

Appendix B – Summary of submissions and responses
Leppington Stages 2 and 5 – Finalisation Report – May 2019

AGENCY COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
Camden Council	119836	General	Recommended that Council support Leppington Precinct rezoning subject to Government working with Council to resolve issues and technical matters.	Noted.
		Land Fragmentation and Infrastructure	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land fragmentation means there is no lead developer and no definitive development projections for infrastructure service providers to rely on. 2. Results in series of 'infrastructure service risks' to Precinct outlined in Precinct Planning Report. 3. Infrastructure Delivery Plan needs to clearly define the timing of key infrastructure delivery and be integrated with the provision of local infrastructure via the preparation of an infrastructure masterplan. 4. Preparation of masterplan will assist Council and Government in aligning the delivery of services in their respective budgeting processes to stimulate development within fragmented land holdings. 	<p>It is acknowledged that standard practice to the delivery of infrastructure to urban growth areas needs to be tailored to enable development in Precinct. The Department will continue to work with key service authorities and other parts of Government to develop appropriate funding and delivery models that allows for the timely delivery of infrastructure that is able to service development as demand arises.</p> <p>Given the existing subdivision and ownership pattern in the Precinct, land owners wishing to develop or sell may need to consider the intentions of their neighbours, and where these align, cooperate to foster interest from the development industry and to demonstrate to infrastructure agencies that there is a willingness to develop the land. The Department will work with landowners and developers that are interested in developing their land to help coordinate the future discussions and planning with servicing authorities.</p>
		Development Implementation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Will be more difficult given fragmented land ownership and lack of lead developer. The IDP indicates that delivery of infrastructure needs to be tailored to enable development. 6. Council accepts staged development but needs to work with Department resolve impediments to development including funding. 	See comments above.
		Staged Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Staged rezoning is supported in principle as consistent with planning objectives and may alleviate concerns raised by landowners about rezoning of land without services that result in increased values and rates and land taxes. 8. However number of issues need to be worked through with DPE such as assessments of DAs. 	Noted.
		St Andrews Rd	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Notes SW Growth Centre Structure Plan does not reflect role and function of St Andrews Road consistent with RMS draft Road Network Strategy as a sub arterial link to F5 and Campbelltown Rd and Northern Rd. Structure Plan makes no reference to St Andrews Rd and shows no extension to Camden Valley Way. 10. DPE has advised it will review traffic access in update of SW Growth Centre Structure Plan. 11. DPE should investigate and resolve role and function of road in consultation with Council. 12. Should Road retain its status as sub arterial road then recommend that funding and delivery be a State Government responsibility. 13. Request Government's Special Infrastructure Contribution Scheme is reviewed to incorporate the road. 	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed and was addressed in the Stage 1 Finalisation Report.
		Sports grounds	<p>District sportsgrounds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. Requests that DPE confirm its commitment to the provision of a district sportsground facility in Rossmore location. 15. DPE should note this facility would serve population of 60,000 and a contribution will be included in Council's draft Section 94 Plan to collect contribution to this facility equivalent to the demand from the Leppington Precinct. The same approach will be used in future Growth Centre Precincts. 16. Council has revised its approach to the delivery of such facilities since precinct planning process commenced and has greater focus on providing fewer, larger facilities. 17. To deliver request that DPE investigate enlarging the 2 sportsground facilities situated on the SW perimeter as part of planning for adjacent precinct. 	A district sportsground will be considered as part of precinct planning for the Rossmore Precinct. Sporting ground facilities are proposed in Stage 4. Opportunities for enlargement of the sports fields will be considered further at the time of rezoning Stage 4.

Appendix B – Summary of submissions and responses
Leppington Stages 2 and 5 – Finalisation Report – May 2019

