

Attachment C – Response to Public Submissions

1.0 Response to Public Submissions

Table 1 provides a detailed response to the public submissions received and the matters raised. The table also identifies and summarises revisions to the proposal to ensure that the public issues have been addressed, which are also further addressed in the Summary Report.

This addresses the total of 35 public submissions of which:

7 support the proposal

3 provide comments

25 object to the proposal

Table 1 Response to Public Submissions

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
Individuals				
1a	Victoria Rupnik (Object)	<u>Narrow Street/Traffic Volumes</u> Kootingal Street is not sufficiently wide enough to accommodate the increased traffic volume resulting from the proposed development. The narrowness of the street presents significant safety hazards, especially during peak traffic periods.	<u>Traffic Impact (specific to Kootingal Street)</u> Traffic volumes and impacts have been addressed in the Transport Assessment at Appendix J of the EIS and updated JMT Transport Report following exhibition is at Attachment K .	Appendix J of EIS Attachment K
1b		<u>Traffic Congestion</u> The proposed housing units would significantly exacerbate existing traffic congestion issues in our neighbourhood. Kunal Place, the proposed access road and the adjoining Kootingal Street, lacks the capacity to handle the influx of residents and visitors, leading to gridlock, delays, and	The traffic modelling performed for the assessment has demonstrated that, even taking into consideration a conservative 2% background traffic growth rate, the Kootingal Street / Old Prospect Road intersection will continue to perform at acceptable levels of service in both the AM and PM peak hours. The proposal will not impact the performance of Kootingal Street, with very minimal increases in vehicle delays of typically less than 2 to 3 seconds on average for both AM and PM peak hours. The intersection level of service remains unchanged in comparison to a 'future base'	

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
------	-----------	-------	----------	------------

heightened risk of accidents to the street.

scenario.

It is also noted that TfNSW surveys demonstrated that the peak traffic periods for Seniors Living is typically between the hours of 10:45am and 3pm and therefore does not coincide with the commuter morning and afternoon peak hour periods.

There is no anticipated increase in traffic movements associated with the clubhouse or golf course as a result of the proposal and additionally there is an increase of the overall car parking provided at the golf course to accommodate any additional parking required.

The proposed new traffic access from Kunyal Place is a secondary access point and only accommodates vehicle access to seniors housing buildings D, E and F. Primary access to the site is proposed from Old Prospect Road where a new access point is also being provided. These Old Prospect Road accesses will accommodate the majority of traffic to and from the site and including all seniors housing access for Buildings A, B, C and the residential care facility.

The traffic entry and exit distributions across each of the three driveways for the additional residential traffic adopted in the assessment is as follows:

JMT update report - Table 4 Traffic distribution across internal driveways

Driveway Location	% of entries and exits*	Peak Hour Traffic Movements	
		AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour
Old Prospect Road (western driveway)	30%	9	15
Old Prospect Road (eastern driveway)	50%	15	25
Kootingal Street	20%	6	10

* Excludes traffic to the golf club car park which will be via the eastern driveway on Old Prospect Road

1c	The current tranquillity of Kootingal Street will be disrupted	Traffic Noise	Attachment O
----	--	-------------------------------	---------------------

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		by increased traffic noise, affecting the quality of life for residents day and night. This disruption would not only compromise our quality of life but also negatively impact our mental and physical well-being.	Traffic noise has been addressed in the original Noise and Vibration Assessment at Appendix O and Traffic Impact Assessment at Appendix J of the EIS as having a minor and barely perceptible impact on residents. It is predicted that there will be no significant increase in traffic generation, and given also the trend towards quieter electric vehicles, a zero long term increase in noise has been adopted.	Appendix N of EIS
1d		Car lights in the night will go directly into my house as I am at the t-intersection of Kunyal Place causing sleep disturbance.	<u>Traffic Amenity Impact</u> Additional traffic impacts associated with entry and exit from the development site will be generated primarily on Old Prospect Road. Access to the site from Kootingal Road via Kunyal Place will be considered limited and will result in minimal traffic or light impacts at Kunyal Place. As noted in the above Table 4, the peak hour movements in Kootingal Street are estimated at 6 vehicles per AM peak hour and 10 vehicles per PM peak hours, with lower levels at other times.	Attachment K
1e		The proposed development fails to address the already limited street parking availability. Additional traffic will exacerbate parking problems, impacting residents' ability to park near their homes causing inconvenience to residents and our own visitors and potentially endangering public safety. There are already many cars, trailers and boats parked on the street now, imagine the chaos following this development. Our current residents will lose their own car spots as potentially, it will become a no stopping/no parking zones or even a one-way street etc to cope with the traffic.	<u>Parking</u> Parking provision was addressed in the Transport Assessment at Appendix J of the EIS and updated JMT Transport Report is at Attachment K . The Proposal provides a combined total of 509 on-site car parking spaces, which is compliant with the minimum parking standards stipulated by the Cumberland City Council and the Housing SEPP and is considered suitable to accommodate future demands from site users. There is a total of 275 parking spaces allocated for the ILU residential component of the development as well as 10 residential care spaces, 4 ancillary commercial spaces and 220 car spaces for the Golf Club (increased from 200). The required golf club parking spaces are assessed in the JMT update report (Section 3.5.1) with justification for the required golf club parking spaces. Analysis has been undertaken which verifies that existing demand can amount to over 200 spaces at any one time. The proposal includes an enhancement to the existing car park for the club and golf course to include 220 spaces, which is over 10% greater than estimated peak parking demands and will be sufficient for peak times and to prevent overflow parking onto surrounding streets.	Appendix J of EIS Attachment K
1f		The proposed number of parking spots in the development is insufficient to accommodate the expected number of residents, visitors, and club patrons, leading to overflow parking on residential street of Kootingal Street.		
1g		Potential signage of no stopping and no parking or oneway signs and road alterations will negatively impact the visual appeal and presentation of our homes. Especially my home which is directly opposite the proposed road opening.	<u>Road Signage</u> There is no public road signage proposed for this development, noting that the proposal provides sufficient on-site parking to meet all requirements on site. Any additional public road signage is the responsibility of council in consultation with the community.	Appendix K of the EIS

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
1h		Building multi-storey structures in a country club setting is incongruent with the character of the area. It's a country club, not a city club. Building multiple stories is not country like at all.	<p><u>Scale/Character of Area</u></p> <p>The proposal has been informed by design advice from the State Design Review Panel (DRP) to prioritise the retention of existing trees on the golf course site, with higher density forms that are set back from existing residences in the area, to ensure a suitable transition to different built form scale. This has informed the building scale, which is setback from the streets and graduates in height further from neighbouring residences. It has also resulted in greater retention of trees and landscaping on-site than would a lower scale option that would use greater area to accommodate sufficient numbers for a successful seniors village. The proposal also minimises the impact on the golf course area, maintaining 90% of the course and retaining this as a key local feature. It is also noted that following exhibition, additional trees and landscaping have been provided along the northern and eastern boundaries of the proposal, to better screen and provide visual amenity to neighbours (see Architectural and Landscape Plans at Appendices B and H of EIS)</p> <p>The proposal recognises the 95% increase in people aged 65-84 years and 183% increase in 85+ years age groups by 2036, and the need to deliver diverse and medium density housing for older people situated close to their established neighbourhood, social group and services, as addressed in the NSW Government's Central City District Plan and Cumberland Council's 2030: Local Strategic Planning Statement.</p> <p>As such, the proposed development is considered suitable in its context as it will increase housing supply and diversity to respond to the needs of the aging demographic in the area., including ancillary health consulting services.</p>	<p>Appendix B of EIS</p> <p>Appendix H of EIS</p>
1i		The proposed development threatens to destroy native trees and habitats, disturbing the local ecosystem (cockatoos, bats etc).	<p><u>Biological Impact</u></p> <p>Biodiversity has been addressed in the Biodiversity Development Assessment Report at Appendix V of the EIS and updated Report from de Witt Ecology provided at Attachment J. It is identified that the study area is located on a highly disturbed golf course landscape that has been highly modified over many years. Further, there were no threatened flora and fauna recorded within or nearby the site. The assessment determined that the proposal is unlikely to have a significant impact on any listed fauna or flora species or communities.</p> <p><u>Tree Removal/Retention</u></p>	<p>Appendix V of EIS</p> <p>Attachment J</p> <p>Appendix L of EIS</p>

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
			<p>Proposed tree retention and removal have been addressed in the Arboricultural Impact Appraisal and Method Statement at Appendix L of the EIS. A total of 88 trees out of the total 1,300 trees (6%) across the golf course are proposed for removal. Of these 88 trees, there are 50 moderate-high retention value trees proposed to be removed, (while the other 38 are of low retention value). it is noted that, following exhibition, the proposal amends tree removal provisions by providing additional tree planting on the northern and eastern boundaries.</p> <p>Replacement rate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • removed 4m-9m: 65 • replaced (1:1): 65 • removed over 10m: 23 • replaced (1:2): 46 • Total remove: 88 • Total replaced: 115 (required number is 111 trees) 	
1j		<p>Current residents on Kootingal Street with golf course views will lose their scenic views to the golf club, impacting the enjoyment and value of their properties and instead it will be given to the new residents of the proposed development, doesn't seem fair as its at our expense they will get the views.</p>	<p><u>Views/Visual Impact</u></p> <p>It is noted that there is some impact on views into the golf course, while noting this will be behind the existing landscaped buffer along the site boundaries. The Visual Impact Assessment reports submitted with the EIS noted the view impacts including views across Old Prospect Road, across the club car park and over rear boundaries. These are not unimpeded views currently and it is anticipated that views will be similar whereby they are of landscaping and vegetation which are proposed to be enhanced in this proposal.</p> <p>A Visual and View Impact Assessment (VIA) was undertaken by Ethos Urban for the development and provided at Appendix II of the EIS. This assessment concluded that the proposal would have no visual impacts of major or high significance and would have moderate visual impacts from Old Prospect Road and low visual impacts from areas of Kootingal Street and Brighton Street.</p> <p>Overall, the VIA concludes that the proposal does not give rise to significant, unacceptable visual impact on the public domain, particularly given the additional landscaping and vegetation proposed at the site boundaries in the EIS. Further, in response to submissions, the updated Architectural Plans and Landscape Plans (Attachments G and I) noted that an addition of 100 trees will be planted along the northern boundary with</p>	<p>Appendix II of EIS</p> <p>Attachment G</p> <p>Attachment I</p>

