</p> <p>The existing minimum lot size for dual occupancies of 1,000sqm in the FSPA is proposed to be retained to ensure the continued protection and preservation of the foreshore area and its character.</p>

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
					4. When acquisition is required, negotiation between Council and the property owner will be conducted in accordance with the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991 which includes compensation and hardship provisions. If owners can show that they will suffer hardship if Council does not purchase their property without delay, Council will be obliged to purchase their property or remove the designation to purchase the property within 90 days. Alternatively, property owners may approach Council at any time and request Council to purchase the property.
343	Objects	Has already written with a detailed submission, but in short, believes the proposed changes to the Foreshore Protection Zone are totally inappropriate and can only lead to over development. Notes that the changes are contrary to the planning objectives in the draft LEP documents.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment		
344	Objects	Concerned that this proposal has been rushed during COVID-19, with not enough time to understand the full implications.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition		
345	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Not objecting to the upzoning of North and West Peakhurst but requests the below. Prior to approving the plan to proceed, requests that the independent traffic body evaluates the effect of traffic on Talbot Street and Cairns Street for both Northbound and Southbound flows if this proposal is approved. Requests that speed humps are installed on Talbot Street to slow the increased traffic down and protect local residents from all surrounding streets which include families with children and elderly who use the roadway for their motorised scooters and bikes as there is no paved sidewalk on either side of Talbot Street. This will ensure that the increased traffic flow will be kept at a speed that is safe for all residents of Talbot Street, Cairns Street and Eldon Street who use Talbot Street to access Peakhurst Park either on foot or via bikes and scooters.	Supports the North and West of Peakhurst Park – Peakhurst HIA		
346	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Concerned about the impacts of rezoning Hillcrest Ave to R4 and the increased pressure on traffic congestion. Extra residential traffic needs to be planned and managed. Increased housing must be complemented by more off street parking and enforcement of	Objects to the Hillcrest Avenue – Hurstville HIA		

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Council Response (refer to respective Theme in Attachment 5)	Additional Issues (not addressed by Themes)	Council Response to Additional Issues (if applicable)
		turning into driveways across double traffic lines. Opportunities for traffic calming infrastructure, dedicated bike lanes, better signage, lighting and education needs to be included in all plans.			
347	Objects	Opposes the proposed changes to the LGA and the FSPA. The character of Oatley and surrounding suburbs should be retained. The proposed changes to the FSPA will negatively impact the leafy character as well as increase vehicular traffic, congestion and density. Council should be accountable for preserving the heritage of the suburbs. Overdevelopment in the area is detrimentally impacting the character of Georges River's most sentimental and significant suburbs.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment Objects to overdevelopment		
348	Objects	Concerned about the LEP process when the community is stressed by COVID-19. Comments that Council did not provide adequate notice or lead time for participating in conversations and placed an advertisement in the local newspaper for a webinar which was held on the evening the paper was delivered. Concerned about the effect on waterways due to increased runoff into creeks and the contamination of runoff due to increased hard surfaces, traffic, population density, loss of established trees, stress on roads, and loss of street parking due to an increase in the number of driveways.	Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition Objects to overdevelopment		

### 3. Received via Your Say – under the draft *Local Housing Strategy* feedback form

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Themes Identified
1	Objects	Notes that enough people live in the area already, and that overcrowding is only of use to developers.	Objects to overdevelopment
2	Supports, but with suggestions for changes	Notes that R4 exists on the south side of Peakhurst Park but questions why it is not recommended on the west side when it is closer to the train station and Riverwood plaza. Believes requiring 2 blocks to make a manor house is a waste of prime real estate. Believes that modernisation doesn't start with R3 and manor houses with max 9m height. Proposes R4 west of Peakhurst Park as it's close to the train station and shopping centers.	Requests amendments to the North and West of Peakhurst Park - Peakhurst HIA
3	Objects	Concerned that this will destroy Oatley and will not be of benefit to residents. Concerned that “variety of housing” will adversely affect the area which is currently: homely, family-orientated, quiet and peaceful, leafy, spacious, and with not a lot of traffic. Notes that it doesn't feel claustrophobic like Hurstville with buildings, infrastructure, lack of greenery and high population density. Notes that COVID-19 reinforces the need for space and outdoors - not apartments, multi-storey housing or duplexes. Requests that their suburb be left alone.	Objects to overdevelopment
4	Objects	Prefers not to make changes allowing additional development that will impact the environment and overall atmosphere of the area. Concerned that increased density will result in more pollution and waste water into the already struggling Lime Kiln Bay.	Objects to overdevelopment
5	Objects	Concerned that the lifestyle of their suburb will be altered if there's no longer a FSPA.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment
6	Objects	Objects to rezoning their area. Believes removing the FSPA zone will be detrimental to Oatley's village atmosphere and will lead to overcrowded streets, less parking and spoil the natural environment.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment
7	Objects	Does not believe lot sizes for building developments are currently sufficiently sized. Suggests Council reconsiders and amends housing sizes to ensure that land sizes are large enough to include housing, garden beds, and outside areas for children to play.	Objects to overdevelopment
8	Objects	Requests no more people or traffic in Oatley, as it will spoil the ambience and foreshore of Oatley.	Objects to overdevelopment
9	Objects	Requests that Oatley be kept as it currently is and without developers.	Objects - no reason provided
10	Objects	Concerned that the LGA has reached saturation point, and that changing residential zoning to accommodate the Local Housing Strategy will put pressure on the environment and surrounding areas.	Objects to overdevelopment
11	Objects	Concerned that smaller lot sizes and the reduction of soft landscapes will result in more buildings and less trees. Objects to the draft LEP 2020 due to the following concerns:  1) Negative impacts on residents and society. The removal of properties from the FSPA would lead to an increase in built and population density, without a concurrent increase in infrastructure such as sewerage, water supply, drainage, street parking and business area parking. This would lead to overcrowding of	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment



No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Themes Identified
		<p>parks/recreational spaces, increased local traffic, increased parking congestion, further overcrowding of public transport, and loss of privacy.</p> <p>2) Negative impacts on the environment and biodiversity. Smaller soft landscaping reduces the leafiness and shadiness of the suburb. The loss of large native trees and space to plant large trees results in increases in summer temperatures, and would mean less biological diversity and poorer ecological function.</p> <p>3) Negative impacts on water quality in the Georges River. There are occasional sewage overflows and leaks from the sewerage system, into the creeks that run towards the Georges River. Denser urban development with less soft landscaping means more hard surfaces, which leads to reduced absorptive capacity for runoff and more polluted urban runoff entering the waterways.</p> <p>4) Negative impacts on the amenity of the foreshore area. Many people move into the area for the attractive amenity and scenic landscape. Tree removal will diminish tree cover and reduce this amenity.</p>	
12	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed amendments to the FSPA as it will increase built areas and other hard surfaces, and decrease soft landscaping and tree cover. Believes this will change the current leafy outlook of the suburb.</p> <p>Concerned that smaller lot sizes will mean a decrease in garden area, the loss of neighbourhood leafiness and the loss of tree canopy. Explains that loss of tree canopy and reduction in soft landscaping will have negative consequences for:</p> <p>1) The amelioration of stormwater impact from urban runoff resulting in increased siltation of the Georges River.</p> <p>2) Greater heat output from the increase in hard surfaces exacerbated by a reduction in the cooling effect afforded by tree canopy.</p> <p>3) A reduction in biodiversity and the ability of native species to move between green spaces.</p> <p>Concerns also raised that the proposal conflicts with Greater Sydney Commission documents relating to biodiversity, landscapes and urban tree cover.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>
13	Objects	<p>Notes no dual occupancy developments permitted in the existing FSPA under the HLEP 2012. Notes that the proposed reduction of the FSPA will enable only about 740 lots to gain the potential to develop dual occupancies. Explains that Council's Director of Planning and Environment anticipates only 3-4 dual occupancy DA's per year (i.e. about 48-64 extra dwellings in the next 16 years). Notes that this will hardly make a dent in Council's shortfall 2,000 needed by 2036. Suggests that dual occupancy developments not be complying development.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p>
14	Objects	<p>Believes dual occupancies should not be allowed in the existing FSPA, and they should not be considered as complying development.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p>

