



Hawkesbury City Council

attachment 1
to
item 73

Copy of Submissions

date of meeting: 27 April 2021
location: council chambers
and by audio-visual link
time: 6:30 p.m.



Hawkesbury City Council re LEP001/18 Jacaranda Glossodia.

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing with an objection with regards to the above proposed development. Please consider the below when assessing the proposal.

The development is not in keeping with the area, it does not retain and enhance the character of the area, nor is it sympathetic with the natural environment and the ecological process.

Community services are stretched at all points without adding additional residents to the area.

Medical services and more specifically the Windsor Hospital does not have the capacity or capabilities to cope with additional requirements. Numerous incidents of being turned away, deaths in emergency and inadequate care have occurred. My brother in law received inadequate care in January ultimately leading to his passing at a young age.

The flooding and insolation of this side of the river has highlighted the inadequacy of river crossings and services. Without additional residents there has been a dearth of all services including food, fuel and medical.

Public transport services are scarce therefore significant additional road traffic is inevitable. The roads are not capable of adjusting to this additional traffic. The road surfaces are poor, the roads are narrow and once again the river crossing issue has not been solved. Traffic during peak hours is bottle necked at Windsor and North Richmond bridges, as well as on the weekends with tourist and through traffic. Fire and flood evacuation is an important issue.

Rural fire services are stretched during emergency periods. Our house has all but burnt down without adding significantly to the work load of the volunteers.

Please consider this and other objections not only for our quality of life, the ecological damage that will be caused; but for the quality of life for those who unknowingly have to deal with the lack of services as they see that are buying into a housing estate and will assume services are available. Educational opportunities, police, ambulance, medical care and transport services are not at the ready in this area.

If this estate is to be approved then a major upgrade of all of these services and river crossings is a must. No evidence of this being possible is evident.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards



26 March 2021

To whom it may concern,
RE: Jacaranda development

We are writing a submission today as a resident of Freemans Reach concerned about the new development and the approval and consultation process undertaken to date.

The new Jacaranda development being built by the Celestino Pty.Ltd. in the Hawkesbury region, should be halted immediately to re-assess the 'real' effects of flooding on properties nearby and the effects to agricultural industries already in place.

With 580 lots (1000m² to 4000m²) likely to be sold, this will place extreme pressure on Windsor and North Richmond bridges, particularly Kurrajong Road, which is a carpark in the morning and at night. The real 'impact' of this rapid population growth, its effects on the region should also be re-assessed, as well-as an outline of what infrastructure that is really required in the region to cater for the extra population it will bring (e.g. schools, hospitals, shops, access roads). It is expected the new Windsor bridge and the proposed upgrade allocated by the NSW Government for the North Richmond Bridge will be far from sufficient to service the new population.

The roads in and out of the region through Richmond and Windsor are not likely to sustain the extra cars that would come with the new population from the development. It is unclear in the documentation how that has been addressed, particularly in reference to recent bushfires and 1 in 50 floods that have pounded the area.

The lack of detail in regard to the upgrading of Wire Lane and Kurmond Road roundabout is of particular concern. As any destruction whilst widening Wire Lane to 9 metres could affect the old established Eucalyptus trees which then counteracts the tree preservation order, according to the correspondence we received from Hawkesbury Council dated 20th Jan 1988. Does Council propose to create a round about at the intersection of Terrace Road and Wire Lane Freemans Reach to help with the flow of traffic at that intersection?

The flooding that occurs in the region also is likely to cause further concerns for new residents of the housing development. Existing neighbours are also likely to be concerned downhill of the development because as recently seen in the March 2021 floods, rivers of water were seen flowing down Spinks Rd, Kurmond Road and Wire Lane.

Celestino Pty.Ltd. have also recently purchased Peel's property (Hambledon Park) which is located between Kurmond Road and Terrace Road North Richmond (253.51 hectare). If Jacaranda development is a blueprint Hambledon Park (now Camlot) what is council purposing to do about the infrastructure?

This part of the Hawkesbury has for many years fed Sydney, through meat, dairy, poultry or vegetables. The adverse effects of having the agricultural hub next to a housing development is too great. It is suggested that either the houses not be built and the agricultural hub maintained or everything in Freemans Reach and Glossodia be rezoned to for residential rural developments, giving the farmers and the horse studs the opportunity to relocate to a suitable location with suitable compensation. This would work for developers also, as interest rates are extremely low, providing real access to the finance required to develop.

I look forward to working with Hawkesbury City Council and Celestino to resolve the issues identified.

[REDACTED], Freemans Reach NSW 2756

The General Manager
Hawkesbury City Council.

10 MAR 2021

1a Wemyss Street,
Castle Hill, 2154.
1. 3. 2021

Notification of Planning Proposal - Jacaranda, Glossodia

My husband and I own the property known as 243 Spinks Road Glossodia (lot 33 DP 214753) adjoining this planning proposal.

In general we are not opposed to the development but have concerns that the second part of the objectives or intended outcome of the planning proposal will not be met ie. "Ensure that future development on the site creates a natural expansion of the town of Glossodia allowing a seamless southward extension"

Should the existing plan proceed then there will not be the 'seamless southward extension' envisaged because we and other larger acreage owners will be trapped between two separate residential subdivisions and this is certain to cause land use conflicts, such as those experienced in the rural area called Bligh Park North, separating Bligh Park and South Windsor. In this area trespass is a common occurrence as people from each residential area take short cuts across the paddocks, the attitude being that they are doing no harm and they have a right to do so.

Additionally, any worthwhile rural pursuit is either curtailed or placed in jeopardy by this expanded residential development.

We note that the proposal provides access to the existing developed area of Glossodia via 3 Derby Place. This street is at this time a quiet rural location of low traffic volume and it seems unreasonable that the residents of this street should suffer the discomfort of substantially increased use of the street for the new development to access Spinks Road.

The rural land in the area between Spinks Road and the proposed development is zoned R2 low density residential and we believe that Council and the State Government should encourage any developer to include this land in any planning proposal before further land is rezoned.

This would lead to the outcome previously mentioned being achieved by providing direct connectivity to the main arterial road (Spinks Road) and the already developed Glossodia residential area.

We would have liked to have our property connected to the developments sewerage system, and hope in the future that we will be able to subdivide our land, as we have held it for 50 years with that in mind.