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
		Timing of Draft Development Contributions Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 18. Council has told DPE that draft exhibition package should include s.94 Plan so local infrastructure can be funded however this has not occurred. 19. Council considers it to be low risk as the rezoning unlikely to take effect until mid-late 2015 and development will be delayed due to lack of services. 20. If rezoning takes place without plan development would be levied under Camden Contribution Plan 2004 which would be at lower rate than State Governments cap. 21. That DPE note that Council maintain its strong commitment to Precinct Planning Project and preparation of s.94 Plan concurrently with the Precinct Planning Package. 	Camden Council has prepared a Contributions Plan to establish funding mechanisms for local infrastructure (roads, drainage, open space and community facilities) required to service development in the Precinct.
		Infrastructure Funding	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 22. Expected that average s.94 contribution per residential lot will exceed the \$30,000 cap given fragmented land ownership pattern, the amount of infrastructure required and amount of constrained land. 23. State Governments policy restricts the Draft s.94 Plan to levying for “essential infrastructure” and Plan can levy for “base level” embellishment of open space to make it safe and suitable for use which means funding for a proportion of the land and capital works costs specified in draft s.94 Plan is uncertain. 24. State Government identified two funding options: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apply under Local Infrastructure Growth Scheme or • Apply for a Special Rate Variation. 25. Concerns regarding impact of the cap on its ability to fund local infrastructure and request work with Council to develop an infrastructure funding strategy. 	Camden Council has prepared a Contributions Plan to establish funding mechanisms for local infrastructure (roads, drainage, open space and community facilities) required to service development in the Precinct.
		Funding Strategy	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 26. Council wrote to Department seeking its assistance to establish an infrastructure funding strategy for Growth Centre Precincts. 27. Funding strategy should include forward funding of essential infrastructure, funding for the non-essential infrastructure shortfall and regional infrastructure funding. 28. To facilitate growth of Leppington North and Leppington Precincts Council need to be able to access funds to forward fund infrastructure projects. Council currently does not have access to a funding source and is requesting assistance to explore ‘seed funding’ opportunities such as interest free government loans. 	As part of the review of the South West Growth Area Structure Plan the Department will identify strategic infrastructure requirements and their indicative delivery timeframes to support development of rezoned precincts. Options for prioritisation and funding will also be considered. The Department will also monitor the rate of development in line with the provision of infrastructure, in consultation with the utility agencies, to maintain a supply of rezoned and serviced land. In terms of local infrastructure, a Section 7.11 Contributions Plan has been developed that will fund the delivery of essential infrastructure when it is needed.
Campbelltown City Council	115929	Roads	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Council reviewed Planning Report and is concerned with references made to St Andrews Rd with respect to indications concerning what seems to be intention to upgrade the road east of Camden Valley Way linking F5 and Campbelltown Rd (p.60). Figure 5-14 p.62 depicts St Andrews Rd as 4 Lane sub arterial road being part of Leppington Road Network. Council seeks deferral of any planning decisions for Leppington that have implications with respect to St Andrews Rd until Council is fully consulted; decided its position; had the opportunity to bring its position to the attention of NSW Government; and assessed the impact on the integrity of the Scenic Hills. 	St Andrews Road is no longer proposed to be extended and was addressed in the Stage 1 Finalisation Report.
Heritage Council	119838	Heritage	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Raby House, a State listed item is located just outside the Precinct to the south west. Distant views of Raby from Camden Valley Way should be protected, possibly by limiting building heights, and appropriate type and placement of landscaping along the road corridor. 2. Concern is raised regarding the reduced curtilage to the proposed items at 43 and 66 Rickard Road, and 168 Heath Road. 	<p>A low density residential zoning is proposed for Stage 5 of the Precinct which will ensure distant views are maintained. Any plantings in the road corridor of Camden Valley Way are the responsibility of the RMS.</p> <p>Concerns from the Heritage Council are not relevant to Stage 2 or 5 of the Precinct. These heritage sites are located within Stage 1 and appropriate curtilages were confirmed at the time of rezoning.</p>
Jemena	115869	General	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reviewed proposal and acknowledge commentary concerning aspects of natural gas reticulation. 2. Essential to understand the requirements of the development within an approved pipeline corridor. Australian Standard 2885 provides guidance in assessing changes in land classification. 3. Jemena requests further discussions and communication through process. 	Noted. Jemena was consulted before finalisation of the Precinct Planning. No concerns were raised.
NSW Rural Fire Service	115937	Bushfire	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vegetation in riparian corridor of Kemps Creek and proposed open space will remain and therefore be a bushfire hazard. 2. Potential for additional bushfire hazard to be created due to eastern riparian corridor being designated for native vegetation retention/environmental protection. 	Noted. Appropriate APZs are set out in the DCP to ensure that the requirements of <i>Planning for Bushfire Protection 2006</i> are met.

