

SUMMARY SHEET OF PUBLIC SUBMISSIONS 12/2016/PLP

Number	Submission Author	Address
SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED PRIOR TO EXHIBITION OF PLANNING PROPOSAL		
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED DURING EXHIBITION OF PLANNING PROPOSAL		
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		
17.		
18.		
19.		
20.		
21.		
22.		
23.		
24.		
25.		
26.		

A. SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED PRIOR TO EXHIBITION OF PLANNING PROPOSAL

No.	1 (pre-exhibition submission)
Document No.	160553541
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. Concern regarding the proposed apartment yield, the quantity of commercial floor space and the removal of the maximum height of buildings control.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2(a), (f) and (g) of the Report.</p> <p>2. This planning proposal, together with the Bella Vista Green shop top housing planning proposal and the twin-tower Solent Circuit proposal shows that the State Government and Council's dominant housing policy is 'shop top housing on steroids'.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section (f) of the Report. The Bella Vista Green and Solent Circuit proposals are the subject of separate processes.</p> <p>3. The whole of Sydney (including The Hills Shire) will soon be dominated by high-rise developments with balconies facing the street loaded with washing. Concern that this will create 'a third world Sydney'.</p> <p>Comment: It is considered that the site has strategic merit for a mixed-use development given its proximity to Castle Hill Town Centre. Site-specific draft Development Controls have been prepared to achieve a high quality development on the site.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	2 (pre-exhibition submission)
Document No.	160585726
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. Concern about over development associated with high-rise, medium density and shop top housing developments. These developments contribute to overcrowding and have a poor visual impact, threatening the quality of life for residents.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2(f), (g) and (h) in the Report.</p> <p>2. Council should send a message to the State Government that it does not support this type of development. Council should join with other councils and their residents to pressure the State Government to repeal its planning laws.</p> <p>Comment: It is considered that there is strategic justification and merit for the proposed development outcome on the site.</p> <p>3. Development that is occurring in the Baulkham Hills Town Centre is unattractive, unnecessary and excessive and will create overcrowding and traffic problems.</p> <p>Comment: This proposal is not located in Baulkham Hills, and a separate planning process is being undertaken for the subject site.</p> <p>4. Concern that some apartments opposite the Bull and Bush Hotel site will only have 1 bedroom. Such units will be very small, will create slums and are unsuitable for Australia.</p> <p>Comment: This proposal will comply with the family-friendly unit mix. The Bull and Bush site is a separate proposal.</p> <p>5. Concern that the population density in Bella Vista will be higher than in Hong Kong, with traffic problems in peak times. Overcrowding will make the Hills Shire suburbs 'unliveable'.</p> <p>Comment: The Hills Shire is set to grow and change in the future, and increased density needs to be appropriately managed. Council's plans seek to keep the key aspects of the Shire whilst accommodating growth.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	3 (pre-exhibition submission)
Document No.	161940891
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. Concern regarding traffic volumes and congestion on roads.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2(c) in the report</p> <p>2. Concern about the narrow width of Francis Street.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>3. Concern regarding noise pollution.</p> <p>Comment: Noise impacts from construction would be addressed as part of the Development Application process. See Section (e) in the Report regarding noise from pedestrian movements in the area.</p> <p>4. Concern regarding the loss of solar access.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (i) in the Report</p> <p>4. There is insufficient open space for any recreation.</p> <p>Comment: Council is currently investigating opportunities for the delivery of future playing fields to meet demand in the broader Castle Hill Precinct. The monetary contribution through the VPA would be allocated towards the delivery of local infrastructure within the vicinity for the site of which a portion could be used towards open space (passive and / or active).</p> <p>5. Concern regarding the topography of the site and implications for water runoff.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (k) in the report</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	4 (pre-exhibition submission)
Document No.	161965415
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. The height of the proposed buildings will significantly impact upon the adjoining residents' privacy. Query how this will be ameliorated.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (g) and (h) in the Report.</p> <p>2. The height of the proposed buildings will significantly impact on sunlight access to adjoining properties. Query how adjoining properties will receive the regulated number of hours of sunlight on the winter solstice given the proposed number of stories in the buildings? Who will check the developer's calculations and what happens if the final building does not conform?</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section (i) in the report.</p> <p>3. Query how can Council allow a developer to propose such a large development despite the company having only recently been formed. Concern for the developer's building track record and whether ratepayers will be responsible for 'picking up the pieces' if the developer's funding runs out.</p> <p>Comment: The developer's ability to complete the development is not relevant to the strategic merits of the planning proposal.</p> <p>4. Query what Council has to gain from allowing the planning proposal to proceed.</p> <p>Comment: Council has nothing specific to gain from the proposal. The planning proposal contributes towards achievement of the Shire's housing growth targets. Council is obliged to consider planning proposals lodged on their merit.</p> <p>5. Query regarding the traffic impacts on the local area from the addition of over 400 units.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (c) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>6. Concern for the safety of students attending the Seventh Day Adventist School in Cecil Avenue given the traffic increases.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 of the Report.</p>

	<p>7. What evidence is available for Sydney that suggests building near a transport hub reduces people's car use. Will the proposed building have sufficient car parking (i.e. greater than 1 space per unit)?</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (d) in the Report.</p> <p>8. Query whether Councillors receive a benefit from allowing the proposal to proceed.</p> <p>Comment: The provision of higher densities around stations will support the Sydney Metro Northwest rail infrastructure. Funds obtained via the Voluntary Planning Agreement will be used to support the provision of local infrastructure and improve traffic management in Castle Hill.</p> <p>9. Concern that Council is considering only the subject land in isolation to adjoining areas. It is more logical to rezone areas rather than a specific site.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>10. Concern regarding the easement running along the boundary between 20 Lincoln Place and the proposed development site and the potential for water run-off to be altered.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (k) in the Report.</p> <p>11. Concerns about sewage issues from over 400 additional units.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (k) in the Report.</p> <p>12. Will residents receive compensation for the noise (and early morning starts) and dust pollution caused during the extended construction period?</p> <p>Comment: Construction impacts such as noise and dust would be addressed as part of the Development Application process, however compensation is not typically provided.</p> <p>13. Will residents receive compensation for the devaluation of adjoining properties?</p> <p>Comment: This is not a relevant planning matter.</p> <p>14. Council has not provided the community with details of its strategy for the development of Castle Hill, suggesting a</p>
--	--

	<p>random approach based on developer input rather than any formal planning.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) of the Report. Council is obligated to consider planning proposals as lodged.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	5 (pre-exhibition submission)
Document No.	162075840
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. The site is located 620m from the station and is outside the area identified for growth in the Hills Corridor Strategy.</p> <p>Comment: The site is partly identified for commercial uses in The Hills Corridor Strategy, with a floor space ratio of 1.5:1.</p> <p>2. Why is Council permitting 460 units outside the Hills Corridor Strategy area?</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) of the Report.</p> <p>3. Why did Council ignore an earlier Council report stating it was inappropriate to rezone the entire site to B4 Mixed Use as it does not protect the amenity and outlook of adjacent low density dwellings?</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) of the Report.</p> <p>4. An earlier Council report stated that the overshadowing impacts of the proposed development on adjoining properties was unacceptable.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (g) and (i) of the Report.</p> <p>5. Query how adjoining residents will be protected from air pollution, construction traffic blocking driveways, asbestos, noise pollution (during and after construction), damage to the foundations of adjoining homes due construction of an underground carpark.</p> <p>Comment: Construction impacts relating to noise, dust, and the safe management of any asbestos on site would be addressed as part of the Development Application process. Techniques to manage construction impacts will be considered at the Development Application stage to ensure that adjoining buildings are not structurally affected by construction on the subject site.</p> <p>6. Concern for the density and height of the proposed buildings, and impacts on privacy and safety.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (f), (g) and (h) of the Report.</p> <p>7. Concern that the proposal will devalue properties.</p>

	<p>Comment: This is not a relevant planning matter.</p> <p>8. Query how many people were consulted about the proposed development?</p> <p>Comment: Council sent 691 letters to surrounding property owners during the exhibition period. The Planning Proposal was also notified on Council's website and an advertisement was placed in the local newspaper.</p> <p>9. The underground carpark entrance is located opposite the school entrance, child care centre and church, and adjoins residential dwellings. It will be a safety concern.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>10. The rear of 109b Cecil Avenue, Castle Hill backs onto the developer's through-site link. How will Council protect the adjoining landowner's privacy and safety when over 1,000 people will be permitted to use the site?</p> <p>Comment: The proposed through-site link does not back onto adjacent properties.</p> <p>10. A development of this size should not be permitted without rezoning the entire block and making sure that no homes are disadvantaged or damaged by a developer.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report. Techniques to manage construction impacts will be considered at the Development Application stage.</p>
Action	Issues addressed. No further action required

No.	6 (pre-exhibition submission)
Document No.	162117922
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. Concern regarding traffic congestion.</p> <p>Comment Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (c) in the Report.</p> <p>2. The construction size, location and domination of this development in Castle Hill will be overwhelming.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (a), (f) and (g) in the Report.</p> <p>3. If the development is allowed as proposed in the application, the building dominance and overshadowing on 22 Lincoln Place and adjoining dwellings will be devastating.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (f), (g), (h) and (i) in the Report.</p> <p>4. The proposal will have negative impacts on the way of living and lifestyle of adjoining residents.</p> <p>Comment: The draft DCP controls seek to manage impacts from overshadowing and loss of privacy on adjoining properties.</p> <p>5. The expansion and development of areas surrounding the train station sites should be well thought-out and sensible, with consideration of the future outlook of Castle Hill precinct, infrastructure capabilities and the needs of existing and future residents.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report. The draft VPA will assist with addressing the infrastructure needs of the proposed development.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	7 (pre-exhibition submission)
Document No.	162118272
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. Why was the subject application seen as positive to the Shire when development at the old IBM site was deemed inappropriate?</p> <p>Comment: This planning proposal involves a separate consideration of merit, and is in a different context.</p> <p>2. Concern for the traffic implications of over 400 units and the potential for road chaos.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (c) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>3. Concern for increased pedestrian traffic on Roger Avenue and additional demand for on-street parking. Most households have two cars irrespective of taking the train to work.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (d) and (e) in the Report.</p> <p>4. The monolith towers will be out of place in the area and have been proposed as a single site rezoning in a fully residential area.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>5. Council has already reached its development targets. Query why a single site is being rezoned rather than a larger area. This is not a good long term strategy for development in the Hills</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section (a) in the Report. Council is obligated to consider planning proposals as lodged.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	8 (pre-exhibition submission)
Document No.	161003981
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. The site is located outside the North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy and has not been subject to precinct planning by Council.</p> <p>Comment: The site is located in the North West Rail Link Corridor area. No precinct Planning has been undertaken for this area as yet. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>2. Concern regarding loss of sunlight, privacy, and safety due to 1000 additional people living next door.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (e), (h) and (i) of the Report. Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) strategies would be considered at the Development Application stage to address any safety issues.</p> <p>3. The entry and exit for 1000 car spaces is beside No. 109B Cecil Avenue and also opposite the entry/ exit to the church and school.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>4. The proposal should not have reached Gateway or the whole street from Old Northern Road to Orange Grove Road should have been incorporated.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) of the Report.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	9 (pre-exhibition submission)
Document No.	160642851
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. As a consequence of this development, the resident has been contacted by neighbours who wish to join together as a consortium and sell to a developer. Concern that the planning proposal will cause a 'domino effect' along Cecil Avenue. How should owners who don't want to sell manage such requests?</p> <p>Comment: Any planning proposal by other residents will be considered by Council on its merits. It is up to individual property owners whether they wish to sell their properties. Council cannot advise individuals on their property.</p>
Action	No further action required

B. SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED DURING EXHIBITION OF PLANNING PROPOSAL

No.	1
Document No.	162704052
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. Cecil Avenue already has parking problems due to bus commuters and parents dropping off / collecting children for The Adventist School. Cecil Avenue will require parking restrictions.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (d) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>2. New units must have adequate off-street parking to cater for residents and visitors.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (d) in the Report.</p> <p>3. Construction entry should be via Roger Avenue to avoid congestion in Cecil Avenue.</p> <p>Comment: Construction matters would be addressed as part of the Development Application process.</p> <p>4. Concern regarding construction noise. Work should be restricted to 7am to 5pm Monday to Friday and 7am to 2pm Saturday (no Sunday work).</p> <p>Comment: Should the planning proposal be supported, it is anticipated that standard development construction times would apply.</p> <p>5. As a consequence of this development, what further rezoning is planned for this area? The fly-through video shows future high rise for the remainder of Cecil Avenue.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report. The fly-through video provided by the developer is not necessarily accurate in relation to other sites or development anticipated in the Terminus Street DCP.</p> <p>6. As it is a one-off development, it does not compliment but rather adversely affects residents currently living in the area. No consideration has been given to those ratepayers, and no consultation has taken place. Council's job is to serve the ratepayers.</p>

	Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (a), (f), (g), (h) and (i) in the Report. Exhibition of the planning proposal occurred between 17 August 2017 and 15 September 2017.
Action	No further action required

