

**From:** [noreply@feedback.planningportal.nsw.gov.au](mailto: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:** Monday, 8 February 2021 9:08:22 PM

---

Submitted on Mon, 08/02/2021 - 21:07

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

**Submission Type**

I am making a personal submission

## Name

**First name**

Maria

**Last name**

Warianka

**I would like my submission to remain confidential**

No

## Info

**Email**

[aleks.warianka@yahoo.com.au](mailto:aleks.warianka@yahoo.com.au)

**Suburb**

Glenfield

**Postcode**

2167

**Submission**

To whom it may concern

RE: DRAFT GLENFIELD PLACE STRATEGY

while I appreciate that Sydney must grapple with an increasing population and all the positives and negatives that entails, I am concerned about the strategy and the way in which it is anticipated that it will be delivered. That is, when looking at, for example, the changes made at Wentworth Point, there is much to be concerned with.

While there are lessons to be learnt from the development of Wentworth Point, I'm concerned that such lessons won't be integrated into the delivery of the Glenfield Place Strategy. This has the potential to create significantly adverse impacts on Glenfield when, as I understand it, the suburb could shift from a population of near 10,000 to a population of around 17,000.

That is a sizeable jump.

Firstly, however, I have some comments on the Strategy, itself.

1. There is no detail behind the attractive artist's impressions and descriptions as to how traffic problems will be mitigated.

Bringing in a 70 % increase in population means more vehicles. However, the resulting cumulative traffic volumes when you consider 6,600 additional heavy vehicle movements/day and the 10,000 additional light vehicle movements / day arising from the Moorebank Intermodal Terminal will create substantially adverse impacts for the community, particularly near the northern part of Canterbury Rd.

While your traffic modellers may say that the local area can handle greater capacity, I wonder if they live in the area. I wonder if they would be comfortable living with such seismic increases?

2. The Strategy does not clarify how it will minimise the risk of the rezoning on the eastern side of the railway line becoming almost ghetto-like.

While the Department has stated that "developers will need to comply with standards of excellence", just how does that contribute to enhanced community development? Rather, does it not detract from community well-being if traffic volumes are vastly increased, if there is less sunlight / more shadowing affecting people, if there are minimal parking spots available, if government is imposing such significant change on people without even attempting to truly involve people in decision making?

Wentworth Point is still in the news as a result of the Department's support for developers instead of the affected community.

3. On social media, it is apparent that there are still many people who are unaware of the proposed seismic change.

How will that be managed?. Or will development just commence and the Department will move to the next Wentworth Point style debacle?

However, it is argued that there is an even bigger concern than those described above.

That is effective delivery of the Strategy as well as its monitoring, evaluation and adaptation through time. The Department has a terrifyingly poor

reputation for this, keen to focus on superficial economic and development announcements, on mainstream media at the expense of the community and environment.

So what is the governance behind this? I was informed that the Department would be involved in a series of "relevant" interagency panels. However, interagencies do not have decision makers on them - or at least not for long.

Their meetings too often are "show and tell" exercises that do not contribute anything to the communities or regions they are meant to serve.

As you read this from your Parramatta or City office, there are some final questions for you to consider. You do not live in this community so there is minimal potential that you will truly appreciate the magnitude of your decisions on the community.

This is simply a job to you so how will you ensure that the seismic development of Glenfield is something more than a commercial news story that you either sell or try to deny?

Would you wish to live in what you intend to create? What will your legacy be?

Yours sincerely

Maria Warianka

**I agree to the above statement**

Yes