

**THE HILLS SHIRE COUNCIL**

3 Columbia Court, Baulkham Hills NSW 2153  
PO Box 7064, Baulkham Hills BC NSW 2153

Telephone +61 2 9843 0555  
Facsimile +61 2 9843 0409

DX 9966 Norwest

Email [council@thehills.nsw.gov.au](mailto:council@thehills.nsw.gov.au)  
[www.thehills.nsw.gov.au](http://www.thehills.nsw.gov.au)

ABN No. 25 034 494 656

12 January 2018

Mr Peter McManus  
Department of Planning and Environment  
Team Leader School Infrastructure Assets  
GPO Box 39  
SYDNEY NSW 2001

Your Ref: SSD 8344

Attention: Iona Cameron

**K-6 Public School – Nos. 120-126 Hezlett Road, Kellyville**

---

I refer to your letter dated 14 December 2017 seeking comment in relation to the Applicant's Response to Submissions of the abovementioned State Significant Development.

As identified in previous correspondence, Council staff remain concerned with the reliance on on-street parking and the appropriateness of the kiss and drop zones given the size and location of the school. Should the Department support the limited on-site parking provided and kiss and drop zone on Hezlett Road, it is recommended that the Department of Education be required to undertake appropriate road works such as a sealed shoulder on Hezlett Road that would facilitate a useable kiss and drop in time for the school to open. Further, 'No Parking' signs will permit set downs and pick ups until all the adjacent roads are built as Hezlett Road on its own will not provide the space required for the demand. The school should also make provision for a signalised crossing on Hezlett Road given its status as a sub-arterial road upon opening.

These works must be added to the scope of the proposal and an amended engineering plan prepared and submitted showing this. The response to submissions letter still wrongly assumes Hezlett Road fronting the site is planned to be a "town centre road" not a sub-arterial road. The DCP clearly shows which part of Hezlett Road forms part of the sub-arterial road network and which part is a town centre road (namely, that part in front of the actual town centre further north). The response to submissions letter calls for either a marked pedestrian crossing or a signalised pedestrian crossing on Hezlett Road without considering the warrants or actual delivery of either as part of this planned development.

Significant concern also remains regarding the non-provision of DCP Roads within the site. The site owner has an obligation to provide these roads to facilitate orderly development of the precinct. If these roads are not to be provided and the ILP varied, the Applicant shall demonstrate how adjoining sites or land owned by the Department of Education, surplus to this application (foreshadowed to be sold), could be reasonably development in accordance with the planning controls applying to the land. Given the encumbrance of road construction, concern would be raised in relation to the feasibility of these development sites.

The response to submissions letter provides some commentary on this matter, however it links it to future/ planned applications, arrangements and an assumption that someone else will deal

with it on the basis that "there is a high demand for land in the precinct". From an orderly development perspective this is not considered sufficient.

It should be noted in relation to comments provided in relation to Mossop Way that Council staff have made no agreements to construct the Mossop Way link Road to Hezlett Road and this form part of this application. The completion of this missing link, along with the turning head at the end of Thorogood Boulevard, are needed at an absolute minimum in order to at least complete that part of the pre-planned road network and in response to the changes to the ILP planned as part of the development of the school. Council has received complaints from local residents with respect to these two roads now, before the additional traffic and on-street parking demand generated by the planned school need to be taken into account also.

In relation to Thorogood Boulevard, the Applicant makes the comment that the cul-de-sac area could be used as a pick up/drop off area within the school grounds. The cul-de-sac diameter provided is the minimum to allow a waste collection vehicle to turn around without the need to reverse (which is a Council requirement). The cul-de-sac would need to be signposted "no parking" in order to comply with this intent. This would mean the use of this area as the only drop off area until Hezlett Road is upgraded is unreasonable further justifying the need for the works in Hezlett Road noted earlier. The response to submissions letter notes an intent to dedicate this cul-de-sac to the public as public road as part of the planned development.

A plan showing the proposed new site boundary (namely, a subdivision plan) is required. As above, Council already receives complaints about parked vehicles blocking driveways and the existing (temporary) turning facility at the southern end of Thorogood Boulevard now. This issue must be properly addressed as part of the planned school development and in response to the fact the school seeks to remove the planned extension of this road as called for by the ILP. The plans show bins stored along the edge of the roadway, which means waste collection is expected to occur from the cul-de-sac contrary to the intent of providing for this turning area.

The actual planned extent of the cul-de-sac shown on the submitted plan extends into the existing road verge north of the site too. This would impact on the two properties on either side immediately to the north and reduce the verge area (minimum 3.5m). The cul-de-sac and associated verge area must be provided wholly within the subject site as advised previously.

The stormwater report still refers to managing stormwater with respect to the Upper Parramatta River Catchment Trust OSD Handbook and the need to balance pre-development and post development runoff. As advised previously:

*The North Kellyville Development Control Plan applies to this site/ development. The Development Control Plan has a very clear set of deemed to comply standards relating to both detention and water quality which are not met. The Development Control Plan does give the option of a site specific stormwater management strategy, however this needs to be accompanied by appropriate calculations and modelling using DRAINS and MUSIC respectively to demonstrate compliance with the overarching targets also set out in the Development Control Plan.*

In order to progress this matter, Council staff have compared the proposal against the deemed to comply standards from the DCP. Accounting for Hipwell Avenue and the residual land on the eastern side of this road along with Prentice Avenue being excluded the effective site area is approximately 3.228 hectares. Based on this site area and accounting for the roadside swales that will eventually be provided if/ when Hipwell Avenue and Prentice Avenue adjacent are constructed, the stormwater management measures proposed would appear to provide sufficient treatment. The stormwater management measures proposed includes the 900 cubic metre OSD storage tank, the 22.5 cubic metre rainwater reuse tank, 200 metres of grassed swale, 10 enviropods (or an approved equivalent) and the jellyfish chamber (or an approved equivalent). With respect to this however, there are still discrepancies that need to be addressed:

- The stormwater report refers to 900 cubic metres of OSD storage however the stormwater plan shows only 634.5 cubic metres of storage.
- The stormwater report refers to a 12.5 cubic metre rainwater tank however the stormwater plan refers to a 22.5 cubic metre rainwater tank.
- The stormwater plan still does not show what roof areas are intended to drain to the rainwater reuse tank.
- The grassed swales are still not shown on the stormwater plan (contrary to the response to submissions letter).

The stormwater plan does not include the detail previously requested for the stormwater connection to Hipwell Avenue, however noting that these works within an existing dedicated public road will require separate approval from Council under the Roads Act 1993 this matter could be dealt with post determination if needed:

*The existing pits and pipes need to be identified via survey and reflected on the plans to show that the pipe sizes and levels included on the design will actually work.*

Should you have any questions please contact Robert Buckham, Development Assessment Coordinator on 9843 0267 or Greg Samardzic, Senior Town Planner on 9843 0276.

Yours faithfully



Paul Osborne

**MANAGER DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT**