

Appendix 5: Summary of correspondence received from the public forum (held on 15 December 2016) up to mid June 2017

Note: This does not reflect all correspondence received regarding Epping since 15 December 2016. It focuses largely on land use issues which are the focus of the Discussion Paper.

No.	Date	Contact method	Issue/s	Discussion Paper reference:
1.	14/12/2016	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process - Concern about process of former Hornsby Council and State Government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discussion Paper explains the background and why the EPR is being undertaken.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic - Concerned about already existing high density residential apartment buildings and the impact on the local area traffic network 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open space - Concerned about overshadowing to open space, bushland pocket parks such as Forest Park, Dence Park. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The overshadowing impacts of the Austino planning proposal are being addressed through the planning proposal process. However, Section 9.0 of the Discussion Paper and the supporting <i>Social Infrastructure Study</i> presents options for funding the acquisition of the park. With regards to Dence Park, Council is not aware of any proposals that will cause overshadowing. However, Dence Park is also covered in the supporting <i>Social Infrastructure Study</i> and Chapter 9.0 of the Discussion Paper.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking - Suggests that adequate parking spaces must be provided for new developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A parking strategy is beyond the scope of the EPR. However Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper explore ways to address the current impacts of private vehicle use within the centre.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilities - Concerned that existing power utilities do not have the sufficient capacity for new developments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. This is beyond the scope of the EPR. However, at the planning proposal stage, state agencies and key infrastructure providers are consulted as part of the process.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools - New schools should be considered. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. This is beyond the scope of the EPR. However, at the planning proposal stage, state agencies and key infrastructure providers are consulted as part of the process.
2.	14/12/16 & 11/1/17	Corresp. & email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern at capacity of power utilities to handle additional density within the town centre. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consideration of infrastructure utilities is beyond the scope of the Discussion Paper and Stage 1. However, the planning proposal process (Stage 2) involves consultation with the utility providers including electricity providers.

No.	Date	Contact method	Issue/s	Discussion Paper reference:
3.	14/12/2016	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Query about the bus lane within Cambridge St depicted in drawings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper. Also, at the planning proposal stage (Stage 2), state agencies and key infrastructure providers are consulted as part of the process.
4.	14/12/2016	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic – concern expressed about volume of traffic and poor local traffic conditions, and impacts of increased density on this; there is a need to encourage public transport use, address local traffic issues, and divert through traffic. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.
5.	14/12/2016 and 11/1/2016	Letter and email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Correspondence raises concern with risks of increased energy demand from additional development which could lead to power shortages. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. This is beyond the scope of the Discussion Paper. However, at the planning proposal stage (Stage 2), state agencies and key infrastructure providers are consulted as part of the process.
6.	14/12/2016	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trees – concern raised that removed street trees are not being replaced by Council 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of the loss of street trees (on private land) is dealt with via the DA process and via Council's Tree Preservation Order framework.
7.	15/12/2016	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process - Concern about process of former Hornsby Council and State Government. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapters 1.0 and 2.0 of the Discussion Paper seek to explain the issues the EPR process is attempting to resolve.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process – appreciation expressed for Council's approach. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
8.	16/12/2016	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic – Volume of traffic and speed a concern in the area around Chesterfield Road, Epping. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommends traffic calming on Chesterfield Road. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.
9.	19/12/2016 and 18/1/2017	Emails	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about traffic impacts on pedestrian safety, particularly at intersections 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.
10.	20/12/2016	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking in the area of Cliff and Carlingford Rds – has Council considered timed or metered parking? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A parking strategy is beyond the scope of the EPR. However Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper explore ways to address the current impacts of private vehicle use within the centre.

