Date

Ms Lucy Turnbull Chairperson Greater Sydney Commission Draft District Plans PO Box 257 Parramatta NSW 2124

Email: engagement@gsc.nsw.gov.au

Dear Ms Turnbull,

#### Draft South West District Plan – Council's Response

Council would like to express its appreciation to the Greater Sydney Commission (the Commission) for the opportunity to review the draft South West District Plan (draft Plan) and would also like to acknowledge the value in being able to have staff input into the preparation of the documentation through technical working group participation.

Council was also pleased to provide the Commission with the assistance of its Executive Planner to help draft the Plan, and as you would be aware, has agreed to commit Ms Puntillo's continued support over the next 12 months.

The task bestowed upon the Commission to prepare the District Plan over a relatively short time frame, was extraordinary, and Council would like to congratulate the Commission and the hard work of the District Commissioner Sheridan Dudley in bringing the draft plan to public exhibition. Council would also like to acknowledge the assistance of the Deputy Commissioner, Professor Geoff Roberts in a number of key discussions.

Overall, Campbelltown City Council views the draft Plan as a strong planning commentary for the future of the South West District, including the Campbelltown Local Government Area, which goes some way in framing a response to the challenges and opportunities that will confront the South West. The re-introduction of place based strategic planning is supported and Council trusts that the relevant government agencies and the NSW Government itself is committed to ensuring respectful placed based development outcomes that may not always be supported by a planning system which up until now has been increasingly focused on 'templating' planning controls in the interest of greater efficiency such as for example State Environmental Planning Policies including the Sydney Region Growth Centres, the Exempt and Complying Development Codes and the Affordable Rental Housing SEPPs. Such

'streamlining' is not always in the interest of good planning outcomes for specific places and different circumstances.

Following the high media profile granted to the District Planning process, briefings by the District Commissioner, and a range of statements by elected and public officials, Council looked forward to greeting the draft plan with great anticipation.

What Council had expected was a renewed and bold approach to land use planning, integrated with infrastructure, economic and environmental "constructs" that committed to forging opportunities for a liveable, productive, connected, and socially just district and city.

Largely speaking and for Campbelltown in particular, the draft Plan seeks to consolidate upon a range of current land use planning initiatives. Further, the efficacy of the draft Plan is overwhelmingly constrained by what presents as a lack of commitment to critical infrastructure to deliver on the range of planning outcomes that are set down in the draft plan's commentary, especially concerning:

- transport and connectivity
- economic and employment development and
- health infrastructure.

It is of concern to Council that the South West has endured for countless years the struggle of seeking Government and Agency support for critical "enabling infrastructure" to facilitate and support extensive new housing development.

The disappointment over this particular aspect of the draft Plan is aggravated given the statutory requirement to be imposed upon the Councils to commit to delivering on housing and employment targets.

Without "enabling infrastructure" at a regional level, such as for instance arterial road upgrades, arterial road connections, new rail connections, upgrades to health infrastructure and more direct and positive intervention by the NSW Government into employment creation and diversification, the South West District cannot and will not achieve its full potential nor deliver on the targets.

On a positive though, Council notes the draft Plan's proposals seeking to enhance the supply of affordable housing opportunities and these are welcomed, although in Council's view, need to be strengthened.

Council has drawn the conclusion that the draft Plan only goes part of the way to achieving the outcomes it had hoped for. The Plan needs to be bold and demonstrate in tangible terms to the community, to the development sector, and to investors the means as to how and when the Commission and the NSW Government intend to deliver on its narrative for the new South West.

In response to the exhibition of the draft plan, Council has structured its submission around a number of key themes:

- Role of the GSC
- Planning presumptions future urban growth
- Structure planning and spatial organisation
- Alignment of agency planning, funding and delivery with district priorities

- Infrastructure funding and delivery
- Economic and employment development
- Inter and intra district connectivity
- Housing affordability
- Sustainability actions
- General.

# 1. Role of the GSC

The draft Plan highlights the complexity of good strategic planning at the metropolitan and district level in particular. Moreover, the district planning process, as much and as important as the draft Plan itself, has highlighted the case for much more closely integrated planning and co-ordination of the work being done by:

- a wide range of State Government Agencies
- councils
- the Federal Government and its Agencies.

These stakeholders are critical in shaping and achieving the types of outcomes promised by the draft Plans and whom have often not understood the importance of spatial based planning outcomes derived from their organisationally "issue" based activities. This co-ordination must relate to long and shorter term budget forecasting, resource planning and allocation (programming), governance – decision making and accountability, and communication.

The role of the Commission in managing these complex interrelationships in a well governed and effective manner cannot be understated (and for the sake of clarity, understanding and certainty), must be better explained to the community in order for it to have confidence in the district and metropolitan planning process moving forward.

Council would seek assurances as to the "responsibilities" the Commission will carry forward from here and the governance framework in which it will work, in terms of:

- a. Controlling State Planning Policy as far as managing implications for District Planning outcomes including holistically applied policies (such as those for Affordable Rental Housing, Growth Centres and the Standard Instrument Template), Priority Growth Area Investigations, planning, infrastructure funding and the like.
- b. Influencing/controlling resource allocation to regional infrastructure projects what will the project prioritisation process within and between districts be; how will they be tempered by State Agency programming and Treasury Budgetary processes.
- c. Planning for and managing Council inputs and performance against targets, compliance with the District Plans and the like.
- d. Managing community and political inputs into the planning process.

# 2. Planning presumptions – future urban growth

Whilst Council appreciates the honesty and forthrightness expressed in the Plan's narrative for the South West's future (of which much is supported by Council) it is concerned not to see any in-depth analysis/audit and discussion of the District's capacity to continue to absorb

the extent of future urban growth that is contemplated by the draft Plan. The concern is somewhat heightened in light of the absence of any clear and specific commitment to the delivery and funding of enabling critical infrastructure, despite the prescriptive approach taken with respect to housing and employment targets that are intended to be imposed upon local government authorities.

The draft Plan accepts as a given, without any apparent clear and detailed comprehensive capability nor capacity assessment and discussion, the extraordinary urban growth scenario already painted for the South West District under existing or proposed State Government Planning Policy, being one of continued and significantly scaled additional housing supply, albeit framed in a policy context of improving the diversity of housing type.

There are verifiable local community concerns in Campbelltown over a range of future urban growth capacity related issues, not the least significant including:

- the poor performance and paucity of regional and local road networks (continuing state of interruption and delay) under growing demands
- lack of public transport connectivity to key destinations
- less than optimum regional air quality
- unsustainable housing affordability for middle to lower income households
- less than optimum accessibility to places where jobs are located (distance, travel time, cost, inconvenience, family separation, health impacts)
- employment sustainability (retaining and growing new jobs)
- the lack of jobs located "close to home" in the district (a widening local jobs deficit)
- poor jobs diversity
- continuing degradation of the natural environment and loss of biodiversity.

Many of these concerns currently exist in light of:

- a range of historical "infrastructure backlogs" where both Government and Councils continue to address "catch up" needs (transport, roads, health infrastructure)
- air quality in the Macarthur Region
- above metropolitan average "social disadvantage"
- historic and extraordinary over supply of public housing, mostly in concentrated large scale estates
- beyond metropolitan average commuting times and distances.

Council has not had the opportunity to discuss with the Commission in any great depth, the implications of these attributes for planning and resourcing future urban growth.

Unfortunately, the draft Plan does not appear to question at an appropriate level of detail, the important issues relating to the District's sustainable environmental carrying capacity, nor the infrastructure capacity and transport connectivity capability to accommodate the extent and nature of future urban housing growth proposed for the District.

This goes to the question of not just planning for the integration of catalyst infrastructure to facilitate new urban development but the actual funding, delivery and timing of the provision of such infrastructure critical for successful, sustainable and productive urban development.

Key areas of Council concern relate to road, public transport and health infrastructure in particular.

Targets for new development and housing supply can only be supported by Council when:

- a. There is an accepted understanding of adequate infrastructure capacity being available to accommodate existing and future predicted needs.
- b. Regional air and water quality standards can be predicted with confidence, to be able to satisfied (with or without mitigation strategies in place).
- c. There is much greater certainty with respect to future job creation within the district that is both relevant to the capabilities of and accessible to the district community.

#### 3. Structure planning and spatial organisation

#### a. Need for a South West District Structure Plan

It is unsatisfactory that the draft plan does not include a spatially based structure plan for the district to illustrate major places, features, connections and the geographical positioning and representation of the Commission's identified priorities.

Such a structure plan is needed to communicate clearly and succinctly the land use, transport, economic and social, as well as environmental dimensions of the draft Plan. A structure plan would spatially illustrate:

- the geographical relationship that exists between key places within and near to the district including:
  - Campbelltown-Macarthur and Liverpool Strategic Centres
  - district centres including Ingleburn (which Council is requesting for inclusion as a District Centre) and Wilton New Town
  - major employment lands/economic hubs including employment precincts such as the Minto and Ingleburn Industrial Areas as well as the Moorebank freight and logistics precinct
  - major environmental assets including the Georges and Nepean Rivers and bushland corridors, the Scenic Hills, the Dharawal National Park and the Australian Botanic Garden Mount Annan
  - major residential living areas existing and proposed
  - significant Community Infrastructure such as Campbelltown and Liverpool Hospitals, Western Sydney University, TAFE, and Campbelltown Sports Stadium
  - existing major connecting corridors (road, rail and bus)
  - metropolitan rural lands.
- the location of current strategic public and private proposals such as the:
  - Western Sydney Airport
  - Leppington Enterprise Corridor
  - Priority Growth Areas including the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area and Wilton New Town
  - Glenfield to Macarthur Priority Urban Renewal Corridor Strategy
  - Proposed South West Rail Link Extension
  - Moorebank Intermodal and freight facilities

- the location of the GSC's strategic priorities including:
  - Health and Education Super Precincts at Campbelltown-Macarthur and Liverpool
  - Campbelltown-Macarthur as a Medical University City
  - Badgally Road connection from South West Growth Centre into Campbelltown CBD
  - Spring Farm Road connection
  - Upgrade to Campbelltown Public Hospital (which Council is requesting be expedited)
  - Connection of the South West Rail Link Extension from Narellan to Campbelltown/Macarthur (which Council is requesting)
  - Protection of the Scenic Hills.

A structure plan would also more simply convey to the community some of the Commission's reasoning behind a number of the important initiatives the Commission proposes as included in its commentary for the South West District.

# b. The South West as Part of the Western City

The map included in the draft plan describes the Western City but a significant part of the City of Campbelltown and much of the Wollondilly Shire are excluded from the description – this is both surprising and strategically flawed. It appears that much of the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area and Wilton New Town appear not to have been given appropriate consideration for inclusion within the Western City, despite the NSW Government's intentions to locate in the order of 160,000+ people in those urban release areas in the future. This is a major challenge for the draft plan and is similar to the concern expressed by the Council to the recently exhibited Western Sydney Rail Needs Scoping Study.

# c. The Potential to Create the Macarthur City

The proposal for a polycentric metropolitan model for Sydney is acknowledged and supported.

However, Council considers that the proposed third city "construct" – the Western City, struggles with a number of shortcomings including:

- the sheer size and geographical spread of the proposed Western City (especially when compared to its more compact central and eastern city counterparts). The distance between Windsor Downs in the north of the Western City and Wilton New Town in the south measures some 80 kilometres
- the existence of many separate well-developed and "distinct" communities of interest (e.g. The Macarthur community) across the "western city" area
- little acknowledgment of the history behind the form and structure of the South West District, much of which has been influenced by a 'corridor planning model' commenced in the 1970s (Sydney Region Outline Plan) and taken up most recently in the Glenfield to Macarthur Priority Urban Renewal Corridor and the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area

What the map shows in a relative sense, is formal recognition of very compact Central City, a consolidated eastern City and a 'sprawling' Western City, that by any geospatial measure will

struggle to be efficient in terms of connectivity and distances to be spanned to 'join communities across the Western City.

Indeed, Campbelltown is located closer (geographically and also in terms of travel time by road and public transport) to the Sydney CBD (42 kilometres) and also to the Parramatta CBD (32 kilometres) than it is compared for instance to the further reaches of the Western City, such as Windsor Downs (53 kilometres).

Council would seek a discussion with the Commission over the potential for an alternative (yet complementary) metropolitan city morphology – including a fourth city, the Macarthur City.

This proposal could complement the third city (focussed on the Western Sydney Airport and supported by the more proximate Liverpool and Penrith Strategic Centres); result in a more compact city form; be more consistent with the geographic scale of the eastern and central cities; and further galvanise the Macarthur community as a discernible social identity. Additional factors that lead Council to want to explore further the possibility of the Macarthur City include:

- the true "community" value of historic and proposed investment by governments and the private sector in "regional city" level infrastructure at Campbelltown-Macarthur such as the Campbelltown Public Hospital, Campbelltown College of TAFE, Western Sydney University, Macarthur Square Regional Shopping Centre, the Campbelltown Arts Centre, the Campbelltown Sports Stadium, and the Macarthur Sports Centre of Excellence
- the significance of Campbelltown-Macarthur's relative locational separation from more central metropolitan Sydney, and reinforcing its claim as a true regional city centre positioned to service the South West Growth Corridor and Macarthur Region, a major part of the South West Growth Centre and beyond to the Southern Highlands. This was the strategic planning scenario that was painted for Campbelltown and the South West many years ago, being seen and treated as a corridor satellite city with connectivity with Parramatta, Liverpool, and the Illawarra
- the level of co-operation between the Macarthur Councils as evidenced by the long standing MACROC organisation.

Importantly, the degree to which the Western Sydney Airport assists in the development of the Macarthur City is not seen to be jeopardised by not being included as part of the third city.

The Macarthur City could comprise the local government areas of Campbelltown, Camden and Wollondilly, which when taken together, could have a capacity to grow in the order of 600,000 people (under current planning) noting that Canberra's population today is approximately 400,000 people.

It is important that the Commission understands Council is not rejecting the proposed three city metropolitan model, but would like to take the opportunity to discuss an alternative fourth city model and listen to any counter arguments that would address its curiosity over whether the three city model is in the best interests of the Macarthur regional community across the longer term.

# 4. Alignment of agency planning, funding and delivery with district priorities

One key concern that Council holds with the draft district plan, relates to what appears to be the absence of a comprehensive alignment between government agency planning and resourcing for infrastructure that has significance for the future of Campbelltown and the South West more generally, including a number of the priorities for the district as espoused by the draft Plan.

This is evidenced by the lack of commitment by the draft plan to infrastructure imperatives that would critically help deliver on its "narrative" including for example:

- the extension of the proposed South West Rail Link extension from Narellan to Campbelltown-Macarthur Regional City Centre
- the extension of Badgally Road into the Campbelltown Strategic Centre CBD across the T2 Southern railway line.

These two examples are completely consistent with the "connectivity" imperative presented in the draft plan and are both 'enabling' mechanisms supporting the long term sustainability of the Campbelltown-Macarthur Strategic Centre, new economic investment and much needed job creation.

Another important issue relates to what appears to be the absence (in the District Plan) of any description of the integration of Health Infrastructure Planning (including infrastructure programming) with the location, scale, nature and timing of the extraordinary urban growth that the draft plan promises for the South West District.

In light of 'A Plan for Growing Sydney' together with planning that is underway with the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area urban release precincts (more than 160,000 people including Wilton New Town) Council was anticipating this critical need would have been addressed by the draft Plan. At the least, Council would have hoped that the attention paid by the draft plan to road and transport needs would have been similarly reflected as part of the draft Plan's narrative for health infrastructure, such as the upgrade of Campbelltown Public Hospital. Council was also hoping for additional detail concerning planning for future paediatric facilities and services in the South West District.

To address the expectations of the community and truly reflect the integration of land use, population and infrastructure planning, the draft plan must seek to articulate the alignment of infrastructure planning by government agencies with district and metropolitan priorities identified by the Commission.

# 5. Infrastructure funding and delivery

A further issue for Council relates to the perpetuation of the current approach to funding for regional roads and transport infrastructure in the South West District, which is discriminatory and:

- contributes to the inflation of the price of housing in South Western Sydney thereby reducing affordability and
- transfers the costs of new infrastructure, the need for all of which is not generated by newly settling households in greenfield urban release areas, to those home buyers.

Within the draft Plan, there is some discussion relating to new funding models including value capture, without any real admission that the current SIC levy approach is indeed a "type" of value capture that works against the basic social and economic interests of new South West households (particularly those starting out in greenfield urban release area communities). This infrastructure funding method disadvantages these new communities, especially when compared to the scale and nature of government investment in infrastructure (past, present and probably future) enjoyed by people settling in more central metropolitan locations.

Council would like to highlight a recent example whereby this approach to regional level infrastructure funding has been applied by the NSW Government. i.e. Upgrade of Appin Road to accommodate the proposed Mt Gilead Urban Release Area.

Planning for the rezoning of land with potential for 1700 new residential allotments was delayed for some time in the face of a delay to secure funding for the upgrade of Appin Road in response to a planning proposal that Council has been dealing with. This is despite such land being included on the NSW Sydney Metropolitan Urban Development program since the 1990s.

More recently, the land has been included as part of the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area.

The Mt Gilead site has a long frontage to Appin Road which is the major arterial connector to Campbelltown-Macarthur. The Local Environmental Study concluded (and it was not challenged by the RMS or Transport for NSW) that the planning proposal triggered the need for an upgrade of Appin Road. The proportion of need/benefit attributed to the proposed development was in the order of 50%. Transport for NSW and the RMS were unable to support the progression of the planning proposal and rezoning of the land unless 100% of the cost was funded by the developer, claiming that funds to accommodate the 'public' or rather non-developer proportion of the cost were unavailable.

Council understands that the most recently adopted approach to funding the required Appin Road upgrade is proposed to be via a Special Infrastructure Contribution Levy applicable to the development (and other future development across the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area urban release area precincts). Council understands that the NSW Government at this stage does not intend to fund the non-developer related proportion of the cost of the Appin Road Upgrade from general revenue. There has been an announcement that some contribution will be made to the project under the NSW Housing Acceleration Fund.

This essentially translates into an outcome that suggests there is some significant degree of reliance by the Government and its Roads/Transport/Planning Agencies for the development sector to wholly or almost wholly - dependent upon the circumstances, fund regional road upgrades and extensions, when some degree of development need for such upgrade already exists. A similar example exists with the Menangle Park Urban Release Area rezoning and the funding of the Spring Farm Link Road.

New home seekers (in greenfield urban release area environments) are paying "more for less" compared to their inner city counterparts that take the benefit of historic government investment in roads and traffic management facilities as well public transport infrastructure, such as for instance light rail and metro - rail and the like.

South West residents do not enjoy the opportunity to make use of such convenient facilities, which can be demonstrated have been and are being developed in areas that already enjoy

high transport and accessibility "amenity" as well as a higher concentration of services, facilities and employment opportunities.

This inequity is serious and needs to be addressed by the South West District Plan.

#### 6. Economic and employment development

It is indeed a sad indictment of historical planning for the South West District that the draft plan admits in respect of Greater Sydney, the proportion of total jobs that are knowledge and professional services related amount to 32%, whilst in the South West District it is just 16%.

In an overall sense, the South West District Productivity Priorities appear to be sound, but again, Council is requesting the draft Plan to be strengthened, to mandate the need for government to pro-actively intervene to ensure the creation of new jobs and the right types of jobs to sustain appropriate and accessible employment outcomes for the South West District.

For instance, to simply state that one of the priorities of the District Plan is "planning for jobs target ranges for strategic and district centres, by planning for the growth of centres" is overly generic. This conveys an understanding to the community that growth of the centres is the panacea for job creation, but without clearly identifying how that growth will be achieved, and what the Commission articulates as being its specific and targeted strategy for the District.

Similar observations can be made with respect to the following statements relating to the draft plan's productivity priorities:

"growing and diversifying the economic opportunities in the District's strategic centres:

growing the diversity, level and depth of jobs and vibrancy of Campbelltown-Macarthur strategic centre"

Council acknowledges that the Campbelltown CBD is in need of renewal and activation, just as it recognises the imperative of enhancing centre access, legibility and permeability. It is aware of the urban growth potential both within and surrounding the Campbelltown-Macarthur Strategic Centre.

Council welcomes the Commission's commitment for the NSW to collaborate with Council on planning for the Campbelltown-Macarthur CBD and delivering on key opportunities and supports all of the potential initiatives listed that such collaboration could focus upon.

However, Council would look towards a direct commitment by the Commission and NSW Government for the delivery of the required critical infrastructure assistance, especially in light of some of the "less specific and definite" language used in parts of the draft Plan such as for example:

- "...a potential extension" of Badgally Road into the Campbelltown-Macarthur City Centre"
- "....identify the required land and infrastructure to support the health sector in Campbelltown Hospital surrounds ...."
- ".....the Government is considering the extension of the South West Rail link to connect to the T2 Southern line.

In addition, Council would seek the support of the Commission in requesting Transport for NSW to consider its commuter car parking strategy to incorporate the potential for remote satellite parking facilities (located outside of the Campbelltown-Macarthur Strategic Centre), in places such as the South West Growth Centre, with rapid bus connections linking to the Campbelltown and Macarthur Stations. This would free up significant public landholdings at key CBD locations, for alternative and more productive economic uses and reduce unproductive vehicular traffic congestion on the local and arterial road network in and around the CBD.

The draft plan acknowledges the capacity of the Campbelltown-Macarthur Health and Education Super Precinct to generate significant economic and employment activity, whilst at the same time providing for enhanced facilities for community benefit. However, there are no "super precinct" specific priorities, actions or commitments that are directly focused on planning, establishing and growing the super precinct, with no directly mentioned committed input of NSW Health.

There are of course a number of statements made in the draft Plan which speak in general terms including:

"growing jobs in the health and education sectors -

- promote and grow Campbelltown the emerging health and medical university city
- support the growth of tertiary education opportunities
- encourage additional private hospital development in the strategic, district and local centres"

The draft plan establishes a series of job target ranges for Strategic and District Centres, which by inference will be the responsibility of Council to fulfil, at the least by ensuring sufficient land and floor space opportunities are available.

However, while such accountability for the Council flows from the draft plan, no solid commitment is given by the draft plan for specific 'enabling' actions to be undertaken by the NSW Government nor its agencies, and especially actions relating to critical regional level infrastructure.

Employment generation and diversity is especially important in light of the extraordinary extent of future urban growth that is set to occur, much of which will take place in remote locations (e.g. Greater Macarthur Urban Release Areas and Wilton New Town). Council supports the statement made in the draft Plan:

"facilitate local employment in land release and urban renewal areas"

Again, this is generic statement and doesn't seem to pay any specific respect to a strategy by which this goal can be achieved. Action P17 tasks the Department of Planning and Environment to:

"Set parameters for the delivery of local jobs as a condition of approval for rezoning in new release areas"

Whilst Council welcomes this initiative, it is concerned over the following explanation:

"The planned provision of job opportunities needs to accompany residential growth across the District. Rezoning of new residential release areas needs to be linked to the rezoning and development of land for employment opportunities".

Council is not convinced that just zoning land for employment in new urban release areas, will actually yield the appropriate scale and diversity of employment that the District will require in the future.

New urban release areas by virtue of their more remote location and lack of accessibility, ordinarily generate jobs that relate to locality based and small scale retailing and services. These employment opportunities are not usually of a higher economic or "value add" order, and in any event, a number of them are not brought to fruition for some time after an urban release area has been developed and when population thresholds have been triggered.

A more proactively considered strategy which targets specific areas for employment lands designation needs to be undertaken by the Commission in partnership with the Department of Planning and Environment and Councils as a matter of urgency as existing industrial/manufacturing precincts in the District reach capacity. The supply of new employment lands in the vicinity of the Aerotropolis and the Western and South Western Sydney Priority Growth Areas will in themselves be inadequate to meet the future employment lands needs of the District, especially in light of poor connectivity with communities living in Campbelltown and southwards in the proposed Greater Macarthur urban release areas.

Council was hoping that the draft plan would have been more specifically tailored to the needs of the South West District and be more precise in their attempt to demonstrate how the Commission was intending to create additional job numbers and employment diversity, in light of its more general declarations with respect to:

- the Western Sydney Airport
- the Aerotropolis and Enterprise Corridors
- the Health and Education Super Precincts
- advanced manufacturing.

There is little specificity, and where such does exist, Campbelltown appears to have been 'missed'. For example:

- there is no proposal for a specific job creation/employment development strategy for the District, yet the District contains the Aerotropolis, and two strategic centres
- there is no specific action with respect to the planning/implementation of the Campbelltown- Macarthur Health and Education precinct
- the draft Plan states:

*"Promote and grow Campbelltown – the emerging Health and Medical University City"* 

and whilst Council welcomes this recognition of the Campbelltown-Macarthur Strategic Centre, it is concerned that no specific actions or statements are made as to how this is planned to occur

- there is no specific action with respect to the planning and attraction of new jobs to Campbelltown. There is a general action of "support" for the development and delivery of the Campbelltown CBD transformation plan, but no parameters are specified. i.e. funding and resources, governance, transport, promotion and marketing and the like
- there is no reference or specific action with respect to the means by which new employment will be attracted to the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area including the Glenfield to Macarthur Priority Urban Renewal Corridor. Council notes that the Commission *"will investigate opportunities to create local employment, and how to sequence local employment with the development and delivery of infrastructure"*.... Again, Council would request that the District Plan commit to a specific action for instance: to prepare and implement an economic/employment development strategy for the District
- it is unclear how the South West District's potential as a visitor destination will be leveraged. What is the potential and what is the District's strategy?

In addition, there are no specific actions with respect to the "soft" infrastructure (education and training facilities and programs) that is employment related, yet the capacity of the South West community to equip itself with enhanced skill sets will be absolutely critical to the success of ensuring the new knowledge and professional jobs that are to be created within the District can be competitively accessed by the District's own resident workforce.

There is an important statement in the draft Plan which reads:

"In order to grow the proportion of smart jobs in the District, it is important to grow the skilled workforce by improving access to the relevant vocational educational and training (VET), higher educational facilities and training programs".

Council's concern relates to there being no specific action or strategy that details how "access" will be achieved.

Notwithstanding the above concerns, Council is pleased that the draft plan acknowledges the importance of new job creation and the necessity to generate a greater diversity of employment within the District in the future. This is clearly an issue relating to the District's resilience and strikes at the heart of the social equity "divide" that has separated and continues to "differentiate" the South West from other parts of Sydney.

Creating local jobs and employment diversity are considered to be the cornerstone of sustainability in the South West. Indeed, the creation of a growing supply of locally accessible and diverse job opportunities in the District would contribute towards a more resilient Sydney as a global city.

Other than a noteworthy and exciting commentary supporting the economic investment and job creation opportunities to be spawned from the Western Sydney Airport and associated Leppington Enterprise Corridor and hopes pinned to the possibilities associated with health and education, there is little promised action that is specifically attributed to pro-active job creation and job diversification in the South West, and moreover, in Campbelltown.

Council's concern with this element of the draft Plan is heightened by:

- the poor level of public transport accessibility (currently and in the future based on current planning) to areas earmarked for employment growth (and diversification) such as the Western Sydney Airport, Broader Western Sydney Employment Area and Leppington Enterprise Corridor, for residents of the Campbelltown and Wollondilly local government areas in particular
- the level of regional road congestion that exists in the South West District and the inadequate capacity of the existing and future proposed road network (including east-west and north-south connections) thereby constraining the movement of people between Campbelltown and these employment centres
- the current intentions of the NSW Government (through NSW Property) to sell supposed "surplus" land at the site of Hurlstone Agricultural High School, primarily for residential development to maximise revenue raising opportunities, with only minor land allocation for employment purposes (despite part of that land being understood to form part of an extended Leppington Enterprise Corridor in the longer term)
- no identified commitment by the Government to build the capacity of the existing and future district workforce to be equipped with the skills to be able to equitably compete for those new jobs to be created around the Western Sydney Airport and surrounding employment areas, many of which will be of a higher technological and information order.

Whilst Council welcomes the Commission's commitment for the NSW Government to collaborate with Council on planning for the Campbelltown-Macarthur CBD and delivering on key opportunities, Council must advise that it is proceeding with this work already as a matter of high priority. Council is unaware of what form this assistance may take.

As stated above, there is a need to redress the "divide" created in part by the lack of jobs in the South West particularly when compared to those available in Greater Sydney - 0.33 jobs per resident as compared to 0.52 jobs per resident in 2016.

The draft plan must recommend that immediate and progressive action be taken to ensure that the south west community is:

- supported with structured and affordable education and training opportunities to equip itself to take advantage of forthcoming higher order employment opportunities, and
- connected with direct and convenient road and public transport access to the Aerotropolis (the WSA and surrounding employment generating lands such as the Leppington Enterprise Corridor and the Broader Western Sydney Employment Area), the rest of the Western City, the Central City and the Eastern City.

Whilst Council acknowledges the proposal included in the draft Plan to prepare an economic development strategy for the Western City, there is an imperative for a district economic and employment action plan to be prepared in conjunction with the local councils, immediately. Such a plan needs to address the following matters:

a. There must be an unequivocal and direct commitment by the GSC and the NSW Government for the delivery of the required critical infrastructure to assist Campbelltown-Macarthur in attracting business investment (and therefore creating new jobs).

- b. The Campbelltown Macarthur Strategic Centre must be directly connected by rail to the Western Sydney Airport and other strategic centres surrounding the airport including the north-south rail link (Option 6) and Option 1 (extension of the South West Rail link from Leppington to the airport) as included in the recently exhibited Western Sydney Rail Needs Scoping Study.
- c. Transport for NSW's commuter car parking strategy needs to incorporate the potential for remote commuter parking facilities outside the Campbelltown-Macarthur CBD with rapid bus connections to Campbelltown and Macarthur stations – this would reduce CBD congestion and allow valuable CBD land currently used for commuter parking to be redeveloped for employment generating land uses.
- d. The draft plan must incorporate specific priorities, actions and commitments focussed on planning, establishing and growing the Campbelltown-Macarthur Health and Education Super Precinct to generate significant economic and employment activity, and the provision of enhanced facilities for community benefit – with committed input, support and resourcing from NSW Health – especially relating to future upgrades to Campbelltown Public Hospital and the incorporation of medical research facilities into the precinct.
- e. Specific statements and actions to develop Campbelltown-Macarthur as an emerging Health and Medical University City.
- f. A solid commitment should be included in the draft plan for the NSW Government to undertake specific actions to achieve the vision and priorities set by the draft plan for the funding and/or provision of critical regional level infrastructure paying an economic/employment dividend.
- g. Council seeks an assurance that the NSW Government will support additional mechanisms (in addition to land use zoning) to ensure that rezoning of new residential release areas is delivered concurrently with rezoning and development of land for employment opportunities.
- h. A more proactive strategy which identifies specific areas for employment lands (both greenfield and brownfield sites) to be undertaken collaboratively by the Commission, the Department of Planning and Environment and councils.
- i. Specific actions about how employment related education and training facilities and programs aimed at increasing the qualifications and skills of local residents and the local workforce to populate future diverse job opportunities will be made available/accessible.
- j. A detailed focus on how the district's potential as a visitor destination will be leveraged.

# 7. Inter and intra district connectivity

The draft plan acknowledges the need for effective connectivity within the District as well as between the District and other areas. Better connectivity will maximise the delivery of sustainable planning outcomes for the South West, including future economic investment and the creation of much needed additional and more diverse jobs.

The draft Plan states:

"6% of Greater Sydney's jobs can be accessed by South West District residents within 30 minutes by public transport or private vehicle. This is lower than the 16% average across Greater Sydney"

and

"This level of access creates barriers to jobs, and business investment, as well as social activities, education and other services."

Whilst the commentary is supported, Council is concerned that the major connectivity challenges for the District are not dealt with adequately by the draft plan. There is little translation into discrete actions to establish key north-south and east west linkages that the community can understand and take confidence from.

Enhanced connectivity will assist in redressing the District's flagging resilience and reducing stresses such as:

- increasing travel times
- lost productivity
- poor take up of employment, health and social capacity building opportunities and
- the inter-generational implications of relatively lower level of educational qualification and skills levels.

There is little or ambiguous commitment granted by the draft Plan to:

a. The much needed extension of the South West Rail Link from Narellan to the T2 Southern Line to establish a direct connection between Campbelltown-Macarthur and the Western Sydney Airport, employment areas such as the Broader Western Sydney Employment Area and the Aerotropolis and enhanced connectivity with other strategic centres - especially Penrith and Blacktown as well as Rouse Hill. This matter has been under investigation for a number of years now and yet still the draft plan makes no commitment to this important connection - a fundamental requirement for the South West District Plan to support - unequivocally.

A copy of the Council's submission to the Western Sydney Rail Needs Scoping Study (attached to this submission) outlines Council's priorities for enhanced rail connectivity. Council supports the establishment of a rail connection between Campbelltown-Macarthur, the Western Sydney Airport and on to St Marys and Rouse Hill, thereby better connecting also with the strategic centres of Penrith and Blacktown. This is Option 6 as described in the recently exhibited Scoping Study. There is also support from Council for the extension of the South West Rail Link from Leppington to Western Sydney Airport coupled with the construction of two "Y" links, one directly linking the T2 Southern Line with the South West Rail Link just south of Glenfield. Further details can be obtained from Council's submission to the Scoping Study.

b. The establishment of public transport links (including early stage corridor preservation) between the proposed urban release areas of the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area and including Wilton New Town, and the Campbelltown Macarthur Strategic Centre, including consideration of light rail and strategic bus corridors.

c. The construction of improved links between the South West Growth Centre and the Campbelltown Macarthur Strategic Centre.

The draft Plan's acknowledgement of the Narellan Road congestion issue is welcomed and consistent with the position that Campbelltown City Council has been advocating to the NSW Government for many years.

Indeed, Council welcomed the support of the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) to include Badgally Road in a recent Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that was executed between the two organisations, connected with planning for the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area. That MOU signals the Government's intention to strike a Special Infrastructure Contributions levy (applicable to development within the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area) for the upgrade of Badgally Road. Council was pleased with this step taken by the Department.

However, whilst Council is delighted to read Productivity Action P7 which states:

"Build the Badgally transport connection, including an active transport link".....

Council was surprised and concerned that the draft Plan also makes the statement that:

"Transport for NSW will investigate the Badgally Road extension across the railway line ......"

Council is seeking an unambiguous commitment by the draft Plan to the identification of the Badgally Road upgrade and extension across the railway line and into the Campbelltown CBD as essential and critical regional level infrastructure to bolster the sustainability of the Campbelltown-Macarthur Strategic Centre. Transport for NSW must undertake any investigation and respond with an outcome that recognises the District strategic planning context. Council believes that it is important for the draft plan to make that commitment and provide greater certainty and confidence for residents, businesses and investors that access to the Campbelltown/Macarthur Strategic Centre is important to the Commission, and accordingly can expect the Commission to secure the construction of such infrastructure on the Infrastructure Priority Action List.

Council is mindful of the draft Plan's affirmation that:

"Investment in new infrastructure such as roads, public transport and utilities is core to the District's prosperity. The location of this infrastructure and the timeliness of delivery will significantly influence the potential of this emerging economy"

There is also a case for the draft Plan to call for the serious examination of an improved connection of the South West District to the Illawarra, which should seriously consider the opportunities for completion of the Maldon-Dombarton rail link to the T2 Southern line (including the ARTC Freight Corridor) to accommodate freight and passenger train capacity. This opportunity must be considered in light of a potential direct connection via the future M9 Orbital to better access Western Sydney Airport and possibly a future Western Sydney Intermodal.

# 8. Housing affordability

The draft plan places significant weight on the importance of affordable housing to support the future growth of the Greater Sydney Region and the South West District. It is considered that this is an issue that needs to be discussed at a State level and also within a broader context as housing affordability looked at in isolation will not resolve the problem in the longer-term. Tackling the cost of housing on its own will not address issues relating to quality of life (such as creating attractive and self-sustaining places with a mix of land uses and employment opportunities), nor address the widening social-equity "divide" that exists across metropolitan Sydney.

It is discouraging that the draft Plan appears to lend support to the current NSW Government position of a "one-size-fits-all approach" to addressing housing affordability, such as via a supply led model supplemented with the Affordable Rental Housing SEPP which does not necessarily address local or spatial differences that are clearly demonstrated across different localities across Sydney.

The Commission does not appear to have recognised the significance of some such differences as they affect the South West.

For instance, the AHR SEPP grants significant planning concessions to multi-unit housing and boarding housing development throughout much of the Campbelltown Local Government Area as incentives to encourage the provision of affordable housing. Such concessions presume that such accommodation is located close to centres and or transport routes.

In reality Council has received a number of development applications for affordable housing at locations far remote from centres but within proximity to bus routes. Unfortunately, such bus routes operate only intermittently and not late of an evening/early morning to accommodate prospective occupants of affordable housing schemes such as shift workers in health, manufacturing and the like. Many of these occupants depend upon motor vehicle or motor cycle convenience for travel.

Accordingly, in Campbelltown, affordable housing developments can typically be characterised as proposals that are overdeveloped for their site context, and underprovided with site facilities such as parking, resulting in a proliferation of on-street parking in low density residential neighbourhoods.

The absence of mandatory requirements for on-site managers for all boarding house development is also a concern to Council given the opportunity for more remote accessibility of a number of boarding houses to support facilities and services ordinarily located in centres. This situation arises given the permissibility of multi-unit housing across Campbelltown's low density residential neighbourhoods.

In addition, the opportunity afforded to AHR SEPP development for significant development concessions (compared to Council's ordinarily applicable planning controls) is inappropriate and encourages developers to avoid Council planning requirements in the case where just 20% of a total development yield is made available for affordable housing. This is unacceptable and discourages broader community support for affordable housing in the face of potential disproportionate benefits for developers.

Other mechanisms to achieve housing affordability, including a more aggressive and mandated approach to inclusionary zoning, should be considered by the Commission.

The proposal for a target of between 5-10% of total affordable housing being part of planning proposals seeking to "up-zone" land or increase development yield beyond ordinarily applicable development standards/controls is:

- not practicable and focuses on the provision of affordable housing at the "margins"
- will likely encourage a diminution of well-established planning regimes for multi-unit housing already put into place by Councils and presumably endorsed by local communities as part of the planning process that led to their adoption
- adds little to the supply of affordable housing if and when provisions such as the existing 20% yield rule (taken from the current AHR SEPP) are applied.

The Commission and governments should not treat affordable housing as a "bonus outcome" for breaking the existing planning rules. This can potentially undermine the legitimacy of sound strategic planning that responds to its neighbourhood and environmental context.

As an alternative, Council would encourage the Commission to mandate the provision of all housing schemes (not subject to a SIC levy or having been subject to the payment of a SIC levy), including development proposals on land already zoned for residential development, to include a minimum provision to provide 10% of the development yield as affordable housing. This percentage may be able to be reviewed (downwards) depending upon the extent of social housing that exists in an area. This would contribute to the provision of affordable housing in areas where worker housing is required but constrained given typical market price points.

It is considered imperative that inclusionary zoning be mandated in all medium density and high density residential zones (R3 and R4 zones).

Given the proposals for affordable housing outlined in the draft Plan, it would appear that much of the responsibility for the actual delivery of affordable housing will rest with local government. Councils will be required to prepare local planning strategies that address provision of affordable housing. However, it is unclear what other roles and responsibilities will be given to councils and whether or not councils will be consulted in devising appropriate schemes. This issue requires more extensive and deliberative discussion with Councils, and take appropriate account of their role in the housing arena as compared for instance to community housing providers, and State and Federal Government Agencies. Council is concerned over continued cost shifting from higher levels of government in their devolution of responsibility for particular services, down to local councils, without adequate revenue sources being made available.

It is considered that the draft Plan's approach to housing affordability should be reviewed in light of the outcomes of work currently being undertaken by the NSW Government's Cross-Government Working Group on Housing Affordability, and in closer collaboration with Council.

# 9. Sustainability Actions

#### a. Scenic Hills

Council welcomes the commentary and the case put forward by the draft Plan for the protection of the Scenic Hills which is consistent with its own position in terms of strategic

direction. For a number of years Council has witnessed the diminution of the iconic and defining landscape and separation (between the urban areas of Camden and Campbelltown) buffer value, primarily in the face of urban development undertaken along the edge of the Camden Local Government Area.

Campbelltown City Council has consistently and continuously resisted pressure for urban and semi-urban development in the Scenic Hills over many years, and has rejected a number of planning proposals, mostly with the support of the NSW Department of Planning and Environment (including its predecessor organisations). Council took the step of strengthening land use controls in drafting the Campbelltown LEP 2015, by prohibiting inappropriate development such as correctional institutions.

Unfortunately, the Minister recently amended the planning provisions for a site located within the Scenic Hills to permit a large scale cemetery. This outcome rests uneasily with the policy position espoused for the Scenic Hills presented in the draft Plan and Council now seeks an amendment to the draft Plan to ensure that such development remains prohibited development within the Scenic Hills more generally.

#### b. Waste facilities

The draft Plan suggests the need to identify alternative land for future waste management/disposal facilities. In the first instance a Waste Management Strategy for the District should be reviewed, taking into account the regional and local waste management strategies already in place. A review of such strategies may reveal that new landfill facilities may be required, or other alternatives may be worthy of closer examination, such as for instance the transportation of waste to other locations outside of the District. The Commission is urged to consult more closely with all Councils and the NSW Environment Protection Authority on this important future infrastructure requirement. The extent and location of future urban development within the District may influence the opportunities, costs and constraints for future District waste management.

# c. Air quality

More stringent work needs to be undertaken on the assessment of regional air quality in the South West of Sydney, particularly in light of:

- the extent of future urban development and redevelopment across the District, reputed as an air pollution "sink"
- intensification of potential air polluting land uses in the District including the Western Sydney Airport, Moorebank Intermodal and other freight facilities
- the paucity of public transport and the relatively high commuter utilisation of motor vehicles.

Council requests the assistance of the Commission to assist with monitoring of air quality impacts in the District by establishing a new air quality monitoring station at a suitable site located within the Greater Macarthur Urban Land Release Areas. This will assist with a real time understanding of any potential and threatening cumulative air quality impacts affecting these extensive new urban areas, and complement the information already collected at Liverpool and Camden. It is an important initiative to assist in better managing and planning for potential pollution and associated public health impacts.

# d. Open space, the green grid and environmental/recreation enhancements

Council supports the action to develop a South West District sport and recreation participation strategy and sport and recreation facility plan.

Many councils have individual sport and recreation strategies. These strategies often have regional considerations, especially in relation to the hierarchy of facilities and their embellishments. A district sport and recreation strategy, which incorporates both physical participation and an audit of facilities and future infrastructure needs, is fully supported. The lack of understanding of the hierarchy of sports facilities is causing the duplication of like facilities where there is no community need to justify multiple similar facilities in the same area.

Council requests that this action be progressed and that a steering committee of South West District Councils be formed to guide and assist the formulation of such a plan.

Council would request an explanation from the Commission as to the reasoning behind the absence of any acknowledgement of the Campbelltown Sports Stadium as the premier regional level stadium and athletics facility located within the District. This is a significant omission and underplays the important contribution that this facility, and its potential to expand into a higher order facility, makes to liveability in Campbelltown. The Stadium is an important element of regional 'anchor' infrastructure that reinforces the higher order 'place and economic' value of the Campbelltown Strategic Centre.

Council has undertaken initial work that has highlighted the significant deficit in the provision of stadia in South West Sydney. The focus of stadia development has been along the eastern coast with Cronulla and WIN Stadium and along the M4 Corridor. Campbelltown Stadium is ideally located off the M5 and is serviced by the Leumeah Railway station. This is an opportunity that needs to be capitalised through the State Government's Stadia strategy to ensure that the needs of South West Sydney are met.

The Green Grid "importantprojects" included in the draft plan is a significant list of proposed improvements all worthy of support.

However, Council is concerned over the small number of priorities (2) identified for the South West, and that no such "priority projects" are listed for the Campbelltown local government area.