No.	2
Document No.	162706805
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. The submission author's property will be adversely affected by the proposal which will cause traffic and pedestrian congestion in the vicinity.</p> <p>Comment: See Section 3.2 (c) and (e) in the Report.</p> <p>2. Submission author would have no objection to the subject planning proposal if the zoning of the lands within the boundaries of the part of Old Northern Road / Cecil Avenue / Roger Avenue / Francis Street and including Lincoln Place were also to be zoned for high and medium density residential development.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	3
Document No.	162955071
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. Has no objection to the planning proposal.</p> <p>Comment: Noted.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	4
Document No.	163093455
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. Construction of the development will affect the quality of life and well-being of residents in Orange Grove.</p> <p>Comment: Construction impacts relating to noise, dust, and the safe management of any asbestos on site would be addressed as part of the Development Application process. Techniques to manage construction impacts will be considered at the Development Application stage to ensure that adjoining buildings are not structurally affected by construction on the subject site.</p> <p>2. Orange Grove, Cecil Avenue, Francis Street and surrounding streets will be unable to cope with heavy construction traffic and then extra residential traffic. The streets are too narrow and busy to accommodate heavy cranes and diggers, and are unable to accept more traffic.</p> <p>Comment: Construction matters would be addressed as part of the Development Application process. Also see Section 3.2 (c) in the Report.</p> <p>3. Orange Grove is already congested with commuter car parking and there are already existing difficulties exiting the submission author's driveway without the extra traffic.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>4. Query how the additional traffic will access Old Northern Road.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) and Attachment 1 of the Report. Funds from the Voluntary Planning Agreement will potentially be used for the installation of traffic signals at the intersection of Old Northern Road / Francis Street, Castle Hill.</p> <p>5. The "Atmosphere" complex being built on the corner of Crane Road and Terminus Street will also add to residents' problems in the area. There is no room for a similar development in the area.</p> <p>Comment: Noted.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	5
Document No.	163272737
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. Concern regarding the proposal's compliance with the Gateway Determination in regards to solar access to adjoining sites, and also the calculation of solar access.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (i) in the Report.</p> <p>2. Concern regarding the proposal's compliance with the Apartment Design Guidelines in relation to setbacks.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (j) in the Report. Post-exhibition DCP amendments have been made to increase building setbacks for the area adjacent to Nos 109A and 109B Cecil Avenue, and to clarify that the ADG design criteria and provisions in The Hills DCP Part C Section 7 Residential Flat buildings shall prevail where there standards exceed the setbacks contained in the draft site-specific DCP.</p> <p>3. Concern regarding traffic, parking and pedestrian movements in the location.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (b), (c), (d) and (e) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>4. Concern regarding the capacity of services, including sewer and stormwater.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (k) in the Report.</p> <p>5. Concern regarding the heights and densities and zone interfaces.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (f) and (h) in the Report.</p> <p>6. The plans only show the heights of the development site (not the relative heights of adjoining development) which has restricted the ability to determine the impact of building heights on adjoining developments. Also, the plans do not show levels for adjoining sites. Concern that in the vicinity of the objectors' site the proposed development will have a building height of 15m above the adjoining single dwellings.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (g) in the Report.</p>

	<p>7. There are no section drawings for the proposal on the boundaries adjoining the residential zones, making it difficult to ascertain the impact.</p> <p>Comment: Site section drawings were provided in the Urban Design Report which was exhibited with the planning proposal. Also see Section 3.2 (f) in the Report.</p> <p>8. There is no information regarding the setbacks and impacts upon the adjoining development.</p> <p>Comment: Figure 8 in the draft DCP identifies the required setbacks for the development. See Sections 3.2 (f), (h), (i) and (j) in the Report. Also, post-exhibition DCP amendments have been made to increase building setbacks for the area adjacent to Nos 109A and 109B Cecil Avenue.</p> <p>9. The solar access drawings include the adjoining dwellings. The adjoining dwellings should also be included in other diagrams.</p> <p>Comment: It is considered that the plans and details that were submitted in support of the planning proposal are sufficient to illustrate a potential development outcome on the site and to enable an assessment of its impacts on adjoining properties. Further details will be required as part of the development application process.</p> <p>10. The solar access diagrams only show the development site. Solar access diagrams should show adjoining sites and their private open space in order to demonstrate compliance with the Gateway Determination on solar access to adjoining sites.</p> <p>The solar access diagrams do not provide details of the existing solar access which is critical to consideration of this application and Item (a) of the Gateway Determination. As the existing situation is not presented it is impossible to justify that the Gateway's solar access requirement has been met. The applicant's solar access table includes times beyond the accepted hours of 9am – 3pm which makes the application appear more generous. Query whether the stated compliance is met.</p> <p>Comment: The Urban Design report includes shadow diagrams. Also see Section 3.2 (i) in the Report.</p> <p>11. The solar access diagram states that the submission author's property has solar access from 9am to 1pm. It is clear that the site is in full shade at 1pm, therefore the site cannot receive 4 hours of sunlight from 9am. On this count alone the proposal fails the Gateway Determination and requires</p>
--	--

further redesign.

Comment:

The solar access information indicates that No. 109B Cecil Ave will receive 4 hours of sunlight between 9am and 3pm, as required by the Gateway Determination. The accuracy of the shadow diagrams was checked by Council prior to exhibition.

The draft DCP requires that setbacks be increased where necessary to ensure the required solar access is provided and that all private open spaces within neighbouring low density residential properties are to continue to receive a minimum of 4 hours of sunlight access between 9am and 3pm on 21 June, where this is currently the case. Also see Section 3.2 (i) in the Report.

12. Elevational shadows should be provided to show the shadow lines and topography to the adjoining dwellings to justify the applicant's claims of meeting the solar access requirement. It is not clear that topography is accounted for in the shadow analysis as the adjoining lands fall away from the site hereby increasing shadow length and impact. The current information is incomplete to justify compliance with the Gateway Determination's solar access requirements.

Comment:

The proposal has sufficiently demonstrated that the Gateway conditions have been satisfied. Further details will be required at the Development Application stage.

13. The proposal is for a significant zonal change and density increase. There is no transition of zone and density.

Comment:

Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (f) and (g) in the Report. Figure 7 in the draft DCP illustrates the requirement for building heights to transition over the site, to respond to the adjacent residential area and the topography of the site.

14. The details of the proposal's compliance with SEPP 65 and the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) should be available to the public as failure could result in significant redesign or failure of the application. The applicant should not be able to claim at the development application stage that shortcomings in the design in regards to the ADG have been considered at the planning proposal stage when such details are not available.

Comment:

The plans and details are at a concept stage only. A full assessment of the proposal against the Apartment Design Guide is not necessary at this stage.

15. The applicant has addressed building separation in relation to the building design internally but not to adjoining dwellings.

	<p>The distance to neighbours and relative heights of the built form (habitable space and parking structures) does not appear to meet ADG guidelines.</p> <p>More information and sections including dimensions and heights of both the adjoining dwellings and open space areas and the proposed built form is required. Amenity impacts occur with height of built form not only the habitable areas and this is exacerbated by topography. This impact needs to be addressed and information provided.</p> <p>Comment: The plans and details are at a concept stage only. A full assessment of the proposal against the Apartment Design Guide (ADG) is not necessary at this stage.</p> <p>A post-exhibition amendment to the DCP is recommended to include a requirement that the ADG design criteria and provisions in The Hills DCP 2012 Part C Section 7 Residential Flat Building shall prevail where their standards exceed the setbacks specified in Section 2.4 of the DCP.</p> <p>16. A zone boundary with significantly different densities and built form should provide a greater distance and transition zone between buildings. The planning proposal will create a business and residential development that is significantly different to the original planned intention and the built form will have a jarring effect to the adjoining development zoned R3 Medium Density Residential that has a maximum height of 9m. Such significant difference should be reflected in greater boundary setbacks than the ADG suggests.</p> <p>Comment: Future development will be required to taper down to follow the topography of the site and to minimise impacts on the amenity of adjoining properties, in accordance with Section 2.3 of the draft DCP.</p> <p>17. The proposal fails to meet the ADG requirements, particularly regarding setbacks and building separation. To achieve the aims, the height of the building should be considered, not just the number of habitable floors. The separation of the building to development on adjoining sites will never be equitably shared. The R3 zone at 9m maximum height will produce 2 – 3 storey townhouses immediately adjoining 6 storey above car parking development.</p> <p>Comment: The draft DCP has been amended post-exhibition to require that the ADG criteria and provisions in The Hills DCP 2012 Part C Section 7 Residential Flat Building shall prevail where their standards exceed the setbacks articulated in Section 2.4 of the DCP. Figure 8 in the draft DCP has also been amended post-exhibition to increase setbacks along the boundary with Nos. 109A and 109B to meet ADG requirements.</p>
--	---

18. The aims of privacy and solar access will not be achieved. If future development on adjoining sites such as 109B Cecil Avenue are required to be setback 9m or more to achieve the privacy controls these sites are severely disadvantaged due to non-compliance and over development by this proposal. Coupled with the failure to provide the required 4 hours of solar access the development requires redesign or a reduction in height and density in the locations adjoining the R3 zone. More information is required to demonstrate that impacts upon adjoining development have been adequately addressed.

Comment:

The draft DCP has been amended post-exhibition to require that the ADG criteria and provisions in The Hills DCP 2012 Part C Section 7 Residential Flat Building shall prevail where their standards exceed the setbacks articulated in Section 2.4 of the DCP. Figure 8 in the draft DCP has also been amended post-exhibition to increase setbacks along the boundary with Nos. 109A and 109B to meet ADG requirements.

19. The location of the site entry is not ideal for such an intense development. Concern that vehicles travelling from the west will be unable to directly access the main entry on Cecil Avenue due to the separated road lanes. Such vehicles will be required to follow a circuitous route through the residential area to gain access. This is a poor location for a development of such intensity particularly when proximity to the school is considered.

Comment:

It is acknowledged that vehicles travelling from the west via Terminus Street will be unable to turn into Cecil Avenue due to the divided road. Vehicles will be able to access the site via Francis Street, which will be supported by the installation of traffic signals.

20. The proposal will result in greater demand for car parking in Council's Terminus Street carpark and also for on-street parking. Pedestrian movement at the intersection of Cecil Avenue and Terminus Street is also not ideal.

Comment:

The Terminus carpark serves the adjoining retail development. The proposed development will provide its own parking. There are traffic signals at the intersection of Terminus Street and Old Northern Road which will allow pedestrians to access the Castle Hill CBD and the rail station.

21. The area presently experiences sewer capacity issues and stormwater flooding. How will adjoining properties be affected by the need to upgrade these services?

Comment:

	<p>See Section 3.2 (k) in the Report. The planning proposal was referred to Sydney Water who advise that network extensions or amplifications to the drinking water and wastewater system may be required to service the redevelopment of the site, which will be assessed at the Section 73 (Sydney Water Act) application stage.</p> <p>The need for such upgrades would be relevant if the site redeveloped now. This is not an issue for the planning proposal. The need for stormwater easements to address any flooding concerns will be addressed as part of a future development application.</p> <p>22. The current zoning of the site provides a good transition between the town centre and the residential area, particularly given the topography of the area. Support for the officer's report on density - the requested 460 dwellings is excessive and the suggested 326 is more reasonable. The proposal in its current form is excessive and has significant impacts on adjoining development. The justification for the requested density is not satisfactory.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (a) and (f) in the Report regarding density.</p> <p>23. Before the planning proposal, Voluntary Planning Agreement and DCP amendments are adopted more information and justification is required. The DCP needs to reflect the ADG (particularly in relation setbacks) and a redesign is necessary.</p> <p>Comment: A post-exhibition amendment to the DCP will include a requirement that the ADG design criteria and provisions in The Hills DCP 2012 Part C Section 7 Residential Flat Building shall prevail where their standards exceed the setbacks specified in Section 2.4 of the DCP.</p>
Action	Post-exhibition amendments to the site-specific DCP are proposed, as discussed above.

No.	6
Document No.	16347136
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. The submission author does not support the DCP amendments for Roger Avenue / Cecil Avenue.</p> <p>Comment: The draft DCP that was exhibited alongside the planning proposal seeks to introduce site-specific provisions to guide future development on the subject site. Some post-exhibition amendments have been made to the DCP to provide further guidance in relation to the future built form and setbacks.</p> <p>2. The immediate vicinity already experiences traffic issues, including congestion, parking and speed in surrounding streets. The proposal will exacerbate these issues.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (c) and (d) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>3. The traffic report contained errors and there is doubt regarding the accuracy of numbers in the report. Suggestion that the real traffic numbers are nearly double what is identified in the report.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) in the Report.</p>
Action	Post-exhibition amendments to the site-specific DCP are proposed, as discussed above.

