

## **Kellyville Station Precinct Submission**

I would like to formally lodge feedback on the future Kellyville Station Precinct.

There are a few areas I wish to make comment on:

1. Lack of advertising regarding the proposal and timing of its release
2. Change in access and traffic in the local area
3. Change in the appeal and amenity of the area
4. Impact on current Strata arrangements in community title area (eg Newbury)
5. Inconsistencies and errors between Precinct Proposal Documents eroding trust in the collateral

### **1. Lack of advertising regarding the proposal and timing of its release**

Firstly, I would like to raise concerns regarding how and when the documents relating to the Precinct Proposal were released.

I live in the area and make it a point to do an online search regularly to see if there is any more material about proposed changes. I noted that as a resident residing in the Kellyville Station Precinct I did not receive notification there was new material for review. There was no letterbox drop, no email (note - I registered for updates and alerts as referenced on page 47 of *Kellyville Station Precinct Planning Report Volume 1 December 2015* via [urbanactivation@planning.nsw.gov.au](mailto:urbanactivation@planning.nsw.gov.au) and have been emailing this address as far back as September 2014 without a single reply back to my questions) or other visible information prompting people to review the new material.

I also have concerns about the time of release being just before Christmas. Many people have a focus on festivities and holidays up to Christmas and also for much of January. This only left people a matter of weeks (end of January through February) to absorb the material and form an opinion.

Combined with a lack of exposure for the plans, I feel that this was either intentionally scheduled like this (to reduce the number of objections) or it was poor planning and foresight.

I live within the Newbury Community title and in late January contacted our Strata Managers to find out if they were aware of the proposed changes (they were not aware of the finer details of the proposal, including the potential R4 zoning in Stanhope Gardens near Newbury Avenue). I requested our Strata Managers send out information (both an email and mail out) for residents residing in our Newbury Community group which they did. I wrongly assumed it was important for the Kellyville Station Precinct Team to formally notify the Strata Managers for the communities (and residents) within Newbury impacted by the proposal.

My partner attended community drop in session and was unable to get any clarity on the questions we had about the proposal. It was also difficult to get time with appropriate representatives and the event seemed poorly managed as there were not enough knowledgeable staff members to talk to. As a result, we did not feel we had gained any new information about the proposal for Kellyville Station.

## 2. Change in access and traffic in the local area

I am fully aware there will be traffic reviews regarding the Precinct Proposal. On page 8 of the *Kellyville Station Precinct Proposal (December 2015)* it states Old Windsor Road, Windsor Road, Memorial Avenue and Samantha Riley Drive are the main roads through the precinct. Unfortunately Newbury Avenue in Stanhope Gardens is not mentioned although it is also incredibly important to the Kellyville Station Precinct - especially since it is only some 50 metres from the proposed station (ie closer than other roads like Windsor Road or Memorial Avenue). Why was Newbury Avenue omitted from this document's consideration? Likewise, on page 8 of the *North West Rail Link Kellyville Station Structure Plan* it also fails to reference Newbury Avenue as an important roadway within the Precinct. Page 31 of the *Kellyville Station Precinct Planning Report Volume 1 December 2015* also fails to address Newbury Avenue and it is not part of any referenced intersection upgrades (other than a pedestrian over bridge across Old Windsor Road). For me, this seems like a critical piece of the puzzle has been overlooked.

Current traffic along Newbury Avenue at peak times is already congested and reflects similar congestion heading towards Stanhope Gardens in the opposite direction along Samantha Riley Drive. As an example, traffic can be banked up as far away as Hixon Street Stanhope Gardens, along Perfection to turn left into Newbury Avenue during morning peak times. The current phasing of the traffic lights and gridlock on Old Windsor Road ensures only 4 or 5 cars can depart Newbury Avenue at each change of lights. We have personally witnessed dangerous behaviour by other drivers trying to jump the queue at the lights (eg turning right out of the left lane onto Old Windsor Road departing Newbury Avenue). Sometimes this behaviour by other drivers risks the lives of pedestrians too.

Looking at the local Community/Facebook pages it is clear residents are annoyed at the current state of the roads and this intersection in particular. Most comments relate to dangerous maneuvers by drivers frustrated by the delay at the lights (eg drivers turning right from left hand lanes, illegal over and undertaking, running red lights, blocking the intersection etc).