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
			Old Prospect Road and eastern boundary of the development site which will serve to improve visual impact for surrounding properties.	
1k		Increased traffic poses a risk of accidents, particularly for residents especially for my house which is situated at intersections of Kunyal Place. A car could easily crash into my house directly if an elderly or visitor loses control. And I would not agree to any barricade's being placed in front of my place as protection either.	<p><u>Traffic Safety (specific to Kunyal Place)</u></p> <p>Traffic impacts have been addressed in the Transport Assessment at Appendix J of the EIS and updated report at Attachment K as discussed above.</p> <p>This is a slow traffic area of 50km/hour and will remain so in the operation of this proposal, within minimal potential for accidents at this low speed.</p>	<p>Appendix J of EIS</p> <p>Attachment K</p>
1l		The development risks diminishing property values due to all the above reasons and eroding the sense of community on Kootingal Street.	<p><u>Property Values</u></p> <p>This matter is not within the scope of consideration of this proposal. However, it is anticipated that this development will provide additional community facilities which will benefit the surrounding community</p>	
1m		There are numerous alternative locations for such developments that do not encroach upon our peaceful community.	<p><u>Alternative Site for Proposal/Scale</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character.</p>	Refer to Item 1h
1n		Previous communications indicated a much smaller-scale development, and the sudden increase in size from 2-3 stories to now 5-7 stories and parking provisions raises concerns about misrepresentation and inadequate planning.		
2a	Name Withheld 1 (Object)	Unfortunately, the street/area cannot support the infrastructure for car traffic and will definitely bring chaos to a small street. I object the project.	<p><u>Traffic Impact</u></p> <p>Traffic impacts have been addressed in the Transport Assessment at Appendix J of the EIS and updated JMT Report at Attachment K as discussed above. The traffic modelling performed for the assessment has demonstrated that, even taking into consideration a conservative 2% background traffic growth rate, the surrounding road intersection will continue to perform at acceptable levels of service in both the AM and PM peak hours. The proposal will not impact the performance of the surrounding road intersections, with very minimal increases in vehicle delays of typically less than 2 to 3 seconds on average. The intersection level of service remains unchanged in comparison to a 'future base' scenario. It is also noted that TfNSW surveys demonstrated that the peak traffic periods for Seniors Living is typically between the hours of 10:45am and 3pm and therefore does not coincide with the commuter morning and afternoon peak hour periods.</p>	<p>Appendix J of EIS</p> <p>Attachment K</p>

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
2b		In addition to that, the initial project was reported smaller than the current.	<p><u>Alternative Design/Scale</u></p> <p>Several different iterations of this proposal have been considered for this site. This is the only application that has been lodged and is being considered by the Department of Planning, Housing and Infrastructure. As described in the EIS and documentation lodged with the DPHI and which was put on exhibition, there is a need to deliver new housing for the ageing population and while preliminary design may have been considered the footprint was greater and the height of the buildings were lower. The change in design was due to the retention of important vegetation on the site and input from the State Government Design Review Panel. This design also incorporates additional parking and larger setbacks to the neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Additionally, the proposal recognises the 95% increase in people aged 65-84 years and 183% increase in 85+ years age groups by 2036, and the need to deliver diverse and medium density housing for older people situated close to their established neighbourhood, social group and services, as addressed in the Central City District Plan and Cumberland 2030: Local Strategic Planning Statement.</p> <p>As such, the proposed development will increase capacity and housing diversity on an existing aged care site and provide an upgraded servicing offering to meet the needs of existing and future residents and to respond to the needs of current seniors and aged care standards and the aging demographic in the area.</p>	
3a	Name Withheld 2 (Object)	Traffic is of concern on the already narrow roads surrounding the site. An influx of traffic will impact local residents trying to commute through to main roads.	<p><u>Traffic Impact</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 2a above for response to Traffic Impact.</p>	Refer to Item 2a
3b		Limited information shared on how the development will impact local residents.	<p><u>Information Access to Proposed Development</u></p> <p>The full application and supporting documentation is available to public on the NSW Major Projects website as well as submissions received.</p> <p>In relation to potential impact on neighbouring developments the responsibility of the design process is to limit the negative impacts on neighbours. In this regard the design has taken into account all aspects of the development and mitigated any likely impacts to neighbours such as by retaining and enhancing landscaping and native vegetation on the site, providing adequate on-site car parking and setbacks and measure to minimise impacts of the development in operation.</p>	NSW Major Projects website

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
3c		A large development on a small site is a concern.	<p><u>Scale of Proposal</u></p> <p>The site entire golf course site is 38ha and the proposed development site is for 3.8ha (approx. 10% of the site), It was intentional for the proposal to minimise the reduction in golf course area to enable the 18 hole course to be retained while providing sufficient area for a successful seniors housing development (requiring a threshold of residents to support the proposed facilities and services) and to support the renewal of the golf club house and associated facilities eg café.</p> <p>Refer also to Item 1h above for response on Scale/Character of the proposal.</p>	
3d		The possibility of building heights being increased has been mentioned, no clarity.	<p><u>Alternative Design</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 2b for response to Alternative Design.</p>	Refer to Item 2b
3e		Needs to be more transparency regarding the long term plans for the development.	<p><u>Long Term Information Transparency to Proposed Development</u></p> <p>It is note that early and comprehensive consultation was undertaken with the local community, including club members, directly impacted neighbours and the wider local community in the preparation of this application. This is fully documented in a Consultation Outcomes Report submitted with the EIS (Appendix Z) which itemises the extensive consultation methods undertaken including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Club member briefings • Community webinar • Survey • 1800 number and email survey • Letterbox drop • Display boards <p>Consultations in addition to neighbours and club members included</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cumberland City Council • Fist Nations Community • Chamber of Commerce • Local Advocacy groups including: • Greystanes Community Hub, and • Greystanes and Surrounds Community Noticeboard. • State and Federal Members of Parliament <p>This report notes that the club has committed to ongoing updates on the development of the site as the planning and construction process</p>	Appendix Z of EIS

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
			proceeds.	
4	Name Withheld 3 (Comment)	<p>I was unable to locate in a supportive report an analysis on building and personal safety from errant golf balls. Stage 2 buildings in particular building E & F are vulnerable to wayward tee shots of what will become the first hole. This is presently played as hole 10 and tee shots albeit a low number are (not purposely) hit and end up in the garden bed or hit the cart shed or finish behind the 11th green, the area traversed conflicting with the new buildings location. No only will some building damage occur, occupants could also be hit at some velocity.</p> <p>Similarly buildings A and C are vulnerable to overhitting to the 11th and 18th greens respectively. This could be from "using too much club" to ensure clearing the water hazards but could also arise from rebounds off sprinkler heads (a total random occurrence that happens at moment) of bounding off hard surfaces such as the new pathways. Again building damage and personal safety is at issue.</p> <p>A larger separation distance from course boundary to buildings would improve the situation and to restrict occupiers / visitors being able to wander onto the playing areas a continuous physical barrier could be considered.</p>	<p><u>Golf Activity</u></p> <p>Additional advice has been provided on this matter from the golf course designer Harrison Golf Pty Ltd, which is detailed in the RTS Report. This includes further mitigation measures in response to submissions to ensure the safety and compatibility of the golf course and residential/clubhouse uses.</p> <p>Harrison Golf consultants have noted that to provide for a pleasant interaction for golfers and for adjacent residents and buildings, and while there are not absolute standards, there must be a "reasonable" interaction, which does not mean that no balls will be hit across the golf course boundary, but that the number is not unreasonable.</p> <p>In relation to the specific design details, Harrison advises as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The first hole (previously the 10th) has been shortened by 30 metres, and the width from the centre line to the boundary is 50 metres at 100 metres from the tee. There are mature trees along the left side of the hole which help to protect the adjacent houses. For these reasons we believe that that there should not be significant problems on this hole. • On the 9th and 18th holes the centre of each green is 30 metres from the residential boundary behind, and there are bunkers at the rear of each green. Golfers do not often overhit by much, and it is most unlikely that there will be a problem behind these greens. When the path on the 11th hole is being constructed Harrison's will ensure it starts far enough back to avoid being hit. In any case not many balls get overhit much beyond the centre of the green. The proposed medium-level planting behind the greens will also help to stop balls reaching the boundary. <p>Harrison's has recommended that additional mitigation measures for the golf course enabling works within the project include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing reasonable setback between the golf course and the proposed development • Additional planting to be added to the existing vegetation being retained within this setback • Starting the path on the 11th hole far enough back to reduce the chances of it being hit 	RTS Report

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Placement of bunkers behind the greens to deter shots played long of the greens 	
5a	Name Withheld 4 (Object)	<p>1. There had been no evidence or information session invitation sent out by the Cumberland Golf Club.</p> <p>2. I became aware of this formal application being in progress after a letter box drop by a Neighbour last Thursday 16/5/2024.</p> <p>3. Some other neighbours shared the same concern (1) as me.</p>	<p><u>Consultation Process</u></p> <p>It is note that extensive consultation was undertaken early in the project with the local community, including club members, directly impacted neighbours and the wider local community. Matters relating to the public exhibition process are undertaken by the project team and the Cumberland Golf Club is not responsible for undertaking consultation.</p> <p>This development proposal is on the NSW Major Projects website, and the entire SSD process is run by the NSW Government.</p> <p>The Consultation Outcomes Report was attached to the EIS as submitted and the following consultation methods were undertaken:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Club member briefing Community webinar Survey 1800 number and email survey Letterbox drop Display boards Cumberland City Council staff Fist Nations Community Chamber of Commerce Local Advocacy groups including: Greystanes Community Hub, and Greystanes and Surrounds Community Noticeboard. Cumberland City Council Elected officials State Member for Prospect Federal Member for McMahon Paul Scully MP Minister form planning and public Spaces Media outlets 	Appendix Z of EIS
5b		<p>4. I can foresee the major impact to residents in Kootingal Street will be traffic volumes, and parking problems on what is a narrow street, with minimal parking available.</p>	<p><u>Traffic Impact (specific to Kootingal Street)</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1a for response to traffic impact on Kootingal Street.</p>	Refer to Item 1a