Appendix B – Summary of submissions and responses
Leppington Stages 2 and 5 – Finalisation Report – May 2019

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Any development adjacent to bushfire prone vegetation must ensure appropriate level of protection through appropriate APZ (Asset Protection Zone) as set out in <i>Planning for Bushfire Protection 2006</i>. Access also important and RFS supports absence of dead end roads. It is assumed reticulated water will be supplied to entire area which should be via a ring system and of sufficient pressure to ensure it remains during firefighting operations. 	The eastern corridor has an APZ specified in the DCP.
		Bushfire Assessment Report	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> RFS has reviewed the Bushfire Assessment Report prepared by Ecological Australia and agrees with assessment and recommendations. This report was done on landscape scale and more detailed assessment required at a site specific level when planning advances which may result in some variations to identified APZs. Report has not identified several areas of bushfire prone vegetation within proposed passive open space/public recreation zones, school sites and land adjoin the site in eastern and western corners. These areas identified on attached plan in orange border. Appropriate APZs should be identified and provided. 	Noted. Detailed assessment will be done at the development application stage.
		Special Fire Protection Purposes	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> RFS notes identification of school sites in plan. Schools are Special Fire Protection Purpose that require higher level of protection particularly in greater APZs. In 2 cases schools would incorporate existing areas of bushfire prone vegetation and one other is adjacent to bushfire prone vegetation. The vegetation would be required to be reduced and managed to the standard of an APZ or schools developed with provision of appropriate APZ adjacent to and/or within the school sites. 	Development of this nature does require setbacks of a greater magnitude from the hazard areas than those for residential development or for other proposed uses. The majority of school sites are of sufficient size to be able to absorb any future required setbacks, and/or already have sufficient separation from the hazard areas (depending on future management).
NSW Office of Water	115897	Riparian Corridor Widths	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Consider that the Biodiversity and Riparian Studies prepared by Ecological Australia are consistent with Office of Water advice regarding merit assessment of stream order and riparian zone widths for the precinct and generally with Office of Water's Guidelines for Controlled Activities. 	Noted.
		Flood Risk and Vegetation Densities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Revised Water Cycle Management Report by Parsons Brinckerhoff outlines conceptual design criteria for online basins and assumes Mannings roughness of 0.06 for vegetated surface swales. Reference to swale is a reference to main channel in precinct as understood by OW. Not clear from report as to what Mannings roughness has been used in modelling bank and overbank areas on watercourses. Adopted Mannings values for flood modelling should not compromise establishment of riparian corridors representative of Cumberland Plain and Alluvial Woodlands as specified in Biodiversity and Riparian Studies prepared by Ecological Australia. Preparation of VMPs would be appropriate to concentrate more dense plantings adjacent to areas of high stability risk and less dense to outer areas of the corridors as not to impact adversely on flood levels. Supporting documents should reference this approach. 	<p>A Manning's n value of 0.06 (page 33 of the Parsons Brinckerhoff WCM report) was not used in the TUFLOW modelling but was used to undertake the preliminary sizing calculations of the swales, which are open drainage lines that convey flow into the main creek system. The swales were not modelled in the interim TUFLOW model, as the aim of the interim TUFLOW modelling undertaken by Parsons Brinckerhoff was to test the basin performance in the existing Upper South Creek TUFLOW model developed by Cardno for Camden Council.</p> <p>The Manning's N values used in the interim TUFLOW modelling were not changed from the values set by the original TUFLOW modelling undertaken by Council's flood consultant Cardno, which were based on aerial photography and landuse mapping.</p>
		Riparian Corridor Ownership	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Office of Water supports the public ownership of the riparian corridors through SP2 zoning. 	Noted. Parts of riparian corridor are also within E2 and RE1 zoning but will also result in public ownership.
		Controlled Activities	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Future detailed design of non-riparian uses including detention basins, drainage infrastructure and public open space should not compromise Office of Water's Guidelines for Controlled Activities. Future development will require controlled activity approval for works on waterfront land as defined in <i>Water Management Act 2000</i>. Works should be conducted in accordance with Office of Water's Guidelines. 	Noted.
Office of Environment & Heritage	117111	Biodiversity	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Prefer ENV to be in public ownership and concerned that objectives of RE1 and SP2 zones do not recognise the protection of biodiversity value and the zones permit a range of uses incompatible with biodiversity protection. OEH does not support the location of a detention basin in the ENV area. Supports recommendation that targeted surveys be performed where ENV is to be retained on certified land. 	The proposed zoning of land parcels is required to respond to differing site values and constraints. In particular the need to provide local infrastructure and the localised management of stormwater in the Precinct. In response, additional vegetation is proposed to be protected in Stage 5 of the Precinct. This vegetation is not currently listed as ENV but has the potential to re-grow to support ecological communities into the future.
		Aboriginal cultural heritage	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Figures removed from public version of report need to be forwarded to OEH to enable proper assessment. 	<p>Full report supplied to OEH.</p> <p>The Camden Growth Centres DCP contains controls for European and Aboriginal heritage (Section 2.3.4) and the proposed Schedule</p>

Appendix B – Summary of submissions and responses
 Leppington Stages 2 and 5 – Finalisation Report – May 2019