I cannot image what Newbury Avenue will be like if the proposed rezoning (R4/R3) in Stanhope Gardens goes ahead. Surely better planning and a significant upgrade to the intersection of Newbury Avenue is required before even contemplating rezoning to higher densities?

Part of my concern with access is also access to the bus network when the train line is functioning. Not everyone will want to use the new train line (especially if one has to alight and change trains at Chatswood). Whilst I understand the number of buses to the city may be revised downwards, I am concerned they may be ceased altogether as referenced on page 29 of the *Kellyville Station Precinct Planning Report Volume 1, December 2015* where it states, 'it is expected that the number of bus services to the Sydney CBD via the M2 will be replaced.' Will there also be loss of the bus priority lanes that already exist?

Parking at the new station is referenced at 1,200 spaces on page 29 in the *Kellyville Station Precinct Planning Report Volume 1, December 2015*. I am anxious about how 1,200 cars (plus additional through and neighbourhood traffic) will be serviced in the area around the station, ie Newbury Avenue, Old Windsor Road and Samantha Riley Drive. This volume sounds ludicrous considering the congestion currently experienced in the area. On page 31 of the same report fails to reference any specific upgrades to this important area. Page 60 says

Old Windsor Road, Windsor Road and Samantha Riley Dr will be up for a potential intersection upgrade if the precinct proposal proceeds, but unfortunately Newbury Avenue is still not referenced.

Additionally, there have been some comments in the media and social media indicating the new train line will have an excessively high fee for a one way journey from the Hills to the city (all with the added inconvenience of having to change trains at Chatswood). I have been unable to find any official document relating to the proposed pricing, but what I have been able to glean from the material in circulation at the moment is the expectation of the fare being up to \$30 one way due to the link being owned by a private entity. Surely in an area where many residents often do not have a choice but to commute to the CBD for employment, a cost of \$60 per day for a return trip or \$300 per week is beyond excessive? That said, with the continual rise in motorway tolls to the city from the Hills District and parking fees in the CBD, \$300 may be a cheaper alternative.

### **3. Change in the appeal and amenity of the area**

We decided to buy land in the (award winning) Newbury release area over a dozen years ago specifically for the ratio of housing to green space, pocket parks, abundant tree planting, retention of community open space and connection to nature. We also were very drawn to the access of community owned facilities to ensure neighbours would get to know each other and create connections amongst residents. I am proud to say I know all of my neighbours and Newbury is one of the best neighbourhoods to live in. Our streetscape is filled with semi mature trees now, beautiful gardens and pocket parks, not to mention visiting birdlife enjoying the variety of greenery and shrubs.

The proposal to increase housing densities close to a train line is understandable. That said, I still believe this needs to be aligned with the 'look and feel' of the local area. Erecting high rise towers in Newbury does not fit with the local neighbourhood streetscape. In my opinion the proposed high rise building up to 14 storeys (as referenced on page 13 of the *Kellyville Station Precinct Proposal*) or, confusingly, 15 storeys (as referenced on page 22 of the *Kellyville Station Precinct Planning Report Volume 1 December 2015*) does not fit with the Newbury philosophy and is grossly out of character - whether it is 14 or 15 storeys. Surely lower height medium density housing is more appropriate for the Eastbourne community area of Newbury? Also, how will Newbury Avenue cope in the future if this goes ahead if it is already beyond breaking point and gridlocked now?

### **4. Impact on current Strata arrangements in community title area (eg Newbury)**

Newbury is comprised of discrete 'communities' within the estate - each with its own clubhouse(s) for access by residents within that area. Residents pay a quarterly strata fee to use these facilities (pool, tennis court, barbeques, clubhouse etc). These fees are based on the number of residents in the catchment for that community facility and the land size of the household.

If any of the Newbury communities are rezoned to allow for more residents (via multi storey complexes) how will this work for the other residents in the community title? Will the remaining residents have to pay *more* for their strata to compensate for the shortfall in strata fees collected by those who have left and sold to developers (ie these sold properties/land would then be outside the strata title)? Or, would the extra influx of

residents in the community title (who have moved into multi storey towers) then cause strain on the facilities and cause congestion? These facilities were built to accommodate a finite number of households and residents and would not cope with increased pressure from more households. Either scenario is unacceptable and goes against what residents in Newbury signed up for when they bought into the estate.