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices										
5c		5. It potentially be a bottle neck due to traffic volume entering and exiting Kootingal Street into Old Prospect Road/Cumberland Road.												
6a	Name Withheld 5 (Comment)	1. The Acoustic Report does not investigate / comment on the impact of noise made by use of / activities undertaken on the course (like golfers using practice facilities and teeing off located close to the ILU's nor operations such as greens mowing / bunker raking and like maintenance). Player activity in proximity to the ILU's occurs as early as day break.	<u>Golf Activity (Acoustic Impact)</u> Refer to Item 4 above for response to golf activity-related acoustic impact.	Refer to Item 4										
6b		2. The Traffic & Transport Report - whilst acknowledging a current shortfall in parking spaces for golfers and promoting an additional 20 spaces to that existing I consider this number will still be short of what is needed on site (and 'prevent' the need to park on street) to accommodate active golfer needs and necessary non-golfing support staff (addition bar staff / additional kitchen staff / etc arising from a larger floor area clubhouse), and in particular	<u>Parking for Golf Club</u> The required golf club parking spaces are assessed in the JMT report (Section 3.5.1) with justification for the required golf club parking spaces. Analysis has been undertaken which verifies that existing demand can amount to over 200 spaces at any one time. The proposal includes an enhancement to the existing car park for the club and golf course to include 220 spaces, which is over 10% greater than estimated peak parking demands and will be sufficient for peak times and to prevent overflow parking onto surrounding streets. For further information on parking space management, refer to the JMT report (Section 3.6) which provides further information that demonstrates measures that will be in place to ensure that golf club patrons only, and not seniors residents or their visitors, will utilise the golf club car park. This includes provision of sufficient ILU parking spaces, signage and landmarking, and future agreements for new residents not to use the golf club spaces, supported by registration details. Traffic at the golf club has been informed by the updated JMT Transport Assessment at Attachment K . The traffic entry and exit distributions across each of the three driveways for the additional residential traffic adopted in the assessment is as follows: JMT report - Table 4 Traffic distribution across internal driveways	Appendix J of EIS Attachment K										
		<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Driveway Location</th> <th rowspan="2">% of entries and exits*</th> <th colspan="2">Peak Hour Traffic Movements</th> </tr> <tr> <th>AM Peak Hour</th> <th>PM Peak Hour</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Driveway Location	% of entries and exits*	Peak Hour Traffic Movements		AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour				
Driveway Location	% of entries and exits*	Peak Hour Traffic Movements												
		AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour											

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices												
			<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Old Prospect Road (western driveway)</td> <td>30%</td> <td>9</td> <td>15</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Old Prospect Road (eastern driveway)</td> <td>50%</td> <td>15</td> <td>25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kootingal Street</td> <td>20%</td> <td>6</td> <td>10</td> </tr> </table> <p>* Excludes traffic to the golf club car park which will be via the eastern driveway on Old Prospect Road</p> <p>Increased traffic associated with entry and exit from the proposed development will be generated on Old Prospect Road and Kootingal Street. Site access from Kunyal Place will be considered limited and will not result in increased traffic impact on Kunyal Place.</p>	Old Prospect Road (western driveway)	30%	9	15	Old Prospect Road (eastern driveway)	50%	15	25	Kootingal Street	20%	6	10	
Old Prospect Road (western driveway)	30%	9	15													
Old Prospect Road (eastern driveway)	50%	15	25													
Kootingal Street	20%	6	10													
6c		3. The Traffic & Transport Report - does not discuss and evaluate the use of the Function Room and its specific parking needs, [the Function Room is mentioned to accommodate up to 200 persons] with concurrent (or even overlapping) use of the golf course proper and its provided car spaces.	<p><u>Parking for Golf Club</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 6b for response to Parking for Golf Club.</p>	Refer to Item 6b												
6d		4. A critique of the development is there is no clear distinction that the golf Club House and curtilage is not other than intimate with the Senior Living component. The community key that the primary use of the property is that of a golf course will be lost to those traversing the primary frontage - Old Prospect Road. This diminishment is further reinforced by the height of the residential buildings being clearly observable at distance when approaching the address.	<p><u>Development Frontage</u></p> <p>Updated Architectural Plans and Landscape Plan at Attachments G and I have addressed that the golf course is largely retained and that redevelopment area (subject of this proposal) is restricted to the northern portion of the site with the north-western corner to Old Prospect Road also remaining as part of the course. It is noted that, following exhibition, the proposal has been amended to include additional tree planting on the northern and eastern boundaries to reinforce the landscaped boundaries for views/vistas into the site.</p>	<p>Attachment G</p> <p>Attachment I</p>												
7a	Diane Aslanian (Object)	Having children, I am highly concerned about the amount of noise and length of time this development will incur and that will affect their studying and down time – this noise will also continue when introducing an additional 350+ residents and additional visitors right at the back of our home which will be a major disturbance.	<p><u>Construction Noise</u></p> <p>Construction noise and mitigation measures have been detailed in the Construction Management Plan at Appendix O of the EIS. Section 6.5 addressed that noise during the construction phase will be monitored in accordance with the Noise and Vibration Management Plan to be produced by the successful building contractor prior to commencing works on site. Noise monitoring equipment may be established around the site to ensure noise levels remain within the stipulated guidelines. Anticipated noise levels during construction are included in Section 10 of the Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment at Appendix N of the EIS.</p>	<p>Appendix O of EIS</p> <p>Appendix N of EIS</p>												

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
			<p>Particular attention will be given to the following activities to ensure noise levels are kept to a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demolition activities • Excavation in rock • Loading of trucks • Truck operating noise • The use of heavy Construction equipment • Construction activities that generate high levels of noise, likely to affect neighbouring residents / facilities. <p>During the construction phase, the following noise minimisation techniques may be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of equipment which produces less noise • Equipment silencers and other equipment noise abatement treatments where possible • Adherence to site working hours • Completing some works off site as part of prefabrication where practical • Conducting particularly noisy activities for short durations, where practical. <p><u>Construction Duration</u></p> <p>The project is being delivered across a number of stages, with the anticipated overall duration being from February 2025 to October 2028. This duration may be reduced if the stages are to overlap.</p>	
7b		<p>The traffic that this development will endure during building and afterwards is a high issue seeing that Kootingal Street is quite narrow as it stands and has always been a street used as a short cut by traffic already which is quite disturbing . Adding onto that will definitely add more congestion and hazards to the entire street.</p>	<p><u>Construction Traffic</u></p> <p>Noted. It is envisaged that construction vehicles would access the site directly via Old Prospect Road, which will be confirmed following the appointment of a contractor. Provisions would be made as part of the construction project to ensure that all vehicles have the ability to enter and exit the site in a forwards direction.</p> <p><u>Traffic Impact (specific to Kootingal Street)</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1a for response to traffic impact on Kootingal Street.</p>	<p>Attachment K</p> <p>Refer to Item 1a</p>
7c		<p>During development cars of workers will conveniently park in our street which would be the closest to the Cumberland</p>	<p><u>Construction Parking (specific to Kootingal Street)</u></p>	<p>Appendix O of</p>

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		Golf Course and again will put all us residents out as most of us need to park on the street already and will be highly inconvenient.	<p>Construction parking on Kootingal Street has been addressed in the Construction Management Plan at Appendix O of the EIS. Section 7.6 outlines that all construction workers will be encouraged to use public transport to access the site, with appropriate tool/equipment drop-off arrangements made at the site.</p> <p>The use of on-street parking on the surrounding local road network by construction personnel will be discouraged. This will be communicated during the induction of personnel and reinforced in daily toolbox talks. The Principal Contractor will be required to propose an appropriate approach for reducing construction worker travel by private car, including but not limited to use of public transport, carpooling, group transport and/or shuttle services from subcontractor premises or key transport nodes.</p>	EIS
7d		The development is being built behind our house and having a pool I deem this will be very unideal as our privacy will be jeopardised – I have kids that are constantly in the pool and don't think this would be appropriate seeing their age.	<p><u>Privacy Impact</u></p> <p>Privacy impacts have been a focus of Architectural Plans at Appendix B of the EIS and as updated at Attachment G. Residential units have been designed with appropriate building setback measures in accordance with State design (ADG) guidelines and orientations of living areas and balconies away from site boundaries to minimise privacy concerns with surrounding properties. Screening is also proposed be applied to further minimise privacy concerns where necessary. Additionally, Attachment U shows architectural treatments to Building F to restrict overlooking to the east boundary.</p> <p>The updated Architectural and Landscape Plans have also included retention of existing additional boundary trees/shrubs and additional new tree planting on the eastern boundary of the site to further screen and minimise privacy concerns for neighbours.</p>	<p>Appendix B of EIS</p> <p>Attachment G</p> <p>Attachment U</p>
7e		My daughter suffers from intense allergies and having the added dust & pollution from this development and future residents may affect this further	<p><u>Construction Air Quality Impact</u></p> <p>Construction air quality (dust) issue has been detailed in the Construction Management Plan at Appendix O of the EIS. Section 6.6 notes that the building contractor is responsible for managing and minimising construction dust during the construction phase.</p> <p>Specific items to address include, but are not limited to, the mitigation of dust off the site through the management of stockpiles and excavation areas. Common techniques used are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The employment of water trucks, sprinklers or spray cannons to spray 	Appendix O of EIS

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
			<p>exposed areas</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Covering stockpiles with geofabric or similar material Covering truckloads of soil or other dusty material prior to leaving site. <p>These measures are to be used as a minimum whenever wind-blown dust is observed.</p>	
7f		It will devalue all our homes in the street quite dramatically.	<p><u>Property Values</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1l for response to Property Values.</p>	Refer to Item 1l
7g		We have in the past made multiple complaints to the Golf Course and Cumberland Council about the noise that comes out from the carpark by customers that go to eat there and stand having quite loud chats right at our fence, the noise that comes from all the glass bottles being emptied from the bin and smashing together, the growth from the bottle brush trees over the fence and over our property and the amount of leaves that we must clean daily from our pool (3 broken pool cleaners due to this at our cost) and absolutely NOTHING has been done to rectify any of these issues.	<p><u>Golf Activity Noise Impact</u></p> <p>This submission raises current operational concerns with the club, while the proposal will be subject to an operational management plan which addresses such operational matters with any future club redevelopment and operations (refer to Appendix OO from the EIS).</p>	
8a	Joe Cuschieri (Object)	<p>The proposed six level Building D that will replace the existing single level club house is situated 60 metres from our back boundary.</p> <p>The construction of such a tall building will undoubtedly obstruct the views from many neighbouring properties, including my own. The unobstructed view from my backyard has been an essential aspect of my home's appeal, providing a sense of openness and connection to the surrounding environment. The proposed building threatens to diminish this aspect of our community, impacting property values and diminishing the overall aesthetic appeal of the area.</p>	<p><u>Visual Impact</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1j for response to Visual Impact.</p>	Refer to Item 1j
8b		In addition to this concern, it's important to note that our area is zoned R2 for residential use, and the proposed development does not appear to align with this zoning. The construction of a proposed six-level building along with other multi levelled buildings in this complex seems incongruent with the residential character of our	<p><u>Land Use Zoning</u></p> <p>The site's land use zoning has been summarised in Section 4.2 of the EIS. The site is zoned as RE2 Private Recreation under the Cumberland Local Environmental Plan (LEP). Seniors housing is identified as permissible in the RE2 zone under the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021</i> (Housing SEPP). Design requirements in the Housing SEPP regarding</p>	<p>Section 4.2 of EIS</p> <p>Appendix B of EIS</p>

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		neighbourhood and could set a precedent for further inappropriate development in the area.	considerations for the neighbouring residential context has been responded to in the Design Report at Appendix B of the EIS. Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character	Refer to Item 1h
8c		Furthermore, it has come to our attention that the developers are attempting to obscure the true eyesore this proposed development will impose by using our homes as a façade to hide the true visual intrusion that this proposed development is. This is shown in Figures 18, 19, and 20 from the Visual Impact Assessment, where our homes are depicted as being utilized to camouflage the looming presence of their project. The developers attempt to illustrate great design through graduating the height levels of the proposed buildings; however, this is at the cost of the residents of Kootingal Street. This exploitation of our properties as a shield for their design is concerning. It's disheartening to see our homes misrepresented to downplay the visual intrusion this building will impose on our community.	<u>Scale/Character</u> Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character. <u>Visual Impact</u> Refer to Item 1j for response to Visual Impact. <u>Privacy Impact</u> Refer to Item 7d response to Privacy Impact.	Refer to Item 1h Refer to Item 1j Refer to Item 7d
8d		Furthermore, it has come to our attention that the proposed building poses a significant threat to the privacy of existing residents. As homeowners, we have the right to privacy that comes with residing in a residential area. However, the design of Building D includes six levels of residential living space featuring large windows and balconies directly facing existing homes, rather than the proposed building adjacent to them. This design oversight is deeply concerning, as it directly infringes upon the privacy that current residents rightfully enjoy. The existing trees along our boundary fence, are insufficient in height to provide a privacy buffer. Without adequate screening, the proposed building threatens to expose our homes to unwanted scrutiny and intrusion, robbing us of the sense of sanctuary that our properties provide to us. It is worth noting that modern unit blocks are typically designed with mindfulness toward the privacy of their neighbours. Windows are strategically placed to prioritize ventilation and light while minimizing the ability of	<u>Scale/Character</u> Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character. <u>Privacy Impact</u> Refer to Item 7d response to Privacy Impact.	Refer to Item 1h Refer to Item 7d

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		residents to look out directly into neighbouring properties. This consideration for privacy is a standard practice in responsible urban development, yet it appears to have been disregarded in the design of Building D.		
8e		Additionally, I urge the Department of Planning to actively engage with residents to ensure that our voices are heard, and our concerns are addressed throughout the decision-making process.	<u>Consultation Process</u> Refer to Item 5a for response to Consultation Process.	Refer to Item 5a
9a	Linda Cook (Object)	The construction will vastly change the outlook for people living nearby on Old Prospect Road. We will go from a nice outlook to one with nothing but suburbia in view.	<u>Scale/Character</u> Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character.	Refer to Item 1h
9b		It will also crowd the area and lead to issues with traffic and parking.	<u>Traffic Impact</u> Refer to Item 2a for response to Traffic Impact. <u>Parking</u> Refer to Item 1e for response to Parking.	Refer to Item 2a Refer to Item 1e
9c		I purchased my property knowing the outlook was one of a golf course, not a crowded development like that proposed.	<u>Scale/Character</u> Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character.	Refer to Item 1h
10a	Name Withheld 7 (Comment)	I object to the height of the private dwellings (5 to 7 storey buildings). I feel aesthetically and on a privacy basis this would be detrimental to the local residents and the area in general.	<u>Scale/Character</u> Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character. <u>Privacy Impact</u> Refer to Item 7d response to Privacy Impact.	Refer to Item 1h Refer to Item 7d
10b		Also the access road (Kunyal Pl) off Kootingal St is going to generate an intolerable volume of traffic for the residents.	<u>Traffic Impact (specific to Kunyal Place and Kootingal Street)</u> Refer to Item 1a and 2a for response to Traffic Impact on Kunyal Place and Kootingal Street.	Refer to Item 1a Refer to Item 2a
11a	Name Withheld 8 (Object)	As a resident living directly across from this proposed Development I have major concerns. I have difficulty already getting out of my driveway on Old Prospect Road due to the heavy traffic, because of Schools, Church, Aged Care Facility and it is one of Greystanes main Roads.	<u>Traffic Impact (specific to Old Prospect Road)</u> The updated Traffic Assessment Report prepared by JMT Consulting (Attachment K) notes that the traffic modelling 'demonstrates that all three critical intersections adjacent to the site continue to perform at acceptable levels of service in both the AM and PM peak hours. The project will not impact the performance of these intersections, with very minimal increases in vehicles delays of typically less than 2 to 3 seconds on average.	Attachment K

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
			<p>The intersection level of service remains unchanged in comparison to a 'future base' scenario. This modelling has been reviewed by Transport for NSW who raised no concerns with the intersection performance outcomes – noting that Greystanes Road is a State Road under the control of TfNSW.</p> <p>The deterioration in intersection performance compared to existing conditions, specifically for the southern approach of the Old Prospect/ Greystanes Road intersection, is a result of background traffic growth and is unrelated to the proposal. The proposal itself only results in an increase in delay of 0.3 seconds when compared to a 'future base' scenario. In this context no further mitigation measures are required.</p>	
11b		As we live in a low density Residential Environment the Scale of what has now been proposed is NOT WHAT WAS ORIGINALLY voted on by CLUB MEMBERS. As a Member of the Golf Club I understand the need to maintain and improve facilities. But this Proposed development is Out of character for our Area. I sincerely hope this development will not be approved in its present Format	<p><u>Scale/Character</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character.</p>	Refer to Item 1h
12a	Anne Carr (Object)	Scale of the project especially the increased height of the apartment blocks. This is higher than I had previously been advised.	<p><u>Scale/Character</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character.</p>	Refer to Item 1h
12b		The new height of 5 to 7 stories changes the character of Greystanes.	<p><u>Scale/Character</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character.</p>	Refer to Item 1h
12c		Accesses to the site, in particular Kunyal Street which comes into Kootingal Street. The additional traffic will affect the lifestyle of us residents in Kootingal, Karuah and Kalang. Old Prospect Road is an extremely busy road. There are four schools nearby which impacts the traffic flow in school pick up/drop off times. The additional access onto Old Prospect Road, near Brighton Street, will cause traffic chaos.	<p><u>Traffic Impact (specific to Kunyal Place and Kootingal Street)</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1a and 2a for response to traffic impact on Kunyal Place and Kootingal Street.</p>	<p>Refer to Item 1a</p> <p>Refer to Item 2a</p>
13	Name Withheld 9 (Object)	The size of the project is too large for the space that has been allocated. The greed of the developers is clear for all to see with the push for 7 storey buildings in a residential area consisting of one and two storey dwellings. The developers are exploiting the loop hole state significant development under schedule 1, section 28 of State Environmental Planning Policy (planning systems) 2021 to get approval from the government. In the house of truth the primary	<p><u>Alternative Design</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 2b for response to Alternative Design.</p> <p><u>Scale/Character</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character.</p>	<p>Refer to Item 2b</p> <p>Refer to Item 1h</p> <p>Refer to Item 2a</p>

Appendix J of

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		<p>focus of the developers is to make money by squeezing the maximum number of units into the smallest amount of space. The plans of the development are not future proof with very little space allocated for parking. A development of this size needs more parking spaces than those proposed on the plans. No mention has been made of where the overflow of users will park their cars, caravans, boats, trailers camper vans etc. The surrendering residential streets are not wide enough to absorb this overflow. The selling point that the site has good public transport links is comically as it is not reliable and bus time tables are determined by time of day/night and weekend/week day. It will be a challenge for elderly residents to use public transport thus ensuring a high demand for private vehicle use.</p> <p>What is the point of building facilities if they are not future proof . For example, the board will get a 3 storey club house for selling out to the developers. Problem being that there is not enough parking for the current clubhouse how can you justify 3 storeys without significantly increasing parking. Dose the Cumberland Board and developers expect the wedding party and their guest to catch public transport or Ubers to their reception as the car park is full of golfing members. Unless done properly it is a waste of time.</p> <p>The local community and the majority of Cumberland Country Golf Club members have been lied from the outset by the Cumberland Golf Board and the developers. At the members meeting arranged to vote on changing the zoning of the land within the golf course boundary those who attended were told that the development would not exceed 3 stories in height. Many ignorant members with the promise of free drinks and nibbles after the meeting were persuaded to vote in favour of the development. One would assume that the board and developers knew that if past residents and members would be powerless to oppose changes as area is zoned RE2, no height restrictions. In the house of truth the majority of full paying/social members would have opposed the changing of the zoning if they knew the development would be 7 stories instead of 3 stories.</p>	<p><u>Traffic Impact</u> Refer to Item 2a for response to Traffic Impact.</p> <p><u>Public Transport Access</u> A Preliminary Green Travel Plan has been prepared at Appendix J of the EIS which addressed public transport access use from the site. The encouragement and increase of use in public transport by residents and visitors will be assisted by the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create a map identifying the location of bus stops and routes to make public transport available to all users; and • Improve wayfinding signage between the site and nearby bus stops (to be discussed with Council). <p><u>Parking</u> Refer to Item 1e for response to Parking.</p> <p><u>Biological Impact</u> Refer to Item 1i for response to Biological Impact.</p> <p><u>Tree Removal</u> Refer to Item 1i for response to Tree Removal.</p> <p><u>Cumberland Golf Club Board and Consultation</u> Refer to comments on Consultation Process.. The club board composition, and operation are not planning considerations.</p> <p><u>Golf Activity</u> Refer to Item 4 for response to Golf Activity.</p> <p><u>Capacity of surrounding infrastructure</u> The EIS is accompanied by technical reports which assess the capacity and any additional requirements which will be provided for the site and to ensure this does not impact on the surrounds in terms of infrastructure and servicing needs.</p>	<p>EIS</p> <p>Refer to Item 1e</p> <p>Refer to Item 1i</p> <p>Refer to Item 4</p>

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		<p>The developers have benefited from the recent ruling that Old Prospect Road has remnant Cumberland Plans vegetation. This has enabled them to significantly change the height of the development to 7 stories. Buildings of this height will have a detrimental impact on the protected vegetation. They will impact drainage and increase the shading which will stress vegetation leaving them vulnerable to disease and eventual death.</p> <p>Who will police the removal of those 71 trees on the development site. Which authority will hold the developers accountable for ensuring that there is no damage or unlawful removal of vegetation. Will the penalties been sufficient to ensure developers are not tempted to deliberately destroy vegetation so more units can be built.</p> <p>It is unethical that significant changes can be made to development plans without a revote. The majority of members who voted yes would have voted no if they knew the changes in height of the development. Furthermore there has been no transparency with the development, the majority of members who voted yes are unaware that plans have changed. Within the club house out dated plans are on display for the public to view they make no mention of the new development heights. What is the board and developers hiding, why do they not have accurate plans on display. Are they scared that there will be a community/members backlash if the truth is exposed</p> <p>As highlighted in the SEAR's report surrounding areas north, east and west of the proposed development are low density 1 and 2 storey residential housing. A 7 storey development would look out of place in Greystanes. Real estate values of surrounding houses will be detrimentally impacted and privacy will be compromised. When questioned response was that established trees would screen out the development and protect privacy. The trees surrounding the development site are not 7 stories high. This is a clear example of the lack of empathy shown by the developers</p> <p>This development was well in the pipeline before the</p>		