#### 4. Received via Your Say – under the draft *Inclusive Housing Strategy* feedback form

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Themes Identified
1	Objects	Notes that the State Government has no right attempting to change the suburb's amenity and character.	Objects to overdevelopment
2	Objects	Concerned that this will destroy Oatley and will not benefit residents. Concerned that "variety of housing" will adversely affect the area which is currently: homely, unique, family-orientated, quiet and peaceful, leafy, spacious, and with not a lot of traffic. Notes that it doesn't feel claustrophobic like Hurstville with buildings, infrastructure, lack of greenery and high population density. Notes that COVID-19 reinforces that people need space and outdoors - not apartments, multi-storey housing or duplexes. Requests that their suburb be left alone.	Objects to overdevelopment
3	Supports	Notes that more available land is needed and that removing restrictions within the foreshore area is required. Requests that the foreshore area be opened for more housing and accommodation.	Supports the removal of properties from the FSPA
4	Objects	Concerned that the lifestyle of their suburb will be altered if there's no longer a FSPA.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment
5	Objects	Objects to rezoning their area. Believes removing the FSPA zone will be detrimental to Oatley's village atmosphere and will lead to overcrowded streets, less parking and spoil the natural environment.	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment
6	Objects	Suggests that Council thinks about the impact to the environment that the proposed changes would have.	Objects - no reason provided
7	Objects	Does not believe this strategy allows for sufficient space in medium and large density development. Notes that Council should ensure that their suburb is not over run with housing development like Peakhurst, that greening policies continue to be developed, and that rate payers will not be overcrowded on their own properties. Notes that people move to Lugarno and Oatley to enjoy the green spaces. Believes Council is doing not much to replace trees or maintain/develop new green space. Concerned that developers are top priority and that the neighbourhood will lose property value if it's overdeveloped.	Objects to overdevelopment
8	Objects	Requests that Oatley be kept as it currently is.	Objects - no reason provided
9	Objects	Concerned that the LGA has reached saturation point, and that changing residential zoning to accommodate the Inclusive Housing Strategy will put pressure on the environment and surrounding areas.	Objects to overdevelopment
10	Objects	Concerned that smaller lot sizes and the reduction of soft landscapes will result in more buildings and less trees. Objects to the draft LEP 2020 due to the following concerns:  1) Negative impacts on residents and society. The removal of properties from the FSPA would lead to an increase in built and population density, without a concurrent increase in infrastructure such as sewerage, water supply, drainage, street parking and business area parking. This would lead to overcrowding of parks/recreational spaces, increased local traffic, increased parking congestion, further overcrowding of public	Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Themes Identified
		<p>transport, and loss of privacy.</p> <p>2) Negative impacts on the environment and biodiversity. Smaller soft landscaping reduces the leafiness and shadiness of the suburb. The loss of large native trees and space to plant large trees results in increases in summer temperatures, and would mean less biological diversity and poorer ecological function.</p> <p>3) Negative impacts on water quality in the Georges River. There are occasional sewage overflows and leaks from the sewerage system, into the creeks that run towards the Georges River. Denser urban development with less soft landscaping means more hard surfaces, which leads to reduced absorptive capacity for runoff and more polluted urban runoff entering the waterways.</p> <p>4) Negative impacts on the amenity of the foreshore area. Many people move into the area for the attractive amenity and scenic landscape. Tree removal will diminish tree cover and reduce this amenity.</p>	
11	Objects	<p>Objects to the proposed amendments to the FSPA as it will increase built areas and other hard surfaces, and decrease soft landscaping and tree cover. Believes this will change the current leafy outlook of the suburb.</p> <p>Concerned that smaller lot sizes will mean a decrease in garden area, the loss of neighbourhood leafiness and the loss of tree canopy. Explains that loss of tree canopy and reduction in soft landscaping will have negative consequences for:</p> <p>1) The amelioration of stormwater impact from urban run off resulting in increased siltation of the Georges river.</p> <p>2) Greater heat output from the increase in hard surfaces exacerbated by a reduction in the cooling affect afforded by tree canopy.</p> <p>3) A reduction in biodiversity and the ability of native species to move between green spaces.</p> <p>Concerns also raised that the proposal conflicts with Greater Sydney Commission documents relating to biodiversity, landscapes and urban tree cover.</p>	<p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p>
12	Objects	<p>Supports the consultation process, but suggests that more time is needed. Supports some areas of the proposal, but notes the following concerns:</p> <p>1) Does not support the removal of properties from the FSPA.</p> <p>2) Does not support the reduction in size required for dual occupancy. Notes the following concerns with current dual occupancy dwellings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There is almost no gap on the side of dwellings, and they are built almost to the edge of each property.</li> <li>- Dual occupancy dwellings are allowed side by side, in a row, and look cramped with no space for trees.</li> <li>- There is no rule that ensures that the water must be seen between houses. Areas are blocked from seeing the water as houses are built shoulder to shoulder.</li> <li>- Requests that the dwelling size allowance for dual occupancy is not reduced.</li> </ul> <p>3) Suggests increasing the area that is protected around the water, and make it accessible to people to walk or explore. Notes that there are limited areas in Oatley and surrounds where one can reach the water other than</p>	<p>Requests amendments to the timing of the exhibition</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the built environment</p> <p>Objects to the removal of properties in the FSPA – impacts on the natural environment</p> <p>Requests amendments to the minimum lot size for dual occupancies</p>

No.	Objects or Supports	Summary of Submission	Themes Identified
		<p>private jetties. Supports Council purchasing open space on the water's edge.</p> <p>4) Believes the proposal can't be accepted without a review of housing where trees have been decimated, and the fines that accompany that.</p> <p>5) Is not reassured that sewerage and other amenities will be addressed.</p>	