

Redbank at North Richmond

Chapter 8

Submission

**North Richmond and Districts Community Action
Association Inc**

Prepared by the Committee of Management

8th September 2014

Introduction

At a briefing held in Council chambers on September 2nd we were told that Chapter 8 is a standalone document relating only to the Redbank site and having no relevance to ,or concern with any area of the community outwith the site.

However Objective 8.2 (c) states

“ To ensure development that will respond to the land attributes and not detrimentally affect the amenity of the locality”

This development adversely affects every ratepayer and family living west of the river and this chapter of the Hawkesbury Development Control Plan cannot be considered in total isolation.

Council members and staff have a responsibility to protect the interests of current residents.

It appears from the Independent Commission Against Corruption transcripts that the original approval process for the Redbank scheme was not justified on merit alone but heavily influenced by financial support for the campaign of the former Mayor. In view of the evidence divulged at ICAC the Hawkesbury City Council should attempt to halt the whole process until the issue is resolved .

Not to do so further compromises the perceived integrity of the Council and its staff.

Key Concerns

We have 4 areas of concern.

1 Authorship.

The primary definition in the Macquarie Dictionary of control is:-

To exercise restraint or direction over; dominate; command.

We do not believe that a developer should write a Council Planning Control document.

Council should have prepared the Development Control Plan outlining the requirements of the Community rather than merely comment on the developer's proposals. It is no excuse to plead lack of resources or expertise. Council should have appointed its own Consultant to prepare this Control document charging the cost to the developer as a condition of approval.

2. Lack of Precision.

As in the VPA there are many clauses allowing a vast amount of flexibility which can be exercised to improve the developer's profitability at the expense of the quality of the overall development

3. Vagueness of Purpose

This is claimed to be a Development Control Plan yet the structure and Language does not reflect this.

The document is basically an aspirational statement having more use as a Sales Aid than a planning tool.

4. Variation from the VPA.

The document fails to deliver or modifies facilities promised in the VPA

Observations

8.2.

Objectives.

We find the plan fails to meet many of its own claimed objectives. In particular we note:-

- (a) Failure to demonstrate any degree of innovation or sustainability whatsoever.
We are to get stock standard housing with only BASIX requirements.
- (c) Failure to protect the amenities of the extended locality
- (e) It was agreed at the briefing that the words “and affordability” be removed as being open to a wide number of interpretations.
- (f) Failure to pay more than lip-service to problems related to access in and out of Redbank.
- (j) Failure to show any improvement in soil quality beyond that Yeomans achieved or improved , or maintained water quality in Redbank Creek
It is difficult to ascertain how many dams are to be removed and how many preserved
Without the dams the vestiges of the keyline system can't be made to work yet at several points it has spoken of 'adaptation'

8.3.3

Heritage Controls

We expect that the Heritage Council will provide the expert comment on this section and have sought a copy of their submission. Should any issues arise we will supplement this submission.

Independently we now raise two issues.

Figure 8.7 shows exotic deciduous trees. These are totally inappropriate for heritage conservation of Redbank where natives predominated.

There is no mention of conservation of railway heritage (Pansy track)

8.3.4

Open Space

We note that the Development Control Plan shows no provision for active recreation on the developer's land.

It is inappropriate to provide this amenity on Council land which will degrade the passive recreation facilities enjoyed by current local residents without local consultation. The views of the Sports Council should not be taken as representative of the local community on providing ugly infrastructure off the development site.

8.3.5.

Water Management

The proposed environmental targets are totally inappropriate. The only acceptable standard is that of the Australian and New Zealand Environment Conservation Council Water Quality Guidelines. The range for a lowland waterway such as Redbank Creek is :-

pH	6.5- 8.5
Electrical conductivity	200-300 uS/cm
Turbidity	<50NTU
Available phosphate	.0612 mg/L
Dissolved Oxygen	85/110%

If Council wishes to retain the proposed targets in addition to ANZECC Guidelines the average annual load needs to be established in recognised measurement units and stated in the Control Plan so that the percentage reduction can be determined and monitored.

8.3.6

Environmental Management

We leave assessment of this section to our affiliated organisation Hawkesbury Environment Network which has great expertise in these issues.

We believe that there should be no removal of Cumberland Plain woodland or River Flat Eucalyptus Forest.

In the unfortunate event that Council should permit removal the only offset should be plantings designed to be continuous with and extending existing areas of Cumberland Plain Woodlands and River Flat Eucalyptus Forest.

The R2 zone, large lot residential area shown in 1 and 2J and 1K on the maps seem not to have riparian areas adjacent to the water body. This must be corrected and private ownership of riparian zones prohibited because of the impossibility of controlling vegetation, noxious weeds and bank erosion.

8.3.7.

Movement Network

The Objectives of this section are not met in terms of safety, public transport and connectivity to neighbouring paths and cycleways.

Further comments on this are provided in the submission from Michael Want which the committee of NRDCAA endorses.

Street Lighting

Various positions are shown for street lighting. Most are shown approximately 4.0m from the kerb. We believe this is the safest option and should be standardised unless totally impractical in certain situations. The provision of one light for every 3 lots seems appropriate.

Figs 8.27 to 8.29

These show three types of street with identical maps giving no indication where individual designs may be employed. This is totally unacceptable for planning purposes denying the opportunity for public comment.