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			5. Concerned that ILP and zoning plan do not contain areas for protection and conservation of Aboriginal cultural heritage. Five areas with moderate to high archaeological significance not specifically incorporated into precinct planning. 6. Aboriginal Community Consultation raised concerns with protection of Aboriginal cultural heritage sites. 7. DCP identifies areas of archaeological sensitivity in riparian corridors, where significant stormwater infrastructure will be located. Location and design of such infrastructure should be modified to avoid impact and test excavation undertaken.	5 (Leppington specific maps and controls) will contain a map titled 'Aboriginal cultural heritage sites' which gives a broad area around each creek corridor where areas of high and medium sensitivity could be impacted. The controls and maps plus the development application process through Council to enable subdivision/works will trigger further investigations and provide protection to any Aboriginal cultural heritage.
		Flood risk management	8. The Leppington Precinct Flood Assessment was completed prior to the completion of the Flood Study for the flood scenario prepared as part of the Upper South Creek Floodplain Risk Management Plan. Recommended that the flood assessment is included in the main Water Cycle Management report and the flood planning area, hydraulic and hazard categories maps are replaced with the latest version.	Noted. Additional work undertaken to model stormwater and detention systems has been undertaken.
Roads and Maritime Services	115909	General	1. Roads and Maritime Services (RMS) have reviewed the Plan and raise no objection however, issues raised as below.	Noted.
		Traffic Signals	2. Transport and Access Strategy concludes on p56 that 'signalisation for the intersections of Rickard Rd/Ingleburn Rd and Rickard/Heath Rd' on the basis that traffic volumes in 2036 are forecast to exceed the minimum RMS signal warrant requirements in the weekday PM peak period. Warrant requirements are outlined in RMS Traffic Signal Design Guide and apply to brownfield sites, no warrant criteria exists for green field sites. 3. Current position of RMS is signals will be approved within greenfield sites if satisfactory evidence in form of traffic analysis submitted demonstrating signal warrant (Traffic Signal Design Guide) is met within medium term (10 yrs). 4. Recommend Council, Urban Growth NSW and RMS work in close partnership in early phase of land release to identify intersection where traffic signals may be warranted in medium term and future proofing intersections identified for long term (15-20 yrs). Once identified then intersections should be incorporated into DCP.	Noted.
		Noise Attenuation	5. Camden Valley Way is principal road and will carry additional vehicles including residential, industrial and employment lands. It is responsibility of developers to provide noise attenuation treatments to comply with RMS noise criteria. 6. RMS does not favour noise walls as undesirable urban design outcome and pose ongoing maintenance. 7. RMS favours architectural treatments, setbacks and noise mounds to comply with noise criteria. These should be identified in DCP.	Appropriate noise treatments contained in Camden Growth Centre Precincts Development Control Plan.
		Infrastructure Delivery Program	8. Notes draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies RMS as provider of certain roads within precinct however RMS advises these roads are not state roads and there is no agreement in place for RMS to deliver roads. 9. Recommends Council TfNSW, RMS and UrbanGrowth NSW work collaboratively to establish way forward in delivering roads.	Noted. Review of infrastructure provision will be ongoing throughout the development rollout of the Precinct.
		Camden Valley Way	10. All vehicular access to precinct via Camden Valley Way should be in accordance with the approved Review of Environmental Factors for upgrade of road as exhibited.	Noted.
Sydney Water	115843	General	1. Supports development of staged zoning that aligns to infrastructure investment but raises issues (below). 2. Would like to be advised on likely timing of further rezoning so that they may make future plans.	Noted.

Appendix B – Summary of submissions and responses
Leppington Stages 2 and 5 – Finalisation Report – May 2019

