

## SUBMISSION - SHOWGROUND PRECINCT

Congratulations to the NSW State Government for its initiative and foresight in planning and implementing this grand project. The North Western Rail Link will be an important piece of much needed infrastructure in this rapidly growing area. We are impressed by the determination, decisiveness and efficiency by which the Government has proceeded on this project.

Of course to derive the maximum benefits from such a huge, costly investment, it is essential that the Rail Link is utilised to the fullest extent. Accordingly the State Government has demonstrated admirable vision and economic wisdom in proposing higher density residential zones near the proposed Stations. This will mean significant reductions in vehicle traffic and easy access and convenience for maximum commuters.

We believe the residential densities proposed generally strike the correct balance between amenity and viability and therefore promote uptake and feasibility. This is in stark contrast to the facile, minimalist alternative proposed by the Hills Council. We urge you to maintain leadership and resolve in this matter.

One issue we ask to be considered is the following:

There appear to be anomalies/inconsistencies between figure 5.2, page 31: (areas **W**, **T2**, **RI**) and figure 5.3, page 32: (areas **V**, **U**, **T2**).

The **T2** areas on fig. 5.2 (p.31) and fig. 5.3 (p.32) are very different and this common “T2” label is therefore confusing.

Figure 5.2 on page 31 indicates a logical transition from 12 storeys to 6 stories via appropriately zoned areas

The area **U** in fig.5.3 appears to be incongruous with the general zoning form of fig.5.2 above. An “enclave” appears to be created by inclusion of this disproportionately small area with a larger FSR than its near neighbours (2.7-2.3). There does not appear to be a compelling reason for this. Most of the area **T2** in fig. 5.2 is near enough (within 400m) to the proposed station to be considered as “equal”. The fact that this total area **T2** (fig. 5.2) is currently proposed as 8 storeys uniformly, supports this. The centroids of area **U** and the remaining area it shares within **T2** (fig. 5.2) are almost the same walking distance to the proposed station.

Wouldn't it be neater and more rational for the FSR transition pattern to follow that of the building heights? In other words why can't the areas in figs.5.2 and 5.3 correspond? The building height (already uniform at 8 storeys) and FSR provisions within this total area **T2** (fig. 5.2) would then be consistent.

This would simply require area **U** (fig.5.3) to be increased to include the remaining area it shares within **T2** in fig.5.2? This would also optimise the land use efficiency within this area **T2** (fig. 5.2) by providing a uniform FSR of 2.7 for 8 storeys rather than 2.7 - 2.3.

This amendment would also enable differentiation between the FSR's of areas **T2** and **RI** in fig.5.2. They are currently equal at 2.3 despite a difference of 2 storeys in height. If it is insisted that area **U** in fig.5.3 needs to remain as is, then perhaps raising the FSR of the remaining area it shares within area **T2** (fig. 5.2) to say 2.5, would be a suitable compromise.

In summary, we suggest that an increase in FSR of this latter area needs to be considered. This would result in optimum land use efficiency and a more logical transition and differentiation between zones.

In conclusion, we wish to confirm our strong support for the overall proposal.

Yours faithfully