No.	7
Document No.	163710037
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. Concern for noise pollution from building construction over a lengthy period of time.</p> <p>Comment: Construction impacts relating to noise, dust, and the safe management of any asbestos on site would be addressed as part of the Development Application process. Techniques to manage construction impacts will be considered at the Development Application stage to ensure that adjoining buildings are not structurally affected by construction on the subject site.</p> <p>2. Concern for the loss of privacy due to overlooking from the new apartment buildings.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (h) in the Report.</p> <p>3. Concern that the loss of sunlight will create a cold environment in the adjoining home.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (i) in the Report.</p> <p>4. There are health concerns for family members who have asthma.</p> <p>Comment: The requirement for dust suppression measures to be used during the construction phase would be addressed as part of a future development application.</p> <p>5. Concern that parking spaces will be scarce, creating difficulties for the families of adjoining owners that have multiple vehicles.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (d) in the Report.</p> <p>6. The 24-hour entry and exit to the site for cars, trucks and delivery vans will adjoin the submission author's property and will destroy their peace, house foundations, and cause a danger to residents who use the footpath to access the town centre and transport. The site is also located directly opposite the school, church and long day care centre entrance.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>7. Cecil Avenue is already highly congested and the roundabout</p>

	<p>entrance at the top of the street is small, dangerous and the site of frequent accidents. Buses and trucks drive over the roundabout.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (c) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>8. The area is steep and sunlight access has not been accurately determined.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (i) in the Report.</p> <p>9. Concern regarding the heavy water run-off that occurs in storms.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (k) in the Report.</p> <p>10. Concern regarding the deep dip and curve in the road before the roundabout creates a problem for all drivers (particularly trucks).</p> <p>Comment: Noted. This would be an issue if the site developed now.</p> <p>11. The proposal will cause stress and grief to the submission author. They support the neighbourhood in stopping the proposal or that they be involved in the expansion of the Castle Hill precinct.</p> <p>Comment: Council will be undertaking planning for the Castle Hill South precinct in the near future, which is likely to include the submission author's property at 109A Cecil Avenue, Castle Hill.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	8
Document No.	163731102
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. Concern regarding the removal of the existing height limit to allow an unlimited height on the site while the eastern side of Orange Grove remains a single residence zone.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (g) in the Report.</p> <p>2. Request for clarification on Council's policy for zone changes in Castle Hill.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report. Council considers all planning proposals on their merits.</p> <p>3. Is Council granting this change to high density based on a developer application? Or, should the zoning be changed for the whole street, in line with the State Government's policy of 800 metres radius from the train station which was clearly announced to the public?</p> <p>Comment: The subject planning proposal was lodged by a developer, not Council, and has been considered on its merits. Council will be undertaking planning for the Castle Hill South precinct in the near future.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	9
Document No.	163917647
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. As per the Council Report on 12 April 2016, the proposal is inconsistent with the State Government's North West Rail Link Strategy as it provides substantially more residential development than the strategy envisages.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>2. As per the Council Report on 12 April 2016, the proposal is inconsistent with the Hills Corridor Strategy as it does not provide the identified commercial floor space that the strategy envisages.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>3. The proposal is premature, as no precinct plan is prepared for land in the south of Castle Hill centre. There has been no case made by the applicant to convince Council that this development should precede the development of a precinct plan for the area. A precinct plan needs to assess suitable zoning for the entire area bounded by Cecil Avenue, Old Northern Road, Orange Grove and Francis Street (including Roger Avenue and Lincoln Place). Consideration of zoning changes on a case by case basis is ineffective and disruptive to the community which is creating uncertainty and financial loss to those residents.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>4. The transition to low density development and the amenity impacts on adjacent residential properties are not acceptable and do not satisfactorily address the required outcomes articulated in the Council Report of 12 April 2016. The proposed blending of high density living with low density cannot be achieved unless there is a physical separation such as a road.</p> <p>The amended proposal has resulted in some changes to building layout as well as some increases in building heights. The two 5 storey buildings on the southern side of the development (as originally proposed) have now increased to 7 and 9 storeys respectively. The objective of creating a sympathetic interface with the surrounding low density dwellings is not met. The revised proposal creates a more unsympathetic interface by effectively adding an additional 2 and 4 storeys.</p>

	<p>Comment: See Section 3.2 (g) in the Report. The exhibited design concept is different to what was considered in the Council Report of 12 April 2016. The revised design (which included changes to building heights and modulation across the site to allow for additional solar access to private open spaces of existing neighbouring properties) was included in the Council Report of 8 August 2017. The revised concept was subsequently exhibited.</p> <p>The draft DCP provisions will achieve a transition of heights across the site. It is considered that the exhibited design concept is a better outcome for adjoining residents as the taller built form is concentrated towards the middle of the site, with heights reduced around the periphery.</p> <p>5. Setbacks to the higher buildings are inadequate and unacceptable.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (g) and (j) in the Report.</p> <p>6. It is incorrect to state that the building heights for this proposal range from 3 – 18 storeys as no stand-alone buildings are three storeys high.</p> <p>Comment: Some aspects of the proposed buildings are 3 storeys in nature, to assist with providing a more suitable transition to adjoining properties. It is acknowledged that there are no 3-storey stand-alone buildings proposed.</p> <p>7. The proposal to build 460 units is excessive for the site's location.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (f) in the Report.</p> <p>8. The applicant has not demonstrated that the proposed floor space ratio and development concept is appropriate for the site, as required by the Council Report of 12 April 2016.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (g) in the Report.</p> <p>9. It would be inconsistent for this proposal to exceed the ratio of residences per hectare that is proposed for the Castle Hill North precinct and that identified in the North West Rail Link Corridor Strategy.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>10. The impact on traffic in the immediate area and the approaches to and from the Terminus Street and Old Northern junction has been grossly underestimated. Cecil</p>
--	--

	<p>Avenue is already beyond the identified environmental capacity.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (b) and (c) in the Report.</p> <p>11. It is unclear how commercial, retail and visitors will be prevented from using the Roger Avenue entrance.</p> <p>Comment: A post-exhibition amendment is recommended to ensure that only residents of the development utilise the Roger Ave driveway to the site. See Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>12. The vehicle movements estimated in the traffic report are unlikely to be accurate. It is difficult to accept that a building with 907 car spaces would have a maximum (Table 4) of 177 peak hour trips. Also, this does not take account of the street parking generated by this development.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) and (d) in the Report.</p> <p>13. Concern that the major driveway access will be in close proximity to the primary school and located in the 40km/hr school zone. Traffic in this location is already congested and future traffic movements associated with this development will be problematic. Orange Grove is a narrow road that constantly has cars parked on both sides of the road, making it difficult for cars to pass.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (c) and (d) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>14. The installation of traffic lights at the intersection of Old Northern Road / Francis Street will have serious impacts on traffic flow into and out of Castle Hill:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unless a third lane is created, a right-hand only turning lane would create an extremely dangerous environment, causing delays and the potential for accidents; • The road camber at this intersection requires vehicles to travel slowly when turning; • Proposed traffic lights in this location, combined with the delays caused by the bus stop near Church Street, vehicles turning right into Parsonage Road and the constant activation of the Kerrs Road traffic lights by bus passengers wishing to cross the road will cause traffic to be banked back into Terminus Street. <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>15. There should be no right-hand turn from Francis Street into</p>
--	---

	<p>Old Northern Road. Traffic turning left from Francis Street onto Old Northern Road should be allowed to turn when safe.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>16. Turning right out of Lincoln Place into Francis Street is extremely difficult and dangerous due the presence of parked cars. An increase in traffic volumes will increase this risk.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>17. The traffic report states that Francis Street is a 4 lane road which is not the case. Francis Street is narrow with cars usually parked on both sides of the road, and it has a dangerous bend west of Roger Avenue that causes vehicles to cross over the double white lines. Increasing traffic volumes on this road will increase the potential for accidents.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) in the Report.</p> <p>18. The assumption that peak traffic in Roger Avenue would increase by 50 vehicles is extremely conservative.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (b) and (c) in the Report.</p> <p>19. The impact of street car parking by residents and visitors to the development has not been considered. Any occupant that has a second vehicle will need to find parking in neighbouring streets. It is unrealistic to expect that buildings with 1, 2 and 3 bedroom apartment will not have more than one vehicle per apartment.</p> <p>Comment: Parking will be required to be provided in accordance with LEP 2012 Clause 7.12, which is considered appropriate for a site that is within walking distance of bus and rail transport options. See Section 3.2 (d) in the Report.</p> <p>20. If the proposal is supported, the movement of transport vehicles during the construction should be restricted to Cecil Avenue with no access via Francis Street.</p> <p>Comment: Construction matters would be addressed as part of the Development Application process.</p> <p>21. The proposal to incorporate commercial and retail businesses in the development is inappropriate or not viable due to its isolation from the Caste Hill Town Centre and its location on the south-eastern side of Terminus Street. Pedestrian traffic would be reluctant to travel to this isolated</p>
--	--

	<p>location.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (a) and (e) in the Report.</p> <p>22. There has been no recognition of the topography of the site in determining appropriate building heights in relation to adjacent lower lying single dwelling residences. There is a substantial fall in elevation from Cecil Avenue to Lincoln Place, and the effective building heights from the perspective of the Lincoln Place residents is considerably higher than submitted. The proposed 18 storey building is situated at the highest point on the site, creating an effective height of 21 storeys for Lincoln Place residents. This is higher than the Atmosphere building opposite the Castle Hill Rail Station.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (g) in the Report.</p> <p>23. The proposal to create a pedestrian through-site linkage between Cecil Avenue and Roger Avenue provides little or no measurable public benefit to existing residents. It is more likely to benefit visitors to the site who will park in Roger Ave or Francis St. However, should further high rise development be approved in these streets, the public benefit will be wider.</p> <p>Comment: The through-site link will benefit residents to the south of the site (particularly those on Roger Avenue and Francis Street) by reducing the walking distance to the Castle Hill centre and the rail station.</p> <p>From the Roger Avenue cul-de-sac, a resident could utilise the through-site link to walk to the rail station in approximately 800m. Without the through-site link, a resident on Roger Avenue would be required to walk approximately 1,100m (travelling via Orange Grove Road and Crane Road) or approximately 1,300m (walking via Orange Grove, Cecil Avenue and Old Northern Road).</p> <p>24. The monetary requirement of the VPA creates a conflict of interest for Council, could affect objectivity in assessing the suitability of development, and encourages the developer to increase their yields. Suggestion that Council could be double-dipping as it will be the beneficiary of a sizeable increase in rates from the proposed 460 residential units and commercial unit holders. It will be difficult to achieve transparency in accounting for the expenditure of the contributions.</p> <p>Comment: VPA negotiations have been transparent. The use of a VPA is appropriate in the absence of a Contributions Plan.</p> <p>25. Council has a conflict of interest in supporting high rise development on this site as it will benefit its own plans to</p>
--	---

	<p>develop high rise buildings in the adjacent town centre including Council's recently acquired Castle Hill Day Surgery site.</p> <p>Comment: The Day Surgery site has a height of 41m, which was in place before this planning proposal and before Council purchased the site.</p> <p>26. The proposal should be rejected subject to the development of a precinct plan that rationally considers the appropriate zoning of this area and not create what is clearly an inappropriate proposal to force the cohabitation of very high density housing with single residence properties.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (a) and (g) in the Report.</p> <p>27. The scale, dominance and long construction phase for the proposal will have a significant impact on the way of life for existing residents and many will be forced to relocate. Many residents in Lincoln Place and Roger Avenue have already been approached by the developer offering below potential value for their properties, in addition to approaches from a number of other real estate agents.</p> <p>Comment: Construction impacts would be addressed as part of the Development Application process. Council cannot advise on individual decisions to sell property.</p> <p>28. The value of surrounding homes is likely to reduce with the impending developments and the proposed incompatible coexistence of high and low density residences created by the proposed rezoning.</p> <p>Comment: This is not a planning matter.</p> <p>29. The Council Report and Minute of 12 April 2016 highlighted several major deficiencies which have not been adequately addressed in the revised submission. The proposal should be rejected.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 2 and Sections 3.2 (a) and (i) of the Report. Amendments have been made to the proposed built form on the site since the Council Report of April 2016 was prepared. Changes were made to building heights and modulation across the site to allow for additional solar access to the private open spaces of neighbouring residential properties following the Gateway Determination. The building forms were reduced in height in many locations, with a complete building being removed from the south-west corner of the site.</p>
--	---

Action	No further action required
--------	----------------------------

No.	10
Document No.	163943600
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. The planning proposal will increase traffic flows in the small Roger Avenue cul-de-sac. The inclusion of a roundabout at the Roger Ave / Francis St intersection will provide no relief for residents of Roger Ave.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (c) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>2. Presently, 28 vehicles are owned by residents in Roger Ave. The proposed development will bring another 900 resident vehicles into the small street and it is unclear how they will be accommodated.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (c) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>3. Concern about parking issues in Roger Avenue, which is a narrow (6.52m wide) corridor. At present, street parking is available to residents and issues already occur when vehicles try and pass, particularly when visitors to the nearby Allan Drew Funeral business park in Roger Ave.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (c) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>4. Concern that tradesmen / heavy duty vehicles parking in Roger Ave will impact on the quiet and safe neighbourhood over a 5 year construction timeframe.</p> <p>Comment: Concerns relating to the construction process would be addressed at the Development Application stage.</p> <p>5. Future pedestrian access from Roger Avenue through to Cecil Avenue is a nice addition. However, the traffic issues that residents will face will far outweigh this small convenience as residents in Roger Avenue are already in such close walking distance to the Castle Hill Town Centre.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (c) and (e) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>6. Concern raised regarding overshadowing of the objector's property and the loss of privacy.</p>

	Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (h) and (i) in the Report.
Action	No further action required

No.	11
Document No.	163943601
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. The proposal will create edge amenity conflicts with adjoining and surrounding properties. Overshadowing will impact on the personal and private use of their properties.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (g), (h) and (i) in the Report.</p> <p>2. Roger Avenue is only 7m wide and accommodates overflow parking for the current residents' 28 vehicles as well as vehicles from Francis Street. Access is currently difficult for heavy service and waste vehicles and community transport. This is exacerbated when services are held at the nearby funeral parlour, with vehicles regularly blocking access to properties.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (c) and (d), and Attachment 1 in the Report.</p> <p>3. Concern about the impact of construction vehicles on residents in Roger Ave and Francis St.</p> <p>Comment: Concerns relating to the construction process would be addressed at the Development Application stage.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	12
Document No.	163945200
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. The planning proposal is not in keeping with surrounding development. The proposal does not respond to and integrate with surrounding land uses or minimise amenity impacts on adjacent residential development.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (a), (f), (g), (h) and (i) in the Report.</p> <p>2. Concern that an additional 907 cars will be allowed to access Roger Avenue. When two cars are parked on either side of Roger Ave, there is a maximum of 3m between them. Question as to how 2 cars can pass safely in opposite directions given the existing road width.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (c) and (d), and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>3. Concern for safety at the Old Northern Road / Francis Street intersection. There is also a dangerous bend in Francis Street where cars park on both sides of the road. This situation is exacerbated when funerals are held at Allan Drew's.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (c) and (d), and Attachment 1 of in the Report.</p> <p>4. Concern regarding the accuracy of the traffic report, particularly in relation to the number of existing road lanes on Francis St and Orange Grove (which are not 4 lane thoroughfares). Council Officers should determine the accuracy of the traffic report.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) in the Report.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	13
Document No.	163958680
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. Francis Street is already very busy and parking is at a premium due to commuters. There is inadequate parking for Allan Drew Funerals which sees Francis Street, Roger Avenue and Orange Grove parked out with barely enough room for 2 cars to pass.</p> <p>Any increase in traffic flow to these streets will create significant traffic issues for Francis Street. This development proposal will use Roger, Francis and Orange Grove to access and exit rather than use Terminus Street.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (c) and (d), and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>2. Acknowledgement that development is necessary in the suburb, but 18 storeys is a burden on the existing residents and the traffic flow. There is another proposal to build an additional 192 units on land in Orange Grove / Francis Street / Roger Avenue – making an additional 652 units in the immediate area if all proposals are approved.</p> <p>Comment: See Section 3.2 (c) and (f) in the Report.</p> <p>Planning Proposal 10/2018/PLP for land on Orange Grove, Francis Street and Roger Avenue was lodged in May 2017, but has not yet progressed to a Gateway Determination.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	14
Document No.	163977096
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. Concern that the safety, security and personal comfort of streets will be adversely affected by the increased pedestrian and vehicular traffic associated with the commercial development (with potentially 211 people employed on site) as well as residents of the 460 dwellings and up to 115 visitors to those dwellings.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (c), (d) and (e) in the Report.</p> <p>2. Parking within Roger Avenue is already limited, particularly when parties and other celebrations are held. Concern that if the development proposal proceeds there will be reduced or no street parking allowed, creating further parking difficulties, particularly for visitors of existing residents.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (c) and (d) and Attachment 1 of in the Report.</p> <p>3. Roger Avenue is subject to flooding due to poor drainage.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (k) in the Report.</p> <p>4. Concern about noise generated by pedestrian and vehicular traffic and impacts on existing dwellings. Are there any plans to install acoustic barriers to prevent road noise from increasing by more than 2dB?</p> <p>Comment: See Section 3.2 (e) in the Report. Noise impacts from vehicles will be considered in the assessment of a future development application.</p> <p>5. Concern about increased vehicle emissions on Roger Avenue which will reduce the current quality of life.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>6. What measures are being taken to ensure that private open space is maintained? Private open space will no longer exist in their backyard as a consequence of the proposed building heights.</p> <p>Comment: See Section 3.2 (h) in the Report.</p>

	<p>7. As there will be an increase in pedestrian traffic, are their plans to pave the footpaths and provide adequate lighting? Will this lighting also be intrusive?</p> <p>Comment: Footpaths and lighting design is a matter for consideration in the assessment of a future development application. The Draft DCP has been amended post-exhibition to show interim and final road profiles for Roger Avenue which incorporates footpaths into the design.</p> <p>8. The submission author's property does not have fencing, which allows neighbours to provide natural surveillance. With the increased likelihood of anti-social behaviour, the submission author requests measures to increase their safety, for example low level fencing, security lighting, lockable letter boxes and creating site-lines. This would also entail removing shrubbery from Roger Avenue and ensuring any blank walls/fences are protected against graffiti.</p> <p>Comment: Section 2.7 'Safety and Security' in the draft DCP requires lighting to be provided along the through-site link and that an assessment of crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) principles be undertaken as part of a future Development Application. Road widening will also be required on Roger Avenue which will involve a change to the existing streetscape.</p> <p>9. The proposal is not in keeping with the quiet residential cul-de-sac of Roger Avenue.</p> <p>Comment: Noted.</p>
Action	The DCP has been amended to include interim and final design outcomes for Roger Avenue, which incorporates footpaths.

No.	15
Document No.	164002713
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. Strongly objects to the planning proposal due to the adverse impact on their property, privacy and traffic movement in the area.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (c) and (h) in the Report.</p> <p>2. The proposal far exceeds any State Government or Council strategy for the area south of the Castle Hill CBD.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>3. The proposal is inconsistent with the surrounding low rise housing. There are no existing high rise buildings on the southern side of the Castle Hill CBD.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>4. Concern regarding the future loss of privacy and overlooking of backyards from proposed units and the 'common area'.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (h) in the Report.</p> <p>5. Concern for noise impacts and light spill from the common area. Floodlighting at night will increase the ambient light levels on the adjoining properties.</p> <p>Comment: The draft DCP has been amended post-exhibition to include a new control to manage light spill. More detailed information will be required at the Development Application stage.</p> <p>6. The proposed high rise buildings will destroy the outlook from neighbouring properties. As the planning proposal seeks to remove building height limits for this site, how can it be guaranteed that the buildings would be limited to the heights currently proposed? Concern that the changes to height controls will enable the future construction of buildings to any height.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (g) in the Report.</p> <p>7. The additional population will place significant strain on existing utility services (power, water, sewerage, telecommunications) with no indication that there will be any</p>

	<p>enhancements to cater for the additional load.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (k) in the Report.</p> <p>8. The sewer line in Lincoln Place is already overloaded (following construction of a 3-storey apartment block on Old Northern Road a few years ago). Blockages occur a number of times a year, resulting in overflows into Lincoln Place.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (k) in the Report. The planning proposal was referred to Sydney Water who advise that network extensions or amplifications to the wastewater system may be required to service the redevelopment of the site, which will be assessed at the Section 73 (Sydney Water Act) application stage as part of a future Development Application.</p> <p>9. The proposal will increase traffic levels in streets that were not meant to accommodate such usage.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (c) in the Report.</p> <p>10. The traffic report identifies Cecil Ave, Francis Street and Orange Grove as “4UP” (i.e. 4 lanes with no parking allowed) which misrepresents the actual situation. These streets do not have marked lanes, are narrow and curved, and cars regularly park on both sides of the road. There is barely enough room for 2 cars to pass without crossing the unbroken centre line, creating safety hazards. Buses travelling on Orange Grove take up the full carriageway, blocking flow in the opposite direction.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (b) and (c), and Attachment 1 of in the Report.</p> <p>11. Cars owned by residents, commuters, and patrons of nearby businesses are parked day and night on local streets leaving streets lined with parked cars. The proposed parking rate of 1 space per unit for the subject development will exacerbate on-street parking issues.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (d) in the Report.</p> <p>12. Concern regarding the accuracy and validity of the traffic report, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The report relies on car counts from two days in December 2016 and February 2017) which is not a valid statistical sample; - By showing the total volume over a 2 hour period it fails to show the reality of shorter peaks. The sample periods
--	---

	<p>should be in 15 minute intervals and the analysis should reflect a complete week of counting rather than single days.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The traffic report underestimates the likely traffic flow from the number of units proposed, and there is no knowledge of the likely destinations of the new residents or their likelihood of using cars rather than public transport for their travel. The buildings will be 600-800m from the Castle Hill Train Station. <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) in the Report.</p> <p>13. The traffic report states that existing and likely traffic flows are within “acceptable norms” yet the April 2016 Council report states that the streets already exceed 100% of acceptable capacity. The traffic report quotes acceptable volumes for “uninterrupted” traffic flow, which is not applicable to this situation as traffic flows will be hindered by narrow street designs and delays at major intersections.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) in the Report.</p> <p>14. Vehicles cannot enter Cecil Avenue from Old Northern Road /Terminus Street heading north. Vehicles coming from the south will need to use Francis Street / Orange Grove / Cecil Avenue to access the commercial parking entry.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>15. The Traffic Report does not address the impact of increased traffic flows on Lincoln Place and the ability for residents to exit Lincoln Place in a safe and timely manner. It is already difficult to leave Lincoln Place due to poor lines of sight caused by parked cars. Additional traffic from the proposed development will make these issues worse.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>16. Increased traffic volumes and the proposed traffic signals will cause traffic delays beyond Lincoln Place as vehicles wait to turn on Old Northern Road (as already occurs at peak hour). It may be impossible for Lincoln Place residents to legally turn right into Francis Street during the morning peak hours.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>17. The Traffic Report does not mention the church and primary school in Cecil Avenue (opposite the proposed development).The school already creates significant traffic</p>
--	--

	<p>congestion in Cecil Avenue in the morning and afternoons, with parent's vehicles queueing in the street to drop off/collect children. Cars can completely block west-bound traffic flow on Cecil Avenue. The church building is used for Saturday church services as well as weekly social activities, which exacerbate impacts on traffic flow in Cecil Avenue.</p> <p>Comment Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (b) and (c), and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>18. The proposed traffic signals at the Old Northern Rd / Francis Street intersection will require land to be resumed on each side of Old Northern Road. Concern about impacts on the historic church building which is located very close to the footpath in this location. There is no scope to resume land in this location without demolishing the heritage item.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.1(a) and 3.1(c) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>19. Land required for a right turn lane will need to come from the western side of Old Northern Road where there are existing problems with traffic flow. Consideration should be given to providing a right turn lane for vehicles turning right from Old Northern Road to Parsonage Road which will involve an even greater resumption requirement.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.1(a) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>20. The proposal is out of character with the area, there is little concern for impacts on adjoining properties. The supporting documentation contains misleading or questionable statements.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (a) and (f) in the Report.</p> <p>21. If more apartments are needed in Castle Hill (and both State Government and Council targets have already been met) there are more suitable sites, such as the Terminus Street carpark, the Castle Mall site or the old primary school site.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p>
Action	The draft DCP has been amended to include a new control to manage light spill.