No.	Date	Contact method	Issue/s	Discussion Paper reference:
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport – has Council considered additional entry/exit points to Epping train station to deal with pedestrian congestion? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 10.0 proposes options for building setbacks which delivers wider footpaths which council is seeking feedback on. Also, Transport for NSW will be consulted as part of the planning proposal process (Stage 2).
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are any upgrades planned for community facilities? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Chapter 9.0 of the Discussion Paper includes options and recommendations for social infrastructure (including community facilities).
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What is Council's position on the Carlingford to Epping rail link? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The importance of the role of the North West Metro Rail link for the Epping Town Centre is briefly summarised in Section 3.6.2. As well, Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion Paper covers traffic and transport issues.
11.	20/12/16	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Has Council considered EOIs for a supermarket on the eastern side of the town centre to alleviate traffic movement from the eastern to the western side to access Coles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 8.5.4 of the Discussion Paper proposes incentives to bring about a supermarket on the eastern side of the town centre.
12.	21/12/2016	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for pavement in the area of Epping Heights Public School to improve safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of Stage 2 of the EPR, a new Public Domain Plan for the centre will be prepared which will detail where paving should be provided within the Town Centre.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request to rezone Epping Baptist Church to increase height 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All planning proposal requests are on hold until the completion of the exhibition of the Discussion Paper and follow up Council report for the 14 August 2017 Council Meeting.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need for parking (or at least preserve existing parking) next to existing Coles supermarket 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A parking strategy is beyond the scope of the EPR. However Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper explore ways to address the current impacts of private vehicle use within the centre.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of trees and fertile land due to development (specifically on Pennant Parade) on private land. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are some options put forward within the Discussion Paper that seek to enhance the tree canopy within the Essex Street and Rosebank Avenue heritage conservation areas. Otherwise, the removal of trees on private land is subject to the development application process and the Tree Preservation Order framework.
13.	22/12/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Schools – note that high rise schools should be considered as a possible redevelopment model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of constructing high rise schools is for the respective school land owners or State Agencies. A review of the planning controls can be carried out at that time to determine whether current controls meet the future needs of a high rise school.
14.	23/12/2016 and 5/1/2017	Emails	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic – concerns raised about intersection of Midson and Carlingford Roads including heavy vehicles 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This enquiry was referred to RMS.

No.	Date	Contact method	Issue/s	Discussion Paper reference:
			damaging intersection lights, dust, noise and vibration.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Also, the preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.
15.	24/12/2016	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Appreciation for Council organising the public forum in December 2016 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
16.	30/12/2016	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transport – more opportunities for active transport are needed, such as shared paths and cycle racks 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As part of Stage 2 of the EPR, a new Public Domain Plan for the centre will be prepared which will detail where shared paths or cyclist facilities should be provided within the Town Centre. The preliminary findings on broader traffic issues are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage and visual amenity – the varied architectural heritage and green leafy character of the area is valued; laundry and storage on balconies detracts from visual amenity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are some options put forward within the Discussion Paper that seek to enhance the tree canopy within the Essex Street and Rosebank Avenue heritage conservation areas. Otherwise, the removal of trees on private land is subject to the development application process and the Tree Preservation Order framework. The issue of balcony storage is the responsibility of the body corporate of the respective development.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Green Space – commends the redevelopment of West Epping Park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted; further discussion about green open space is contained in the Chapter 9.0 of the Discussion Paper.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify that the Uniting Church building on Oxford is not a heritage item and is currently being demolished. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted.
17.	23/12/2016	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposed rezoning of former Epping Bowling Club – Is against the proposed rezoning. Suggests that the site should instead be used for public open space. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Austino planning proposal is being addressed through the planning proposal process. However, Section 9.0 of the Discussion Paper and the supporting <i>Social Infrastructure Study</i> presents options for the acquisition of the former bowling club site.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Societal and community values should be the focus and priority of the Epping Planning Review. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted – The Discussion Paper process seeks to establish community values (through the consultation process) so that this (together with the technical studies) can inform a future planning direction for Epping.
18.	4/1/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage – request that Heritage Conservation Area be lifted from Kent Street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of heritage conservation areas are covered in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper.
19.	9/1/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public open space – not enough recreational green space is being provided to accommodate the needs of the expanding Epping population. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of open space for the Epping residents is addressed in Section 9.0 of the Discussion Paper and the supporting <i>Social Infrastructure Study</i>.