There are no priority projects located in the Campbelltown area despite the extensive future urban development and redevelopment set to take place here.

There is no recognition by the Commission of the nomination by "A Plan for Growing Sydney" of the Scenic Hills as reserve/parkland. Council seeks clarification on the position of the Commission on this matter.

Despite the initiative being raised by Council staff at the technical working groups, a potential link between Western Sydney Parklands and The Australian Botanic Garden - Mount Annan, along the Scenic Hills ridgeline and beyond, as an important "green link" project, has not been appropriately recognised by the District Plan.

Whilst Council is supportive in principle of the proposed Camden Park/Georges River Open Space Corridor the Commission is urged to liaise further with the NSW Department of Planning and Environment and Council about the provisions that are currently being drafted

for the Greater Macarthur Urban Release Areas and as a result of more detailed technical investigations that take account of biodiversity and natural resource management. Attached to this submission is a copy of Councils recent report concerning the rezoning of the Mt Gilead Urban Release Area site which includes relevant information concerning fauna movement corridors and open space provision.

#### 10. General

There is a range of issues that Council has grouped together for the purposes of raising additional significant matters for consideration by the Commission in reviewing and finalising the South West District Plan. A number of matters will likely require further discussion with Council at the Commission's earliest convenience.

#### a. Ingleburn Business Centre

Ingleburn needs to be identified as a District Centre in the draft Plan's centres hierarchy – this is considered to be vitally important given that:

- it is the second largest CBD located outside of the Campbelltown-Macarthur Strategic Centre and incorporates a range of retail and commercial uses
- is recognised by Council and the Department of Planning and Environment in the Glenfield to Macarthur Priority Urban Renewal Corridor as a centre worthy of renewal and densification – it has substantial liveability and capacity to grow with infrastructure support
- it has a particularly important economic function of supporting the Ingleburn Industrial Area.- one of Sydney's most significant manufacturing areas
- it has identified significant potential to grow as a mixed use business hub in the South West Corridor incorporating not only retail and residential accommodation, but also business park and technology based land uses – with significant land holdings available for redevelopment.

This is a particularly significant issue for Council and gives rise to the need for the draft Plan to be reviewed to recognise the potential for redevelopment of the centre and to a range of matters, primarily related to enhancing centre accessibility, that will be required to support and sustain the district centre's future growth. These items include:

- the construction of a railway over-bridge linking the Ingleburn industrial area more directly with the district centre
- improved facilities to accommodate growing commuter car parking demands at Ingleburn Railway Station that do not compromise centre parking
- enhancing east-west arterial road access to the Ingleburn District Centre from newly developing areas in the South West Growth Centre, making use of opportunities afforded by existing road and corridor reservations already held in Government ownership
- ensuring strategic bus corridors linking Liverpool and Campbelltown-Macarthur include in-centre bus stop facilities in the Ingleburn District Centre

• the construction of an industrial by-pass route that links the Minto and Ingleburn industrial areas more directly with the Hume Highway without compromising local residential neighbourhoods and local traffic.

# b. Freight and logistics

The South West District will be challenged by the scale and proliferation of freight and logistics based enterprises that seek to establish in response to the Moorebank Intermodal facilities, but also the likely expansion of existing freight facilities that currently occupy land adjacent to the Southern Sydney Freight Line at Minto and Ingleburn. This predicted intensification of freight and logistics activity in the District will only be heightened by the development of the Western Sydney Airport.

Council holds a view that the South West District will suffer from unbridled heavy traffic movement that will increasingly impinge on local road network efficiency and safety as well as importantly, neighbourhood amenity and liveability - thereby drawing on the Districts' future productivity efficiency.

Accordingly, Council calls on the Commission to undertake to prepare a South West District based Freight and Logistics Movement Strategy that investigates, assesses and plans an appropriate District and Metropolitan level response to the planning and management of freight through and within the South West District. Such a strategy should for instance, identify and support options to separate intrusive heavy vehicle freight based traffic from residential and business centre neighbourhoods and connect freight based destinations/facilities directly with the arterial road network.

This issue has been identified by Council as one of the most significant risks to the South West District's future sustainability.

# c. Engagement with Indigenous Communities

There is a need for close engagement with the Aboriginal community to ensure that the draft Plan reflects the Indigenous perspective in an overall sense and specifically on a number of the priorities and actions. This is particularly relevant in the areas of:

- art and culture,
- place-making and the public domain
- natural assets
- economic and employment development
- tourism and destination planning and management
- indigenous heritage and conservation
- housing affordability.

Council would be pleased to speak in further detail on these matters and assist the Commission in working more closely with the relevant indigenous communities.

# d. Planning for schools and other State facilities

There is a need for Government to engage with and consult local councils in the planning for and design of social infrastructure such as new schools and hospitals and to give due consideration to the potential for multiple use of space where appropriate and sustainable.

The increasing reliance upon council owned open space and recreation facilities due to population increase and institutional (e.g. schools) expansion without adequate provision of on-site space and facilities needs to be addressed.

The potential for shared use of open space in particular needs be considered for its impact on both schools and local communities. The practice of not providing suitable and sufficient open space within new schools should be avoided where possible.

Where insufficient open space is provided by the Department of Planning in schools and there is a reliance upon adjoining public open space, this should only be considered where there is an offset by the community use of school facilities. This may include, but should not be limited to:

- halls
- multipurpose classrooms
- open space such as hard courts on school grounds

Whilst Council would be pleased to participate in further discussion with both the Commission and Department of Education over joint use initiatives, concerns are raised with management of accessibility and maintenance responsibilities, with Council committed to avoid the opportunity of being subject to further Government cost shifting.

At the same time, Council would like to express its significant concern with respect to the recently emerging trend for schools not to be designed and constructed with sufficient on-site car parking and transport related facilities. This has recently been a major for issue with respect to the proposed new Bardia Primary School, leading to concerns over safety, traffic congestion and cost shifting. The NSW Government has a responsibility to provide public facilities with public support infrastructure such as parking, just as does any other form of new development.

Council requests urgent discussions with the Department and the Commission over these concerns. These discussions should consider the option to form a working group, containing relevant State departments, local government representatives and community to create a workable model that can be implemented by the relevant Government Agencies.

# e. Designing for 'place' and liveability

Council believes that the recognition of the importance of design in planning for the District (and across the whole metropolitan area) is commendable. However, local councils should be given more influence over designing their local places (to ensure local appropriateness) and the mechanisms via which they can integrate local concerns into planning controls.

Council is not convinced over the capacity or the suitability of requiring Councils to implement new overarching neighbourhood design guidelines prepared by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment/Government Architect.

The importance of place and place making needs to be supported by design guidelines that have been prepared in partnership with councils and via amending the planning system to allow place-based statutory plans to be created.

Council's experience has reassured Council that it is better placed to work in partnership with developers in the area of urban and neighbourhood design. However, in order to avoid new

planning outcomes that do little for the creation of more liveable neighbourhoods, the Commission is also urged to revisit the current 'blanket' planning controls that heavily influence development yield and the built form, especially in new urban release areas. This requires a structural review of the Growth Centres SEPP and also the Exempt and Complying Development Codes SEPP, that combined do little to encourage good neighbourhood design (at the expense of promoting maximum housing supply yields).

Council would also strongly urge the Commission to encourage the Department of Planning and Environment to allow place based LEP provisions, as part of the Standard Instrument Template. This will be critical to building the appropriate character of the District.

# f. Metropolitan Rural Areas (MRAs)

Council commends the inclusion of consideration of the MRA in the draft Plan. However, it would like to see a more 'resilience' based approach to the frameworks for planning in this area. Council would commend the commencement of a dialogue on articulating and valuing these areas, and notes that it appears that the term MRA refers to a collective of disparate and often competing land uses located at the periphery of Greater Sydney.

Council would like to see the discussion move towards planning for potential future metropolitan needs, in order to obtain a more holistic and resilient city based approach associated with a 'Sydney at capacity' planning horizon. (i.e. a Greater Sydney achieving its anticipated growth).

The MRAs are very important functional areas for Greater Sydney as they represent some of the last remaining opportunities to obtain/retain/ promote/ protect potential resilience areas for the city. These are areas that traditionally have been most difficult to economically quantify: ecological, agricultural and scenic. These are also the areas that will be required to meet resilience factors for a 'Sydney at capacity'.

To this end Council would support a bold approach to future planning and value capture for these areas. The potential for the MRAs to have discretely valued (and potentially undervalued) aspects i.e. through ecological or current or potential future agricultural / food belt uses, has not been but deserves to be fully explored.

There is already a considerable body of knowledge on the impacts of the loss of agricultural lands/ scenic protection lands and the like on the potential resilience of the city. It would be useful for the draft plan and subsequent structure plans/ planning frameworks to deal with the need to address the role of scenic areas/ food belts through a resilience and sustainability lens.

Whilst Council supports utilising the design-led planning approach premised by the draft plan; it would however, like to see this provide a strong basis to consider the agricultural, scenic, ecological, and economic elements within the planning hierarchy as opposed to just only the built form.

Council would also like to see the body of work in these areas shift away from a cost-benefit based analysis of existing agricultural use/ or clusters towards planning for future food production possibilities as well as a need to identify costs associated with a net loss of these lands.

As a brief comment on sustainability Priority 6 – Council would recommend the Commission review the wording to provide more certainty for the MRA beyond the short to medium term.

This may need to be tied into some discussion of the overall capacity for the Greater Sydney region. It is envisaged that further urban encroachments into the MRAs may further negatively impact on the resilience of Greater Sydney, so an evidence based and precautionary approach should be pursued.

Council would also like to take the opportunity to raise an issue with Sustainability Priority 7, which it believes should be rephrased. Whilst it is noted that there may a need to accommodate a range of potential land uses on the periphery of Greater Sydney, Council would support a greater emphasis incorporating a cost - benefit analysis to improving enhance the overall efficacy of the resilience aspects associated with value capture possibilities for land uses in the MRAs. In this instance there is a need for the GSC to utilise and incorporate financial cost - benefit analyses that more fully quantify the impact of agricultural resilience.

There is merit in dealing with these issues at the Commission level.

# Draft South West District Plan -Campbelltown City Council Draft Submission

# Attachment 1

Campbelltown City Council Submission on the Western Sydney Rail Needs Scoping Study Discussion Paper









Campbelltown City Council Civic Centre Queen Street Campbelltown (02) 4645 4000 (02) 4645 4111



# CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	. 3
INTRODUCTION	. 3
PART ONE: THE DISCUSSION PAPER - COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS	.6
Overview	.6
Issues of Concern with the Western Sydney Rail Needs Scoping Study:	.8
A. The Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area	. 8
B. Strategic connectivity and the "Three City" Metropolis Model	.9
C. Future Proofing – Corridor Preservation1	12
D. Travel Distances and the Social Equity Dimension of Accessibility	13
E. Connecting Western Sydney to Western Sydney Airport1	14
PART TWO: COUNCIL'S PREFERRED OPTION1	16
The Business Case for Council's Preferred Option (with enhancements)	19
A. Connectivity and City Shaping2	20
B. Productivity	22
c. Social Inclusion and Customer Focus2	25
d. Environmental Sustainability	26
CONCLUSION	28



#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Campbelltown City Council supports Option 6 ("Extended") from the Western Sydney Airport linking to the South West and extended through to Rouse Hill in the north. However, instead of a 'stand-alone shuttle' as described in the Western Sydney Rail Needs Scoping Study, Campbelltown City Council (Council) has commissioned a study detailing a proof of concept for the extension of the proposed southern portion of Option 6 through Narellan and looping through the proposed new land release area at Menangle Park, south of Campbelltown-Macarthur Regional City Centre, and linking back up to Macarthur station. This would enable exponentially increased connectivity to the Western Sydney Airport and the Western Sydney "Aerotropolis" as proposed by the Greater Sydney Commission, the Broader Western Sydney Employment Area, Western Sydney Science Park, St Marys/Penrith as well as the North West Growth Centre and other economic/employment nodes. Council refers to this as "Option 6 Extended".

#### INTRODUCTION

The Western Sydney Airport will be a major catalyst for growth and development in Sydney's west and south west. It will create jobs, growth and new industries, as well as provide an economic flow on impact for existing and emerging industries. The recent announcements around the Greater Sydney Commission's "Three City" metropolitan planning model brings forward the need for the Western Sydney Rail Scoping Study to recognise the importance of connecting Western Sydney (importantly being understood to include the South –West) with this Aerotropolis.

Western Sydney will experience, major urban growth both in terms of residential and employment capabilities. This has been articulated in a number of state and local position papers including A Plan for Growing Sydney. Achieving a desirable, sustainable liveable outcome will require a greater integration and connection of residential and employment destinations. The government stated desire for a "30 minute city" will require additional connectivity between and within Western Sydney. The preferred option of 6 (extended) supports and reinforces the potential of Western Sydney to deliver on housing, population and employment numbers whilst supporting a liveable city.

Council has prepared an infographic plan illustrating the strategic importance of improving linkages to and within the West and WSA. This graphic plan; the **Campbelltown Strategic Inter-Regional Connectivity Plan** (below) demonstrates and highlights the linkages and potentials that could be obtained by supporting Option 6 Extended. This plan demonstrates the need to improve linkage throughout the west including a north-south rail linkage to exponentially improve regional connectivity from and to major employment and residential hubs and the new WSA.

Campbelltown as the epicentre of a rapidly expanding South-West Sydney has significant existing and planned employment areas with some significant precincts clustered around health, education, business innovation, advanced manufacturing and retail. These precincts can assist in delivering the employment numbers required by government.

The three regional city centres of Campbelltown-Macarthur, Liverpool and Penrith will provide the strategic centres of population, housing, medical, education, recreation and other services opportunities



for their growing regional populations. This population has the potential to form a significant proportion of the workforce to build and service the airport and the associated economic growth and smart jobs within the proposed Western City Aerotropolis.

This submission is divided into two parts:

- Part 1 provides overall feedback to Government on the Western Sydney Rail Needs Scoping Study

   Discussion Paper.
- Part Two provides details supporting Campbelltown City Council's case for a north-south rail link. In
  order to fully unlock the potential to create an employment focused, liveable western Sydney a
  number of additional linkages on the existing and already proposed lines is proposed. These will be
  outlined within the submission.

Council's submission addresses the strategic assessment criteria that the Government has indicated will be used to assess and determine the most appropriate option for the airport rail connection, namely:

- connectivity and city shaping
- productivity
- social inclusion
- customer focus
- environmental sustainability.

The Government has also established other Assessment Criteria including: Network Capacity, Financial Sustainability, Delivery Risk and Safety. These criteria are considered to be operational in nature and whilst equally important to the strategic criteria, are matters for rail network planning and delivery.







#### PART ONE: THE DISCUSSION PAPER - COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS

#### OVERVIEW

Council appreciates the opportunity to be able to present its response to the public exhibition of the Western Sydney Rail Needs Scoping Study and commends the Federal and NSW Governments on taking this important initiative.

The future of Sydney as Australia's premier global city relies to no small degree on the success of planning and delivery of integrated land use and transport solutions for Western Sydney, a substantial component of which is the South West Growth Corridor that encompasses the Macarthur Region.

The Southwest District is earmarked to accommodate the most extensive future urban growth compared to any other district within the Greater Sydney area.

Coupled with the emergence of the Western Sydney Airport as a primary driver of future economic and employment development in Western Sydney and as the focus of the growth of a new urban city centre supported by surrounding regional city centres such as Campbelltown-Macarthur, the significance of integrated transport connectivity linking the south-west with broader Western Sydney must not be underestimated.

This is particularly relevant in terms of long term transport corridor preservation and importantly, delivering better access to jobs, services and facilities for the often forgotten about south west community, as well as driving the creation of new economic and employment initiatives, that have historically been focused in other parts of Sydney.

Overall, Council is concerned for the Western Sydney Rail Needs Scoping Study to address the metropolitan imbalance that has historically denied, and which has the potential to continue to disadvantage, people living and working in South-West Growth Corridor.

The very recent execution of a Memorandum of Understanding between the Federal and NSW Governments over a new City Deal for Western Sydney is exciting, and the commitment to genuinely engage with local government across Western Sydney, including Campbelltown City Council, presents all levels of government with a once in a lifetime opportunity.

Council looks toward the City Deal to renew a holistic focus on the *achievement* of integrated strategic outcomes that can drive economic and social gains in the South-West thereby building greater community capacity, resilience and sustainability in the face of the extraordinary future urban and population growth that is earmarked for the corridor.

The City Deal must address the issue of transport connectivity across Western Sydney in order to harness and distribute more equitably, the opportunities that stand to be afforded by future urban growth and the Western Sydney Airport. Together, these two seminal influences must be carefully managed to extract maximum benefit for Western Sydney, including the South-West.



The key challenges for the Rail Needs Scoping Study are multiple. The Study must look to identifying and committing to actions that establish transport connectivity to improve economic efficiency, create new employment opportunities, and enhance liveability in the South-West. This can be accomplished by:

- directly linking current and designated urban growth areas to existing and future nodes of economic and employment activity throughout the South-West, within a travel-time threshold of no more than 30 minutes
- directly linking existing and future nodes of economic and employment activity within the South-West to each other, and in particular with strategic city centres such as Campbelltown-Macarthur, the Western Sydney Airport, the Broader Western Sydney Employment Area, and industry hubs such as Ingleburn and Minto
- more efficiently linking the South-West Growth Corridor with the Parramatta CBD.

Council has reviewed the Rail Needs Scoping Study and would like to raise a number of concerns over the document itself. However, at the same time Council would like to present a suggested series of recommendations for the Government's serious consideration and response, including proposals for rail enhancements that have not specifically been raised in the Study but which would in Council's view, help our existing and future community to better access employment, health, education and business precincts in the South West and across broader Western Sydney.





#### ISSUES OF CONCERN WITH THE WESTERN SYDNEY RAIL NEEDS SCOPING STUDY:

#### A. THE GREATER MACARTHUR PRIORITY GROWTH AREA

The Scoping Study Area does not include the Greater Macarthur Urban Land Release Precincts nor the proposed Wilton New Town as recently exhibited as part of the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area package, and originally mooted by the NSW Government in 2015.

# These areas will account for a total urban development yield in the order of approximately 70,000 new dwellings or up to approximately 200,000+ people, with planning work well underway and first land releases expected by early 2017.

It would appear to be a major flaw in the Scoping Study's understanding of the scale of future population growth in the South-West Growth Corridor, and no formal reference is made anywhere in the Discussion Paper to the recently announced Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area, which does not only include the Greater Macarthur Urban Land Release Precincts but also the Glenfield to Macarthur Priority Urban Renewal Corridor.

This is very disappointing and does little to reassure the Council that the South West's transport needs are prepared to be considered properly as part of the Western Sydney Rail Needs Scoping Study, despite statements made in the Discussion Paper including:

- 'Understanding and planning for where people will live and work across Sydney and how these places are connected to each other, will influence Western Sydney's long term success"
- Figures 3 and 4 show population density across the Greater Sydney metropolitan region in 2016 and the projected increases to population densities by 2051. These maps show that Sydney's west, north west, and south west areas will experience significant population density increases.

This growth in Western Sydney's population presents two broad transport challenges:

- 1. Ensuring the transport network has the capacity to support population growth in established areas
- 2. Ensuring transport services are integrated with eth planning of new land releases and areas of urban renewal"

It is almost embarrassing to see that Figure 4 concerns itself with estimated population densities for areas including Dee Why, Brookvale, North Sydney, Sydney, Bondi Junction, Randwick and Port Botany, notwithstanding the Discussion paper is expected to focus on the rail needs of Western Sydney. The omission from Figure 4, of areas south of Campbelltown-Macarthur including places such as Menangle Park, Gilead, Wilton New Town, Picton as well as recently nominated (by Planning NSW) future urban release areas is extraordinary and suggests the Study is not concerned with the existing and future transport needs of these communities.


Further, It is not lost on Council that Figure 5 does not include the Glenfield to Macarthur Priority Urban Renewal Corridor Greater despite that corridor being estimated to accommodate in the order of 20,000 new jobs. Council would appreciate advice as to why this important and Government announced urban housing and employment initiative is not depicted under the Map "Western Sydney Growth Precinct Areas" nor referred to on page 12 along with other nominated employment sites.

### B. STRATEGIC CONNECTIVITY AND THE "THREE CITY" METROPOLIS MODEL

The recent announcement by the Greater Sydney Commissioner – Ms Lucy Turnbull of the Commission's vision to establish a "three city" metropolitan city model for Sydney does not appear to have been taken into account by the Western Sydney Needs Study to any clear and significant degree.

A copy of a map depicting the Commission's Three City Model appeared in the Parramatta Holroyd Sun on 20 October 2016.

The Sydney Morning Herald on 20 October 2016 reported:

"The chief of the agency charged with reshaping the city, the Greater Sydney Commission, said Australia's most populous city should be "reimagined" as three great cities – what she has termed the Eastern Harbour City, Central Parramatta River City and the Western City near the "

In addition, the Daily Telegraph reported on October 26, 2016:

A NEW city in Badgerys Creek is part of a triple-pronged approach to making Sydney the "liveable, loveable" capital of the Southern Hemisphere.

In last week's Bradfield Oration, Greater Sydney Commission chief commissioner Lucy Turnbull described a vision for three cities – western, central and eastern – where people could live within 30 minutes of where they work, study and play.

"Focused on the new Western Sydney Airport, we think a greater ambition for the west of Sydney is greatly needed," Ms Turnbull said.

"This will not be a city as we know it in Sydney, and it will not rise from a desert like Dubai in the UAE, but it will build on ... the string of pearls – Camden, Campbelltown, Liverpool and Penrith."

Ms Turnbull said ad hoc planning and "hoping for the best" would not suffice for the western city.

"A co-ordinated approach to delivering city-scale economic, social and environmental outcomes is required," Ms Turnbull said.



"Focusing on a west city will allow us to ensure the resources we need ... go to the most vulnerable in the west and also to where the population is growing at the greatest rates."

Whilst the Western Sydney Rail Needs Scoping Study places special emphasis on transport solutions that support the strengthening of Parramatta, little mention is made specifically of the need to focus transport solutions that build connections to support the new Western City Hub - the "aerotropolis", especially connections from population growth areas and economic nodes located in the Campbelltown LGA including the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area. This anomaly must be addressed as a matter of the greatest urgency to encourage greater alignment between transport and land use planning imperatives.

The Greater Sydney Commissions "string of pearls" city model will depend on strategic, well-defined, direct and efficient connectivity between the regional city centres of Campbelltown-Macarthur, Penrith and Liverpool with each other and with the "Western Sydney Aerotropolis City."

This is what will drive Western Sydney's future economic and employment success, build on the opportunity offered by the new Western Sydney Airport, and redress a long history of CBD and Parramatta Centric transport planning that has disadvantaged the South west community for many years – in terms of access to higher order services and facilities and much needed access to employment opportunities located both within the south west and to those jobs located elsewhere in Sydney.

The current connectivity between South-West Sydney and the newly proposed Western City is sadly lacking and the failure of the Rail Needs Scoping Study to draw out the significance of and effectively respond to this new approach to planning for the future growth and development of Western Sydney is problematic in so far that the strategic transport planning required to support the new land use planning model is not recognised.

This "transport disadvantage" suffered by the South West, and what is suspected to continue to be the case, is reflected in the Discussion Paper's dialogue focusing on "Sydney's Bus Future".

A point is made of the Government's "Rapid Bus Network" that will support the growth of the region over the next 15 years, and that planned rapid routes will focus on trips between:

- Liverpool Western Sydney Airport- Penrith
- Parramatta Western Sydney Airport
- Rouse Hill-Penrith
- Blacktown-Hornsby
- Castle Hill to Parramatta.

Unfortunately, the Campbelltown community is not planned to benefit from a similar level of service, and the absence of any such planned strategic connectivity between Campbelltown-Macarthur to the Western Sydney Airport (including presumably the "Aerotropolis"), the Broader Western Sydney Employment Area, and Penrith is not acceptable.



The Discussion Paper finds that:

"Analysis indicates that passenger demand for a western Sydney airport would mostly come from the Western Sydney Region, in the early years of the airports operations, providing western Sydney residents faster and easier access to aviation services"

Council would concur with the paper's statement and hence the added need for the South West community to be able to enjoy direct access to the new Western Sydney Airport. Given the extensive population growth to be accommodated in the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area and at Wilton N1ew Town, a significant market for Western Sydney Airport could be expected to be drawn for the South-West.

The issue of strategic inter-regional connectivity is also an important one as far as access to the Western Sydney Airprort, the new Western Sydney Aerotropolis, and the regional city centres throughout Western Sydney such Campbelltown-Macarthur. This has the capacity to generate additional wealth and investment in Western Sydney and drive new job creation, leveraging in particular against the demands from other regions such as the Illawarra and the Sydney-Canberra Corridor. Hence, Council is surprised to see the map at Figure 13 does not recognise any strategic connection (in terms of aviation catchment) between the Western Sydney Airport and the Illawarra as well as Sydney Canberra Corridor regions.

This connectivity between the Illawarra, the Sydney - Canberra corridor is strategically important to the economic development of the South-West.

The Discussion Paper's expose on Sydney's Rail Future is as equally disappointing and only serves to exacerbate Council's and the South-West community's concern that notwithstanding the extraordinary future urban growth that is slated for the south west, the need to accommodate the Greater Sydney Commission's "Western City construct", and that access to the economic and employment benefits that stand to be gained in the South West from greater connectivity, it is seemingly not important.

Table 2 on Page 20 of the Discussion Paper articulates the five stages of Sydney's rail future. Disappointingly, that Table makes no reference to a commitment to:

- the South-West's direct access to a rapid transit system
- any connection of the proposed south west rail link extension between Narellan and Campbelltown-Macarthur other than "the NSW Government is also considering the possibility of extending the corridor further south to the existing.... T2 Line"
- construction of the entire south west rail link extension (the table notes "Complete South West Rail Link as complete or underway"
- investigations over the electrification of the T2 Southern Line to Menangle Park.

It is of interest to Council that the Discussion Paper heralds a range of rail initiatives that benefit less remote, more developed places located elsewhere in metropolitan Sydney that already enjoy enhanced spatial accessibility to services, facilities and jobs that people living in the South-West growth corridor don't. Such initiatives include:

Sydney Metro Northwest



- Sydney Metro City and South-West
- investigations into the potential extension of the metro rail from Bankstown to Liverpool
- Parramatta Light Rail.

Council considers that the case for a better and fairer distribution of strategic transport infrastructure investment across metropolitan Sydney to enhance access for communities living in the South West should be a priority for the NSW Government.

### C. FUTURE PROOFING – CORRIDOR PRESERVATION

This is a particularly frustrating issue for Campbelltown City Council.

The following statements made in the Discussion Paper are unambiguous and enjoy the full support of Council:

"The NSW Government is planning ahead by preserving corridors for future additional public transport services in Western Sydney...A preserved corridor provides certainty for communities, businesses and landowners about how the land will be used in the future and reduces the cost of providing infrastructure in the long term"

"The NSW Government is preserving a public transport corridor in Sydney's south-west to provide a north-south connection through the South West Priority Growth Area and the Western Sydney Employment Area, including the proposed Western Sydney Airport. The extension corridor is proposed to connect Leppington Station to Bringelly and then head in two directions: north to the T1 Western Line near St Marys; and south to Narellan.

The NSW Government is also considering the possibility of extending the corridor further south to the existing T2 Inner West and SouthLine. To date, the NSW Government has consulted extensively with local communities about these plans and sought their feedback on the alignment of the rail corridor.

While the South West Rail Link Extension may connect to the proposed airport, the NSW Government anticipates that this extension will be needed regardless of the airport to support population growth in Sydney's south-west"

There has been extensive community consultation by Transport for NSW over the extension of the south west rail link, including the possibility to connect rail from Narellan to Campbelltown-Macarthur. This is a strategic connection, and is consistent with the principles of:

- Linking the future Greater Macarthur Urban Land Release populations directly with the Western Sydney Airport and the Broader Western Sydney Employment Area.
- Linking the South West Growth Centre community with the Campbelltown -Macarthur Regional City Centre including Macarthur Square Regional Shopping Centre, Campbelltown Public and



Private Hospitals, Western Sydney University, Campbelltown College of TAFE, Campbelltown Sports Stadium, and the Campbelltown Arts Centre.

 Linking the Campbelltown - Macarthur Regional City Centre with the Penrith Regional City Centre, the Western Sydney Airport and proposed Greater Sydney Commissions Western City Aerotropolis, the Broader Western Sydney Employment Area.

Critically, there is an opportunity within the Campbelltown LGA to plan for and secure corridors for the SW Rail Link extension, and opportunity to work with Council to co-ordinate land use planning that could facilitate these connections, before extensive urban development proceeds. Council demands an explanation as to why this critical corridor cannot be supported by Government? The strategic case for supporting the extension of the proposed South West Rail Link extension from Narellan to Campbelltown-Macarthur becomes clearer upon closer inspection of Figure 7 that depicts the geographical inequity. The map shows a direct rail connection between St Marys/Penrith, to Western Sydney Airport, but not from Campbelltown – Macarthur.

### D. TRAVEL DISTANCES AND THE SOCIAL EQUITY DIMENSION OF ACCESSIBILITY

Appropriately, Chapter 5 the Discussion Paper speaks to the issue of "Rail Demand in Western Sydney", and highlights the likelihood that the existing rail network will be significantly constrained from 2030 onwards.

As admitted by the Discussion Paper, residents of Campbelltown travel an inordinate number of vehicle kilometers compared to other people in Sydney. For instance, the number of kilometres travelled in Campbelltown is double that number travelled by people residing in eastern and inner Sydney...clearly a reflection of the higher level of accessibility to services, facilities and jobs in those areas, not only brought about by the geographic concentration of such opportunities but also the prevalence of transport options available at those locations.

It is not surprising that there is a correlation between these vehicle travel distances and travel times that are spent by people to access these services and facilities and jobs.

If the existing vehicle kilometers travelled in Campbelltown is of a concern to Government, and given that existing rail network capacity is set to fail beyond 2030, then why is proper consideration not due to be given to the implications of significant urban growth to be experienced in the South-West corridor especially when much of that growth would have either been taken up by 2030 or set to accelerate at that time?

Figure 10 on page 26 of the Discussion Paper projects the performance capacity of the Sydney train network at 2051 in the event that no additional investment was to be made in that network. Both unfortunately and disappointingly, the map at Figure 10 does not reflect the existing Sydney Trains network that extends southwards of what appears to be Minto.



Council finds it unbelievable that if no additional investment is made in the T2 south line there is still likely to be "space available standing or seated", especially in light of the additional capacity for population growth that stands to be delivered in the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area and Wilton New Town.

Can Council please be reassured that this prediction which implies 'no problems' has taken proper account of future urban growth in these areas and the propensity of this population to access the T2 southern line to link to Campbelltown/Macarthur and beyond including, Liverpool, Parramatta, and the Sydney CBD.

This situation is likely to only worsen, in terms of passenger capacity and comfort, should no additional investment be made in connecting Campbelltown-Macarthur to the South West Rail Link via Narellan, and on to the Western Sydney Airport and the Broader Western Sydney Employment Area.

The Discussion Paper admits that:

"Increasing numbers of residents without access to rail will rely on the road network for travelling to work and other key destinations. This will result in greater congestion and longer journey times"

Already the level of congestion experienced in the regional road network in and around the Campbelltown-Macarthur precinct in particular, is well understood by Council, the Macarthur community, businesses and a range of government agencies. Major congestion already occurs on Narellan Road in particular, in light of an absence of adequate road connectivity with the South West Growth Centre, and importantly the absence of the extension of the South West rail link from Leppington to Campbelltown/Macarthur via Narellan.

### E. CONNECTING WESTERN SYDNEY TO WESTERN SYDNEY AIRPORT

The Discussion Paper concedes that:

"...an initial airport rail service may need to connect to other employment and housing areas in Western Sydney to provide the patronage, economic benefit and the frequency required for a major investment in rail. If a rail service to and from the proposed airport in the initial years of operation is not part of an existing suburban rail line and is a dedicated airport rail connection, it may not meet passenger needs.......Making an investment in an airport rail service therefore must consider both the rail needs of the broader Western Sydney region and the proposed airport."

Many Western Sydney residents must currently travel outside of the region for work, particularly for higher-income, knowledge-based jobs. While connections to the Sydney CBD will continue to be vital, improving transport connections across Western Sydney to residential areas, commercial and business precincts, university and health precincts as well as a Western Sydney Airport will help to unlock Western Sydney's full economic potential.



Better integration between land use and transport planning is essential to ensure that people have a greater range of options for where they live and work and to increase the efficiency and competitiveness of the region."

Council wholeheartedly agrees with these conclusions and sees the South-West as clearly demonstrating by example, the critical need to ensure that communities, including new communities in Western Sydney, are connected to the airport and other nodes of economic activity within and beyond the region. This integrated land use, transport and economic development planning principle, underpins much what is trumpeted in "A Plan for Growing Sydney" as being the guiding philosophy that must underpin metropolitan scale strategic planning.

Council is hopeful that this overarching principle is fairly and evenly applied to South West Sydney in deciding plans and priorities for future investment in transport infrastructure. To deny Campbelltown and the South-West any fair and reasonable degree of connectivity to the Western Sydney Airport and other nodes of economic activity, particularly in Western Sydney, at the expense of investment elsewhere with lesser need, would be unacceptable and only serve to demonstrate an unpreparedness to recognise and address the social injustice that continues to prevail over this community.

Indeed, as the Discussion Paper concludes:

"Further investment in transport infrastructure will be needed to support the growing population, to bring jobs closer to homes and over time, to support passenger growth at the proposed Western Sydney Airport





#### PART TWO: COUNCIL'S PREFERRED OPTION

Council's preferred option is Option 6 but incorporating (in order of priority):

- construction of a connection from the T2 Southern Line to the proposed South West Rail Link extension at Narellan via a proposed relocated Menangle Park station as per the sketch plan shown as attachment 1. To this submission. This proposal should incorporate provision for the required stabling of a limited number of trains as well as a turn back facility.
- planning and construction of Option 1 linking with the existing South West Rail line at Leppington
- construction of a new "Y" junction connector between the T2 Southern Line and the existing South West Rail Line located between Edmondson Park and Macquarie Fields stations shown as attachment 2 to this submission
- planning and construction of a "Y" junction connector between the north heading and south heading legs of the proposed South West Rail Link extension just west of the proposed station at Rossmore attachment 3
- extension of Option 6 connecting to Rouse Hill and the North West Growth Centre.





### Campbelltown City Council's Preferred Rail Option



Council has also undertaken a body of work to examine an extension of the electrification of the T2 Southern Line beyond Macarthur station, south to a possible and relocated new Menangle Park station with further opportunity to extend this rail line to Spring Farm and onwards to the proposed new rail station at Narellen (as depicted in the South West Rail Link Extension work undertaken by TfNSW in June 2015). This submission also highlights the importance of supporting the extended rail network with a satellite commuter car parking station at Gregory Hills with the capacity to accommodate 1800 cars and a shuttle bus service to bring commuters into Campbelltown and Macarthur stations.

Council, again with the assistance of suitably qualified consultants, has undertaken some preliminary investigation and costing associated with this proposal. This information can be provided if required. In respect to this proposal, Council has commenced discussions with the major new land owner of over 500 hectares of land within the Menangle Park Urban Release Area which includes the site suggested for the possible new and relocated rail station. This land owner has indicated interest in the proposal and has indicated a preparedness to work with Council (and Government if interested) to further this idea and explore possible funding models.

In relation to the implementation of Option 1, Campbelltown City Council submits that there is significant merit associated with improved connectivity to the T2 Southern Line, the Glenfield to Macarthur Priority Urban Renewal Corridor, the Ingleburn and Minto Industrial Areas and on to the Campbelltown-Macarthur Regional City Centre, facilitated by the construction of a new "Y" junction connection between Edmondson Park and Macquarie Fields stations.

If Government was to proceed with Option 1 as detailed in the Scoping Study, commuters travelling between the proposed Western Sydney Airport and the series of rail stations from Macquarie Fields through to Macarthur would be required to change service at Glenfield station. Council's proposal for a "Y" junction would allow uninterrupted service between the Western Sydney Airport and the Campbelltown-Macarthur Regional City Centre. This new service would complement the Western Sydney Airport to Sydney CBD service that the Option 1 provides for.

Council has commissioned a preliminary rail engineering analysis, complete with QS for this proposal. Further information on this can be provided if required. Council would be able to expand on this proposal once the preferred options shortlist is announced, should such list include Option 1 as a priority.

Campbelltown City Council believes that this north-south rail link, with an additional link from the Western Sydney Airport to connect with the existing South West Rail Line at Leppington and two new 'y-links'- one attached to the South West Rail Line at Glenfield and the other attached to the planned extension of the South West Rail Link just west of the proposed Rossmore Station linking the northbound and southbound extension legs, is an optimal solution worthy of further and serious consideration by the Government. The **Campbelltown Strategic Inter-Regional Connectivity Plan** demonstrates and highlights the linkages and potentials that could be obtained by supporting Option 6 Extended. This plan demonstrates the need to improve linkages throughout the west including a north-south rail linkages to exponentially improve regional connectivity from and to major employment and residential hubs and the new WSA.

Altogether, this rail solution creates extensive connectivity and an efficient accessibility solution that serves to both enhance the South West's connectivity to the Western Sydney Airport and other key economic and employment nodes elsewhere in Western Sydney.



This is in effect a combination of Option 6 as the main spine with Option 1, enhanced with additional connectors. This is considered to be the most appropriate and valuable option for a Western Sydney Airport Link, as it connects a wide range of existing infrastructure and places and provides the framework for new innovation-based and employment generating activities.

### THE BUSINESS CASE FOR COUNCIL'S PREFERRED OPTION (WITH ENHANCEMENTS)

Western Sydney will experience, major growth both in terms of residential and employment capabilities. Achieving a desirable, sustainable liveable outcome will require a greater integration and connection of residential and employment land uses. The government stated desire for a "30 minute city" will require additional connectivity within and across Western Sydney.

Existing rail linkages in Sydney are radial in nature and at present are focused on an east-west alignment. This must be addressed to ensure full capacity building and leveraging associated with the new Western Sydney Aerotropolis as proposed by the Greater Sydney Commission. Council signals the need for a new north –south rail link between Campbelltown-Macarthur and St Marys, to be extended to the North West Growth Centre and Rouse Hill.

This north-south link should integrate with the existing and proposed South West Rail Link Extension that has previously been announced by the Government.

Very importantly, Council confirms its historic position, that the need to connect the existing South West Rail Link extension from Narellan to directly link with the T2 Southern Line and the Campbelltown - Macarthur Regional City Centre. This connection would assist in generating greater patronage as residents could access greater number of potential economic nodes/employment hubs (existing and planned new/ redevelopment).

The benefits to jobs growth and economic development associated with the development of a north-south rail corridor can be demonstrated for all Western Sydney councils. Increasing and leveraging jobs growth throughout the west – where connectivity is at present lacking, will have real and demonstrable flow on impacts.

The achievement of greater connectivity between and across Western Sydney will be a key driver in achieving the polycentric city model and the "Three Cities" metropolitan paradigm. To achieve sufficient employment and residential opportunities within a 30 minute commute will necessitate greater north-south connectivity. This in turn will enable access to and from where people live, and economic nodes/employment hubs.

The **Campbelltown Strategic Inter-Regional Connectivity Plan** demonstrates and highlights the linkages and potentials that could be obtained by supporting Option 6 Extended. This plan demonstrates the need to improve linkages throughout the west including a north-south rail linkages to exponentially improve regional connectivity from and to major employment and residential hubs and the new WSA.



In line with the Government's stated policy, a North-South rail connection extending into the Campbelltown LGA via the proposed South West Rail Link extension through Narellan and via a potential new station to be built at Menangle Park, would demonstrate tangible benefits including:

- increased public transport utilisation and a reduction in traffic congestion, enabling residents to spend more time with their families
- the delivery of more jobs closer to homes and services
- support cleaner air, green spaces, vibrant arts and cultural initiatives.

### A. CONNECTIVITY AND CITY SHAPING

Campbelltown-Macarthur is the epicentre of a population boom in the South-West that is driving infrastructure, investment, innovation and jobs. It has outstanding education, health, arts, retail and sporting facilities and significant tracts of undeveloped land available for development, all set within an attractive natural environment.

As one of the key strategic centres to service the Western Sydney Airport and complement the proposed Western City Aerotropolis as well as being a key destination servicing the growing Greater Macarthur Region, accessible via the T2 Southern Line, Campbelltown-Macarthur requires direct rail connections to the Airport and Aerotropolis. With the potential to provide increased functionality associated with the southern gateway to Greater Sydney, existing rail networks need to be enhanced through construction of the preferred option 6 (extended) as outlined in this submission.

Existing rail and road infrastructure connects Campbelltown to the Southern Highlands, the ACT, the Riverina, and Victoria. The Illawarra also enjoys close geographical proximity to the Illawarra Region. Both existing and future residents (many of whom either are or could become rail network customers) need frequent and reliable public transport that enables efficient travel between key destinations within South West Sydney and beyond.

The north-south rail connection will link a local (Campbelltown LGA) population expected to reach 265,000+ and a regional population of more than 500,000 by 2036 to both existing and new infrastructure and employment opportunities. The table below provides a snapshot of some of the expected growth within the Campbelltown Local Government Area.



Opportunity within LGA	Estimated Potential New Dwellings	Estimated Potential New Jobs
Menangle Park and Mount	20,000	24 hectares to accommodate a
Gilead Urban Release		proportion of the anticipated
Precincts-Greater Macarthur		17,000 jobs expected in the
Priorty Growth Area		Greater Macarthur Priority Growth
		Area (excluding Glenfield to
		Macarthur Priority Urban Renewal
		Corridor)
Macarthur	5,000	4,320+
Campbelltown	4,000+	6,850
Leumeah	1,000	1,880
Minto	400	1,900
Ingleburn	1,400	4,000
Macquarie Fields	400	780
Glenfield	2,800+	970+
Total	35,000+	20,700+

#### Table 1: Estimated Development Potential – Campbelltown LGA 2036+

\*Source – The Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation; The Glenfield to Macarthur Urban Renewal Corridor Strategy.

# Table 2: Estimated Development and Population – Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area and Wilton New Town

Regional figures	Potential New Dwellings as identified in Government Policy	Potential additional new population
	70,000+	200,000+

\* Source: The Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area package information,

\* Note - excludes South West Growth Centre

Additional and significant urban growth will also occur in the South West Growth Centre, the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area (outside of the Campbelltown LGA at places such as West Appin) and the Wilton New Town. Better connecting these areas to the Western Sydney Airport will facilitate the development of an accessible and sustainable South-West Growth Corridor. This will dramatically improve access to employment, education and training opportunities for the existing and planned populations. A rail connection linking to the new Airport as well as the rest of Western Sydney will also link the socially and economically isolated communities through access to employment. The growing population of the Macarthur Region will provide a potential workforce to service the Airport and the associated industry clusters (Aerotropolis) and accessible public transport is key to harnessing this vital resource. This synergy of growth and opportunity will significantly improve much needed and deserved social equity outcomes.

Increased and enhanced linkages to the airport will have a measurable flow-on effect for the WSUs Western Sydney Innovation Corridor, Western Sydney University's Campbelltown and Werrington



campuses, health and medical research, sports excellence precincts (including the recently funded Centre for Sports Excellence at Campbelltown/Macarthur), agricultural research and both nature-based and culture-based tourism. This dynamic interplay will ensure that residents can live, work, learn, play and invest in the South-West, thereby reducing the need for the current commuter pathways eastwards. Increased investment in the short term will add value to the possibilities of place making associated with the Western Sydney Airport.