## **5. Inconsistencies and errors between Precinct Proposal Documents eroding trust in the collateral**

After carefully reviewing the numerous documents available to the public online we have found inconsistencies that erode the trust in these documents and make us suspicious about their content.

Already referenced earlier is the inconsistency with the proposed building height maximums (14 or 15 storeys) between documents. Which are we to believe? Neither is acceptable for the character of the area but besides that, it makes us feel there has not been enough due diligence and proper research and editing before publishing the collateral.

On page 14 of the *Kellyville Station Precinct Proposal December 2015* it references the proposed precinct zoning for the area. At the far north western tip of the plan (corner of Perfection Avenue and Bentwood Terrace in Stanhope Gardens) there is no proposed R3 zoning (ie it is shaded to be R2), yet on page 27 of the same document, the area referenced above is now R3 zoning. Which is correct? Or, more worryingly, is this intentionally misleading to confuse residents? The R3 zoning for this area is also left off Figure 13: Precinct Plan from the *Kellyville Station Precinct Planning Report Volume 1, December 2015*. I am personally confused if these lots are to be R2 or R3.

Page 16 of the *Kellyville Station Precinct Proposal December 2015* mentions, 'apartment buildings up to 14 storeys are also proposed in Stanhope Gardens close to Newbury Avenue.' This directly contradicts the *Kellyville Station Precinct Planning Report Volume 1, December 2015* on page 22 as it claims, 'a portion of land within Stanhope Gardens is being considered for rezoning to provide apartment buildings up to 15 storeys in height...' As a Stanhope Gardens resident, am I protesting against 14 or 15 storey towers? I don't want either but clearly there are inconsistencies here in the precinct materials.

Following on from this, on page 35 of the *Kellyville Station Precinct Planning Report Volume 1, December 2015* it states (for Stanhope Gardens), 'recommended controls include building heights up to 12 storeys,' thereby introducing a new height level for Stanhope Gardens and further creating confusion. (NB, 15 storeys is mentioned earlier on the same page of the referenced report). Code X2 on Figure 62: Proposed Height Map (in the *Kellyville Station Precinct Proposal December 2015*) has the maximum height of buildings in Stanhope Gardens as 46m now (46m does not align with other information in the documents).

I am also concerned as to why the area south of Newbury Avenue in Stanhope Gardens is potentially being rezoned up to high density/R4 (towers at 12, 14 or even 15 storeys depending on which document you read) whereas similar areas (or even closer to the other stations) are not being rezoned and remain R2.

Viewing documents for Rouse Hill Station (*North West Rail Link Rouse Hill Station Structure Plan, page 16*), one can see that the area to the south of Castlebrook Lawn Cemetery in Kellyville Ridge (also behind the Service

Station and other existing apartments) remains R2. Why is this so when this area has very close access to Rouse Hill Station? There are already apartment blocks in the vicinity so shouldn't this should be scaled up to R3 or even R4? Why is this area and its proximity to a station (ie Rouse Hill) different to the area proposed in Newbury for Kellyville Station?

Similarly, (and perhaps more inconsistent with the Kellyville Station Precinct Plan), parts of Glenwood very close to Bella Vista station (*Bella Vista Station Precinct Proposal December 2015, page 25*) remains R2 zoning (west of Old Windsor Road, opposite the station site). Why is this not rezoned to be R3 and R4 as per Newbury in Stanhope Gardens? This location is just as close to Bella Vista Station as Eastborne Community is in Newbury to Kellyville Station and this is proposed to be rezoned to R3/R4?

On page 11 of *Kellyville Station Precinct Planning Report Volume 1, December 2015* it states, 'How close is close?... A rule of thumb is that most people are comfortable with a ten-minute walk to public transport and shops and services. A ten-minute walk is approximately 800m.' If this is the case, then **this is evidence** for making the area south of the lawn cemetery at Kellyville Ridge (for Rouse Hill Station) and west of Old Windsor Road at Glenwood opposite Bella Vista station R3 and R4 zoning to be consistent with the proposed rezoning at Kellyville Station at Newbury. The logic behind proximity and access to stations has to be consistent; otherwise one could assume there are other vested interests at play that are not known publicly. I would have assumed that the idea of planning the precinct is to create a balanced urban landscape along the train corridor. I cannot see this being the case if the areas/streets west of Old Windsor Road near stations along the north west train line remain R2/low density residential whilst Eastbourne in Newbury near Kellyville Station has 15 storey high rise towers.