No.	Date	Contact method	Issue/s	Discussion Paper reference:
20.	13/1/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for rezoning of property from R4 Low Density Residential to R3 Medium Density Residential to reflect adjoining properties. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to the potential rezoning of land within a heritage conservation area are made in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
21.	18/1/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Essex Street Heritage Conservation Area – should be reviewed by Council to determine impact of adjacent and adjoining five storey residential developments. Also mentions previous resident petition to the Hornsby Shire Council – seeking to have Essex St HCA reviewed in light of recent development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to the potential rezoning of land within a heritage conservation area are made in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Proposal process – interested in lodging a planning proposal or being considered for a different zoning for site at 19 High St. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All planning proposal requests are on hold until the completion of the exhibition of the Discussion Paper and follow up Council report for the 14 August 2017 Council Meeting.
22.	21/1/2017	letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requests the removal of the Essex Street HCA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to the Essex Street HCA are in Chapter 7.0 and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
23.	21/1/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about new developments near Carlingford Road and Epping Road changing the character of the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This new development is in accordance with the current controls that came into effect in March 2014 on account of the Department of Planning's Priority Precinct process. Refer to Chapter 2.0 of the Discussion Paper.
24.	25/1/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Former bowling club site planning proposal – raises some questions about the process. Specifically, will it be put on hold pending outcomes of Planning Review? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This planning proposal process is separate to the EPR project. However, there are some matters covered within Sections 3.2 and 9.5.1 of the Discussion Paper that relate to this site.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage Study – Interested in Heritage Study and outcomes. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to Chapter 7.0 and the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
25.	5/2/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic flow issues on Lilli Pilli Street 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.
26.	8/2/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage conservation areas – queries whether any heritage conservation area will be rezoned and why 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to the heritage conservation areas are made in Chapter 7.0 and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
27.	9/2/17	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that public recreation, infrastructure and employment use issues need to be considered 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of social infrastructure is dealt with in Chapter 9.0 and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping Social Infrastructure Study</i>. The issue of commercial floorspace is dealt with in Chapter 8.0 and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping Town Centre Commercial Floorspace Study</i>.

No.	Date	Contact method	Issue/s	Discussion Paper reference:
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern about current and future traffic conditions, and expresses the view that uses that generate less traffic than residential (i.e. employment or school use) would be preferable to residential development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper. The needs around what makes a viable commercial centre – including the need for residential development – is contained within Chapter 8.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping Town Centre Commercial Floorspace Study</i>.
28.	10/2/2017	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questioning the approach that Council took in only visiting a proportion of properties in HCAs with interface issues to higher density zoning Submission on DA/468/2016 at 12-22 Langston Place and its interface with the EPR process. Concerns raised that this DA should not be determined in isolation from the broader EPR process, including technical studies. Other specific issues were raised with the proposed development under the DA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted and letter of response provided regarding the consultant's preferred methodology. The comments specifically relating to the DA raised in the letter were forwarded to the assessing officer for that DA.
29.	13/2/2017	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for removal of Essex Street HCA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to the Essex Street HCA are contained in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
30.	13/2/2017	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic – concern about construction noise, dust, loss of parking and impacts on safety from construction 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.
31.	14/2/2017	Email w/ petition and signatures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Petition opposing the Austino Planning Proposal (2-18 Epping Road, 2-4 Forest Grove, and 725 Blaxland Road) Concerns expressed support for the principles outlined in the former Parramatta City Council's submission on the Planning Proposal, exception for the proposed pedestrian link and a view that the principles should have gone further regarding overshadowing at Forest Park. Further concerns expressed included need to preserve public open space and heritage, perform traffic analysis, and improve connectivity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Refer to the section after this table). The Austino planning proposal is being addressed through the planning proposal process. However, Section 9.0 of the Discussion Paper and the supporting <i>Social Infrastructure Study</i> presents options for the acquisition of the former bowling club site.
32.	15/2/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request rezoning of properties at 3 Essex St Epping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to the potential rezoning of land within a heritage conservation area or a heritage item are made in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.