In order for the three regional city centres (of Campbelltown-Macarthur, Liverpool and Penrith) to both service and support the Airport and Western City Aerotropolis, and to benefit and prosper from the associated economic development opportunities and smart jobs, all three of those centres require high connectivity – to the airport, to other major facilities (located along the preferred rail option route), to each other, and also to the Sydney CBD and Parramatta.

Council considers that the most strategic way of achieving the central spine of this connectivity network is to construct a rail link running north-south from St Marys (on the T1 line) to a junction with the T2 Southern Line, just south of Macarthur Station, via the Western Sydney Airport. The Airport should also be linked back to the South West Rail Line at Leppington. Adding two new 'y-links' would complete the connectivity loop, elevate accessibility and shape the future growth corridors within Western and South Western Sydney. Constructing this route also has the potential to create a true 30 minute city with the Airport and Aerotropolis at its heart, surrounded by three existing liveable, accessible, high-amenity strategic regional city centres

The preferred rail connection option will also act as a catalyst for the development of nominated growth areas and revitalisation of existing employment hubs south of the Western Sydney Airport. It will create a core spine of connectivity between the key strategic centre of Campbelltown-Macarthur, the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area and the rest of Western Sydney including the WSU's Western Sydney Innovation Corridor, the Campbelltown campuses of Western Sydney University and TAFE, existing employment lands and the industry clusters that will locate around the Airport/Aerotropolis

### B. PRODUCTIVITY

The preferred rail connection option will invigorate and drive greater employment development synergies in existing and expanding centres. The southern part of the corridor will have great benefits in the South West for centres such as Campbelltown- Macarthur and link these centres with surrounding employment lands. It will value add to the region dovetailing into the key economic drivers associated with the Western City Aerotropolis as well as enacting the desired position of a 30 minute city.

The "Campbelltown Strategic Intra-Regional Connectivity Plan" highlights the linkages and productivity drivers already in play within the Campbelltown Region. There is a demonstrated potential for these precincts to deliver significant economic growth and expansion with improved connectivity to WSA and the rest of the west/ north west.







Council's preferred rail connection will link the Western Sydney Airport to major business, employment, health and medical research, education, agricultural research, lifestyle hubs and tourism opportunities and the significant existing and planned residential and population growth surrounding the Airport. The southern section of the corridor will have significant benefits for areas to the south and south west of the Airport. It will also link the Airport and the business and industry clusters that will locate around it with a rapidly expanding population and an accessible, skilled workforce.

Significant existing growth catalysts, within the Campbelltown LGA, whose accessibility could be further enhanced by the southern section of the corridor include:

- Macarthur Priority Growth Area an extensive opportunity for residential and employment intensification along the T2 Southern Rail Line between Glenfield and Macarthur and further greenfield urban development south of Campbelltown and beyond
- Western Sydney University, including the School of Medicine an established and innovative university campus with a \$47.5 million state-of-the-art medical education and research facility that is one of the most advanced in Australia
- TAFE South Western Sydney Institute Campbelltown a major provider of vocational training for residents of the greater South West
- **Campbelltown Hospital** currently undergoing a \$139 million redevelopment
- Western Sydney University's Clinical School of Medicine at Campbelltown Hospital a \$21 million centre currently under construction that will bring together expert medical teachers and clinical training facilities to create advanced training opportunities for medical students and researchers
- Macarthur Square Shopping Centre the major regional shopping centre in the Campbelltown-Macarthur strategic centre- currently undergoing a \$240 million expansion that will transform the centre into the fifth largest shopping centre in NSW
- **Campbelltown Sports Stadium** a major sporting facility for the South West, with the potential to form the core of a sports focussed enterprise and entertainment hub
- The Ingleburn and Minto Industrial Areas where significant investment and innovation in advanced manufacturing is emerging, with an increasing interest and expansion into export oriented activities
- **Tabcorp** (Harness Racing) Park at Menangle Park significant racing/ breeding and associated infrastructure and industries w2ith a developing international profile
- Dharawal National Park
- The Georges River Regional Open Space Corridor.



### C. SOCIAL INCLUSION AND CUSTOMER FOCUS

The case for providing infrastructure that supports and promotes social inclusion would be welcomed by Campbelltown. Potentially providing access to a greater range employment and transport options would serve to provide defined uplift for existing populations and would also enable a greater diversity of potential resident population.

Disadvantage is spatially distributed in Greater Sydney and within Campbelltown, and is demonstrated by lower incomes, difficulty of access to employment and recreation opportunities, higher travel to work costs, loss of time to travel, poorer health, and lower education levels than Greater Sydney.

Greater social and economic uplift can be achieved through improved connectivity for areas that currently experience economic and social disadvantage. This is supported by many studies which have confirmed that small increases in wealth have a bigger benefit for people on low incomes, so gaining employment or finding better paid work is particularly important for the health and welfare of low income families.

While Campbelltown is a predominately middle income area and there are some high income locations, there are a few suburbs with very low incomes and low SEIFA scores. At the 2011 Census Claymore had the lowest SEIFA score (Index of Relative Social Disadvantage) of any urban area in Australia. Much of this disadvantage is a result of high unemployment (40% in Claymore in 2011), and transport is a key limiting factor in choices for employment.

The experience of limited local employment in Campbelltown has created travel patterns that disadvantage local residents. Congestion on roads has meant slower journeys to work, higher travel costs, reduced local business investment, and therefore fewer opportunities for local employment. Limited rail connectivity makes access to employment difficult in the growing M7 corridor. In 2011 journey to work from Campbelltown to Liverpool, Blacktown, and Penrith was dominated by car use, being 90%, 94%, and 94% respectively (BTS).

Improved rail connections to the Western Sydney Airport and beyond will open up access to a wider range of education and employment options. This improved connectivity through rail will create the opportunity for improved education and employment levels and in turn improved health and social outcomes, along with reduced dependence on welfare payments. This will be enhanced by the increasing density along the Glenfield to Macarthur rail corridor, with larger numbers of residents having easy access to rail transport, especially if that Corridor is more effectively and directly linked with the Western Sydney Airport and Aerotropolis.

Greater economic and employment development in Campbelltown through improved rail connectivity will also boost Campbelltown's role as the southern gateway to Greater Sydney. Existing rail and road infrastructure connects Campbelltown to the Southern Highlands, the ACT, the Riverina, and Victoria. Growth in trade with these areas will increase with the development of the Wilton New Town and potentially through the completion of the Maldon-Dombarton rail line which would link Port Kembla with the Minto intermodal, warehousing and industry in Campbelltown.



Although all industrial sectors are represented in Campbelltown, service industries lag behind state-wide patterns. NIEIR data (2016) shows that service industries in Campbelltown accounted for 75.2% of output compared to 84.1% across the state. The potential for growing knowledge based jobs in the city is immense given its health and education infrastructure, and its role as the service centre for the Macarthur and Southern Highlands area.

The educational profile for Campbelltown shows that the percentage of people with a Bachelor or Higher degree (11.5%) was less than half that in Greater Sydney (24.1%, ABS 2011). Greater access to a variety of educational opportunities through improved rail connectivity along with the potential growth of knowledge based industry in Campbelltown would enable further improvements in social outcomes for the city.

Importantly, the Council's preferred rail option is complementary to the principles and targets of other initiatives such as Resilient Sydney.

### D. ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY

A significant proportion of Campbelltown City's existing residents do not have ready access to public transport and they therefore rely heavily on private vehicles, particularly for the journey to work.

In 2011, 35,190 (54.1%) of Campbelltown City's working residents travelled outside of the area to work. The preferred rail option would allow a significant number of existing residents and a large proportion of the incoming population to better access new employment, education, health, retail and recreation opportunities within the local area, reducing car reliance and potentially improving air quality. It would also allow more people to travel by rail rather than road, particularly for journey to work.

The two figures provided below illustrate the high car dependence within the Campbelltown Local Government Area for journey to work travel. In 2011, of the 64,777 employed persons in Campbelltown City, 39,020 drove to work, 3,708 travelled to work as passengers in private motor vehicles (a total of 42,728 persons using cars) while only 10,351 used the train. The largest increase in mode of journey to work travel between 2006 and 2011 was also in private vehicle usage.









### CONCLUSION

Council has presented series of recommendations for the Government's serious consideration and response, including proposals for rail enhancements that have not specifically been raised in the Study but which would in Council's view, help our existing and future community to better access employment, health, education and business precincts in the South West and across broader Western Sydney, as well as maximising economic leverage from WSA.

Western Sydney will experience, major growth both in terms of residential and employment capabilities. Achieving desirable, sustainable and liveable outcomes will require a greater integration and connection of residential and employment land uses. The government stated desire for a "30 minute city" will require additional connectivity between and across Western Sydney.

It is of major concern that the Scoping Study Area does not include the Greater Macarthur Urban Land Release Precincts nor the proposed Wilton New Town as recently exhibited as part of the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area package, and originally mooted by the NSW Government in 2015. These areas will account for a total urban development yield in the order of approximately 55,000- 60,000 new dwellings or up to approximately 170,000+ people, with planning work well underway and first land releases expected by early 2017.

Overall, Council is concerned for the Western Sydney Rail Needs Scoping Study to address the metropolitan imbalance that has historically denied, and which has the potential to continue to disadvantage, people living and working in South-West Growth Corridor. There is a real opportunity to augment the existing rail linkages in Sydney which are radial and at present are focused on an east-west alignment. This must be addressed to ensure full capacity building and leveraging associated with the new Western Sydney Aerotropolis as proposed by the Greater Sydney Commission. Council signals the need for a new north –south rail link between Campbelltown-Macarthur and St Marys, to be extended to the North West Growth Centre and Rouse Hill.

Council's preferred option is Option 6 Extended but incorporating (in order of priority):

- construction of a connection from the T2 Southern Line to the proposed South West Rail Link extension at Narellan via a proposed relocated Menangle Park station as per the sketch plan shown as attachment 1. To this submission. This proposal should incorporate provision for the required stabling of a limited number of trains as well as a turn back facility
- planning and construction of Option 1 linking with the existing South West Rail line at Leppington
- construction of a new "Y" junction connector between the T2 Southern Line and the existing South West Rail Line located between Edmondson Park and Macquarie Fields stations shown as attachment2 to this submission
- planning and construction of a "Y" junction connector between the north heading and south heading legs of the proposed South West Rail Link extension just west of the proposed station at Rossmore
- extension of Option 6 connecting to Rouse Hill and the North West Growth Centre.



# Attachment 1

Proposed rail loop from Narellan via Menangle Park to Campbelltown-Macarthur



0.00/07/51/TRAFFIC MUD ROADS DESIGNAPROJECTSVM Engineering Projectavieur Rail Comidor® Design/Concept Design/Monking Daming/Mem Rail comidor-durg.8/15/26/18 AM



# Attachment 2

Proposed 'y-link' between Edmondson Park and Macquarie Fields (heading south towards Campbelltown)





# Attachment 3

Possible 'y-link' corridor reservation between the extended South West Rail Line and the proposed north-south line (within the Camden LGA



# Draft South West District Plan -Campbelltown City Council Draft Submission

# Attachment 2

Campbelltown City Council Report - Draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal - Outcome of Public Exhibition

## 8. **REPORTS FROM OFFICERS**

# 8.1 Draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal - Outcome of Public Exhibition

## Division

City Development

# **Reporting Officer**

Acting Manager Environmental Planning

## Attachments

- 1. Mt Gilead Locality Map (contained within this report)
- 2. Amended draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal (contained within this report)
- 3. Amended draft Mt Gilead Development Control Plan (contained within this report)
- 4. Copy of letter from Lendlease to Council regarding control of land for Mt Gilead planning proposal (contained within this report)
- 5. Copies of letters from Lendlease regarding offer of Regional VPA (contained within this report)

# Purpose

The purpose of this report is to advise Council of all the submissions received as a result of the public exhibition of the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal, associated documentation and the draft Mt Gilead Development Control Plan, and to seek Council's approval to forward the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal to the NSW Department of Planning and Environment requesting the Minister for Planning to make the plan.

# History

Council in July 2012 resolved to endorse a draft planning proposal for the rezoning of rural land at Appin Road, Mt Gilead (see details of property and ownership below) to permit the development of the site for urban residential purposes, and forward to NSW Department of Planning and Infrastructure (now known as NSW Planning and Environment) for determination by the Gateway Panel.

Property Description:	Part Lot 1, Part Lot 2 and Part Lot 3 DP 1218887
Owner:	Mount Gilead Pty Ltd
Property Description:	Lot 61 DP 752042
Owner:	S and A Dzwonnik
Applicants:	Old Mill Properties Pty Limited and Cardno (previously Design + Planning)

Council has received correspondence from Lendlease that addresses its interest in the subject land. That correspondence includes the following:

Lendlease has entered into conditional agreements with both Mt Gilead Pty Ltd and Anna and Stefan Dzwonnik that shall result in Lendlease acquiring and developing this land upon satisfactory completion of necessary planning approvals including the rezoning of the land in accordance with the current planning proposal and entering satisfactory local and state infrastructure agreements.

Regarding the Mt Gilead Pty Ltd land, the landowners have engaged Old Mill Property to continue to secure the necessary planning approvals and the purchase agreement permits Lendlease to be a party to necessary planning agreements including Local Voluntary Planning Agreements and State Infrastructure Agreements.

Regarding the Dzwonnik land, Lendlease are responsible for securing the necessary planning approvals for this land and the purchase agreement permits Lendlease to be a party to necessary planning agreements including Local Voluntary Planning Agreements and State Infrastructure agreements."

A full copy of the correspondence received from Lendlease that sets out its interest in the land subject of the Mt Gilead Planning proposal is shown as attachment 4.

Please note that two small portions of land which are part of the Mt Gilead Planning Proposal are proposed to remain within the ownership of Mt Gilead Pty Ltd. These are the access road on the southern boundary of the site with Beulah and a small portion of the dam on the western boundary of the site.

Council subsequently received a Gateway Determination which advised that the proposed rezoning of the subject land could proceed under certain conditions. These conditions included the preparation of a number of technical studies to support the draft planning proposal. These technical studies were completed and form the basis of the final draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal.

A briefing to the Councillors on the status of the proposed rezoning of the subject land at Mt Gilead was undertaken on Tuesday 26 August 2014.

A report was prepared for the Planning and Environment Committee Meeting held on 10 February 2015 requesting Council's endorsement of the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal, draft Mt Gilead Development Control Plan and associated planning documentation for public exhibition purposes. Council at its meeting held on 17 February 2015 resolved that the matter be deferred until the Councillors had received a copy of all the technical reports relating to this matter, and had been briefed on the holistic approach that is required for this development and further developments in Campbelltown South to proceed.

In accordance with Council's resolution a copy of all the technical studies prepared to support the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal was forwarded to all Councillors.

Also, the proponents of the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal provided Councillors with a briefing on Tuesday 24 March 2015 where they specifically addressed concerns that had been raised by Council. These included the proposed road-works to Appin Road and associated funding issues, the proposed fauna corridor through the subject site and the proposed mitigation measures with regard to protecting the visual impact of any future development on the adjoining heritage listed Mt Gilead homestead and mill.

A further briefing was provided on Tuesday 31 March 2015 by representatives of NSW Planning and Environment with regard to the State Government's Urban Capability Study into the Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation Area, which includes the Mt Gilead site.

Subsequently a report was again submitted to Council requesting the public exhibition of the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal, draft development control plan and associated documentation and Council at its meeting held 2 April 2015 resolved to place this documentation on public exhibition for a period of 60 days.

### Report

The draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal, draft Development Control Plan (DCP) and associated documentation was publicly exhibited for 64 days from Tuesday 28 April 2015 until Tuesday 30 June 2015 at the Civic Centre, all Council's libraries and on Council's website.

The objectives of the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal as exhibited were to:

- 1. Permit low density residential development supported by public open space and community facilities, including a small retail centre.
- 2. Protect environmentally sensitive land and provide an environmental bushland corridor that links the Noorumba Reserve with the Beulah biobanking site and the Nepean River corridor.
- 3. Respect the heritage significance of the Mt Gilead homestead site including the outbuildings, old mill and dam and their setting.
- 4. Respect the environmental significance of the Beulah biobanking site.
- 5. Reserve land for acquisition by Roads and Maritime Services for future road infrastructure (widening of Appin Road).
- 6. Increase the supply of housing within the Campbelltown Local Government Area with the addition of up to 1700 new dwellings.

### Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation

Since the public exhibition of the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal and associated documentation, the NSW State Government released the Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation document for public comment in September 2015. This document provides an investigation into the potential of land within the Greater Macarthur area to be developed for urban purposes to assist in addressing the growing need for new housing in the Sydney Basin, and includes the provision of land for employment uses. It also proposes to amend State Environmental Planning Policy (Sydney Region Growth Centres) 2006 by including certain land within the Greater Macarthur area as part of the South West Growth Centre. The land at Mt Gilead is specifically noted as having potential for future residential development, and the document included an action to have had the subject land rezoned by the end of 2015. Reference is also made to the need for the upgrading of Appin Road to accommodate the increase in traffic that would result from any future development in this area.

This document also identifies three biodiversity corridors through the Greater Macarthur area linking the Georges River and the Nepean River. These roughly follow the watercourses of Mallaty Creek, Woodhouse Creek and Menangle Creek.

Council at its meeting held 17 November 2015 considered a report on the Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation (including the Preliminary Strategy and Action Plan) and resolved:

- 1. That Council express in principle support for the Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation, subject to:
  - a) the early implementation of a fully funded infrastructure plan
  - b) a job creation strategy to cater for the increased population.
- 2. That Council requests a specific timeline for the provision of infrastructure and the job strategies as outlined in a) and b) above.
- 3. That Council forward a submission on the investigation (and its supporting documents) to the NSW Department of Planning and Environment consistent with the matters outlined in the report.

In response to the above resolutions the Department of Planning and Environment established a Greater Macarthur Steering Group where Council staff work with the Department of Planning and Environment, Transport for NSW and other agencies to prepare a Land Use and Infrastructure Strategy for the Menangle Park and Mt Gilead precincts of the Campbelltown-Macarthur Priority Growth Area. The Executive Director – Housing and Employment Delivery from the Department of Planning and Environment provided Councillors with a briefing on the Campbelltown-Macarthur Priority Growth Area on 7 June 2016 and a further briefing on 5 July 2016.

This Strategy will guide rezoning and layout plans for each precinct of the growth areas. It will integrate important elements of the precincts including transport, open space, housing, employment lands and environmental protection. A new Special Infrastructure Contribution (SIC) levy will be established to cover the cost of regional road and transport infrastructure, regional open space and recreation, district cultural facilities, schools, emergency services and health facilities, strategic land use planning costs and environmental protection measures.

To further facilitate this partnership the Department of Planning and Environment requested that Council enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) for progressing the planning and implementation of growth opportunities within the Campbelltown-Macarthur Priority Growth Area. Council at its meeting held 19 July 2016 considered a report on the MoU and resolved:

- 1. That the Memorandum of Understanding between Campbelltown City Council and the NSW Department of Planning and Environment shown as the attachment to the above report be executed and the General Manager be authorised to sign the Memorandum on Council's behalf.
- 2. That Council write to the Secretary of the Department of Planning and Environment seeking to organise with the Department that the satisfactory arrangements referred to in her letter to Council dated 14 July 2016 to be put into place for regional level infrastructure prior to rezoning being determined, meet with Council's satisfaction.

The MOU provides a formal commitment to the establishment of a Special Infrastructure Contributions (SIC) scheme as a means to fund the critical and higher (regional) level infrastructure required to support the development of the Mt Gilead Urban Release Area. Three traffic access roads into the subject site from Appin Road are proposed and the proposed SIC levy will provide for the widening of Appin Road from two to four lanes from the southern access road of the subject land through to the intersection of Fitzgibbon Lane and Kellerman Drive.

It has also been recognised that due to the increase in traffic as a result of this planning proposal, that some of the existing intersections on Appin Road will require upgrading. These include the following:

- Copperfield Drive/Kellerman Drive and Appin Road
- Fitzgibbon Lane/Kellerman Drive and Appin Road
- St Johns Road and Appin Road.

The Department of Planning and Environment has recently advised that the Growth Centres SEPP is now proposed to be amended to include the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area which covers the land releases at Menangle Park, Mount Gilead and in the vicinity of Appin, and the urban renewal precincts along the Glenfield to Macarthur rail corridor. A report on the public exhibition of the proposed Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area Package was presented to Council at its meeting held on 25 October 2016 and Councillors resolved as follows:

- 1. That Council make a formal submission to the NSW Department of Planning and Environment concerning the exhibition of the Greater Macarthur Priority Urban Growth Area in August to September 2016, addressing the matters raised in the above report.
- 2. That as an addition to the submission that Council urge the NSW Government to pursue south facing ramps to the Hume Highway as a key element of the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area Infrastructure package.

### Submissions

In response to the public exhibition of the draft planning proposal a total of 20 submissions have been received from government agencies and service providers, and 31 submissions have been received from the community. The following table identifies the main issues raised by the submissions and the comments of Council officers. Copies of the submissions have been made available to all Councillors.

Su	Submissions from government agencies and service providers		
	Organisation	Submission Items	
1.	Department of Primary Industries - Fisheries	<ul> <li>no objections to the planning proposal provided the:</li> <li>proposed riparian buffers zones are implemented</li> <li>stormwater reduction targets are achieved.</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>It is noted that these r future development approximation</li> </ul>	natters can be dealt with as part of the assessment of any	
2.	Fire & Rescue NSW	<ul> <li>no objections to the planning proposal.</li> </ul>	
	Comment     The no objection comm	nent is noted.	
3.	NSW Rural Fire Service	<ul> <li>identifies the key issues and assessment requirements regarding bush fire protection that will be required for any future development of the subject site.</li> </ul>	
		relating to bush fire protection can be dealt with as part of future development application.	
4.	Water NSW	<ul> <li>notes the need to avoid and minimise impacts on the Upper Canal by any future development</li> <li>generally supports the provisions of the draft DCP with a few minor amendments relating to name changes (Water NSW has now replaced the Sydney Catchment Authority, and the Sydney Water Catchment Management Act 1998 is now Water NSW Act 2014) and an additional objective ensuring that all future development adjacent to the Upper Canal corridor considers and responds to its heritage values.</li> </ul>	

	Comment	
	• it is recognised that any development applications on land adjacent to the Upper Canal must ensure no detrimental impacts on the canal corridor	
	• the minor amendments to the draft DCP as requested have already been included in Campbelltown (Sustainable City) DCP 2015.	
5.	Transport for NSW	Requests the following:
		<ul> <li>development be capped at 1,700 lots through the inclusion of a provision within Campbelltown LEP 2015</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>the proponents enter into a planning agreement with the Department of Planning and Environment for the provision of agreed road infrastructure</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>the draft DCP be amended to increase the width of the parking lane on the Collector Road (Bus Route) from 2.3 metres to 2.5 metres to accommodate a standard bus</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>provision and dedication of a 20 metre setback along Appin Road through a planning agreement, to be shown under a SP2 Infrastructure Classified Road Zone.</li> </ul>

- Campbelltown LEP 2015 contains under clause 4.1A a maximum dwelling density requirement for three existing urban development areas. The draft Planning Proposal has been amended to include Mt Gilead into clause 4.1A by imposing a cap of 1,700 lots supported by the provision of a density/yield map
- a technical design brief for the upgrade works required to Appin Road as a result of future development of the subject land between the southern boundary of the subject land and Fitzgibbon Lane Ambarvale has been agreed upon by staff from Council, Roads and Maritime Services and Transport for NSW. Further, Council staff are aware that the proponent in conjunction with Lendlease (the conditional purchaser of the subject land) has lodged an offer to enter into a Regional Voluntary Planning Agreement with the Department of Planning and Environment to majority fund the required upgrade works prior to the completion of the 1700 lots. While the Regional Voluntary Planning Agreement including the staging and timing of the required upgrades is yet to be finalised, Council is afforded security that the required infrastructure will be provided in a staged and orderly manner based upon demand prior to the completion of the 1,700 lots through the satisfactory arrangements requirement of the recently signed MoU with the Department of Planning and Environment
- A copy of the formal Lendlease offer to the NSW department of Planning and Environment and advice to Council concerning that offer is shown as attachment 5

	Agreement similar to acceptable funding de that section between F Urban Release Area The offer by Lendlea verbal advise has been • the above agreement is metre setback along A	ote, subject to acceptance from the Department, a Planning that in the offer made by Lendlease would secure an livery mechanism for the timely upgrade of Appin Road for fitzgibbon Lane and the southern extremity of the Mt Gilead se is currently being considered by the Department and a received that the response is expected in the near future is proposed to include a reference to the dedication of a 20 opin Road the location of which has already been loosed zoning map as SP2 Infrastructure Classified Road ited
	<ul> <li>it is noted that the request to widen the parking lane from 2.3m to 2.5m is in keeping with the request from Busabout (item 15) to widen the road carriageway to 12m. The draft DCP has been amended to accommodate this request.</li> </ul>	
6.	NSW Trade & Investment Resources & Energy	<ul> <li>Extractive Resource Issues:</li> <li>notes the location of the Menangle Sandstone Quarry west of the subject land and advises that Council would need to be satisfied that any potential land use conflicts are appropriately addressed</li> </ul>
		Coal and Petroleum Issues
		<ul> <li>due to geological constraints the extraction of resources is considered unlikely and thus no issues are raised.</li> </ul>
	Comment	
	• it is noted that a small area of the subject land falls within the transition (buffer) area of the Menangle Sandstone Quarry and that any future development of this land will need to take into consideration the impacts of any extraction that may occur on the quarry site.	
7.	Sydney Water	Water
		<ul> <li>drinking water can be provided to the urban release area from the Rosemeadow drinking water system</li> </ul>
		• the developer will need to provide a new elevated reservoir, water pumping station and associated trunk and reticulation mains to service the subject site.
		Wastewater
		<ul> <li>wastewater can be transferred to the Glenfield Water Recycling Plant</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>the developer will need to provide a new wastewater pumping station and associated lead-in and reticulation mains to service the subject site.</li> </ul>

	Comment	
	• it is noted that both water and wastewater services can be provided to the site and that the developer would be responsible for its provision	
		s been nominated for the location of the proposed new hin the south eastern portion of the subject land as noted in
8.	Office of Environment	Biodiversity
	and Heritage	<ul> <li>advises that areas proposed for conservation should be zoned E2 Environmental Protection to ensure the long term retention and protection of these areas</li> </ul>
		• supports the biodiversity link connecting Noorumba Reserve with the Nepean River but requests that the corridor be widened and the stormwater detention basins, active recreation and other incompatible uses be removed, and the 'dead end' portion be continued through to lands west of the site
		Floodplain Risk Management
		<ul> <li>recommends a number of issues that should be considered at the design stage of any future development on the subject land.</li> </ul>
		Stormwater Management
		<ul> <li>provides a number of comments and recommendations with regard to the water quality modelling as noted in the Mt Gilead Stormwater Management and Flooding Assessment.</li> </ul>
	Comment	
	<ul> <li>to ensure consistency with Campbelltown LEP 2015 (CLEP 2015) the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal does not propose to zone conservation lands E2 Environmental Conservation as these lands will instead be subject to the provisions for conservation and enhancement as noted below:</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>the draft Planning Proposal includes a Terrestrial Biodiversity clause which aims to maximise the retention and enhancement of native biodiversity</li> </ul>	
	as future biobanki	some of the proposed conservation lands will be considered ng sites which would therefore result in them being covered ation and rehabilitation provisions of any biobanking
		Ind Infrastructure Services Delivery Plan includes provisions ion and enhancement of all open space land that will be incil

Council is in the process of finalising a Koala Plan of Management and Biodiversity Strategy which will further strengthen the conservation and rehabilitation of all lands proposed for biodiversity conservation through a future amendment to CLEP 2015 Noorumba Reserve was zoned RE1 Public Recreation under CLEP 2015 and it is thus considered preferable to zone any adjoining conservation land, that is proposed to be dedicated to Council, the same zoning to provide continuity. it is recognised that there are at least two well established existing wildlife corridors from the Georges River through both Noorumba Reserve and Beulah to the Nepean River and the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal will not have any detrimental impact on these corridors. However, the draft Planning Proposal does aim to provide an additional option for a wildlife link through the subject land from the Noorumba Reserve to Beulah. Whilst this link will contain active open space and drainage basins it is also proposed to include a significant amount of vegetation aimed at providing habitat for native fauna. All of this land is proposed to be dedicated to Council. Clearly the wider the width of a wildlife corridor the better. However, further information with regard to corridor widths was received from the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) which advised that local corridors can be less than 50m in width. The narrowest part of the proposed wildlife link is 45.2m, but the total open space area that the corridor passes through is approximately 14 hectares. It is therefore not proposed to widen this link any further as it is considered that sufficient land has been allocated to allow for the movement of native fauna through the subject site whilst the dead end area of vegetation does not link to lands on the west of the site through public recreation areas, it will be connected via significant street tree plantings, and this approach is supported by Council's environmental officers comments with regard to floodplain risk management are noted • it should also be noted that wildlife corridors are being considered as part of the Master Planning by the Greater Macarthur Steering Group and are being investigated in more technical detail for the whole of the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area comments with regard to water quality modelling are noted and it is considered that no additional work is required at this stage. However, more detailed assessment will need to be undertaken as part of any future development of the subject site, i.e. dealt with by development application. advises that the existing schools within the vicinity of the ٠ 9. NSW Education and subject land are at or near capacity and thus will not be Communities able to meet the additional demand that would be created by the proposed development of the Mt Gilead Urban Release Area. They will either need to be upgraded or a new school site identified as lands surrounding the subject site have been • identified as having potential for future housing development, the investigation of a site for a new school within these lands is considered an option.

	Education and Comm future school should Department of Educa within surrounding lan	I between the proponents and officers of Council and NSW bunities and while initially it was proposed that a site for a be provided within the boundaries of the subject land, the tion has now advised that such a site could be provided ds if they are developed for urban purposes in the future as carthur Land Release technical investigations.
1 0.	NSW Health	<ul> <li>supports the proposed cycleway/pedestrian network and recommends the provision of well-placed bike racks and good lighting</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>notes the importance of ensuring access to healthy foods</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>advises that the proposed bus service should be commenced early in the development of the area and should be extended further into the site</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>supports the range of proposed residential lot sizes but concerned by the cap of 65 smaller lots as this will not address housing affordability</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>notes that the plan is purely residential and thus may result in long commuting times for residents travelling to work</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>concerned that there are no apparent plans for a school or childcare centres</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>supports the proposed public open space and neighbourhood/community facilities</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>consider that the potential for impacts of gas extraction in the future need to be closely monitored</li> </ul>
		• notes a number of issues that would be dealt with in conjunction with any future development applications, e.g. land contamination, noise, air quality, bushfire risk
		<ul> <li>advises that suitable measures should be undertaken to mitigate the potential for mosquito breeding within any water retention basins or ponding areas.</li> </ul>
	Comment	
	• generally the issues concerning land contamination, noise, air quality, bushfire risk and issues with regard to the development of drainage basins can be dealt with in the assessment of any potential development applications for the subject site	
of the incoming comm the subject site wou Council could write to MOU to request the provide for the early	roposed bus service is anticipated to be dictated by the need nunity. However it is recognised that the potential residents of all benefit from the early establishment of a bus service. The Department under the auspices of the recently executed Department to ensure arrangements are put into place to commencement of bus services to and from Mt Gilead and acarthur Regional City Centre	
--	--	--
affordability will not b minimum area of 3 residential lots size purchasers. The bulk subdivided into lots w Whilst it is proposed 65, there is still the minimum area of 450 traffic infrastructure (u Maritime Services ha	ents are provided with regard to the concern that housing e addressed due to the proposed cap of 65 small lots with a 75sqm. The planning proposal provides for a variety of s to ensure a wide opportunity of choice for potential of the site (being approximately 1250 lots) is proposed to be vith a minimum area of 500sqm and 700sqm on steeper land. to cap the number of lots with a minimum area of 375sqm to opportunity for approximately 350 lots to be subdivided to a 0sqm. It is also important to note that in light of the proposed upgrading of Appin Road), Transport for NSW and Roads and ve requested a provision within Campbelltown LEP 2015 that of residential lots to 1700	
<ul> <li>whilst this draft planning proposal is mostly for residential development it is important to note that the Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation document includes certain employment lands, and access to these areas will be provided as the Priority Growth Area develops. Thus it is anticipated that the development of these lands will assist in providing jobs closer to homes thus reducing travelling times</li> </ul>		
<ul> <li>as noted in item nine above the provision of a school is proposed by Department of Education to be provided within surrounding lands. With regard to childcare centres these are a permissible land use within the proposed R2 Low Density Residential Zone, and thus there would be opportunities for the private sector to establish such facilities within the subject site</li> </ul>		
	ssue of the impact of gas extraction it is noted that AGL ruary 2016 that it will cease production at the Camden Gas	
all other comments an	re noted.	
Department of Primary Industries Agriculture NSW	<ul> <li>notes the difficulties that can arise due to the interface between residential development and existing agricultural practices</li> </ul>	
	<ul> <li>supports the retention of agriculture heritage landscapes and views</li> </ul>	

1 1.

> considers that before any further planning proposals are determined the Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation should be completed. If Council wishes to keep rural productive land then other options for housing will be needed.

#### Comment

• comments are noted

 as noted previously in this report, since the public exhibition of the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal, the NSW State Government released the Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation document for public comment. This investigation specifically notes that the land at Mt Gilead has the potential for future residential development. The Greater Macarthur Investigation Area covers a large portion of land within the Campbelltown and Wollondilly Local Government Areas (LGA) and includes both the Mt Gilead and Menangle Park Urban Release Areas. These release areas are the only lands within the investigation area within the Campbelltown LGA that have been specifically identified within the NSW Metropolitan Development Program for future urban development. As they have both been supported by the Department of Planning and Environment and publicly exhibited, it is considered that they should continue to be assessed in accordance with their Gateway determinations. The Department of Planning and Environment supports this position.

12.	Environment Protection Authority	<ul> <li>considers that this planning proposal should not be assessed in isolation, but should be considered as part of the Macarthur Investigation Area and the South West Sydney Sub Regional Delivery Plan</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>considers that photochemical smog (ozone) and particle pollution remain air quality issues of significant regional concern. However, advice is provided on ways to meet relevant air quality goals and protect human health, the environment and community amenity. Refers to the document Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads-Interim Guideline and ways to manage wood burning heaters</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>provides advice on ways to mitigate potential noise pollution, contamination issues, waste management and water quality impacts.</li> </ul>

#### Comment

- as noted previously and in item 11 above, since the public exhibition of the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal, the NSW State Government released the Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation document for public comment. This investigation specifically notes that the land at Mt Gilead has the potential for future residential development. Further the Department of Planning and Environment has identified that the planning proposals for the Mt Gilead and Menangle Park Urban Release Areas can proceed ahead of the finalisation of the technical studies associated with the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area
- it is recognised that vehicle emissions are a major source of air pollution and thus negotiations have already been held with a local bus company to ensure that an adequate bus service can be provided to the subject site in an effort to reduce private car usage. Also, the draft DCP provides for an extensive network of pedestrian and cycle paths to encourage walking and cycling

<ul> <li>the impact of air pollution from vehicle emissions on development adjoining Road can be ameliorated through careful site planning and architectural de- is recommended that a reference to the Department of Planning Environment's Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads-I Guideline be included within the draft Mt Gilead DCP to ensure th provisions of this document can be taken into consideration with regard planning for any future development fronting Appin Road</li> <li>with regard to domestic solid fuel heaters it is anticipated that gas v available to all residences within the release area thus reducing the ne such heaters. However, it is noted that there are significant regulations cu in place within the Protection of the Environment Operations (Clea Regulation 2010 to ensure that all domestic solid fuel heaters sold in comply with emission limits specified in Australian Standard AS/NZS 4013</li> </ul>		
	flue gas emission,	solid fuel burning appliances - method for determination of and are marked accordingly. Advice with regard to wood able on Council's website
		h regard to mitigating potential noise pollution, contamination gement and water quality impacts is noted.
13.	Endeavour Energy	<ul> <li>advises of the procedure needed to be undertaken for the provision of electricity to the subject site.</li> </ul>
	Comment	· · · · ·
	reveal that the subjut that additional infrast	etween the proponent's consultants and Endeavour Energy ect land can be serviced with electricity. However, it is noted structure will be required including a new zone substation and o 11kV feeders from the Ambarvale zone substation.
14.	NSW Local Land Services	<ul> <li>Local Land Services (LLS) is an approval authority for clearing native vegetation under the <i>Native Vegetation</i> <i>Act 2003.</i> As the Act does not apply to Campbelltown the LLS has no approval role for the clearing of native vegetation on the subject land</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>supports the assessments made by the Flora and Fauna consultants that the proposal can achieve a maintain or improve outcome with variations as required if the Shale Sandstone Transition forest is impacted by the development.</li> </ul>
	Comment	
	Comments are note	d.
15.	Busabout Neville's Bus Service Pty Ltd	prepared to provide bus services to the subject site
		<ul> <li>requests the widening of the road carriageway from 11.6m to 12m.</li> </ul>
	Comment	
<ul> <li>it is noted that the request to widen the road carriageway to with the request from Transport for NSW to widen the parking 2.5m. As noted in item 5 the draft DCP has been amended to</li> </ul>		m Transport for NSW to widen the parking lane from 2.3m to

	request.	
16.	request. Sydney Living Museums	<ul> <li>concerned by the: <ul> <li>loss of mature vegetation on Appin Road and its historic alignment</li> <li>loss of open rural land of considerable cultural significance</li> <li>future impacts on fauna within Beulah from domestic animals.</li> </ul> </li> <li>does not support the proposed access road on the southern boundary of the subject land adjacent to Beulah, and requests replacing its proposed RU2 Rural</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>Landscape zone with the RE1 Public Recreation zone. Also requests the inclusion of this land within the Terrestrial Biodiversity Map. However, it is also requested that the maximum building height and minimum subdivision lot size be identified for this land under the RU2 zone</li> <li>identify the Mt Gilead Urban Release Area as an Urban Release Area in draft Campbelltown LEP 2014</li> <li>identify Appin Road as a significant feature in both the draft DCP Indicative Heritage Principles and Indicative</li> </ul>
		Landscape Strategy maps.
<ul> <li>Comment</li> <li>it is recognised that any development of rural land for urban purposes wi in the loss of rural landscapes and arguments for higher densities clurallway stations as an alternative are often proposed. However, it is im that Council recognises that a variety of housing forms should be avail accommodate the changing needs of the community. Whilst apartment close to all amenities is preferable to certain sections of the population, de housing in an open environment is more attractive to other sections. This Mt Gilead has been identified for development for many years and thus the always been an expectation that it would one day be developed for purposes</li> </ul>		I landscapes and arguments for higher densities closer to an alternative are often proposed. However, it is important hises that a variety of housing forms should be available to changing needs of the community. Whilst apartment living as is preferable to certain sections of the population, detached environment is more attractive to other sections. This land at identified for development for many years and thus there has
	<ul> <li>it is noted that whilst some of the mature trees along Appin Road will need to removed to provide for the proposed road widening, appendix 1 of the draft Gilead DCP provides for the replanting of street trees along Appin Road indigenous species. It is also noted that due to the proposed construction roundabouts at the three intersections of Appin Road and the subject land, traffic will travel at a significantly reduced speed in this area, thus creating a s environment for all</li> </ul>	
	boundary of the sub	proposed to be zoned RU2 Rural Landscape on the southern oject site, and adjacent to Beulah, is proposed to be retained the property owner of the land to the west of the subject site

in the ownership of the property owner of the land to the west of the subject site to enable direct access from Appin Road for agricultural management purposes.

	<ul> <li>of this land. However, subdivision lot size if</li> <li>whilst the Mt Gilea identified within Pa (CLEP 2015) it is provisions of Part 6</li> </ul>	lered necessary or appropriate to amend the proposed zoning er, it is noted that the maximum building height and minimum maps should be amended to include this land d Urban Release Area (MGURA) has not been specifically rt 6 Urban Release Areas within Campbelltown LEP 2015 noted that this draft planning proposal has addressed the 5. However, it is recommended that an Urban Release Area CLEP 2015 and that the MGURA be identified as a release	
	other comments are	e noted.	
17.	Wollondilly Shire Council	<ul> <li>requests that the following matters be considered:</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>placing the proposal on hold until the Greater Macarthur Area investigation is complete</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>zone all areas of native vegetation E3 or E4 Environment Protection or use Natural Resources (Biodiversity) Clauses</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>undertake further investigation into the potential impacts on existing regional habitat corridors and the movement of koalas</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>undertake further investigation into potential air quality impacts</li> </ul>	
	Oceanit	<ul> <li>undertake further investigation into the impacts of traffic travelling south to Bulli and Appin.</li> </ul>	
	Comment		
	<ul> <li>as noted previously, since the public exhibition of the draft Mt Gilead Plannin Proposal, the NSW State Government released the Greater Macarthur Lan Release Investigation document for public comment. This investigation specifically notes that the land at Mt Gilead has the potential for future residentiat development, and enjoys the support of the NSW Government. Further the Government recently exhibited a proposal to include these lands in the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>the areas of native vegetation are proposed to be zoned public recreation as the will be dedicated to Council. However, these lands are proposed to be subject a number of provisions as noted in item 8 above including the provisions of proposed terrestrial biodiversity clause and map that have been included in draft planning proposal</li> </ul>		
	has been undertake	t at this stage of the planning process sufficient investigation on with regard to habitat corridors particularly as the site has	

has been undertaken with regard to habitat corridors particularly as the site has been substantially cleared for a number of years. However, the draft planning proposal aims to provide additional opportunities for the movement of wildlife through the subject site

	<ul> <li>in light of the information provided by the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) it is considered that further investigation into potential air quality issues is not required. However it is noted that any future development on the subject site must be assessed within the guidelines referred to by the EPA</li> <li>it is not considered necessary to undertake any further investigation into traffic travelling south to Wollondilly Shire as only 5 per cent of the total traffic flow from the site is anticipated to travel south. Of more concern to Council is the volume of traffic that is generated from the recent and proposed developments at Appin which travels in a northerly direction through the Campbelltown LGA.</li> </ul>		
18.	Transport – Roads and Maritime	Has no objection to the draft planning proposal subject to:	
	Services	<ul> <li>development being capped at 1700 lots through a provision within Campbelltown LEP 2015</li> </ul>	
		• the proponents entering into a planning agreement (prior to the making or gazettal of the planning proposal) with the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) for the provision of agreed road infrastructure, and dedication of a 20 metre road reserve along the western boundary of the subject site at no cost to Government.	
	Comment		
	density requiremen planning proposal h	2015 contains under clause 4.1A a maximum dwelling t for three existing urban development areas. The draft has been amended to include Mt Gilead into clause 4.1A by 700 lots supported by the provision of a density/yield map	
	<ul> <li>a technical design brief for the upgrade works required to Appin Road as a result of future development of the subject land between the southern boundary of the subject land and Fitzgibbon Lane Ambarvale has been agreed upon by staff from Council, Roads and Maritime Services and Transport for NSW. Further, Counce staff are aware that the proponent in conjunction with Lendlease (the condition purchaser of the subject land) has lodged an offer for a Regional Voluntal Planning Agreement with the Department of Planning and Environment majority fund the required upgrade works prior to the completion of the 1700 lot While the Regional Voluntary Planning Agreement including the staging an timing of the required upgrades is yet to be finalised, Council is afforded securit that the required infrastructure will be provided in a staged and orderly mannet based upon demand prior to the completion of the 1700 lots through the satisfactory arrangements requirement of the recently signed MoU with the Department of Planning and Environment</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>the above agreement is proposed to include a reference to the dedication of a 2 metre setback along Appin Road the location of which has already bee recognised on the proposed zoning map as SP2 Infrastructure Classified Roa that was publicly exhibited</li> </ul>		
	Department of Plar	er by Lendlease for a Planning Agreement with the NSW nning is shown at attachment 5. This sets out a proposed mechanism for the upgrade of Appin Road.	