No.	16
Document No.	164012209
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. The development is too large, it is unnecessary in light of the Castle Hill CBD redevelopment strategies, and is an outlier in the residential area. Concern for overdevelopment of the area.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (a) and (f) in the Report.</p> <p>2. The plans give a poor representation of building heights and topographical changes are unclear. It is impossible to gauge the full effect of the buildings on the submission author's property when the ground level is inadequately defined on a sloping plot.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (f) and (g) in the Report.</p> <p>2. The value of the public easement to surrounding residents is unclear.</p> <p>Comment: The through-site link will reduce the distance and time taken to walk to the Castle Hill centre and rail station which will encourage a reduction in car usage.</p> <p>3. The CAD video does not show the development within the context of the surrounding residential area and it fails to show the vehicular entry from Cecil Ave.</p> <p>Comment: The fly-through video provided by the developer is indicative only and is not necessarily accurate in relation to other sites.</p> <p>4. The addition of commercial space contradicts the stance that this development is near the CBD where all these facilities are already available.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>5. The proposed 18-storey high rise development is out of character with the North West Rail Link Structure Plan for this area of Castle Hill, which identified 3-6 storey buildings (medium density housing) in this location. Other more suitable areas have been identified for high rise.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>6. The developer states that the site is surrounded by recent</p>

	<p>higher density residential uses, however nothing has been built 18 storeys high. To the west and south-west, the height of existing apartments is only 4-6 storeys on land that is lower. The planned 18-storey building is proposed to be constructed at almost the highest point which will not enhance the streetscape.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (a) and (f) in the Report.</p> <p>7. How does Council justify the short term gains of the developer against the long-term destruction of the residential structure of Lincoln Place?</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>8. How does Council assess a developer based on track record? Why would Council allow a company established in 2012 with no track record in building large developments to attempt this large build? Can Council guarantee that the project can actually be funded and sustained to finality? Question as to what happens if construction stalls before completion – will Hills Shire residents be required to pay?</p> <p>Comment: The history of the company is not relevant to the merits of the planning proposal. The developer will be financially responsible for completing the development.</p> <p>9. The site is on the extremity of the Hills LEP and is out of character with its residential surrounds. Castle Hill is already zoned and available for development.</p> <p>The submission author refers to comments by the former Mayor and General Manager in a Daily Telegraph newspaper article (25 November 2015) about the need to take a holistic approach to planning in the Shire to avoid ad-hoc development, and to involve the community in discussions about what future suburbs will look like.</p> <p>Suggestion that the community has had no involvement in Council's plans except via individual submissions on specific development proposals.</p> <p>Comment: Council consulted with the community on The Hills Corridor Strategy, which was exhibited in September / October 2015. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>10. The “accessible roof greenery” will likely be for residents only. The developer’s ‘eco-marketing’ of greenery areas is over emphasised in relation to current residents of Castle Hill.</p> <p>Comment:</p>
--	--

	<p>Rooftop terraces are part of the open space for the development.</p> <p>11. The proposal does not provide a sensitive transition of development in the residential areas. It is imprudent to rezone the site without consideration of the surrounding area.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (a) and (g) in the Report.</p> <p>12. The Hills Shire has met its housing targets and the proposed 460 unit complex is superfluous to NSW State Government guidelines.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>13. Query why the developer isn't responsible for all infrastructure redevelopment necessitated by their proposal. Is the \$15,000,000 contribution to Council all earmarked for upgrades to infrastructure/ amenities in the immediate vicinity of the development or towards other infrastructure/amenities for the Shire?</p> <p>Comment: The VPA gives Council the ability to utilise the funds where needed, as outlined in Section 1.3 of the Report.</p> <p>14. The Draft VPA states that the developer will ensure that nuisances, unreasonable noise and disturbances from the carrying out of the works will be prevented. How will Council monitor this?</p> <p>Comment: Noise and disturbance from the construction process will be addressed as part of a future Development Application.</p> <p>15. Is there a required date for the development to be completed? For how many years will residents need to live with ongoing construction impacts works?</p> <p>Comment: There is no maximum timeframe for the development to be completed once the development is formally commenced.</p> <p>15. Existing road infrastructure already has difficulty coping with traffic at peak times, and has further deteriorated since Castle Towers introduced paid parking. Commuters are now using side streets for parking. The developer's Traffic Report conflicts with Council's own previous findings.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (b), (c) and (d) in the Report.</p> <p>16. The Traffic Report does not identify the parameters entered into the SIDRA traffic modelling program. Also, the trip</p>
--	---

	<p>generation and distribution results are based on guidelines published 15 years ago which is not relevant to current conditions.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) in the Report.</p> <p>17. The Traffic Report incorrectly identifies many roads as being 4 lane with 2 additional parking lanes.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2(b) in the Report.</p> <p>18. The vehicle counts in the Traffic Report significantly underestimate current conditions.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) in the Report.</p> <p>19. Concern that numbers in the Traffic Report are inaccurate, particularly in relation to Roger Avenue. It states that the 460 units will generate 90 departures in the morning peak hour and 54 arrivals in the afternoon peak. However, the report also says that traffic will increase by less than 50 cars along Roger Avenue during the AM and PM peak which does not appear to be accurate.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) in the Report.</p> <p>20. The Traffic Report does not consider that adding traffic lights at Francis Street will significantly impact flow on Old Northern Road, particularly given the existing pedestrian controlled traffic lights at Kerr's Road.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) in the Report.</p> <p>21. Concern that traffic counts were conducted on 8 December and 2 February (summer holiday time for many people) and is not an ideal time to undertake traffic counts. Also, the afternoon peak didn't start early enough to include the congestion that occurs when schools finish at 3pm. The traffic report also does not identify that a school is located opposite the site.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) in the Report.</p> <p>22. According to the Traffic Report, "Terminus and Crane currently operate at an acceptable level of service "D" during morning peak hour improving to "C" in afternoon peak". However, elsewhere in the document "D" is defined as "approaching unstable".</p>
--	--

	<p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) in the Report.</p> <p>23. Query why a roundabout is not also proposed at the intersection of Lincoln Place and Francis Street, as it is already difficult to enter Francis Street during peak times and there is limited visibility of oncoming cars.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (d) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>24. Drivers approaching from Baulkham Hills are unlikely to drive around the Castle Hill CBD to enter the development from Cecil Avenue. All traffic coming from the south along Old Northern Road and wanting to access the site through either of the entrances, will do so via Francis Street as it is the most direct route.</p> <p>Comment: Traffic lights are recommended for the intersection of Old Northern Road and Francis Street to improve access.</p> <p>25. The proposed traffic lights will impede flow on Old Northern Road.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.1 (a) and (b), and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>26. Traffic lights on Francis Street would cause traffic to bank up and will limit egress from Roger Avenue and Lincoln Place. The ability to turn right from Lincoln Place will be affected. Question as to whether Council should require traffic lights there too, with a yellow boxed-square to maintain space for cars exiting Lincoln Street?</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.1 (a), (b) and (c), and Attachment 1 of the Report in the Report.</p> <p>27. Query if there is any evidence that people will have fewer cars if they are close to the railway? 2016 Census data suggests that 51% of households have access to two or more vehicles, but the proposed development will limit each unit to only 1 car space.</p> <p>Comment: Over time, it is expected that vehicle ownership will reduce in areas that are located close to public transport services that offer fast and direct access to surrounding areas. The Sydney Metro Northwest is due to commence in 2019 and will significantly improve public transport accessibility in Castle Hill.</p> <p>28. It is incorrect to assume that Roger Avenue will be less used</p>
--	---

	<p>by cars than the Cecil Avenue entry. How can Council police this?</p> <p>Comment: Section 2.8 'Traffic, Parking and Vehicular Access' in the DCP requires that commercial vehicles access the subject site from Cecil Avenue only. The DCP has been amended post-exhibition to require that the design of the carpark shall prevent commercial and visitor vehicles from utilising Roger Avenue, for example via the use of an access card system. Signage will also be required to be erected to advise that access to the site from Roger Avenue is for residents only.</p> <p>29. How will Council address the traffic impacts caused by construction vehicles using Francis Street to loop around into Cecil Avenue for site entry?</p> <p>Comment: Construction matters would be addressed as part of the Development Application process.</p> <p>30. How will an exclusive right turn lane into Francis Street be incorporated into the existing Old Northern Road road-width given there is already no space? A few years ago consideration was given to lights being installed at Old Northern Rd / Francis Street but weren't deemed feasible. How can Council / RMS now approve traffic lights at Francis St when they were previously rejected?</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.1 (a) and (b), and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>31. Can Council guarantee that there will be a requirement that the upgrade of Francis Street / Old Northern Road occurs prior to the redevelopment of the site?</p> <p>Comment: No such guarantee can be made. The Roads and Maritime Services have not yet agreed to the installation of traffic signals at the intersection of Francis Street and Old Northern Road.</p> <p>32. Concern that the existing vehicle levels are based on current usage, however there are already plans for a high rise building in the day surgery / car parking area adjacent to Cecil Avenue which will significantly add to vehicle / road usage numbers. How will this affect Council's plans into the future? Has this been taken into account for this proposal?</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.1 (a) and (b), and Sections 3.2 (b) and (c) in the Report.</p> <p>33. The restriction of on-street parking will significantly impact on the school on Cecil Avenue and is a safety issue that should</p>
--	---

	<p>be addressed.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (d) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>34. How will traffic flows on Old Northern Road be maintained with three closely operating traffic lights at Cecil Ave, Francis St and Kerr's Rd? Kerr's Rd is controlled by pedestrians and cars (it is not timed).</p> <p>Comment: See Section 3.1 (a), and Sections 3.2 (b) and (c) in the Report.</p> <p>35. The Council Report of 12 April 2016 (p.75) indicated that "no vehicle access will be provided via Roger Avenue". This is a contradiction to what is now being proposed.</p> <p>Comment: This is correct. The proponent amended the Traffic Report following the Council Report of April 2016.</p> <p>36. A large development along the back fence will be a significant imposition on residents' lifestyle and will alter the outlook from surrounding homes. The development will affect the ambience of Lincoln Ave. The submission author's backyard will be fully overlooked which is an invasion of their privacy and lifestyle. Proposed setbacks are insufficient – the greatest setbacks are around the cemetery.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (f) and (h) in the Report.</p> <p>37. It is impossible to determine from the developer's plans how high the multi-level garage (under the grassed communal area) will be above the adjoining residential properties. It will be visible above the residents' existing back fence.</p> <p>Comment: The DCP has been amended post-exhibition to require that the basement carpark protrudes above ground level for ventilation purposes to a maximum of 1.2m only.</p> <p>38. Concern that the underground carpark will be vented towards the submission author's dwelling. It should be vented towards the cemetery.</p> <p>Comment: The current design is a concept only. Section 2.8 'Traffic, Parking and Vehicular Access' in the draft DCP has been amended post exhibition to require that the carpark ventilation point be located on Cecil Avenue and not be directed towards adjoining dwellings.</p> <p>39. Concern that the communal green area above the carpark will increase noise impacts and cause a loss of privacy for</p>
--	---

	<p>the submission author. It is not clear from the plans how high the communal area will be (it is not at ground level). It is difficult to define ground level from the plans.</p> <p>Comment: See Section 3.2 (h) in the Report. The existing plans are conceptual only and will need refinement prior to a DA being lodged. Section 2.8 'Traffic, Parking and Vehicular Access' in the draft DCP has been amended post exhibition to require that basement carparking does not protrude more than 1.2 metres where required for ventilation purposes.</p> <p>Section 2.5 'Sunlight, Solar Access and Privacy' in the draft DCP has been amended post-exhibition to require that the proposed buildings, underground carparking structure and common open space areas are to follow the contour of the site to minimise overshadowing and the loss of privacy of adjoining private open space areas. The DCP has also been amended post-exhibition to require that retaining walls and any fencing should not exceed a total height of 1.8m above natural ground level.</p> <p>40. Mature landscaping should be provided to adjoining dwellings, similar to what is proposed for land adjoining the cemetery.</p> <p>Comment: A design concept has only been submitted at this stage. The need for additional landscaping will be further considered at the Development Application stage. The DCP has been amended post-exhibition to require that mature landscaping be provided on property boundaries.</p> <p>41. Concern regarding overshadowing to adjoining properties.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (i) in the Report.</p> <p>42. Concern about structural alterations to the water easement along the submission author's back fence during construction, and the potential for flooding from run-off. The plans don't address this issue sufficiently.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (k) in the Report. A detailed review of the need for easements would be undertaken as part a future development assessment process.</p> <p>43. Concern about the impact of an additional 460 units on the existing grey/black waste water infrastructure.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (k) in the Report.</p> <p>44. There is a lack of information about drainage. The North West Rail Structure Plan identified that further investigation of</p>
--	--

	<p>flooding may be needed at future rezonings or DA stage to establish appropriate flood planning levels, and that a detailed flooding study will need to be undertaken at the masterplan level. Such a flooding study has not been prepared and should be done as part of this proposal, not once an approval is given.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (k) in the Report.</p> <p>45. Query whether Council is satisfied that all current and future risks associated with this proposal have been identified and addressed in the plans.</p> <p>Comment: The planning proposal is just one part of the planning process for a development on this site. The Development Application stage will involve a further review of the proposed development.</p> <p>46. Is Council satisfied that any long term effects created as a result of the proposed development can be rectified by the proponent, and not fall as costs to individual home owners, Council or its ratepayers?</p> <p>Comment: Concerns relating to the construction process will be addressed at the Development Application stage.</p> <p>47. Query whether Council can take legal action against the proponent if required without cost to Hills Shire residents.</p> <p>Comment: Should a development be approved on the subject site in future, a private certifier will be responsible for ensuring that the development is undertaken in accordance with approved plans. Under the VPA, the developer has an obligation to carry out and complete the easement works. The VPA also allows for the costs incurred by Council in completing works to the through-site link to be recovered by the developer in the event of a failure to complete the works.</p> <p>48. Query whether Council is satisfied that the proposed development will remain intact on the sloping topography, and that it will not impact on surrounding buildings (even after several years).</p> <p>Comment: Any future development on the site will be required to meet the construction standards in the Building Code of Australia.</p> <p>49. Concern about how upgrades to the stormwater / drainage network would occur if there are no remaining funds from the Voluntary Planning Agreement. Problems are already being experienced in Lincoln Place. Will the stormwater / drainage system still get upgraded?</p>
--	---

	<p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (k) of the Report.</p>
Action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Section 2.8 'Traffic, Parking and Vehicular Access' of the DCP has been amended post-exhibition to require that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The design of the carpark shall prevent commercial and visitor vehicles from utilising Roger Avenue. - The carpark ventilation point be located on Cecil Avenue and not be directed towards adjoining dwellings. - Basement carparking does not protrude more than 1.2 metres where required for ventilation purposes. ▪ Section 2.5 'Sunlight, Solar Access and Privacy' in the draft DCP has been amended post-exhibition to require that the proposed buildings, underground carparking structure and common open space areas are to follow the contour of the site to minimise overshadowing and the loss of privacy of adjoining private open space areas. The DCP has also been amended post-exhibition to require that retaining walls and any fencing should not exceed a total height of 1.8m above natural ground level.

