

From: noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au on behalf of [Planning Portal - Department of Planning and Environment](#)
To: [DPIE PDPS Glenfield Precinct Mailbox](#)
Cc: [DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox](#)
Subject: Draft Glenfield Place Strategy
Date: Thursday, 11 February 2021 4:28:38 PM
Attachments: [submission-on-draft-glenfield-place-strategy-february-2021.pdf](#)

Submitted on Thu, 11/02/2021 - 15:56

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Name

First name

Anne

Last name

McLean

I would like my submission to remain confidential

No

Info

Email

annemcl@tpg.com.au

Suburb

Glenfield

Postcode

2167

Submission file

[submission-on-draft-glenfield-place-strategy-february-2021.pdf](#)

Submission

My submission focuses on objection to the R4 rezoning on the eastern side of the railway line, where I am a long-term resident homeowner. (Please let me know if you experience any issues in accessing the attached pdf file.) Sincerely, A.I. McLean

I agree to the above statement

Yes

Submission on Draft Glenfield Place Strategy

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Glenfield Place Strategy and associated documents.

Objection to the “high density residential” rezoning east of the railway station

I strongly object to the proposed “high density residential” (R4) rezoning of current residential areas east of the railway line, allowing for buildings up to 33m high. I am a resident homeowner in the proposed R4 areas. I’d prefer there to be no rezoning, but as that seems improbable I believe that 12-15m should be the absolute maximum height allowed, due to the significant negative effects of taller buildings on resident homeowners, all in single or two-storey houses, who do not wish to move.

Many of these negative effects would be obvious to anyone, and some are mentioned in the draft documents in relation to other areas. For instance, the importance of “...equity of access to sunlight, views and privacy for all residents” (in the North West section description, Draft Strategy p10); “Taller buildings are located closest to the train station and building heights will be limited to 2-3 storeys along the interface with Hurlstone Agricultural High School to minimise their impact” (Draft Strategy p25); and “...undesirable impacts (such as overshadowing, character) to adjoining low-rise predominantly single-detached dwelling housing stock” (Intended Effects p10, in reference to land north of Fawcett St and west of Canterbury Road).

The Draft Strategy describes the character of and provisions for the proposed distinct Glenfield West areas, then moves straight on to the chapter about delivery of the plan. There is no discussion at all on the character of and provisions for the proposed distinct/merging areas on the eastern side. The ramifications for homeowners such as myself are not even mentioned, let alone discussed. This is a major flaw in the strategy.

While some owners will doubtless be interested in selling to developers, especially if they are offered attractive prices, the rest of us will be put in a completely unenviable situation whereby we may well be forced to move and sell anyway (even though there are no compulsory acquisitions proposed). People who don’t sell may find themselves firstly, surrounded by all the noise, vibration and general disruption caused by major construction. After that, a rash of 33m apartment buildings will lead to the losses of sunlight, views and privacy alluded to above. Neighbourhood and community connections will also be lost as previous residents leave. Finally, those who hold out the longest may find their properties have become devalued, as only developers, and likely by then a smaller pool of them, will be interested in buying one- or two-storey homes located among too many tall apartment buildings.

There are many reasons why people would not want to move – personal and social, practical and financial. To use my own situation as a case study, I have lived here for over 22 years and it was the last home of my late husband who died in the early

2000s. My home is nicely-designed, well-built, has the ideal amount of space and suits me well. In my garden there are mature trees and shrubs. Many birds visit. There are hundreds of small lizards, some frogs, bees and spiders, skinks and occasionally one or two blue-tongues. I am attached to my home and garden.

Some people have had their homes built or extended, or undertaken substantial renovations, just in the past year or two. Others have put a lot of time, effort and love into their gardens. Leaving because you choose to is one thing, but being forced to go is something else entirely.

I have great neighbours, one of whom looks after my house, garden and pets while I'm away (and I look after her garden when she is away), and people I regularly chat to in the relevant streets. I have been taking pets to the same veterinary practice since we moved here. I consult health practitioners whom I trust, without having to travel too far. Additionally, I have found excellent local tradesmen who do work here. It takes quite some time to find the best people. (If I left I would probably not buy in this area or even this region as it'd be too distressing to see my place gone.)

The convenience of having the station within walking distance, along with a few useful shops, was a reason for buying in this location originally. It is a bonus being able to walk around there, get on a train and go into town or to the airport. How ironical that this advantage now becomes the opposite for those who saw the value earliest.