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
		Infrastructure Servicing	<p>Stormwater and Water Cycle Management</p> <p>3. Leppington Precinct South West Growth Centre Water Cycle Management Strategy July 2014 misses opportunity to develop:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated water cycle strategy • Trunk drainage corridor that facilitates restoration and rehabilitation of a continuous creek and floodplain system <p>4. Any adopted strategy must make clear distinction and either be 'at source' (lot and street scale facilities) or 'end of pipe' (precinct scale facilities)-a hybrid mix is not supported.</p> <p>5. Use of creek corridor as part of water quality treatment system, installing bio retention beds and embankments sacrifices opportunity to achieve quality creek improvements.</p> <p>6. Should promote 'at source' facilities.</p> <p>7. Flood management targets have been set without overarching regional western Sydney strategy which could cause cumulative flood impacts downstream.</p> <p>8. Strategy provided mixed messages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • promoting infiltration but expressing concerns on consequences re salinity management • inconsistencies in percentage size of 'rain garden' base areas 	Noted.
		Infrastructure and Servicing	<p>Leppington Reservoir</p> <p>9. Under South West Growth Centre 2nd Release Precincts Water Strategy have identified new 50ML reservoir may be required in future at existing reservoir and SP2 zoning should be applied so it is "System Land".</p>	SP2 zone currently applies to Leppington Reservoir.
Transport for NSW	115917	General	1. Provide support for the plan but raises issues as below.	Noted.
		Delivery of Roads	2. Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan identifies RMS as provider of several roads. TfNSW advises that these are not state roads and there is no formal agreement with RMS to deliver roads.	Noted.
		Bus Capable Roads	<p>3. All bus capable roadways need to adhere to the Austroads Design Guidelines.</p> <p>4. Eastwood Rd and Rickard Rd are proposed as bus capable with adequate widths and design, but Dickson Rd is proposed as two lane sub arterial road with one travel lane in each direction and has been identified in Transport and Access Strategy as potentially accommodating a Leppington to Oran Park bus route. To accommodate bus route and facilitate other traffic it is recommended to be a four lane sub-arterial road.</p> <p>5. <i>Austroads Guide to Road Design part 3: Geometric Design</i> recommends general traffic lane widths of 3.5m. TfNSW supports all bus roads in precinct have at least a 3m width in the parking lane for other vehicles to pass or overtake, without either vehicle having to move sideways towards the outer edge of lane.</p> <p>6. Any roundabout on bus capable lane should be designed with a swept path to accommodate a turning circle for a 14.5m rigid non-rear steer bus. Intersections on bus capable roads should also be capable of accepting a swept path of a 14.5m rigid non-rear steer bus.</p> <p>7. As indicated on previous advice TfNSW has concerns with the location of 2 school sites-Heath Rd near intersection of Heath and Eastwood Rds and the site within block bounded by Heath Rd, Camden Valley Way, Rickard Rd and St Andrews Rd as neither of these sites are located on roads planned to accommodate regular bus services.</p> <p>8. TfNSW request consideration be given to relocating the school sites so they share a boundary with a road planned for regular bus services.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Can form part of any detailed road design.</p> <p>Noted. Can form part of any detailed road design.</p> <p>The school site in Stage 2 of the Precinct is located in close proximity to Rickard Road which is planned to cater for bus-services.</p>
		Active Transport Accessibility	<p>9. TfNSW supports the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision for bicycle rider to cross main creeks • Referencing the cycling aspects to Austroads Guides • Development of Green Travel Plans for activity centres in precinct. 	Noted.
TransGrid	112537	General	<p>1. Plans of TransGrid's easement that traverses the precinct attached.</p> <p>2. Note majority of land over which easement situated is proposed to be zoned low density residential and TransGrid infrastructure can be situated in any land use zone in accordance with Planning Practice Note (PN 10-001), and therefore TransGrid has no objection to draft Plan but raises issues as per below.</p> <p>3. Residential subdivided lots will not be permitted on the transmission line easement.</p>	The proposed easement is located in Stages 2 and 5 of the Precinct. Clarification was sought from TransGrid on the proposed zoning of Stages 2 and 5 of the Precinct before gazettal occurred. TransGrid raised no further objections with the proposed zoning. Other identified concerns can be addressed during the development application stage.

Appendix B – Summary of submissions and responses
Leppington Stages 2 and 5 – Finalisation Report – May 2019

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
			<p>4. Attached <i>TransGrid Guidelines for Easement Activities and Restrictions</i>. Guidelines not exhaustive and therefore TransGrid should be consulted for any development proposed near our easements and/or infrastructure and is subject to TransGrid prior written approval.</p> <p>5. Development approval must comply with regulation 45 of <i>SEPP (Infrastructure) 2007</i>.</p>	

Appendix B – Summary of submissions and responses
Leppington Stages 2 and 5 – Finalisation Report – May 2019