Yours Faithfully

SCANNED

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED]

Sent:

From: [REDACTED]

Sent: Thursday, 18 March 2021 5:29 AM

To: Hawkesbury City Council

Subject: Jacaranda Pond Development

To whom it might concern [Andrew Kaerns],

After our conversation on the 12 -3 -2021 I would like to inform you that we , [REDACTED], have a few objections against your proposal [developers] ,for 9 James Street Glossodia We decided to get a solicitor to handle our objections.

Main problem is the walk way against our border line , We rather have 1 neighbour than 100 walkers, and I don't think our dogs would like them .

Why can't you put your walk way 3 lots further away from our fence line?

We didn't ask for neighbours definitely not 100 every night coming past the fence , and what about the future when kids grow up , they might like the GREEN zone to much, if you know what I mean.

Second is the straight road coming right in front of our house, we had to sign a right of way on the promise that this was going be a cull de sac{ [according to Phillip Proust]

I hope you not going to send us a COUNCIL rate which is highly increased and say you improved our living standards, THAT WOULD BE AN INSULT

I know I shouldn't say this but after all them years looking after all this blokes [REDACTED], we expected fair treatment]

Thank you for my opportunity to speak my mind.

We hope we can come to a solution.

Yours sincerely

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] antivirus software.

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, 27 March 2021 12:15 PM
To: Hawkesbury City Council
Subject: LEP001/18 Jacaranda

The General Manager Hawkesbury City Council , Mayor, Councillors and Council,

The Planning Proposal, draft Development Control Plan, draft Voluntary Planning Agreement and Biodiversity application of land at Glossodia known as the Jacaranda development should not be approved.

Celestino Pty Ltd is not addressing the most obvious Hawkesbury infrastructure problems which cannot cope at present, an influx of 580 allotments will only increase current local gridlock.

- Roads and bridges are at saturation point
- Hospital and medical facilities are overloaded
- Water mains on the western side of the Hawkesbury River are at capacity

The following must happen before Jacaranda (and any other local development) can be approved:

- Dual lane roads to Windsor Road and Richmond Road BEFORE and not after allotments are available for sale, widening of existing single lane roads will not alleviate current problems
- Bridges with dual carriage in each direction
- At least one guaranteed flood free entry/exit to the western side of the Hawkesbury River with a flyover from Windsor to the high side of Freemans Reach or from Richmond to North Richmond
- Additional major supermarket, medical services, primary and high schools on the western side of the Hawkesbury River
- Major works to enlarge Hawkesbury District Health Service (Hawkesbury hospital)
- Water issues

None of these issues have been addressed.

Within the application it states Hawkesbury City Council Development Control Plan does not have any stormwater quality metrics, why not?

I, like most residents of the Hawkesbury do not use the Glossodia Community Centre, nor do I use the pre-school and would never enter the Jacaranda development to gather and meet with the Jacaranda community at Lake Park as per the proposal.

However, I do drive, use local shops (rarely Glossodia shops), have used the hospital as well as appreciate the mostly rural/agricultural lifestyle of the western side of the Hawkesbury River.

Council has convinced Catherine Van Laeren from NSW Planning, Industry and Environment that local convenience retail needs have been met.

How can the existing Council owned Glossodia Village meet the needs?

The current flood has proven the inadequacies of infrastructure and convenience retail needs on the western side of the Hawkesbury River after the landslide on Bells Line of Road cut off and isolated the area. Food, medical and veterinary supplies are constantly being helicoptered over the river as well as by barge on the river from Windsor to Wilberforce with volunteers driving the supplies to the North Richmond Coles supermarket as well as chemists, medical facilities and veterinarians on the western side of the river. A dentist was ferried over as there was no dentist west of the river.

The Gables at Box Hill, originally another Celestino development, is giving parents a choice of public and private with onsite purpose built education. Within The Gables will be a commercial supermarket, shops and restaurants built around a town centre. Until this is completed residents also have close access to the large Rouse Hill Town Centre with most commercial retail businesses as well as being a stone's throw from The Metro, the newest mode of transport in Sydney.

What is the Jacaranda development offering? The vague possibility of an on-site café and a few local shops in a small rundown Council owned poorly lit quadrangle. The closest train station to the Jacaranda development is at least 12km away on single lane roads.

Glossodia encompasses approximately 385 houses. The elitist Jacaranda enclave will add another 580 houses.

A trip between Richmond and Glossodia depending on time of day can now take from 10 to 40 minutes.

Council elections will be held later this year, your voters, we ratepayers won't stand for what the current council is proposing to accept with the Jacaranda development.

Few ratepayers know last year's purchaser of the Peel family beef property, now renamed Camlot on Terrace Road, North Richmond is Celestino Pty Ltd. Another landbank waiting to be developed.

The proposed development of the Jacaranda elitist enclave is not only relevant to Glossodia, it is relevant to the whole Hawkesbury district.

I accept progress is inevitable, however Council, please do not think short term with glazed eyes of 580 new rate payments.

Think of planning, infrastructure and if done correctly, development.

However with many Hawkesbury properties now being landbanked, do not overlook the agricultural benefits and the reason why the Hawkesbury is a sought after commodity.

Councillors, stay true to your original word, no further development on the western side of the Hawkesbury River without necessary infrastructure.

Regards,

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Kurmond Road,

Freemans Reach 2756

Your Submission

Type your submission here.

The infrastructure in the local area cannot cope with another 580 houses! Build parks and improve roads and community areas but forget the housing developments. Just look what has happened in Box Hill - previously rural area is now another suburb of McMansions with congested roads. Leave the ridiculous density to the other side of the river.

Is the school going to be upgraded as it is a small school and will need more building to accommodate the extra children that will be coming into this area. This will need to be done first as a priority.

This proposed development is a fantastic idea - if you're a developer. For everyone else, of course, it is a disaster. Acres of western-Sydney-style rubbish houses built with no thought of aspect, building materials, or energy efficiency, and you can bet your life every one of these boxes will have a black-tile roof, radiating a furnace into the surrounding ambience, or its ghost. Oh, let's bung another heat-sink into a rural community, and to add insult to injury, make sure another 10,000 cars are domiciled there too.

Then, of course, the poor sods who pay way too much for the privilege of living in Dante's new inferno can busy themselves driving to work every day on a dodgy single-lane road, over a dodgy single-lane bridge, into the rat-race of their useless and pointless existence.

Oh frabjous joy!

Does any Councilor seriously want their name attached to this?

Building and maintaining roads around this infrastructure is not adequate. The additional bridge BEFORE any further infrastructures need to be put in place. I won a fair way accross and in an emergency cannot access my kids at peak hour!! NOT a replacement bridge, a duplicate bridge and preferably bypassing traffic. I've lived in a couple of council areas and have found Hawkesbury the most laid back and inefficient. You keep promising the community this bridge but no action.