13m access street fig 8.27

The zoning maps permit the 6m carriageway roads virtually anywhere in the development except on R5 or specifically designated collector or entry roads. The plan should clearly identify which roads are to be this narrow.

The design has no footpath forcing pedestrians and children on bikes to walk in the centre of the road which may have parked cars and traffic in both directions.

We consider the design to be so unsafe that its use should be tightly controlled and restricted to cul-de-sac areas.

16m Local Street Figs. 8.28 to 8.29

These appear to be the most common designs. With 8m carriageways they are narrower than the roads in the surrounding area and we request parking should be allowed on only one side of the street to reduce the chance of accidents.

Local Street.- Transmission Line.fig 8.30 and 8.31

There should be one proposal only as the preferred option can be identified at this stage. If the safety of parking under transmission lines is confirmed our only concern for either design would be the lack of a paved footpath which should be provided in the centre reservation.

Collector Roads Fig. 8.39

The variation for Arthur Philip Drive is completely inappropriate.

This will be the most convenient access for residents of the Central Valley and the northern end of the Southern valley and the only connection with the sole active recreation area at Peel Park. It will be the most attractive route for cyclists and pedestrians as it is almost level.

It is the most logical point to build a footpath and cycle way from Redbank to North Richmond as promised in the VPA.

Despite the importance it has the lowest level of safety and accessibility of all collector roads having a single foot path and no shared path. This proposed inferior variation should be disallowed and the standard collector road in fig. 8.37. substituted.

90 degree On-street Parking Fig 8.42

This should include provision of bicycle racks.

Pram ramps fig 8.43

The design in figure 8.43 is unsuitable for shared paths with only 1.5m x 2.00m landing where a 2.5m wide concrete access is required.

Entry Road Landscape

Fig 8.46.

We question the use of out of character and non-heritage exotic trees and propose suitable natives be used instead.

We object to marketing information being incorporated into the entity signage which should be restricted to way finding and heritage.

8.38

Residential lot parameters

As most households in the area require two cars Objectives (b) and (c) should specify garage for at least 1 vehicle and off-street parking for a second.

8.3.10 Built form

This section lacks clarity.

Tables 8.3 and 8.4 clearly refer to all types of building in the entire development yet appear with the heading '8.3.10.1 Single dwellings, outbuildings and studios' as the only development control.

'Section'8.3.10.2 Other residential accommodation" by contrast provides clear development control designed to cover multiple occupancy.

The control plan needs to be improved by providing separate controls for single dwelling and multiple occupancy. Removal of section 8.3.10.2 is not an appropriate solution.

8.3.10.2 Single Dwellings

We have concerns that the smallest blocks of 180-250 sq. metres are out of character with adjacent established areas. We note only a 3.0m set back is required- less than a car length.

8.3.10.3 Other Residential Accomodation

Without the benefit of a DA it is difficult to assess the adequacy of the Development Controls

We have the following comments:-

Three storey features on corners are not appropriate.

3.5 metres to the building would appear to be inadequate.

A 10% provision of disability/aged convertibility should be doubled given the rapidly aging of our demographic.

The reference to the maintenance of street parking is of great concern considering the 6 m. carriageway proposed. The emphasis should be off-street parking.

Control 10 suggests dark materials. It is now well established that to have low ambient temperature in urban areas light coloured roads, driveways and roofs are essential. This should be modified to reflect best practice.

10.3.10.3

Shops

The rezoning application and supporting documentation refer to a small cluster of convenience store type of local shop. The document refers to the “town centre” with diagrams showing shops with 90 degree parking on both sides of the street.

The Hawkesbury Land Strategy identifies only Richmond and Windsor as Town Centres. We doubt that there is an intention to supercede the existing North Richmond Shopping Centre but the Development Control Plan should clearly state the parameters regarding intent, number and type of shops/commercial activity.

We note the control plan provides for solar access but see no indication of any requirement to control heat build-up on horizontal surfaces or roofs by use of light coloured materials

10.3.11

Fencing

We note that the developer is to provide fences of maximum 1.8m. with the location clearly identified. Only the Grose Vale Road frontage has a description of these fences.

Others could be anything from costly brick walls to star post and wire. There is need for a general indication of design specifying the degree of privacy etc.

North Richmond and Districts Community Action Association Inc.

8th September 2014

Mr. Peter Jackson
General Manager
Hawkesbury City Council,
Windsor.

Dear Peter Jackson,

Chapter 8 Hawkesbury Development Control Plan

We enclose our submission on the above plan.

This document represents a missed opportunity for the Hawkesbury. Rather than having an innovative sustainable development of which we could all be proud the plan encourages mediocrity and outdated ideas.

Why is there no attempt at on-site reticulated water recycling, community based solar power generation or requirements for power saving LED lighting?

The permitted density with large buildings on small lots will collect and radiate large amounts of heat in Hawkesbury's hot summer sun. Why is there no requirement for pale colored roofs and road surfaces as is current best practice?

Allowing the developer to prepare the Council's control document is odd. Maybe the choice of heading typeface Comic Sans throughout the document shows lack of respect for these controls?

Yours sincerely

Bryan Smith
for the Committee .