No.	Date	Contact method	Issue/s	Discussion Paper reference:
33.	17/2/2017	Phone call	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage – requests removal of heritage listing of 3 Essex Street, and removal of 1 and 3 Essex St and 6,8 and 10 Chester Street from the East Epping HCA, and changing of planning controls at those sites to reflect those of proximate construction sites. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to the potential rezoning of land within a heritage conservation area are made in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
34.	19/2/2017	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for commuter parking station at Epping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic including the issue of commuter car parking are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion Paper.
35.	19/2/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comment that Council should be selective in designating HCAs, and expressed a view that the Essex Street HCA listing in particular is not appropriate and should be removed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to the HCAs are contained in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
36.	20/2/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern expressed that Essex Street HCA is a sensitive and treasured area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to the HCAs are contained in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
37.	20/2/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Heritage and amenity needs to be preserved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to amenity at the interface with certain HCAs are contained in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
38.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Infrastructure provision in Epping has lagged behind development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of social infrastructure is addressed in Section 9.0 of the Discussion Paper and the supporting <i>Social Infrastructure Study</i>. When the EPR progresses to the planning proposal stage (Stage 2) state agencies and certain infrastructure and utility providers will also be consulted.
39.	20/2/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request removal of HCAs at Essex Street and East Epping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to the Essex Street and East Epping HCAs are contained in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
40.	21/2/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request retention of HCAs for Essex Street, East Epping and Rosebank precinct due to concerns around heritage and potential for increased traffic, tree loss and development if HCAs were to be removed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to the Essex Street and Rosebank Avenue HCAs are contained in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
41.	26/2/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressed a view that the Essex Street HCA is inappropriate from a heritage perspective and the HCA should be removed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations and options in relation to the Essex Street HCAs are contained in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
42.	28/2/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressed support for expanding Essex Street HCA to include the whole of Essex Street south of Epping Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations and options in relation to the Essex Street HCA are contained in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.

No.	Date	Contact method	Issue/s	Discussion Paper reference:
43.	6/3/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request removal of entire Rosebank HCA, and rezoning commensurate with Cliff Rd and Hazlewood Place areas 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations and options in relation to the Rosebank Avenue HCA are contained in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
44.	6/3/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressed concern that traffic study is not being completed fast enough, as Development Applications continue to be lodged. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.
45.	6/3/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern expressed about potential development at 25 Ray Road Epping, and request confirmation of zoning and heritage listing at that site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 25 Ray Road was reviewed as part of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting Epping (East) Heritage Study (Hornsby Heritage Review Stage 6).
46.	7/3/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressed concern that Development Applications continue to be lodged in Epping, exacerbating current problems 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under the <i>EP&A Act 1979</i>, Council is not legally able to delay the progression of a development application.
47.	9/3/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requesting retention of the Rosebank HCA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations and options in relation to the Rosebank Avenue HCA are contained in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
48.	10/3/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressed concern about traffic flow and intersections in Epping particularly at Bridge St, Boronia Ave and Kent St. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.
49.	13/3/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Query as to whether HCAs on the West side of Epping are being considered as part of the EPR 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The consideration of heritage items and HCAs on the western side of the Epping Town Centre was beyond the scope of the <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>. The east side matters were looked at on account of outstanding matters that had not been completed by Hornsby Council.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern expressed for amenity and liveability of Epping, particularly in regards to infrastructure like Epping Pool/Dence Park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of social infrastructure is addressed in Section 9.0 of the Discussion Paper and the supporting <i>Social Infrastructure Study</i>.
50.	12/3/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enquiry about opening a café in Epping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of commercial floorspace is covered in Chapter 8.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in SGS's <i>Commercial Floorspace Study</i>. This enquiry was also referred to Council's Economic Development team.
51.	15/3/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Questioning the approach that Council took in only visiting a proportion of properties in HCAs with interface issues to higher density zoning, and concern that the HCA landowners meeting was scheduled too close to the meeting where preliminary findings would be shared 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Letter of response provided. Council supports the methodology relied upon by the heritage consultant since Council was carrying on work that Hornsby Council had committed to.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While supportive of the Essex Street HCA review, a view was also expressed as to the importance of protecting examples of heritage in Epping. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations on heritage items and heritage conservation areas in the former Hornsby Council area made in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.