LANDHOLDER COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

Name	Sub ID	Category	Issue	Response
Name Withheld Leppington	116106	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
Name Withheld Leppington	116108	Staged Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to staged rezoning. 2. Wishes to know if Heath Road will be 2 or 4 lane road. 	Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
Michael Camilleri Catherine Field NSW 50 & 51 (1203) Camden Valley Way, Leppington	114763	General	Supports the broader Precinct Plan and critical infrastructure support it provides for development in SW area.	Noted.
		Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objects to Lot 50 nominated for Open Space as impacts on future use of the land to point where site cannot be used for what it was purchased for. 2. Purchased property with intention that it would house one of the children in future. 3. This open space in addition to land acquired by RMS in 2012 for turning bay for St Andrews Rd extension. 4. Questions location and topography of land allocation for open space being safest and most efficient use of land when it would be more appropriate residential land as park lands are usually low lying areas inappropriate for other uses, but this lot is elevated. Also close to two main roadways and busy intersection. Believes location on busy roadway is unsafe and suggests residential is more appropriate. 	<p>St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed and was addressed in the Stage 1 Finalisation Report. The location of planned open space will ensure that all residents will have a park within walking distance of their home. Open space is an essential part of every community and is located strategically to achieve equitable access to all residents.</p>
		Land Acquisition	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned will not be awarded fair market value for the area and seeks written confirmation of the process to be used for compensation. Cites examples of court proceedings they have had with RMS over compensation for acquired land. Believes land unfairly devalued. 2. States further disadvantage by not sharing in the appreciated value that the open space will benefit other owners. 	<p>The acquisition of land is undertaken in accordance with the Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991 (the Act). Most privately-owned land, required by government for public purposes, is acquired by negotiation and agreement between the landholder and the acquiring authority.</p> <p>When an acquiring authority and a landholder are unable to negotiate the purchase of the land, an acquiring authority can compulsorily acquire the land for a public purpose.</p> <p>The Valuer General is required under the Act to determine the amount of compensation to be paid by the acquiring authority to the former landholder. Provision is also made for owner-initiated acquisitions in cases of hardship.</p>
Name Withheld Leppington NSW	112641	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
Helen & Stan Ditrich 36 Woolgen Park Rd Leppington	115827	Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Draft Plan Map shows a proposed St Andrews Rd extension to Woolgen Park Rd going through family home. 2. Strongly object with plan. 3. Don't believe people who drafted plan up visited the property or they would have seen devastating impact on the occupying family, its businesses, as well as environment. 4. Points out house features and surrounds in mud map. 5. Historical account of family and their story and how the property developed-with several photographs. 6. Acknowledge additional roads required to cater for the population explosion expected but submit that consideration be given to long term residents. They were the first buyers in their road. 7. Farm mentioned in local history book, excerpt included. 8. Chicken business they have built up on property is their livelihood and they are the number 1 or 2 grower with the company they have contract with. 9. Currently 5 businesses operating from the property and they work for charitable organisations from the premises-list given. 10. Always viewed themselves as caretakers and feel close connection to nature and look after environment. List things they have done. 11. Property is seasonal home for native and introduced wildlife, listed in submission with photographs. 12. Support animal welfare. 	St Andrews Road upgrade and extension is no longer proposed and was addressed in the Stage 1 Finalisation Report.

Appendix B – Summary of submissions and responses
Leppington Stages 2 and 5 – Finalisation Report – May 2019

			<p>13. Suggest alternatives to proposed plan as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cancel extension of St Andrews Rd completely as Park Rd and George Rd will connect proposed Rickard Rd and will adequately service the area. • Change alignment and curvature of St Andrews Rd extension through our property so it completely avoids house and swimming pool area. • Have no objection to road passing through greenhouse. • Object to it going through machinery shed, garage and workshop. • Object to road going through house and gardens. <p>14. Mud map of alternatives suggested included. Request further consultation process happen with their family to create win: win scenario.</p>	
Raju Dommaraju 83 Ridge Square, Leppington NSW	114732	Staged Rezoning	<p>1. Surprised and disappointed by rezoning staging due to following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Huge differences in land values across sub precincts • Drop in land value in stages 2-5 • Uneven development of suburb • Underutilisation of investment in SW rail link and other infrastructure • Lost opportunity for individual owners in stage 2-4 to make further investment in subdivision and home building. • Lost opportunity for private companies' larger investment in development of whole suburb. • Lost opportunity for job creation and tax collection. • Lost opportunities for affordable housing supply. <p>2. Requests accelerate provision essential services for whole suburb and rezone in one stage.</p>	Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
Donald Kennedy 14 Dwyer Rd Leppington NSW 2179	112961	Staging of Rezoning	<p>1. Concerns about staging of rezoning.</p> <p>2. Request that entire precinct released with a publicised time frame with committed dates for each 5 stages or rezone at same time.</p> <p>3. Believes opens up owners being manipulated and defrauded by unscrupulous dealers who will see as opportunity to frighten people into selling under true value.</p> <p>4. Believes it to be the responsibility of the Department to protect the rights of owners.</p> <p>5. Rate relief is easily fixed by Council only charging new land rates on properties sold for development, leaving people who stay on their land paying normal rates.</p>	Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
Yan Jun Li 74 Woolgen Park Road, Leppington	112790	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
Name Withheld Leppington	116130	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
Anna & Ferdinando Mazzaferro 46 Hulls Road, Leppington NSW	115887	Staged Rezoning	Objects to staged rezoning.	Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
Viet Ngyuen 125 Heath Road, Leppington	116458	Heritage Listing	<p>1. Property should not be listed under Plan as a heritage item.</p> <p>2. Reasons based on report by Rappoport P/L</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Primary heritage significance of property to be severely compromised by imminent demolition of all auxiliary buildings • Fragmented site comprised of cottage, pond and redundant driveway will not communicate heritage values. • Slated demolition and irrevocable loss of heritage values on property will render site unworthy of listing. <p>3. Has attached:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Heritage Assessment by Rappoport P/L • Structural Report by D& M Consulting • Photos in support 	The site is located in Stage 2 of the Precinct. It is proposed to be listed as a heritage item under the SEPP. Following the receipt of the landowner's submission, a review of the original report and the landholder's heritage report was undertaken. Further detail can be found in Section 4.7 of the Finalisation Report.