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		<p>current housing crisis and non of the properties in the development fall under affordable housing. The incompetent Cumberland Golf Club board have been played by the developers "they have gone to the pet shop to buy a golf fish but have been sold a piranha instead". The future of the golf club is out of the control of its members, its destiny is in the hands of the developers and the State Government and an incompetent Cumberland Golf Club Board. In years to come will this valuable open space be subdivided to the highest bidder, will there even be a golf course in the future on this site?</p>	<p>Of concern is the lack of diversity on the Cumberland Golf Club Board. The majority are over the age of 55 and many of them have businesses that could benefit from the development going ahead. There has also been a lot of movement on the board recently. Board members instrumental in pushing for the development have stood down and new board members appointed at the discretion of the existing board. Is there a conflict of interest, have the actions of those current and past board members been ethical. In the house of truth if the board and management of the golf club were competent there would be no need to sell out to the developers to stay afloat. Examples of question decisions by board and management include,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -reduction of raffle prizes on a Thursday/ Friday night -reduction of frequency of members badge draws on Thursday/ Friday night -closure of the club to the public to cater for member events that are poorly patronised -recruitment of members from outside the LGA that do not patronise club house -boys club mentality that does not encourage new members in particular families to patronise the club - in denial unaware that social members /non golfing members inject money into the club and <p>Is it any wonder why potential patrons drive past the club and go to Wenty Leagues instead</p> <p>The infrastructure in the surrounding streets has not been designed to cater for a development of this size. Within the</p>	

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		<p>seniors village there will be approximately 230 independent living units plus 30-50 aged care beds. How is it possible for a development to be approved on estimates. As previously mentioned nobody knows how much parking has been set aside within the development site. From the plans available developers have made a lot of assumptions to justify the volume of independent living units that will be squeezed on site. Build now worry about parking later attitude. In the house of truth the more space set aside for parking the less units that can be built, thus reducing the profit of the developer. More than likely the overflow of vehicles will take the spaces of residents in surrounding streets. Kootingal Street for example has a large number of multi generation house holds. As a consequence many residents need to park cars on the road outside their house as they do not have room. Sharing with space with overflow from the village will create congestion and further narrow the street. Currently cars need to wait until other car passes to safely enter and exit street, image the congestion when ambulances, waste disposal and visitors use the street to access the development. The street is also used as thoroughfare short cut for visitors and residents avoiding morning/afternoon congestion from local school. Speed limits are not adhered to which increase risk to residents reversing out of drives and young children who use the park within Kootingal street.</p>		
		<p>It makes no sense to approve a development of this scale without traffic plans. Will roads be widened, will there be speed humps/roundabouts, traffic lights etc. Who will pay for these. These cost's should be the sole responsibility of the developer not the rate payers of Greystanes</p>		
		<p>Area where the club house and independent living units are to be built accumulates a lot of run off in heavy rain and floods, yet it requires no further assessment beyond industry specific SEARS. How is this possible, if golf carts can not be driven in these locations after rain how is it not a flood risk</p>		
		<p>For the residents that buy into this development are they aware that they are living on a golf course. Are they aware</p>		

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		<p>that the occasion stray golf ball may damage their property, are they aware that green keepers will be using heavy/loud machinery early in the morning, are they aware that fertilisers will create odours etc. Will the golf club be allowed to function in the manner it currently functions or will new residents living in the development dictate what can and can not be done</p>		
		<p>In conclusion I am opposed to this development as it will not benefit the majority. This is a clear example of a money making development that fails to take into consideration the current and future needs of the rate payers of Greystanes. The lack of vision in terms of allocated car parking and the heights of the proposed buildings will destroy Greystanes for future generations. Infrastructure such as roads and public transport are struggling now, how will they cope if a development of this scale is approved. If approved this development will open up a pandoras box, the future of all open space will be at the mercy of developers and the State Government looking for easy revenue</p>		
14	Name Withheld 10 (Object)	<p>Greystanes/Pemulwuy areas are already saturated with aged care and retirement homes – we don't need anymore retirement living or as such.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Genista Aged Care Facility (opposite the golf club) 2. Greystanes Nursing Home 3. Southern Cross Care Greystanes Residential Aged Care 4. Estia Health Cumberland Road Greystanes 5. Bolton Clarke Pemulwuy Residential and Aged Care 6. Nelson Grove Retirement Community Pemulwuy 	<p><u>Age care facility within vicinity</u></p> <p>The proposal recognises the forecast 95% increase in people aged 65-84 years and 183% increase in 85+ years age groups by 2036, and the need to deliver diverse and medium density housing for older people situated close to their established neighbourhood, social group and services, as addressed in the Central City District Plan and Cumberland 2030: Local Strategic Planning Statement.</p> <p>As such, the proposed development will increase capacity and housing diversity for aged care and provide an upgraded servicing offering to meet the needs of existing and future residents and to respond to the needs of modern-day aged care standards and the aging demographic in the area.</p>	

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		Lack of medical centres and pharmacies – A lot of our GPs have left the areas for the past few years and there is no new medical centre being setup for the past 15 years. All existing medical centres have only 1 or 2 doctors. This is due to the increase in consultation fees. As most GPs here do not charge additional consultation fees for pensioners, the GPs are unable to earn extra for their services. Because of this, none of the medical centres in Greystanes and Pemulwuy accepts new patient at moment. Additionally, the pharmacies are not accepting any new Webster patients except Discount Drug Store in Greystanes. Even then, the number of Webster patients have skyrocketed to 140 and recently they are unable to accept anymore.	<u>Lack of medical centres and pharmacies</u> The proposal includes a residential care facility which will include ancillary health and wellness consulting rooms which will support the seniors resident health needs and services on site, minimising impacts on local related health service needs.	
		Kunyal Place – The gate that connects the golf club to Kootingal Street has always been used for the purpose of gardening use of the golf club; where garden ute, trailers or tree loopers can drive through when necessary. Although, it is rarely open and used. This entry/exit should not be used as a gateway and thorough-fare for the residences of the new 234 units, 3 storeys of residential facility, THE STAFF AND THEIR GUESTS.	<u>Site Access (specific to Kunyal Place)</u> Refer to Item 10b for response to traffic and site access impact on Kunyal Place.	Refer to Item 10b
		Kootingal Street – Kootingal Street is not a main street. Instead, it is a small, narrow rectangular shaped road that goes around for the sole use of the Kootingal residences and our guests only. Most of our houses have 3 to 5 bedrooms. We have on average of 2 or more cars per household. Due to the cost of living crisis, some of the houses have two families living in one house. As a result, there are numerous cars parked on both sides of the street; making the street a one-way street especially in the afternoon and evening. On the weekend, the street kerb is a chockablock as residences stay at home we have guests coming over for gathering. This makes our street very congested enough without taking into account the additional numbers construction trucks, tradies utes, the future new residences and the staff likely want to find parking in our street for additional parking spots; and using our street as thoroughfare. In shorts, this will cause severe congestion and there is absolutely no way, our street can be used as thorough-fare for the new golf residences.	<u>Traffic Impact (specific to Kootingal Street)</u> Refer to Item 1a for response to traffic impact on Kootingal Street. <u>Parking</u> Refer to Item 1e for response to parking impact.	Refer to Item 1a Refer to Item 1e

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		<p>The 234 units – I've noticed that some of the units have 2 or 3 bedrooms. For retirement homes, I'm rather suspicious of the reasons of that 3 bedrooms been built. This will enable the apartments to be used as a family residence instead of being solely used for the purpose of retirement living.</p>	<p><u>Housing Mix and Seniors requirement</u></p> <p>Diverse dwelling mix has been addressed in the EIS. Seniors housing provisions under the <i>State Environmental Planning Policy (Housing) 2021</i> (Housing SEPP) encourages more diverse forms of seniors housing than may be permitted in council LEPs in order to meet the needs and expectations of an ageing population. This application is proposing a diversity of seniors living options, including independent living units (ILUs) comprising 1, 2 and 3 bedroom units in various sizes and layouts, and a residential care facility (RCF), providing high care services and with a range of studio and one bedroom suites.</p> <p>The Housing SEPP requires residents to be over 60 years and most new units will be occupied by a single persons or a couple. Given that seniors are generally retired or semi-retired, in general they will spend more time in their home and like to have living options such as a separate bedroom each and a hobby room/s in the spare bedroom.</p> <p>The Housing SEPP contains detailed requirements for ensuring that purpose built seniors housing developments provide for people to remain living independently and to "age-in-place" in their communities, through quality design and accessibility measures both external and internal to the apartments (eg. Level accesses, lifts, and larger internal spaces such as wider corridors and larger bathrooms). This is supplemented by shared health and wellness spaces to encourage active lifestyles and social interaction and support.</p>	EIS
		<p>5 – 7 storeys – Our Greystanes has always been a low density suburb. Building such high apartments will block the western sun the view of the golf course. For the Kootingal residences on the western side, we do not want others in multi storey blocks looking down into their houses. Hence, this housing development does not align with the community goals and expectations in Kootingal St and Greystanes.</p>	<p><u>Scale/Character</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character.</p>	Refer to Item 1h