Don't do it it's a dumb idea

Please consider the character of the area. Look at Vineyard, which was partly also a Celestino development the excessive amount of new suburban homes that have been built on boundary road have completely changed the character and the function of the area. The hawkesbury is known for its rural character and this development will be the slippery slope into turning into a copy and paste of Box Hill and alike.

The surrounding infrastructure will not support ongoing development on the west side of the bridge. There is already mounting congestion, adding another 500-1000 cars that will need to cross either the Windsor or North Richmond bridge for their commute is ridiculous. It will set a precedent for further development

Blacktown and Hills council have already done an atrocious job of managing development in their areas. My partner and I specifically bought in the hawkesbury because to date it has not been afflicted with this.

Additionally, the Hawkesbury contributes so much to agriculture. At some point Hawkesbury council needs to implement a plan to safeguard the areas ability to continue to produce.

I'm conclusion, these developments do nothing to add to the value or character of the area. It is needlessly adding pressure to infrastructure which is already largely in disrepair and/or under pressure. Similar housing developments in Riverstone and Vineyard are shoddily planned, most without even footpaths etc. Do not seek change for the sake of change and rates. Look after your existing residents first.

Such a waste of a beautiful piece of land , I feel the property's should be large acreage blocks, with wildlife corridors in place, with parks and reserves in place also.

Looks Good

I feel the importance of the environment for the flora and fauna in this area is too important to destroy for more development. We need to provide and protect this environment for the ecosystem. Many more places to allow development.

There needs to be public transport as well as better infrastructure build (a new bridge and a train station at least to north Richmond for example) to prevent more traffic in Richmond and Windsor so Hawkesbury locals don't have even longer travels on-top of their already unnecessarily long travels.

The roads will not be able to handle this, especially the north richmond bridge. Expansion or alternative bridge planning needs to be finalised and begun before this can even go ahead. Our roads will become more of a nightmare than they already are. How can you even think this is plausible if the roads people are driving on are unmaintained death traps and busy already

I do not agree with this or any other similar development in the Hawkesbury. I moved here to escape the rat race. The developments in Marsden Park and Rouse Hill are appalling and Redbank is horrible. Looking at all those houses where beautiful lush green paddocks and cows used to be is depressing. Furthermore, the roads are already clogged due to lack of river crossings and these should be fixed before any development is considered. Also the condition of the roads are dangerous and need fixing. This is not the Hawkesbury myself or my family want to live in.

'The proposal seems to be all about biodiversity and contains precious little information about how existing public services such as schools, hospitals and policing will be provided for or impacted upon by this new development.

Whilst I would generally be in support of development of this nature now the Windsor Bridge project has been completed and now that commitments are forthcoming on improvements to the Richmond bridge crossing, I cannot support this proposal in its current form without demonstrated commitment to the increased funding and provision of local education, health and police services in the area.

- Glossodia and Freemans Reach public schools, as well as Hawkesbury High school, are currently at or near capacity and any future growth will need to be accommodated by installation of portables. A commitment to permanent extension of these schools needs to be obtained from the NSW Govt prior to the development proceeding.

- There is no permanent police station facility on the North side of the river. With the recent expansion of North Richmond, the addition of more development on the North side of the river requires a permanent police presence.

I cannot support this proposal in its current form.

The surrounding infrastructure can barely cope with the amount of residents we currently have. Regardless of what was decided in 2014, adding another 580 homes (assuming 2 cars per household = 1160 extra cars on our roads) is beyond ridiculous. Are we all to sit for hours and hours every morning and afternoon to get out to work and then back in? North Richmond is already choked with Redbank and upcoming Kurmond builds, now you want to add another thousand to Glossodia! Look at Box Hill - the traffic on Windsor Rd is already bumper to bumper yet they continue to add thousands of new homes.

Leave Glossodia the semi rural/village suburb it is and put more planning into public recreation for the EXISTING RESIDENTS who pay their rates for unknown services already.

I believe you have not taken into consideration that we need more sporting fields in the Hawkesbury. I assume the common spaces aren't to be shared with the public. Have any provisions been made for more sporting fields in the Hawkesbury?

i am dead against further development , as we dont want another marsden park etc

I have lived in Glossodia for 27 years and while my children have grown and moved on I still would like to see a shared bicycle/walking path from Glossodia to the High School.

My son used to ride his bike to high school but it became far too dangerous as traffic increased on the dreadful goat track called Spinks road.

We should be encouraging these young people to move more and if there was a safer walking path this could happen.

I see a widening of Spinks road in the plans so surely a shared path would not be unreasonable

Thank you

This development is not appropriate for the area. Upgrading the surrounding roads is not enough. The roads connecting to the development are already under traffic stress as it is. There is no public transport except for buses which is also more traffic on roads. 580 new homes could potentially add 1000 cars to the road system or more!

This area should stay rural and semi rural

Overviewing the plans for this new development proposal, our concerns are the proposed properties adjoining to Jordan Avenue properties.

Hence we are local market gardeners in the area, adjoining this new development. Our concern raised is there a way the developer can factor in placing a privacy fence preferably colour bond and at least 1.8metres high to allow us farmers privacy and to continue our living without complaints from adjoining neighbours. Also I hope that there will be a set boundary of how far they can build from our adjoining fence line. Also residents that purchase these properties are informed they are purchasing a property next to a working farm land so that they understand the farmer will do there best but farm life never stops....I hope these concerns will be taken into consideration

I am concerned this large development is innapropriate in this rural area.

Connecting roads are already inadequate, and the increased traffic over the single lane bridges on the south side of the river will be unbearable.

If Hawkesbury needs more development, the logical place is the border of Hills Box Hill where arterial roads can service the increased traffic flows.

For those families with little people, or those with various other needs, it would be nice to see toilet facilities at both the village green and the lake park.

It seems the word 'potential' or 'could' is used a lot to describe facilities, it would be nice if these came about!

How are you even seriously looking at this when you haven't sorted the problems from Redbank. Where is our 3rd crossing ?

The current condition of the roads in Glossodia is sub standard and serious upgrades need to happen before any development goes ahead. The suburb also has no footpaths with families having to walk/ride on the side of roads. It's an accident waiting to happen. The Jacaranda development will be good for the area but not before significant upgrades to roads and footpaths.