No.	Date	Contact method	Issue/s	Discussion Paper reference:
52.	21/3/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern expressed for traffic management and parking, particularly as regards access to Epping Train Station 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.
53.	22/3/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> View expressed that more commercial uses, including fresh food shops, restaurants and cafes are needed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of these types of commercial floorspace that makes a centre vibrant and successful is covered in Chapter 8.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in SGS's <i>Commercial Floorspace Study</i>.
54.	22/3/2017	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for removal of Rosebank HCA and rezoning commensurate with surrounding properties 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations and options in relation to the Rosebank Avenue HCA are contained in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
55.	29/3/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for rezoning of property near to Epping Train Station to 24 storeys (no address given) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All planning proposal requests are on hold until the completion of the exhibition of the Discussion Paper and follow up Council report for the 14 August 2017 Council Meeting.
56.	29/3/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern expressed for housing affordability issues, and suggests insertion of LEP clause allowing some denser housing types in R2 zones 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council has recently released its Housing Affordability Discussion Paper. The issue of housing affordability is also a State issue and the Department's Draft District Plan is seeking ways to introduce a state wide approach.
57.	11/4/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request that HCA review also include community members who are not landowners within HCAs, as some are supportive of retaining HCAs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Response provided. Council supports the methodology relied upon by the heritage consultant since Council was carrying on work that Hornsby Council had committed to and heritage consultation carried out to date included both HCA land owners and non HCA land owners.
58.	18/4/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request for careful consideration of changing any heritage listings or HCAs and any impact thereof on Dence Park and surrounds 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to heritage are contained in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
59.	20/4/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request rezoning of properties at 8 and 10 Chester Street, Epping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to the potential rezoning of land within a heritage conservation area or a heritage item are made in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
60.	23/4/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Request rezoning of properties at 6 Chester Street, Epping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to the potential rezoning of land within a heritage conservation area or a heritage item are made in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
61.	22/4/2017 and 24/4/2017	Emails	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Note that the previous Hornsby Shire Council's commitment was to review the whole HCA zones, not just those parts sharing a common boundary with new development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The extent of the brief of the heritage review is detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.

No.	Date	Contact method	Issue/s	Discussion Paper reference:
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions the approach that Council and consultants took consulting HCA property owners with common boundary to higher-density development, rather than a representative sample of all property owners in the HCA. • The HCA properties directly adjoining new development have a higher proportion of contributory buildings than those properties not directly adjoining. • There may be other examples of different kinds of heritage throughout all of Epping area that may be worth considering as HCAs in future. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i> provide recommendations on the removal of heritage conservation areas, of heritage items and the potential rezoning of land that is within and adjacent to a heritage conservation area.
62.	1/5/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for there to be community input into traffic and infrastructure technical studies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper. Both are being exhibited from 21 June to 19 July 2017 in which Council is seeking community feedback.
63.	3/5/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern expressed about loss of commercial floor space 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The loss of commercial floorspace is covered in Chapter 8.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in SGS's <i>Commercial Floorspace Study</i>.
64.	3/5/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports retention of East Epping HCA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports retention of Rockleigh Park zoning as is 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. Recommendations in relation to heritage are contained in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing traffic issues need to be addressed before more development is approved 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional open space is required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The issue of the provision of opens space for Epping residents is addressed in Chapter 9.0 of the Discussion Paper and the supporting <i>Social Infrastructure Study</i>.
65.	8/5/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission on DA/237/2017 at 24-36 Langston Place and its interface with the EPR process. Concerns raised that this DA should not be determined in isolation from the broader EPR process, including technical studies. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was referred to the respective Assessment Officer at Council.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other specific issues were raised with the proposed development under the DA 	

