From: noreply@feedback.planningportal nsw.qov au on behalf of Planning Portal - Department of Planning and Environment

To: DPIE PDPS Glenfield Precinct Mailbox
Cc: DPE PS ePlanning Exhibitions Mailbox
Subject: HPE CM: Draft Glenfield Place Strategy
Date: Sunday, 10 January 2021 11:05:20 AM
altachments: dlenfield-precinct-plan-suagestions.docx

Submitted on Sun, 10/01/2021 - 10:49

Submitted by: Anonymous

Submitted values are:

Submission Type

I am making a personal submission

Name

First name



Last name



I would like my submission to remain confidential

Yes

Info

Email





Submission file

glenfield-precinct-plan-suggestions.docx

Submission

Hi,

I have 3 suggestions in relation to the current Glenfield Precinct Plan.

- 1. Failure to bring in the intended number of new homes and the expected upgrade of Cambridge Ave will put stress on liveability of the area (predominantly on the Eastern Side) need to upgrade the block surrounded by Railway Parade-Foreman St-Canterbury Road-and Chesham Parade to R4/33m/2.66 FSR (consistent with U2 zoning). If not done, this block will suffer from being a noise and pollution 'sink' once the Cambridge Avenue upgrade has been completed by Transport NSW. See document for further explanations
- 2. Sprawl of zoning deserves a re-think migrate from he 'hill top' town planning to a 'stadium' town design to mi igate the conges ion and different traffic types during different times of the day. At the moment, the areas around the station is too busy mixing residen ial and commercial and school and shopping traffic, whilst also limiting the number of residents that can access he Urban Plaza on foot on the West side i.e. this design restricts accessibility to most residents of Glenfield AND creates congestion at the same time.
- 3. Thinking about Glenfield beyond 2030 not enough office space for a very strategic part of Sydney he ONLY area which will connect 2 airports by train good freight road access to the ports of NSW

Please see a more detailed explanation of my 3 key points in the attached .doc.

Thanks for your consideration

Kind Regards



I agree to the above statement

Yes

Glenfield precinct plan (2020)

To whom it may concern,

I want to write to you in relation to the latest draft proposal on the new Glenfield Precinct, dated December 2020.

First of all, I concur with the intent of the draft plan in terms of bringing both residential diversity and business investment into the area.

I note 3 broad areas that the plan falls short on its commitment to bring 3000 new homes into the area. The plan is also at risk of establishing unnecessarily splitting Glenfield into half (Western and Eastern side) resulting in uneven gentrification of the area.

Failure to bring in the intended number of new homes and the expected upgrade of Cambridge Ave will put stress on liveability of the area (predominantly on the Eastern Side)

1. Problem: The block(s) bounded by Canterbury Road-Fawcett St – Hurlstone Ave – Belmont Ave already have multi-housing dwellings on the land. By rezoning this area to R3/11m height/1.3 FSR makes little difference to developers from a return-on-investment perspective. Additionally, this has the unintended flow on effect of putting dwelling construction pressures on the Western side of Glenfield (and unintended congestion) to achieve the target number of new housing for the area. We want to achieve balanced dwelling growth and gentrification for Glenfield.



Solution: To buffer the drop in expected housing on the Eastern side of Glenfield without placing excess burden on the Western side, the only 'undeveloped' and dilapidating pieces of land that offers an acceptable return on investment for developers is to rezone land bounded by Railway Parade-Foreman St-Canterbury Road-and Chesham Parade. This block has fairly old with scattered development from various periods (mostly owner occupier single dwelling). The return on investment in these blocks is much more palatable to developers. Moreover, with the intended upgrade to Cambridge avenue, if this block is left

as a low lying 11m/R3/1.3 FSR precinct, it becomes somewhat of a pollution and noise 'sink', capturing the noise and pollution from the upgraded Cambridge Ave overpass and Canterbury Road (24 hour trucking and logistics) and near 24 hour train services of 3 train lines. To mitigate these issues is to upgrade this block to R4 zoning/33m/FSR of 2.66 (consistent with U2 zoning). This ensures that this block rises above the pollution and the noise with park views on the north/west and east sides, and broader views of the area from the other angles. This design is modelled on the current design in Wolli Creek, which despite being bounded by Princes highway and 2x railway lines, liveability is high. There are adequate roads/access points to ensure the high density will not impede traffic, especially around the main station areas. With the upgrade of Cambridge Ave, a footbridge can also allow access over the train line to the Western side of Glenfield.



Sprawl of zoning deserves a re-think

I also urge the committee to migrate from having a 'hill-top' town design (i.e. high density buildings in most congested areas around the station) to a 'stadium' town design (i.e. higher density buildings on the outsider edges of Glenfield and low lying buildings in the centre). This has 3 positive effects:

- 1. The congestion is not so concentrated around the station and thereby segregating commuter, shopping, residential, logistics and schooling traffic
- 2. At present the Urban Plaza proposed on the Western side is only accessible by foot by 1 block of R4 development. Everyone else will need to drive in (congestion). If the council adopts a stadium approach and rezone a larger part of both the Eastern and Western side for shopping and commercial facilities, many more residents can have equal access to key commercial amenities around the station (on foot), which is good for house prices all around and improves the liveability for all.
- 3. The stadium design also cater to future growth and zoning around the station should more high density buildings be required in the future. You also reserve the most prized land for future development with higher stamp duty revenue intake for the state



Thinking about Glenfield beyond 2030

Glenfield is strategically placed in Sydney. No other train station has access to 3 train lines and (potentially) train linkages to 2 airports. Glenfield is a clear intermodal and logistics and freight hub. This level of access for businesses, and especially those involved in import/export is unmatched by any other city nor location. I suggest the Planning department allocate more office space and also warehousing facilities to capture this growth. The current Glenfield design seem to only allow office space around the station in the B3 and B4 zoned areas. This is not enough for logistics facilities nor corporates, especially with the low density objective around Hurlstone Agriculture High School.

<u>Solution:</u> On the Western side of Glenfield, there needs to be additional land dedicated to the commercial core (B3). By expanding the current proposal's B3 areas to the B4 zone on the western side, it means that Glenfield can become a vibrant commercial hub. The 'forfeited' B4 zoning can then be re-located to the Eastern side of Glenfield where most of the residents currently live. This has the effect of segregating the congestion with office/commercial/student traffic on the Western side and shopping traffic on the Eastern side. During peak mornings and afternoon runs, you won't have commuters clashing with families as they try to traverse the train line.

Thank you for your attention and I look forward to seeing the final plans for Glenfield.

Kind Regards