Road upgrade

23 million is not a lot of funds for infrastructure upgrades. Looking at the concept plans for the upgrades there will be small upgrades on the major roads. Council needs to match funds in order to upgrade the residential roads off Spinks Rd specifically Boomerang, Mitchell Dr, Chestnut and Grand Pde. These are roads that I walk on regularly as do many others and they are not safe with cars and trucks constantly over the speed limit and walkers have to move onto the verge to feel safe.

community development worker

My concern is that the Jacaranda Ponds development will create animosity between the residents of older Glossodia and the new development. This will be more likely if the Jacaranda Ponds has wonderful infrastructure and the older parts of Glossodia remain relatively unchanged.

In order to reduce the likelihood of this happening I suggest a community worker to introduce new people to what is offered in the region and more importantly to bring the newer and exiting residents together in events and celebrations.

Thank you for considering my submission

I'm highly concerned about nearly 600 new houses moving into the area when every school in the area is at capacity, the roads are atrocious due to truck use and can't be fixed fast enough

The bridges in and out are both single lane

There is only one hospital

If the planner is making them build new amenities to support the local area then by all means it's fine but at the moment the area is bordering in crowded and there is still the new red bank development building causing the same issues

'Concerns regarding the development;

- Many roads in the area of the development and surrounding roads are already requiring repairs and upgrade.

Poor condition safety risk.

- one bridge either way traffic is already to the limit.

- Educational facilities,schools,Daycare centres,social activities for families in the area must be increased.

- Emergency services,Hospital capacity,medical services and specialist services are required these services should be accessible and available to all.

- Shopping centres on this side of bridge x 1 at North Richmond (in need of upgrading)which impacts on traffic over the bridge for people to shop.

- Increased traffic in places zoned semi-rural areas.

Is the zoning going to be changed in all surrounding areas due to the development which renders "rural" inappropriate.

Due to the significant increase of traffic this development will generate.

- No sewer on a main thoroughfare road Terrace Road still sullage pumping and sewer tanks. 2021 main road,no sewer yet a development this size is proposed not far from here where increased traffic will be significant.

Sullage trucks pumping sullage on a main road.

The surrounding infrastructure must be developed appropriately such as sewer through surrounding areas.

- Crime management and resources.

- Public transport access what are the plans here?. Very limited public transport.

Crucial for support service access,appointments for ill and chronic illness.

The vulnerable and people with disabilities etc.

Although development is inevitable and growth is inevitable there must be appropriate infrastructure,safety considerations,resources,support services,educational services,medical services,emergency services in place prior to development in any area.

Equity for others to enable development of their land if rural into housing blocks.If growth is going to occur in surrounding

areas.

Who will be funding the improvement and upgrade of all surrounding roads ? State Government which is a must "before" this development is commenced.

A list of all increased services, infrastructure and road upgrades should be transparent and accessible to all residents in the area to enable an appropriate assessment of the development and the impact it will have on surrounding residents. If this occurs and appropriate infrastructure is in place this is then a positive growth submission.

14th March 2021

Hawkesbury City Council
Att: Mr Andrew Kearns
Manager Strategic Planning

Dear Sir,

We are making a written submission to council following the information session, held at the Glossodia Community Centre on Friday 12th March 2021.

This submission is a reiteration of our submission to Council in July 2013.

We own the property at [REDACTED], adjacent to 361 Spinks Rd, which forms part of the Jacaranda Development.

On Friday 12th March my wife and I attended the information session, presented by council, as we did similarly, on 27th July 2013.

We hereby submit our objections and proposed solutions which would be acceptable to us.

The proposed development is in a rural area and environment. We believe that council must maintain segregation between rural and residential areas. The development includes house blocks along our side boundary. These blocks must be large residential blocks (min, 3000m²) and we must have a 20m greenbelt along the length of our side boundary so as not to share fences with any residential properties. The Proposed Concept Master Plan and other plans are ambiguous and do not clearly show details of the block sizes and separation areas. They vary mainly on the blocks proposed on 361 Spinks Rd.

We have concerns that the developers may change block sizes & locations post DA Approval.

We also have concerns regarding traffic flows and safe egress for 580 blocks, especially in emergency situations, with only two entries and exits, both on Spinks Rd. A possibility of residential access on to Kurmond Rd, in the location of the dirt road which is currently used by the vehicles (including semitrailers) to access the poultry farms.

There is a major problem with the general conditions of roads in the Hawkesbury which must be looked at if the district is to cope with increased number of vehicles.

The intersection of Terrace Rd and Kurmond Rd is currently very dangerous.

Creek Ridge Rd from Spinks to Putty Rds is also extremely bad.

Similarly, most of Terrace road through Freemans reach is falling apart.

These are just a few examples, and ones that will be directly affected by future developments.

We trust that you will take all this into consideration, but please note that we will not accept anything other than what we request, relating to the 361 Spinks Rd portion of the development (ie, Large blocks and greenbelt separation).

Yours Faithfully

Before this subdivision is approved the 3rd proposed crossing at Nth. Richmond must be commenced.

The Redbank Subdivision is expanding at a fast rate. One provision was the the new Bridge across the Grose River near Navua Reserve was to be constructed.

There has been no update on what is happening there.

Therefore the Jacaranda Development must not be approved until either the 3rd crossing at Nth Richmond or the Grose River Crossing is commenced. The amount of traffic in the Nth. Richmond vicinity is growing at a fast rate.

I do not support this development AT ALL. There is not adequate infrastructure in this area. We have two bridges in and out of this side of the river. They are at absolute capacity in peak hour traffic. Unless the council/government plan to build more bridges, more roads, fix the current roads, build more schools etc, then this development is not fair!

I don't think this development should go ahead. We live out in the Hawkesbury to be rural and to be away from major traffic. Putting this development in will make a lot of people that are already living here want to move. We chose to live here for peace and quiet and get away from the rat race. The roads around here are already terrible, the bridges do not accommodate the amount of traffic already coming through. Then you want to develop a whole new area and not fix what is already wrong. It's a very wrong decision.