No.	Date	Contact method	Issue/s	Discussion Paper reference:
66.	10/5/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing HCAs can affect neighbouring properties to HCAs negatively, and change the consultation requirements for certain developments 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to heritage are contained in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern expressed that residential uses are dominating at the expense of services and other land uses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The loss of commercial floorspace is covered in Chapter 8.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in SGS's <i>Commercial Floorspace Study</i>.
67.	12/5/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressed view that residents in close proximity to HCAs but whose properties are not HCA-listed should also be consulted 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. Council Officers fully support the methodology relied upon by the heritage consultant since Council was carrying on work that Hornsby Council had committed to. It is also noted that consultation carried out to date on this issue include both HCA land owners and non HCA land owners.
68.	15/5/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressed support for removal of HCA at Norfolk Road 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recommendations in relation to heritage are contained in Chapter 7.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in the supporting <i>Epping (East) Heritage Study</i>.
69.	18/5/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suggested a Carlingford Road flyover to relieve congestion in Epping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A flyover over the Epping Town Centre would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> be of such magnitude of height and scale that that it would be visually obtrusive from substantial distances from the centre, cause excessive overshadowing of the much of the town centre and surrounds, and reduce the capacity for development to meet the current building height controls, that this option is not considered a viable option. Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed within the Interim Traffic Modelling Report which supports the Discussion Paper.
70.	19/5/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would like to see commercial uses like fresh and specialist food vendors, cafes, medical and health services, legal services, bookshops and other services in Epping 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of these types of commercial floorspace that makes a centre vibrant and successful is covered in Chapter 8.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in SGS's <i>Commercial Floorspace Study</i>.
71.	23/5/2017 D05069029	Face-to-face / community workshop	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction – Materials being stored in driveway and footpath opposite Arden Anglican School. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. This was forwarded to Council's compliance team.
72.	24/5/2017	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expressed concern for provision of adequate social infrastructure, trees and open space, a town centre space and investigating purchasing land to better service the population with infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of the provision social infrastructure is addressed in Chapter 9.0 of the Discussion Paper and the supporting <i>Social Infrastructure Study</i>.
73.	24/5/2017 D05073633	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking – Concern about cars parked both sides of Delaware Street allowing room for only one car to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling</i>

No.	Date	Contact method	Issue/s	Discussion Paper reference:
			travel through at a time. Worried there could be an accident.	<i>Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper. However, the development of a car parking strategy is beyond the scope of the EPR.
74.	26/5/2017 D05075119	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial floor space – Concerned about loss of commercial floor space / commercial role of Epping as a centre and detrimental impacts upon local businesses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of these types of commercial floorspace that makes a centre vibrant and successful is covered in Chapter 8.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in SGS's <i>Commercial Floorspace Study</i>.
75.	25/5/2017 D05075586	Social Media - Facebook	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community engagement – supportive of workshops and community engagement so far. However, concerned about wording of recent survey which is perceived as being “loaded”. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. The Discussion Paper and supporting studies are being exhibited from 21 June to 19 July. Any further items that require clarification can be resolved at this time.
76.	25/5/2017 D05075585	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community engagement / process – the pool should've been included as an option on the survey. Concerned that survey was too restrictive. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The pool is addressed in Chapter 9.0 of the Discussion Paper and the supporting <i>Social Infrastructure Study</i>.
77.	30/5/2017 D05079128	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilities / Infrastructure – Supports the renewable energy targets of 50%. However, concerned that this amount is not realistic and unachievable and could even cause potential power shut-down. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. This is beyond the scope of the EPR. However, at the planning proposal stage, state agencies and key infrastructure providers are consulted as part of the process.
78.	1/6/2017 D05084406	Face-to-face / Op Plan info session	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Commercial floor space – Lack of offering for food / retail businesses. Concerned that increased number of apartments is taking away commercial function of Epping. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The issue of these types of commercial floorspace that makes a centre vibrant and successful is covered in Chapter 8.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed in SGS's <i>Commercial Floorspace Study</i>.
79.	1/6/2017 D05084406 1/6/2017 D05084405	Face-to-face / Op Plan info session Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community facilities – Hopes that the current community facilities and public domain around Rawson St are enhanced, upgraded and better utilised. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provision of open space for the Epping residents is addressed in Section 9.0 of the Discussion Paper and the supporting <i>Social Infrastructure Study</i>.
80.	1/6/2017 D05084405 5/6/2017 D05088098	Email Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Access to train stations – Would like to see a regular, efficient shuttle bus service for residents around Epping to access the train station. Traffic – Concerned about increased street parking and traffic flow along Essex St, particularly in the afternoon between 5:15pm to 6pm. Suggests that this may be caused by rat running. Requests that the traffic review takes into consideration the impact upon local and surrounding roads in the Epping area. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper. Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.
81.	5/6/2017 D05088098	Email Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pedestrian safety – Concerned that recent rezoning and development around Forest Grove will increase the number of vehicles and consequently the danger that pedestrians face when accessing the laneway 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.