	1	
19.	Department of Primary Industries Water	would prefer the zoning of the watercourses and riparian corridors to be zoned E2 Environmental Conservation and not RE1 Public Recreation and RU2 Rural Landscape, and be under Council's ownership and management
	•	recommends that the draft DCP include a separate section to deal with watercourse/riparian issues, and that the objectives of clause 3.3 Public Open Space be amended to strengthen the need to conserve and enhance the existing riparian corridors watercourses
	•	supports the concept of a biodiversity corridor linking the Georges River with the Nepean River and considers that the planning proposal does not provide such a linkage.
	Comment	
	dedicated to Council a The portion proposed ownership. However, proposed Terrestrial I and enhancement of r be considered as a fu	bosed to be zoned RE1 Public Recreation is proposed to be and will thus come under its ownership and management. to be zoned RU2 Rural Landscape will remain in private all this land would be subject to the provisions of the Biodiversity clause which aims to maximise the retention hative biodiversity. It is also proposed that some of this land uture biobank site which would therefore result in it being ervation and rehabilitation provisions of any BioBanking
	zoned E2 Environme clause 7.3 which aim groundwater systems. Management and B conservation and reha CLEP 2015. Thus, to Planning Proposal do	in draft Campbelltown LEP 2015 (CLEP 2015) are not ntal Conservation, but are covered by the provisions of ns to protect and maintain riparian land, waterways and Also, Council is in the process of finalising a Koala Plan of iodiversity Strategy which will further strengthen the abilitation of riparian lands through a future amendment to ensure consistency with CLEP 2015 the draft Mt Gilead wes not propose to zone riparian lands E2 Environmental instead be subject to the provisions for conservation and d above
	DCP with regard to rip	ered necessary to include a separate section in the draft parian corridors, it is considered that the wording in clause ened as recommended by this submission
	proposed Ecological C The draft DCP also in Indicative Structure PI should be included to recommended that an the scope of this draft of this biodiversity co location of the propos	oposal in Figures 16 and 17 denote the location of the Corridor from Noorumba Reserve through the subject land. Indicates the location of this corridor in Figure 2 Mt Gilead an. It is considered that additional wording in the draft DCP o strengthen the establishment of this corridor. Thus it is additional objective be included in clause 2.2. It is beyond to provide provisions for the extension prridor beyond the subject site boundaries. However, the sed corridor through the site was chosen to connect with tside the site's boundaries and thus provide a link with both Beulah

		ted that wildlife corridors are being considered as part of the the Greater Macarthur Steering Group.
20.	Office of Environment and Heritage - Heritage Council	<ul> <li>considers that the proposed curtilage for Mt Gilead is insufficient and should include the cultural landscape. Thus a curtilage study and a conservation management plan need to be prepared prior to the finalisation of this draft planning proposal</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>recommends that a buffer zone be provided between the proposed R2 and RU2 zones to reduce the visual impact of new development on the heritage values of Mt Gilead</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>considers that the adjacent colonial farms (Mt Gilead, Beulah and Meadowvale) have been overlooked in the heritage assessment</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>considers that the draft planning proposal does not provide any measures to minimise the impact of future development on the Upper Canal, and recommends that consideration be given to providing a RE1 (public recreation) buffer along the canal</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>recommends a number of amendments to the draft DCP with regard to:</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>strengthening the heritage objectives and controls</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>issues relating to significant vistas and view corridors</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>appropriateness of the proposed tree planting along the interpretive driveway</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>landscape screening and appropriate tree planting</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>relationship with adjoining heritage properties</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>recognition of the former Hillsborough cottage</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>extending the pedestrian/cycle route along the entire interpretive driveway</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>retention of significant trees and remnant vegetation</li> </ul>
		- ensure One Tree Hill remains as is
		<ul> <li>natural heritage needs further consideration.</li> </ul>

#### Comment

- the boundaries of the proposed residential areas of the subject land were determined after extensive investigations were carried out to ensure the integrity of the Mt Gilead homestead site and associated heritage items. As a result a large area of land on the western boundary of the subject site is proposed to remain rural and will thus act as an extensive buffer between the proposed residential development and the outskirts of the homestead precinct. The DCP provisions recognise the importance of the significant view corridors through the site and also the need to protect the existing views from the homestead particularly to the north and east. Thus the proposed buffer will include significant new tree planting to provide screening of any new development from the homestead site
- it is considered that the heritage significance of the surrounding cultural landscape has been satisfactorily taken into consideration with regard to this draft planning proposal. This is proposed to be achieved through the provision of a significant area of rural land on the western boundary to buffer the impacts of any future development on the Mt Gilead homestead site, and the provision/retention of an open space area on the southern boundary to provide separation from the Beulah site. It is unclear how further recognition of other previous colonial farms could be achieved
- provisions are already included in the Campbelltown (Sustainable City) DCP (of which the proposed draft Mt Gilead DCP will be a part) to ensure the protection of the Upper Canal, and these provisions have been supported by Water NSW
- in order to provide a clear view corridor from Appin Road towards the entrance of the Mt Gilead homestead site, it is not proposed to retain the existing alignment of the carriageway from Appin Road to the Mt Gilead homestead, only the entrance from Appin Road. Thus whilst there is not proposed to be any vehicular access to Appin Road at this point the historic entrance is proposed to be acknowledged and identified with specimen tree planting
- whilst it is recognised that some of the existing vegetation is proposed to be removed it is noted that most of this vegetation comprises scattered trees. However, provisions are included within the draft planning proposal to protect and enhance significant areas of native vegetation through the provision of a terrestrial biodiversity clause and map. Also, some of the proposed conservation lands are being considered as future biobanking sites and would thus be covered by the conservation and rehabilitation provisions of any BioBanking Agreements
- it is considered that additional objectives and controls can be included by Council in the draft DCP to address relevant heritage issues. These include:
  - an additional key development objective in clause 2.2 relating specifically to the heritage significance of the Mt Gilead homestead site, outbuildings, mill and dam and their setting
  - amendment of control 1 in clause 3.1 to address the interpretation of the former Hillsborough Cottage
  - amendment of Figure 6 to extend the pedestrian/cycleway westward along the proposed interpretive driveway

_	amendment of control 2 in clause 3.1 to refer to Figure 7 and not Figure 3 with regard to the identification of the proposed landscape screening
-	inclusion of an additional objective in clause 3.1 to address the retention of regional views as referred to in the note to clause 3.1
-	removal of the word Indicative from the title of Figure 3 to read Heritage Principles Plan.

	Comments		
21	National Parks Association of NSW	does not support the draft Planning Proposal for the following reasons:	
		<ul> <li>the road infrastructure in Campbelltown should be improved before land is released and that redevelopment should occur closer to railway stations</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>widening of Appin Road will be detrimental to native fauna</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>the development is likely to have an adverse impact on Noorumba Reserve and Beulah</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>the planning documentation fails to adequately explain how views, bushland, riparian corridors, heritage items and water quality will be protected</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>as the proposal is located between two areas of endangered ecological communities it should be referred to the Federal Government for assessment</li> </ul>	
	Comment	<u>.</u>	
	• significant road-works are proposed along a large section of Appin Road to accommodate the additional transport need that would be created by this draft planning proposal and demands by other road users		
	• the issue of providing an alternative means for native fauna to cross Appin Road is currently being investigated as part of the design for the upgrade of this road		
• whilst it is recognised that public areas of natural bushland can abused it is considered that the majority of the community resp and benefit from their location being within walking distance f areas		lered that the majority of the community respect such areas	
		at the planning documentation provides more than adequate views, bushland, riparian corridors, heritage items and water cted	

	•	it is recognised that development in the vicinity of endangered ecological communities should be referred to the Federal Government for comment. Whilst this does not need to occur until a development application is prepared the proponents have been in contact with the Federal Department of the Environment to discuss the implication of the provisions of the <i>Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999</i> .
22.	•	objects to the draft planning proposal and refers to a letter to Council from the then Member for Werriwa, Mark Latham dated 5 January 1996 who argues that Macarthur South should never proceed
	•	considers that traffic congestion, air and water pollution are just as worrying today as they were in 1996.
23.	•	objects to the draft planning proposal as Council is seeking to take the last remaining farmland in the Sydney Basin and turn it into yet another developer and Council cash cow
	•	recommends permitting subdivision into one - three acres rural lots interconnected by a series of horse and mountain bike paths, protecting the rural vistas and natural beauty
	•	concerned by the volume of traffic on Appin Road from development at Appin Valley.
24.	•	concerned by the impacts of future development on:
		<ul> <li>wildlife corridors and particularly koala habitat</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>loss of mature trees</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>increased traffic on Appin Road and the need for effective wildlife crossings and buffer zones</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>the increase in potential residential lots from 1500 noted in the Metropolitan Development Program to up to 1700 lots</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>impact on the heritage listed Upper Canal.</li> </ul>
25.	•	requests consideration be given to the impact that this proposed development will have on wildlife and bushland.
26.	•	considers that it's really not the road that's a danger, it's the stupidity of the impatient, speeding drivers that makes Appin Road a dangerous road. Even if it were expanded into two lanes either way it would make the situation worse, so serious and careful consideration to cancel this zoning should be put into place.
27.	•	considers that a pair of beautiful, architecturally designed 90 storey buildings next to Campbelltown station would be much better than turning the beautiful Mt Gilead into another cookie cutter concrete and bitumen one-storey suburb. And with an urban footprint a fraction of the size of this draft Mt Gilead proposal.
28.	•	opposes the subdivision of the subject land and requests Council approach NSW State Government, Federal Government and industry to have the land purchased for public use and environmental corridors.
29.	•	opposes the proposed development at Mt Gilead and notes the following:
1	l I	

- the Upper Canal will be hugely impacted

		<ul> <li>Mt Gilead is the most major part of Campbelltown's history and also played a very important part with regard to Aboriginal heritage</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>there will not be enough infrastructure to support this development, e.g.</li> <li>Campbelltown Hospital where the new extension is already flawed</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>Appin Road is still full of sink holes from mine subsidence</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>more development will create more pollution for the Nepean and Georges Rivers</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>What we will be leaving for our children and grandchildren, nothing. Affordable housing is being preached over and over by all sections of Government, who may I ask is this affordable housing for, our growing population, of immigrants and at whose cost?</li> </ul>
30.	•	14 short submissions have been received by email all opposing any more housing along Appin Road. The main concern is the increase in traffic on Appin Road and resultant safety issues, loss of a rural landscape, negative impact on the Nepean and Georges Rivers and the impact on wildlife.
31.	•	objects to the draft Planning Proposal for the following reasons:
		<ul> <li>potential impact on:</li> <li>air quality</li> <li>holistic approach to the development of South Campbelltown</li> <li>future residential amenity</li> <li>visual landscape</li> <li>the heritage properties of South Campbelltown</li> <li>fauna and flora corridor between the Nepean and Georges Rivers and between Noorumba Reserve and Beulah</li> <li>Nepean River</li> <li>Appin Road.</li> </ul>
		- approval of this draft Planning Proposal would set an undesirable precedent
		<ul> <li>failure to adequately address and demonstrate:</li> </ul>
		<ul> <li>a curtilage that preserves the historic integrity of Mt Gilead</li> <li>impact of air emissions and provision of a comprehensive air quality study</li> <li>impact of stormwater and floods on the Nepean River</li> <li>impact of noise</li> <li>any proposal for mass public transport</li> <li>visual impact of the development and that all important site views and vistas are fully retained</li> <li>management of bush fire risk</li> <li>extent and impact on flora and fauna and an adequate environmental corridor between Noorumba Reserve, Beulah and the Nepean River.</li> </ul>
		- the release area is located in a long recognised Scenic Protection Area.
	•	requests that Council endorse and forward this submission to the Minister for Planning requesting a public inquiry

r						
	<ul> <li>requests that Council also write to the Minister for Water</li> <li>requests that the Government is made aware of Lendlease's proposal to acquire 610 hectares of land at Mt Gilead</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>requests that Council upgrade the Appin Road study in light of the developm of Appin Valley</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>requests that Council notify all local residents of the impact that this or Planning Proposal will have on their quality of life.</li> </ul>					
32	• The Macarthur Greens object to the draft Planning Proposal for the following reasons:					
	<ul> <li>Appin Road is already at capacity and consider that no further development along Appin Road should occur until there is a clear source of funding available for its upgrade</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>considers that the draft planning proposal should not proceed until it is clear that the Glenfield STP has capacity to service the subject land and the planned 20,000 dwellings at Appin</li> </ul>					
	<ul> <li>concerned by the amount of clearing of Shale Sandstone Transition Forest and none of the reports detail the procedure for obtaining assent from the Commonwealth Government for this clearing.</li> </ul>					
Comment						
The main issues of concern raised by the submissions numbered 22 - 32 are as follows:						

- Appin Road
- visual impact and loss of a rural heritage and agricultural landscape
- the impact on fauna and flora including adequacy of environmental corridors
- the impact on the Upper Canal
- air pollution
- water pollution and the impact on the Nepean River
- curtilage around Mt Gilead
- Aboriginal heritage
- provision of infrastructure.

### Appin Road

It is recognised that Appin Road currently carries a significant amount of traffic into and out of Campbelltown every day, and that the proposed development at Mt Gilead will add to the overall traffic volume. Whilst it is noted that there have been a number of fatalities on Appin Road with the majority of these occurring on the section between Appin and Bulli, the issue of safety is a major matter of concern. Appin Road is classified as a State Road and comes under the jurisdiction of NSW Roads and Maritime Services (RMS). The proponents of the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal and Council have been working with RMS and Transport for NSW to ensure that appropriate road-works along Appin Road are provided to accommodate the proposed increase in traffic. These road-works include the widening of Appin Road to 4 lanes from the intersection of Fitzgibbon Lane and Kellerman Drive to the southernmost access point of the subject site, the provision of three roundabouts at the three access points from the proposed release area, and upgrades to existing intersections further north. It is considered that these road-works, particularly the provision of the three roundabouts, will assist in slowing the traffic down along Appin Road and thus improving its safety record.

Please see attachment 5, which sets-out an offer from Lendlease for a Planning Agreement with the NSW Department of Planning and Environment to upgrade Appin Road.

The issue of providing for a safe wildlife access route across Appin Road is difficult for Council to resolve due to Appin Road's classification as a State Road. While Council staff are aware that the brief for the upgrade to Appin Road includes the provision of wildlife crossing, it is recommended that Council write to Transport for NSW and Roads and Maritime Services and request that a safe wildlife crossing be included in any road-works on Appin Road. Council should also seek the formal support of the Department of Planning and Environment for this action.

Some concern was raised with regard to the loss of trees along Appin Road due to the proposed widening. The majority of trees along Appin Road are located within the road reserve and not within the Mt Gilead property, with minimal stands within the northern section of the site. It is this northern section that will be most impacted by the proposed future road-works. The southern section of Appin Road that borders the subject site does exhibit denser stands of tree, but initially no major road-work is proposed within this area. However, significant street tree planting is proposed along Appin Road as part of any future road widening.

#### Visual impact and loss of a rural heritage and agricultural landscape

Any development of the Mt Gilead site will result in the loss of rural vistas across the site and the use of the land for agricultural purposes. As noted in the technical reports the amount of land that would no longer be available for agricultural uses is small and currently has a limited productive capacity and is therefore not considered to be an impediment to this proposal.

Whilst the majority of the rural vistas across the site from Appin Road would be lost if the site was developed, there has been a significant amount of work undertaken to ensure that important view corridors through the site are maintained. These include views to One Tree Hill and the original driveway to the Mt Gilead homestead. Extensive street tree planting is also proposed along Appin Road and throughout the proposed release area to soften the impact of any future development on the site. It is recognised that this will take some time to establish, but it is considered that as the trees mature they will provide significant screening of any future development.

#### The impact on fauna and flora including adequacy of environmental corridors

There are already two existing vegetated links from the Noorumba Reserve, on the northern boundary of the subject site, and from Beulah, on the southern boundary of the subject site, through to the Nepean River. These links provide important corridors for the movement of fauna.

The land subject to this draft planning proposal has been used for stock grazing for many years, and therefore exhibits large areas of grassland with scattered trees. However, in accordance with Council's previous resolution the draft planning proposal has provided for the connection of a number of areas of public recreation to connect Noorumba Reserve with existing vegetated areas of the subject site through to both Beulah and the Nepean River, thus providing an additional wildlife corridor. It is also important to note that all streets within the proposed release area will be required to have trees planted in the road reserves thus providing a further habitat.

#### The impact on the Upper Canal

The heritage listed Upper Canal is located on the north western boundary of the subject site. Water NSW has noted the need to avoid and minimise any impacts on the Upper Canal by any future development at Mt Gilead. Previously Water NSW provided Council with a number of provisions for inclusion in the Campbelltown (Sustainable City) DCP 2015 (CSCDCP 2015), which aim to ensure that any development adjacent to the Upper Canal corridor does not impact on the continued operation of the Canal infrastructure. These provisions have already been included in CSCDCP 2015 and apply to the full length of the Upper Canal corridor that occurs within the Campbelltown local government area.

The submission from Water NSW with regard to this draft planning proposal supported the provisions to be included in the DCP to ensure the protection of the Upper Canal.

#### Air pollution

As noted above in item 12, the NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA) has advised that photochemical smog (ozone) and particle pollution remain air quality issues of significant regional concern. However, it has provided advice on ways to meet relevant air quality goals and protect human health, the environment and community amenity. Specifically the EPA refers to the document Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads-Interim Guideline and advises on ways to manage wood burning heaters.

To assist in addressing the impact of vehicle emissions which are a major source of air pollution, negotiations have been held with a local bus company to ensure that an adequate bus service can be provided to the subject site in an effort to reduce private car usage. In addition, the draft DCP provides for an extensive network of pedestrian and cycle paths to encourage walking and cycling.

Also the impact of air pollution from vehicle emissions on any future development adjoining Appin Road, are proposed to be ameliorated through careful site planning and architectural design. As noted in item 12 above it is recommended that the draft DCP include a reference to the Department of Planning and Environment's Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads–Interim Guideline to ensure that the provisions of this document can be taken into consideration with regard to any future development fronting Appin Road.

#### Water pollution and the impact on the Nepean River

Any proposed development of the subject site must comply with both State and Council's water management principles and requirements. As such it is considered that the Mt Gilead Stormwater Management and Flooding Assessment prepared by Worley Parsons has adequately addressed the proposed methodology to manage the quantity and quality of stormwater drainage which is likely to result from any proposed urban development on the subject site.

#### Curtilage around Mt Gilead

It is recognised that if this draft planning proposal proceeds it will impact significantly on the cultural landscape that is located east of the heritage listed Mt Gilead homestead, outbuildings, old mill and dam which are located outside of the boundaries of this proposed urban release area (except for a small portion of the dam). However, to protect the integrity of these items the draft DCP proposes a number of controls. These include significant landscape screening to ensure that any proposed residential development is not viewed from the homestead and old mill. The draft Height of Buildings Map within the draft planning proposal also proposes that only single storey dwellings be permitted on the northern side of One Tree Hill to ensure that land to the north west, west and south of the homestead site. It is important to note that land to the north west, west and south of the significance of the Mt Gilead homestead site including the outbuildings, mill and dam and their setting it is recommended that a further objective be included within the draft DCP to address this issue.

#### Aboriginal heritage

The Aboriginal community have been involved in the preparation of this draft planning proposal, and have undertaken site visits with the proponent's consultants with regard to Aboriginal cultural heritage sites and areas of archaeological sensitivity. Any future development of the subject land must ensure compliance with the provisions of Campbelltown (Sustainable City) DCP 2015 through clause 2.11.1 Indigenous Heritage. The Aboriginal community was invited to comment on the final draft planning proposal as publicly exhibited, but to date Council has not received any further comments from the community.

#### Provision of infrastructure

#### Roads and Traffic Access

Appin Road is proposed to be widened and upgraded to accommodate the additional traffic that will result from any future development of the subject land. The proponents have been working with the traffic authorities to ensure the provision of all necessary road infrastructure through the provision of a planning agreement.

A technical design brief for the upgrade works required to Appin Road as a result of future development of the subject land between the southern boundary of the subject land and Fitzgibbon Lane Ambarvale has been agreed upon by staff from Council, Roads and Maritime Services and Transport for NSW. Further, Council staff are aware that the proponent in conjunction with Lendlease (the conditional purchaser of the subject land) has lodged an offer for a Regional Voluntary Planning Agreement with the Department of Planning and Environment to majority fund the required upgrade works prior to the completion of the 1700 lots. While the Regional Voluntary Planning Agreement including the staging and timing of the required upgrades is yet to be finalised, Council is afforded security that the required infrastructure will be provided in a staged and orderly manner based upon demand prior to the completion of the 1700 lots through the satisfactory arrangements requirement of the recently signed MoU with the Department of Planning and Environment.

Please see attachment 5, which sets-out an offer from Lendlease for a Planning Agreement with the NSW Department of Planning and Environment to upgrade Appin Road.

#### Water and Wastewater

Sydney Water has advised that water and wastewater services can be provided to the subject land. However with regard to the supply of water the developer will need to provide a new elevated reservoir, water pumping station and associated trunk and reticulation mains. With regard to wastewater services the developer will need to provide a new wastewater pumping station and associated lead-in and reticulation mains.

Electricity

Endeavour Energy has advised that the subject land can be serviced with electricity. However it is noted that additional infrastructure will be required, including a new zone substation and the installation of two 11kV feeders from the Ambarvale zone substation.

Gas

Whilst there is currently no gas service available to the subject land, Jemena has previously advised that the site can be serviced.

#### Telecommunications

Whilst the existing Telstra infrastructure can be extended from the north to the subject land, there is also an opportunity for the site to be eligible for connection to the National Broadband Network.

- 33. supports the proposal and considers that it will be a positive outcome for the community and is in sympathy with the nature of the area
  - requests consultation with regard to any works on the north western boundary of the subject land and land owned by the Mt Gilead Retirement Estate
  - requests that the land where the Mt Gilead Retirement Estate is situated be included in this draft planning proposal as its current rural zoning does not reflect its residential land use.

Comment

• the comment of support is noted, as is the request to be consulted with regard to any works that would affect land owned by the Mt Gilead Retirement Estate				
<ul> <li>the inclusion of any additional land within this draft planning proposal would result in its re-exhibition. Thus it is not considered appropriate to include the land adjoining the subject site, and owned by the Mt Gilead Retirement Estate, within this draft planning proposal. However, it is suggested that the owner of the Mt Gilead Retirement Estate be advised that any request for the rezoning of its land should be through the lodgement of a site specific planning proposal request.</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>requests that Council consider a further planning proposal for land south of the Beulah site (known as the property Meadowvale which does not have a boundary with land the subject of this draft planning proposal). The site is approximately 70 hectares in area and the submission considers that rezoning this land to permit low density residential development is consistent with the NSW Government planning policy.</li> </ul>				
Comment				
<ul> <li>The Department of Planning and Environment is currently investigating the potential or certain other land within the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area for future urban development. As this land at Meadowvale falls within the scope of that investigation is is considered appropriate to delay the assessment of any further planning proposals within that area until this investigative work has been completed.</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>35. considers that this is an excellent plan that has been well researched and carried out and that low density residential development is suitable for this site</li> <li>requests that Council consider nominating the Mt Gilead homestead and associated heritage items, Humewood Forest and Meadowvale for inclusion or the State Haritage Degister.</li> </ul>				
the State Heritage Register.				
Comment				
comment of support is noted				
• the previous practice of Council has been to only support the State listing of heritage properties where the owners of such properties have requested and/or supported a nomination for listing. As no requests by the property owners have been made to Council to date it is not considered appropriate for Council to pursue such listings. This issue is likely to be further investigated as part of the Greater Macarthur Priority Growth Area technical studies.				
36. • Mount Gilead Pty Ltd supports the draft Planning Proposal and notes the following:				
<ul> <li>the subject land has been recognised in the Metropolitan Developmen Program for more than 20 years</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>extensive technical studies have been prepared to support the draft Planning Proposal</li> </ul>				
<ul> <li>the proposed upgrading of Appin Road will provide a significant benefit to the community and would not happen if this draft planning proposal was no prepared</li> </ul>				

	1					
	_	it is proposed to enlarge Noorumba Reserve and provide an additional wildlife corridor through the subject site				
	_	advises of the interest of Lendlease as a development partner in delivering a development which fulfils the vision that the owners have for the future of the subject site.				
Corr	ment					
• (	Comme	nts are noted.				
37.		endlease advises of its interest in the subject site, supports the draft Planning oposal and considers it is in the best interests of the community				
	<ul> <li>requests the replacement of the proposed RE1 Public Recreation zoning with residential zoning to provide more flexibility to maximise opportunities for t provision of quality open space without compromising the vision and expectati of the proposed development. Further requests an amendment which provid for future development to benefit from the zone flexibility clause in dr Campbelltown LEP 2014 (clause 5.3)</li> </ul>					
	thi	tes the resolution of Wollondilly Shire Council with regard to its submission on s draft planning proposal and does not support any part of this resolution.				
Corr	nment					
<ul> <li>the comments of Lendlease's interest in the site and its views regarding Wollondilly Shire Council's submission are noted</li> </ul>						
<ul> <li>land that is proposed to be zoned RE1 Public Recreation is anticipated to be dedicated to Council for use by the community, as noted within the draft Mt Gilead Infrastructure Services Delivery Plan. Significant detailed investigation has been undertaken to identify the boundaries of these lands, and as they are proposed to be used for public recreational uses it is considered that they should be zoned for that use and not for residential purposes. It is noted that recreational uses are a permissible land use with the R2 Low Density Residential zone thus any expansion of these areas could be permitted with development consent. Thus it is not considered necessary to amend clause 5.3 of Campbelltown LEP 2015 which does not currently permit any flexibility of the zone boundary of land zoned RE1 Public Recreation.</li> </ul>						
38.		esign + Planning on behalf of the property owners of part of the subject land				
	• su	pports the draft planning proposal and notes the following:				
	_	rezoning the land will provide housing and considerable economic benefits for Campbelltown and Sydney generally				
	_	notes that the land has been included in the Metropolitan Development Program for several decades				
<ul> <li>rezoning will provide the opportunity for upgrades to Appin Road</li> </ul>						
	_	biodiversity areas have been investigated including a biodiversity corridor link from the Georges River to the Nepean River.				
• (	Comments noted.					

Council also advised the following government agencies and service providers of the public exhibition of this draft Planning Proposal and associated documentation but has not received any response:

- Mine Subsidence Board
- Camden Council
- Telstra
- Landcom (Urban Growth)
- NSW Department of Family and Community Services including: Community Services and Land and Housing Corporation
- NSW State Emergency Service
- NSW Dam Safety Committee
- AGL Energy Limited
- Aboriginal Community
  - Cubbitch Barta Native Title Claimants
  - o Tharawal Local Aboriginal Land Council
  - Darug Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Assessments
  - Darug Aboriginal Land Care
- Interline Bus Services Pty Limited
- Georges River Combined council's Committee.

#### Draft Infrastructure Services Delivery Plan

A copy of the draft Mt Gilead Infrastructure Services Delivery Plan (for local site specific infrastructure), was included in the public exhibition of the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal and draft Mt Gilead Development Control Plan, for the purposes of providing information only. The document will inform a Voluntary Planning Agreement (VPA) between the proponents and Council for the provision of local level infrastructure that is being prepared to ensure that all proposed local infrastructure is funded and constructed in a timely manner and to the satisfaction of Council. On completion of the draft VPA a report will be prepared for Council requesting approval for its public exhibition. It is anticipated that, subject to the subject land being finalised.

#### **Biodiversity Certification**

The property owners of the subject land at Mt Gilead have requested that the site be biodiversity certified under the provisions of the *Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995*. The biodiversity certification process assesses the condition of the existing vegetation on the whole of a site and ensures the protection of any significant threatened species. The residue of a site would then be permitted to be developed without the need for a developer to provide a site by site threatened species assessment for any subsequent development applications on the land.

The applicant for biodiversity certification can only be a planning authority and as such the property owners of the Mt Gilead Urban Release Area have requested Council to make an application to the Minister for the Environment. A comprehensive assessment has been undertaken with regard to the condition of the existing vegetation on the whole of the land within the release area and subsequently a biodiversity certification application form has been prepared. In order to lodge the application with the Minister for the Environment the form needs to be signed by Council. It is therefore requested that should Council endorse this rezoning, that it issue delegation to the General Manager to sign this document on its behalf.

#### **Biodiversity Banking and Offsets Scheme (BioBanking)**

The NSW Government has introduced BioBanking to help address the loss of biodiversity values, including threatened species, due to habitat degradation and loss. BioBanking is a market-based scheme that provides a streamlined biodiversity assessment process for development, a rigorous and credible offsetting scheme as well as an opportunity for rural landowners to generate income by managing land for conservation. BioBanking enables biodiversity credits to be generated by landowners and developers who commit to enhance and protect biodiversity values on their land through a BioBanking Agreement. These credits can then be sold, generating funds for the management of the site. Credits can be used to counterbalance (or offset) the impacts on biodiversity values that are likely to occur as a result of development. The credits can also be sold to those seeking to invest in conservation outcomes, including philanthropic organisations and government.

The proponents at Mt Gilead are proposing to retain certain areas of vegetation throughout the site under the BioBanking process and use them as offsets for the removal of vegetation in other areas. One site proposed to be retained adjoins the southern boundary of Noorumba Reserve and would effectively increase the overall area of the reserve.

#### **Terrestrial Biodiversity**

In order to protect and encourage the recovery of significant flora and fauna and their habitats, and retain and enhance native biodiversity, it is intended that some ecologically sensitive land proposed to be zoned RE1 and RU2 receives special protection. As such the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal included a Terrestrial Biodiversity clause and map which is proposed to be incorporated in Part 7 - Additional Local Provisions of the CLEP 2015. Since the public exhibition of this draft planning proposal, Council has made some minor amendments to this clause which do not affect its intent.

#### Conclusion

Generally any matters of concern raised by the government agencies and service providers have been addressed in the responses above and it is considered that there are no impediments to progressing this draft planning proposal to finalisation. However, there is clearly a feeling among some sections of the local community that the draft Mt Gilead planning proposal should not proceed. Council therefore needs to assess whether there is justification in not supporting its finalisation at this time.

The main concerns as noted above appear to be:

- safety issues with regard to traffic using Appin Road and a commitment from the State Government to contribute towards the cost of the road upgrades
- visual impact and loss of a rural heritage and agricultural landscape
- the impact on fauna and flora including adequacy of environmental corridors
- the impact on the Upper Canal
- air pollution
- water pollution and the impact on the Nepean River
- curtilage around Mt Gilead
- Aboriginal heritage
- provision of infrastructure.

The proponents and their consultants have been working in consultation with the Department of Planning and Environment, Transport for NSW and Roads and Maritime Services to come to an agreement over the funding and construction of the proposed road-works that would be required on Appin Road as a result of any future development of land at Mt Gilead.

A technical design brief for the upgrade works required to Appin Road as a result of future development of the subject land between the southern boundary of the subject land and Fitzgibbon Lane Ambarvale has been agreed upon by staff from Council, Roads and Maritime Services and Transport for NSW. Further, Council staff are aware that the proponent in conjunction with Lendlease (the conditional purchaser of the subject land) has lodged an offer for a Regional Voluntary Planning Agreement with the Department of Planning and Environment to majority fund the required upgrade works prior to the staging and timing of the required upgrades is yet to be finalised, Council is afforded security that the required infrastructure will be provided in a staged and orderly manner based upon demand prior to the completion of the 1700 lots through the satisfactory arrangements requirement of the recently signed MoU with the Department of Planning and Environment.

Council has been sent a copy of the formal offer made by Lendlease to the NSW Department of Planning and Environment to enter into a Planning Agreement to deliver the upgrade of Appin Rd between Fitzgibbon Lane and the southern extremity of the release area.

This is a significant offer and would encompass the establishment of four lanes from Rosemeadow to the southernmost access point to the Mt Gilead Urban Release Area and is valued at \$45m requested to be supplemented at \$9m from the NSW Housing Acceleration Fund.

Council is anticipating a formal response from the Department in the near future.

If this development at Mt Gilead does not proceed then it is unclear when any upgrading of Appin Road would occur. Therefore, it could be argued that this proposal will assist in helping to accelerate the upgrading of the road.

Council has already requested the departments of Roads and Maritime Services and Transport for NSW to include provisions for a safe wildlife crossing of Appin Road within the detailed planning of any proposed upgrading road-works. However, it is recommended that Council request further reassurance from these departments and the Department of Planning and Environment that this matter is dealt with to Council's satisfaction.

It is acknowledged that any future urban development of the subject land will result in the loss of a rural landscape. However, Council cannot overlook the need to consider the needs of the future residents of Campbelltown. This will include the opportunity to have a wide variety of housing choices. Whilst there have been a number of proposed and approved developments for higher density living within the existing residential areas of the city closer to transport and services, there is also a need for more lower density residential areas. It is therefore considered that the range of residential lots proposed at Mt Gilead will assist in catering for the ever growing need for more housing opportunities within the Campbelltown Local Government Area. This particular site can offer a very desirable living environment particularly for young families with access to high quality active and passive open space areas.

The location of the proposed open space areas has specifically taken into consideration the location of the existing native vegetation and the most appropriate route for an additional wildlife corridor through the site. It could be argued that the conservation and revegetation of the open space areas and the proposed planting of trees along all the proposed roads would in-fact increase the overall amount of trees on the subject land in comparison to the land continuing under its current agricultural use.

As previously noted, provisions have been included in the draft DCP to ensure the protection of the heritage listed Upper Canal to the satisfaction of Water NSW.

The Environment Protection Authority has not suggested that this proposed draft planning proposal should not proceed, but instead has provided advice on a number of matters including how to deal with air pollution, which has been taken into consideration in the proposed amendments to the proposal.

Any future development of the subject site will be required to ensure that there is no impact on the local waterways and subsequently the Nepean River, and it is considered that the proposed stormwater drainage system and provisions of both State and Council's documentation will be well able to provide such assurance.

With regard to non-indigenous heritage it is considered that the integrity of the Mt Gilead homestead and associated outbuildings and dam will be preserved through provisions proposed to be incorporated within CLEP 2015 and the draft DCP as noted above in the response to items 22 - 32.

With regard to the provision of infrastructure, it is noted that all relevant agencies and service providers have indicated that the subject site can be adequately serviced.

In light of the growing need for new opportunities for the provision of a variety of housing choices, and the demonstrated capability of the subject land to provide such housing, it is recommended that the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal and draft DCP be amended as noted below, and the draft planning proposal be forwarded to the Department of Planning and Environment for approval and referral to the Minister for Planning to make the plan.

### **Proposed Amendments to Planning Documentation**

As a result of the submissions received during the public exhibition of the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal and draft Mt Gilead Development Control Plan, and to update factual information and address typographical errors, the following amendments to the planning documentation are proposed.

#### a. Draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal

The draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal has been amended to ensure that the most recent documentation is referenced, e.g. Campbelltown Local Environmental Plan 2014 is now Campbelltown Local Environmental Plan 2015 (CLEP 2015). It has also been amended to address the following proposed amendments to CLEP 2015.

#### b. Proposed Amendments to Campbelltown Local Environmental Plan 2015

• amend clause 4.1 to provide for the subdivision of a maximum of 65 residential lots with a minimum area of 375sqm on Lot 61 DP 752042 Appin Road, Gilead

- amend clause 4.1A and the Restricted Dwelling Yield Map to ensure a cap of 1700 residential lots on the subject land
- amend the Lot Size Map and Height of Buildings Map to include all land proposed to be zoned RU2 Rural Landscape
- include an Urban Release Area map which indicates the location of the Mt Gilead Urban Release Area
- amend the proposed Terrestrial Biodiversity clause to be included in Part 7 Additional local provisions.

#### c. Proposed Amendments to draft Mt Gilead Development Control Plan

#### Clause 2.2 Key Development Objectives

Add the following new objectives:

- provide for the establishment of a biodiversity corridor to allow for the movement of fauna from Noorumba Reserve through the subject site to connect with the Nepean River and Beulah
- respect the heritage significance of the Mt Gilead homestead site including the outbuildings, mill and dam and their setting.

#### **Clause 3.1 Heritage and Views**

Add the following objectives:

- retain the regional views to hills to the west from within the subdivision to retain the visual context of the landscape's prior land uses and heritage values
- retain the bald character of One Tree Hill above the background skyline when viewed from The Old Mill, with a single landmark tree.

In control 1i, replace the words "An interpretive road entrance" with "An interpretation of the historic carriageway alignment from Appin Road to the Mt Gilead homestead".

Add the following matter in the first control:

iii interpretation of the former Hillsborough Cottage is to be provided in the general vicinity as identified in Figure 3. This may include landscaping, signage, walling or the erection of a commemorative plaque.

#### Figure 3: Indicative Heritage Principles Plan

- omit the word "Indicative" from the title of Figure 3
- identify the location of the former Hillsborough Cottage.

#### **Clause 3.2 Street Network and Public Transport**

Add the following additional control:

• where bus bays are required on the Collector Road, the carriageway must be widened to accommodate a 2.5m wide bus parking bay.

#### **Figure 5: Indicative Street Cross Sections**

Amend the Collector Road (Bus Route) street cross section to include a note advising of the need for the carriageway width to be widened to 12m to provide for bus parking bays where required.

#### Figure 6: Indicative Pedestrian/Cycle Network

Amend the map to show the pedestrian/cycleway extending west along the interpretive driveway to join with the proposed north/south pedestrian/cycleway.

#### **Clause 3.3 Public Open Space**

Amend the title to clause 3.3 to Public Open Space and Landscaping

Amend the fourth and fifth objectives in clause 3.3 as follows:

- provide, enhance and protect existing watercourses and riparian corridors and improve habitat features
- promote riparian areas for the conservation and enhancement of riparian habitat and connectivity values, and for passive open space uses and activities where such uses will not degrade the riparian corridors.

Include an additional clause to address development on land adjacent to Appin Road being:

#### Clause 3.5.6 Land Adjacent to Appin Road

Objectives

- ensure reasonable standards of residential amenity and a high quality residential environment in the vicinity of Appin Road
- ensure residential dwellings are not adversely impacted by traffic noise.

#### Controls

 in addition to the provisions of clause 3.5 of Volume 1 development is to comply with Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads–Interim Guideline (Department of Planning 2008).

#### Additional Matter

 advise the owner of the Mt Gilead Retirement Estate that Council would only consider any change to the current rural zoning of the land occupied by the Mt Gilead Retirement Estate being Lot 2 DP 1065919 Glendower Street, Gilead through the lodgement of a site specific planning proposal request.

### Delayed commencement of draft Mt Gilead Development Control Plan

Council is required under the provisions of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000 to give notice in a local newspaper of any decision it makes with regard the draft Mt Gilead Development Control Plan (DCP). If Council decides to approve the draft Mt Gilead DCP then it is recommended that it advise in its notice in the local newspaper that the draft DCP has been approved and will come into effect on the date that the rezoning of the Mt Gilead Urban Release Area is notified on the NSW legislation website. This recommendation is made to ensure that any amendment of Campbelltown CLEP 2015 to provide for the rezoning of the Mt Gilead Urban Release Area coincides with the implementation of the Mt Gilead DCP.

### Officer's Recommendation

- 1. That Council endorse the amended draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal generally in accordance with attachment 2 and forward to the Department of Planning and Environment for approval and referral to the Minister for Planning to make the plan.
- 2. That Council approve the amended draft Mt Gilead Development Control Plan being an amendment to Campbelltown (Sustainable City) Development Control Plan 2015, Volume 2, Part 6 generally in accordance with attachment 3.
- 3. That notice of Council's approval of the amended draft Mt Gilead Development Control Plan being an amendment to Campbelltown (Sustainable City) Development Control Plan 2015, Volume 2, Part 6, be published in the local newspaper in accordance with clause 21(2) Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000, and such notice include a commencement date equal to the date of notification of the amendment of Campbelltown Local Environmental Plan 2015 with regard to the rezoning of the Mt Gilead Urban Release Area.
- 4. That all those who provided a submission to the public exhibition of the draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal and draft Mt Gilead Development Control Plan be advised of Council's decision.
- 5. That Council delegate authority to the General Manager to sign the application to the Minister for the Environment for the biodiversity certification of the Mt Gilead Urban Release Area.
- 6. That Council write to Roads and Maritime Services and Transport for NSW requesting assurance that the provision of a safe wildlife crossing of Appin Road will be included as part of any upgrading road-works. Also write to the Department of Planning Environment requesting formal support for this action.
- 7. That Council advise the owner of the Mt Gilead Retirement Estate that Council would only consider any change to the current rural zoning of the land occupied by the Mt Gilead Retirement Estate being Lot 2 DP 1065919 Glendower Street, Gilead through the lodgement of a site specific planning proposal request.

# **ATTACHMENT 1**



# Mount Gilead Locality Plan

# **ATTACHMENT 2**

# **Mt Gilead Planning Proposal**

July 2016

**Campbelltown City Council** 

#### 1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 Background
- 1.2 The Need for the Planning Proposal
- 1.3 Council and Stakeholder Involvement

#### 2.0 Strategic Planning Context

- 2.1 New South Wales 2021: A Plan to Make NSW Number One
- 2.2 Metropolitan Strategy
- 2.3 Campbelltown Council Strategic Policies
- 2.4 Residential Land Supply

#### 3.0 Site Description and Context

- 3.1 Land to be Rezoned
- 3.2 Legal Description and Ownership
- 3.3 Current Zoning
- 3.4 Location and Context
- 3.5 Site Characteristics
- 3.6 Site Opportunities and Constraints

#### 4.0 Planning Proposal

- 4.1 Objectives and Intended Outcomes
- 4.2 Explanation of Provisions
- 4.3 Justification
- 4.4 Mapping
- 4.5 Additional Development Controls
- 4.6 Community Consultation

#### 5.0 Key Planning Issues

- 5.1 Ecology
- 5.2 Bushfire Risk
- 5.3 Ecological and Riparian Corridors
- 5.4 Soils and Geotechnical Conditions
- 5.5 Mine Subsidence
- 5.6 Contamination
- 5.7 Non-indigenous Heritage
- 5.8 Aboriginal Heritage
- 5.9 Landscape Character and Visual Impact
- 5.10 Transport, Traffic and Access
- 5.11 Noise
- 5.12 Air Quality
- 5.13 Stormwater and Flooding
- 5.14 Utility Services
- 5.15 Economic and Social Impacts

#### 6.0 Summary and Conclusion

- 6.1 Need for Planning Proposal
- 6.2 Relationship to Strategic Planning Framework
- 6.3 Environmental, Social and Economic Impact
- 6.4 State and Commonwealth Interests
- 6.5 Conclusion

#### Figures

- 1 Land Title and Ownership
- 2 Aerial photograph of the site
- 3 Site context
- 4 Beulah Bio-banking Reserve/Humewood Forest to the south of the site
- 5 The Old Mill with Mt Gilead farm manager's house in the foreground

- 6 Mt Gilead outbuildings (former coach house)
- 7 Pasture land
- 8 Access to the Mt Gilead property from Appin Road
- 9 Looking west at constructed dam towards the middle of the site
- 10 North-west boundary and the highest point of the site looking north-west
- **11** Topography of the site
- 12 Site Analysis
- 13 Land to which the planning proposal applies
- 14 Proposed zoning
- 15 Indicative Site Structure Plan
- 16 Indicative open space strategy illustrating riparian and ecological corridors
- 17 Classification of riparian corridors

### Tables

- 18 Draft Metropolitan Strategy South West Sydney targets
- 19 Consistency of the proposal with the relevant SEPPs
- 20 Consistency of the proposal with the relevant Section 117 Directions

### Appendices

- A Gateway Determination Department of Planning and Environment
- B Planning Proposal Maps
- C Proposed LEP Amendments

# 1.0 Introduction

### 1.1 Background

A planning proposal was submitted to Campbelltown City Council (CCC) by Mt Gilead Pty Ltd and S & A Dzwonnik (the landowners) requesting that the land described as Part Lot 1 and Part Lot 2 in DP 807555, Lot 59 in DP 752042 (now known as Part Lots 1, 2 and 3 in DP 1218887) and 61 in DP 752042 at Appin Road, Mt Gilead (the site) be rezoned to predominantly residential land. The proposal accords with NSW government strategic objectives for the release of greenfield land in the Sydney Metropolitan Region for residential development. By logically extending the urban footprint of Campbelltown for future residential development the proposal seeks to enhance and expand housing choice and supply close to the Campbelltown-Macarthur Regional Centre.