Appendix B – Summary of submissions and responses
Leppington Stages 2 and 5 – Finalisation Report – May 2019

Pascoe Planning Solutions on behalf of Name Withheld Leppington	116156	Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Clients withheld property investments and improvements waiting for rezoning. 2. Now in Stage 2. 3. Acknowledged land can't be serviced at outset however considers market forces will reflect the same should Precinct be zoned as one entity. 	Land is proposed to be rezoned. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
		Land Rates and Staged Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Cited concerns around increased land rates until land disposed of or developed. Concern fails to acknowledge 'relief' available pursuant ch.15,p.8,div.2 LG&A Act s.558-599. 5. Concern with potential negative impacts of increased land values and commensurate rates payable should not be cited as reason to stage rezoning. 6. Given this and absence of any substantive reason for staging of rezoning requests review of staged rezoning and rezone whole precinct. 	Land is proposed to be rezoned. Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
Pascoe Planning Solutions on behalf of Name Withheld Leppington	116152	Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ILP identified subject site largely for parkland. 2. Predicted on existing vegetation of variable quality and potentially inconsistent ecological reporting. 3. Optimum urban outcomes not reflected in ILP. 4. Land currently zoned RU4, 2 ha minimum lot size. 5. Proposed zoning discriminates against the reasonable future urban expectation of client. 6. Land not subject to any prime order constraints which would mitigate residential purposes. See Annexure C. 7. Subject land not identified on fig.5.4 TSC Act vegetation community classification. 8. Veracity of 'Additional High Conservation Value Vegetation' in fig.5 of field validated Vegetation Biodiversity and Riparian Studies by EcoLogical is challenged. 9. Vegetation is not of such significance to require retention in parkland reserve only part of it. 10. View reinforced in field investigation and report prepared by ACS Environmental PL in Annexure E. Fig 1 highlights lack of veg, African Olive infestation and lack of understorey. 11. Better quality vegetation extends onto adjacent properties N and S, see Annexure E. 12. Suggests amendment to zoning Annexure D to R2 zoning and capitalise on high amenity open space setting while providing passive surveillance and ownership. 13. As minimum open space should be reconfigured minimising impact on client's property and additional residential opportunities as in Annexure D. Open space area remain the same size but address prevailing vegetation qualities and urban design objectives as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Realign roads for flexibility of subdivision design and conservation Cumberland Plain Woodland (CPW). • Consultants mapped CPW conservation maximised. • Reconfigure open space to provide maximum conservation area, recreation areas and same open space in ILP. • Facilitate stormwater management through open space and road network. • Remove road crossing under electricity easement consistent with cl.2.38 Camden Growth Centres DCP. • Bushfire risk managed through design and ongoing management. 	Provision of open space seek to balance the provision of good quality useable open space in accessible locations with ensuring the cost of its provision does not result in excessive contribution rates. Refer to Section 4.2 of the Finalisation Report.
		Staging of Rezoning and Land Rates	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 14. Object to proposed staging as in stage 5. 15. Concern with potential negative impacts of increased land values and commensurate rates payable should not be cited as reason to stage rezoning. 16. Cited concerns around increased land rates until land disposed of or developed. Concern fails to acknowledge 'relief' available pursuant ch.15,p.8,div.2 LG&A Act s.558-599. 	Refer to Section 4.4 in the Finalisation Report which discusses staging.
		Compensation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 17. Requests that the Department ensure appropriate mechanisms in place to address monetary compensation for land and paid in timely manner. Department expected to find solution to impasse with Camden Council for open space provision/funding/compensation upfront. 	Council will acquire land identified for a public purpose at the time it is required.
		Mapped Provisions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 18. Requests following amendments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height of Buildings be 9m • Residential Density be 15 dwellings per ha 	<p>Housing typologies and associated development controls are based on the Housing Analysis.</p> <p>Provision of open space seek to balance the provision of good quality useable open space in accessible locations with ensuring</p>

