

In response to the North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy Plan, I would like to lodge my comments.

I am a resident and owner of a property at Clifton Place in Cherrybrook. I strongly object that the plan recommends to rezone the complete area bounded by Castle Hill Road, County Drive, John Road, Neale Avenue, and Edward Bennett Drive to Low/Medium Density Residential. **Especially the area bounded by Castle Hill Road, County Drive, John Road, and Robert Road.** The reasons being,

1. The houses in this area are all built in the period between 10 to 20 years. The information shown in section 2.7 Recent Resident Development in your draft plan for 'A Vision for Cherrybrook Station Surrounds' is inaccurate. One good example is the house next to ours was built at the same time as ours within two months and it is now 16 years already. But in your diagram, it is shown as within 15 years and ours is not. I can see that there are a few houses in the next street are also marked as within 15 years but they are actually built before ours. In the report, it is mentioned that this information was based on the DA submission record from the council. But I know that my other neighbor at the back of my house did lodge a DA two years ago, but it was to apply for approval to build a deck in the backyard. So I would question how accurate the process was to compile the information and built the basis of your recommendations.

2. In the report, it mentions that one of the constrain to be considered is that the average life cycle of a building is generally 30-40 years and I cannot agree to this. This has to be more depend on the environment of the area, and the quality of the houses. When an area like the ones that we are living in are all designed as cul-de-sac without any through traffic, the average size of the houses are 35 to 45 squares, and are all in good quality and good conditions, I would question why the owners will be happy to change the zoning to medium density town houses.

3. One thing I would suggest that the report has overlooked. It should also consider the buying and selling activities to the properties in an area. If the properties in an area can attract more buyers and keeping the value, then it is unfair to change the zoning after people have invest heavily into a property in the area they loved. The report should look into areas where the properties are struggling to find buyers. One of the situations is when the properties are on a major arterial road. I wonder how many people would like to but a big quality house along these roads with all the noise and pollution from the busy traffic. The owners of these properties will be more than happy to have the zoning changed so that it will be easier for them to sell the properties to developers.

I think rezoning of established areas need to be handled very carefully. It should not be changed unless it is absolutely necessary and the owners of the affected properties must be properly compensated. This cost should always be taken into consideration in rezoning process.

I am not just a NIMBY. I understand the State Government is struggling to find areas that they can build more houses, especially where they have invested to build a new railway. So I would like to make a few constructive comments also.

1. In the Cherrybrook area under investigation, the only suitable area for rezoning will be along Castle Hill Road, between Franklin Road, and Edward Bennett Drive. This area is right on Castle Hill Road, and some houses are pretty old already. Another location is probably the south end of Robert Road, right opposite to the new station as those houses are also rather old.
2. In the same context, in the Showground Station and Surround, the recommendation to change the southern side of Carrington Road and Castle Hill Road to Medium Density Apartments should be reduced to only along Castle Hill Road and Carrington Road. It should also be change to medium density townhouses only so that it will not affect the residents of the inner streets. To compensate this, the site where the existing council building is should be recommended to change to medium density apartment because this is a separate area that will not affect any existing residents.
3. Around Rouse Hill station, the area of high density residents should be increased. Rouse Hill Town Centre is already making up of a retail centre and high rise apartments. So it is sensible to concentrate more high rise density apartments in the same area. This can include the whole stretch of area between Windsor Road and Green Hill Drive / Caddies Boulevard.
4. Around the Cudgegong station, this area should be the focus of high density to medium density development. As this is a new area, and just opposite to the Rouse Hill Town Centre, this should be developed into another area similar to the Rouse Hill Town Centre. When this is completed, together with Rouse Hill, this will become the major retail commercial hub for the north west, servicing from Kellyville all the way up to Box Hill, which the State Government has already earmarked for major development. If the north west rail link is to be extended in the future, linking to the Western Line, then this centre will become more important. The disappointment is that the report only recommends for low density development in more than half of the land available in this area, and not even one single high rise apartment block.

On the whole, I think this Strategy Plan is poorly developed. Information used in developing the analysis is incorrect. Recommendations are ill thought, only taking a lazy option to spread the development into various areas without considering the actual environment and the right of the residents. Areas that should be fully utilized are not considered. This is really disappointing.