This proposal follows CCC's endorsement on 3 July 2012 of a preliminary planning proposal for the site and the subsequent Gateway Determination made by the Director-General of the then Department of Planning and Infrastructure on 7 September 2012 to proceed with a planning proposal subject to conditions (see Gateway Determination at **Appendix A** which includes the Alteration of Gateway Determination to extend the date for completion of the planning proposal until 7 March 2017).

Please note that at the time that the original planning proposal was submitted to Council it was anticipated that the proposed rezoning of the subject land would be effected through an amendment to *Campbelltown (Urban Area) Local Environmental Plan 2002* (CLEP 2002). However, as Council has now replaced CLEP 2002 with *Campbelltown Local Environmental Plan 2015* (CLEP 2015), this planning proposal has been prepared as an amendment to CLEP 2015.

In his determination, the then Director-General required detailed investigation of a range of issues in support of the rezoning process as well as consultation with various public authorities. In response to the Gateway Determination and CCC's requirements for additional technical studies, the landowners, in consultation with CCC, commissioned a team of expert consultants to prepare detailed assessments of the following planning issues:

- flora and fauna
- conservation of ecological and riparian corridors
- Aboriginal heritage
- non-indigenous heritage
- bushfire risk
- traffic, transport and access
- noise
- air quality
- contamination
- geotechnical conditions and mine subsidence
- infrastructure, stormwater and sewer services
- visual impact
- agricultural land impacts
- economic impacts
- social impacts.

This final planning proposal addresses these issues and also establishes the key development standards and planning controls for the Mt Gilead land to inform the proposed local environmental plan amendment.

In addition, an indicative structure plan and site-specific development controls have been prepared for the land to supplement controls in *Campbelltown (Sustainable City) Development Control Plan 2015.* Draft voluntary planning agreements for the delivery of local and regional infrastructure (respectively) will be publicly exhibited in due course.

This planning proposal has been prepared in accordance with section 55 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* (EP&A Act) and the guidelines prepared by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure titled *"A guide to preparing planning proposals"*, dated October 2012.

# 1.2 The Need for the Planning Proposal

The land the subject of this planning proposal has been identified for some time on the former Metropolitan Development Program (MDP) as future greenfield release land. By providing new land use zoning and key development standards for the site, the planning proposal facilitates the strategic outcomes of the MDP and, more currently, the draft *Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney 2031, a Plan for Growing Sydney* and State government policies in relation to housing supply. Furthermore, the planning proposal is consistent with regional, sub-regional and local strategic planning objectives and outcomes (as discussed in **Section**[2.0].

The MDP had set the minimum development yield of the Mt Gilead site at 1500 lots. However, the studies detailed in this planning proposal show that the land and the surrounding road network are capable of accommodating and supporting up to 1700 dwellings. This development yield will incorporate a range of lot sizes (375 square metres to 1000 square metres) with an average area of 600 square metres so providing a variety of housing types to facilitate choice in the Campbelltown local government area (LGA).

By extending the established urban footprint of Campbelltown, the site will not sit as an unconnected, stand-alone residential development. Rather, it expands the existing residential land to the immediate north and will utilise any excess capacity in existing community infrastructure and services such as schools, recreation facilities, shops and the like.

The planning proposal is required to facilitate the above outcomes as the land is currently not zoned for the proposed residential development. The planning proposal seeks to zone the majority of the site to Residential R2 (approximately 149ha), along with smaller areas for open space (approximately 31ha) (including riparian corridors and provision of a sports field), and roads, in accordance with the Standard Instrument – Principal Local Environmental Plan and consistent with CLEP 2015. In addition, a small area is intended to be zoned as a neighbourhood centre in order to facilitate the future delivery of a community centre, and approximately 29ha will remain as rural land.

# 1.3 Council and Stakeholder Involvement

A joint Landowner-Council Working Group was established to advance and oversight the preparation of the planning proposal.

In accordance with the Gateway Determination, consultation with the community and public authorities under section 56(2)(c) and (d) of the EP&A Act was undertaken by CCC during the exhibition of the planning proposal. The outcomes of the consultation with public authorities are reflected in **Section 5.0** 

# 2.0 Strategic Planning Context

The Mt Gilead site is included broadly and specifically in relevant State, regional and local strategic planning documents, and has been identified as contributing to the Government housing targets for the Sydney metropolitan area. The relevant strategic planning framework is discussed below.

### 2.1 New South Wales 2021: A Plan to Make NSW Number One

NSW 2021: A Plan to Make NSW Number One is a long-term plan to deliver services in NSW, which sets clear priorities to guide government decision-making and resource allocation.

NSW 2021 is based around five strategies to rebuild the economy, provide quality services, renovate infrastructure, restore government accountability, and strengthen our local environment and communities. The rezoning of the site for residential uses would be consistent with the strategy in that it could contribute to the aim of improving housing affordability and availability, and assist in facilitating the goal of delivering 25,000 new dwellings per year.

### 2.2 Metropolitan Strategy

#### 2.2.1 Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036

The *Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036* aims to provide an integrated planning framework to manage Sydney's growth to 2036. Since its release in December 2010, the strategy has been reviewed and a draft *Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney to 2031* has been released. This draft strategy establishes the most up-to-date strategic framework for Sydney, and is addressed further below.

### 2.2.2 Draft Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney to 2031

The draft *Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney 2031* was publicly exhibited until 31 May 2013 and was the new strategic plan to guide Sydney's growth, superseding the 2036 Plan. The draft strategy sets the framework for Sydney's growth and prosperity to 2031 and beyond. It has a strong focus on boosting housing and jobs growth, and includes targets and actions to facilitate investment and growth in NSW.

The draft 2031 strategy anticipates that Sydney's population will grow by 1.3 million people by 2031 taking the population to 5.6 million. Notably the number of people over 65 will be double that at present, and there will be more than one million people under 15 years of age. Relevantly, Greater Western Sydney will be home to more than half of Sydney's population.

To drive sustainable growth, the draft strategy is built around five key outcomes for Sydney including balanced growth; a liveable city; productivity and prosperity; a healthy and resilient environment; and accessibility and connectivity. The draft strategy sets employment and housing targets across six subregions and new housing is encouraged in areas close to existing and planned infrastructure in both infill and greenfield sites.

The Campbelltown LGA, in which Mt Gilead is situated, is classified as part of the South West Subregion and Campbelltown–Macarthur is a major centre under this plan servicing the South West Subregion.

Table 1 lists a number of targets contained in the Draft Strategy and relevant to this proposal.

Area	Current	Target to 2021	Target to 2031
Population	829,000	1,048,000 (218,000)	1,298,000 (469,000)
Housing	286,000	346,000 60,000)	427,000 (141,000)
Employment	298,000	362,000 (64,000)	432,000 (134,000)

 Table 1 – Draft Metropolitan Strategy South West Sydney targets

\*Brackets denote the increase from existing numbers

More specifically, the Campbelltown-Macarthur Major Centre will continue as the regional focus for office, retail, entertainment, cultural, public administration and services developments, and is projected to provide capacity for at least an additional 10,000 jobs until 2031.

The planning proposal is consistent with, and directly supports, the strategic objectives of the draft Metropolitan Strategy in relation to boosting housing supply, and indirectly in facilitating jobs growth in the South West Subregion.

#### 2.2.3 Draft South West Subregional Strategy

The draft *South West Subregional Strategy* (SWSS) is applicable to the Campbelltown LGA and sets actions for the subregion to ensure local delivery of the objectives set out within the *Metropolitan Plan for Sydney to 2036*. The proposal is consistent with several of the key directions in the draft SWSS in that:

- it will unlock land for the development of residential dwellings, directly contributing to the growth of housing in the South West subregion
- it will support the provision of dwellings in the vicinity of new centres identified in the South West subregion such as the Campbelltown centre
- it recognises and respects the rural character of the subregion through limiting the extent of the proposed residential zoning.

### 2.2.4 A Plan for Growing Sydney

The draft *Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney to 2031* has been finalised in the strategy document *A Plan for Growing Sydney* which was released in December 2014. Campbelltown-Macarthur is now recognised in this strategy as one of three Regional City Centres outside of the Sydney and Parramatta Central Business Districts.

To achieve the vision for Sydney to be a strong global city A Plan for Growing Sydney has set the following goals:

- a competitive economy with world-class services and transport
- a city of housing choice with homes that meet our needs and lifestyles
- a great place to live with communities that are strong, healthy and well connected
- a sustainable and resilient city that protects the natural environment and has a balanced approach to the use of land and resources.

It is considered that the proposal is consistent with these goals particularly with regard to assisting in the delivery of new housing to meet the needs of Sydney's growing population. It is noted that the subject site at Mt Gilead is included in the land defined as the Macarthur South Investigation Area. However, it is assumed that as a Gateway determination has been given for the subject site, it is only included in this investigation area as a component to be considered in the overall assessment proposed to be undertaken for the Macarthur South Area.

#### 2.2.5 Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation

The Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation was released for public comment in October / November 2015. This document provides an investigation into the potential of land within the Greater Macarthur area that could be developed for urban purposes to assist in addressing the growing need for new housing in the Sydney Basin. It also proposes to amend *State Environmental Planning Policy* (*Sydney Region Growth Centres*) 2006 by including certain land within the Greater Macarthur area as part of the South West Growth Centre. The land at Mt Gilead is specifically noted as having potential for future residential development, and the document includes an action to have had the subject land rezoned by the end of 2015. Reference is also made to the need for the upgrading of Appin Road to accommodate the increase in traffic that would result from any future development in this area.

### 2.3 Campbelltown Council Strategic Policies

#### 2.3.1 Campbelltown 2025 - Looking Forward

Campbelltown City Council has adopted *Campbelltown 2025 – Looking Forward*, an overarching planning strategy that sets social, environmental and economic foundations for the growth of the LGA. The document articulates a vision to provide a sustainable city by 2025, and sets out six strategic directions which include desired outcomes and focus areas that will need to be considered in future development within Campbelltown. The proposal's consistency with these strategic directions is explored below.

#### Growing the Regional City

This focus area sets out a vision to ensure a sustainable future for Campbelltown city as a strong regional centre with regional facilities and employment opportunities. By supplying a range of residential lots, on average 600 square

metres in area, development of the Mt Gilead site can make Campbelltown more attractive for people seeking employment in the area, so encouraging growth and investment in new enterprises and infrastructure.

#### Building a Distinctive Campbelltown Sense of Place

Campbelltown is to grow into a place that is distinctive in terms of natural and built environment, offering residents a relaxed, safe and scenic environment. The proposal at Mt Gilead will facilitate a community that will have high civic pride with a built form that responds and capitalises on the site's natural landscape features. The future community should contain an ambience of growth, prosperity and contemporary style.

#### **Getting Around the City**

The development of the city is to be planned and integrated around transport needs. Future planning is to increase opportunities for accessibility and reduce the need for private cars with increased use of existing public transportation within the city. Mt Gilead will be linked by bus to Campbelltown City Centre, ensuring that accessibility is created to an existing activity node.

#### **Building and Maintaining Quality Infrastructure**

New development is to satisfy its own infrastructure requirements by means of direct provision on site or contributing proportionately to the broader infrastructure upgrades by Council. The site is capable of being serviced to support the incoming community.

#### Creating Education, Employment and Entrepreneurial Opportunities

The city's vision is to retain and create jobs to grow the supply of skilled and adaptable workers within the city. By catering for the mid to upper end of the housing market, Mt Gilead can facilitate the city's growth in professional and business jobs.

#### 2.3.2 Campbelltown Local Planning Strategy

The Campbelltown Local Planning Strategy (CLPS) is a background document which informed the preparation of the Campbelltown Local Environmental Plan 2015. The aim of the CLPS is to provide a strategic land use planning direction to deliver the strategic vision documented in Campbelltown 2025 - Looking Forward. It also acknowledges the growth targets within the draft South West Subregional Strategy (SWSS) and establishes a basis for achieving those targets.

Specifically it refers to the potential of the Mt Gilead site as an area that could be developed to assist in meeting the 4,700 'greenfield' dwelling target nominated in the draft SWSS for the Campbelltown LGA.

#### 2.3.3 Campbelltown Residential Development Strategy

The Campbelltown Residential Development Strategy (CRDS) seeks to identify dwelling opportunities to address the projected population growth of the Campbelltown LGA, and has thus provided valuable input into the preparation of the CLPS. The CRDS seeks to manage the anticipated future residential growth required for the Campbelltown LGA through the forms of both 'infill' and 'greenfield' development. It further notes that the Mt Gilead site could provide a potential yield of 1,500 dwellings.

### 2.4 Residential Land Supply

#### Metropolitan Development Program

The *Metropolitan Development Program* (MDP) was a key NSW Government program to maintain housing supply in the Sydney metropolitan region, and its main function was to manage land supply to meet new housing needs from urban renewal and greenfield sites in Sydney. The program rolled forward annually and included assessing future land supply to meet housing needs, and maintaining housing and land supply databases. The MDP identified the Mt Gilead site as greenfield release land that was yet to be zoned.

Currently, monitoring of supply of new home sites to accommodate Sydney's growing population is reported via MDP reports which provide up to date information on greenfield land and dwelling supply.

The land at Mt Gilead the subject of this planning proposal is the same as that originally identified for release under the then MDP.

### Supply of housing in Campbelltown

The Department of Planning and Environment released updated population projections in June 2014. These projections identified that Greater Sydney requires one million more homes by 2031 to house Sydney's growing population. The Campbelltown LGA is expected to grow at a rate of 1.8% per annum, with an increase in population of 64,600 (42.7%) between 2011 and 2031. An additional 24,846 homes will be needed in Campbelltown by 2031 to accommodate the expected population increase<sup>1</sup> (2014 NSW Population Projections data, Department of Planning and Environment).

As discussed above, Campbelltown-Macarthur is now a Regional City Centre. It is understood that, accordingly, CCC wishes to stimulate and broaden the area's economic base and range of business opportunities. A limitation in housing choice could limit the attractiveness of the Campbelltown area as a place to live for professional and business people. The proposed range in lot sizes at Mt Gilead could help redress this issue, so contributing to the growth of Campbelltown-Macarthur as a Regional City Centre.
# 3.0 Site Description and Context

## 3.1 Land to be rezoned

The site subject to this planning proposal is essentially a triangle extending south of Campbelltown's urban footprint. The western boundary of the site diagonally bisects Lot 1 in DP 807555 ending at the south eastern boundary of Lot 2 in DP 807555. The eastern boundary is Appin Road. The total land area of the site is 210ha.

# 3.2 Legal Description and Ownership

The site consists of four lots owned by two land owners as shown in Figure 1.

- Part Lots 1 and 2 in DP 807555 and Lot 59 DP 752042, (now known as Part Lots 1, 2 and 3 DP 1218887) owned by Mt Gilead Pty Ltd, a company of the MacArthur Onslow family that has held property around the area since the 1940s
- Lot 61 DP 752042, owned by S & A Dzwonnik who have held the land since the 1980s.



Figure 1 – Land Title and Ownership Source: Cox Richardson

# 3.3 Current Zoning

The site is currently zoned No 1 (Non-Urban) under the *City of Campbelltown Interim Development Order No 15* (IDO 15) (see **Figure 2**). Under IDO 15, the proposed residential development of the Mt Gilead site is not permissible.

IDO 15 does not permit subdivision in Zone 1 unless a minimum area of 100 hectares can be achieved. It includes several provisions relating to agricultural and rural land uses and seeks to retain large lots for these purposes.

CCC has now finalised the preparation of *Campbelltown Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2015* (CLEP 2015) which commenced on 11 March 2016. While the CLEP 2015 covers the majority of the Campbelltown LGA, some areas of land within IDO 15, including the Mt Gilead land release site, are identified as deferred matters within the LEP.



Figure 2 - Map indicating the current zoning of the subject site

# 3.4 Location and Context

The Mt Gilead site, as defined by the MDP, is located in the Campbelltown LGA approximately seven kilometres south of the Campbelltown city centre. Mt Gilead covers a total area of approximately 210 hectares, part of which is the long-established Mt Gilead rural property (see **Figure 3**).



Figure 3 – Aerial photograph of the site Source: Cox Richardson

The site is immediately bounded by:

- Appin Road to the east
- Noorumba Reserve and Non-Urban land to the north
- the Sydney Water Supply Canal (the Upper Canal) in the north west

- rural land to the west and the associated Mt Gilead Homestead, Old Mill and the Artificial Lake all of which date back to the early construction and use of the Mt Gilead estate
- part of the Beulah Biobanking Reserve/ Humewood Forest to the south.

Access to the respective landholdings is from Appin Road.

More broadly, the surrounding locality includes (see Figure 4 to Figure 7):

- the low density residential suburbs of Rosemeadow and St Helens Park (including the Gilead Retirement Village) located around one kilometre to the north
- the M31 motorway (previously known as the M5) beyond the Mt Gilead Homestead and farm to the west
- the Nepean River about 2 kilometres to the west of the Mt Gilead Homestead
- a number of rural land parcels along the eastern side of Appin Road adjoining the Dharawal State Conservation Area located south east of the site
- the Georges River approximately one kilometre to the east of Appin Road
- the Beulah Estate and rural residential land further to the south.

Figures 5 to 7 illustrate the surrounding locality.



Figure 4 – Site context Source: Cox Richardson



Figure 5 - Beulah Bio-banking Reserve/Humewood Forest to the south of the site



Figure 6 - The Old Mill with Mt Gilead farm manager's house in the foreground



Figure 7 - Mt Gilead outbuildings (former coach house)

## 3.4.1 Relationship to Surrounding Development

The urban areas to the north of the site are predominately residential, forming the southern extent of residential development in Campbelltown. This land is generally categorised by low density, single dwelling development, while the non-urban zoned land to the immediate north and north-west of the site has been developed for seniors living. As the Mt Gilead site is located less than 1km to the south of the above development, the proposed rezoning will provide a logical addition to the residential area.

The Noorumba Reserve which part forms the northern boundary of the site is a significant local natural resource in that it contains Cumberland Plain Woodland including 39 plant species of regional significance.

# 3.5 Site Characteristics

Located within a semi-urban area, the site has historically been used for agricultural purposes and thus contains cleared paddocks with improved pastures. Pockets of residual vegetation are located along drainage lines and steeper slopes. The site comprises remnant and degraded native vegetation and exotic pastures.

There are no buildings or other improvements on the land, other than a number of farm dams, fencing and a track to the Mt Gilead homestead. The land is currently approximately 95% cleared for grazing and is currently used for cattle production (see Figures 8 to11).



Figure 8 - Pasture land



Figure 9 – Access to the Mt Gilead property from Appin Road



Figure 10 - Looking west at constructed dam towards the middle of the site



Figure 11 - North-west boundary and the highest point of the site looking north-west

### 3.5.1 Topography and Drainage Corridors

Topographically, the majority of the site is generally undulating and consists of gentle rises, rounded crests and ridges with slopes generally less than 5 degrees (see **Figure 12**). The land generally slopes north-west into a shallow valley at the foot of the ridge line in the north-west. The ridge line has a hill with steeper gradients up to 25 degrees.

There are several surface water features on the site consisting of small farm dams and drainage channels. The major drainage channels are:

- a steep gully to the north-west trending north and a shallow gully to the north-east trending north which form part of the Menangle Creek Catchment
- a shallow gully to the south-west trending north-west that forms part of the Woodhouse catchment and eventually flows out to the Nepean River.





Source: Cox Richardson

### 3.5.2 Flora and Fauna

Essentially agricultural land, the site has a long history of grazing, pasture improvement and weed invasion.

A total of 154 flora species were identified on the site, comprising 67 native and 87 introduced species; and no threatened flora was recorded during field surveys. The site contains three native vegetation communities:

- Cumberland Plain Woodland a Critically Endangered Ecological Community under both Commonwealth and NSW legislation, with three localised clumps located along the northern and western borders of the site
- Shale Sandstone Transition Forest a Critically Endangered Ecological Community (EEC) under both Commonwealth and NSW legislation, and represented by two pockets in the middle of the site
- River-flat Eucalypt Forest listed as an EEC under NSW legislation, and represented by a small patch in the north western corner of the site.

In relation to avifauna, a total of 58 bird species were recorded on the site, including one vulnerable and one migratory species. Few native mammals were identified during field surveys - 13 native bat species including six vulnerable species and a lone wallaby. Domestic livestock graze throughout the site.

These matters are discussed further in **Section 5.1** of this report.

## 3.5.3 Geology and Soils

The site is underlain by the Triassic Ashfield Shale of the Wianamatta Group deposited over the Hawkesbury Sandstone. In general there are only limited bedrock outcrops across this area, with shale underlying the northerm portion of the site and sandstone the southern portion of the site.

The area is covered by Blacktown group soils derived from Wianamatta Shale, ranging from shallow to moderately deep Red Podzolic Soils and Brown Podzolic Soils on crests, upper slopes and well drained areas, to deep Yellow Podzolic Soils and Soloths on the lower slope and in the drainage depressions and areas of poor drainage. Soils derived from Wianamatta Shale will generally exhibit a subsoil profile of moderately reactive high plasticity clay.

The site is considered to present a very low risk of Potential Acid Sulphate Soils (PASS).

In terms of salinity, the local soil types are expected to yield negligible salinity.

### 3.5.4 Geotechnical Observations

In general, the site was found by URS to have no significant observable geohazards. Although, several areas of potential hazard were identified, in general the overall stability of the site was considered good with only surficial soil instabilities on the steeper northern area and minor rock fall potential localised to the former quarry.

### 3.5.5 Heritage

#### Non-indigenous Heritage

A number of non-indigenous heritage items are located in close proximity to, or abutting, the site. These are:

- the Sydney Water Supply Upper Canal System, also known as the Upper Canal, forms the north-western boundary
  of the site. It is listed on the NSW State Heritage Register
- the Mt Gilead Homestead and surrounding buildings and structures, including the Old Mill are outside of, but in
  close proximity to, the site to the west. The Homestead group is a local heritage item listed in Campbelltown IDO
  No 15 and on the Register of the National Trust of Australia (NSW). A small part of the Artificial Lake (dam), which
  is part of the group, is located on the site
- the Beulah Estate lies approximately 0.5 to one kilometre to the south of the site. Beulah, a cultural landscape containing early colonial structures and an important garden layout, is listed on the State Heritage Register. It is shielded from the site by bushland in the Beulah Biobanking area
- the Humewood Forest lies to the immediate south of the site and is part of the Beulah Biobanking area. Humewood, a stand of trees associated with the former home of the Hume family (see Meadowvale below), is a local heritage item listed in IDO 15 and is significant because of the landscape value of its vegetation

Meadowvale (formerly known as Humewood) is situated south of the Beulah Biobanking bushland. Meadowvale, a
house with colonial characteristics and a local heritage item listed in IDO 15, stands on the original land grant made
to Andrew Hume, the colonial explorer of NSW.

In addition to the above, the archaeological remnants of the early Hillsborough homestead, located within the site, is considered to have local significance but is not listed in any statutory instrument.

### Indigenous Heritage

There are twelve items of indigenous significance located on the site, comprising three artefact scatters; two isolated finds; one modified tree; and six Potential Archaeological Deposits.

# 3.6 Site Opportunities and Constraints

In summary, from the foregoing examination the site presents a number of opportunities and constraints for future residential development - as follows and as illustrated in Figure 13.

Opportunities:

- close to physical, social and employment infrastructure in the Campbelltown City Centre
- identified as a greenfield land release area within the Metropolitan Development Program
- has sufficient area for provision of open space and community facilities
- provides potential for views and vistas in a rural setting
- largely cleared of vegetation
- retained existing vegetation creates opportunities for biodiversity corridors
- land generally level or gently undulating
- no geotechnical or geological issues.

#### Constraints:

- steep slope in the north west corner of the site
- drainage lines traverse the site
- proximity to heritage items.



Figure 13 – Site Analysis Source: Cox Richardson

# 4.0 Planning Proposal

This planning proposal has been prepared in accordance with the *A guide to preparing planning proposals* (Department of Planning & Infrastructure, October 2012) and in accordance with Section 55(2) of the EP&A Act.

# 4.1 Objectives and Intended Outcomes

The primary outcome of the planning proposal is residential development of the 210 ha Mt Gilead site in close proximity to the social and community assets within the Campbelltown LGA that respects the heritage and ecological significance of adjoining land.

The objectives of the planning proposal are to:

- permit low density residential development supported by public open space and community facilities, including a small retail centre
- protect environmentally sensitive land and provide an environmental bushland corridor that links the Noorumba Reserve with the Beulah biobanking site and the Nepean River corridor
- respect the heritage significance of the Mount Gilead homestead site including the outbuildings, mill and dam and their setting
- respect the environmental significance of the Beulah biobanking site
- reserve land for acquisition by Roads and Maritime Services for future road infrastructure (widening of Appin Road)
- increase the supply of housing within the Campbelltown LGA with the addition of up to 1700 new dwellings.

# 4.2 Explanation of Provisions

The proposed outcome will be achieved by:

- amending Campbelltown Local Environmental Plan 2015 (CLEP 2015)
- adopting the provisions within CLEP 2015
- including a number of local provisions in relation to minimum lot size and protection of terrestrial biodiversity as explained below.

## 4.2.1 Land to which the Plan will apply

The planning proposal applies to the land at Appin Road, Gilead, in the Campbelltown LGA, known as Part Lot 1 DP 807555, Part Lot 2 DP 807555, Lot 59 DP 752042 and Lot 61 DP 752042 (see Figure 14).

## 4.2.2 Relationship to Existing Local Planning Instruments

The land to which this planning proposal applies falls within the provisions of the *City of Campbelltown Interim Development Order No. 15* (IDO 15), which has been identified as a deferred matter within CLEP 2015. The planning proposal is anticipated to be an amendment to the new CLEP 2015.



Figure 14 - Land to which the planning proposal applies

# 4.2.3 Land Use Zones

The Mt Gilead site is proposed to be zoned (in accordance with the Standard Template) as follows:

- R2 Low Density Residential
- RU2 Rural Landscape
- B1 Neighbourhood Centre
- RE1 Public Recreation
- SP2 Infrastructure.

The proposed zoning is shown on the Land Zoning Map appended at Appendix B and illustrated in Figure 15.



### 4.2.4 Proposed Provisions

It is proposed that all the provisions within CLEP 2015, including proposed land uses, will apply to the land the subject of this planning proposal. It is further proposed that additional provisions be inserted into the CLEP 2015 in order to:

- ensure a cap of 1700 residential lots on the subject land
- enable an exception to the minimum lot size on Lot 61 DP 752042, Appin Road, Gilead
- maximise the retention and enhancement of native biodiversity.

#### Minimum subdivision lot size

It is proposed to include an additional clause to permit lot sizes smaller than the minimum in recognition of the need for greater housing choice within the Sydney Metropolitan Region.

In order to provide a range of dwelling sizes and types to suit the diverse needs of the incoming population, it is intended that in specific circumstances subdivision to allow lots less than 450 square metres in area, but with a minimum area of 375 square metres. This provision applies to a small area of land in the centre of the site (as shown on the Lot Size Map appended at **Appendix B**) and is subject to the resultant lot(s) satisfying all of the following conditions:

- the lot(s) being for the purpose of a single dwelling
- there being no more than three lots less than 450 square metres in area contiguous with each other on a street
- the lot(s) not being located on a bus route
- the lots(s) being within 200 metres of a bus route, the community hub or open space area.

In addition, the maximum number of lots less than 450 square metres able to be created is capped at 65. The proposed provision, to be inserted into clause 4.1 of the CLEP 2015, is appended at **Appendix C.** 

#### Restricted dwelling yield

To address the concerns of both Transport for NSW and Roads and Maritime Services it is proposed to amend clause 4.1A and the Restricted Dwelling Yield Map to provide for a restricted dwelling yield of 1700 residential lots on the subject land. The proposed provision to be inserted into clause 4.1A of the CLEP 2015 is appended at **Appendix C**, and the subject land is identified on the Restricted Dwelling Yield Map appended at **Appendix B**.

#### **Terrestrial Biodiversity**

In order to protect and encourage the recovery of significant flora and fauna and their habitats, and retain and enhance native biodiversity, it is intended that some ecologically sensitive land proposed to be zoned RE1 and RU2 receives special protection. A clause to this effect, titled Terrestrial Biodiversity, is to be incorporated in 'Part 7 - Additional Local Provisions' of the CLEP 2015, and is appended at **Appendix C.** The relevant land is identified on the Terrestrial Biodiversity Map and is appended at **Appendix B**.

### 4.2.5 Key Development Standards

The proposed development standards that will apply to the Mt Gilead land are generally consistent with those applying across the rest of the Campbelltown LGA as set out in CLEP 2015 and shown on the maps in **Appendix B** and are as follows:

R2 Low Density Residential

- minimum lot sizes 450 square metres; 500 square metres; and 700 square metres
- maximum building height 8.5 metres. Note a small area is restricted to 6 metres to protect views from the Mt Gilead Homestead site
- maximum floor space ratio 0.55:1.

RU2 Rural Landscape

- minimum lot size 100ha
- maximum building height 9 metres.

B1 Neighbourhood Centre

- Maximum building height - 9 metres.

## 4.3 Justification

The matters justifying this planning proposal, as required by *A guide to preparing planning proposals*, are covered in Section 6 of this report.

## 4.4 Mapping

The land to which this planning proposal applies is illustrated in Figure 14 above and on the maps located at Appendix B.

#### LEP maps

The following draft LEP maps are included with this planning proposal and are attached at Appendix B:

- Land Zoning Map
- Lot Size Map
- Height of Buildings Map
- Floor Space Ratio Map
- Land Acquisition Reservation Map;
- Yield Map
- Urban Release Area Map
- Terrestrial Biodiversity Map
- Heritage Map.

## 4.5 Additional Development Controls

### 4.5.1 Campbelltown (Sustainable City) Development Control Plan 2015

To support the planning proposal and to reflect the special characteristics of the Mt Gilead site, an amendment to *Campbelltown (Sustainable City) Development Control Plan 2015* (DCP) is proposed. The amendment (see **Appendix D)**, to be incorporated as Part 6 in Volume 2 of the DCP, sets the vision and key development objectives for Mt Gilead, and provides additional site specific development principles and controls in relation to:

- heritage protection
- protection of key views
- the street network and public transport
- open space and landscaping
- residential subdivision
- residential development.

### 4.5.2 Indicative Site Structure Plan

The DCP amendment incorporates an Indicative Site Structure Plan as well as a section covering the proposed landscape palette for Mt Gilead, including street trees.

The Indicative Site Structure Plan, shown in Figure 16 and appended at Appendix D has been developed to support the planning proposal and provide a framework for the future subdivision and development of the Mt Gilead site. The plan shows:

- the indicative layout of roads, including the proposed main bus route through the site
- transport access points off Appin Road
- the distribution of public open space and the indicative location of detention basins
- the location of riparian corridors
- the general location for a future sports field and neighbourhood centre.

## 4.6 Community Consultation

Consultation with the community with regard to this planning proposal was undertaken through the formal statutory notification and exhibition period which occurred from 28 April 2015 until 30 June 2015.



# 5.0 Key Planning Issues

This section of the report addresses the planning issues listed for assessment in the Gateway Determination (see **Appendix A**) and further augmented by CCC's requirements for additional technical studies.

# 5.1 Ecology

The site and its surrounds currently contains areas of native vegetation and exotic pastures. As such, Eco Logical Australia prepared a detailed Ecological Assessment Report for the planning proposal. This report identifies the existing site conditions and provides an assessment of the acceptability of rezoning the land for residential purposes. The following is a summary of the key issues.

### 5.1.1 Fauna

### Context

A total of 58 bird species (including three introduced species) were recorded on the site during bird census and opportunistic observations, including one vulnerable species, *Glossopsitta pusilla*, and one migratory species, *Ardea ibis*. No evidence of nocturnal bird activity was found.

During site surveys 13 microbat species were identified. A single Swamp wallaby - *Wallabia bicolor* - was observed along the eastern boundary adjacent to native vegetation. Domestic livestock, (cows and ponies) were grazing on the site and one feral mammal, the European fox, was recorded.

No koalas were identified on the site.

#### Issues and Assessment

Seven threatened fauna species and one migratory species were identified on site. Potential habitat for hollow dependant bat species was also identified in the form of hollow bearing trees. Eco Logical Australia has recommended that these trees should be retained where possible. No other potential habitat areas were identified as substantial.

While no koalas were identified on the site, some scattered koala habitat trees - *Corymbia maculata* and *Eucalyptus crebra* - are present. Importantly, the coverage of potential koala habitat trees does not exceed the 15% threshold under *State Environmental Planning Policy No* 44—*Koala Habitat Protection* (SEPP 44) and therefore the site is not classified as potential koala habitat. Despite this, Eco Logical recommends that these trees should be retained where possible, and management plans should be developed to reduce the impact of domestic pets on koalas in the surrounding area.

Eco Logical has confirmed that the rezoning of the site will not have any adverse impact on existing fauna species. There is limited fauna habitat, but where scattered hollow trees do occur, they should be retained if possible.

### Planning Proposal Response

It is considered that the proposed rezoning of the subject site will not have any adverse impacts on threatened or endangered fauna species. The future design of residential development on the site – as shown in the Indicative Site Structure Plan incorporates the retention of potential fauna habitat trees.

### 5.1.2 Flora

### Context

The site comprises both remnant and degraded native vegetation and exotic pastures, and three native vegetation communities are located within the boundaries of the site:

- Cumberland Plain Woodland (CPW) 9 hectares
- Shale Sandstone Transition Forest (SSTF) 24.5 hectares
- River-flat Eucalypt Forest (RFEF) one hectare.

CPW is listed as a critically endangered ecological community (CEEC) under both the Commonwealth *Environment Protection & Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act) and the *NSW Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995* (TSC Act). SSTF is also listed as a critically endangered ecological community (EEC) under both these Acts, and RFEF is listed as endangered under the TSC Act.

#### Issues and Assessment

A total of 154 flora species were identified within the site including 67 native and 87 introduced species. Nine weed species listed as noxious in the Campbelltown LGA and four Weeds of National Significance were identified on the site. No threatened flora was recorded.

The proposed rezoning of land does not trigger any particular mechanisms of the TSC Act. Matters relating to threatened species, endangered populations and endangered ecological communities are typically considered in the plan-making stage to ensure subsequent development can be undertaken without having a significant impact on these matters. If a development is likely to have a significant impact on these matters, a Species Impact Statement (SIS) must be prepared and submitted with the development application.

An alternative approach is Biodiversity Certification which removes the need to undertake a SIS with a development application. To provide the option of Biodiversity Certification, an assessment consistent with the Biodiversity Certification Assessment Methodology (BCAM) was undertaken by Eco Logical Australia to determine if the 'improve or maintain' test is met by the proposed rezoning. Biodiversity Certification of the site is currently under consideration.

The site has been divided into three categories for the purposes of the BCAM:

- land for biodiversity certification (extent of the development) 152 hectares
- land for conservation/riparian/open space 41 hectares
- land maintaining its current land use (rural) 17 hectares.

Under the BCAM the development footprint will impact 1.8 hectares of the SSTF CEEC which is 'red flagged'. The 'improve or maintain' outcome will not be met unless a variation is obtained from the NSW Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) prior to any future development occurring. Overall, the envisaged future development will involve the retention of 83% of CPW, 49.6% of SSTF and 100% of RFEF. The rezoning will remove 1.5 hectares of CPW and 12.5 hectares of SSTF, both largely comprising scattered trees.

In light of the small area of SSTF likely to be removed, and the area of CEEC proposed to be protected, it is considered by Eco Logical Australia that a red flag variation request could be considered favourably by OEH.

The BCAM compares the impact of a proposal to the conservation benefits. This comparison is measured using Biobanking credits which are attributed for the extent of the existing vegetation, or for factors such as how land will be managed or protected. Based on the existing site conditions, a total of 192 credits are required. A total of 366 credits are expected to be generated, resulting in a surplus of 174 credits.

Future applications for development on the site which impact any EECs or CEECs will be required to be referred to the Commonwealth Government under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999*.

Overall, the ecological assessment concluded that the balance between development and conservation is achievable and that the planning proposal adequately addresses ecological issues.

#### Planning Proposal Response

The planning proposal proposes to retain significant areas of vegetation within public open space areas. The site's ecological values are proposed to be addressed by either Biodiversity Certification or via a Species Impact Statement submitted with future development applications.

Moreover, the proposed LEP amendment protects the ecological values of the site in the following ways:

- ecologically sensitive land proposed to be zoned RE1 and RU2 will receive special protection via a clause to this
  effect, titled Terrestrial Biodiversity (as shown in Appendix C), which is proposed to be incorporated in 'Part 7 of
  CLEP 2015. The relevant land is identified on the Terrestrial Biodiversity Map
- the land proposed to be zoned RE1 in the north of the site connects with Noorumba Reserve and there are generally connections between all the areas of RE1 zoned land so facilitating the passage of native fauna.

# 5.2 Bushfire Risk

The site is identified as bushfire prone on the Campbelltown Bush Fire Prone Land Map and therefore a Bushfire Assessment has been undertaken by Eco Logical Australia. This assessment investigates the capability and suitability of the site for future residential development with regard to the relevant bushfire planning legislation and policies.

### Context

Eco Logical Australia has undertaken site specific and surrounding vegetation mapping, identifying vegetation formations including Sclerophyll (Dry) and Grassy Woodland. To the east and south of the site are areas of forest, whilst smaller pockets of forest, woodland and grassland are contained within the site. The majority of the site has a gentle slope with areas of steeper slopes in the northern western portion of the site.

While the majority of the site is proposed for residential development, portions of existing bushland will be retained as open space.

#### **Issues and Assessment**

The existing vegetation on the site has been classified as 'forest' or 'grassland' which presents a hazardous risk of bushfire. To ensure protection from bushfire risk, Eco Logical has established indicative Asset Protection Zones (APZ) to provide a buffer to future residential development with calculations based on the vegetation of the site and slope of the land.

Eco Logical has identified other bushfire protection measures including the provision of adequate access, water supply for fire fighting, the safe installation of utilities, and building construction standards for future dwellings. These measures would be implemented as part of future applications for residential development.

#### Planning Proposal Response

The Bushfire Assessment has demonstrated that the site is capable of accommodating future subdivision and land development subject to appropriate bushfire protection measures.

The NSW Rural Fire Service has advised that it has no objection to the planning proposal in principle but notes that any future development will need to comply with the requirements of *Planning for Bush Fire Protection 2006*. Accordingly, the site is considered suitable for rezoning for future residential use.

# 5.3 Ecological and Riparian Corridors

The current vegetation on the site provides opportunities for creating effective biodiversity corridors thereby linking vegetation to the north, south and east. This, along with the preservation of riparian corridors, was assessed as part of the aforementioned Ecological Assessment Report prepared by Eco Logical Australia (see Section 5.1 above).

## 5.3.1 Ecological Corridors

### Issues and Assessment

The nature of current vegetation on the site and its proposed retention/removal is discussed in Section 5.1.2 above.

There is currently connectivity within the site to areas of vegetation to the north and south via a fragmented series of islands or stepping stones of vegetation. The ecological assessment concluded that while the planning proposal would remove some areas of scattered trees, it would at least maintain the interrupted connectivity with surrounding vegetation to the north (Noorumba Reserve) and south (the Beulah Biobanking area).

The report further notes that as an outcome of the planning proposal the fragmented patches of vegetation would be consolidated through improved management and revegetation. At a broader landscape scale, connectivity between Noorumba Reserve and Beulah is via the vegetation to the east of Appin Road which, with the exception of Appin Road, provides a contiguous linkage of vegetation in a very good condition with low disturbance.

### Planning Proposal Response

Together, the planning proposal, the Indicative Structure Plan and proposed conservation measures are intended to enhance the condition of retained patches of woodland so reducing the degree of fragmentation. As discussed earlier, it is intended that significant areas of vegetation be retained on the site within areas of public open space. In addition, the proposed LEP amendment fosters the retention and creation of ecological corridors in the following ways:

- the land proposed to be zoned RE1 in the north of the site connects with Noorumba Reserve, and all the areas of RE1 zoned land are generally connected (as shown indicatively in Figure 17)
- ecologically sensitive land proposed to be zoned RE1 and RU2 will receive further protection via a Terrestrial Biodiversity clause (as shown in Appendix C) which is to be incorporated in 'Part 7 of the Campbelltown LEP 2015. The relevant land is identified on the Terrestrial Biodiversity Map.

### **Riparian Corridors**

#### Issues and Assessment

There are several streams and drainage lines across the site, particularly in the north and towards the western boundary.

All streams and drainage lines were categorised and mapped by Eco Logical Australia following the 'Guidelines for controlled activities' set out by the NSW Office of Water. This methodology utilises the Strahler Stream Order classification which identifies riparian corridor widths as measured from the top of bank and minimum vegetated riparian zone widths.

Drainage lines that were not classified in the assessment were deemed to be of limited riparian value or did not meet the definition of a river. In some situations the watercourses have been significantly disturbed and in some areas display no true bed and bank characteristics.

The mapping of top of bank and stream order is presented in **Figure 18** The majority of the watercourses are considered to range from slightly to substantially modified, with clearing of vegetation within the catchment and along the tops of banks. Aquatic habitat is limited due to the modification of the watercourses, and even in unmodified watercourses the aquatic vegetation is generally of marginal quality. Eco Logical Australia concluded that the overall rating of riparian and aquatic conditions varies from degraded to moderate.

#### Planning Proposal Response

Riparian zones have been defined to the top of bank and appropriate vegetated riparian zones mapped (see **Figure 18**), noting that the NSW Office of Water has agreed that since some previously mapped first order Strahler streams/channels do not meet the definition of 'waterfront land' they can be removed.

Wherever possible, development and subsequent asset protection zones will not occur in areas mapped as riparian corridor or vegetated riparian zone. As shown in Figure 17 the majority of mapped watercourses on the site will be contained within areas of proposed open space or on retained rural land, which are to be zoned RE1 and RU2 respectively. Moreover, as explained above, further protection is provided via the terrestrial biodiversity clause and attendant biodiversity overlay map to be incorporated in the CLEP 2015.

Eco Logical Australia has made a series of recommendations in relation to the future management of riparian corridors. These cover matters such as:

- the determination of stream ordering downstream
- · the determination of riparian corridor widths
- future maintenance, rehabilitation and vegetation of riparian corridors
- · measurement of the top of bank of any proposed new constructed channels
- · the permissibility of cycleways and paths within the outer vegetated riparian zone
- the permissibility of detention basins within the outer vegetated riparian zone, and associated equivalent offset areas.

These requirements have either been taken into account in the planning proposal or will be implemented as part of subsequent development applications.





Figure 18 - Classification of riparian corridors

Source: Eco Logical Australia

# 5.4 Soils and Geotechnical Conditions

The proposed rezoning of the site for future residential uses required an assessment of the existing soil and geotechnical considerations to identify any potential risks. As such, URS prepared a Phase 1 Environmental and Geotechnical Site Assessment.

### Context

The site generally slopes north-west into a shallow valley at the foot of a ridge line in the north-west. The ridge line comprises a hill with steeper gradients. The site contains a number of small farm dams with three major drainage channels.

The northern portion of the site is underlain by Ashfield Shale, while Hawkesbury Sandstone underlies the southern portion of the site. Soils on the site are shallow to moderately deep (<1.5 m) and are expected to be moderately reactive high plasticity clay.