Appendix B – Summary of submissions and responses
Leppington Stages 2 and 5 – Finalisation Report – May 2019

			19. Delete proposed acquisition of component of land proposed for residential development in this submission which is proposed RE1.	the cost of its provision does not result in excessive contribution rates. Refer to Section 4.2 of Finalisation Report.
Name withheld Blacktown	115903	Drainage	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Trunk drainage running through property as per table 5.9 p47 Water Cycle Mgt Strategy, row B9-Western tributary applies to drainage swale on property. 2. 25m would be needed for swale width and substantial amount of land will be denied its development potential. 3. Does channel flow path meet definition of 'watercourse'? 4. Request drainage swale relocated close to northern periphery of property and a local road built on the site of the drainage channel. 5. Request swale reduced in size like in Austral and Leppington North precincts. 6. In ILP triangular part of land to NW of proposed drainage channel cannot be developed to full potential and suggest exploring ways to do so and incorporate with rest of property. Maximum development should be allowed on property due to close proximity amenities. 	The sizing and location of drainage infrastructure are based upon a hydrological assessment. Any change would need to be based upon detailed investigations at the development application stage.
		Roads	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Road along SE of drainage swale occupies excessive amount of land limiting land for development. 8. Local road layout should not restrict development and limit density so some should be moved to prevent creation of narrow parcels which make it difficult to subdivide without amalgamation. 9. Request road SE of drainage swale removed altogether. 	The proposed road layout may be able to be incorporated into the subdivision design at the development stage. As local roads are not zoned as SP2 the final location may be altered following design investigations, at the development application stage.
		Contamination	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Land is identified as high risk contamination - see p.18 of Preliminary Environmental Site Assessment. Could you provide an explanation? 11. Request further field work done to verify contamination as land currently used to grow fruit and veg and not known to have intensive agriculture use. 	Further field work is required at development stage due to previous land use history as identified in the Land Capability and Salinity Study for the Leppington Precinct. Further detail on reason for high risk ranking available in that Study.
Boris Tintner 69 Heath Rd Leppington NSW 2179	115200	Rezoning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Land zoned for low density housing has been reduced and may no longer be attractive to developers. 2. May be stuck with it and the increased rates it attracts. 3. Land zoned E4 may similarly leave us unable to subdivide as two dwellings on it are not situated to fit subdivision. 4. Concerned about possible rate increases that as retirees may not be able to sustain and could be forced out of home. 5. Accept that Scalabrini Creek flows through our property so will impact on zoning and also believe several decisions made during drafting of Plan have compounded the effect of the topographical features on the rezoning. 6. Believe need for exaggerated area of RE1 land on property has been created by other decisions which were dubious necessity. 7. Decision to run drainage canal down our side of the boundary from the top of our block to the creek may look ok on paper but would run or not run against the topography. 8. Boundary fence actually runs along shallow rounded ridge with streams of flood water presently running down both sides of this. Both of your flood maps suggest that the greater flow moves through our neighbours-so why choose our side? 9. Issue is what would this RE1 land achieve? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is a drainage basin needed to slow 100 year flood? No-your own maps indicating drainage basins does not include it. • 50% seen as flood prone-ness in 100 year flood and accept this but Euclidian solution of running a straight line boundary across at right angles from our boundary means that hillside included that only carries rainfall from the hillside above. • Passive recreation area? Doesn't believe anybody would use such a small area when in close proximity to oval. • As sanctuary for flora and fauna? Presently vegetable patch surrounded by grasses and no native flora present. 10. Has been repeatedly told by Council reps that it was Councils interest to zone maximum land for development so shouldn't worry-but did not mention inflated percentage of recreational land. 11. Objects to straight line demarcation of zone to maximise RE1 land where as properties on either side and elsewhere zone boundaries follow natural landscape. 12. E4 zoning on other side of creek may prove counterproductive as may force targeting of larger native trees for removal to achieve larger block sizes. Larger minimum block sizes= less room to manoeuvre and run against concept E4. 	<p>The E4 zoning has been used for flood affected land and to accommodate APZs. The remainder of the site is drainage as identified in the Water Cycle Management Strategy which reflects the constraints present on the site.</p> <p>The location of planned open space will ensure that all residents will have a park within walking distance of their home. Open space is an essential part of every community and is located strategically to achieve equitable access to all residents.</p>