Features of people's homes which would usually add sale value will be meaningless if the properties are bought by developers. My house has high ceilings and beautifully veneered doors, cupboards and skirting boards. Big windows and glass doors provide attractive garden views. There is an extra-large room at the back which I use as storage for my late husband's artworks (those that don't fit on the walls) among other items. In other circumstances that room would be seen as a granny flat opportunity.

Similarly, financial investments homeowners have made would not be reflected in the selling price if the buyer is a developer. In the last year I have spent a fair amount on a new air conditioning system, chandeliers and bathroom vanity.

Some retro features and tailored installations would not be possible, or not easy, or expensive, to replicate anywhere else. A decade ago I had an outdoor cat enclosure tailored for the house. It is connected through a window (with bars installed on the window so it can remain always open).

This year I was planning to have solar panels put in, but I am now not sure about it as if I am forced to sell, and to developers, the investment will never pay for itself. With the vision for the new Glenfield a longer-term one, it may be that initial work will focus on the western side of the railway. However, I have already received letters from a developer and a development sales facilitation company. I think homeowners' property enhancement plans will need to be put on hold, which is frustrating to say the least.

I definitely didn't expect to have to deal with the stresses of finding and acquiring another home, along with the disruption and hassle of moving house, for many years, if at all. I thought that the property would grow in value to benefit my heirs.

While I have used examples specific to my situation, I believe the considerations for many other affected homeowners will be broadly similar, especially in regard to love for their homes; appreciation of location, neighbours and community amenity; and the expectation that they would not have to sell unless they wanted to, and if they did, they would get a price reflective of original features as well as the enhancements they'd invested in.

Everyone I have spoken to so far believes this rezoning will destroy much of what we hold dear about our current situations and streetscapes. Some of the affected streets have very mature trees which are valuable for their beauty and contribution to cooling and neighbourhood ecology. Trees, shrubs and other plants have never been more important. People are upset about the trees that were removed in Moorebank Avenue, Holsworthy and how ugly the treeless landscape there now looks.

It is completely unfair to subject so many people (who are in no way at fault!) to such disruption, uncertainty, risk of loss, worry and stress – just so developers can make more money and people, most of whom don't currently live in Glenfield, can reside near the station.

With the current pandemic, thousands of public and private employees as well as small business operators have begun working from home or increased the frequency with which they do so. Some companies, departments and businesses intend that this will continue indefinitely. So does the plan to have thousands near a railway station really need to be prioritised at current residents' expense? Will people even want to live in tall apartment buildings when in the same area, a bit further away, they could have so much more space?

The opportunity to build higher apartment buildings on the western side of the railway line should suffice. There is no need to also build them on the eastern side, and given the issues such building would cause, that part of the strategy should be abandoned.

Railway Parade and the mixed-use area east of the station

I do see advantages in the proposed mix with new shops, cafes and offices etc, but the even taller buildings proposed for Hosking Crescent, along with the possible acquisition of current home sites for a park, clearly have similar or worse negative impacts as those outlined above, for the resident home owners there who wish to stay.

Cambridge Avenue upgrade

It's been obvious for years a solution was needed for the paucity of exit roads to the north of the suburb, with Cambridge Avenue regularly unusable due to flooding,

leading all the northern traffic to converge on Glenfield Road which is single-lane and for many years now has been crowded during peaks (even without those diverting from Cambridge Avenue) due to the lack of road upgrades when the areas abutting Glenfield Road were intensively developed. So the upgrade is a good idea, but options to avoid taking people's homes should be further explored.

I note that with the upgrade expected to be some years off, traffic during peaks on the existing roads will become even more congested once higher population density in Glenfield becomes a reality.

Hurlstone Agricultural High and areas west of the railway line

I don't have enough knowledge of the school to comment on its situation in any depth. On the face of it, it would seem the school's main needs will be met, but of course the stakeholders most closely affected will provide the most valuable input. In regard to the new developments on the western side, broadly speaking they seem ok. As this will more or less be a greenfields site, there is the opportunity to plan, design and build intelligently, ensuring a good mix of different sizes and shapes of buildings with various usages, protecting heritage, increasing amenity, and paying close attention to climate impacts and mediations – all of which I hope will be the case.

Anne McLean
11 February 2021