No.	Date	Contact method	Issue/s	Discussion Paper reference:
	2/6/2017 D05088755 & D05106574		<p>between Essex St and Forest Grove. Requests that the safety risk for pedestrians is addressed through the implementation of safety strategies such as a pedestrian road crossing, speed mitigation strategies, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic mitigation measures – concerned about proposed traffic mitigation measures by Downer Mouchel (local developer) and possible impacts upon local streets in Dence Park area as a result. Disagrees with proposal to stop right eastbound turning from Epping Road to Forest Grove and Essex St. Argues that this will make it more difficult for local residents to get around Epping. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.
82.	5/6/2017 D05106573	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment – Concerned about tree removal in area around Maida Rd and Forest Grove. Recently two mature eucalyptus trees were removed on land currently under development. Several other trees have been on similar sites around Epping. Concerned that this will have negative impact on local fauna, air quality, noise absorption and aesthetics. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are some options put forward within the Discussion Paper that seek to enhance the tree canopy within the Essex Street and Rosebank Avenue heritage conservation areas. Otherwise, the removal of trees on private land is subject to the development application process and the Tree Preservation Order framework.
83.	6/6/2017 D05106573	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environment – Similar to above comments, local resident is concerned about tree removal in area around Maida Rd and Forest Grove. Concerned that redevelopment is leading to massive loss of trees. Also unhappy about construction impacts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are some options put forward within the Discussion Paper that seek to enhance the tree canopy within the Essex Street and Rosebank Avenue heritage conservation areas. Otherwise, the removal of trees on private land is subject to the development application process and the Tree Preservation Order framework.
84.	6/6/2017 D05104723	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic – Concerned about increased traffic in Epping as a result of new development and increased densities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.
85.	9/6/2017 D05106572	Letter (via local member)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking signs – Not supportive of recently erected 3 hour parking signs in Orchard St, West Epping. Concerned that these signs were erected as a result of new development in area which does not have sufficient parking for new residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper. However, the development of a car parking strategy is beyond the scope of the EPR.
86.	13/6/2017 D05104365 15/6/2017 D05104673	Email (via local member) Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Parking – Local resident in Chester St, Epping concerned about lack of street parking in area. Often finds it very difficult to find a car park. Requests timed parking on Oxford St from Chester St / Essex St and residential parking permits. Planning controls - Local resident in Midson Rd would like to build dual occupancy or duplex development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion Paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper. However, the development of a car parking strategy is beyond the scope of the EPR. The issue of permissible uses in each zone and bringing across any consistency will be addressed in Stage 2 which involves the preparation of a planning proposal.

No.	Date	Contact method	Issue/s	Discussion Paper reference:
			on land. Interested in putting in submission on Epping Planning Review Paper.	
87.	13/6/2017 D05106568	Letter	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic – Exiting from Chambers Court, Epping into Pembroke St is difficult due to parked cars. Also recommends traffic mitigation measures such as a speed hump on Pembroke street or traffic lights to slow down vehicles. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preliminary findings on traffic are presented in Chapter 11.0 of the Discussion paper and detailed within the <i>Interim Traffic Modelling Report</i> which supports the Discussion Paper.

Petition on Austino PP

Over 500 petitions were received objecting to the Austino planning proposal. This petition will be dealt with as part of the planning proposal process.

*