To be specific about the area I am referring to, please examine the example of Shamrock Avenue, Cramer Place and associated streets in Glenwood which are within the 400m ring from Bella Vista station and remain R2/low density. Strangely, Roxburgh Crescent, Somerset Street and associated streets in Stanhope Gardens (Eastborne in Newbury Estate) are also within the 400m ring of (Kellyville) station but are being proposed as R4/high density. This seems illogical. Either they should all be consistent, or, the rezoning of streets south of Newbury Avenue should be scaled back to R2 and potentially R3, but not R4. The latter option is more in line with the Newbury Estate philosophy and landscape.

For the controversial 301 Samantha Riley Drive development building heights have been referenced as a 'maximum of 37m... approximately 15 storeys (see page 18 of *Kellyville Station Precinct Planning Report Volume 1, December 2015*) but later in the same document (see page 38) and *Kellyville Station Precinct Proposal December 2015* (see page 28), this R4 building height for 301 Samantha Riley Dr is now referenced at 50m, ie 13 metres taller (N.B. oddly, 15 storeys is still the claimed number of levels). Surely all of the residents who opposed the controversial and much taller previous proposal for 301 Samantha Riley Drive would be distressed to learn the new proposal plans to add an additional and significant 13 metres to the total height of the complex?

Besides the high rise R4 inconsistencies and concerns, there are concerns with the proposed low to mid-rise apartments too. On page 36 of the *Kellyville Station Precinct Planning Report Volume 1, December 2015*, it clearly states, 'there are three main areas within the precinct to provide for low to mid-rise apartment buildings

up to 6 storeys.' The third area referenced is in Stanhope Gardens and includes R3 medium density zoning. Two pages later in the same report (ie page 38) it now states, 'the types of dwellings permitted in this zone include detached dwellings, attached dwellings and dual occupancies, but not apartments....' This is confusing considering the previous information a few pages earlier mentions apartments. How can an apartment block up to 6 storeys high not be comprised of apartments? Importantly, I'd like to know if developers can build apartment blocks in the R3 zoned sections of Folkestone Terrace, Rothbury Terrace, Castleford Terrace, Bentwood Terrace, Hayle Terrace, Tilbury Avenue and around the Kentwell Park bordered by Islington Road, Hoxley Street, Epsam Avenue and Eccles Way Stanhope Gardens( as these zones are shaded in darker pink on various zoning maps in the collateral). Figure 13 in the *Kellyville Station Precinct Planning Report Volume 1, December 2015* says, 'land within Stanhope Gardens in close proximity to the station,' can be low to mid-rise apartments. What defines 'close proximity?' The streets mentioned above are deemed to be close proximity if the given definition of being within a ten-minute walk is taken into account.

Although outside the Kellyville Station Precinct and outside the Newbury Estate strata titles, I have concerns about the potential rezoning of the vacant lot of land recently sold to developers (previous potential site for a school on Perfection Avenue Stanhope Gardens). New higher densities within Newbury Estate may set a precedent for the developer to push to increase the density zoning for this parcel of land. At the moment, this 57,470 square metre block is R2 residential but may be pushed to a higher density by a developer thereby further exacerbating current congestion.

The final concern I have about the documents for public review is about distinct and blatant errors. For example, on page 37 of the *Kellyville Station Precinct Planning Report Volume 1, December 2015*, Figure 22 is for the proposed land use zones for the 'Showground Station Precinct!' Were these documents put together by someone as a copy and paste exercise? Why would Showground Road be mentioned for the wrong map unless it was a copy and paste from another report? Page 15 of the same document has Epsam Avenue in Stanhope Gardens incorrectly as 'Epsom Avenue.' Again, errors and inconsistencies like this have left me concerned about the accuracy of all published documents and feeling very confused about the proposed changes to our beautiful area. I am not a copywriter nor editor and I have picked up these errors. I would not have expected this from official Government documents.