#### Issues and Assessment

Geotechnical observations by URS identified five areas of potential hazard, including hilly areas of the site, gullies and a quarry. The overall stability of the site has been confirmed by URS as 'good' with only surficial soil instabilities on the steeper northern area and minor rock fall potential localised to the quarry. URS has noted that areas proposed for residential zoning are not located in these areas.

The existing soils on the site are cohesive and potentially have low bearing strength when wet. URS has suggested compaction of soil will enhance the bearing strength of the founding soil. It has been recommended that the site should be graded and site drains should be designed to prevent ponding or channelling of water across the soil horizons.

An investigation by URS of surface soils (0-300mm depth) across the site identified that all surface soil samples were non-saline. A review of the available Acid Sulphate Soil Risk Map and an assessment of the topography and lithology of the site also confirmed there is a very low risk of potential acid sulphate soils (PASS).

Given the topography and lithology of the site, URS considers no further assessment is required to provide an appropriate characterisation of acid sulphate soil risk and that consideration of PASS is not necessary in relation to future development.

### Planning Proposal Response

URS has confirmed that the site is acceptable for residential land uses as there are no significant geohazards. It has been recommended that targeted geotechnical testing occur with future applications for development to support the detailed design of any residential development.

# 5.5 Mine Subsidence

Subsidence as a result of future coal mining is a potential issue for the site. Accordingly, a Mine Subsidence Report was prepared by Mine Subsidence Engineering Consultants (MSEC). The report predicts subsidence parameters and the potential impacts on the future development.

#### Context

The site is located within the Coal Exploration Authorisation Area A248, associated with the Bulli and Balgownie Coal Seams. The Bulli Seam, containing coking coal, lies approximately 500-590 metres below the surface, whilst the Balgownie Seam, containing thermal coal, is approximately 610 metres below the surface.

BHP Billiton plans to operate a mine in the Bulli Seam south of the site, and whilst not currently planned, there is potential for mining to continue north below the Mt Gilead site. Despite this potential, MSEC is of the opinion that part of the coal seams below the site are unlikely to be mined due to the presence of faults in the seams. Based on current technology, the Balgownie Seam is unlikely to be mined in the near future due to extraction constraints.

As well as containing coal resources, the site lies within the Petroleum Exploration Licence Area PEL2 and contains significant gas reserves which could potentially be extracted through gas wells. The owner of the exploration licence, AGL, has suspended expansion of nearby gas extraction projects due to community concern and legislation prohibiting wells being established within two kilometres of residential dwellings. As such, the extraction of gas is not considered an issue for the site.

#### Issues and Assessment

Potential impacts from future mining activities are predicted to include subsidence, tilts, strains and curvatures. As no specific mining activities are currently proposed, MSEC has assumed a scenario of longwall mining with a width of 320 metres and chain pillars between longwalls of 45 metres width. This scenario involves the mining of the Bulli Seam only, due to the unlikely capability of mining the Balgownie Seam.

In consultation with BHP Billiton and based on the above scenario, MSEC has identified the potential for subsidence and maximum tilt, curvature and strain. The potential impacts comprise:

- maximum predicted subsidence varies from 1120mm to 1440mm
- maximum predicted tilt is 7mm/m at the perimeter of the subsidence trough and 2 to 3mm/m within the bottom of the trough
- maximum predicted strains are 1.1mm/m, tensile, and 2.3mm/m, compressive
- maximum predicted curvature is 6.4 kilometres radius.

Although the above figures represent the maximum potential impact, the presence of faults within the coal seams will restrict the layout of any future longwall mining activities. As such, the Mt Gilead site will be outside, or on the edge of, any subsidence trough. The level of subsidence on the site is therefore expected to be lower than these maximums.

Likewise unlikely, if advancements in technology allow the Balgownie Seam to be mined, the maximum subsidence is expected to be approximately 750mm to 850mm. Cumulatively, this would result in a vertical subsidence of approximately two metres. This level of subsidence is unlikely to cause damage to buildings, with maximum tilt, curvature and strain being the most relevant impacts.

The Mine Subsidence Board has established building guidelines to be followed when constructing moderately sized housing. These guidelines embody provisions of the Building Code of Australia (BCA), Australian Standards and good building practices. Based on these guidelines, MSEC has established a range of subsidence parameters which should be implemented in the future construction of residential development on the site.

#### Planning Proposal Response

Based on the above assessment, the site is capable of being developed for residential purposes if the relevant guidelines and standards for residential buildings are followed and the level of construction is commensurate with the established subsidence parameters. These matters will be further addressed in future applications for development on the site.

# 5.6 Contamination

Past and current agricultural uses on the site can result in a risk of soil or groundwater contamination via the release of chemicals through leaks and spills. URS has prepared a Phase 1 Environmental and Geotechnical Site Assessment to assess these risks and confirm the suitability of the site for future residential development.

#### Context

The ownership of the site has changed on several occasions since 1890, and the land has been used for farming and grazing prior to 1954 and to the present.

#### **Issues and Assessment**

Low levels of contamination associated with previous and current uses are expected on the site based on the preliminary environmental and historical review undertaken by URS. This contamination could be attributed to various chemicals such as arsenic and organochlorine pesticides (OCPs) associated with sheep and cattle grazing activities.

A single instance of an asbestos cement pipe was identified on the site by URS in 2006. No asbestos was observed during the most recent site inspection.

URS has suggested that the migration of onsite contaminants to adjacent receptors should be able to be adequately controlled by the use of surface drainage. A Phase 2 investigation should also be undertaken to reduce the risk of unexpected findings during the future development. This is capable of being undertaken as part of future applications for development.

#### Planning Proposal Response

URS has confirmed there is minimal likelihood of significant chemical contamination of the site that would compromise development for residential purposes. Any further investigations and mitigation measures can be undertaken during the preparation of detailed applications for the future residential development.

# 5.7 Non-indigenous Heritage

The presence of several historical sites within and adjacent to the site necessitates an assessment of non-indigenous heritage. Navin Officer and Tropman & Tropman Architects (the heritage consultants) have jointly prepared a European Heritage Assessment in relation to the historical significance of the site and to confirm the appropriateness of future residential development.

### Context

There are no items of state heritage significance within the site. However, the Upper Canal System located adjacent to the site and part forming the north western boundary is listed on the State Heritage Register.

The following items on the site are listed as, or considered to be of, local heritage significance:

- part of the Artificial Lake (dam) listed as a heritage item in the Campbelltown IDO 15 as part of the 'Mt Gilead Group'
- the archaeological remnants of the early 'Hillsborough' homestead is considered (by the attached heritage assessment) to be of local heritage significance, as are significant and endangered ecological features on the surrounding land.

The history of these items and their significance are detailed in the European Heritage Assessment.

In addition, as identified in **Section** 3.5.5 the following heritage items are located outside, but in the immediate vicinity, of the site:

- the Mt Gilead Homestead and surrounding buildings and structures (listed in Campbelltown IDO No 15 and on the Register of the National Trust of Australia (NSW));
- the Beulah Estate (listed on the State Heritage Register);
- Humewood Forest (listed in IDO 15); and
- Meadowvale (listed in IDO 15).

#### **Issues and Assessment**

The heritage consultants have undertaken an assessment of the impacts of the planning proposal on the heritage significance of the local and state listed items on and within the vicinity of the site as summarised below.

#### Upper Canal System

The Upper Canal – is a system of tunnels, aqueducts and open canals which transport water from the Appin area to the Prospect Reservoir, has historic and architectural significance and is listed on four heritage registers: NSW State Heritage Register; IDO 15; the Sydney Catchment Authority's Heritage and Conservation Register; and the Register of the National Trust of Australia (NSW).

The proposal will indirectly impact the aesthetic qualities of the Upper Canal System by partially removing the bushland setting.

#### Artificial Lake (Dam)

The Mt Gilead Group – the group of stone buildings, homestead, stables, granary and windmill without sails (referred to as the Old Mill) is listed in IDO 15 and on the Register of the National Trust of Australia (NSW - Classified). Neither listing defines the area of the item, but the description from both demonstrates that they focus on the Homestead Complex and Old Mill, with the IDO 15 also including a dam which is assumed to be the Artificial Lake. Other than a small area of the lake, none are within the site.

The proposal has the potential to impact the heritage significance of the Artificial Lake as it is partially located within the site.

#### Site of early Hillsborough homestead

The site of the early homestead known as Hillsborough has been identified as a site of local archaeological significance.

#### **Remnant tracks**

An assessment of remnant access tracks and a carriageway to the Mt Gilead Homestead was undertaken to identify if these contained any heritage significance. It was determined that these tracks and the carriageway do not satisfy any state or local level criteria for significance. Despite this, any possible interpretation of the extent of the carriageway has been encouraged to reflect the historic quality of the site.

#### Mt Gilead Homestead Complex

The heritage assessment concluded that historically, the Mt Gilead Homestead Complex and Windmill (the Old Mill), together with the Artificial Lake to the east, had been considered to be part of a single picturesque vista. The views to and from these items are considered important in the context of their heritage significance and as such, where practicable and feasible, it is considered desirable that the current rural landscape setting for these two items be retained.

The consultants note that the overall heritage significance of these two items is not considered to be affected by the proposal. Views to the Mt Gilead Homestead Complex and the Old Mill from the proposed residential development are not considered to have a significant, or otherwise unacceptable, impact on the heritage values of these items.

#### Neighbouring items

The heritage items listed above in the vicinity of the site are not identified as being affected by the planning proposal.

#### Planning Proposal Response

The heritage conservation provisions in clause 5.10 of Campbelltown LEP 2015 will apply to the site and protect the heritage values of the site and its surrounds. In addition, further measures are proposed as described below.

#### Upper Canal

The proposal will indirectly impact the aesthetic qualities of the Upper Canal System, a State heritage item, by replacing part of the bushland setting with residential development. As the Canal has its own corridor of 'bushland setting' which will not be impacted by the proposal, the overall heritage significance of the item will not be detrimentally impacted.

Notwithstanding this, to address any potential impacts, it is proposed that a statement of heritage impact (SOHI) be prepared prior to any development application for works adjacent to the Upper Canal. The SOHI should clearly document the extent of visual or aesthetic impacts and all necessary controls to minimise or avoid heritage impacts.

Approval from the NSW Heritage Council should be sought for any development impacts within, or directly adjacent to, the bushland corridor of the Upper Canal.

#### Views and Vistas

The residential use of the site is considered acceptable by the heritage consultants subject to the incorporation of the heritage assessment recommendations and subdivision guidelines provided in the European Heritage Assessment. These recommendations and guidelines will generally be applied in relation to the preparation of future applications for residential development on the site.

More specifically, the planning proposal has responded to the issues in relation to significant vistas from, and views to, the Mt Gilead Homestead complex in the following ways:

- the land to the north east of the Mt Gilead Homestead is to retain a rural zone and is proposed to be zoned RU2, so
  protecting and retaining the landscape setting of the Mt Gilead group
- views to the north-east from the Homestead to the hill (within the RU2 zone), known as 'One Tree Hill' would generally be protected as the parklike backdrop and surrounds are not proposed to be disturbed with residential development. It is proposed that future residential development to the east will be screened with the planting of trees. 'One Tree Hill' will be retained as a grassed knoll with a single tree
- the rural, parklike setting of the Old Mill will be retained within the proposed RU2 zone of CLEP 2015.

These measures are further supplemented with a series of provisions in the site specific DCP in relation to retaining and interpreting heritage and views. Moreover, the Indicative Structure Plan interprets the significance of the historic alignment of the Mt Gilead carriageway off Appin Road by generally setting it on the axis of the Old Mill. Particular elements of the alignment, such as the gateway off Appin Road and the curve of the road around the Artificial Lake are retained where possible, as are views of the Old Mill.

#### Artificial Lake (Dam)

The integrity of that part of the Artificial Lake within the site is generally not compromised as it will continue to be surrounded by rural land by virtue of the proposed RU2 zone along the western boundary of the site, and the whole lake is to remain in one ownership.

In addition, a heritage curtilage is to be provided around the Artificial Lake to mitigate any potential impacts and only the construction of a stormwater detention basin within the curtilage would be acceptable. Construction outside of the curtilage area would have no impact on the item.

If the Artificial Lake was to be visually or functionally impacted or if impacts were to occur adjacent to it, a SOHI and a conservation management plan (CMP) would be developed for the lake prior to any development application. The CMP would establish whether any impact(s) may or may not occur to the item during and post construction, and serve to manage them.

The heritage assessment further recommends that the Artificial Lake should be considered for State heritage listing, as well as for inclusion in Campbelltown's LEP rather than it being part of the general Mt Gilead listing as is currently the case.

#### Hillsborough Homestead

The site of the Hillsborough cottage will be recorded and interpreted in the subdivision design of the site, as shown in the Indicative Structure Plan, and existing archaeological evidence of the cottage will be recorded and interpreted.

#### Beulah Biobanking Site

The southern boundary of the site adjoins land at Beulah which has been established as a biobanking site. In recognition of the environmental significance of this biobanking site, an area of 3.5 hectares of public recreation land has been included on the draft zoning map (refer to **Appendix B**) in order to provide a buffer between the Beulah site and proposed future residential development.

# 5.8 Aboriginal Heritage

The generally undisturbed nature of the subject site results in potential for Aboriginal cultural heritage sites and areas of archaeological sensitivity. As such, Navin Officer has prepared an Archaeological Assessment and Aboriginal Consultation Report which examines the significance of existing Aboriginal Archaeological Sites on the site and provides an assessment on the potential impact of permitting residential development.

#### Context

Three artefact scatter sites (MGA13, MGA26 and MGA27) have been identified as possessing moderate scientific significance. Two isolated finds (MGA12 and MGIF3) are of low scientific significance at a local level. One culturally modified tree (MGMT1) has been assessed to have high scientific and cultural significance at a local level. Further information on six potential archaeological deposits (PADs) (MG PAD42, MG PAD43, Mt Gilead Property PAD, MG PAD44, MG PAD45 and MG PAD46) was not identifiable at this time, but it is acknowledged by Navin Officer that an Aboriginal Heritage Impact Permit (AHIP) would be required in the future if any disturbance was proposed to the PADs.

#### Issues and Assessment

A comprehensive consultation process was undertaken by Navin Officer in accordance with the OEH document 'Aboriginal cultural heritage consultation requirements for proponents 2010'. This involved correspondence with Local Aboriginal Land Councils, government agencies and various Indigenous relations groups. A field assessment of the site and various desktop searches were also undertaken by Navin Officer to inform the assessment.

On the assumption that all of the identified items, Aboriginal sites and PADs will be directly affected by future development, Navin Officer has determined that the future development of the site for residential purposes will have an impact on items of Aboriginal significance, and that future construction on the site would have a high degree of harm and result in the removal of all items of significance.

Navin Officer has not precluded the proposed rezoning of the site but has recommended that the following mitigation measures, should be implemented in the future development of the site:

- implementation of conservation areas
- subsurface testing of archaeological deposits
- surface salvage of Aboriginal objects
- · care and management of recovered artefacts
- ongoing consultation with Aboriginal stakeholders.

#### Planning Proposal Response

The heritage conservation provisions in clause 5.10 of Campbelltown LEP 2015 will apply to the site and are considered adequate to protect the Aboriginal significance of the site.

The culturally modified tree will continue to be protected by virtue of its location on land proposed to be zoned RU2.

The mitigation measures outlined above should be implemented by CCC in relation to future applications for development.

# 5.9 Landscape Character and Visual Impact

As detailed above in Section 5.7 there are existing features of the site and surrounding landscape elements that have been identified as having heritage significance. The proposed rezoning of the land for residential purposes has the potential to materially affect the rural agricultural nature of the site and its associated heritage features – in particular

the Mt Gilead Homestead Complex and surrounding land. Accordingly, Clouston Associates were commissioned to undertake a Landscape Character and Visual Impact Assessment to assess the extent of the impacts of the planning proposal and establish whether and how such impacts can be mitigated.

#### Context

A number of elements associated with 19<sup>th</sup> Century English landscapes are present both within and surrounding the site. Of particular relevance are:

- the Homestead Complex and the Old Mill and associated landscape including the Artificial Lake (dam) and One Tree Hill
- historic references which indicate that the landscape character of the property in the 19th century was 'park-like' and resembled an 'English country seat'
- landscape elements such as individual tree specimens within a grazing landscape, ironbark fencing, a backdrop of native timber and extensive views.

While some of these elements are missing from today's property, the core elements commonly associated with the 19th Century romantic English landscapes remain – that is, a parkland style landscape of individual and groups of trees in a rolling pasture and extensive district views, providing the context and curtilage for the heritage listed structures and buildings.

The combination of these elements creates the landscape character significance and establishes a wider landscape context for the identified heritage items.

The Upper Nepean/Sydney Water Supply Canal is also identified as an important heritage element of the landscape but has limited visual presence from the site.

#### Issues and Assessment

Clouston Associates originally identified numerous visual receptors grouped into public domain views, private domain views, views to and from the site, and views within the site. Of these, six locations were identified which best demonstrate any effect of future residential development.

An assessment of these viewpoints has identified impacts ranging from moderate/high to moderate and negligible. In essence, the future residential development on the site may have impacts on significant landscape and visual elements if not appropriately mitigated.

The Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) identifies two broad areas of landscape character and visual significance that require specific mitigation measures:

- the core visual catchment from the Old Mill looking north and from the access road to the Mt Gilead Homestead looking north east (both with a moderate/high visual impact rating)
- the approaches to the site on Appin Road along the eastern boundary of the site which would change as a result of the removal of existing vegetation along the eastern side of Appin Road to facilitate road widening so revealing the physical features of new urban development (moderate visual impact rating).

Other identified receptor locations were considered to be of such distance from the core heritage elements, or the view cones of any part of the site so narrow, that any change was expected to be barely visible and thus mitigation measures were not deemed to be warranted.

The view from the Gilead Aged Care Facility (located to the north of the site) would also potentially be significantly impacted by the proposed rezoning, but the approved development of the Gilead retirement village currently in construction on the adjoining site will entirely obscure this view; thus impacts from this receptor were discounted.

#### Planning Proposal Response

Clouston Associates has identified a range of mitigation measures to be considered in the future residential development of the site framed around the key principles of avoidance, reduction, alleviation, compensation and management. The VIA sets out specific mitigation principles and measures to manage the impacts of the residential development that would flow from the planning proposal, and indicates that if these are implemented in relation to the above two areas of impact, the visual impact rating would reduce to moderate/low.

More specifically:

- In relation to the visual catchment from the Old Mill looking north and from the access road to the Mt Gilead Homestead looking north east, the core mitigation principles for these receptors would be to:
  - retain the 'bald' character of One Tree Hill as a grassed knoll with a single landmark tree
  - maintain the skyline of the tree and grassed crest uninterrupted by planting or built form
  - ensure that only native vegetation and no built form is visible on the lower flanks of One Tree Hill
  - maintain views to the Artificial Lake (dam) with a vegetated backdrop and no visible built form.

In relation to the loss of vegetation along Appin Road and views of new urban development, the core mitigation principles would be to:

- establish a sense of the former character of, and arrival experience at, the Mt Gilead property driveway entrance through simple landmark tree planting and landscape design
- re-establish, through new roadside native planting and landscape design, a roadside character evocative of the former rural approach to the Mt Gilead property along Appin Road from both north and south.

The recommended landscape and design measures will be implemented via the proposed site specific provisions in the site specific DCP. In addition, the proposed land use zones listed in Section 5.7 above, the proposed larger lots in the north west corner of the site (as shown on the Lot Size Map) and the proposed limit to building height on the northern side of One Tree Hill (as shown on the Height of Buildings Map) will further mitigate any impacts on the views from the Homestead and the Old Mill.

The rezoning of the site to permit residential development is thus considered acceptable as there are sufficient mitigation measures available to appropriately reduce landscape character and visual impacts.

# 5.10 Transport, Traffic and Access

The Traffic, Transport & Access Study prepared by Parsons Brinckerhoff was designed to assess the effects on traffic of the proposed rezoning for a range of dwelling numbers (1500-1700). The traffic study was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of CCC, Transport for New South Wales (TfNSW) and Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) and the road and intersections included in the traffic study were accepted by both TfNSW and RMS.

### Context

The site is located adjacent to Appin Road which is classified as a State Road. Other important surrounding roads include Narellan Road, Oxley Street and the Hume Motorway. Appin Road carries approximately 21,500 vehicles daily south of Woodland Road, Bradbury. No formal pedestrian paths are located on Appin Road along its boundary with the subject site. A review of crash data on Appin Road in close proximity to the site indicates a total of 17 reported crashes in the five year period from 2007 to 2012.

Two bus services (Route 887 and 888) operate within close proximity of the site with Route 887 travelling past the site on Appin Road.

#### Issues and Assessment

The roads and intersections assessed in the traffic study included Appin Road from Appin to Narellan Road, Narellan Road from Appin Road to Gilchrist Drive and the major intersections along these routes. The study area included 13 existing intersections and three proposed intersections along Appin Road directly accessing the site. Annual increases in background traffic in addition to the potential increased traffic that would be generated as a result of the planning proposal traffic growth were factored into the traffic assessment, ensuring a conservative and true assessment of the future situation.

Various development scenarios were modelled: 1,500 and 1,700 dwellings by 2026, and an interim scenario of 50% of these dwellings being constructed by 2021.

The traffic, transport and access study confirmed that the proposed rezoning for residential development will further contribute traffic to intersections along Appin Road into the future. Several of the intersections were operating at or near capacity in 2013 and will further deteriorate on the basis of background traffic growth into 2021 and 2026. Likewise, several intersections are expected to operate near, at or over capacity due to the addition of traffic from the Mt Gilead site. As such, additional capacity would be required at the following intersections in order to improve intersection performance to acceptable levels of service:

Appin Road, Kellerman Drive and Copperfield Drive

Appin Road and St Johns Road

Appin Road, Oxley Street, Narellan Road and The Parkway.

In addition, the mid-block capacity assessment of the capacity of Appin Road to handle the expected traffic increases determined that Appin Road would need to be upgraded – including adding turning lanes, slip lanes and augmenting the carriageway to two lanes.

A range of mitigation measures have been proposed to address the impacts of the planning proposal on the road network. These include:

providing a bus service to the site

accommodating a walking and cycle network in the site

investigating car share schemes

developing a residential travel plan

upgrades to specific intersections and Appin Road (see below).

TfNSW and RMS have reviewed the Traffic, Transport and Access Study and have confirmed that the mitigation measures are acceptable to mitigate the impacts of the Mt Gilead. TfNSW and RMS also advised that they had no objection to the Mt Gilead Planning Proposal being publicly exhibited provided the following conditions were met:

- development is set back 20 metres from the existing Appin Road western boundary providing for a future road corridor of 40 metres
- The land required for road widening is dedicated at no cost to Government through an appropriate agreement
- The land required for road widening is shown as SP2 Infrastructure 'Classified Road' on the Mount Gilead Planning Proposal Land Zoning and Land Reservation Acquisition Maps.

#### Planning Proposal Response

It is considered that the site is capable of being developed for residential purposes with the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in the Parson Brinkerhoff study and confirmed by TfNSW and RMS. Specifically, the road infrastructure upgrades identified in the recommendations in the report aim to overcome the congestion anticipated to be caused by both background growth and the Mt Gilead development and thus enable the development of the site for up to 1700 dwellings. The planning proposal maps reflect the conditions required by the traffic authorities.

The funding and staging of road infrastructure works is the subject of a regional voluntary planning agreement (VPA) between the landowners and the State government, which also addresses land dedications matters.

With regard to public transport, the Indicative Structure Plan shows a bus route through the site and the intersections with Appin Road will be designed to accommodate buses.

# 5.11 Noise

The site is potentially susceptible to noise impacts as it adjoins Appin Road and is located in close proximity to a number of industrial uses. As such, a Noise Assessment has been prepared by Wilkinson Murray to assess the potential noise impact from surrounding industrial uses and traffic on the Mt Gilead site. The predicted noise impact from traffic generated by the development of Mt Gilead on surrounding residential areas has also been addressed.

### Context

Wilkinson Murray conducted noise monitoring at the site to determine existing background levels and traffic noise levels from Appin Road. The existing background noise levels of the site are similar to those of a rural context. Noise levels of surrounding uses, such as the Rosalind Park Gas Plant and Menangle Quarry, were also identified for consideration in the noise assessment. It should be noted that subsequent to the completion of the acoustic assessment, advice was given that the proposed Leaf's Gully power station would not be proceeding. Accordingly the noise impacts of the power station are no longer relevant to this planning proposal.

#### Issues and Assessment

The surrounding industrial activities are potential catalysts for noise intrusions on the future residential development at Mt Gilead. However, as a result of on-site noise monitoring, it was determined that the surrounding industrial uses are barely audible on the site. This is due to both the considerable distance of the uses from the site and the topographical shielding between the uses and the site.

Based on the identified traffic noise levels from Appin Road, Wilkinson Murray assessed the suitability of the site for residential development. Noise level criteria were established for future residential development based on the Department of Planning's document *Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads – Interim Guideline* and the requirements of *State Environmental Planning Policy (Infrastructure) 2007*. If new residential development was to be constructed without any mitigation measures but set back approximately 30 metres from Appin Road, it would not comply with the relevant noise criteria. As such, Wilkinson Murray has suggested measures such as glazing specifications and acoustic door seals to achieve the relevant noise levels.

Traffic noise generated by the proposal was determined using criteria set in the NSW Road Noise Policy (March 2011) and the expected traffic generation from the future residential development. The expected traffic generation on Appin Road will result in an increase of 2.4dBA for the peak hour, and between 2.0 - 2.2dBA over a fifteen hour period. The NSW Road Noise Policy specifies that an increase of 2dBA is barely discernible, therefore the proposal is not expected to have any impact on surrounding residential areas.

#### Planning Proposal Response

The noise impacts both on the proposal and resulting from the proposal will not be significant and are capable of being appropriately addressed in future design and development stages. Noise impacts do not preclude the rezoning of the site for residential purposes.

Moreover, it is noted that the Indicative Structure Plan for the site proposes a substantial buffer between residential development and Appin Road.

# 5.12 Air Quality

The proximity of the site to several industrial uses increases the potential for adverse air quality impacts on any future development. Wilkinson Murray has performed a qualitative air quality impact review to determine the viability of the proposed planning proposal. The review addressed the potential impact on air quality from surrounding industrial facilities and road traffic on the future residential development that would eventuate as a result of the planning proposal.

### Context

The existing air quality environment at the Mt Gilead site is expected to be good due to its location away from significant urban development; however the following surrounding uses could influence air quality at the site:

- Appin Road
- the M31 motorway approximately 1.8 kilometres to the west
- Menangle Quarry approximately 1.2 kilometres to the west
- Rosalind Park Gas Plant approximately 1 kilometre to the west
- poultry farms (Ingham's Broiler Complex) approximately 4 kilometres to the south.

It should be noted that subsequent to the completion of the air quality assessment, advice was given that the proposed Leaf's Gully power station would not be proceeding. Accordingly, any potential air quality impacts of the power station are no longer relevant to this planning proposal.

Current data from nearby quality monitoring stations indicates that the regional air quality is below the target levels established for New South Wales. As such, there is capacity within the region for additional development.

#### **Issues and Assessment**

Wilkinson Murray have identified that potential impacts on the air quality of the Mt Gilead site could arise from elevated levels of particulate matter, carbon monoxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulphur dioxide and ozone. An assessment concentrating on the impact of the surrounding uses listed was undertaken with each of the surrounding uses expected to operate within the relevant air quality levels established by the NSW Environment Protection Authority (EPA). Two of these uses, the Rosalind Park Gas Plant and Ingham Broiler Complex, operate under environmental protection licenses, which ensure that they are continually monitored by the EPA for compliance with air quality targets.

The substantial distance of all of these uses from the Mt Gilead site further diminishes the likelihood of any air quality impacts on the future residential development. Prevailing winds within the region will contribute to disbursing any air quality impacts, such as dust or odour, away from the site.

Likewise, the separation distance of the site from Appin Road is sufficient to ensure that no air quality impacts are experienced on the site. Wilkinson Murray have noted that even with the widening of Appin Road, a minimum of 30 metres will be achieved between the roadway and the nearest dwelling, appropriately mitigating any air quality impacts.

#### Planning Proposal Response

In light of the above assessment, Wilkinson Murray have identified that there will not be any significant impact on air quality at the Mt Gilead site from surrounding industrial uses and traffic. The site will be suitable for residential development from an air quality perspective and thus capable of being rezoned for this purpose.

# 5.13 Stormwater and Flooding

Worley Parsons has prepared a Stormwater Management and Flooding Assessment of the site covering the future management of the stormwater quality and quantity and flood risk post rezoning (and as a result of development).

#### Context

The site consists predominantly of open pasture land currently used for grazing livestock. The existing land surface grades generally towards the north-west with some steep areas, particularly in the north-western corner of the site. A number of low order ephemeral watercourses drain the site and discharge to four identifiable points along the site boundary.

#### Issues and Assessment

#### Stormwater quality

The objectives of the strategy for the management of stormwater quality agreed with CCC are to preserve the state of existing watercourses and to ensure that post-development pollutant loads are consistent with Council's stormwater pollutant load reduction targets. The pollutant reduction targets that were adopted for Mt Gilead are stricter than the baseline targets in Council's draft parameters for MUSIC modelling, but are considered appropriate given the proximity of the site to the Upper Canal and the Nepean River.

Separate MUSIC models were prepared to reflect the existing catchment and site conditions and the post development scenario as shown in the Indicative Site Master Plan. The modelled treatment train consisted primarily of end-of-line stormwater treatment devices such as gross pollutant traps (GPTs) and bio-retention systems located in areas of public open space. The results of detailed water quality modelling indicate that the proposed treatment train achieves Council's requirements in relation to stormwater quality.

#### Stormwater quantity

The focus of the strategy to manage the quantity of stormwater was to demonstrate that stormwater runoff under postdevelopment conditions can be managed so that post-development peak flow rates do not exceed pre-development peak flow rates at each of the site's discharge points, and to ensure that flows up to the 100 year ARI event can be accommodated; safe passage of the probable maximum flood (PMF) is provided; and development does not result in water runoff causing flooding or erosion on adjacent properties.

XP-RAFTS software was used to develop a hydrologic model of the catchments that drain through the site which was then used to simulate a range of design storms and predict peak flow rates under existing and post-development scenarios. Required stormwater detention storage volumes were calculated to ensure that post-development peak flow rates would be less than, or equal to, pre-development peak flow rates at each of the proposed bio-retention systems for events up to the 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) event.

The results established the volume of stormwater detention that would be required at each bio-retention system to limit discharges so that post-development peak discharge rates do not exceed pre-development peak discharge rates for storm events up to the 1% AEP event.

#### Flooding

The objective of the flood assessment was to provide information regarding potential flood constraints that could affect development of the site and to identify potential flood management measures. The assessment was informed by various Australian and NSW flood plain management guidelines and policies.

One-dimensional flood modelling of the major creek lines within the Mt Gilead site was undertaken to define flood characteristics, with the HEC-RAS software used to develop flood models of each tributary. These were then used to

simulate the 1% AEP and PMF events, and to determine preliminary flood extents and potential constraints that flooding may pose on future development.

The results indicated that the 1% AEP flood and PMF flood extents would generally be contained within riparian corridors and outside of proposed development areas. Where future residential development could be affected by the PMF, the indicative road layout shown on the Indicative Site Structure Plan was considered to provide sufficient capacity for flood free evacuation.

#### Planning Proposal Response

The strategy for the management of stormwater quality has been developed so that the land parcels under different ownership are able to achieve the agreed stormwater quality objectives independently of each other, so enabling them to be developed at different times.

The overall stormwater management strategy involves the implementation of a treatment train to satisfy the agreed pre-determined stormwater quality objectives and includes rainwater tanks, GPTs and bio-retention systems. The bioretention basins and/or swales will collect surface runoff from roads and general urban areas and, as shown in the Indicative Site Structure Plan, are to be located in open space areas adjacent to, and generally outside of, riparian corridors.

Stormwater detention structures with multi-staged outlets will be provided adjacent to the proposed bio-retention systems to ensure that post-development peak discharges are equal to or less than pre-development peak discharges.

Flooding up to the PMF is not predicted to impact on most areas proposed for residential development. Where residential development is proposed within flood affected areas, minimum habitable floor levels and flood free evacuation routes will need to be considered at development application stages in accordance with Council and State policies. A more detailed assessment of flood behaviour and flood impacts will be necessary at DA stage based on proposed lot layouts and site grading.

In summary, the results of detailed water quality modelling documented in the Worley Parsons report indicates that the proposed treatment train achieves CCC's requirements in relation to the management of both stormwater quantity and quality. The risk of flooding is low and is not a constraint to the proposed rezoning of the site for residential uses.

# 5.14 Utility Services

Worley Parson has investigated and documented the future utility servicing requirements for the site. This is summarised below and documented in detail in the Infrastructure and Services Report and the Water and Wastewater Servicing Strategy.

Existing services and future requirements

#### Potable water

There is currently no potable water reticulation infrastructure in the vicinity of the site. However, the site is located adjacent to Sydney Water's Rosemeadow reservoir zone.

The preferred potable water servicing involves connection to the Rosemeadow elevated system and construction of a new reservoir zone to service high level lots within Mt Gilead, including construction of a water main connecting to the Rosemeadow system, a main parallel to Appin Road, a water pumping station at the north-eastern corner of the site and an elevated security reservoir at the south-eastern corner of the site.

#### Waste water

There is currently no wastewater reticulation system in the vicinity of the site with the nearest wastewater infrastructure being Sydney Water's reticulation system that services the suburb of Rosemeadow to the north of Mt Gilead.

Worley Parsons investigated various wastewater servicing options for the site and have proposed that the site be connected to the Glenfield-Liverpool gravity wastewater system. This would require a new 310 kW wastewater pumping station; two rising mains; and, a gravity sewer which would ultimately convey wastewater from Rosemeadow to the Glenfield wastewater system.

#### Electricity

The site is located within Endeavour Energy's area of operation. There is currently no existing electricity infrastructure within the vicinity of the site.
Initial discussions with Endeavour Energy suggest that future development can be supplied from the Ambarvale Zone Substation. It is expected that a new substation will be required and two new 11 kV feeders would need to be installed. The existing power poles running along Appin Road cannot accommodate the new 11kV feeders.

#### Gas

There is no reticulated gas service in the immediate vicinity of the site. Initial discussions with Jemena have established that there is sufficient capacity within existing infrastructure to service the proposed development, and it is likely that the gas connection would be made within Rosemeadow and run down Appin Road and into the site.

The nearest gas main to the site is the 'Eastern Gas Pipeline', a 457mm diameter high pressure main that is the major gas supply line between Sydney and the Gippsland Basin in Victoria. This main is located approximately 600 metres from the western site boundary. A direct connection from the Eastern Gas Pipeline is unlikely to be a feasible option for servicing the development.

#### Telecommunications

Existing copper and fibre optic cabling is located in existing residential areas to the north of Mt Gilead. Telstra telephone exchanges are located at St Helens Park and Menangle. A high intensity copper main line runs north-south through the Mt Gilead site and an optic fibre line is located along the eastern side of Appin Road.

Telecommunications services would be provided by Telstra under the Universal Service Obligation arrangement referenced under the *Telecommunications Act (1997)*. Existing Telstra infrastructure would need to be extended from the north via Appin Road to reach the site. Initial discussions with NBN Co indicate that the proposed development may be eligible for the National Broadband Network.

#### Planning Proposal Response

As indicated above, the site is capable of being serviced through the extension/augmentation of existing utility infrastructure or the provision of new infrastructure. The provision of appropriate lead in works will be addressed as part of future development applications and in consultation with the relevant service providers. Sydney Water has advised that whilst all work with regard to water and wastewater services is not yet complete it supports the public exhibition of the planning proposal.

## 5.15 Economic and Social Impacts

## 5.15.1 Social and Economic needs

The scale of the future envisaged residential development on the site will result in potential social and economic impacts. As such, MacroPlan Dimasi has prepared a Social and Economic Needs/Impact Assessment.

#### Context

An expected yield of 1,400 to 1,700 dwellings by 2026 was used in predicting the future population on the site. Based on an occupancy rate of three people per household, the population at Mt Gilead is expected to lie between 4,188 and 5,088 persons by 2026 - an increase equivalent to 0.3% of the overall Campbelltown LGA population per annum, reflecting the minor nature of the increase in the LGA context.

## Issues and Assessment

The projected population is expected to have a negligible impact on demand for employment land. Based on existing labour force rates in outer south western Sydney, between 2,115 and 2,568 working residents are expected to reside within the site. MacroPlan Dimasi suggests there is no causal relationship between employment land increase and population growth, rather employment land is linked to broader market forces.

The only need for employment land is expected to be for minor services such as retail facilities for local residents. Furthermore, there is an abundance of existing employment land to satisfy demand in South West Sydney.

The existing retail opportunities in the context of the site have informed an assessment of the retail needs. Based on the expected population and surrounding context, no large supermarket facility is required to service the site. A small convenience store is expected to be suitable to service the future population in addition to the existing facilities in the surrounding locality.

The scale of envisaged development on the site does not produce a substantial demand for social and community infrastructure and open space, and the expected additional population will have a nominal impact on local and regional services which are expected to be able to cater to the demands of the new population. The future residential population could not support a new government funded school or hospital and would not generate a significant

demand for district or regional open space for organised sporting and recreational activities. It is thus anticipated that the existing wider provision of services will cater for the incoming Mt Gilead population elsewhere in the catchment.

The size and type of neighbourhood services and social infrastructure required to support the Mt Gilead release area has been measured against relevant benchmarks for the Sydney Growth Centres and other national standards. MacroPlan Dimasi recommends that the following provision be accommodated at Mt Gilead to meet the needs of the new population:

- a small convenience store
- a Neighbourhood Community Centre (on approximately 1500 square metres of land)
- 2.5ha Neighbourhood Park
- 14.39ha of open space generally.

## Planning Proposal Response

The aforementioned study confirms that the population likely to result from the planning proposal is able to be serviced by existing social and economic infrastructure within the Campbelltown LGA and there are no social or economic obstacles to the proposed rezoning.

Moreover, in accordance with the above recommendations, the planning proposal makes specific further provision with the following:

- the zoning of a small area of land adjacent to proposed open space as B1 Neighbourhood Centre. The land uses within this zone permit a community centre and neighbourhood shop
- the zoning of almost 31ha of land as RE1 Public Recreation. Both active and passive recreation uses are permissible in this zone.

In addition, the Indicative Structure Plan for the site shows the location of a 2.9ha sports field as well as a 'community hub' that would accommodate a community centre and convenience store/ kiosk (approximately 0.21ha). The provision of open space and a community centre are the subject of a VPA between the landowners and CCC.

## 5.15.2 Impacts on Agricultural Land

The site is classified as Agricultural Land Class 3 and has been, and currently is, used for agricultural purposes. Accordingly, an Agricultural Investigation has been prepared by AgEconPlus Consulting to determine the strategic importance of land for agricultural production.

## Context

The site is mostly cleared and gently sloping with three creeks. The soil is predominately shallow and composed of a clay base and shale rock beneath. The average rainfall is 767.4mm with an even monthly distribution. Previously, the site was used for beef cattle grazing and dairy cattle milk production. It is now used for cattle grazing purposes.

## Issues and Assessment

Feasible forms of food production based on the agricultural land classification include horticulture not dependent on irrigation water, such as olive or wine crops, or livestock grazing. Producing crops such as olives or wines is not feasible as these crops are currently oversupplied and prices are depressed. The grazing of livestock on the site is also undesirable as more intense forms of grazing and animal production are currently carried out in areas west of the Great Dividing Range, with significantly more suitable sites than Mt Gilead for such activities.

In regard to the availability of land for food production in the Sydney Basin and NSW, the site represents 0.2% and 0.01% of Class 3 agricultural land respectively. As such, the site is not critical to the vitality of the agricultural industry of Sydney or NSW. If the site was not used for beef cattle grazing, there would be a lost opportunity of 125 additional beef cattle grazed in NSW. The beef cattle industry in NSW currently comprises over six million cattle; therefore the minor reduction of 125 cattle from the site would be negligible.

## Planning Proposal Response

The site does not play a critical role in the agricultural industry of Sydney or NSW, with limited value for a select range of agricultural activities. The rezoning of the site for residential purposes will not adversely affect food production in Sydney or NSW.

# 6.0 Summary and Conclusion

## 6.1 Need for Planning Proposal

## Is the planning proposal a result of any strategic study or report?

The planning proposal seeks to rezone land in accordance with the intent of, and land identified within, the Metropolitan Development Program (MDP). The MDP had earmarked the site for the expansion of the existing residential land situated to the north of the site.

The MDP had set the development yield of the Mt Gilead site at 1500 lots. Subsequently the assessments undertaken for the planning proposal have demonstrably indicated that the land and relevant infrastructure have the capacity to accommodate more dwellings. This planning proposal has established that the site has the capacity to accommodate up to 1,700 dwellings.

The planning proposal responds directly to the MDP and also contributes to the target of 60,000 new homes by 2021 in the South West Subregion.

# Is the planning proposal the best means of achieving the objectives or intended outcomes, or is there a better way?

The planning proposal to rezone the Mt Gilead site from Rural to Residential land is the most efficient means of achieving the State and regional planning objectives and strategic outcomes.

## 6.2 Relationship to Strategic Planning Framework

Is the planning proposal consistent with the objectives and actions of the applicable regional or subregional strategy (including the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy and exhibited draft strategies)?

As set out in **Section 2**, the proposal is consistent with applicable regional and subregional strategic documents, including all draft strategies, prepared by the NSW Government and Campbelltown City Council as summarised below.

#### Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036

As described in **Section 2**, the *Metropolitan Plan for Sydney 2036* aims to provide an integrated planning framework to manage Sydney's growth to 2036. Since its release in December 2010, the strategy has been reviewed and a *Draft Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney to 2031* has been released. As this new draft strategy represents the most up-to-date strategic planning policy in Sydney, the proposal has been assessed against this new strategy.

## Draft Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney to 2031

As set out in **Section 2**, the *Draft Metropolitan Strategy for Sydney 2031* establishes the latest strategic directions for the Sydney Metropolitan Region. The proposal is consistent with the draft Metropolitan Plan in that it will provide additional dwellings to contribute to the delivery of the targeted 427,000 dwellings in South West Sydney by 2031. By unlocking the Mt Gilead land for residential development, the proposal will indirectly stimulate and support employment growth and jobs closer to home.

#### Draft South West Subregional Strategy

The proposal is consistent with the *Draft South West Subregional Strategy* as it will unlock land for the development of residential dwellings, contributing to the supply of housing in the South West subregion, and supporting the Campbelltown-Macarthur Major Centre.

## A Plan for Growing Sydney

It is considered that the proposal is consistent with the goals of *A Plan for Growing Sydney* particularly with regard to assisting in the delivery of new housing to meet the needs of Sydney's growing population.

## Is the planning proposal consistent with the council's strategy or other local strategic plan?

As mentioned in **Section 2**, the planning proposal is consistent with Council's strategic documents *Campbelltown 2025* – *Looking Forward, Campbelltown Local Planning Strategy and Campbelltown Residential Development Strategy.* The proposal will enhance Campbelltown as a growing Regional Centre by addressing the need to provide for future residential development, maintaining protection of sensitive environments, utilising existing transport and traffic infrastructure into Campbelltown City, and improving the diversity and choice of housing.

*Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable State Environmental Planning Policies?* The consistency of the proposal with the relevant State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs) is outline **[2]** 

Table 2 – Consistency of the proposal with the relevant SEPPs

SEPP	Requirement	Proposal	Complies
SEPP 19 – Bushland in Urban Areas	SEPP 19 aims to protect bushland in urban areas identified in Schedule 1 of the SEPP. Campbelltown is listed in Schedule 1 and therefore a Plan of Management is to be developed where bushland is zoned or reserved for public open space purposes.	The urban bushland within the site is to be dedicated to CCC. Plans of Management for future bushland within the site will be prepared at the time of relevant development as required by CCC.	Yes
SEPP 44 – Koala Habitat Protection	Campbelltown is identified as a local government area with the potential for providing koala habitat. This Policy aims to encourage the proper conservation and management of areas that provide habitat for koalas to ensure a permanent free-living population over their present range and reverse the current trend of koala population decline.	The number of Koala habitat trees does not exceed the 15% threshold under the SEPP and therefore the site is not considered potential Koala habitat.	Yes
SEPP 55 – Remediation of Land	SEPP 55 requires a planning authority to consider whether land is contaminated, and if so whether it is, or can be made suitable for proposed residential use.	This planning proposal indicates that the land is not contaminated and is suitable for future residential development	Yes
SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007	The aim of this Policy is to facilitate the effective delivery of infrastructure across the State.	Future development of the site will need to be consistent with the relevant provisions of this SEPP, with future development applications referred to the RMS where necessary.	Yes
SEPP (BASIX) 2004	The overall aim of this Policy is to encourage sustainable residential development through establishing targets for thermal comfort, energy and water use.	DAs for all future residential development will need to comply with the targets established under BASIX.	Yes
SEPP (Housing for Seniors or People with a Disability) 2004	The aim of this policy is to encourage the provision of housing which increases the supply and diversity of residencies that meets the needs of seniors or people with a disability.	The planning proposal does not preclude the provision of housing for seniors and people with a disability.	Yes
SEPP Mining, Petroleum production and extractive industries 2007	The aims of this Policy are to support petroleum production and extractive industries to provide and manage development of mineral, petroleum and extractive material resources for promoting the social and economic welfare of the State.	The planning proposal does not impede potential mining of coal resources.	Yes
SEPP Affordable Rental Housing 2009	The aims of this Policy are to provide an overall consistent planning regime for the provision of affordable rental housing.	The planning proposal does not preclude the provision of affordable rental housing	Yes
SEPP Exempt and Comply	The aims of this Policy are to provide exempt and complying development codes that have State-wide application.	The planning proposal is not inconsistent with this SEPP which would apply to future development	Yes
SREP 20 Hawkesbury Nepean River	The aims of this plan is to protect the environment of the Hawkesbury-Nepean River system by ensuring that the impacts of future land uses are considered in a regional context.	The assessments undertaken for this planning proposal have addressed the environment of the Hawkesbury Nepean system. The inclusion of proposed LEP provisions in relation to the Terrestrial Biodiversity (see <b>Section 4</b> ), and the delivery of water quality and quantity infrastructure ensure the protection of the Hawkesbury Nepean system	Yes

*Is the planning proposal consistent with applicable Ministerial Directions (s.117 directions)?* The consistency of the proposal with the relevant Section 117 Directions is outlined in **Table 3** 

Table 3 - Consistency of the proposal with the relevant Section 117 Directions

Section 117 Direction	Summary / Implications	Proposal	Complies
1.1 Business and Industrial Zones	This direction applies when a relevant planning authority prepares a planning proposal that will affect land within an existing or proposed business or industrial zone. A planning proposal must ensure that proposed new employment areas are in accordance with a strategy that is approved by the Director-General of the Department of Planning	The area proposed to be rezoned to Zone B1 Neighbourhood Centre is approximately 3,200m <sup>2</sup> and is proposed to accommodate a community centre and small convenience store/kiosk. This planning proposal is thus considered to be justifiably inconsistent with this direction as it is of minor significance due the small area proposed for business purposes.	Yes
1.2 Rural Zones	This direction applies when a council prepares a draft LEP that creates, removes or alters a Rural Zone or provision. Any rezoning of Rural land needs to be justified by an environmental study or is in accordance with the relevant Regional Strategy prepared by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure.	As noted previously, the site was identified for rezoning on the Metropolitan Development Program. The planning proposal reflects the outcomes of extensive environmental studies and accords with relevant regional strategies as set out in this report.	Yes
1.3 Mining, Petroleum Production	Any future extraction of State or regionally significant reserves of coal, other mineral, petroleum and extractive materials are not compromised by inappropriate development.	Faults within the coal seam below the site will restrict any future mining activities, whilst the remainder of the seam will still be capable of being extracted.	Yes
2.1 Environment Protection Zones	This direction seeks to ensure the protection and conservation of environmentally sensitive areas.	Environmentally sensitive land is protected and conserved by way of provisions in a proposed Terrestrial Biodiversity clause in the draft LEP for the site (see <b>Section 4</b> )	Yes
2.3 Heritage Conservation	This direction applies to the conservation of heritage items, areas, objects and places of environmental heritage significance and indigenous heritage.	The heritage report has recommended appropriate mitigation measures to ensure that existing heritage is protected.	Yes
3.1 Residential Zones	This direction applies when Council prepares a draft LEP that creates, removes or alters a Residential Zone or provision. Any draft LEP will need to ensure that residential development is adequately serviced with water and sewerage.	The options for the provision of water and sewer infrastructure have been investigated and will be delivered as part of future applications for subdivision	Yes
3.3 Home Occupations	This direction encourages the carrying out of low-impact small businesses in dwelling houses.	The provisions in the draft LEP are consistent with CCC LGA-wide practice and do not preclude the carrying out of low-impact small businesses in dwelling houses	Yes
3.4 Integrated Land Use and Transport	This direction aims to ensure that urban structure, building forms, land use locations, development design, subdivision and street layouts achieve improved access to housing, jobs and support viable public transport.	The proposal seeks to deliver new housing in close proximity to existing residential urban land with access to public transport.	Yes
4.1 Acid Sulphate Soils	This direction aims to avoid significant adverse environmental impacts from the use of land that has a probability of containing acid sulphate soils	Previous studies on site indicated that Acid Sulphate Soils were considered to present low risk. No further assessment is required	Yes
4.2 Mine Subsidence and Unstable Land	This direction aims to prevent damage to life, property and the environment on land that may be unstable or subject to mine subsidence.	The Mine Subsidence Report has confirmed that any subsidence related issues can be managed.	Yes
4.3 Flood Prone Land	This direction aims to ensure that development is consistent with flooding policies and includes consideration of potential floor impacts.	The site subject to this proposal is not identified as flood prone land.	Yes

Section 117 Direction	Summary / Implications	Proposal	Complies
4.4 Planning for Bushfire Protection	This direction aims to protect life, property and the environment from bush fire hazards, and to encourage sound management of bush fire prone areas. The direction requires that a Council shall consult with the Commissioner of the NSW Rural Fire Service prior to undertaking community consultation on a draft LEP, and take into account any comments made. It also requires that the draft local environmental plan shall have regard to <i>Planning for Bushfire Protection</i> 2006, and introduce controls that avoid placing inappropriate developments in hazardous areas.	Any future development on site will have regard to <i>Planning for Bushfire Protection</i> 2001. Council has consulted with the NSW RFS who advise that it has no objection to the planning proposal in principle.	Yes
6.1 Approval and Referral Requirements	This direction aims to ensure that LEP provisions encourage the efficient and appropriate assessment of development.	No new unnecessary referral or concurrence conditions are proposed as part of the planning proposal.	Yes
6.2 Reserving Land for Public Purposes	This direction aims to facilitate the provision of public services and facilities by reserving land for public purposes.	The planning proposal includes the reserving of land to enable the widening of Appin Road which is classified as a State Road. Road and Maritime Services has advised that it will be the responsible public authority for the acquisition of the land dedicated for the road widening.	Yes
7.1 Implementation of A Plan for Growing Sydney	Planning proposals shall be consistent with the NSW Government's A Plan for Growing Sydney published in December 2014.	The planning proposal achieves the overall intent of the Plan and does not undermine the achievement of its vision, directions, actions or priorities.	Yes

## 6.3 Environmental, Social and Economic Impact

Is there any likelihood that critical habitat or threatened species, populations or ecological communities, or their habitats, will be adversely affected as a result of the proposal?

There is no critical habitat on the site.

Seven threatened bat species were identified on the site. The ecological assessment carried out for the planning proposal concludes that these species will not be affected by the proposal.

The following ecological communities are located within the boundaries of the site: Cumberland Plain Woodland (CPW) – a critically endangered ecological community; Shale Sandstone Transition Forest (SSTF) – a critically endangered ecological community; and River-flat Eucalypt Forest (RFEF) - an endangered ecological community.

The proposal involves the retention of 83% of CPW, 49.6% of SSTF and 100% of RFEF, with 1.5 hectares of CPW and 12.5 hectares of SSTF to be removed - both largely comprising scattered trees.

Any adverse effects as a result of the removal of CPW and SSTF will be addressed either via a Species Impact Statement submitted with future development applications, or offset with Biodiversity Certification as detailed in the Ecological Assessment. The proposal is capable of achieving the test of 'improving or maintaining' the current vegetation on the site, subject to a red-flag variation being granted by the Office of Environment and Heritage. The landowners have committed to achieving bio-banking offsets and substantial land has been set aside for this purpose.

Also as noted in clause 5.1.2, the proposed LEP amendment protects the ecological values of the site in the following ways:

- ecologically sensitive land proposed to be zoned RE1 and RU2 will receive special protection via a clause to this
  effect, titled Terrestrial Biodiversity (as shown in Appendix C), which is proposed to be incorporated in 'Part 7 of
  the Campbelltown LEP 2015. The relevant land is identified on the Terrestrial Biodiversity Map
- the land proposed to be zoned RE1 in the north of the site connects with Noorumba Reserve and there are generally connections between all the areas of RE1 zoned land so facilitating the passage of native fauna.

Are there any other likely environmental effects as a result of the planning proposal and how are they proposed to be managed?

The environmental effects as a result of the planning proposal are detailed in Section 5 of this report and involve impacts on:

- non-indigenous heritage views and vistas
- Aboriginal heritage
- native vegetation
- traffic.

None of the impacts are considered of sufficient magnitude to preclude the land uses the subject of the planning proposal. All will be managed by:

- proposed LEP provisions
- proposed development controls in Campbelltown (Sustainable City) DCP 2015
- the provision of State road infrastructure to be delivered via a regional voluntary planning agreement between the landowners and the State government
- the retention of significant stands of trees within open space areas
- provision of Biobanking offsets and/or other measures to protect the biodiversity of the site as determined by SIS
  assessments at development application stage.

## Has the planning proposal adequately addressed any social and economic effects?

The planning proposal has considered the potential social and economic effects of the rezoning for future residential development. While local community and recreation facilities will be provided within the site, as noted in **Section 5.15**, the incoming population will be able to access all other social services in neighbouring suburbs where there is excess capacity (eg schools, health services, retail, entertainment, etc).

The site will accommodate a range of lot sizes, so providing choice in housing form and size which would respond to a variety of living situations and lifestyle choices. This has the potential to attract new residents who could, in turn, stimulate employment growth within the Campbelltown LGA.

## 6.4 State and Commonwealth Interests

## Is there adequate public infrastructure for the planning proposal?

## Utility Services Infrastructure

The full range of utility services needed to support the site has been investigated, covering electricity, telecommunication, gas, water, waste water and stormwater drainage. The site is able to be serviced with all-of-the above utility infrastructure as set out in **Section**[5.14]

## Transport Infrastructure

The site is capable of absorbing and supporting public transport and provision has been made for a bus route within the site. The street layout within the site, as proposed in the Indicative Structure Plan, facilitates local traffic movements as well as walking and cycling. Local roads will be constructed as part of future development applications.

The need for road and intersection upgrades has been set out in the Traffic, Transport & Access Study and discussed in **Section**[5.10] Various intersection and road upgrades will be required to address capacity deficits which are forecast to occur as a result of the planning proposal and background growth. These will be the subject of a regional voluntary planning agreement between the landowners and the State government.

# What are the views of State and Commonwealth public authorities consulted in accordance with the Gateway determination?

Council has consulted with all public authorities listed in the Gateway determination and the following table advises of their views or non-response.

	Public Authority	Comments	
	-		
1	Transport – Roads & Maritime Services	<ul> <li>Has no objection to the planning proposal subject to:</li> <li>Development being capped at 1700 lots through a provision within Campbelltown LEP 2015.</li> <li>The proponents entering into a planning agreement (prior to the making or gazettal of the planning proposal) with the Department of Planning and Environment (DPE) for the provision of agreed road infrastructure, and dedication of a 20 metre road reserve along the western boundary of the subject site at no cost to Government.</li> </ul>	
	Response		
	<ul> <li>Campbelltown LEP 2015 contains u requirement for three existing urban de</li> </ul>	nder Cause 4.1A a maximum dwelling density velopment areas. The Planning Proposal has been se 4.1A by imposing a cap of 1,700 lots supported by	
	<ul> <li>a technical design brief for the upgrade works required to Appin road as a result of future development of the subject land between the southern boundary of the subject land and Fitzgibbon Lane Ambarvale has been agreed upon by staff from Council, Roads and Maritim Services and Transport for NSW. Further, Council staff are aware that the proponent conjunction with Lend Lease (the conditional purchaser of the subject land) has lodged a offer for a Regional Voluntary Planning Agreement with the Department of Planning and Environment to majority fund the required upgrade works prior to the completion of the 1,700 lots. While the Regional Voluntary Planning Agreement including the staging and timing of the required upgrades is yet to be finalised, Council is afforded security that the required infrastructure will be provided in a staged and orderly manner based upon demand prior to the completion of the 1,700 lots through the "satisfactory arrangements" requirement of the recently signed MoU with the Department of Planning and Environment</li> </ul>		
	setback along Appin Road the location	nclude a reference to the dedication of a 20 metre on of which has already been recognised on the ure Classified Road that was publicly exhibited.	
2	Fire & Rescue NSW	No objections to the planning proposal.	
	Response		
	<ul> <li>The no objection comment is noted.</li> </ul>		
3	NSW Rural Fire Service	<ul> <li>Identifies the key issues and assessment requirements regarding bush fire protection that will be required for any future development of the subject site.</li> </ul>	
	Response		
	• It is noted that matters relating to bush fire protection can be dealt with as part of the assessment of any future development application.		
4	Water NSW	<ul> <li>Notes the need to avoid and minimise impacts on the Upper Canal by any future development.</li> <li>Generally supports the provisions of the draft DCP with a few minor amendments relating to name changes (Water NSW has now replaced the Sydney Catchment Authority, and the Sydney Water Catchment Management Act 1998 is now Water NSW Act 2014) and an additional objective ensuring that all future development adjacent to the</li> </ul>	

		Upper Canal corridor considers and responds		
		to its heritage values.		
	Response			
	• It is recognised that any development applications on land adjacent to the Upper Canal must ensure no detrimental impacts on the canal corridor.			
	The minor amendments to the draft [ Campbelltown (Sustainable City) DCP 2	DCP as requested have already been included in 2015.		
5	Transport for NSW	Requests the following:		
		<ul> <li>Development be capped at 1700 lots through a provision within Campbelltown LEP 2014 (now LEP 2015).</li> </ul>		
		<ul> <li>The proponents enter into a planning agreement with the Department of Planning and Environment for the provision of agreed road infrastructure.</li> </ul>		
		• The draft DCP be amended to increase the width of the parking lane from 2.3 metres to 2.5 metres to accommodate a standard bus.		
		<ul> <li>Provision and dedication of a 20 metre setback along Appin Road through a planning agreement, to be shown under a SP2 Infrastructure Classified Road Zone.</li> </ul>		
	Response			
	Campbelltown LEP 2015 contains under Cause 4.1A a maximum dwelling density requirement for three existing urban development areas. The Planning Proposal has been amended to include Mt Gilead into Clause 4.1A by imposing a cap of 1,700 lots supported by the provision of a density/yield map			
	• a technical design brief for the upgrade works required to Appin road as a result of future development of the subject land between the southern boundary of the subject land and Fitzgibbon Lane Ambarvale has been agreed upon by staff from Council, Roads and Maritime Services and Transport for NSW. Further, Council staff are aware that the proponent in conjunction with Lend Lease (the conditional purchaser of the subject land) has lodged an offer for a Regional Voluntary Planning Agreement with the Department of Planning and Environment to majority fund the required upgrade works prior to the completion of the 1,700 lots. While the Regional Voluntary Planning Agreement including the staging and timing of the required upgrades is yet to be finalised, Council is afforded security that the required infrastructure will be provided in a staged and orderly manner based upon demand prior to the completion of the 1,700 lots through the "satisfactory arrangements" requirement of the recently signed MoU with the Department of Planning and Environment			
	<ul> <li>the above agreement is proposed to include a reference to the dedication of a 20 metre setback along Appin Road the location of which has already been recognised on the proposed zoning map as SP2 Infrastructure Classified Road that was publicly exhibited.</li> </ul>			
	request from Busabout (item 16) to wide	barking lane from 2.3m to 2.5m is in keeping with the en the road carriageway to 12m. It is also noted that a minimum width of 2.6m for parallel kerbside parking inded to accommodate this request		
6	NSW Trade & Investment	Extractive Resource Issues:		
	Resources & Energy	• Notes the location of the Menangle Sandstone Quarry west of the subject land and advises that Council would need to be satisfied that any potential land use conflicts are appropriately addressed.		
		Coal & Petroleum Issues		
		Due to geological constraints the extraction of resources is considered unlikely thus no		

		issues are raised.	
	Response		
	<ul> <li>It is noted that a small area of the subject land falls within the transition (buffer) area of the Menangle Sandstone Quarry and that any development of this land will need to take into consideration the impacts of any extraction that may occur on the quarry site.</li> </ul>		
7	7 Sydney Water Water		
		• Drinking water can be provided from the Rosemeadow drinking water system.	
		• The developer will need to provide a new elevated reservoir, water pumping station and associated trunk and reticulation mains to service the subject site.	
		Wastewater	
		Wastewater can be transferred to the Glenfield Water Recycling Plant.	
		• The developer will need to provide a new wastewater pumping station and associated lead-in and reticulation mains to service the subject site.	
	Response		
	<ul> <li>It is noted that both water and wastewater services can be provided to the site and that the developer would be responsible for its provision.</li> </ul>		
		ed for the location of the proposed new elevated on of the subject land as noted in the draft DCP.	
8	Office of Environment & Heritage	Biodiversity	
		<ul> <li>Advises that areas proposed for conservation should be zoned E2 Environmental Protection to ensure the long term retention and protection of these areas.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>Supports the biodiversity link connecting Noorumba Reserve with the Nepean River but requests that the corridor be widened and the stormwater detention basins, active recreation and other incompatible uses be removed, and the 'dead end' portion be continued through to lands west of the site.</li> </ul>	
		Floodplain Risk Management	
		• Recommends a number of issues that should be considered at the design stage of any future development on the subject land.	
		Stormwater Management	
		<ul> <li>Provides a number of comments and recommendations with regard to the water quality modelling as noted in the Mt Gilead Stormwater Management and Flooding Assessment.</li> </ul>	
	Response		
	Proposal does not propose to zone cor	own LEP 2015 (CLEP 2015) the Mt Gilead Planning nservation lands E2 Environmental Conservation as the provisions for conservation and enhancement as	
	<ul> <li>The draft planning proposal in to maximise the retention and of</li> </ul>	cludes a Terrestrial Biodiversity clause which aims enhancement of native biodiversity.	
	<ul> <li>It is proposed that some of the proposed conservation lands will be considered future biobanking sites which would therefore result in them being covered by the conservation and rehabilitation provisions of any biobanking agreements.</li> </ul>		

		ture Services Delivery Plan includes provisions for ment of all open space land that will be dedicated to	
	<ul> <li>Council is in the process of finalising a Koala Plan of Management and Biodiversity Strategy which will further strengthen the conservation and rehabilitation of all lands proposed for biodiversity conservation through a future amendment to CLEP 2015.</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Noorumba Reserve will be zoned RE1 Public Recreation under CLEP 2015 and it is thus considered preferable to zone any adjoining conservation land, that is proposed to be dedicated to Council, the same zoning to provide continuity.</li> </ul>		
	It is recognised that there are at least three well established existing wildlife corridors from the Georges River through both Noorumba Reserve and Beulah to the Nepean River. However, the Mt Gilead Planning Proposal aims to provide another option for a wildlife link through the subject land from the Noorumba Reserve to Beulah. Whilst this link will contain active open space and drainage basins it is also proposed to include a significant amount of vegetation aimed at providing habitat for native fauna. All this land is proposed to be dedicated to Council. Clearly the wider the width of a wildlife corridor the better. However, further information with regard to corridor widths was received from the Office of Environment and Heritage (OEH) which advised that local corridors can be less than 50m in width. The narrowest part of the proposed wildlife link is 45.2 metres but the total open space area that the corridor passes through is approximately 14 hectares. It is therefore not proposed to widen this link any further as it is considered that sufficient land has been allocated to allow for the movement of native fauna through the subject site.		
		does not link to lands on the west of the site e connected via significant street tree plantings.	
	<ul> <li>Comments with regard to floodplain risk</li> </ul>		
	Comments with regard to water quality	y modelling are noted and it is considered that no e. However, more detailed assessment will need to	
9	Office of Environment & Heritage -	Does not support the planning proposal for the	
	National Parks Association of NSW	following reasons:	
		<ul> <li>The road infrastructure in Campbelltown should be improved before land is released and that redevelopment should occur closer to railway stations.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>Widening of Appin Road will be detrimental to native fauna.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>The development is likely to have an adverse impact on Noorumba Reserve and Beulah.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>The planning documentation fails to adequately explain how views, bushland, riparian corridors, heritage items and water quality will be protected.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>As the proposal is located between two areas of endangered ecological communities it should be referred to the Federal Government for assessment.</li> </ul>	
	Response		
	Significant road works are proposed alor additional need that would be created by	g a large section of Appin Road to accommodate the this planning proposal.	
		ans for native fauna to cross Appin Road is currently or the upgrade of this road.	
	<ul> <li>being investigated as part of the design for the upgrade of this road.</li> <li>Whilst it is recognised that public areas of natural bushland can sometimes be abused it is considered that the majority of the community respect such areas and benefit from their location being within walking distance from residential areas.</li> </ul>		
	considered that the majority of the comm		
	<ul> <li>considered that the majority of the comm location being within walking distance fro</li> <li>It is considered that the planning docume</li> </ul>		

## Ordinary Meeting 22/11/2016 8.1 Draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal - Outcome Of Public Exhibition

	<ul> <li>It is recognised that development in the vicinity of endangered ecological communities should be referred to the Federal Government for comment. Whilst this does not need to occur until a development application is prepared the proponents have been in contact with the Federal Department of the Environment to discuss the implication of the provisions of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.</li> </ul>		
10	Department of Primary Industries Agriculture NSW Response • Comments are noted • Since the public exhibition of the	<ul> <li>Notes the difficulties that can arise due to the interface between residential development and existing agricultural practices.</li> <li>Supports the retention of agriculture heritage landscapes and views.</li> <li>Considers that before any further planning proposals are determined the Greater Macarthur land release investigation should be completed. If Council wishes to keep rural productive land then other options for housing will be needed.</li> <li>Mt Gilead Planning Proposal, the NSW State</li> </ul>	
	Government released the <i>Greater Ma</i> public comment. This investigation spi potential for future residential develop covers a large portion of land within the areas (LGA) and includes both the Mt These release areas are the only Campbelltown LGA that have been so Development Program for future urban by the Department of Planning and E	acarthur Land Release Investigation document for ecifically notes that the land at Mt Gilead has the oment. The Greater Macarthur Investigation Area the Campbelltown and Wollondilly local government Gilead and Menangle Park Urban Release Areas. Iands within the investigation area within the pecifically identified within the NSW Metropolitan development. As they have both been supported invironment and publicly exhibited, it is considered assessed in accordance with their Gateway	
11	Endeavour Energy	<ul> <li>Advises of the procedure needed to be undertaken for the provision of electricity to the subject site.</li> </ul>	
	the subject land can be serviced wit	ent's consultants and Endeavour Energy reveal that h electricity. However, it is noted that additional a new zone substation and the installation of 2 x	
12	Wollondilly Shire Council	Requests that the following matters be	
		<ul> <li>Placing the proposal on hold until the Greater Macarthur Area investigation is complete.</li> <li>Zone all areas of native vegetation E3 or E4 Environment Protection or use Natural Resources (Biodiversity)</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>Clauses.</li> <li>Undertake further investigation into the potential impacts on existing regional habitat corridors and the movement of koalas.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>Undertake further investigation into potential air quality impacts.</li> </ul>	
		<ul> <li>Undertake further investigation into the impacts of traffic travelling south to Bulli and Appin.</li> </ul>	
1	Response		

	• As noted in item 10 above, since the public exhibition of the Mt Gilead Planning Proposal, the NSW State Government released the <i>Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation</i> document for public comment. This investigation specifically notes that the land at Mt Gilead has the potential for future residential development.			
	• The areas of native vegetation are proposed to be zoned public recreation as they will be dedicated to Council. However, these lands are proposed to be subject to a number of provisions as noted in item 8 above including the provisions of the proposed terrestrial biodiversity clause and map that have been included in the planning proposal.			
	<ul> <li>It is considered that sufficient investig corridors particularly as the site has However, the planning proposal aims t of wildlife through the subject site.</li> </ul>	been	substan	tially cleared for a number of years.
	<ul> <li>In light of the information provided by considered that further investigation However it is noted that any future d within the guidelines referred to by the</li> </ul>	into evelo	potentia pment o	l air quality issues is not required.
	<ul> <li>It is not considered necessary to under south to Wollondilly Shire as only 5% of travel south. Of more concern to Count recent and proposed developments at the Campbelltown LGA.</li> </ul>	of the	e total tra the volur	ffic flow from the site is anticipated to ne of traffic that is generated from the
13	Office of Environment & Heritage – Heritage Council	•	is insuff landsca conserv	ers that the proposed curtilage for Mt Gilead ficient and should include the cultural pe. Thus a curtilage study and a vation management plan need to be ed prior to the finalisation of this planning al.
		•	Recom betwee reduce	mends that a buffer zone be provided n the proposed R2 and RU2 zones to the visual impact of new development on tage values of Mt Gilead.
		•	Gilead,	ers that the adjacent colonial farms (Mt Beulah and Meadowvale) have been ked in the heritage assessment.
		•	provide future d recomn	ers that the planning proposal does not any measures to minimise the impact of evelopment on the Upper Canal, and nends that consideration be given to ag a RE1 (public recreation) buffer along the
		•		mends a number of amendments to the CP with regard to:
			0	Strengthening the heritage objectives and controls.
			0	Issues relating to significant vistas and view corridors.
			0	Appropriateness of the proposed tree planting along the interpretive driveway.
			0	Landscape screening and appropriate tree planting.
			0	Relationship with adjoining heritage properties.
			0	Recognition of the former Hillsborough cottage.
			0	Extending the pedestrian/cycle route along the entire interpretive driveway.
			0	Retention of significant trees and remnant vegetation.

		• Ensure One Tree Hill remains as is.	
		<ul> <li>Natural heritage needs further consideration.</li> </ul>	
Re	esponse		
•	• The boundaries of the proposed residential areas of the subject land were determined after extensive investigations were carried out to ensure the integrity of the Mt Gilead homestead site and associated heritage items. As a result a large area of land on the western boundary of the subject site is proposed to remain rural and will thus act as an extensive buffer between the proposed residential development and the outskirts of the homestead precinct. The DCP provisions recognise the importance of the significant view corridors through the site and also the need to protect the existing views from the homestead particularly to the north and east. Thus the proposed buffer will include significant new tree planting to provide screening of any new development from the homestead site.		
•	taken into consideration with regard to the through the provision of a significant are impacts of any future development on the open space area on the southern bour	cance of the surrounding cultural landscape has been his planning proposal. This is proposed to be achieved ea of rural land on the western boundary to buffer the he Mt Gilead homestead site, and the provision of an indary to provide separation from the Beulah site. It is previous colonial farms could be achieved.	
•	Provisions are already proposed to be ir Upper Canal, and these provisions have	ncluded in the draft DCP to ensure the protection of the been supported by Water NSW.	
•	Gilead homestead site, it is not propos from Appin Road to the Mt Gilead home there is not proposed to be any vehic entrance is proposed to be acknowledge	for from Appin Road towards the entrance of the Mi ed to retain the existing alignment of the carriageway stead, only the entrance from Appin Road. Thus whils cular access to Appin Road at this point the historic ed and identified with specimen tree planting.	
•	<ul> <li>Whilst it is recognised that some of the existing vegetation is proposed to be removed it is noted that most of this vegetation comprises scattered trees. However, provisions are included within the planning proposal to protect and enhance significant areas of native vegetation through the provision of a terrestrial biodiversity clause and map. Also, some of the proposed conservation lands are being considered as future biobanking sites and would thus be covered by the conservation and rehabilitation provisions of any biobanking agreements.</li> </ul>		
•	• It is considered that additional objectives and controls can be included in the draft DCP to address relevant heritage issues. These include:		
	<ul> <li>An additional key development objective in clause 2.2 relating specifically to the heritage significance of the Mount Gilead homestead site, outbuildings, mill and dam and their setting.</li> </ul>		
	<ul> <li>Amendment of control 1 in cla Hillsborough Cottage.</li> </ul>	ause 3.1 to address the interpretation of the former	
	proposed interpretive driveway.		
	<ul> <li>Amendment of control 2 in clause 3.1 to refer to Figure 7 and not Figure 3 with regard to the identification of the proposed landscape screening.</li> </ul>		
	views as referred to in the note		
<ul> <li>Removal of the word "Indicative" from the title of Figure 3 to read Heritage Principle Plan.</li> </ul>			
M	ine Subsidence Board	No submission received	
Ca	amden Council	No submission received	
	latra	No submission received	
Те	elstra		

In addition to the above agencies Council also invited comments from a number of additional government agenci and service providers. Their comments and Council's responses are noted in the table below.

	Public Authority	Comments		
18	Department of Primary Industries – Water	<ul> <li>Would prefer the zoning of the watercourses and riparian corridors to be zoned E2 Environmental Conservation and not RE1 Public Recreation and RU2 Rural Landscape, and be under Council's ownership and management.</li> <li>Recommends that the draft DCP include a separate section to deal with watercourse/riparian issues.</li> <li>Supports the concept of a biodiversity corridor linking the Georges River with the Nepean River</li> </ul>		
		and considers that the planning proposal does not provide such a linkage.		
	Response	1		
	Council and will thus come under its own zoned RU2 Rural Landscape will remain subject to the provisions of the proposed the retention and enhancement of native	RE1 Public Recreation is proposed to be dedicated to ership and management. The portion proposed to be in private ownership. However, all this land would be Terrestrial Biodiversity clause which aims to maximise biodiversity. It is also proposed that some of this land be n would therefore result in it being covered by the s of any biobanking agreement.		
The riparian corridors in Campbelltown LEP 2015 (CLEP 2015) are not a Conservation, but are covered by the provisions of proposed clause 7.7 maintain riparian land, waterways and groundwater systems. Also, Cour finalising a Koala Plan of Management and Biodiversity Strategy which we conservation and rehabilitation of riparian lands through a future amenda to ensure consistency with CLEP 2015 the Mt Gilead Planning Proposal riparian lands E2 Environmental Conservation but will instead be subject conservation and enhancement as noted above.		ovisions of proposed clause 7.7 which aims to protect and oundwater systems. Also, Council is in the process of nd Biodiversity Strategy which will further strengthen the n lands through a future amendment to CLEP 2015. Thus, ne Mt Gilead Planning Proposal does not propose to zone vation but will instead be subject to the provisions for		
	<ul> <li>Whilst it is not considered necessary to include a separate section in the draft DCP with regard to riparian corridors, it is considered that the wording in clause 3.3 should be strengthened as recommended by this submission.</li> </ul>			
<ul> <li>The planning proposal in Figures 16 and 17 denote the location of the Corridor from Noorumba Reserve through the subject land. The draft DC location of this corridor in Figure 2 Mt Gilead Indicative Structure Plan. I additional wording in the draft DCP should be included to strengthen the of corridor. Thus it is recommended that an additional objective be included beyond the scope of this planning proposal to provide provisions for the biodiversity corridor beyond the subject site boundaries. However, the local corridor through the site was chosen to connect with existing vegetation</li> </ul>		agh the subject land. The draft DCP also indicates the difference of the subject land. The draft DCP also indicates the difference of the structure Plan. It is considered that build be included to strengthen the establishment of this an additional objective be included in clause 2.2. It is oposal to provide provisions for the extension of this site boundaries. However, the location of the proposed		
	<ul> <li>it should also be noted that wildlife corrie by the Greater Macarthur Steering Group</li> </ul>	dors are being considered as part of the Master Planning b.		
19	Environment Protection Authority	<ul> <li>Considers that this planning proposal should not be assessed in isolation, but should be considered as part of the Macarthur Investigation Area and the South West Sydney Sub Regional Delivery Plan.</li> <li>Considers that photochemical smog (ozone) and particle pollution remain air quality issues of significant regional concern. However, advice is provided on ways to meet relevant air quality goals and protect human health, the environment and community amenity. Refers to the document <i>Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads-Interim Guideline</i> and ways to manage wood burning heaters</li> <li>Provides advice on ways to mitigate potential noise pollution, contamination issues, waste management and water quality impacts.</li> </ul>		

	Response			
	<ul> <li>As noted in item 10 above, since the public exhibition of the Mt Gilead Planning Proposal, the NSW State Government released the <i>Greater Macarthur Land Release Investigation</i> document for public comment. This investigation specifically notes that the land at Mt Gilead has the potential for future residential development.</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>It is recognised that vehicle emissions are a major source of air pollution and thus negotiations have already been held with a local bus company to ensure that an adequate bus service can be provided to the subject site in an effort to reduce private car usage. Also, the draft DCP provides for an extensive network of pedestrian and cycle paths to encourage walking and cycling.</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>The impact of air pollution from vehicle emissions on development adjoining Appin Road can be ameliorated through careful site planning and architectural design. It is therefore recommended that the draft DCP include a reference to the Department of Planning and Environment's Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy Roads – Interim Guideline to ensure that the provisions of this document are addressed with regard to any future development fronting Appin Road.</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>With regard to domestic solid fuel heaters it is anticipated that gas will be available to all residences within the release area thus reducing the need for such heaters. However, it is noted that there are significant regulations currently in place within the Protection of the Environment Operations (Clean Air) Regulation 2010 to ensure that all domestic solid fuel heaters sold in NSW comply with emission limits specified in Australian Standard AS/NZS 4013:1999: Australian Domestic solid fuel burning appliances - method for determination of flue gas emission, and are marked accordingly. Advice with regard to wood heaters is also available on Council's website.</li> </ul>			
	<ul> <li>The advice given with regard to mitigatir management and water quality impacts is</li> </ul>	ng potential noise pollution, contamination issues, waste s noted.		
20	Department of Primary Industries – Fisheries	No objections to the planning proposal provided the: • Proposed riparian buffers zones are		
		implemented Stormwater reduction targets are achieved		
	Response			
	•	t with as part of the assessment of any future		
21	NSW Education & Communities	<ul> <li>Advises that the existing schools within the vicinity of the subject land are at or near capacity and thus will not be able to meet the additional demand that would be created by the proposed development of the Mt Gilead Urban Release Area. They will either need to be upgraded or a new school site identified.</li> </ul>		
		<ul> <li>As lands surrounding the subject site have been identified as having potential for future housing development, the investigation of a site for a new school within these lands is considered an option.</li> </ul>		
	Response			
	Communities and while initially it was pro within the boundaries of the subject land,	nents, and officers of Council and NSW Education & oposed that a site for a future school should be provided the Department of Education has now advised that such ng lands if they are developed for urban purposes in the		
22	NSW Health	<ul> <li>Supports the proposed cycleway/pedestrian network and recommends the provision of well- placed bike racks and good lighting.</li> </ul>		
		<ul> <li>Notes the importance of ensuring access to healthy foods.</li> </ul>		
		<ul> <li>Advises that the proposed bus service should be commenced early in the development of the area and should be extended further into the site.</li> </ul>		

		• Supports the range of proposed residential lot sizes but concerned by the cap of 65 smaller lots as this will not address housing affordability.		
		<ul> <li>Notes that the plan is purely residential and thus may result in long commuting times for residents travelling to work.</li> </ul>		
		Concerned that there are no apparent plans for a school or childcare centres.		
		<ul> <li>Supports the proposed public open space and neighbourhood/community facilities</li> </ul>		
		Consider that the potential for impacts of gas extraction in the future need to be closely monitored.		
		<ul> <li>Notes a number of issues that would be dealt with in conjunction with any future development applications, eg land contamination, noise, air quality, bushfire risk.</li> </ul>		
		<ul> <li>Advises that suitable measures should be undertaken to mitigate the potential for mosquito breeding within any water retention basins or ponding areas.</li> </ul>		
	Response			
		ntamination, noise, air quality, bushfire risk and issues ge basins can be dealt with in the assessment of any e subject site.		
	• The provision of the proposed bus service is anticipated to be dictated by the need of the incoming community. However it is recognised that the potential residents of the subject site would benefit from the early establishment of a bus service.			
	• The following comments are provided with regard to the concern that housing affordability will not be addressed due to the proposed cap of 65 small lots with a minimum area of 375m <sup>2</sup> . The planning proposal provides for a variety of residential lots sizes to ensure a wide opportunity of choice for potential purchasers. The bulk of the site (being approximately 1250 lots) is proposed to be subdivided into lots with a minimum area of 500m <sup>2</sup> and 700m <sup>2</sup> on steeper land. Whilst it is proposed to cap the number of lots with a minimum area of 375m <sup>2</sup> to 65, there is still the opportunity for approximately 350 lots to be subdivided to a minimum area of 450m <sup>2</sup> . It is also important to note that in light of the proposed traffic infrastructure (upgrading of Appin Road), Transport for NSW and Roads and Maritime Services have requested a provision within Campbelltown LEP 2015 that restricts the number of residential lots to 1700.			
	Greater Macarthur Land Release Investi	or residential development it is important to note that the gation document includes the potential for 24 hectares of assist in providing jobs closer to homes thus reducing		
	lands. With regard to childcare centres the	f a school is proposed to be provided within surrounding nese are a permissible land use with the proposed R2 there would be opportunities for the private sector to t site.		
	<ul> <li>With regard to the issue of the impact of February 2016 that it will cease production</li> </ul>	gas extraction it is noted that AGL announced on 4 on at the Camden Gas Project in 2023.		
	All other comments are noted.			
23	NSW Local Land Services	<ul> <li>Local Land Services (LLS) is an approval authority for clearing native vegetation under the <i>Native Vegetation Act 2003</i>. As the Act does not apply to Campbelltown the LLS has no approval role for the clearing of native vegetation on the subject land.</li> </ul>		
		<ul> <li>Supports the assessments made by the Flora and Fauna consultants that the proposal can achieve 'a maintain or improve' outcome with</li> </ul>		

		we with the second second states and the second states and	
		variations as required if the Shale Sandstone Transition forest is impacted by the development.	
	Response		
	Comments are noted		
24	Busabout Neville's Bus Service Pty Ltd	• Prepared to provide bus services to the subject site.	
		<ul> <li>Requests the widening of the road carriageway from 11.6m to 12m.</li> </ul>	
	Response		
	• It is noted that the request to widen the road carriageway to 12m is in keeping with the request from Transport for NSW to widen the parking lane from 2.3m to 2.5m. As noted in item 5 it is proposed to amend the draft DCP to accommodate this request.		
25	NSW Department of Family and Community Services – including:	No submissions received	
	Community Services		
	Land and Housing Corporation		
26	NSW State Emergency Service	No submission received	
27	NSW Dam Safety Committee	No submission received	
28	AGL Energy Limited	No submission received	
29	Aboriginal Community	No submissions received	
30	Interline Bus Services Pty Limited	No submission received	
31	Georges River Combined Councils Committee	No submission received	

## 6.5 Conclusion

The studies undertaken in support of this planning proposal have confirmed that the Mt Gilead site is suitable for residential development. The proposal will enable the 210 ha site to be rezoned for low density residential development on land that is generally unconstrained by biophysical and ecological features.

The planning proposal will facilitate development that would have demonstrable social and economic benefits for the region. With up to 1700 new dwellings in a low density environment, the proposal will deliver positive outcomes for housing supply to the South West Region and the Campbelltown-Macarthur Regional City Centre, and with a range of lot sizes, 600 square metres on average, it will expand the type and choice of dwellings available in the Campbelltown LGA. This outcome is consistent with local and regional strategies and objectives to promote housing diversity.

The land is proposed to be rezoned (in accordance with the Standard Instrument – Principal Local Environmental Plan and consistent with CLEP 2015) to a predominantly R2 residential zone along with smaller areas for public open space and roads. In addition, a small area is intended to be zoned as a neighbourhood centre in order to facilitate the future delivery of a community centre. 29ha is to be retained as rural land. Ecologically sensitive vegetation will be protected.

In accordance with the Gateway Determination a range of planning and environmental issues were considered in preparing the planning proposal. They demonstrate that the proposed rezoning can proceed with few, if any, adverse effects. Impacts in relation to sensitive vegetation; heritage; and traffic and transport infrastructure are able to be managed and mitigated by a combination of additional LEP provisions, site-specific development controls, the provision of road infrastructure through a VPA, and the offsetting of the loss of vegetation.

The proposed rezoning makes provision on site for local passive and active open space, community facilities and a small area of retail development. For those social and economic services and facilities that will not be provided on site, it is considered that there is sufficient capacity in the neighbouring areas to accommodate the needs of the incoming community.

The site is able to be serviced with necessary water, waste water and other utility services.

A technical design brief for the upgrade works required to Appin road as a result of future development of the subject land between the southern boundary of the subject land and Fitzgibbon Lane Ambarvale has been agreed upon by staff from Council, Roads and Maritime Services and Transport for NSW. Further, Council staff are aware that the proponent in conjunction with Lend Lease (the conditional purchaser of the subject land) has lodged an offer for a Regional Voluntary Planning Agreement with the Department of Planning and Environment to majority fund the required upgrade works prior to the completion of the 1,700 lots. While the Regional Voluntary Planning Agreement including the staging and timing of the required upgrades is yet to be finalised, Council is afforded security that the required infrastructure will be provided in a staged and orderly manner based upon demand prior to the completion of the 1,700 lots through the "satisfactory arrangements" requirement of the recently signed MoU with the Department of Planning and Environment



Contact: Michelle Dellagiacoma Phone: (02) 9860 1560 Email: Michelle.Dellagiacoma@planning.nsw.gov.a Postal: GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001

Our ref: PP\_2012\_CAMPB\_002\_00 (12/12442) Your ref:

Mr Paul Tosi General Manager Campbelltown City Council PO Box 57 CAMPBELLTOWN NSW 2560

Dear Mr Tosi,

Planning proposal to amend the Interim Development Order (IDO) No. 15 and the Campbelltown (Urban Areas) Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2002

I am writing in response to your Council's letter dated 18 July 2012 requesting a Gateway determination under section 56 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 ("EP&A Act") in respect of the planning proposal to rezone land being part Lot 1 and part Lot 2 DP 807555 and Lots 59 and 61 DP 752042 Appin Road, Mount Gilead from Non Urban under Interim Development Order No 15 to a range of urban purposes under the Campbelltown (Urban Area) LEP 2002.

As delegate of the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, I have now determined that the planning proposal should proceed subject to the conditions in the attached Gateway determination.

I have also agreed that the planning proposal's inconsistencies with S117 Directions 1.2 Rural Zones and 1.5 Rural Lands are of minor significance given the subject land is included under the Metropolitan Development Program as future urban. No further approval is required in relation to these Directions.

The amending Local Environmental Plan (LEP) is to be finalised within 24 months of the week following the date of the Gateway determination. Council should aim to commence the exhibition of the planning proposal as soon as possible following agency consultation and upon completion and consideration of the necessary technical studies as required by the attached Gateway determination. Council's request for the department to draft and finalise the LEP should be made six (6) weeks prior to the projected publication date.