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		<p>Low density area - area with no railway line and metro. There are a few bus lines. Even so, you need to take two buses just to get to our nearest railway station (Pendle Hill Train Station). I can't see this is a good place for a big retirement group living.</p> <p>See image attachment on the NSW Major Projects website.</p>	<p>Public Transport Access Refer to Item 13 for response to public transport access.</p>	Refer to Item 13
15a	Graham Luckman (Support) Note this was an Objection submission instead of the Portals record of Support)	<p>We have significant concerns in regard to traffic management</p> <p>1] increased traffic in Kootingal st as street is very narrow, requires cars to give way if even 1 car is parked on side of the road, most families have 2 vehicles.</p>	<p>Traffic Impact (specific to Kootingal Street) Refer to Item 1a for response to traffic impact on Kootingal Street.</p>	Refer to Item 1a
15b		<p>2] The use of Kunyal st both during construction but ongoing access for the subsequent 99 years</p>	<p>Construction Traffic Refer to Item 7b for response to Construction Traffic.</p>	Refer to Item 7b
15c		<p>3] impact on resale values of a once quiet st/ cul-de-sac morphing into a busy construction and resident access road - what is going to cost me?</p>	<p>Construction Traffic Refer to Item 7b for response to Construction Traffic.</p>	Refer to Item 7b
15d		<p>4] potential lack of parking for golf club members and visitors in particular on busy golf days.</p>	<p>Parking for Golf Club Refer to Item 6b for response to Parking for Golf Club.</p>	Refer to Item 6b
15e		<p>5] during one of the "public consultations" the general dismissal of traffic concerns re points 1 to 4</p>	<p>Community Consultation (specific traffic concern) The traffic concerns as discussed in the public consultation session has been recorded and addressed in the Consultation Outcomes Report at Appendix Z of the EIS. Section 6.1 has identified traffic concerns recorded during the community neighbour drop-in session, consultation email, and golf club member briefing, of which has been individually responded to.</p>	Appendix Z of EIS
15f		<p>6] why isn't Brighton st not being considered as access to village? road is wider and has housing on only one side of road</p>	<p>Traffic and Access (specific to Brighton Street) The development site does not include the corner of Brighton Street and Old Prospect Road as this part of the site is intended to continue golf course and is required for the reconfigured golf course to remain an 18 hole course.</p> <p>Refer to Item 1a and Item 2a for response to traffic impact in the surrounds of the proposed development.</p>	<p>Appendix J of EIS</p> <p>Refer to Item 1a</p> <p>Refer to Item 2a</p>

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
15g		7] during a community webinar majority of area inclusive of Kootingal st lost internet late in presentation and were not given opportunity to qualify points 1 to 4 - my request for copy of presentation was rejected even though they knew we lost internet	Community Consultation (specific to webinar) Noted. The community webinar presentation has been attached as Appendix B.2 under the Consultation Outcomes Report at Appendix Z of the EIS.	Appendix Z of EIS
15h		8] suggest that many in our street have no computer or skills to navigate the creation of account etc. to be able to submit additionally I know of at least one couple overseas on holiday - so reply count will not be an accurate representation of residents in particular those who have been here for years.	Submission Process A Notice of Exhibition was distributed via physical mail as well as being available online to the relevant area of distribution for neighbouring properties. The Notice of Exhibition was available to the public on [23 April 2024] which detailed the project exhibition date (from 23 April 2024 to 20 May 2024), with assistance to public submission available via contact with Service NSW on 1300 305 695.	Appendix Z of EIS
16a	Name Withheld 11 (Object)	We as a street all have concerns about the traffic and congestion this project will have on our street. Can this project be moved elsewhere even suggesting the side of Brighton street greystanes, as no homes back onto the golf course / the road is much wider for traffic to be controlled. We have a lot of children and families in our street that use the park on Kootingal street. We also don't want our children being hurt or injured due to increased amount of traffic coming onto our street. The road is already very narrow with residents parking up and down the street.	Traffic Impact Refer to Item 2a for response to Traffic Impact. Traffic and Access (specific to Brighton Street) Refer to Item 15f for response to traffic and access impact on Brighton Street.	Refer to Item 2a Refer to Item 15f
16b		Also the devalue of the houses that are currently facing the beautiful golf course side.	Property Value Refer to Item 11 for response to Property Value.	Refer to Item 11
16c		We as a street are against this planned action. We also noticed not everyone on the street has been made aware of this plan and only certain neighbours received letters in the mail and not the whole street. Hence why residents are now taking action and informing each other in person. A lot of residents on our street have lived here for 40+ years and we don't want this to happen.	Community Consultation Refer to Item 5a and 15h for response to general community consultation response.	Refer to Item 5a Refer to Item 15h
17a	Name Withheld 12 (Object)	I very much oppose this project This is way too big, such an eye sore and nothing comes close to this size within the community.	Scale/Character Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character.	Refer to Item 1h

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
17b		This is going to create more traffic on old prospect which is already a very busy not to mention that intersection already known to have accidents	Traffic and Access (specific to Old Prospect Road) Refer to Item 11a for traffic and access impact on Old Prospect Road.	Refer to Item 11a
17c		There is already other aged care facilities very close and there fore no need for another that large. Honestly the whole physical profile of this suburb will change and the fact that even in Pemulwuy nothing comes close to this size is telling	Scale/Character Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character.	Refer to Item 1h
18a	Name Withheld 13 (Object)	It's going to create too much traffic in a position that there is already accidents.	Traffic Impact Refer to Item 2a for response to Traffic Impact.	Refer to Item 2a
18b		There is already an aged care facility close.	Age care facility within vicinity Refer to Item 14 for response to Age care facility within vicinity.	Refer to Item 14
18c		It's not the correct location for a massive building like what's proposed.	Scale/Character Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character.	Refer to Item 1h
19	Name Withheld 14 (Object)	<p>I am a concerned resident of Kootingal st and am writing to advise my concerns on this development. Plans for this development have change and is considerably larger in size. (Each building is between 5-7 stories not the original height that we were told) and means a lot more traffic to the area. Kootingal st is a very congested street and is not designed for this amount of traffic. We already struggle to drive through the street.</p> <p>Kootingal st cannot handle any more overflow of traffic or parking, especially on peak periods. 5-7 story buildings are not common in the area and will harm the overall landscape of the suburb. A more suitable design should be considered like only 2 stories high to match the landscape in the area.</p> <p>We moved here for the quietness of the street but bringing such large structures to the area is just not acceptable. Please listen to the residents views as we are the ones that will have live with these consequences. Thank you</p>	<p>Alternative Design Refer to Item 2b for response to Alternative Design.</p> <p>Traffic Impact (specific to Kootingal Street) Refer to Item 1a for response to traffic impact on Kootingal Street.</p>	<p>Refer to Item 2b</p> <p>Refer to Item 1a</p>

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
20a	Name Withheld 15 (Object)	I object to the level of traffic and noise that Kootingal St would incur as a result of this development. Kootingal St, once voted as one of the best streets in Greystanes, would inherit an ugly backdrop of multi-storey buildings.	<u>Traffic Impact (specific to Kootingal Street)</u> Refer to Item 1a for response to traffic impact on Kootingal Street.	Refer to Item 1a
20b		Furthermore, the whole development would change the nature of our locality and destroy its community feel.	<u>Scale/Character</u> Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character.	Refer to Item 1h
21	John Kiddle (Support)	To Whom it may Concern, I have been a member of Cumberland Country Golf Club for over 50 years and a strong supporter of the proposed development. Cumberland has always been a leader. Always on the forefront of new ideas such as being the first course in NSW to install a fairway watering system but now it has reached a stop. In order for growth to continue within the club we need to meet modern day.	This submission in support is noted. <u>Proposal supports long term success of golf club</u> <u>Enable the golf course to be refreshed</u> <u>Seniors proposal will provide new members</u> <u>Protects the future of the course as major green space</u>	

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		<p>It is vital that Cumberland as a golf course and social hub for the community continues for next 100 years. There is no reward for a short-term plan, or having the club be taken over by one of the Major Clubs. These clubs are only invested in gambling revenue, they have no interest in the green space.</p> <p>The model of Cumberland is not broken but hardships such as Covid and wet weather strangles the Club's ability to operate.</p> <p>The current Clubhouse having just surpassed it's 60th year, has seen it's day. Our community deserves a rejuvenated space.</p> <p>In closing, the proposed Seniors Living Development will refresh the current course & provide a coming of age Club House for all members, guests and the public to enjoy for an additional 60 years+ This arrangement will ensure the future of Cumberland Country Golf Club not only as a Club but as a major green space within the area.</p>		
22	Marina Murphy (Support)	<p>My extended family and I regularly use the club facilities including the restaurant</p> <p>We live locally and find both the staff and venue a safe and friendly environment</p> <p>With family, it is great to have a club locally which has a great outlook and where gambling is not the main game It's a golf club with a wonderful family orientation.</p> <p>I has seen the plans to the proposed new club house and retirement living and can only say it looks wonderful and will give many locals the opportunity to stay in the area</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity</p>	<p>This submission in support is noted.</p> <p>Supports continued club facilities for locals</p> <p>Seniors housing allows locals to stay in the area.</p>	
23a	Name Withheld 16 (Object)	<p>I object to The Cumberland golf club seniors housing development as it will create more traffic and congestion next to my property.</p>	<p>Traffic Impact</p> <p>Refer to Item 2a for response to Traffic Impact.</p>	Refer to Item 2a
23b		<p>This also affects my privacy and will be blocking natural light into my property.</p>	<p>Privacy Impact</p> <p>Refer to Item 7d response to Privacy Impact.</p>	Refer to Item 7d

Appendix B of

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
			<p><u>Solar Access and Overshadowing</u></p> <p>Overshadowing impact has been addressed in Section 6.5 of the EIS. Winter solstice shadow diagrams included in the Architectural Drawings at Appendix B of the EIS demonstrated that the proposed development is not considered to give rise to any unacceptable overshadowing impacts on existing or future public domain areas or adjoining properties. Given the direction of sunlight and the location of the proposed development in the northern portion of the site with an extensive southern setback afforded by the golf course, the majority of the shadow cast will fall within the subject site and there will be no shadows cast over adjacent properties from 9am – 1pm during the winter solstice, and limited shading over adjacent properties to the south-east of the development from 2pm during the winter solstice. Given that these properties will only experience shading in the mid-late afternoon while receiving in excess of three hours of unobstructed access to sunlight for the remainder of the day, the overshadowing impact is considered to be reasonable and acceptable.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is clear the proposed works will not give rise to any unacceptable overshadowing impacts, ensuring appropriate amenity to surrounding properties and open space can still be achieved.</p>	EIS
23c		Our street is one of the most sort after streets in greystanes this project will also affect resale price of properties on my street. The buildings are excessive and too close to homes.	<p><u>Property Value</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1l for response to Property Value.</p>	Refer to Item 1l
23d		Works carried out will cause major dust and allergies to many residents surroundings.	<p><u>Construction Air Quality Impact</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 7e for response to Construction Air Quality Impact.</p>	Refer to Item 7e
24a	Name Withheld 17 (Object)	The proposed development is very large and will be an eye-sore. The average height of the six accommodation buildings is over 6 storeys, with 3 of them being 7 storeys. Certainly way beyond the norm for our lovely suburb.	<p><u>Scale/Character</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character.</p> <p><u>Visual Impact</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1j for response to Visual Impact.</p>	<p>Refer to Item 1h</p> <p>Refer to Item 1j</p>
24b		Despite assurances otherwise, common sense indicates that traffic and parking will be a big problem in Kootingal Street, especially near Kunyal Place. Kootingal Street is a narrow street (historically with a Light Traffic sign) and the extra traffic is just an accident waiting to happen. Exit onto Old Prospect Road from Kootingal Street can already take a	<p><u>Traffic Impact (specific to Kunyal Place and Kootingal Street)</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1a and 2a for response to traffic impact on Kunyal Place and Kootingal Street</p> <p><u>Parking</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1e for response to Parking.</p>	<p>Refer to Item 1a</p> <p>Refer to Item 2a</p> <p>Refer to Item 1e</p>

