



West Schofields precinct submission

Carlton Street, Denmark Link Road and Garfield Road West

1. The Denmark Link Road would be optimised if the proposed “dog leg” is avoided. This may be achieved by relocating Trevithick Street to the south, to align with the proposed east-West section of the link road.
2. The opportunity to remove the right turn manoeuvre from Garfield Road West to West Parade should be explored to improve the level of service possible at the Garfield Road / Riverstone Parade / Railway Terrace intersection. This would require access to West Parade via Carlton Street and a new local road parallel to Garfield Road West.

This could be considered in relation to resident submissions suggesting modifications to the proposed layout and / or extent of playing fields in the locality.

Location and accessibility of local centre(s)

3. While the plan proposes housing development along a north-south axis which is 3 kilometres long, there is only one local centre proposed. This means that for most residents, the local centre will be outside the ideal 400 metre walking radius. I suggest that there should be two local centres within the precinct, one further to the south of Schofields Road than is currently proposed, to be more central to the residential area on the southern side of that arterial road; and a second located centrally in the northern sector.

Former Landfill sites

4. What future use is envisaged for the former landfill site known as Grange Avenue Reserve? I understand that the long term expectation is that the site will be the location of sporting fields. If this is correct, I believe the site should be zoned for that purpose even if it requires a condition imposed to reflect that the land may not be capable of approval for that use for some years.

This would allow the future provision of sporting fields in this location to be taken into account in determining the location and number of fields to provided elsewhere in the precinct. Again this may be a matter considered in conjunction with resident submissions.

Roads adjacent to schools

5. The roads adjoining the location of the proposed school should be wide enough to permit both bus routes and on-street parking on both sides of the road. I understand a carriageway of 13 metres is required to achieve this.

In addition, as schools (and primary schools in particular) are notorious traffic hotspots at drop off and pick up times, I believe that student safety demands that parents are enabled to drop off and pick up on the "right" side of the road (ie. the school side) regardless of which direction they approach the school from, through the provision of roundabouts at the intersections at each end of the school frontage. The road width needs to be sufficient to facilitate this.

Commuter parking areas

6. I note that there is land adjacent to Schofields Road (on both sides) which lies within the easement of high voltage transmission lines. My suggestion is that these sites could be used to provide commuter parking areas next to bus stops. This would promote the use of public transport.

Richmond Road

7. The Bells Creek section of Richmond Road needs to be widened to 3 lanes each way and the south-east bound carriageway raised to provide PMF flood immunity to ensure the road can perform its role as the flood evacuation route for NWPGA residents between South Creek and Eastern Creek.

Development between 1% AEP and PMF

8. While I recognise the rationale for the capping of dwelling yield on land between the 1% AEP and PMF levels I do not support additional controls applicable "to building design" to such development to increase flood resilience.

Self evidently the likelihood of a house at, say, the 0.75% ARI level in the West Schofields precinct being inundated is the same as it is for a house at the 0.75% ARI level in any other part of the Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley or any other valley in NSW. The same regime of controls should apply.

Significantly, the 1% chance per year of inundation implies that a house with a life expectancy of less than 100 years is *on average* unlikely to be damaged more than once by floodwaters during its expected life. That level of risk has been deemed an acceptable level of risk of property damage throughout NSW. Why is that level of risk less acceptable in West Schofields?

I am aware of the argument that the risk to property in the Hawkesbury-Nepean Valley is greater than many other floodplains because of the greater variation in flood heights which can occur here. This recognises that while the *likelihood* of inundation is the same here as anywhere else with the same ARI, the *degree* and therefore the *consequences* of inundation of a dwelling could well be greater. Nevertheless it would be extraordinary and unreasonable to suggest building controls all the way up to PMF level when the annual recurrence interval at higher levels would be in the thousands of years.

Surely when considering ***risk to property***, a conscious decision about what level of risk is acceptable is a rational approach which, once determined, should apply in a logically consistent and defensible manner across the whole state, reflecting the relative risk in each location.

I contrast this approach to the “PMF - focussed” approach which must be applied to address *risk to life*. When life is at risk, we must address the worst case scenario.

The cap on development below PMF and the provision of adequate evacuation roads above PMF level or consistently rising to a level above PMF are essential to ensure that risk to life is comprehensively addressed. The “acceptable risk” approach cannot apply when it comes to protecting life.

Flood evacuation

9. I note that the main north-south road through the northern section of the precinct, Carnarvon Road, is not above the 1% level and is not ideally located to serve the function of an evacuation route in time of flood. I believe the ideal evacuation route would be located within the “spine” of the precinct, ie. within that area located above PMF level.

The primary evacuation route identified in Figure 15 in the Exhibition Discussion Paper is below PMF in the section north of Grange Avenue adjacent to the proposed school site. There are also sections below PMF between the transmission easement and Meadow Road.

To optimise flood evacuation capacity the road the alignment of this road – and therefore the proposed school site - should be relocated a short distance further west to ensure that the road is above PMF. Similarly between the transmission easement and Meadow Road the primary evacuation route could be relocated slightly to the west to remain wholly above PMF.

Vine Street / Excelsior Avenue

10. The various exhibition maps show Vine Street East as “Excelsior Avenue”. Is this correct? It was my understanding that Vine Street West was renamed Excelsior Avenue to distinguish that section of the road which lies on the western side of Bells Creek, given that there is no crossing of the creek, from Vine Street East.

Is my understanding incorrect?

My preference would be to retain the name “Vine Street”. I am unaware as to whether local residents have had the opportunity to express a preference about this matter.


Kevin Conolly
Member for Riverstone
27 September 2018