No.	17
Document No.	164019750
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. The proposal will negatively impact on wildlife on the development site. A wildlife impact study should be prepared which identifies ways to minimise impacts.</p> <p>Comment: There is no evidence of significant wildlife on the site.</p> <p>2. Concern about relations between neighbours. The subject proposal, as well as the potential for another group sale, has generated conflict between neighbours.</p> <p>Comment: Council is not able to provide advice on whether to sell properties.</p> <p>3. If the proposed development will result in unbearable extra noise from traffic/people/music as well as overlooking and overshadowing, the submission author will be forced to sell and move.</p> <p>Comment: Council is not able to advise property owners on any decision to sell their properties. See Sections 3.2 (e), (f), (g), (h), (i) in the Report.</p> <p>4. The overall plans for Castle Hill to 2023 resemble that of a small city such as Chatswood or St Leonards and do not reflect the type of residential surroundings that the resident would like.</p> <p>Comment: The Hills Shire is set to grow and change in the future, and increased density needs to be appropriately managed. Council's plans seek to keep the key aspects of the Shire whilst accommodating growth.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	18
Document No.	164046156
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. Cecil Avenue is on a steep incline. The proposed buildings will be higher in the skyline and will impact on the privacy of residents.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (g) and (h) in the Report.</p> <p>2. The noise and dust from the trucks, heavy machinery and cranes during construction will significantly impact on adjoining residents' quality of life over an extended period of time.</p> <p>Comment: Construction impacts would be addressed as part of the Development Application process.</p> <p>3. Due to heavy traffic congestion it is already difficult (and often dangerous) to turn right from Old Northern Road into Francis Street, and to turn left or right from Francis Street onto Old Northern Road. The signalisation of Francis Street and Old Northern Road will not address congestion problems.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (c) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>4. The proposal will provide insufficient carparking for residents and visitors.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (d) in the Report.</p> <p>5. The proposal will add additional cars to already heavily congested roads. Traffic volumes are already set to significantly increase with the expansion of Castle Towers Shopping Centre, completion of the railway stations in Castle Hill and Showground, and the completion of the nearby apartment and commercial development (on Corner of Crane Rd and Old Northern Rd).</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (c) in the Report.</p> <p>6. Cecil Avenue is already busy due to businesses, the Seventh Day Adventist Church, primary school and the early learning facility (located opposite the subject site). Cars are constantly parked in the street by clients of existing businesses, parents drop off and pick up children, and vehicles queue in the street to access the pick-up / drop-off area behind the school.</p>

	<p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (c), (d) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>7. Concern for the amenity impacts of construction vehicles queuing in local streets, which will start from 7am daily. There is no ability for Cecil Ave, Roger Ave, Terminus Street and Orange Grove to accommodate construction vehicles.</p> <p>Comment: It is likely that there will be additional construction traffic and demand for on-street parking in the locality for a temporary period if the proposal is supported. Construction impacts would be addressed as part of the Development Application process.</p> <p>8. Query as to how the heavy machinery, cranes and trucks will navigate Cecil Ave and Roger Ave.</p> <p>Comment: The manoeuvring of construction vehicles to the site would be addressed as part of the Development Application process.</p> <p>9. Query where workmens' utes and cars will park during construction.</p> <p>Comment: It is likely that there will be additional construction traffic and demand for on-street parking in the locality for a temporary period if the proposal is supported. Construction impacts would be addressed as part of the Development Application process.</p> <p>10. Many residents have lived in their homes for 20-30 years and many are retirees. Some have renovated their homes with the expectation of living in their homes for many years to come. Residents feel that they are being forced to leave their homes, which is causing stress and anxiety. Homes will be devalued if the proposal proceeds and residents will have difficulty affording a comparable home.</p> <p>Comment: Impacts on property value are not a consideration. Property owners cannot be forced to sell their properties.</p> <p>11. This development is unnecessary as Council has already achieved its quota for high density apartment dwellings. The proposal is not aligned with the Hills Corridor Strategy Plan as it is located 620m from the train station and therefore outside the area identified for growth.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>12. If this development does proceed, request that Council rezone the land from Cecil Avenue to Francis Street from R3</p>
--	---

	<p>Medium Density to R4 High Density Residential which will give impacted residents an opportunity to sell to a developer.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	19
Document No.	164021792
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. As an adjoining neighbour, their privacy, quality of life and quiet enjoyment of their property will be materially impacted by the development.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (h) and (i) in the Report.</p> <p>2. Request for building heights to be reduced and for setbacks to be increased to prevent overlooking into private open space areas. The buildings will be built on a hill above neighbouring properties, which will exacerbate problems posed by building height.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (g) and (h) in the Report.</p> <p>3. The proposed roof-top gardens should be rejected outright in the buildings adjacent to property boundaries to prevent large gatherings / parties on the roof from impacting on neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (h) in the Report.</p> <p>4. The proposed building heights will rule out the prospect of the submission author ever being able to install a viable solar electricity system on their property. They will lose this option if the development goes ahead in its current form, which is a considerable penalty.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (i) in the Report.</p> <p>5. The traffic plan should be amended and access to the carpark from Roger Avenue be rejected. Roger Avenue is one of the narrowest and quietest streets in Castle Hill – allowing 900 vehicles access to the development via this road will adversely affect access and egress from the submission author's property, on-street parking for their visitors, and pedestrian safety as there is no footpath in Roger Avenue. All vehicle traffic in and out of the development should be via Cecil Avenue only.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (c), (d) and Attachment 1 of the Report. A post-exhibition amendment to the DCP is recommended to ensure that only residents of the development utilise the Roger Avenue driveway to the site, and that a footpath be provided for the safety of pedestrians.</p>

6. The proposed access point / driveway for vehicles is too close to the submission author's property and poses a danger to pedestrians.

Comment:

Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 of the Report. The safety of the proposed driveway access points will be further reviewed as part of a future Development Application.

7. Using Roger Avenue as an access point for residential vehicles is incompatible with the concept of opening a pedestrian thoroughfare from Cecil Avenue to Roger Avenue. Pedestrians from Francis Street will need to compete with a huge increase in traffic in a 6-metre wide street with no footpath in order to take advantage of the boulevard (the development's major drawcard).

Comment:

Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 of the Report.

8. A more comprehensive stormwater run-off plan should be developed. Stormwater runoff is already a major issue for properties on the northern side of Roger Avenue. Concern that the Council drain in the easement behind the submission author's property will not cope with the proposed increased extent of hard surfaces. They already experience problems with overflow from water not captured by the drainage system, an issue that will worsen with the proposed development.

Comment:

Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (k) in the Report.

9. Surrounding residents will experience up to five years of construction noise, dust, vehicles and workers, which will impact on the ability for an adjoining owner to work from home. Appropriate mitigation measures and possibly compensation should be considered.

Comment:

Construction impacts relating to noise, dust, and the safe management of any asbestos on site would be addressed as part of the Development Application process.

10. This rezoning decision has been made arbitrarily with the line drawn at the submission author's small boundary fence. Some issues could have been resolved if the entire street of Roger Avenue was rezoned rather than just 2 properties in a cul-de-sac, which would have opened up other options for future development and enabled a better planning outcome. Council should reconsider the zoning of Roger Avenue with this in mind.

Comment:

	Council is required to assess any planning proposals that have been lodged on their merits.
Action	A post-exhibition amendment to the DCP is recommended to ensure that only residents of the development utilise the Roger Avenue driveway to the site, and that a footpath be provided for the safety of pedestrians.

No.	20
Document No.	164028835
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. The exhibition material fails to provide adequate and accurate details on the proposal's impact on the Castle Hill Precinct and its direct impact on 22 Lincoln Place (which adjoins the southern boundary of the development site).</p> <p>Comment: It is expected that more detailed information on the design would be submitted as part of any Development Application for the subject site.</p> <p>2. The site is located outside the area identified in The Hills LEP for high density construction within the CBD (which is contained to the south by the Terminus Street ring road). The proposal is excessive in relation to the Northwest Corridor Strategy which envisages 3-6 storey construction on the site to allow a gentle transition to existing low rise residences.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (a) and (g) in the Report.</p> <p>3. The proposal has no sensitive transition to the surrounding low rise residences and it is not in character with the area. The bulk and scale of the proposal will destroy the existing amenity and lifestyle for residents.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections (f) and (g) in the Report.</p> <p>4. The Urban Design Report displays adjoining heights of neighbouring future planning proposals. No future planning proposals neighbouring this site have been submitted to Council. The Cecil Avenue development is an enormous, stand-alone structure that is completely out of character with the surrounding area.</p> <p>Comment: See Section 3.2 (a) and (g) in the Report. Planning Proposal 10/2018/PLP for land on Orange Grove, Francis Street and Roger Avenue was lodged in May 2017, but has not yet progressed to a Gateway Determination.</p> <p>5. The North West Corridor Strategy's five year target of increasing the number of residential dwellings in the Castle Hill Precinct has already been met by Council via development applications that have already been approved or are already under construction.</p> <p>Comment: No, Council's housing target has not yet been met.</p>

6. The proposed public easement opens at Cecil Avenue at the northern end of the site where there is no direct access to the future Castle Hill Rail Station. Pedestrians would have to walk approximately 150m west to the traffic lights at the corner of Old Northern Road and Terminus Street to legally walk to the station. The easement offers no great benefit in providing easier and direct access to the Castle Hill CBD and future train station.

Comment:

Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (e) in the Report.

7. The exhibited traffic report is incorrect and misleading. Table 6 in the report classifies Cecil Avenue, Francis Street and Orange Grove as "4UP", defined as "4 Lane Undivided with 2 Parking Lanes". These streets do not contain parking lanes – they are occupied with constant on-street parking that allows only 2 undivided lanes for through-traffic. The data collected in the report is inaccurate and provides misleading information.

Comment:

Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) in the Report.

8. The main access to the development for residential and commercial vehicles is located opposite the access for the local primary school, church and day care centre. This will add to congestion in this location and will create an extremely hazardous environment for children and the public who use these facilities.

Comment:

Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 of the Report.

9. The limited on-street parking in Castle Hill has been further reduced following the introduction of paid parking in Castle Towers. The proposed 460 apartments will further restrict on-street parking availability and hamper through-traffic on some streets (such as Orange Grove near the Crane Road intersection) where cars currently have to stop on the side of the road to allow vehicles travelling in the opposite direction to pass.

Comment:

Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (c) and (d), and Attachment 1 of the Report.

10. The proposal is imposing on the submission author's residence and destroys the outlook and lifestyle that they currently have.

Comment:

Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (g), (h) and (i) in the Report.

	<p>11. The DCP only refers to the number of storeys in each building and does not provide the exact height of each structure.</p> <p>Comment: Noted.</p> <p>12. The shadow study does not indicate that it allows for the site's topography (where the submission author's residence is 11m lower than the higher point on the development site). More detail is needed in the shadow report to ascertain the actual building heights and ground levels, including the topography of the land. The overshadowing could be greater than indicated by the report. The shadow report does not take into account fencing or screening, so overshadowing on the submission author's property is inaccurate.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (i) in the Report. A post-exhibition amendment to the DCP is recommended which will require that retaining walls and fencing are not to exceed 1.8m above ground level to minimise overlooking and overshadowing of adjoining properties.</p> <p>13. Overshadowing from the proposed development will block sunlight to the solar panels that are installed on the submission author's roof, particularly in winter when morning sun is required for the north-east facing panels.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (i) in the Report.</p> <p>14. The DCP does not detail the actual depth of excavation on site. Concern is raised regarding the structural integrity of the submission author's concrete pool and dwelling.</p> <p>Comment: Concerns relating to construction methods or impacts to adjoining properties would be addressed at the Development Application stage.</p> <p>15. There are no details of the actual proposed ground level for the "common area" adjacent to the boundary with 22 Lincoln Place. Underground parking will be located under this common area (possibly elevating the ground level) which would encroach upon the neighbours' privacy. No actual heights are detailed.</p> <p>Comment: The plans submitted in support of the planning proposal are conceptual only. A greater level of detail will be required as part of a future Development Application for the site.</p> <p>16. The proposed location of the 'common area' adjacent to the boundary with 22 Lincoln Place will impact upon the privacy</p>
--	--

	<p>and tranquillity that is currently enjoyed by the property owners, due to noise levels, lighting at night and visual exposure. Query as to what prevents the public from access this common area?</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (g) and (h) in the Report. A post-exhibition DCP amendment is recommended to minimise the impacts of light spill.</p> <p>17. The visual bulk and scale of this development overlooking 22 Lincoln Place will destroy the owner's current amenity and lifestyle. The proposed apartments and public areas will create disruptive noise levels that will impact on the ambience of the Lincoln Place cul-de-sac.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (f), (g), (h) and (i) in the Report.</p> <p>18. It is unclear from the exhibition material where the underground carpark exhaust is extruded. Query whether exhaust vents are proposed and if so, where they will be located.</p> <p>Comments: Section 2.8 'Traffic, Parking and Vehicular Access' in the draft DCP has been amended post exhibition to require that the carpark ventilation point be located on Cecil Avenue and not be directed towards adjoining dwellings.</p> <p>19. The draft DCP does not conform to the setback standards in the Apartment Design Guidelines.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (j) in the Report.</p> <p>20. Traffic conditions around the immediate area are already difficult, especially when trying to exit Lincoln Place onto Francis Street and at the Francis Street / Old Northern Road intersection at peak hours. The traffic report identifies problems with this intersection however the proposed traffic lights will not resolve problems. Instead, traffic lights would only extend the traffic queue on Francis Street, making it more difficult for vehicles exiting Lincoln Place.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (b) and (c), and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>21. Allowing vehicular access to the development through Roger Avenue will further exacerbate the traffic flow with more traffic being focussed onto Francis Street.</p> <p>Comment:</p>
--	---

	<p>Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (c) and Attachment 1 in the Report.</p> <p>22. The intersection of Cecil Avenue and Terminus Street is already heavily congested at peak hour, especially at school drop-off and pick-up times. The proposed development will significantly increase this traffic congestion.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (c) in the Report.</p> <p>23. An average of 3 main line sewer blockages occurs in the immediate area each year, requiring attendance by the Water Board to the submission author's residence to unblock backflow from the main sewer line. Concern is raised regarding the disruption and extra load that the new development would create.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (k) in the Report.</p> <p>24. The planning proposal fails to achieve the Draft DCP objectives, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A sensitive transition to adjoining development (objective 2.2(i)), - Development that responds to the site's topography – actual ground level measurements and building heights are not provided and more detail is needed (objective 2.3(i)), - Minimising traffic impacts or improving the flow and function of the local road network (objective 2.8(i)) – the proposal will have the opposite effect. <p>Comment: The DCP has been updated to increase setbacks to some property boundaries and to ensure that commercial vehicles are not able to utilise Roger Avenue to access the basement carpark. The DCP also requires that future development follow the contours of the site.</p> <p>25. The proposal needs more information and significant adjustment before it goes further in the planning process.</p> <p>Comment: Noted.</p> <p>26. Concern that there is no precinct plan for south of Castle Hill at this stage. Is this development a catalyst for Council sacrificing the long term residential structure of the locality to allow the developer short term gains because there is no precinct plan at this stage?</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p>
--	---

	<p>27. The current zoning of the site already allows for additional dwellings that would be a sensitive transition from the Castle Hill CBD to the lower density residential areas with far less impact on infrastructure, traffic flow and congestion, and would comply with the Northwest Corridor Strategy and the LEP.</p> <p>Comment: A planning proposal is needed to amend LEP 2012 to achieve the development outcome sought by the proponent.</p>
Action	<p>Section 2.8 'Traffic, Parking and Vehicular Access' in the draft DCP has been amended post exhibition to require that the carpark ventilation point be located on Cecil Avenue and not be directed towards adjoining dwellings. The DCP has also been amended to require that lighting be designed to minimise the impacts of light spill.</p>

No.	21
Document No.	164198243
Submission Author	Hills Adventist College
Issues raised	<p>While the school is not seeking to oppose the development proposal, they are keen to receive assurances, supported through appropriate monitoring by the designated agencies, about the manner in which construction will proceed. Their concerns relate to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Traffic congestion:</i> Transit buses pick up and drop off students in front of the college and church twice a day, a process that is already challenging during the hours of 8am – 9am and 2pm - 5pm. Traffic congestion has been underestimated in the subject development proposal. The school needs ongoing protection of the current bus zone and access to the campus. Request to be consulted regarding traffic management plans affecting Cecil Avenue. <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (b) and(c), and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <i>Safety and security for students, parents and staff:</i> Students attending the early learning centre spend portions of each day outside including in play areas adjacent to Cecil Avenue. Concern regarding the noise, dust and potential safety risks of a large-scale construction site. Request for assurances regarding the monitoring and management of noise and pollution levels, the induction process for on-site personnel and the restrictions that will be placed on construction workers regarding proximity to the College campus. <p>Comment: Construction impacts and safety matters relating to noise, dust, the safe management of any asbestos on site, and child safety would be addressed as part of the Development Application process.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Following experiences at the College's Kellyville Campus, regulations are required to protect the Cecil Avenue community against litter, parking problems and damage caused by cranes and cement trucks. <p>Comment: Construction impacts would be addressed as part of a future Development Application.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. <i>Securing the Campus:</i> Construction sites introduce issues such as parking for construction workers and damage to the local environment. Request for additional security measures to protect the College campus and Church grounds. <p>Comment:</p>

	<p>Construction impacts would be addressed as part of a future Development Application.</p> <p>5. The proposed 460 units (with minimal facility for playgrounds) will create an interest in the College playgrounds, parking areas and the sporting field which the school is not able to accommodate. Request for the developer to fund the installation of boom gates to control access to the campus, as they are only being considered in light of the inadequate provision of facilities for the occupants of the apartments.</p> <p>Comment: The school and church may wish to negotiate with the developer regarding the funding of boom gates on their site, however this is not a matter that can be resolved with the planning proposal.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	22
Document No.	164309177
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. The properties are located outside the Castle Hill CBD. They are appropriately zoned R3 which provides an appropriate transition from the high rise zoning of the CBD to the existing residential development that surrounds the CBD. This transition is recognised as appropriate in the Northwest Corridor Strategy.</p> <p>Comment: The North West rail Link Corridor Strategy identifies the subject site as being suitable for 3 – 6 storey apartment buildings.</p> <p>2. The bulk and scale of the proposed development will destroy the ambience and amenity of Lincoln Place and will inevitably lead to a deterioration of its existing character.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (f) and (g) in the Report.</p> <p>3. The proximity of the proposed development to the rear private open spaces of adjoining residents' properties will lead to overlooking and will impact on residents' ability to enjoy their rear yards.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (h) in the Report.</p> <p>4. Approval of the planning proposal and subsequent high-rise development will cause further traffic congestion and the loss of existing character in the area.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (c) and (f) in the Report.</p> <p>5. The proposal ignores the significant number of studies and reports that have been prepared for the future planning of the Castle Hill business centre, which envisage low rise residential development in this area. Cecil Ave is nominated for medium density housing which recognises the existing nature of development in the area. Existing residents should not be affected by non-conforming proposals that clearly conflict with the desired future character of the area.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>6. As recognised in existing studies / reports, the existing ambience of Castle Hill should be maintained, with high rise development appropriately located close to the transport hub and commercial centre. Long term strategies should have</p>

	<p>precedence over short term financial gain.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>7. Request that the submission author's clients be given the opportunity to address Council regarding this matter to ensure that the Councillors understand their desire for their homes to be protected from inappropriate development.</p> <p>Comment: Submission authors were notified prior to the post-exhibition report being considered by Council. The notification letter contained information for people wishing to address Council at the Council meeting.</p>
Action	No further action required.

No.	23
Document No.	164620901
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. The planning proposal and its development outcome will come at a cost to the amenity and future planning of Castle Hill.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>2. Concern regarding the dominant bulk and scale of the proposed development which will be detrimental to the amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (f) and (g) in the Report.</p> <p>3. The planning proposal is contrary to the local and state government strategic planning framework for Castle Hill, particularly the Hills Corridor Strategy. The planning proposal will delay the delivery of redevelopment and hinder the orderly development of Castle Hill. This proposal is not necessary in order to meet the growth targets that have been set for Castle Hill. The benefit of the dwelling numbers in this proposal comes at the cost of providing a vibrant town centre, as well as the amenity of surrounding residents.</p> <p>The planning proposal conflicts with the sound planning regime that has been established to shape the orderly growth of Castle Hill, it jeopardises the delivery of the strategic vision for Castle Hill and should not proceed. It will result in the haphazard growth of the Castle Hill town centre, rather than the coordinated and logical approach that is articulated in the strategic documents that underpin the planning of Castle Hill's growth. The Hills LEP 2012 and the Hills Corridor Strategy should prevail when determining what constitutes appropriate development.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>4. The Hills LEP 2012 and key strategic plans for Castle Hill adhere to fundamental principles including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concentration of high rise mixed use developments within the core of the commercial precinct; • Concentrating increased heights and densities in the block bounded by Old Northern Rd, Terminus St, Crane Rd and Cecil Ave; • Delivering increased residential densities to the west of the commercial core where topography and more regular

	<p>road patterns are available;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retaining lower densities to the south and south east of the commercial core where topography is steeper and road pattern is irregular; and • Transitioning heights and densities from the commercial core to the fringes of the commercial area where it adjoin lower housing densities. <p>Large scale development should be focussed on the Old Northern Rd, Terminus St, Crane Rd and Cecil Ave block.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>5. Acknowledgement that the planning proposal will contribute to meeting State Government housing and employment targets. However, the proposed development is not the only option for achieving the growth targets in Castle Hill, and the subject site is not appropriate for a development of this scale.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>6. The public benefits of monetary contributions will always be achieved through Section 7.11 or Voluntary Planning Agreements and we should not be swayed by the numbers put forward with this planning proposal.</p> <p>Comment: The Section 7.11 Plan that currently applies to the site does not anticipate the development outcomes that would be facilitated by the subject planning proposal. The Voluntary Planning Agreement will ensure that the developer contributes towards the provision of new local infrastructure to address the demand generated by the increased residential yield on the land.</p> <p>7. Consideration is required of A Plan For Growing Sydney Direction 1.7 which seeks to increase employment opportunities close to home in centres such as Castle Hill.</p> <p>Comment: The exhibited planning proposal did include a discussion of the proposal's compliance with A Plan for Growing Sydney. As outlined in the planning proposal, the consolidation of a large development site provides the opportunity to achieve a range of activities that will respond to the demand for smaller commercial office suites and facilitate a more vibrant and walkable centre.</p> <p>8. A Plan for Growing Sydney (Directions 2.1, 2.2 and 2.3 aim to increase the availability and diversity of housing options. It encourages the use of under-utilised sites and urban renewal.</p> <p>Comment:</p>
--	---

	<p>Noted.</p> <p>9. The Castle Hill Station Structure Plan focusses medium density residential development of 3 – 6 storeys on the subject land and the surrounding land in Lincoln Place and Roger Avenue. Although a somewhat greater height and density than is currently permitted for the properties in Lincoln Place and Roger Avenue, this is generally in keeping with current zoning and planning controls for the subject land. The desire to reinforce and contain the commercial core within the ring road created by Terminus Street should be noted.</p> <p>Comment: Noted.</p> <p>10. The Hills Corridor Strategy does not propose anything for the subject portion of land zoned R3 Medium Density Residential or the land zoned R3 Medium Density Residential in Lincoln Place and Roger Avenue.</p> <p>Comment: Noted.</p> <p>11. The proposal fails to provide an adequate transition between the high density, high activity commercial core and the low density residential neighbourhoods that adjoin it. The site acts as a transition between the higher density tower development envisaged for the Castle Hill commercial core, as reflected in current planning controls.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (g) in the Report.</p> <p>12. The proposal will delay the delivery of high density mixed use development within the commercial core on land where such development is encouraged. The planning proposal is contrary to the sensible planning of Castle Hill which aims to encourage higher densities in the commercial core, rather than the fringes.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>13. Inadequate traffic modelling has been undertaken to determine impacts on the Francis Street, Orange Grove Road, Roger Avenue and Lincoln Place street network. The proposed development will cause excessive traffic on the local street network.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) and (c) in the Report.</p> <p>14. The use of Roger Avenue (a 2 lane cul-de-sac in a low density residential setting) as the single access for 460</p>
--	--

apartments is inappropriate.

Comment:

Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 in the Report.

15. The planning proposal does not adequately address the elevated situation of Cecil Avenue which exacerbates the appearance of the development when viewed from around the neighbourhood. Development along the Cecil Ave frontage must be of a scale and form that respects the transitional situation of the land and its elevation. The development that would be enabled by the proposed controls would not respect such constraints.

Comment:

Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (f) and (g) in the Report.

16. Concern that the planning proposal seeks to dispense with a height control which leaves the potential final building envelope uncertain.

Comment:

Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (g) in the Report.

17. The development outcome will be visually dominant and imposing and will impact on the amenity of the residential area to the south and east.

Comment:

Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (g), (h) and (i) in the Report.

18. The proposed height and FSR controls will create a development that does not respond well to the site's topography. Objection to the proposed height and density of the proposed development.

The planning proposal will allow for development with an FSR of 3.5:1, a density that is not in keeping with the location of the site as a transition to lower density housing forms.

Comment:

Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (f) and (g) in the Report.

19. Under the current FSR, approximately 8,000m² of floor space in the R1 General Residential zone alone could be achieved, meaning that any development (commercial, residential or a mix thereof) could achieve a floor space in the order of 8,000m². Subject to satisfying the 16m height limit and the 1:1 FSR, it would be possible to achieve a mixed use development with offices and consulting rooms on the ground floor and residential apartments above under the current controls.