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		wait of many minutes during peak times. A packed lunch will be needed if the development goes ahead.		
24c		To summarise: Our main concerns are that the whole character of our neighbourhood would change, become less safe and would be much more difficult to access.	<u>Scale/Character</u> Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character.	Refer to Item 1h
25a	Name Withheld 18 (Object)	1. The height of the buildings. I cannot believe that under Cumberland Council's LEP there's no maximum building height for buildings in zone RE2. The area around the golf course is low density residential. The height of the buildings, in particular the 7, 6 and 5 storeys impacts on the amenity of a low density residential environment.	<u>Land Use Zoning</u> Refer to Item 8b for response to Land Use Zoning. <u>Scale/Character</u> Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character.	Refer to Item 8h Refer to Item 1h
25b		2. Additional accesses to the site. a. Old Prospect Road near Brighton Street. Old Prospect Road is a very busy road. It's the main bus route from Pemulwuy/Greystanes to Parramatta and Merrylands. There's two schools on Old Prospect Road and two in Beresford Road. The site access near Brighton Street will cause traffic problems especially during school pick up/drop off times.	<u>Traffic and Access (specific to Brighton Street)</u> Refer to Item 15f for response to traffic and access impact on Brighton Street.	Refer to Item 15f
25c		b. Kunyal Place into Kootingal Street. The local streets (Kootingal, Kalang and Karuah) are very quiet residential streets. The additional traffic from the site will impact on the resident's lifestyle.	<u>Traffic Impact (specific to Kunyal Place and Kootingal Street)</u> Refer to Item 10b for response to traffic impact on Kunyal Place and Kootingal Street.	Refer to Item 10b
26a	Name Withheld 19 (Object)	I would like to object to the proposed planning development in our community, primarily on the grounds of its potential impact on traffic congestion. As a resident who considers the well-being and functionality of our neighborhood, I believe it is crucial to carefully consider the implications of any development projects on our local infrastructure, particularly regarding traffic flow and safety. The proposed development, as outlined in the plans, appears to lack sufficient provisions for managing the increased traffic volume on and around Kootingal Street, Greystanes.	<u>Traffic Impact (specific to Kunyal Place and Kootingal Street)</u> Refer to Item 10b for response to traffic impact on Kunyal Place and Kootingal Street.	Refer to Item 10b
26b		I hope that meaningful community engagement is prioritized to ensure that the voices and concerns of local	<u>Community Consultation</u>	Refer to Item 16c

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		residents are heard and addressed in the planning process.	Refer to Item 16c for response to Community Consultation.	
27a	Name Withheld 20 (Object)	The basis of my objection to this project is on four grounds. 1. The reduction of green space (being the golf course land) in Western Sydney at a time of climate change where the planet continues to heat especially with the removal of trees and vegetation. I can accept that development of additional housing is necessary in Sydney but I do not believe this should be done at the expense of green space.	<u>Biological Impact</u> Refer to Item 1i for response to Biological Impact. <u>Tree Removal</u> Refer to Item 1i for response to Tree Removal.	Refer to Item 1i
27b		2. My second objection is on the basis that the local streets around the golf course are very narrow and cannot cope with additional traffic that this development will bring. It is difficult enough now to pass other cars and the addition of cars will only make this more dangerous.	<u>Traffic Impact</u> Refer to Item 2a for response to Traffic Impact.	Refer to Item 2a Refer to Item 6b
27c		3. My third objection is on the basis that insufficient parking has been allowed under this development. Currently, the overflow of cars on busy golf days park ion the practice fairway. Under the proposal there will be no practice fairway so where are these cars going park? Is already busy side streets? A suggestion from one club offical was that people could catch the bus to golf! This is hardly very practically when you are also I transporting golf clubs.	<u>Traffic Impact</u> Refer to Item 2a for response to Traffic Impact. <u>Parking for Golf Club</u> Refer to Item 6b for response to Parking for Golf Club.	
27d		4. My final objection is under the golf club development there will be no practice fairway or facilities other than perhaps a putting green. Cumberland Golf Club has had a long standing practice of providing junior golf clinics to help develop the next generation of golfers and provide local juniors an opportunity to be outdoors and doing some exercise. This ability will be lost in the future at a time where we should be encouraging young people to be active.	<u>Loss of golf course</u> Changes to the golf course have been addressed in the Consultation Outcomes Report at Appendix Z of the EIS. The golf course realignment provides the most suitable balance in terms of a continuing course, minimised development footprint and retention of trees and landscaping. It is noted that while the course will be changing from a par 72 to a par 70, it will still be a championship 18-hole course. While the development will require the removal of the short-range practice green, the Club will still have practice and warm up nets, and is looking at other low key opportunities such as undercover practice nets and exploring virtual golf technology. The Club often makes the course available to juniors and will continue to	Appendix Z of EIS

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
			do so.	
28	Alan Storey (Support)	The long term viability and sustainability of Cumberland Golf course would be under significant pressure without this proposal. Golfing numbers at our club and in the wider world are falling and without this injection of funds from the project and the income it will generate on an annual basis, the club would almost certainly close at some time in the future. If this were to happen then the course and beautiful parkland that it provides would be lost. I believe our directors have done an excellent job in talking with the community, and taking into account their concerns, as well as those of our fellow members. My member number is 2389 and I support the project	This submission in support is noted. <u>Supports long term success of the Golf club and course.</u>	
29	Robert Shield (Support)	NSW Planning I have been a golfing member of Cumberland Country Golf Club for over 15 years. The club is my major social and sporting base and a place where my wife and I have made great friends. The club provides access for all, with a very good golf course and welcoming clubhouse which has a restaurant. Our extended family recently celebrated a significant birthday at the restaurant, which is open to the public. The last three years with Covid and the wet weather, has demonstrated that the golf club as a standalone sporting club cannot generate the cash flow to operate and find money to complete golf course mandatory upgrades and maintenance. The club house is 60 years old and needs to be replaced or modernized. The economics of golf are that, unless a club has non golf income it cannot reinvest. The investment in the Seniors living with the developer partnership provides income, improved utilization of the facilities and a real "hub". The seniors living development will complement, refresh the course and a provide a new clubhouse. The lease income will support investment in the course and provide a very good experience for all members, guests and the	This submission in support is noted. <u>Supports long term success of the Golf club and course</u> <u>Club provides local social and recreation benefits</u> <u>Enable the golf course to be refreshed</u> <u>Seniors proposal will provide new members</u> <u>Seniors design protects the integrity of the course</u> <u>Protects the future of the course as major green space</u>	

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		<p>public. The majority of members (average age 60 years) live in the area, and many can now see an opportunity to retire in the proximity of the golf course.</p> <p>The club has always respected neighbours and members raise substantial funds for Legacy and Prostrate cancer. It is a good corporate citizen.</p> <p>The design of the retirement village, at the northern end of the course means that the integrity of the green space will be retained and the senior's living footprint will not be the dominant feature.</p> <p>In summary this is a very significant step for the golf club which is 87 years old and has the support of the majority of golfing and social members.</p>		
30	Name Withheld 21 (Support)	<p>I grew up in the Greystanes area and have been a member of the Cumberland Golf Club for about 30years when I joined as a junior golfer. I travel once or twice a week to pay golf at Cumberland because it's a good Club and Course and I still have many lifelong friends there. I think the development should be approved because it will provide income for the club to remain strong and exist for well into the future. It will provide badly needed retirement accommodation options for the area and free up housing for families like mine to move into. Many of my friends would like to downsize but don't want to leave the Greystanes area.</p> <p>I am concerned that if nothing is done to secure the club's future, it will be swallowed up like many other smaller clubs have been and cease to exist.</p> <p>It will also give people in the area somewhere to downsize and stay connected with the community they know and have strong community ties with.</p> <p>The design of the living units, the new clubhouse and golf course are very good because they provide plenty of trees and green space and open areas for members and the local community to enjoy. The new clubhouse will give more modern options for people to socialise and enjoy.</p> <p>I like the idea of having an aged care block in the development so that people living in the complex or nearby</p>	<p>This submission in support is noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports long term success of the Golf club and course • Club provides local social and recreation benefits • Enable the golf course to be refreshed • Seniors proposal will provide new members • Seniors housing will provide for locals to stay in area/downsize/age in place • Seniors design protects the integrity of the course and trees • Protects the future of the course as major green space 	

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		can be looked after as they grow older without having to move too far away from their family.		
31	Martin Smith (Support)	I support this development application	This submission in support is noted.	
32a	Name Withheld 22 (Object)	<p>1. Parking – provision and rate</p> <p>The club has advised members that there are 180 current parking spaces at the club. The development proposes increasing this to 220 spaces. This is totally inadequate. In the proposal the Developer states that there are currently overflow spaces used by the club in the Southern area of the property and has provided pictures of this area. What the developer has intentionally omitted is the fact that the current practice fairway, further south of what they state is the overflow area, is the real overflow carpark area, and on the main golf competition days, every Saturday, Sunday and Wednesday, this area holds anywhere from 40 up to 100 cars, depending on how busy the club is. The Developer has allowed approx 40 additional car spaces, yet on a minimum of 3 days per week, there will be up to 60 cars seeking a park that won't exist. Their only option will be to park on Old Prospect Rd or Kootingal St. Parking on either Street will be dangerous, especially on Kootingal St which is a narrow suburban street, not designed to handle non resident parking. I have included as attachments, 3 pictures of the practice fairway, used as an overflow carpark.</p> <p>In marketing the Development to Club members, the Club board and management stated the new clubhouse will attract significant public visitors and the club facilities will attract many new functions and so boost the profitability of the club. That is great, but there is no parking for members of the public or people attending the function to be held at the club. Again, these visitors will be forced to park on Old Prospect Rd or Kootingal St.</p> <p>The problem with the parking stems from the fact that the Developer, in maintaining the huge profit margin that will be made, has elected to try to get away with keeping the existing car park, instead of building a car park under the new club. That would be the common sense option.</p> <p>The apartment blocks have an allowance of 1 car spot per</p>	<p><u>Parking for Golf Club</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 6b for response to Parking for Golf Club.</p>	Refer to Item 6b