Overall this appears to be a good development for the area. I think if the DCP mirrors that of the rural lots in the Redbank development that would be in keeping with this area. Some comments:

- * Main through roads should be wide, tree lined (through the middle?) and/or mechanisms to discourage speeding, and allowance for on street parking that won't affect drivers in both directions. (This is a problem in Redbank).
- * In relation to the main water body and entrance on Spinks Rd it looks like the road separates the lake from the houses. Wouldn't it be a better idea to have the road either cut through the lake or have the road on the eastern boundary so that the lake and associated open spaces are more easily accessible to the housing?
- * Some more ponds/water features throughout the estate rather than just on the edges would keep that rural feel.
- * In terms of fencing, requiring post and rail (with hedges on boundaries) throughout would create a sense of space and keep that rural feel especially on lots that have parkland boundaries, as opposed to having standard lap and cap fencing.
- * It appears as though most of the lots are deeper than they are wider. It would be good to require a number of wider lots to encourage large acreage homes especially on the lots that are greater than 2000sqm.
- * The southern / western part of the development looks as though the streets are grid pattern and all the same, it would be nice to have some variation in road pattern and lot shapes.
- * It's probably not possible but if there was any way to discourage rented granny flats, that are becoming the norm, being built here. Perhaps that's a developer issue which could be achieved through minimum house sizes relative to lot size.
- * Another possible developer issue is having landscape requirements and either mandating a holding deposit which is released to the purchaser once the landscaping has been completed per the requirements or having a rebate incentive that would ensure quality and timely completion. I can't remember what the DCP said in regard to the number of trees and landscaping but it should be more than 2 per lot.

General Manager

Hawkesbury City Council

REF: LEP001/18 JACARANDA GLOSSODIA

Dear Sir,

Thank you for the notification of the above application before Council and the opportunity to attend and address the community meeting on the 12th of March 2021 at the Glossodia Community Centre.

We, [REDACTED], own the property on the far eastern boundary of this proposed development. We have several concerns which we would like Hawkesbury City Council and the developers, Celestino Group, to take into consideration and address.

1. Will Celestino market this proposed development so that it marries harmoniously with the existing rural residential

community?

We have run our 8-hectare farm, raising beef cattle and growing lucerne and oat crops for the past 33 years. One major concern we have is that objections will be raised by the new development's residents because our farming activities impact their lifestyles. We bale lucerne at night to prevent loss of moisture and the collapse of the baled lucerne itself. We also rotary hoe and prepare the soil for new crops late into the night at times, and the last thing we want is to have council prevent us from carrying on our farming activities and those of the vegetables farmers that surround us because of complaints.

2. We request a boundary fence that will be high enough to prevent trespassers onto our property. We worry that juveniles using the park may enter our property and vandalise our sheds and equipment.

3. People walking their animals along the dam bank may disturb and annoy our cattle. This walkway, used by the residents, which sits high above our property in parts, encroaches on our privacy.

4. Another concern we have is storm water runoff. With 580 proposed lots, meaning more bricks, concrete and less paddocks to soak up the rain, run off into our farm will significantly increase, particularly during wet seasons.

The large dam needs two overflows, not one, like it currently has on the north eastern corner. Another needs to be on the south eastern corner.

The drain that once existed running down our boundary fence on the proposed development site is now non-existent. It used to be maintained when the property was tenanted to a breeding stud. This drain needs to be reinstated it has not been cleaned out for years. The water that overflows, needs to be directed into this drain flowing to the lowest point before water enters our property, so that our one- hectare paddock nearest the current overflow point is not swamped anymore.

There also needs to be rubbish mitigation to prevent plastics and paper from flowing into our property during heavy rain or flood conditions, contaminating our dam water or lying where our cattle can ingest it, which could be fatal.

We sincerely hope that our concerns are considered, and we look forward to hearing a response from Council and the Celestino Group.

Kind regards,

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.

I have noted on the latest VPA that no action has been taken as to the safety issues of having a major feeder road from the proposed housing estate and 361 Spinks Road that only surrounding residents can understand. This part of Spinks Road has no visibility from that address to turn right into or out of the proposed road. Council/RMS has installed reflectors down the centre lane of the road and 90% of people driving up and down this road drive over them which can be heard clearly from the surrounding residences as drivers seem to have a problem keeping on the road. Anyone attempting to turn right into or out of the proposed road would be risking having an accident as not many drivers do the

60km speed limit and if you came over the hill doing 60km in wet weather you would still have problems stopping in time due to poor visibility over the hill. Removing this road or making it left turn in and out only are two suggestions on how to deal with this problem. A roundabout on top of the hill would be extremely costly and probably not much help anyway as the main feeder for the water tower goes directly under the top of the hill across the road and needs 3 metres of soil on top, which it currently has, any less would make it pop out of the ground.

The new VPA also has removed any other feeder roads from the side streets and now only has one main road with all the other small roads feeding off it, which means only two exits onto Spinks Road. If in case of an emergency, say bushfire, how are they going to evacuate 580 residences out of only two small roads? Why are the developers not using the pre-existing dirt road access for the current chicken farm on the property? Semi trailers go up and down that road frequently. It should be used as another feeder road out of the estate to take the pressure off Spinks Road.

The amount of blocks and therefore residents, will cause major problems on the already congested main roads leading in and out of Windsor and North Richmond with an average of 2 cars per house there would be at least 1160 more cars on the roads which are generally potholed every time it rains. The new Windsor Bridge has not solved any problems as it is still only a single lane in each direction and still floods and the new Richmond bridge is at least 6-10 years away.

On the length of road on Spinks Road between Kurmond Road and the proposed new road at 361 Spinks, after the culvert and just before the hill, on the left side, Council now places "water over road" signs if we get good rains as the nature strip is continually overgrown due to run off and fertilisers from the adjoining market garden, therefore making the road even more dangerous as Council does little to no roadside/nature strip maintenance. I cannot understand how the developer can state that most of the vehicles would use Windsor Bridge; they must be mind readers to know the habits of yet unknown residents of their subdivision. Combine this with the other new subdivision proposed for North Richmond I cannot see how North Richmond lights, bridge and feeder roads are going to cope with a massive increase in housing and subsequently cars. Anyone coming from Richmond on a Friday afternoon from about 2.30pm onwards (for roughly the next 4 hours or more) sits in a slow crawl down from Richmond across the bridge and onwards as the roads cannot cope with the traffic, especially if the weather is nice or it's a long weekend approaching. If there is a car accident on or leading into either bridge and they are closed it leaves one way only for all the extra cars to get around resulting in traffic chaos.

Currently the main public transport available to residents is the train from Richmond which takes approximately 20-25 mins to drive to as the bus services in this area are fairly non-existent.

Please take the above comments seriously as they impact the whole area not just a handful of residents who will bother to make a submission.

Hello, my home/property is ■■■ Spinks Road, Glossodia. I'm concerned about the fact that one of the main entry roads into the new development will be on my boundary, where there is no road at all at the moment.

I am concern about the security, the noise and the safety of my property.