It is estimated that a yield of 40 – 50 multi dwelling housing dwellings could be achieved over that part of the land zoned

	<p>R3 Medium Density.</p> <p>Comment: Noted.</p> <p>20. The remaining R1 General Residential land along Cecil Ave and Terminus St can be developed for a range of residential and office uses. Surrounding land that is zoned R3 Medium Density Residential could be developed for multi-dwelling housing. But, the majority of homes are not nearing the end of their lifespan, especially those in Lincoln Place that are of substantial size and on generous lot sizes.</p> <p>Comment: Noted.</p> <p>21. Higher densities and dwelling numbers should be provided closer to the commercial core where there are greater building heights and floor space ratios that allow for mixed use developments.</p> <p>Comment: Noted.</p> <p>22. The planning framework for Castle Hill sensibly focusses growth within the commercial core.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>23. The desire of the North West Rail Link Castle Hill Station Structure Plan to reinforce and contain the commercial core within the ring road created by Terminus Street should be noted. The Hills Corridor Strategy does not propose anything for the land zoned R3 Medium Density Residential on the subject site, or the land zoned R3 Medium Density Residential in Lincoln Place and Roger Ave.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>24. The building heights fronting Cecil Avenue are 18 storeys and 14 storeys, suggesting building heights of approximately 45 – 55m (similar to the 45m heights desired for the Old Northern Rd / Terminus St / Crane Rd / Cecil Ave block) which does not provide a transition to lower density housing forms. This is not in keeping with the location of the site as a transition to lower density housing forms.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (f) and (g) in the Report.</p> <p>25. Although the design aims to step the building heights to integrate with surrounding lower density housing, the tallest components of the development are proposed in the highest</p>
--	--

	<p>areas of the site (the natural ridgeline that Cecil Ave follows). The stepping of the development is an insufficient response to the adjoining developments and the transitioning of heights is sharp. The benefits of stepping are lost to the slope of the site and the development does not respond to the site's topography.</p> <p>A more gradual transition is required that provides a larger 3 storey floor plate where the land adjoins low density residences. From 3 storeys, the development should step up to 5 storeys for a larger floor plate before transitioning to a greater number of storeys.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (g) and (k) in the Report.</p> <p>26. The overshadowing and amenity impacts of the proposal are unreasonable and are a product of unsatisfactory siting and massing of buildings over the site. Shadow impacts can be avoided with a lesser density of development that responds more appropriately to topography and site surrounds.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (g), (h) and (i) in the Report.</p> <p>27. The height and form of the proposed structures will cause privacy issues that will be extremely difficult to mitigate while providing amenity to the proposed apartments.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (g) and (h) in the Report.</p> <p>28. When viewed from Francis St, Cecil Avenue and Terminus St the development will be visually intrusive, imposing and dominating, a function of its excessive height and lack of response to the topography of the neighbourhood, on what should be a transitional site.</p> <p>Views of the development from the residences in Lincoln Place and Roger Avenue will be of a building that is in the order of 55 – 60m tall situated some 10-12m higher again due to topography. This is a significantly more imposing backdrop than would be created if redevelopment occurred under current controls.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (g) in the Report.</p> <p>29. While no objection is raised to an increase in residential density over the R1 General Residential zoned land, what is sought by the planning proposal will result in a development that is of excessive scale and inappropriately located.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (a) and (f) in the Report.</p>
--	---

	<p>30. The proposal seeks to completely remove the height control applying to the site which is concerning given the elevated situation of the land. A development scheme that reduces heights at the interface with the single dwellings to the south could result in even higher forms at the Cecil Avenue frontage in order to achieve the 3.5:1 FSR and a certain yield. A height control should be included to give certainty to all stakeholders about the built form, and to ensure a sensible height along the ridgeline of Cecil Avenue.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (g) in the Report.</p> <p>31. The suggested benefits of the planning proposal could be achieved through other development scenarios on the site and does not justify the scale of this proposal.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (a) and (f) in the Report.</p> <p>32. Any increased traffic impacts in Roger Avenue and Francis Street will need to have consideration for nearby heritage items (former St Paul's Anglican Church and Castle Hill House).</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.1(a) and 3.1(c), and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>33. Lincoln Place includes homes that have been built in the last 10 years, which is indicative of the investment in single dwellings over medium density housing options. It is likely that the shift to medium density housing will be gradual given the condition of homes in the area. Most adjoining low-density dwellings are not near the end of their typical lifespan and do not represent any short-term redevelopment options.</p> <p>Comment: Noted.</p> <p>34. Acknowledgement that a pedestrian link between Roger Avenue and Cecil Avenue would benefit the public by providing better access to the town centre, however it could be achieved without developing the subject land as proposed. Such a link could be provided as part of a land dedication via a medium density development.</p> <p>Comment: Noted.</p> <p>35. The height and density of development that could result fails to recognise its situation as a transition site between the town centre and low density residential environment. A medium density development would be a better fit for the site, in terms</p>
--	--

	<p>of satisfying the strategic framework and relating better to surrounding development.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (a), (f) and (g) in the Report.</p> <p>36. Objection to the supply of such a significant amount of commercial floor space on the fringe of the commercial area. The proposed 8,025m² of commercial floor space is over 7 times what is currently provided and would better provided within the commercial core where such activities can be consolidated. The current proposal will result in an intensified pocket of commercial floor space dispersed to the fringe, making the town centre uncoordinated and illegible.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>37. The provision of such a large supply of commercial floor space outside the core block of Old Northern Rd / Terminus St / Crane Rd and Cecil Ave will result in an uncoordinated and illegible pattern of development in the town centre, and reduce the desire for redevelopment in the commercial core. The demand for commercial floor space and apartments should be met within the commercial core rather than on the fringe.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>38. The residential component of the development proposal will generate approx. 699 vehicle trips per day that will utilise Francis Street via Roger Avenue. Roger Ave is a residential cul-de-sac with a 7m carriageway and parking restrictions will be required (on at least one side) to facilitate safe 2-way movements.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (c) and (d) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>39. Wait times for the right turn from Francis Street into Old Northern Road are inconvenient and will remain so until traffic signals are provided to that intersection. The roundabout that the intersection of Orange Grove Rd and Francis Street is therefore a critical intersection but is not addressed in the Parking and Traffic Study.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>40. The Parking and Traffic Study fails to consider the wait times for vehicles exiting Lincoln Place at Francis Street, particularly the right turn movement out of Lincoln Place.</p>
--	--

	<p>There is no analysis of whether any traffic control measures are necessary in that intersection.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (b) and (c), and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>41. The Parking and Traffic Study refers to Orange Grove Rd, Cecil Ave and Francis St as being 4 lanes with parking. For clarity it should be noted that these roads have only 2 trafficable lanes with an additional parking lane on each side of the road. It should not be construed that those streets provide for 4 lanes of traffic with an additional opportunity for parking.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (b) in the Report.</p> <p>42. The lane widths in Francis Street are narrow, requiring vehicles to cross the dividing line. Consideration should be given to realigning the lanes and placing parking restrictions on one side of the street, which may result in overflow parking from the veterinarian and funeral home being pushed further into residential streets (such as Lincoln Pl).</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (c) and (d), and Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>43. Traffic impacts have not been sufficiently modelled. Concern expressed for the amenity of Roger Ave and the level of performance of Francis St and how that impacts on Lincoln Pl and Orange Grove Rd.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Sections 3.2 (b) and (c) in the Report.</p> <p>44. A roundabout at the intersection of Lincoln Place and Francis Street may be required, subject to further assessment of impacts of the function of that intersection.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Attachment 1 of the Report.</p> <p>45. Question as to whether the proposed traffic management measures really constitute a community benefit or if they will simply be addressing the traffic generation from the proposed development. The items being offered as benefits of this planning proposal could be achieved with any development. The long term strategic vision for Castle Hill should not be lost in favour of short term gains. The proponent is not offering something that would not ordinarily be gained through a more appropriate development of the subject land. The contribution offered under the Voluntary Planning Agreement should not be seen as an incentive to allow this</p>
--	--

	<p>proposal to proceed.</p> <p>Comment: Traffic signals are already needed at the intersection of Old Northern Road and Francis Street, and funds generated under the VPA will contribute towards the intersection signalisation. See Section 1.3 in the Report.</p> <p>46. The plaza is located outside the core areas of the town centre and is unlikely to benefit anyone other than the users of the development.</p> <p>Comment: The public through-site link will encourage walking by reducing the distance for nearby residents to access the Castle Hill centre and the rail station. The right of way will provide access for pedestrians from Cecil Avenue to Roger Avenue, and to the plaza space.</p> <p>47. The pedestrian link offers little community benefit. It will only benefit residents of the development and those around the Roger Ave intersection with Francis St. This is a benefit that is not dependant on the planning proposal or subject development proceeding - Council could acquire a pedestrian link between those streets though the future redevelopment of those properties, regardless of what form that development took. The dedication and embellishment of the pedestrian link should not be seen as an incentive to allow this planning proposal to proceed.</p> <p>Comment: There is currently no mechanism to obtain such a pedestrian link. The planning proposal stage is considered to be the best time to secure such a link.</p> <p>48. Concern raised about the proposed amount of commercial floor space and how that will hinder commercial redevelopment within the commercial core. The benefit of the commercial floor space in this proposal comes at a cost of providing a legible and structured town centre.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	24
Document No.	163955928
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. The church facilities are used for a variety of groups throughout the week, for example Out of School Hours care, dance groups and children's playgroups.</p> <p>Comment: The various groups that utilise the church facilities are noted.</p> <p>2. In light of the imminent prospect of rail in Castle Hill the submission author does not object to the proposed development in Cecil Avenue. However, they are concerned about the likely impacts of the development on the church's activities and wellbeing.</p> <p>Comment: Noted.</p> <p><u>Impacts During Construction:</u></p> <p>3. Request that Council mitigate noise and dust hazards during construction via conditions for the development.</p> <p>Comment: Construction impacts relating to noise, dust, and the safe management of any asbestos on site would be addressed as part of the Development Application process.</p> <p>4. <i>Construction Traffic:</i> Request that vehicular access to the church site via Cecil Avenue is maintained without restriction during school "drop off" and "pick up" times (8am – 9:30am and 2:30pm – 4pm). Request that Council control construction traffic by operational conditions of consent on the future development.</p> <p>Comment: It is likely that there will be additional construction traffic and demand for on-street parking in the locality for a temporary period if the proposal is supported. The management of construction impacts and associated traffic would be addressed at the Development Application stage.</p> <p>5. <i>Security and Costs:</i> The installation of boom gates on the church site will be necessary to control car parking and provide security during both the construction period and in the longer term. Request that the developer pay for the installation of key-card operated boom gates.</p> <p>Comment: The school and church may wish to negotiate with the developer regarding the funding of boom gates on their site, however this is not a matter that can be resolved with the planning proposal.</p>

	<p><u>Development Impacts After Completion:</u></p> <p>6. <i>Traffic:</i> Due to traffic generation from the development there will be increased demand for parking. The need for boom gates will remain after the construction period.</p> <p>Comment: The school and church may wish to negotiate with the developer regarding the funding of boom gates on their site, however this is not a matter that can be resolved with the planning proposal.</p> <p>7. <i>Security:</i> Due to the increased population in the vicinity of the church a night patrol security service will be required.</p> <p>Comment: This is a decision for the church.</p> <p>8. <i>Child Safety:</i> Children may frequent the front yard of the church without strict supervision on weekends between church services. The installation of an appropriate fence will be necessary to control random pedestrian access to the church site.</p> <p>Comment: Noted.</p> <p>9. <i>Costs:</i> The provision of security patrols and a front fence will be significant cost impacts, which will be borne by the church. The proposal will have significant operational and cost impacts on the church and school. The church will pay for necessary fencing and security patrols.</p> <p>Comment: The cost of front fencing and security patrols on a neighbouring site is not relevant to the consideration of a planning proposal. The College may wish to negotiate with the developer.</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	25
Document No.	166484278
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. The Terminus Street carpark is in desperate need of redevelopment. The site is an ideal location for high density flat roof development as it is located within the Terminus Street Ring Road, creating a truly defined Castle Hill CBD area; it allows for a gradual transition to the existing lower residential properties located to the south of Terminus Street; it allows for streamlined access to the future Castle Hill Train Station for future residents; and it would not create such a harsh impact with congestion on the surrounding local roads.</p> <p>The subject planning proposal 12/2016/PLP does not accommodate any of the above points. Request for Council to consider the greater impact on the future of this precinct.</p> <p>Comment: Noted.</p> <p>2. The submission author engaged a town planner (Glenn Apps, Cohesive Planning) to submit a comprehensive report on the planning proposal.</p> <p>Comment: Refer to Submission No.23 for a discussion on the issues raised by Glen Apps (Cohesive Planning).</p>
Action	No further action required

No.	26
Document No.	166800384
Submission Author	
Issues raised	<p>1. One of the major concerns of The Hills community is the number and size of proposed developments being put forward to Council for approval.</p> <p>Comment: Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (a) in the Report.</p> <p>2. Request for Council to consider whether the scale and location of the development is suitable.</p> <p>Comment Issue addressed. See Section 3.2 (f) in the Report.</p>
Action	No further action required