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		<p>bedroom, with a small number for visitors. The number allowed for visitors is inadequate as it basically assumes there are only 14 visitors at any one time for approx 230 apartments. That is totally inadequate, especially on weekends and public holidays, the same days the golf course and clubhouse is at maximum use.</p>		
32b		<p>2. Construction Phase ; Construction hours ; Construction noise</p> <p>The documents state construction will be limited to the hours of 7am - 6 pm. These hours are excessive and will cause undue noise at times when families are either still in bed, getting kids ready for school and too late when neighbors are having dinner or kids are trying to do homework. The total construction time is approximately 4 years, so it is a massive amount of time to be interrupted from your daily routine. surely 8am - 5pm is a reasonable daily construction time, not negatively impacting on neighbour's everyday life.</p>	<p><u>Construction Phase</u></p> <p>During the construction phase, the following noise minimisation techniques may be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of equipment which produces less noise • Equipment silencers and other equipment noise abatement treatments where possible • Adherence to site working hours • Completing some works off site as part of prefabrication where practical • Conducting particularly noisy activities for short durations, where practical. <p><u>Construction Hours</u></p> <p>The nominated construction working hours are included in the Construction Management Plan at Appendix O of the EIS. Section 3.3 has addressed that the proposed working hours during construction is aligned with the Cumberland City Council guidelines. The proposed working hours include the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monday to Friday: 7:00 am – 6:00 pm • Saturday: 8:00 am – 4:00 pm • Sunday/Public Holidays – No construction work <p><u>Construction Noise</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 7a for response to Construction Noise.</p>	<p>Appendix O of EIS</p> <p>Refer to Item 7a</p>
32c		<p>3. Visual impact</p> <p>The original development consisted of 2-3 story buildings and that had been approved by Club members, but following outside input, the development has been amended to consist of 5, 6 and mainly 7 story buildings. Greystanes is a suburb with low rise development and these 6 separate apartment block will look hideous and totally out of place in the neighborhood. The developers</p>	<p><u>Visual Impact</u></p> <p>Refer to Item 1j for response to Visual Impact.</p>	<p>Refer to Item 1j</p>

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		state the building will blend in with the surrounding trees and be no higher than neighbouring trees, but that claim is window dressing, the buildings will be substantially taller than neighboring trees and will prominently stand out for the entire neighborhood to see. It will be an eyesore, but the only way for the Developer to generate to profit needed to do the project.		
32d		4. Aged Care facility – initial proposal – no aged care facility The original plan put to members did not include an aged care facility. I believe that has been included purely to get a positive or faster approval for the development. No information in the development documents has been given on existing aged care facilities in the suburb. There is a large aged care facility approximately 50 metres from the golf club on Old Prospect Rd (Genista) which has a great reputation for providing aged care. There is also another large, aged care facility in Spotted Gum place approximately 500 metres away. The aged care facility has been included for 1 reason only, and it's not out of sympathy for the older members of our community.	<u>Alternative Design</u> Refer to Item 2b for response to Alternative Design.	Refer to Item 2b
32e		5. Local land values - Devaluation The development will negatively impact property owners on Kootingal St and Old Prospect Rd. The construction phases will take approximately 4 years with increased traffic, noise and disruption. Once completed the ongoing impacts include additional noise, parking congestion, shading from the apartment blocks and a significant visual impact. These factors will have a material negative impact of property values and all approaches to the Developer to seek compensation for this have been rebuffed. I get the firm impression that the Developer will not entertain any action that may impact their profit margin.	<u>Traffic</u> Refer to Item 2a. <u>Construction Noise</u> Refer to Item 7a for response to Construction Noise. <u>Parking</u> Refer to Item 1e for response to Parking. <u>Solar Access and Overshadowing</u> Refer to Item 23b for response to Solar Access and Overshadowing. <u>Property Value</u> Refer to Item 11 for response to Property Value.	Refer to Item 2a Refer to Item 7a Refer to Item 1e Refer to Item 14 Refer to Item 23b
33a	Name Withheld 23 (Object)	The development was originally 2-3 stories high, but it has now been changed to 6 apartment blocks 6 & 7 stories high,	<u>Alternative Design</u> Refer to Item 2b for response to Alternative Design.	Refer to Item 2b

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		the highest in Greystanes.		
33b		As well as consisting of multiple apartment blocks, the development will cause traffic and parking congestion in Old Prospect Rd and Kootingal St.	<u>Traffic Impact (specific to Old Prospect Road and Kootingal Street)</u> Refer to Item 2a for response to traffic impact on Old Prospect Road and Kootingal Street.	Refer to Item 2a
33c		As well there will be scores of trees to be cut down, a lot of these trees are old gums and once removed, will also remove any wildlife as well.	<u>Tree Removal</u> Refer to Item 1i for response to Tree Removal.	Refer to Item 1i
34	Samuel Prasad (Object)	I have been a resident of the area for 8 years. While frequenting suburbs such as Wentworthville and Merrylands. I have seen substantial development in these areas, and the transport infrastructure has not coped with these changes. It has also increased the amount of traffic in the Greystanes area. I oppose this project because it will greatly increase the amount of traffic in Greystanes and there is not enough space to increase the transport services in the area. I think the best location for this is on the Great Western Highway near McDonalds. There is a lot of space, close access to Wenty Leagues Club, and the highway having enough space to support the increase in traffic. Thank you for your time.	<u>Traffic Impact</u> Refer to Item 2a for response to Traffic Impact. <u>Scale/Character</u> Refer to Item 1h for response to Scale/Character.	Refer to Item 2a Refer to Item 1h
35	Denis Clifford (Club President) (Support)	<u>BACKGROUND:</u> Cumberland CGC is a member owned club founded 86 years ago by locals who purchased the land and developed it into a golf course. Our current membership is about 1000 Golfers and 1500 Social Members with a high percentage of members living in the Greystanes and surrounding areas. We have an inclusive CALD membership including Korean, Indian, Middle Eastern, Polynesian. Our Junior Academy has over 50 junior members run by Head Professional Joanne Bannerman, a local junior, named as the Australian Golf Professional 2022. She also runs low-cost school holiday clinics for children. We have very sound governance and administration in place. Our Board is committed and fully supports the Development.	This submission in support is noted. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Supports long term success of the Golf club and course• Club provides local social and recreation benefits• Consultation process also run by the club• Environmentally sustainable operations• Cumberland plain trees to be protected and enhanced• Enables the golf course to be refreshed• Seniors proposal will provide new members• Seniors housing will provide for locals to stay in area/downsize/age in place• Seniors design protects the integrity of the course and trees• Protects the future of the course as major green space• Parking provision increased• Operational matters to be a focus eg traffic, amenity of neighbours	

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
------	-----------	-------	----------	------------

Our current clubhouse built in 1960's – it's aging, has high maintenance costs and would need a major unaffordable upgrade to provide modern facilities. Our course provides healthy and active opportunities for golfers aged from 5 to 80's plus. We are a community club providing a safe, friendly environment for members and visitors alike. We cater for vulnerable members of the community with regular visitors from nearby nursing homes and elderly people who come to the club for a meal, a drink or simply for the company. We are also an Emergency Evacuation Centre for nearby Nursing homes.

ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY CLUB Our main water source is run off water from the Pemulway Industrial area that flows through a piping system onto the course and then via a man-made creek into our seven storage dams. We are an Oasis for native bird life in the area, ducks and even the odd pelican.

Last year we had a Walk on Country with Ngurra man Uncle Colin when we learned a lot about the significance and need for protection of Remnant Cumberland State Forest, the significance of running water and bird life.

We have since introduced our own Cumberland Plain Conservation Plan that we have embedded in the induction of staff and members. The planting of trees and native grasses on the course is now guided by the plan.

We are committed to preserving as many of our native trees as possible and irrespective of the outcome of the DA we have created a plan to plant an additional 100 native trees throughout the course.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT We have hosted a number of information sessions for members, neighbours and the general community. The feedback has been overwhelmingly positive. Our supporters want to see the club remain viable because it's their community club.

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		<p>There is lot of interest from locals living in large homes on big blocks of land who want to downsize and stay in the area. They have strong ties with friends, their local church and familiar surroundings with many having lived in the area for decades. Unfortunately, so many have had to relocate further out west and southwest into retirement villages because there are few other options around Greystanes.</p>	<p>I have been the Club President for the past 6 years and a resident of Greystanes for the past 30 years. I am typical of many of my friends and neighbours, retired and living in a 4 bedroom house on a large block of land. I love my local community, the shopping centre where I regularly run into locals who stop for a chat and generally the feeling of belonging to the community. The option of moving into one of the residential units will give people like me an opportunity to stay connected with the area. It would also free up housing for new families to move in and regenerate the community.</p>	
		<p><u>VIABILITY OF THE PROJECT</u> We've been exploring and planning for this project for about 6 years. Other developers we engaged with were unable to come up with a proposal that would deliver a sufficient number of living units to make it viable without having too detrimental an impact on the community and our local environment. Through working with the developer Pariter over last 3 years, our due diligence shows they have the experience, backing and resources to complete the project and deliver something good for the club and the community.</p>	<p>Pariter have undertaken wide-spread consultation including presenting at information nights and meeting with individual members and neighbours. They have responded to and addressed concerns raised including sufficient on-site parking for the club, traffic flow in and out of the village to minimise impact on the community, a design that will have the least impact on trees and the set-back of buildings away from our boundaries. They have undertaken to continue consulting our members and</p>	

Item	Submitter	Issue	Response	Appendices
		<p>neighbours alike through the life of the project and to respond to any issues raised during construction. We have established a Project Control Group which will respond to any issues that arise affecting the good relationship we have with our neighbours.</p>	<p><u>THE FUTURE</u> Our Club is currently financially sound however the future is unknown. It's becoming harder and harder for community clubs to survive without a secondary source of income such as the funding we will derive from the proposed Development. Under this proposal we get a new clubhouse with modern facilities, greater flexibility of use by patrons, an improved golf course and importantly a source of income to guarantee our survival in the community.</p> <p>We are confident that there will be an adequate number of parking spaces for golf and club patrons and no adverse impact from traffic entering or leaving the property. The proposed main gates for the club are close to the existing ones and driveways off Old Prospect Road and Kootingal Street will be for residents of the village. Research indicates that retirement villages generate minimal traffic particularly during peak hours because residents are generally retirees. We are and will continue to be responsible for noise and behaviour of patrons from the club as we currently are under our Liquor Licence.</p> <p>The agreement for profit share from ongoing sales and fees from the residential units will ensure our survival. We will continue to be a member owned financially sound club, a community hub, an environmentally friendly oasis with guaranteed protection for a significant footprint of the Cumberland Plain Forest. Under a 99 year agreement, the club will keep servicing the community for many, many years to come.</p> <p>I respectfully submit that this development is what the club and the community in general want and need for the future.</p>	