By opening up the neighbouring property to the general public gives easy access to my home and storage sheds for theft and vandalism.

There will be a increased noise from traffic, going in and out. With the traffic, also increases the risk vehicles accidents in close proximity to my home.

We have a rural wire fence separating us from the next door property (approx. 120 meters), which would not be a sufficient barrier for all the above mentioned concerns. I would like council to discuss this with Celestino to fund and construct a suitable fence/ barrier a long the boundary

.

One of my concerns is the infrastructure of our roads if we introduce 580 homes with the development of Jacaranda Ponds Estate in Glossodia.

I work in Richmond and already it can take me 1 hour to get home (driving only 18kms).

Why is it we get our roads re-tarred only to drive over and feel the same humps and bumps and within only weeks of the job being finished and the same potholes appear?

I feel that me as a rate payer deserve better work done on our roads.

I feel that if our roads and bypasses should be implemented/completed or let alone considered prior to developments being started.

Please consider this issue before building 580 homes!!!!

A 3rd entrance is needed into the estate. I would like council to advise if they will be arranging footpaths for the rest of Glossodia

Firstly let me say that I'm in favour of the development to bring life into the suburb. Whilst I have the same concerns as many existing residents about additional vehicular movements and traffic, additional residents bring more vibrancy and economic benefits to both schools and retail outlets.

I work for the Council that Celestino has built 'The Gables' and it looks very nice but my concerns are that Glossodia will become 'us and them'. Whilst this is somewhat inevitable due to new homes and infrastructure Council has a lot of responsibility to integrate new with established.

If the new development has coloured footpaths, the established part should get them as well.

If the new development has kerb and gutter, the established part should get it as well.

The new part should have the same road widths as the established part, nothing less.

Street scape planting should have adequate widths to allow planting without damage to infrastructure.

Cycleways in the new part should integrate into the established section.

23 million dollars in developer contributions is a huge windfall to spend on a suburb that was originally developed in the '80's. This economic windfall should go a long way to right the wrongs of a development that would not be allowed to have been built to this standard in this day and age.

My biggest concerns are integrating the established and new. I hope Council accepts these points and uses developer contributions wisely and without financial impacts to existing established properties in Glossodia.

Just need infrastructure done before development goes ahead.

I respectfully submit that any improvements made to Woodbury Reserve as a result of the Jacaranda Ponds development, does not affect the natural bush access way along Kentucky Drive into Woodbury reserve.

I wish to make the following submissions:

1. To address traffic flow and connection:

The JP development includes land currently being used as a chicken farm with its own private road access.

Two access points to a 580 housing lot development, will create congestion for the new JP development residents, and for existing Glossodia residents.

My submission in this regard is that a third access to the Jacaranda Park development be made from Kurmond Road using the private road servicing the chicken farm that is part of the JP development.

2. In recognition of a lack of public transport servicing Glossodia.

A lack of public transport services compells residents to have two or more cars per household, in addition to recreational vehicles such a boats and caravans.

Nearby housing developments of recent do not provide sufficient off street parking for numerous vehicle and trailers, and the 'overflow' vehicles generally end up parked on the roadway.

This impacts the effective width of the road and makes it difficult for emergency services vehicles and garbage trucks to safely negotiate the streets.

My submission in this regard is that roadways within the JP development are sufficiently wide (not just minimum width as per Aust. Standards) to allow emergency services vehicles and garbage truck to safely navigate the streets and negotiate vehicles parked on the roadside.

Thank you.

I object to the proposed development. I live adjacent to where the proposed entrance is to be placed on Spinks Road. The crest notoriously has poor visibility, as my husband had a car accident trying to turn out of our driveway, because cars often speed up the hill and you can't see cars approaching from either side. I don't feel a roundabout would adequately slow the traffic. Also the roads are in poor condition. Will they be maintained and a footpath be put in place on Spinks Road? It is currently unsafe for my family to walk and I feel with the added traffic, from the development, it will be worse. Also, I feel my kids will not get the same education, from the public schools, as they will not be able to support the influx of children, academically. Due to the recent flooding event I also feel the shops will be less able to support the community. Traffic, in my travel to work, will also be impacted. I currently spend 2 hours a day travelling and extra cars will mean this time will increase and therefore impact on my quality of life with my family.

In conclusion I am against this development and hope you will consider my points above.

I object to the development in light of recent events, how is North Richmond Coles and Audi meant to support that quantum of additional mouths to feed along with all the other smaller private food suppliers who sold out during the floods. This also puts higher pressure on emergency services and the SES as those who move into the area will not be prepared for the floods.

I also feel that the lack of quality roads and footpaths in the area means there will be more road maintenance for council as roads will deteriorate quicker. These generally need to improve immensely before this development becomes a viable option, if it was at Freemans Reach near the school they have footpaths and kerbs so it would be a more viable option apart from the first paragraph above.

Another issue is the safety of traffic turning onto Spinks Road near 361 (if I recall correctly where the road comes out) I should have been killed coming out of my driveway a few weeks ago (the oncoming vehicle swerved to miss me so only took out my engine bay but had they not I would not be here to object I can tell you that now) and that is almost opposite where the road is meant to come out, I am happy to provide photos it is a notorious section that although it is 60km not a lot of people actually do 60 they stick to the speed limit about 100m down the road of 80km if this development goes ahead it will become very unsafe for me to pull out of my driveway and I already struggle with doing so since the accident to the point I see I psychiatrist.

Then there is the fact that a lot of the land should be deemed CEC so to clear land for the sake of clearing land is just absurd there are plenty of already cleared blocks they could have bought and then they wouldn't need to touch any CEC land at all. I can't even cut down a dead tree without permission because of that go figure.

I have a lot more I could say but these are my biggest points.

I live on Spinks Road (■■■■ Spinks Rd) right on the crest of the where there is to be a proposed entry to the Jacaranda development. This road is very dangerous at the moment. Over four accidents in the last 12 months have happened near my house and three weeks ago there was nearly a fatality right in front of my house, please see attached photos. At the top of the hill there is no visual from both directions. The speed limit is 60km/h however most vehicles do 80-100km/h. This is a main road in and out of Glossodia, there are large trucks and a lot of local farmers that commute back and forth with transporters/tractors which makes the road even more dangerous.

This planned road to come out at the top of a crest with no visual either way is ridiculous. It is extremely dangerous and will only cause more accidents and I fear for the safety of my family and neighbours which is a Public Liability. There's no way this should be allowed or approved.

