

The Secretary  
Department of Planning, Industry and Environment  
GPO Box 39  
SYDNEY NSW 2001

**SSD-9472 Sikh Grammar School**  
**Lots 42 & 43 DP30186 151-161 Tallawong Road Rouse Hill**

Dear Prity,

The following forms our submission regarding the above Development Application for a proposed school. We are making a submission on behalf of 119 Cudgegong Road Rouse Hill (GG Dev Pty Ltd ATF GG Dev Unit Trust).

**Height of Buildings**

The site is zoned R2 Low Density Residential. The height limit for the site is 9m which is intended to result in development of the site presenting a reduction in scale from the 12m height limit in the planned local centre on Guntawong Road.

The proposal seeks a maximum building height of more than double the existing height limit at 18.19m. The justification for this significant breach relies on the commercial viability, operational requirements of the school and demand for infrastructure.

The application fails to provide adequate justification as to why the departure from the development standard is unreasonable or unnecessary or that the development presents a better outcome for the site as a result of the non-compliance. The commercial viability of a project is not a valid planning consideration and the operational requirements of the school can be equally served by a development of lesser scale that occupies a greater land area.

**Suitability of the Site**

The demand for educational infrastructure within the Precinct was examined during precinct-planning and appropriate sites were identified for schools. These sites have largely not been taken up for the development of schools despite the Department of Education identifying some of them as surplus to public education needs. This site was not identified for a school with the result being that the proposed development is inconsistent with the planning controls and expected future character. There exist more appropriate alternate locations for the provision of educational infrastructure within the Precinct.

**Building Massing**

There are no established FSR controls for the site as the site was never expected to be developed for non-residential development. Whilst the building massing is centred on the site to limit the impacts of overshadowing there remains a considerable disconnect between the proposed density and building massing to that which would be expected in a low-density residential environment.

### **Access Arrangements**

The application proposes the construction of half roads to the northern, western and southern boundaries of the site which is consistent with the Indicative Layout Plan.

Vehicle access to the proposed basement is proposed to be via the new northern and southern roads. Further, access to the above ground parking is proposed to be provided via the northern half road.

In the interim and until such time as the neighbouring sites have been developed this access arrangement is problematic as these half roads are unlikely to be able to safely accommodate the vehicles movements expected to service the development during peak times.

Additionally, the turning manoeuvres indicated on the architectural plans cannot be accommodated without driving into our property, and no consent has been given to temporary or permanent works within our site.

### **Inadequacies of Documentation on Exhibition**

There are a number of inadequacies with the documentation that has been included in the exhibition package that make an informed assessment of the proposal difficult:

- The survey plan is illegible as only Sheet 1 has been included whereas Sheets 2-7 which have not been included presumably provide a greater scale and legible text.
- The architectural plans do not provide any measurements from natural ground level making precise measurement of the building height and impact on the adjoining properties difficult.
- There are significant inconsistencies between the masterplan and the architectural plans. Building locations are substantially changed, land uses have been relocated and parking areas, bus layby and access arrangements are different.

### **An Undesirable Precedent**

The development of an intensive non-residential land use within a low-density residential area proposes amenity, traffic and visual impacts that undermine the precinct planning and desired future character of the Precinct which presents an undesirable precedent for the development of the area.

### **Devaluation of Adjacent Residential Lands**

The significant overdevelopment of the site is inconsistent with the planning controls and the vision for the Riverstone Precinct. Current and future purchasers of residential land within the Precinct should rightly expect that the low-density character of the area envisaged in the precinct planning and the planning controls should be protected and enhanced by any development proposal. Any deviation presents a devaluation of the vision and can be expected to impact property values.

**Conclusion**

There are significant deficiencies with the development as proposed and the documentation exhibited not least of which is that owner's consent has not been obtained for the whole of the development.

We would welcome the opportunity to discuss our concerns further with the Department and would appreciate being kept informed of the status of this application.

Should you have any questions or require any further clarifications please don't hesitate to contact me on 0406 338 822 or at [ritchie@ua.com.au](mailto:ritchie@ua.com.au)

Yours sincerely



Ritchie Perera