

SUBMISSION 2

From: Davies Family [daviesjcs@bigpond.com]**Sent:** Tuesday, 21 January 2003 7:31 PM**To:** Committee, Public Works (REPS)**Cc:** Victoria Clay; Phil & Mary Craine; Kate Rendle; Joan Lambert; Jeremy Oliver; Doug Hawke; Craig Tindall; Carol Foster; Anne Crisp**Subject:** Dept of Defence Land at Adamstown Heights
Attention Mr Phil Miles ,

Dear Phil ,

I am the Secretary of the Adamstown Residents Actions Group and wish to respond to your advertisement in the Newcastle Herald of the 11th January 2003 . Firstly the residents of Adamstown are naturally saddened by the bush fires in Canberra and I trust that you and your family were not affected by the tragedy.

In respect of the Defence Department land our view is that the proposal represents an over development of the site and to this end we have presented to the Newcastle City Council the following concerns (see attachment below) .

The crux of the residents concerns relate to the over development of the site as proposed by the DHA . While our proposal (see attachment) relates to the DHA plans (simply because we have been told that the development will happen) , the review by the Standing Committee on Public Works gives us some faith that perhaps the logic behind the proposal might be explored and exposed as an uncommercial proposal that exposes DHA to risk in the current financial environment while reducing the amenity of residents.

Firstly :

Defence Housing has told residents that while they intend to develop this site , that within 5 years they intend to sell off most of the housing reducing their involvement to 30 % ... clearly their aim is to reap profits from the development

Question : Why not simply subdivide this valuable site (if the site was developed into larger holdings overlooking the Golf Links the land would be worth more , maybe \$250 - \$300K per block and DHA would on a 40 block (rather than 72) development receive ~\$10 M. This would avoid the creation of a substandard ghetto environment at high cost, when a superior development could be achieved , maybe incorporating the 30% of lots for the DHA). The residents of Adamstown would be happy with a development that was less dense (see our concerns) .

Secondly

DHA's cost benefit review fails to recognise the real community cost associated with their proposal . Residents have repeatedly pointed out the safety and environment risks arising from the DHA development . Residents are painfully aware of the safety issue that the DHA proposal will bring to motorists on Brunner Road if this new over developed estate is allowed to proceed . The whole issue of traffic flows has been treated in a very shallow way .

Thirdly

DHA has ignored the community concerns expressed by residents over the alienation of the adjoining Merewether Golf Club and have ignored the safety issues impacting residents of the proposed estate.

The attached letter to the Newcastle City Council cover many of our other issue .

We are a community based organisation with few resources and none of the sophistication of the DHA , but we trust that the JSC on PW will look closely at the logic behind the DHA's proposal and take into account the legitimate concerns of the residents of Adamstown .

Kind Regards

John Davies

Hon. Secretary ARAG

02 49 430661
0417 251 863

Attachment.

ADAMSTOWN RESIDENTS ACTION GROUP

8 Montrose Avenue Adamstown Heights 2289 - Email daviesjcsg@bigpond.com

25th November 2002

The General Manager

Ms Janet Dore

Newcastle City Council

Administrative Centre

King Street

Newcastle 2300

Re: Brunker Road - Defence Land DCP Process

Dear Janet ,

At the Quarterly Meeting of the Adamstown Residents Action Group on the 4th November , residents many of whom have participated in the two recent meetings with the Department of Defence Housing on the 21st and 28th October , reviewed the proposal to date and expressed concerns about the process being undertaken by Defence Housing and the Council . While both bodies might consider that consultation with the community is occurring , residents unanimously are of the view that none of the concerns expressed by residents on the 21st October or again on the 28th October are being incorporated into the DCP process . This letter aims to summarise the community concerns on this matter .

1) The process

As mentioned above residents are unanimous in their view that DHA and the Council are ignoring the views of residents in the proposal developed to date .Residents are concerned that the DCP being developed inadequately addresses the impact of the proposed development on the surrounding area , while simultaneously ignoring the fact that the surrounding area will impact the amenity of residents in this new area . We believe that DHA is ignoring the real practical problems that this development will have on the Adamstown Community .

2) Density Levels

While the DHA may claim that the proposed development of 72 lots is within the Council's guidelines , residents argue that this fails to reflect the fact that urban consolidation is occurring throughout the area . In addition the mixed use nature of the area further compounds the problem for this site . Adjacent to the site is a school meaning that daily large numbers of students and parents are drawn to the area , across the road is a doctors surgery complex that already brings large numbers of people into the area , and across the road the Taylor's Cycles site is up for redevelopment we understand into more medium density housing .

We note that in an earlier public meeting Jim Davies (NCC's Town Planning) advised residents that this site

could accommodate 40 - 50 residents (the Council's official records record this comment). We ask why now the Council and DHA should be considering an increased density of 50% , when densities throughout the area have already increased since Jim Davies made that comment.

2) Access , Parking & Safety .

Residents strongly oppose the current proposal to channel all traffic through a proposed round about in Brunker Road . The topography of the area is not suitable for such a round about . Issues include

- Traffic volume already on Brunker Road is such that access out of the site will be severely limited (of a morning cars bank up past Rifle Street (the site of the proposed round-about)) .

- Residents wish to draw the Councils attention to bus route 334 that uses Rifle Street. Our view is that a safe turning circle will not be achieved using the round about proposal.

- Access distances between two access points will be very short , and is expected to result in further loss of parking in the area . Currently the eastern side of Brunker Road is used by employees and patients to the doctors surgery (based on verbal approval from the Council) , if these spaces are lost we would expect this traffic to move into the proposed estate.

- Development of another access into Lockyer Street was considered by most residents as desirable to spread the traffic bottleneck that is proposed . Reducing the development size and increasing the on site parking would assist by mitigating these problems .

- Any access to Brunker Road should however be through Military Road , by way of traffic lights . This would also assist the Department of Defence , where training nights on Tuesday and Friday result in large volumes of traffic coming into and leaving the area .

- Finally pedestrian access seems to have been ignored in the proposal .

3) Internal Roads

While DHA was rather vague on the proposed road width we understand that the development is looking at minimum road widths (5.2 m) to maximise the number of lots . Although DHA claim that onsite parking exists they clearly have not allowed sufficient room for visitors (a development of 72 houses is likely to have needs for service vehicles , social functions where will these people park ?)

4) Open Space

The Council's 1999 motion called for a development with useable open space (that is active open space) . The proposal places the open space adjacent to the Merewether Golf Course . This area is not useable for children and their mothers ,due to the risk of injury from golf balls . Residents agree that the area adjacent to the Golf Club should be open space but not active open space . The development needs active open space of around 10% of the total site .5 Hectare.

5) View Corridors

The previous Council's motion called for retention of view corridors . DHA's only attempt to address this issue is by aligning two roads with the Golf Course , while ignoring significant view corridors enjoyed by all Novocastrians from Brunker Road through to the city . We request that a proper assessment of significant corridors be undertaken .

6) Landscaping

The community request that significant trees on the site should be secured and that attention to retaining a significant nature strip along Brunker Road should be part of the plan

In summary residents consider that the proposal is a gross over development of the site and that insufficient work has been done to assess the impact of this proposal on the local area . While DHA and the Council claim that they have prepared their proposals based on studies of the area , residents are sceptical of these statements as the recommendations proposed fly in the face of our day to day experience .We seek that the Council as a minimum require that new studies of traffic, parking , sewerage and environmental impact should be undertaken and that residents should be provided with copies of these studies for comment before the Council approves any DCP for the site .

While we await circulation of the draft DCP we consider it necessary to signal to Council the general dissatisfaction of the Community with the proposal being promoted and the process to date .

Yours Sincerely

John Davies (Secretary ARAG)