Recommendations:

- For the road to be coming out onto Spinks Road, not to go ahead due to being so dangerous and instead have it as a cul-de-sac to service the blocks at that end of the subdivision.
- Have a main road to connect onto Kurmond Road/Wire Lane, as Celestino Developers already own that property and want to develop it next - in stage 2...that comes out at AANALEE ENTERPRISES private road between 780 and 778 Kurmond Road that already exist. That is the safest exit and entry into the Jacaranda Ponds Development and a direct route heading into North Richmond.

I have the following concerns as a minimum which I would like addressed;

1. Insufficient Infrastructure – Roads, Quality of Roads, Water Drainage, Sewage, Grocery shops, Schooling, Medical practices, Telecommunications and Power.
2. Calculate the correct volume of people living in the new development. (modern families today living in one house now consist of three generations, as seen in Box Hill and Marsden Park Development). Which affects child care which is already full in Glossodia, the same with OOSH no spare spaces from additional children, schooling, vehicles / traffic and all the items listed in point one.
3. Noise pollution - increased noise running up the side of my property which the developer will need to provide fencing for security of my property and also a sound proof walls due to the excess noise.

Council and the Developer Celestino need to take into account the valid points raised at the Community Meeting held on Friday 12 March:

- * Current farming community in existence - these new residents cannot then make a claim about noise, timing of work, their view, farming traffic on road etc
- * Please make it part of any sale that they recognise that they are purchasing in a rural community and have no recourse to come back and complain about what is acceptable in the community
- * Current infrastructure ie local roads are not capable of taking current traffic let alone another 580 homes
- * Major infrastructure ie Bells line of Road with North Richmond Bridge and Windsor Bridges, in light of recent major flooding, no routes out - traps another 580 homes and their mode of transport (cars) - need upgrading, lifting of these bridges to be able to cope with any major floods
- * Transport not available now let alone more residents - need to be more available/efficient/reliable and cost effective in comparison to cars ie similar to Hills buses direct to city.
- * Current routes proposed out of estate dangerous - Spinks Rd located on a crest and view is obscured. Not enough routes out due to fire or flood
- * Not enough local community shops/petrol stations/community centres/schools currently to provide for these new residents - need to be planned into estate
- * Water run off from these properties/estate MUST not impact the surrounding properties or community

I oppose the Jacaranda Estate mainly due to the fact I moved to Glossodia so I could enjoy and live in the rural environment. By building a big housing estate, you will essentially be taking away the rural aspect of Glossodia. There will be so many more people living in the area, which can be a concern in times of flooding as we have just witnessed. I do not believe the roads will be maintained as the roads in Glossodia currently are not looked after. Mitchell Drive is slowly eroding away and desperately needs curb and guttering. I enjoy the wildlife I see in the area. I imagine so many of them will have to relocate as their homes will be destroyed. We do not need another Jordan Springs in Glossodia.

These comments are not collated in a coherent way as they are from notes taken while reading the Proposal and the Proposal is huge and I am just a resident in the Hawkesbury.

There seems to be a lot of unclassified woodland (eg in the north and its quite large) on some maps, where the red gum etc are listed and no explanation of what unclassified woodland is. It is left up to us to interpret from areal photos or go there and look.

It would be nice if the total area of good Cumberland Plain Forest were the same as before when the table of original,

lost and added are totalled. You lose 5ha out of 17ha, I think. Maybe it can be made up somewhere.

When the riparian areas etc are put aside for hybrid use, the uses should preclude things that will degrade the flora and fauna, ie ecosystem eg flora not looked after and gradually degraded due to attrition over time eg council workers seem not to be trained in managing parks and destroy say native flower beds by mindlessly wippersniping. An ecosystem does not have these activities. Plus no one seems to take responsibility to ensure trees are replaced by young ones. Everything is cleaned up and no saplings grow and the place degrades, eg McMahon's Park Kurrajong. Measures to avoid this should be in the plan and not listed as "potential".

Pg 65 Tree removal conditions are not appropriate. Why on earth are they not? They are....

the community centre is only "Potential", it should be included for a development of 500 houses. Parks for kids should specifically be included. Why is the community centre and village green areas (nodes) all along the river apart from the NE one. Village greens are in the centre of villages. they form a nice hub for the community, like in Kurrajong, that is why I like Kurrajong. Maybe it's an English thing but I think it's a good one.

Why is a development out this far from Sydney regarded as a part of the third Sydney city, that is ridiculous. Yes it affects Sydney and vice versa but really it's the Hawkesbury and its west of the river as well. That takes priority ie the amenity of the Hawkesbury. It should not be degraded. hence it is very important to maintain the overall ecosystems here, ie not lose habitat. This is possible as the land use of this spot has been so poor in that regard. Find that 5 ha please. It will take time to establish especially if you have taken it from moderate grade Cumberland woodland on the development. So we can't do this all over the place at once otherwise we lose nearly half of the remaining habitat at once and if my memory serves me correctly there is only 5% of Cumberland Plain left. It's about that anyway. So we need to be careful.

The company responsible for managing the area to be funded by the biobank needs goals and rewards stated in advance. ie to make it really and truly even if they have a totally money minded management to ensure the biobank's area is managed in perpetuity (if possible, I hope that does not mean until it is declared bankrupt or sold and stripped) to maintain a natural ecosystem as much as possible ie keep the Australian biodiversity that is indigenous to this area viable.

Why are so many (all) of the social bits down as potential? Things like park facilities etc. These should be in it as done and dusted. Do not approve this until that is clear and carried out.

The regular money from the bio bank fund should be paid to the council as a tied grant to this site. Companies come and go and are not subject to the democratic control of us through the council. This is important. There are many eggs of

unscrupulous company operatives and owners. Environmental goals and objectives will always when push comes to shove be a minor part of their motivations. Making money will be the major part. it is not healthy to have them control this money.

I would be very concerned about the salinity and look into that further. At Hawkesbury High School the copper pipes corroded and made major leaks. The same happened in my house. in both cases a blue kind of copper sulfate residue was at the leak sites. I know this is not salt. According to the report its notlikely to be sulfuric acid in the soil due to mobilised pyrite. I'm not sure what caused that but it is to do with our water (possibly a North Richmond water treatment issue from the Hawkesbury River (which I know has very little salt in it, ie its very healthy in that respect I have measured it several times). I've seen salt from the soild affect the aluminium window frames in the shops at Kurrajong and I am sure I have seen its effects locally in bricks.