The State Government is committed to reducing the time taken to complete LEPs by tailoring the steps in the process to the complexity of the proposal, and by providing clear and publicly available justification for each plan at an early stage. In order to meet these commitments, the Minister may take action under s54(2)(d) of the EP&A Act if the time frames outlined in this determination are not met.

Should you have any queries in regard to this matter, please contact Michelle Dellagiacoma of the regional office of the department on 02 9860 1560.

Yours sincerely.

Signature has been removed

7/9/12 Sam Haddad

Director-General

 Bridge Street Office: 23-33 Bridge Street, Sydney NSW 2000
 GPO Box 39 Sydney NSW 2001
 DX 22 Sydney

 Telephone: (02) 9228 6111
 Facsimile: (02) 9228 6455
 Website: www.planning.nsw.gov.au



## **Gateway Determination**

Planning proposal (Department Ref: PP\_2012\_CAMPB\_002\_00): to amend the Interim Development Order No.15 and the Campbelltown (Urban Areas) Local Environmental Plan (LEP) 2002

I, the Director-General, Department of Planning and Infrastructure as delegate of the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, have determined under section 56(2) of the EP&A Act that an amendment to rezone land being part Lot 1 and part Lot 2 DP 807555 and Lots 59 and 61 DP 752042 Appin Road, Mount Gilead from Non Urban under Interim Development Order No 15 to a range of urban purposes under the Campbelltown (Urban Area) LEP 2002 should proceed subject to the following conditions:

- It is noted that Council has identified that additional information regarding flora and fauna, heritage, bushfire, flooding, air quality, economic impacts, social impacts, traffic and transport, geotechnical and mine subsidence and infrastructure will be investigated in detail to support the next stage of the rezoning process. Council is to undertake the necessary technical studies and the planning proposal is to be amended to reflect the outcomes of this work.
- Council is to ensure that a proposed land zoning map is prepared following completion of the necessary technical studies. The zoning map and any other relevant maps are to be included with the planning proposal for the purposes of public exhibition.
- 3. It is noted that a detailed investigation into traffic, transport and access has not been undertaken at this stage. Council has indicated that infrastructure impacts will be investigated. In doing so, Council is to consult Roads and Maritime Services in regards to access and traffic impacts and the department's Strategy and Infrastructure Planning team in regards to infrastructure provision and contributions.
- Council is to ensure that an assessment of the final planning proposal against relevant S117 Directions is also carried out. This is to be undertaken prior to the commencement of public exhibition.
- 5. Community consultation is required under sections 56(2)(c) and 57 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 ("EP&A Act") as follows:
  - (a) the planning proposal must be made publicly available for 28 days; and
  - (b) the relevant planning authority must comply with the notice requirements for public exhibition of planning proposals and the specifications for material that must be made publicly available along with planning proposals as identified in section 4.5 of *A Guide to Preparing LEPs (Department of Planning 2009)*.
- Consultation is required with the following public authorities under section 56(2)(d) of the EP&A Act:
  - Sydney Metropolitan Catchment Management Authority
  - Office of Environment and Heritage
  - Landcom
  - NSW Department of Primary Industries (Agriculture)
  - NSW Department of Primary Industries (Minerals and Petroleum)
  - Integral Energy
  - Mine Subsidence Board

CAMPBELLTOWN PP\_2012\_CAMPB\_002\_00 (12/12442)



- NSW Fire and Rescue
- Transport for NSW
- NSW Rural Fire Service
- Roads and Maritime Services
- Sydney Water
- Telstra
- Adjoining Local Government Areas

Each public authority is to be provided with a copy of the planning proposal and any relevant supporting material. Each public authority is to be given at least 21 days to comment on the proposal, or to indicate that they will require additional time to comment on the proposal. Public authorities may request additional information or additional matters to be addressed in the planning proposal.

- A public hearing is not required to be held into the matter by any person or body under section 56(2)(e) of the EP&A Act. This does not discharge Council from any obligation it may otherwise have to conduct a public hearing (for example, in response to a submission or if reclassifying land).
- 8. The timeframe for completing the LEP is to be **24 months** from the week following the date of the Gateway determination.

Dated

7 day of September

2012.

Signature has been removed

Sam Haddad Director-General Delegate of the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure



Our ref: 16/04392

Ms Lindy Deitz Acting General Manager Campbelltown City Council PO Box 57 CAMPBELLTOWN NSW 2560

Dear Ms Deitz

Extension of Gateway timeframe for Mount Gilead Planning Proposal (Ref: PP 2012 CAMPB\_002\_00)

I refer to your letter of 8 March 2016 seeking an extension of time to complete the above Planning Proposal for a new release area at Mount Gilead

I have determined as the delegate of the Commission, in accordance with section 56(7) of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* to alter the Gateway determination dated for PP\_2012\_CAMPB\_002\_00. Alteration of the Gateway Determination is enclosed.

If you have any questions in relation to this matter, I have arranged for Ms Michelle Dellagiacoma to assist you. Ms Dellagiacoma can be contacted on (02) 9860 1527.

Yours sincerely

Signature has been removed

/16

Catherine Van Laeren Regional Director Sydney Region West Planning Services

Encl: Alteration to Gateway Determination

## Alteration of Gateway Determination

Planning proposal (Department Ref: PP\_2012\_CAMPB\_002\_00) (Mount Gilead release area)

I, the Regional Director, Sydney Region West at the Department of Planning and Environment as delegate of the Greater Sydney Commission, have determined, under section 56(7) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 ("EP&A Act"), to alter the Gateway determination dated 7 September 2012, for the proposed amendment to Campbelltown Local Environmental Plan 2015 as follows:

1. Delete:

condition "8"

and replace with:

a new condition 8 "The LEP is to be finalised by 7 March 2017".

Dated 13<sup>th</sup> April 2016.

Signature has been removed

Catherine Van Laeren Regional Director, Sydney Region West Planning Services

Delegate of the Greater Sydney Commission











Ordinary Meeting 22/11/2016 8.1 Draft Mt Gilead Planning Proposal - Outcome Of Public Exhibition







- (b) the condition and significance of the vegetation and other biodiversity on the land
- (c) the importance of the vegetation to the sustainability of native flora and fauna in the locality
- (d) the potential to fragment, disturb or diminish the biodiversity values of the land including biodiversity structure, function and composition
- (e) the condition and role of the vegetation as a habitat corridor, and any adverse impact on the habitat elements providing connectivity on the land
- (f) whether the location, design and density of the proposed development supports the protection and enhancement of biodiversity values
- (g) any proposed measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate the impacts of the development.
- 4. Before granting consent to development to which this clause applies, the consent authority must be satisfied that the development:
  - (a) has taken into account the objectives of this clause
  - (b) is sited, designed, constructed and managed to avoid adverse impacts on native biodiversity or, if an adverse impact cannot be avoided:
    - the development minimises disturbance and adverse impacts on remnant vegetation communities, threatened species and populations and their habitats
    - (ii) measures have been considered to maintain native vegetation and habitat parcels of a size, condition and configuration that will facilitate biodiversity protection and native flora and fauna movement through biodiversity corridors
    - (iii) the development includes measures to offset the loss of biodiversity values.

# Proposed LEP Amendments

## PROPOSED ADDITIONAL LEP CLAUSES

Proposed amendment to clause 4.1

## 4.1 Minimum subdivision lot size

Insert the following:

- (4C) Despite subclause (3), development consent may be granted to the subdivision of land into lots that do not meet the minimum size shown on the Lot Size Map if:
  - the land is within Lot 61, DP 752042, Appin Road, Gilead
  - each lot has a minimum lot size of 375m<sup>2</sup>
  - the number of lots with a minimum lot size of 375m<sup>2</sup> is limited to 65 of the total lots
  - each lot is contiguous with no more than two other lots on the street frontage which are of a lot size less than 450 m<sup>2</sup>
  - each lot is not located on a bus route
  - each lot is not located more than 200 metres from a bus route, community centre or open space area.

Proposed amendment to clause 4.1A

## 4.1A Maximum dwelling density in certain residential areas

Insert the following:

Column 1Column 2"Area 4" on the Restricted Dwelling Yield Map, being land at Mt Gilead1700

Insert after clause 7.19

## 7.20 Terrestrial Biodiversity

- 1. The objective of this clause is to maximise the retention and enhancement of native biodiversity, including the following:
  - (a) protecting native flora and fauna
  - (b) protecting the ecological processes necessary for their continued existence
  - (c) encouraging the recovery of native flora and fauna, and their habitats
  - (d) maximising connectivity and minimising habitat fragmentation.
- 2. This clause applies to land identified as "Areas of Biodiversity Significance" and/or "Biodiversity-Habitat Corridor" on the Terrestrial Biodiversity Map.
- 3. Before granting development consent on any land to which this clause applies, the consent authority must consider the following matters:

# **ATTACHMENT 3**

# Campbelltown (Sustainable City) Development Control Plan

# Volume 2 Site Specific Development Control Plans

# Part: 6 Mt Gilead

## Part 6 MT GILEAD

# Table of Contents

1. INTRODUCTION	2
1.1. Land to which this DCP Applies	2
2. VISION AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES	4
2.1. Vision for Mt Gilead	4
2.2. Key Development Objectives	4
3. DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES AND CONTROLS	6
3.1. Heritage and Views	6
3.2. Street Network and Public Transport	8
3.3. Public Open Space and Landscaping	. 16
3.4. Residential Subdivision	. 18
3.5. Residential Development	. 18
3.5.1. Front Setbacks	18
3.5.2. Side and rear setbacks	. 19
3.5.3. Corner lots	. 19
3.5.4. Private Open Space	. 20
3.5.5. Fencing	. 21
3.5.5. Land Adjacent to Appin Road	21
APPENDIX 1 INDICATIVE STREET TREE HIERARCHY	. 22
## 1. INTRODUCTION

## **1.1.** Land to which this Development Control Plan Applies

This Part applies to the land identified in Figure 1.

This Part establishes additional provisions for Mt Gilead. When a development control is not specified in this Part, development should be consistent with all other relevant controls of Volume 1 Campbelltown (Sustainable City) DCP. Where there is an inconsistency between Part 6 and any other Part of this Development Control Plan, Part 6 applies to the extent of the inconsistency.

The arrangement of controls in this section does not represent any particular order of priority or importance. Maps and diagrams in this Part are indicative only.

Campbelltown City Council Engineering Design Guide for Development applies to development specified in this Part.

# Part 6 <u>M</u>T GILEAD

# Figure 1: Land to which this DCP applies



# 2. VISION AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES

### 2.1. Vision for Mt Gilead

Mt Gilead will be a high quality residential estate set within a rural landscape setting. When completed, Mt Gilead will contain approximately 1,700 detached dwellings and a population of around 5,000 people. Mt Gilead will contain significant bushland parks providing attractive recreation areas and a pleasing setting for residential development. A small community hub co-located with open space will be provided in a central location to provide a focal point for the community.

European heritage will be interpreted through street layout and open space provision, providing an insight into land use patterns and significant early settlers. Known areas of Aboriginal cultural heritage will be protected.

Access will be provided from three main entries off Appin Road. The rectilinear subdivision layout will provide legible connections, maximise accessibility and transport choice, and offer alternative trips via walking and cycling.

Housing will typically be detached single and two storey dwellings on a range of lot sizes to provide choice and diversity. Smaller lots will be located in areas of special character such as close to open spaces, the community hub and bus route.

# 2.2. Key Development Objectives

Key Development Objectives for Mt Gilead are to:

- create an environmentally and socially sustainable residential estate at Mt Gilead that provides housing diversity and choice within the Campbelltown local government area
- provide a broad variety of lot sizes
- ensure all development achieves a high standard of urban and architectural design
- promote walking and cycling, and provide good access to public transport
- maximise opportunities for future residents to access and enjoy the outdoors
- protect riparian corridors and significant vegetation
- provide for the establishment of a biodiversity corridor to allow for the movement of fauna from Noorumba Reserve through the subject site to connect with the Nepean River corridor and the Beulah biobanking site
- respect the heritage significance of the Mount Gilead homestead site including the outbuildings, mill and dam and their setting.

#### Controls

1. Development of Mt Gilead is to be generally consistent with the Indicative Structure Plan shown in Figure 2.

# Figure 2: Mt Gilead Indicative Structure Plan



### 3. DEVELOPMENT PRINCIPLES AND CONTROLS

### 3.1. Heritage and Views

#### Objectives

- Interpret the rural landscape values of the site and surrounding locality
- Where possible, retain and enhance European heritage through its integration into the development of Mt Gilead
- Retain the regional views to hills to the west from within the subdivision to retain the visual context of the landscape's prior land uses and heritage values
- Retain the 'bald' character of One Tree Hill above the background skyline when viewed from The Old Mill, with a single landmark tree.

#### Controls

- 1. Development of Mt Gilead is to be consistent with the heritage principles identified in Figure 3 Heritage Principles Plan. The following specific measures are to be incorporated into the subdivision design:
  - i. An interpretation of the historic carriageway alignment from Appin Road to the Mt Gilead homestead at the existing entrance to the Mt Gilead Property as shown in Figure 3 *Heritage Principles Plan*. This should include land mark specimen tree planting
  - ii. Retention of One Tree Hill as a grassed knoll with a single tree
  - iii. Interpretation of the former Hillsborough Cottage is to be provided in the general vicinity as identified in Figure 3 Heritage Principles Plan. This may include landscaping, signage, walling or/and the erection of a commemorative plaque.
- 2. Landscape screening is to be provided in the locations identified in Figure 7 Indicative Landscape Strategy to:
  - i. Ensure that housing at Mt Gilead is not visible when viewed from the Old Mill
  - ii. Interpret the original landscape setting around the lake when viewed from the Old Mill.
- Where possible, the key view corridors identified from the indicative locations in Figure 3 Heritage Principles Plan to the Old Mill and One Tree Hill are to be retained and interpreted.
- 4. When the subdivision street pattern and open space locations are finalised, a site review will be required to confirm that important views to the west are retained and interpreted within the public domain (streets and parks). These locations will be identified on the plans submitted with development applications for subdivision.

Note: Methods to retain and interpret views include:

- Using trees species that will not block views when mature
- Placement of seating and/or interpretive signage at the viewpoints that explains the view and its significance in the context of the locality's cultural and natural heritage.

# Figure 3: Heritage Principles Plan



#### Page 148

# Part 6 MT GILEAD

### 3.2. Street Network and Public Transport

#### Objectives

- provide a clear hierarchy of interconnected streets that enables safe, convenient and legible access
- provide easily accessible connections to Appin Road
- ensure carriageways and verges match the function of the road
- provide adequate land within verges for infrastructure, landscaping and pathways
- facilitate use of public transport with suitable seating and adequate road widths
- provide a clear pedestrian and cycle network that provides links between bus stops, the community hub and open space areas
- provide a connected, convenient, efficient and safe network of pedestrian and cycle shareways
- promote the efficient use of land by allowing pedestrian and cycle shareways located within open spaces wherever practical.

#### Controls

- 1. The design of the local street network is to:
  - i. facilitate walking and cycling and enable direct local vehicle trips
  - ii. create a safe environment for walking and cycling with safe crossing points
  - iii. encourage a low-speed traffic environment
  - iv. optimise solar access opportunities for dwellings
  - v. take into account the site's topography and view line;
  - vi. provide frontage to and maximise surveillance of open space
  - vii. facilitate way finding and place making opportunities by taking into account streetscape features
  - viii. retain existing trees, where appropriate, within the road reserve.
- 2. Three entrances are to be provided off Appin Road generally in accordance with the locations identified in Figure 2 Mt Gilead Indicative Structure Plan and Figure 4 Indicative Street Network and Public Transport.
- 3. The public street network is to be provided generally in accordance with Figure 4 Indicative Street Network and Public Transport.
- 4. Street design is to comply with the minimum standards in the cross-sections detailed in Figure 5 Indicative Street Cross Sections.
- 5. Where bus bays are required on the Collector Road, the carriageway must be widened to accommodate a 2.5m wide bus parking bay.
- 6. Alternative street designs may be permitted on a case-by-case basis if the functional objectives and requirements of the street design are maintained and the outcome is in accordance with the Campbelltown City Council Engineering Design Guide for Development.
- 7. All kerbs are to be barrier kerbs.
- 8. Cul-de-sac streets will only be permitted where there are physical constraints such as sloping land, riparian corridors and bushland.

- Verges abutting open space and riparian areas may be reduced to 1m in width providing no servicing infrastructure is installed on the non-residential side of the road.
- 10. Appropriate seating or shelters shall be provided at bus stops.
- 11. Footpaths must be provided on at least one side of every street, except on the collector road where a footpath must be provided on both sides, unless it can be located within adjacent open space.
- 12. Pedestrian and cycle network is to be provided in accordance with Figure 6 Indicative Pedestrian/Cycle Network, and is to:
  - i. provide safe and convenient linkages between residences and open space systems, neighbourhood shops, the community facility and the bus route
  - ii. respond to the topography and achieve appropriate grades for safe and comfortable use where possible
  - iii. comply with the requirements of Campbelltown City Council Engineering Design Guide for Development.
- 13. Street trees are to be provided in a manner consistent with the Indicative Street Tree Hierarchy at Appendix 1.
- 14. A 10m wide Landscape Green Link is to be provided in the verge of the local street in the location shown in Figure 7 Indicative Landscape Strategy. The Landscape Green Link is to be planted with endemic native plant species and designed in a manner consistent with Figure 5 Indicative Street Cross Sections.

# Figure 4: Indicative Street Network and Public Transport









Note: Carriageway to be locally widened at bus stops to 12.0m to allow for 2.5m bus bay







**Figure 5: Indicative Street Cross Sections** 





# Figure 5: Indicative Street Cross Sections



# Figure 6: Indicative Pedestrian/Cycle Network



### 3.3. Public Open Space and Landscaping

#### **Objectives**

- provide safe and accessible open space areas for the enjoyment of the local population and promote local character
- provide open space which can be used by a range of users, linked with other activities and services
- conserve trees and other vegetation of ecological, aesthetic and cultural significance
- provide, enhance and protect existing watercourses and riparian corridors and improve habitat features
- promote riparian areas for the conservation and enhancement of riparian habitat and connectivity values, and for passive open space uses and activities where such uses will not degrade the riparian corridors
- Restore and conserve remnant bushland.

#### Controls

- 1. Landscaping and public open spaces are to be generally provided in accordance with Figure 7 Indicative Landscape Strategy.
- 2. Public Open Space is to be linked using streets, pedestrian paths and cycle ways.
- 3. Development is to front public open spaces to allow for casual surveillance and enhance safety.
- 4. Riparian areas are to be protected and enhanced.
- Bushland to be conserved is to be identified in each development application for subdivision, and the application is to provide details of proposed regeneration and restoration.
- Significant trees are to be retained where possible. Trees proposed for removal are to be identified in each development application and the impact of their removal is to be assessed appropriately.
- 7. Screen planting on the slopes of One Tree Hill as shown on Figure 7 Indicative Landscape Strategy should not be planted above the background skyline.

## Figure 7: Indicative Landscape Strategy



## 3.4. Residential Subdivision

#### Objectives

- Provide a residential subdivision layout that utilises development areas efficiently and responds to the natural attributes of the site
- Establish a consistent residential character and sense of place
- Ensure that residential lots are sited to provide a high level of residential amenity in terms of solar access, views, outlook and proximity to open spaces
- Provide a range of densities, lot sizes and house types to foster a diverse community and interesting streetscapes
- Provide for a maximum of 65 lots less than 450sqm in area (but with a minimum area of 375sqm) in appropriate locations where they will not impact on the streetscape character of the wider Mt Gilead development.

#### Controls

- 1. Street layouts are to be an appropriate length and width to ensure that pedestrian connectivity, stormwater management and traffic safety objectives are achieved.
- 2. Subdivision layout is to deliver a legible and permeable street network that responds to the natural site topography, the location of existing significant trees and bushland, and solar access design principles.
- 3. Residential lots should be rectangular in geometry as far as possible.
- 4. The minimum lot width on any street frontage is 12.5m.
- 5. The maximum number of lots with a minimum area of 375sqm and maximum area of 450sqm is 65.
- 6. Lots less than 450sqm are to be located within 200m of key amenity attractors such as the bus route, community hub and open space areas.
- 7. Subdivision layouts must provide a variety of lot frontages and lot sizes within each street. Lots less than 450sqm must be dispersed throughout the subdivision and not be located in a manner where they form the dominant streetscape presentation.
- 8. The repetition of lot widths of 12.5m is to be avoided, with no more than 3 lots of this frontage to be adjacent to one another.

### 3.5. Residential Development

#### 3.5.1. Front Setbacks

#### Objectives

- Provide a variety of front setbacks dependant on lot size
- Create streets with a diverse and interesting character
- Encourage articulation of the front facades of dwellings
- Reduce the dominance of garages on the streetscape.

#### Controls

1. Front setbacks are to be consistent with Table 2.

#### Table 2: Front setbacks

Lot Size	< 450sqm	>450sqm
Front setback	3.5m	4.5m
Articulation zone	2.5m	3.5m
Garage line	5.5m and at least 1m behind the façade line	1m minimum behind the façade line

- 2. To create an interesting and diverse streetscape, the following building elements are encouraged within the front setback articulation zone:
  - i. entry feature or portico
  - ii. awnings or other features over windows (excluding roller shutters)
  - iii. recessed or projecting architectural elements
  - iv. open verandas
  - v. a mix of building materials, finishes and colours.
- 3. The articulation zone is to occupy no more than 50% of the frontage, excluding any garage.

#### 3.5.2. Side and rear setbacks

#### **Objectives**

- Protect the amenity of adjacent properties particularly in terms of privacy and overshadowing
- Use land efficiently.

#### Controls

- 1. Minimum side and rear setbacks are to be consistent with Table 3.
- 2. Upper storey setbacks are to ensure that neighbouring dwellings receive the minimum required solar access to habitable rooms and private open space.
- 3. Any continuous wall shall be no more than 10m in length. Walls over 10m long shall have a minimum offset of 300mm for a minimum of 2m. This does not apply

#### Table 3: Minimum side and rear setbacks

Lot Size	≤ 450sqm	>450sqm
Side setback – single storey	0.9m	0.9m
Side setback – double storey	0.9m	1.2m
Side setback - garage	0m	0.9m
Rear setback – ground level	3m	4m
Rear setback – upper level	6m	8m

## 3.5.3. Corner lots

#### Objective

- Ensure that land is efficiently used at block ends
- Provide a strong visual identification of the street block by articulating both frontages
- Locate garages on secondary street frontages.

#### Controls

- 1. The minimum lot size on a corner lot is 450sqm.
- 2. To provide an attractive streetscape, dwellings on corner lots are to provide appropriate articulation to the facade on both street frontages.
- 3. Small windows to bathrooms, en-suites or the laundry are not to be visible from the secondary street frontage.
- 4. Where feasible, garages should be located on the secondary street frontage of corner lots.
- Dwellings shall be set back at least 3m from the secondary street boundary. However, garages on secondary streets are to be set back at least 5.5m from the boundary.
- 6. Dwellings and landscaping shall be designed to minimize the amount of privacy/security fencing that faces roads.

### 3.5.4. Private Open Space

#### Objective

- Contribute to effective stormwater management, management of micro-climate impacts and energy efficiency
- Ensure a balance between built and landscaped elements in residential areas
- Provide high quality private open space within properties for relaxation and entertainment
- Provide useable private open space relative to the size of the property
- Provide private open space with high levels of amenity including privacy and direct sun access
- Ensure that dwellings are designed to minimise overshadowing of adjacent properties including private open space.

#### Controls

1. Private Open Space is to be provided at the following minimum rates:

i. Lots equal to or less than 450sqm:	15% minimum of the site area; and
ii. Lots above 450sqm:	20% minimum of the site area.

2. An area of Principal Private Open Space (PPOS) is to be provided that is directly accessible from the main living area of a dwelling. It is to have a maximum gradient of 1:10 and be provided at the following minimum rates:

i. Lots equal to or less than 450sqm:20sqm with minimum dimension of 3m ii. Lots above 450sqm: 25sqm with minimum dimension of 5m.

**Note:** *"Principal Private Open Space" means the portion of private open space which is conveniently accessible from a living zone of the dwelling.* 

- 3. For lots equal to or less than 450sqm, at least 2 hours of direct sunlight is to be received to 50% of the PPOS area of the proposed dwelling between 9am and 3pm on 21 June.
- 4. For lots above 450sqm, at least 3 hours of direct sunlight is to be received to 50% of the PPOS area of the proposed dwelling between 9am and 3pm on 21 June.
- 5. Direct sunlight to the PPOS of neighbouring dwellings is to be maintained in accordance with the above minimum requirements.

#### 3.5.5. Fencing

#### Objective

 Ensure boundary fencing is of a high quality and does not detract from the streetscape.

#### Controls

- 1. A front fence to the primary street frontage is to be a maximum of 1.2m high and with a predominantly open character.
- 2. On corner lots, the front fence is to continue around the corner to the secondary street for a minimum of 30% of the lot length on this frontage.
- 3. A 1.8m side fence on a secondary street is to be:
  - i. a maximum of 50% of the lot length;
  - ii. include a gradual transition to the front fence that has continued along the secondary frontage; and
  - iii. of a similar look and character as the front fence.

Note: The provision of a front fence is not mandatory.

#### 3.5.6. Land Adjacent to Appin Road

#### Objective

- Ensure reasonable standards of residential amenity and a high quality residential environment in the vicinity of Appin Road
- Ensure residential dwellings are not adversely impacted by traffic noise.

#### Controls



• In addition to the provisions of clause 3.5 of Volume 1 development is to comply with *Development Near Rail Corridors and Busy roads – Interim Guideline (Department of Planning 2008).* 

#### **APPENDIX 1 INDICATIVE STREET TREE HIERARCHY**





# **ATTACHMENT 4**

14 November 2016

lendlease

Jeff Lawrence Director – Growth and Economy Campbelltown City Council Civic Square 91 Queen Street Campbelltown, NSW, 2560

#### Re: Lendlease control of land for Mt Gilead planning proposal.

As requested, Lendlease wish to confirm our position and control over the land subject to the current planning proposal at Mt Gilead.

The current planning proposal covers part lot 3 DP 121887 owned by Mt Gilead Pty Ltd and Lot 61 DP 752042 owned by Anna and Stefan Dzwonnik.

Lendlease has entered into conditional agreements with both Mt Gilead Pty Ltd and Anna and Stefan Dzwonnik that shall result in Lendlease acquiring and developing this land upon satisfactory completion of necessary planning approvals including the rezoning of the land in accordance with the current planning proposal and entering satisfactory local and state infrastructure agreements.

Regarding the Mt Gilead Pty Ltd land, the landowners have engaged Old Mill Property to continue to secure the necessary planning approvals and the purchase agreement permits Lendlease to be a party to necessary planning agreements including Local Voluntary Planning Agreements and State Infrastructure Agreements.

Regarding the Dzwonnik land, Lendlease are responsible for securing the necessary planning approvals for this land and the purchase agreement permits Lendlease to be a party to necessary planning agreements including Local Voluntary Planning Agreements and State Infrastructure agreements.

Therefore Lendlease wish to confirm our interest and control over the land subject to the current planning proposal and our ability to be a party to necessary planning agreements required to obtain necessary planning approvals.

Lendlease look forward to the resolution of the current planning proposal.

Regards SIGNATURE HAS BEEN REMOVED

Paul Thompson State Business Development Manager – Communities NSW.

Attachments: A: Land Ownership plan: B: Dzwonnik letter regarding ability to enter agreements on behalf.

ref: G:New Business/Project 31/Authorities/Campbelltown City Council/land control letter/Jeff lawrence leter re land control Nov 2016.docx

Lendlease Communities (Australia) Limited, ACN 88 000 966 085 Level 2, 88 Phillip Street, Parramatta NSW 2150, Australia www.lendlease.com

lendlease



### Attachment B:

Authority to represent Dzwonnik land and enter planning agreements.



## ATTACHMENT 5



10 November 2016

Lindy Deitz General Manager Campbelltown City Council Civic Centre 91 Queen Street Campbelltown NSW 2560

Dear Lindy,

#### **Re: Mount Gilead Regional Infrastructure**

Further to our meeting to discuss Lendlease's interests in the proposed Mount Gilead development, I would like to share the details of our offer to the NSW Department of Planning and Environment ("Department"), to contribute towards the funding the upgrading of the regional road network.

Lendlease is highly committed to actively assist in facilitating the provision of regional road infrastructure to support development in conjunction with and support of Greater Macarthur to the satisfaction of Campbelltown City Council and the Department.

The attached letter to the Department outlines the details for two works packages for the upgrading of the regional road network, with Lendlease offering to enter into an agreement to provide a contribution of 'works in kind' to the value of \$45m toward the design and construction of upgrades to the regional road network.

While Appin Road remains our key focus, Lendlease also believes that the provision of Spring Farm Link Road to connect Appin Road to the Hume Highway provides an opportunity for a superior community outcome, hence the offer for 2 options.

In anticipation of acceptance of Option 1 by the Department, Lendlease has commenced a tender process to award the detailed design of the upgrade works, in consultation with the Department and NSW Roads and Maritime Services. This design package is likely to cost approximately \$1m.

Option 1 includes the provision of the following works:

- Duplication of Appin Road from the Mount Gilead southern boundary to Fitzgibbon Lane, providing 2 additional lanes and median separating north bound traffic from south bound traffic.
- Upgrading of existing Appin Road intersections at St John's Road, Fitzgibbon Lane & Copperfield Drive
- The provision of 3 new intersections to service the Mount Gilead development.



Recent supplementary traffic modelling completed by Lendlease in collaboration with NSW Roads and Maritime Services, confirms that the package of works outlined as 'Option 1', will provide the required capacity for in excess of 2100 dwellings within the Mount Gilead development.

Please refer the attached letter to the Department for details regarding Lendlease's view of the specific scope of work and potential timing and staging.

Should you have any queries regarding Lendlease's offer to provide a significant contribution towards the provision of infrastructure please do not hesitate to contact me

Yours sincerely,

SIGNATURE HAS BEEN REMOVED

Ranisha Clarke Regional Development Manager, Lendlease Communities Australia



28 July 2016

Gina Metcalfe Senior Project Manager NSW Department of Planning and Environment 23-33 Bridge Street Sydney, NSW 2000

Dear Gina,

#### Regional Voluntary Planning Agreement – Mount Gilead

Further to our meeting Wednesday 27<sup>th</sup> July, please find attached the two works packages tabled by Lendlease.

Option 1 provides for the duplication of Appin Road from the Mount Gilead southern boundary to Fitzgibbon Lane, upgrading of Appin Road intersections at St John's Road, Fitzgibbon Lane & Copperfield Drive, and the provision of 3 new intersections to service the Mount Gilead development. Lendlease Engineering estimate the cost of these works at \$54 million, subject to the caveats described on the attached.

Option 2 delivers a superior community outcome by including the construction of Spring Farm Link Road (Stage 1) to provide 1 lane in each direction between Appin Road and Menangle Road. This increases the total of cost of works to \$94m, subject to the caveats described on the attached.

As discussed, Lendlease is prepared to increase its funding contribution toward these works to a maximum of \$45 million. This implies a funding shortfall of \$9 million for Option 1, and/or \$49 million for Option 2.

Accordingly, we seek advice from DPE, whether there is capacity to meet the funding shortfall for either Option from the Housing Acceleration Funding commitments announced in the recent NSW Budget.

Should this be the case, and DPE is able to confirm in principle support for a preferred Option, Lendlease would seek to progress drafting a formal VPA with DPE immediately. Concurrently, in good faith, we would also commit to the \$1m P50 detailed design works required to inform the final VPA.

Please note, the above proposals are on the basis that Lendlease Engineering would construct the agreed works (subject to appropriate independent scrutiny), and that Lendlease's funding contribution toward the works would be creditable against any future SIC.

Lendlease Communities (Mt Gilead) Pty Limited ACN 605 278 331 Level 2, 88 Phillip Street, Parramatta NSW 2150, Australia www.lendlease.com



Yours sincerely

15

SIGNATURE HAS BEEN REMOVED

do not hesitate to contact me.

**Ranisha Clarke** Regional Development Manager, Lendlease Communities Australia

CC: Adrian Miller Director Program Delivery, NSW Department of Planning and Environment

Attachments: Regional Road Funding Options



111	(@)	NODES 5-10 27 km 8		1	)		9		5		-	1	12.24	IUIAL				54.00	45.00	9.00			45.00	3.45	4.55	53.00		
	i	NOON NO								STAGE B NODES 3.4.4	TEARS		0081 #2 068m 2 16446 2	8	5	1661		0.00	0.00									lendlease
													100er 100er 100er	FY 24	20	1661		0.00	0.00									lend
			,			-					-		3	11 23	-	1439		0.00	0.00									
21200	(ws)			2	51.UZ			3	41.11	11 04	5	54.00	2	FY 22	0	1134	0	9.45	9.45									
2	5			2	0				-		-	25	202	17.71	0	628	æ	10.93	10.93									
IVI.	~	-					-					_	8	PY 20	4	517		1.97	1.97									
LINANUAL	YEAR			2	2			2	17 1.1	5	3		ş	1718	2	217	A	25.03	19.34	5.68								
INCINI	YEAR			•	0				n	u	þ	D COSTS	iming	191	2			5.04	2.52	2.52								
DEVELOPMENT	STAGE				¢				o	c	>	APPIN ROAD COSTS	elivery t	11.4	-			1.60	0.80	0.80	e 2018	WORKS			REA			
0000	(WS)	1.64	4.09	11.44	3.31	7.54	3.00	8.03	3.11	8.46	3.36		otential d						(WS)	(MS)	ommence Jur	REDITABLE			RELEASE AF	(WS)		
		250	250		250					1421	1400		ased on p						RIBUTION	RIBUTION	and works c	OTAL SIC C	UCTION)		DF URBAN F	ION VALUE		
	DEUVERY TIMING (LOTS)												OW - B				ξED		ER CONT	INT CONT	March 2011	T - NOTU	& CONSTR	PIN ROAI	ICATION (	ONTRIBUT		
INVIENCE SILVE	(LOTS)	1400	250	800	250	1100	250	1100	1100	1600	1600		FORECAST CASHFLOW - Based on potential delivery timing	CIAL TEAK	DEVELOPMEN   YEAR	LOTS DEVELOPED	ROAD STAGE DEUVERED	ROAD COSTS	PROPOSED DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTION	REQUIRED GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION (\$M)	Note - Assumes rezoning March 2017 and works commence June 2018	DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTION - TOTAL SIC CREDITABLE WORKS	WIK - ROAD (DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION)	LAND DEDICATION (APPIN ROAD) ***	BIODIVERSITY CERTIFICATION OF URBAN RELEASE AREA	TOTAL DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTION VALUE (\$M)	Based on valuation	
1. 1		INTERSECTION UPGRADE	INTERSECTION UPGRADE	NEW LANES	INTERSECTION UPGRADE	NEW LANES	NEW INTERSECTION	NEW LANES	NEW INTERSECTION	NEW LANES	NEW INTERSECTION		FOR	HINAN	DEVE	LOTS	ROAD	ROAD	PROP	REQUI		DEVE	- MIK	LAND	BIODI	TOTA	" Base	
		StJOHNS / APPIN RD	FITZGIBBON / APPIN RD	COPPERFIELD TO FITZGIBBON	COPPERFIELD / APPIN RD	NORTH INTERSECTION TO COPPERFIELD	NORTH INTERSECTION	MID ENTRY TO NORTH ENTRY		TO MID ENTRY				Lendlease	costs to SIC obligation				irred as a result of this development	for the cost plan with following changes:	<ul> <li>Building new dual Lane in Northbound carriageway from Southern Access point to Frizgibbon Lane</li> <li>No clearing to the asstern side of existing carriageway form Southern Access point to Frizgibbon Lane</li> <li>No Allowance made for water quality management, OST tanks, GPTs, Basins, etc.</li> <li>No Allowance for relative management, OST tanks, GPTs, Basins, etc.</li> <li>No Allowance for relative management, OST tanks, GPTs, Basins, etc.</li> <li>No Allowance for relative transference on a shown on JWP drawings.</li> </ul>	ining walls unless shown on JWP drawings.						
		10 EXISTING INTERSECTION S	9 EXISTING INTERSECTION F	8 MIDBLOCK C	7 EXISTING INTERSECTION C	6 MIDBLOCK	5 NEW ENTRY INTERSECTION N	4 MIDBLOCK M	3 NEW ENTRY INTERSECTION MID ENTRY	2 MIDBLOCK SI	1 NEW ENTRY INTERSECTION SOUTHERN ENTRY		Assumptions/Qualifications: GENERAL	All construction works directly awarded to Lendlease	No disadvantage clause to reconcile WIK costs to SIC obligation	Review at P50 detailed design and costing Project Varifier injuity appointed	index volute joints appointed	APPIN ROAD	- No upgrading of existing pavements required as a result of this development	<ul> <li>Total Lenger assumed to be 4.57 km.</li> <li>JWP concept design and quantities used for the cost plan with following changes:</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Building riew dual Lane in Northbound carriageway from Southern Access points - No clearing to the eastern side of existing carriageway (south bound).</li> <li>No Allowance mode rowater quality management, OST tanks, GPTs, Basins, etc.</li> <li>No Allowance for relocation of any services.</li> <li>Assumed the affected services to be protected only as shown on JWP drawings.</li> </ul>	- No allowance made for noise walls, retain	NO MIOWANCE MADE IOL II S.					



<del>2</del> )	uni	6	STAGE A	27 km 8	LEWER	1	1				9						2	-	5 TOTAL		-		94.00	45.00	49.00			AE AN	3.45	0.43 4.55	53.00	
								STAGE	NODE 11 3.7 km	YEARS			STAGE	12m			STAGE D NODES 1 & 2 D.Sun		FY 24 FY 25	8	1661 1661										The second	
																			FY 23 F	7	1439 1											
																			FY 22 F	9	1134	0	9.45	2.72	6.72							
(2W)					31.02				40.00	11.14		11.84		40.00	54.00	94.00	(S.4m)		FY 21	9	829	ВС	25.55		12.78							
																	ing lanes costs circa \$		FY 20	4	517		21.47		10.73							
YEAR					FY 19				FY 21	FY 21		FY 22				-	<sup>#</sup> Above costs exclude structural overlay to existing lares Which remians subject to confirmation (Estimated costs circa \$5.4m)		FY 19	e	217	Υ.	29.90	14.95	14.95							
	æ	$\vdash$		_				+					_	AD			structural ov	iming	FY 18	2	0		5.54	2.77	2.77							
	YEAR	128	1		m	0.43			2	5		60	148	SPRING FARM ROAD	ROAD"	COSTS	osts exclude ians subject	delivery t	FY 17		0		2.10	1.05	1.05	ne 2018	WORKS	CARLON		REA		
, ,	STAGE			-	4				60	0		0		SPRING	APPIN ROAD	TOTAL COSTS	* Above co Which remi	otential o						(NNS)	(WS)	ommence Ju	REDITABLE			RELEASE A	(WS)	
(MS)		1.64	4.09	11.44	3.31	154		3.00	40.00	8.03	3.11	8.46	3.38					ised on po							RUTION	and works or	DTAL SIC CF	INOLUI	(NICHION)	OF URBAN F	ION VALUE	
DELIVERY	(LOTS)	250	250	250	250	250	000	067	006	1100	1100	1421	1400					FORECAST CASHFLOW - Based on potential delivery timing	4.R	TYEAR	ED	<b>JELIVERED</b>		PROPOSED DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTION	REQUIRED GOVERNMENT CONTRIBUTION (\$M)	Note - Assumes rezoning March 2017 and works commence June 2018	DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTION - TOTAL SIC CREDITABLE WORKS	Mik - DOAD (DESIGN & CONSTRUCTOR)		BIODIVERSITY CERTIFICATION OF URBAN RELEASE AREA	TOTAL DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTION VALUE (\$M)	stion
TRIGGERS	(2) 22	1400	250	800	250	1100	000	NG7		1100	1100	1600	1600					FORECAST C	FINANCIAL YEAR	DEVELOPMENTYEAR	LOTS DEVELOPED	ROAD STAGE DELIVERED	ROAD COSTS	PROPOSED DE	REQUIRED GOV	Note - Assumes	DEVELOPER C		I AND DEDICAT	BIODIVERSITY	TOTAL DEVELO	** Based on valuation
ĝ		INTERSECTION UPGRADE	INTERSECTION UPGRADE	NEWLANES	INTERSECTION LIPGRADE	NEW LANES		NEW IN IEKSECTION	NEW LANES	NEW LANES	NEW INTERSECTION	NEW LANES	NEW INTERSECTION								M Lane											
			8			COPPERFIELD													elopment	wing changes:	II ACCESS POINT TO FILEGIDDO	Ts, Basins, etc	VP drawings.	n JWP drawings.		of verge each side. • wide)	Ts, Basins, etc	sinage allowed.	he road)	C.	e II nup funitfurt	
		StJOHNS / APPIN RD	FITZGIBBON / APPIN RD	COPPERFIELD TO FITZGIBBON	COPPEREIEID / APPIN RD	NORTH INTERSECTIC		NUKIH IN IEKSECIK	APPIN Rd TO MENANGLE Rd	MID ENTRY TO NORTH ENTRY		SOUTHERN ENTRY TO MID ENTRY	SOUTHERN ENTRY					andlease sts to SIC obligation	ed as a result of this deve	or the cost plan with follo.	arriageway iron sourcer amageway (south bound	gement, OST tanks, GP	ted only as shown on JV	ing walls unless shown or		i direction) including 1m c	gement, OST tanks, GP	itudinal), pits, subsoil dra	try soum	pvided. Allowed \$1.5M D	river routed on the substance of the sub	
		EXISTING INTERSECTION	EXISTING INTERSECTION	MIDBLOCK	NTERSECTION	Т		CIION	RM ROAD	MIDBLOCK	NEW ENTRY INTERSECTION	MIDBLOCK	NEW ENTRY INTERSECTION SOUTHERN ENTRY				Assumptions/Qualifications:	GENERAL In construction works directly awarded to Lendlease All constructions works directly awarded to Lendlease No disadvantage clause to reconcile Wilk costs to SIC obligation Review at PSO detailed design and costing Project Ventiner jointly appointed	APPIN ROAD •No upgrading of existing pavements required as a result of this development • of all remain assumed to be 4.57km.	JWP concept design and quantities used for the cost plan with following changes:	<ul> <li>- building free used care in two uncount carriagemay riom sourcers point to Fridgiboon care.</li> <li>No clearing to the eastern side of existing carriageway (south bound).</li> </ul>	- No Allowance made for water quality management, OST tanks, GPTs, Basins, etc	the affected services to be protect	<ul> <li>No allowance made for noise walls, retaining walls unless shown on JWP drawings.</li> </ul>		SPRING FARM ROAD - Total length assumed to be 3.75km - Allowater and a to build 2 lanes (one each direction) including 1m of verge each side. - Allowatore for clearing and earthworts for the Mobile confloor (23.5m wide)	ince made for water quality mana-	nent Drainage (transverse or long	<ul> <li>Cross drainage (1 x out KULY) allowed every bulum</li> <li>Grass lined open drain allowed on one side of the road (parallel to the road)</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Bridge Allowed over gas line. No details provided. Allowed \$1.5M DC.</li> <li>No allowance marke for services (Relocation Protection and Stread linhibut and ITS)</li> </ul>	· No allowance made for fencing, noise walls, retaining walls, etc	
		10	6	8	Τ	T	T		11	4	6	2	-				Assumption	<u>GENERAL</u> All construc No disadvar Review at F Project Veri	APPIN ROAL - No upgradin - Total Lengt	JWP cont	- No clearin	- No Allows	- Assumed	- No allowa		SPRING E - Total leng - Allowance	No Allowa	No Paven	- Grass line	Bridge All	- No allowa	