I would be especially concerned about this due to the changes in the water table due to the development. the report says nothing about that it only reports the water tables as they are now. All those spots on the site to distribute storm water will change that. What about the water bought on site for domestic use then recycled as grey water, I assume for gardens, cleaning cars. This will all add to the water table and likely cause salinity if its here already. it occurs when you chop trees down (which you are doing) and add water (which you are) and cause the water table to rise. this needs to be looked at very closely. I would not buy a house there unless I was sure this would not happen and seeing signs of it a s reported is a very big concern. I'd be steering away and buy somewhere else. Salinity is really bad for buildings and roads and pipes. Please study this and be sure its not going to happen either naturally or via appropriate intervention.

That is about it, apart from the following. I'm as you have probably guessed a person very much concerned with our wonderful heritage of Oz flora a fauna. its in a bad way and we need to do better if it will be here for our grandchildren etc. I love living in Kurrajong for that reason. I'm not against development just to be against it. We need to do it in a way that improves the habitat for our wildlife. There is plenty of scope for that as our farms have degraded it so much, as indeed this land shows. It is fantastic to see this being taken seriously in this proposal, at least to the extent that ecological surveys are done, the ecosystems understood and seriously considered. We are a part of that ecosystem. We are happiest, most sane and content when the ecosystem around us is and we are part of is healthy. There are peer reviewed psychological research that has been done that proves this. Sorry I cant quote it, my source was professionals talking about city design on radio national. So your process here is very encouraging. Please ensure you don't get hoodwinked by spives though (eg developers trying to pull the wool over your eyes).

I guess I should add that a development at Glossodia is an unlikely place really. Its right at the worst place re access you could imagine. Such an awkward place to go to and come from work or shopping etc with few amienities in its own right. You really do need to ensure good community facilities at least. The residents I would imagine were totally cut off in the

recent floods. Putty out, North Richmond shops out as Redbank Creek flooded, Bells Line out by land slip, access to Bells Line at Kurmoond and Slopes Rd out due to local floods. NO given this and potential salinity I would not be buying there. Are you sure you want to put people there?



PS

Please don't call it Jacaranda. It is a South African tree here and a weed. Yes pretty. Find an Oz tree thats pretty. Say She Oak, Blue Gum, Waratah, Mountain Devil, but not Jacaranda.

Ps Ps

My previous submission concerned mainly the impact on the flora and fauna also environmental concerns such as effect on water courses, water tables and potential for salinity. Its location is also problematic in that this is a really isolated spot away from amenities. I was not opposed this development, many people have already made successful lives from this spot and are happy there.

The second that the name Jacaranda is inappropriate as this tree is an exotic species from South Africa, i think, certainly not Australia or local

On thinking about it I have missed very important aspects that need to be commented on, as follows.

This is a wonderful opportunity to build a suburban environment to the best standards we know to meet the needs of future residents. This means it needs to take into account the reality of global warming. To build in a way that does not exasperate this. Once this has been done to have created a community that helps reduce the severity and impact of this on the community and the planet.

Provision should be made to source materials that have least carbon footprint on planet, ie least embedded CO2. That will be long lasting and easy to maintain. This includes all aspects from the road construction to the houses etc.

The colours you have chosen for your eggs of houses etc are dark grey etc. these are close to the black body in physics and the worst for converting the suns light (short wave IR) into heat within the body (house and roads). Which then remit

it as long wave IR, via black body principles ie a lot, as a result of heating up themselves. The air is opaque to this and absorbs this long wave IR and heats up. That is the area becomes a heat island with higher temperatures than the surrounding bushland. (I wonder if this adds to bush fire risk, ie dries out the nearby bush more. North Richmond is a nightmare for this, I often fill up my motorcycle there after a run along Bells Line of Road, it maybe say 29C at Kurrajong heights on a summer day and 35C at North Richmond. It is just horrible and every time I do that I feel sorry for the people at North Richmond.

Even though the proposed development housing plots are on average about half the size bigger in area than the existing blocks in Glossodia they are still quite small. This means apart from the increased hard surfaces which increase the effects of flood and potentially salinity there will be a lot of black bodies (ie houses) acting as above as opposed to green bodies (trees and grass that reflect the highest energy suns rays back to space and do not have the air absorb it. SO what I am getting at is that the colours of the houses (and roads, if possible) should be stipulated to be those that reflect as much suns energy to space as possible, thus making the suburb more comfortable to live in with a greater likelihood kids etc will take advantage of the "green routes" to "green spaces" you are so proud of. They won't if it is hot they will stay inside their energy consuming houses playing computer games getting fat and building up health issues like diabetes, Richmond the 2nd highest incidence in Oz for obesity and Oz one of the highest in the world).

I am not sure if building regulations insist on minimum standards for insulation and energy efficiency of the houses. Like say they do in Germany where houses get rated for this and get a certificate which affects their selling price, ie if poor but meets the minimum standards the price to the seller is lowered. Hawkesbury City council should insist that the house are use as much passive design principals as possible to reduce energy consumption to keep cool in the summer and warm in the winter (both issues at Glossodia). Solar panels should be required and if possible a battery system and links for electrical energy exchange be made between houses with there being a community agreement on the prices the owners get when energy is exported from their batteries. This way the community will reduce or eliminate its reliance on the main grid and any CO2 produced via fossil fuel generated electricity.

In these ways the community will be more resilient in the face of climate change (global warming due to human production of CO2). It will be cheaper to live and more comfortable for the community and they will not be at the whim of the politics of electricity generation via the big companies and vested interests with monopolistic advantage seeking rentier profits eg when community members need electricity on a hot day they, up the prices). At the same time this community would be helping to ensure we do not reach thresholds that ensure a global catastrophe re climate change ie pass tipping points of no return, such as the tundra melting.

If the council is fair dinkum in their commitment to helping avoid this, which I am sure they have stated they are, then they will insist on measures like these. New developments are an opportunity to lead the way and hopefully old ones

retrofitted. These also create wonderful employment opportunities.

Get on board HHC.

Like I said in the previous submissions it is great to see that we have started to move along these lines in this development but will it be fast enough This submission makes some suggestions to help with that. For us all and our grandchildren and indigenous people's grandchildren, the traditional custodians of this land.

■■■■

PS PS PS

I forgot to stress. You need to ensure as many soft green surfaces as possible, like tree canopy which also provides shade to keep the suburb cool and nice to move around. The overall plan does not insist on this and the HHC should. This is in line with what Barry Calvert was saying on RN about the resolutions at the Wesrock meetings for Western Sydney and if this means anything HHC should be actioning this. This is an ideal opportunity for a suburb who's location will make these concepts very important

■■■■